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Introduction and Required Components in Support of Self-Evaluation

College History

East Los Angeles Junior College was established in June 1945 by the Los Angeles City Board of Education. The College opened its doors in September 1945 as a wing of Garfield High School, boasting 19 faculty members and 380 students, most of whom were World War II veterans.

The College quickly outgrew the borrowed high school facilities. In 1947, the Board of Education was able to purchase 82 acres of agricultural land with funding from a bond issue. Two years later, in January 1949, classes began at the College’s present location in wooden bungalows moved to the campus from the Santa Ana Army Base. More than nineteen hundred students enrolled that year.

An evening program that began in 1947 was expanded to many locations. By 1954, the popular program offered classes at 25 different sites. The Civic Center program alone enrolled 1,927 students that year.

A name change was proposed in 1948. Angeles Bella Vista College, Ramona Hills College and Hillview College were considered. The following year “Junior” was dropped and the name East Los Angeles College (ELAC) was firmly established.

Permanent buildings were constructed to accommodate growing enrollment. In 1951 the stadium and auditorium were built. More classrooms, an administration building, library, planetarium, men’s and women’s gyms, a swim stadium, theater, and art gallery followed.

The same year, 1951, ELAC began a relationship with noted actor, collector and one of Los Angeles’s great champions of the arts, Vincent Price. This relationship has grown into the establishment of the Vincent Price Art Museum (VPAM), the largest art museum associated with a community college. Currently, the museum houses over 9,000 objects of art, has held over 100 art exhibits, and continues to carry out Price’s vision for a “teaching art collection.”

During the 1960s and 1970s, buildings to house the nursing program, a new library, and the automobile technology center were added to the campus. Many of the original bungalows were still used as classrooms until 2007, when they were finally demolished to make way for new campus structures.

In 1969 the California State Legislature clearly defined higher education in the state and separated the (then) eight community colleges from the Los Angeles Unified School District and formed the Los Angeles Community College District. A seven-member Board of Trustees was elected to govern the new district. The ELAC service area was defined to include the communities of Alhambra, Bell, Bell Gardens, City of Commerce, Cudahy, East Los Angeles, Huntington Park, Los Angeles, Maywood, Montebello, Monterey Park, Rosemead, San Gabriel,
South San Gabriel, South Gate and Vernon.

In 1972 the City of Monterey Park annexed the College and surrounding neighborhood, officially changing the main campus address. ELAC began growing, adding faculty members, programs and classes as demand for higher education increased.

ELAC hosted swimming and field hockey events during the 1984 Olympics, welcoming thousands of spectators to campus and increasing the international visibility of the College. Despite funding challenges that limited growth during the 1980s, ELAC continued to offer a variety of vocational and transfer programs.

During the 1990s ELAC experienced unprecedented changes. Enrollment grew from 13,000 to approximately 30,000 students and the number of permanent faculty almost doubled. Outreach programs were located throughout the service area for the convenience of students who could not easily travel to the main campus. The full-service South Gate Educational Center was established in the southern part of the service area so students could complete a transfer program and several career programs without attending the main campus.

The face of ELAC continues to change with several large scale construction projects that are transforming the campus. The adoption of Proposition J in fall 2008 secured $3.5 billion dollars for LACCD, of which $666 million was targeted for ELAC’s main campus. This funding stream was added to previously adopted Propositions A and AA, allowing ELAC to substantially improve the College’s infrastructure. An additional $220 million from Measure J was allocated to build a permanent location near South Gate/Firestone.

**Major Developments since Previous Visit**

Notable changes since the previous accreditation visit of 2009 include the physical enhancement of the campus, a heightened focus on student support and student services, and numerous personnel changes, including two interim presidents prior to the appointment of Marvin Martinez as president in 2013.

Campus renovations include the Helen Miller Bailey Library, a refurbished stadium, a new baseball diamond, the Administration Building, Student Services Building, two parking structures, a Social Sciences classroom building and a Visual and Performing Arts Complex that houses the Vincent Price Art Museum as well as theaters, labs, classrooms and studios for the art, music, dance and theater programs.

The campus is currently engaged in three additional large-scale building projects in the center of the campus: a Student Success and Retention Center for the language arts and humanities disciplines, a Campus Student Center, and a Science Career and Mathematics Complex.

Enrollment growth during the first decade of the 21st century was matched by an increased
emphasis on student-centered education and support services that promote student success, improve transfer rates, and increase the numbers of degrees and certificates awarded. Spurred by recommendations from California Community Colleges’ Task Force on Student Success and the passage of Senate Bill 1456 (SB 1456) in 2012, these efforts have expanded.

In particular, as a result of SB 1456, ELAC has initiated the A + O + C = Success campaign. This Assessment, Orientation and Counseling effort has been directed toward feeder high schools to recruit and matriculate seniors during the spring semester to make them eligible for priority enrollment. Another program, GO East LA, short for Greater Outcomes for East Los Angeles, is building a college and career pathway for elementary, middle, and high school students by increasing awareness, preparation, retention, completion and transfer in the community.

ELAC is engaged in several other developments in curriculum and instruction. Creation of new cohort programs include the Adelante First Year Experience and the John Delloro programs, which complement the existing Escalante, MESA and Puente efforts. Eighteen new Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADT) have been approved by the state and provide guaranteed admission and a streamlined pathway to earn a bachelor’s degree for students at a California State University. Highlights of academic achievement in the past year include the awarding of the Jack Kent Cooke Scholarship to ELAC student, Eric Huyn (the seventh time an ELAC student has been awarded this prestigious national honor); participation by four students in NASA’s Jet Propulsion Laboratory Student Independent Research Internship (SIRI); and a national title for the Speech Team at the Phi Pho Pi tournament for community colleges in Cleveland, Ohio.

Under the leadership of interim president Farley Herzek and current president Marvin Martinez, several task forces have been created to bring the campus together to analyze an issue, look at data, consider best practices and brainstorm solutions. These task forces focused on the First Year Experience, Transfer, the South Gate Educational Facility, Student Equity, and Adult Education. Recommendations from these task forces are being incorporated into existing planning and budgeting efforts, including ELAC’s participation in Achieving the Dream.

As ELAC celebrates seventy years of transforming lives, it is proud of its reputation in the community and its ability for students to “Start at ELAC, . . . Go Anywhere.” The campus community looks forward to its Diamond Jubilee in 2020, and many upcoming opportunities to help students achieve their educational goals, expand their individual potential, and successfully pursue their aspirations.

**Student Enrollment and Demographic Data**

ELAC has the largest student enrollment in the LACCD, with more than 26,000 credit students enrolled each fall at the main campus, the South Gate Educational Center, offsite locations (including high schools and community agencies), and through online/hybrid modalities.
In addition, ELAC contracts with the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department and local fire departments to provide in-service training for their employees. The Public Service Academy (PSA) program augments the College’s enrollment and provides a vital service to the community. For the last five fall semesters, ELAC has enrolled more than 37,000 unduplicated students in its credit, noncredit, and PSA programs. Its credit enrollment has remained relatively steady over the last five years, but enrollment in the PSA program, which is dependent on funding from the county and city agencies, has varied tremendously, peaking in 2012 and decreasing to its lowest level over the past five years in fall 2014.
After three years of lower results, the FTES generated by the College grew in 2014-15, with a 6.3 percent increase over the prior year. FTES increased in all three categories: credit, noncredit regular, and noncredit enhanced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTES Type</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>22,427</td>
<td>22,956</td>
<td>20,787</td>
<td>20,715</td>
<td>21,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit Regular</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit Enhanced</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL COLLEGE</td>
<td>24,061</td>
<td>24,591</td>
<td>21,923</td>
<td>21,963</td>
<td>23,345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ELAC offers numerous programs for students that provide additional support and monitoring. These include DSP&S, EOPS, and programs for international students, foster youth, and veterans. Enrollments in EOPS decreased dramatically in fall 2014 due to cutbacks in available funding while enrollments by foster youth, with the support of the state, have increased significantly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Programs</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% of College</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% of College</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSP&amp;S</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOPS</td>
<td>1,864</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>2,228</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>2,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>1058</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1102</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Youth*</td>
<td>1058</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1102</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data not available for Fall 2010 and Fall 2011.

In fall 2014, female students accounted for 58 percent of the credit student population. At the South Gate Education Center, at the offsite locations, and in online/hybrid classes, more than 66 percent of the students in fall 2014 were female. The distribution has remained relatively consistent over the last five years.
ELAC is a Hispanic Serving Institution, with more than 75 percent of its credit students of Hispanic/Latino background. Asian/Pacific Islander students make up the next largest ethnic group with 15 percent of the student population. All other groups account for less than 5 percent of the student body. The distribution has remained relatively consistent over the last five years.
For the last 15 years, approximately 64 percent of the ELAC students have been less than 25 years old. The distribution has remained relatively consistent over the last five years.

Differences in student demographics exist across the different locations and modalities, most notably in terms of the greater proportion of men and Asian/Pacific Islander students attending classes at the main campus. A larger proportion of the student population offsite and at South Gate is Latino. Finally, not surprisingly, the proportion of offsite classes, which are mostly conducted at local high schools, are under age 20.
Hispanic/Latino | 77.4% | 91.3% | 93.4% | 71.3%
Multi-Ethnic  | 1.9%  | 0.8%  | 0.6%  | 2.6%
Native American | 0.2% | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.2%
Unknown       | 2.0%  | 0.9%  | 3.8%  | 2.2%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Under 20     | 15.7%  | 16.9%  | 85.8%  | 7.6%
| 20-24        | 47.3%  | 50.7%  | 1.6%   | 43.6%
| 25-39        | 29.3%  | 28.0%  | 4.2%   | 39.8%
| Older than 40| 7.7%   | 4.4%   | 8.4%   | 9.0%

Approximately 35 percent of ELAC students receive financial aid, which includes Pell Grants as well as Board of Governor (BOG) waivers. The proportion of students receiving financial aid has decreased somewhat in the last two years, likely as the result of changes to the maximum number of semesters of eligibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Aid</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10,114</td>
<td>11,759</td>
<td>11,322</td>
<td>10,442</td>
<td>9,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17,193</td>
<td>16,680</td>
<td>15,576</td>
<td>16,186</td>
<td>17,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL COLLEGE</td>
<td>27,307</td>
<td>28,439</td>
<td>26,898</td>
<td>26,628</td>
<td>27,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty and Staff Demographic Data**

The number of academic employees has increased by 6.6 percent over the past five years. Among the academic positions at the College, the proportion of adjunct faculty has been reduced slightly, compared to five years ago, due to a large number of full-time hires that have been made to keep the College in compliance with the state-mandated Faculty Obligation Number (FON) requirements. These include Specially Funded Program (SFP) employees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Employees</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Administrator</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>1087</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ethnic distribution of the academic employees has changed over the past few years, largely as the result of a greater number of employees choosing a listed ethnicity of “Unknown.” All
other ethnicities have declined during this five-year period while the proportion of individuals in the “Unknown” category doubled from 16 percent to 32 percent. At the same time, extremely few individuals (only 2 percent) have chosen to indicate “Multi-Ethnic” as their chosen ethnicity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Employee Ethnicity</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Ethnic</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of classified staff and managers has increased by 11.7 percent over the last five years. As with the academic employees, the ethnic distribution of the classified workforces has changed as a result of more employees being listed with an ethnicity of “Unknown.”
Service Area Demographics

ELAC’s service area covers 24 zip codes.

![Map of ELAC service area]

The White, Hispanic group was the largest group in the ELAC service area in 2014. The ratio of females and males was evenly distributed. Projected growth by age group is expected to be largest in the population between 20 and 29 and older than 60.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>2014 Population</th>
<th>2021 Population</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>2014 % of Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White, Hispanic</td>
<td>820,841</td>
<td>856,677</td>
<td>35,836</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>169,206</td>
<td>179,102</td>
<td>9,896</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>40,284</td>
<td>38,594</td>
<td>(1,690)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>27,359</td>
<td>26,751</td>
<td>(608)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native, Hispanic</td>
<td>17,505</td>
<td>19,885</td>
<td>2,380</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races, Hispanic</td>
<td>12,214</td>
<td>14,483</td>
<td>2,269</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, Hispanic</td>
<td>7,194</td>
<td>8,094</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>4,715</td>
<td>5,175</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Hispanic</td>
<td>3,775</td>
<td>4,344</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In ELAC’s service area, “Personal Care Aides” was ranked as the fastest growing occupation, with a 77 percent expected increase. The category of “Laborers and Freight, Stock, and Material Movers” was ranked as the largest occupation. The College’s new Technology & Logistics program prepares students for this large employment market.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Care Aides</td>
<td>3,568</td>
<td>6,327</td>
<td>2,758</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>$10.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Food Preparation and Serving Workers, Including Fast Food</td>
<td>7,639</td>
<td>9,633</td>
<td>1,994</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>$9.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Salespersons</td>
<td>9,486</td>
<td>10,716</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>$11.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Health Aides</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>1,889</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>$11.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Representatives, Wholesale and Manufacturing, Except Technical and Scientific Products</td>
<td>7,139</td>
<td>7,959</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>$24.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashiers</td>
<td>8,979</td>
<td>9,785</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>$9.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Nurses</td>
<td>6,004</td>
<td>6,775</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>$45.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiters and Waitresses</td>
<td>4,403</td>
<td>5,114</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>$9.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers and Freight, Stock, and Material Movers, Hand</td>
<td>11,060</td>
<td>11,736</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>$11.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy and Tractor-Trailer Truck Drivers</td>
<td>5,687</td>
<td>6,303</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>$18.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laborers and Freight, Stock, and Material Movers, Hand</td>
<td>11,060</td>
<td>11,736</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>$11.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Salespersons</td>
<td>9,486</td>
<td>10,716</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>$11.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashiers</td>
<td>8,979</td>
<td>9,785</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>$9.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewing Machine Operators</td>
<td>7,650</td>
<td>5,629</td>
<td>(2,022)</td>
<td>(26%)</td>
<td>$9.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Food Preparation and Serving Workers, Including Fast Food</td>
<td>7,639</td>
<td>9,633</td>
<td>1,994</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>$9.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock Clerks and Order Fillers</td>
<td>7,335</td>
<td>7,742</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>$11.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Representatives, Wholesale and Manufacturing, Except Technical and Scientific Products</td>
<td>7,139</td>
<td>7,959</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>$24.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Clerks, General</td>
<td>6,581</td>
<td>6,912</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$14.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Nurses</td>
<td>6,004</td>
<td>6,775</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>$45.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General and Operations Managers</td>
<td>5,924</td>
<td>6,305</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>$51.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructional Locations**

East Los Angeles College has two sites at which students can earn 50 percent or more of a program, certificate or degree: the main campus and the ELAC South Gate Educational Center. The addresses are provided below.

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

ELAC South Gate Educational Center  
2340 Firestone Blvd.  
South Gate, CA  90280

**Specialized or Programmatic Accreditation**

Four academic programs at ELAC are accredited by specialized accrediting agencies.

The Health Information Technology associate degree program is accredited by the Commission on Accreditation for Health Information and Information Management Education (reaffirmed on September 8, 2015).

The Automobile Technology Department’s program is accredited by the National Automotive
Technicians Education Foundation (reaffirmed on May 4, 2015).

The Respiratory Therapy associate degree program is accredited by the Commission on Accreditation for Respiratory Care (reaffirmed on November 21, 2014).

The Associate Degree Nursing Program was placed on “Warning Status with Intent to Close” by the Board of Registered Nursing on September 3, 2015. It is required to submit quarterly progress reports to the Nursing Educational Consultant and return to the Education/Licensing Committee in August 2016.
Student Achievement Data and Institution-set Standards

At East Los Angeles College (ELAC), all college planning and evaluation is focused on student achievement as guided by the College mission and goals. These goals serve as broad objectives for all college planning activities and provide a foundation for building a true student success agenda. The student achievement data that follow are linked to the goal they most directly support and serve as evidence of the College’s ongoing efforts to strategically improve the College and ensure the success of its students.

Goal 1: Increasing student success and academic excellence through student-centered instruction, student-centered support services, and dynamic technologies.

Goal 2: Increasing equity in successful outcomes by analyzing gaps in student achievement and using this, to identify and implement effective models and programming to remedy these gaps.

Institution-set Standards

On March 1, 2013, the Accreditation Response Group proposed a set of six measures as the Institution-set Standards (ISS) for student achievement. These were subsequently approved by the Academic Senate and Shared Governance Council. The standards were set with the intention of monitoring academic quality and maintaining performance expectations. They are embedded into each of the College’s comprehensive planning processes—the Program Review Self-Evaluation (PRSE) and Annual Update Plans (AUP)—for ongoing evaluation. In addition, the Strategic Planning Committee and Educational Planning Subcommittee review the ISS and make recommendations for improvements. The six standards are summarized below, along with data from the past five fall semesters/years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall Course Success</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Course Retention</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall-to-Fall Persistence for First-Time Students</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Degrees Awarded</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>1,203</td>
<td>1,583</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Certificates Awarded</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>1,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Transfers to a UC or CSU</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>1,047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fall-to-Fall Persistence not available at the time of publication

The data show that the College is exceeding the ISS for success, retention, and persistence rates.
The largest increase was seen in the fall-to-fall persistence rates, which have been boosted by the existence of a number of programs that offer support services for new college students.

The College has substantially increased the number of the degrees, certificates, and transfers to the University of California and California State University systems over the five-year time span. In fact, the most recent academic year data show ELAC students earning 50 percent more degrees, 21 percent more certificates, and 29 percent more transfers than in 2010-11. Given these significant improvements, the College’s Strategic Planning Committee will revisit the ISS as part of its review of the Strategic Plan to determine whether new standards should be established. The College will continue to monitor student achievement on these measures and strive for continuous improvement.

Course Success
The College tracks success rates, which are measured by the proportion of A, B, C, and P grades divided by total grades awarded, and examines them by student demographics, location, and modality. Students have higher rates of successful course completion in offsite courses and the main campus than at the South Gate Education Center (SGEC). Online/hybrid courses have the lowest success rates, which is also below the set standard for the College. The Distance Education Coordinator and Committee have examined course success rates and determined that their success rate is greatly affected by the large number of students withdrawing from the class with a “W” grade. To address this, the Distance Education program has implemented a plan to increase success rates in all online/hybrid courses by holding professional development workshops for the faculty teaching these classes and providing additional support services for students that can be accessed without coming to campus.

Similar to the overall College, students across gender and ethnic groups perform better in offsite courses. Female students tend to be more successful than their male counterparts, regardless of location or method of instruction. For the College’s two largest ethnic groups, Asian/Pacific Islanders are outperforming their Hispanic/Latino counterparts at every location. These inequities are also manifested in the course success equity analyses, which, in addition, reveal inequities for African Americans and foster youth. To begin addressing some of the course success disparities, the College is implementing interventions through its Student Equity Plan.
### Fall 2014

#### Success Rates by Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>5-Year Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGEC</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsite</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online/Hybrid</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL COLLEGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>65.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>67.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>66.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>64.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>65.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>65.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Success Rates by Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Group</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>5-Year Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENDER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RACE/ETHNICITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Ethnic</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### AGE

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Success Rates by Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Group</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>5-Year Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older than 40</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fall 2014 Student Equity Data

**NOTE:** Red highlight indicates a significant equity gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Group</th>
<th>Course Completion Rate</th>
<th>Number of Enrollments</th>
<th>Course Completion Gap (from College Average)</th>
<th>Completions Lost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL COLLEGE</strong></td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>69,386</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENDER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>39,494</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>29,892</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
<td>(716.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RACE/ETHNICITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>-3.9%</td>
<td>(42.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>9,905</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>54,663</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
<td>(1,534.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Ethnic</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>1,249</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>14,582</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>33,816</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
<td>(664.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>17,072</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older than 40</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>3,916</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOSTER YOUTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>-13.5%</td>
<td>(73.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>68,844</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISABILITY STATUS (DSP&amp;S)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
<td>(31.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>67,456</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VETERAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>(9.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>68,382</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINANCIAL AID</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>38,267</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
<td>(756.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>31,119</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Fall 2014 Student Equity Data

**NOTE:** Red highlight indicates a significant equity gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Group</th>
<th>Course Completion Rate</th>
<th>Number of Enrollments</th>
<th>Course Completion Gap (from College Average)</th>
<th>Completions Lost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RACE/ETHNICITY - FEMALE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American-F</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>-3.8% (20.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander-F</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>5,170</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian-F</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino-F</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>31,798</td>
<td>-1.0% (302.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Ethnic-F</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American-F</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown-F</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RACE/ETHNICITY - MALE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American-M</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>-4.0% (21.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander-M</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>4,735</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian-M</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino-M</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>22,865</td>
<td>-5.4% (1,232.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Ethnic-M</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American-M</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown-M</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Course Retention**

The retention rate data, which are calculated by dividing the number of grades other than W by the total number of grades awarded, show that the overall College is currently meeting the ISS, and has met the ISS for the past five fall semesters. Only in one area, online/hybrid, did the College fall below the ISS. As discussed in the course success section, the Distance Education program is working with students and faculty to improve the retention rate.

Across demographic groups, females outperformed their male counterparts, although most gaps were less than two percentage points. Most ethnic groups, on average, earned retention rates above the overall college ISS, with the exception of online/hybrid courses. Similar to success rates, there were retention rate gaps between the College’s two largest ethnic groups, Hispanic/Latino and Asian/Pacific Islanders. On average, the largest gaps between these groups were in online/hybrid (7.7 point gap) and in the main campus (6.1 point gap) courses.
Fall 2014 Retention Rates by Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>5-Year Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGEC</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsite</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online/Hybrid</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL COLLEGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>86.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>86.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>85.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>83.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>84.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>85.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Retention Rates by Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Group</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>5-Year Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENDER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RACE/ETHNICITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Ethnic</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Retention Rates by Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Group</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>5-Year Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older than 40</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Awards: Associate Degrees and Certificates

At ELAC, the number of Associate Degrees and Certificates earned has increased over the past five academic years. Students at ELAC set a five-year high in 2014-15 earning 1,800 Associate Degrees and 1,241 Certificates of Achievement.
An analysis of the disaggregated data shows that female students are earning a majority of the Associate Degrees (AA/AS) and Certificates of Achievement (C) each year. About half of the AA/AS and C are earned by students ages 20-24. Hispanic/Latino students, the College’s largest ethnic group, earn a majority of the degrees and certificates followed by Asian/Pacific Islander students. Additionally, there is an increasing number of AA/AS and C being earned by students receiving BOG aid.
## Degrees and Certificates by Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Group</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AA/AS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>AA/AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Ethnic</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FINANCIAL AID

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Aid</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOGG Only</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PELL Only</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOGG+PELL</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VETERANS

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transfers

Between 2010-11 and 2014-15 more than 4,100 ELAC students transferred to a California State University (CSU) and nearly 1,100 transferred to the University of California (UC). CSU transfers have increased from year-to-year, with the exception of 2011-12 to 2012-13, where there was a decrease. The 2014-15 CSU transfers are at a five-year high of 1,025. A majority of these CSU transfers are to CSU Los Angeles, which is less than four miles from ELAC. Transfers to a UC reached a five-year high in 2013-14 with 247, followed by 2014-15 with 235 transfers.

The majority of the CSU transfers are Hispanic/Latino students while Asian/Pacific Islander students comprise the majority of UC transfers. The 2014-15 academic year also marked the five-year high for CSU transfers by Asian/Pacific Islander and Hispanic/Latino students.
California State University (CSU) Transfers by Academic Year and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Ethnic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Alien*</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall College</strong></td>
<td>774</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>1,025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CSU defined category

University of California (UC) Transfers by Academic Year and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall College</strong></td>
<td>201</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cohort Analysis

Student Success Scorecard Cohort
The scorecard data, which are produced by the California Community College Chancellor’s Office, show the College on a three-year increasing trend for the persistence, remedial math, and CTE completion measures. The completion rate has decreased over the past three academic years while remedial English and remedial ESL progress rates both dropped from 2007-2008 to 2008-2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cohort Size</td>
<td>Cohort Rate</td>
<td>Cohort Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>2,425</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>2,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>2,425</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>2,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Units</td>
<td>2,425</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>2,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial English</td>
<td>2,373</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>2,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Math</td>
<td>3,161</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>2,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial ESL</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Technical Education</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>1,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Development &amp; College Preparation</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>748</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ELAC Three-Year Pipeline Cohort Analysis
In addition to reviewing the data from the state’s Student Success Scorecard cohort, the College also analyzes the three-year progress of cohorts of entering students across multiple achievement milestones. These analyses allow the College to identify “leak points” in the pipeline and to target specific interventions based on the proportion of cohort students that reach, or fail to reach, a particular milestone. According to the pipeline analysis, approximately one in four students completes English or math competency (course required for the associate degree) within three years. Approximately one in five students completes both English and math competencies and only 7.4 percent of the cohort earns a certificate or degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELAC Three-Year Pipeline Cohorts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed 1st Semester Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall-to-Spring Persistence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall-to-Fall Persistence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Math Competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Transfer data for these cohorts not available at the time of publication*

Analyzing the most recent cohort data available by ethnicity shows that Hispanic/Latinos, the College’s largest ethnic group, are reaching milestones at a lower rate than their Asian/Pacific Islander counterparts, the second largest ethnic group. The greatest disparities between groups are in the attainment of English and math competency and therefore, not surprisingly, degree/certificate attainment. The College recognizes these equity gaps and, as mentioned previously, is seeking to address them through the activities identified in the College’s Student Equity Plan.
Goal 3: Sustaining community centered access, participation, and preparation that improves the college’s presence in the community, maximizes access to higher education and provides outlets for artistic, civic, cultural, scientific, and social expression as well as environmental awareness.

Assessment and Placement
The ELAC Assessment Center uses ACCUPLACER assessment instruments, supplemented by multiple measures, to determine student skill levels in English, mathematics, and reading. Accurate course placements enable students to successfully pass courses, and complete the required course sequences to meet their educational goals.

According to the data, a majority of ELAC students assess below transfer in English, mathematics, and reading. In English, over 85 percent of students over the past five academic years assessed below transfer level. Data from the most recent academic year, 2014-15, show improvement but a majority of ELAC students need to complete multiple English classes to earn an Associate Degree or to transfer.

In fall 2014, the Curriculum Committee removed English 26 (the course two levels below transfer) from the English course sequence, thereby shortening the number of courses students needed to reach transfer level. This aligned the College with the English course sequence across the district and will expedite student progression through the remedial pathway. This change explains the dramatic difference in distribution of those students placing two and three levels below transfer between 2013-14 and 2014-15. As part of this process, the English department realigned its curriculum to support students through the expedited sequence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Cohort Count</th>
<th>Completed First Semester Units</th>
<th>Fall-to-Spring Persist</th>
<th>Fall-to-Fall Persist</th>
<th>English Comp</th>
<th>Math Comp</th>
<th>English and Math Comp</th>
<th>On-campus Comp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>3,013</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Ethnic</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Cohort</td>
<td>3,719</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Math assessment placement data show that, on average, nine out of every ten ELAC students assesses below transfer level. In addition, nearly 60 percent of ELAC students have placed in courses 3 or more levels below transfer over the past five years. Approximately two out of three Hispanic/Latino students are placing three or more levels below transfer. Asian students tend to be more distributed across the categories, but are skewed toward the two highest levels. Similar to the English placements, male students, on average, place higher than female students. Approximately, one out of two male students places three or more levels below transfer compared to two out of three for female students.

The College recognizes its responsibility in making Math accessible to all students and ensuring they have the opportunity to succeed. To increase the number of students reaching transfer level Math, the College has implemented the Math Advancement Program (MAP), which allows students to complete two math courses in one semester, and the First Year Experience (FYE) program, which focuses on helping students reach college-level English and Math within their first year.

Overall, the placement data parallel the Chancellor’s Office Student Success Scorecard (SSS) data, which report 90 percent of the ELAC student cohort being “unprepared” for college. Given the recent changes to the course sequencing and the programs available to help students reach transfer level course, the College expects improvements in these outcomes in the coming years.
Goal 4: Ensuring institutional effectiveness and accountability through data-driven decision-making as well as evaluation and improvement of all college programs and governance structures.

Learning Outcomes Assessment
The College has made a concerted effort to ensure that all courses have Course Learning Outcomes (CLO) and that faculty conduct ongoing assessments of these outcomes. As of the end of the spring 2015 semester, 90 percent of course are assessing their outcomes on an ongoing basis. Data from the assessment of these CLOs show that students are not meeting the benchmarks for approximately 22 percent of CLOs.

When benchmarks are not met, disciplines have created course-level improvement plans to increase the number of students meeting the CLO benchmark and to remedy the assessment-based learning gaps. This includes, but is not limited to, integrated reading or math instruction, piloting of new pedagogical approaches, and contextualized in-the-field learning. Course-level improvement plans are implemented and evaluated as part of the College’s 3-year learning outcomes assessment cycle.

Currently, 18 percent of courses do not have benchmarks for CLO assessment. The Learning Assessment Coordinator advises faculty to complete an assessment cycle to gather sufficient data before establishing a data-driven CLO benchmark.
Program-set Standards
As part of the Program Review Self-Evaluation (PRSE) and Annual Update Plans (AUP), all departments established standards for each of their disciplines and programs (available on the OIEA website at http://www.elac.edu/facultyStaff/oie/annualupdates2016.htm). Program-set standards include in-course retention and success rates, and job placement and licensure rates, if applicable. These standards will be evaluated annually through PRSEs and AUPs.

Licensure and Job Placement Rates
Licensure exam data show that the College is currently meeting the ISS in Respiratory Therapy (CRT) and Emergency Medical Technician (EMT). Passage rates in Health Information Technology (HIT) are below the ISS, but have nearly doubled from 2012-13 to 2013-14 as part of a systematic effort to meet the standards of the American Health Information Management Association. The low nursing exam passage rate is also being addressed by the Nursing Department in accordance with the regulations set by the Board of Registered Nursing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>CIP Code 4 digits (###.##)</th>
<th>Examination</th>
<th>Institution set-standard (%)</th>
<th>2009-10 Pass Rate (%)</th>
<th>2010-11 Pass Rate (%)</th>
<th>2011-12 Pass Rate (%)</th>
<th>2012-13 Pass Rate (%)</th>
<th>2013-14 Pass Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>51.38</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respiratory Therapy (CRT)</td>
<td>51.08</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Information Technology (HIT)</td>
<td>62.07</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Technician (EMT)</td>
<td>51.09</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job placement rates, which are available for some programs through the Perkins CTE Core Indicator Reports, are difficult to obtain reliably. Over the past five academic years, the College’s Respiratory Therapy, Registered Nursing, and Health Information Technology programs graduates have obtained jobs at a rate above the ISS. The Real Estate Certificate placement rates have declined over the years, but this is likely due to the decline in the real estate industry in California and nationally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>CIP Code 4 digits (###.##)</th>
<th>Institution set-standard (%)</th>
<th>2009-10 Job Placement Rate (%)</th>
<th>2010-11 Job Placement Rate (%)</th>
<th>2011-12 Job Placement Rate (%)</th>
<th>2012-13 Job Placement Rate (%)</th>
<th>2013-14 Job Placement Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Certificate</td>
<td>05.11</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respiratory Therapy</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Nursing</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Information Technology</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Career Technical Education (CTE) (Perkins Core Indicators IV) Report Website
Organization of Self Evaluation Process

In many ways the process of accreditation has been ongoing since 2009. After ELAC’s previous visit, the Accreditation Response Group (ARG) was formed to address the six college and four district recommendations. The follow-up report was sent to ACCJC in spring 2010.

As part of a response to the 2009 recommendations, several new ongoing procedures with embedded evaluation processes were implemented. The Accreditation Response Group (ARG) provided oversight for some of these newly developed procedures such as the ongoing evaluation and update of the *Governance Policy Handbook*.

Efforts to create accreditation work groups and set benchmarks to complete the self evaluation report were undertaken. In spring 2013, standard committee chairs were identified and met several times during the 2013-14 year. This group named the Accreditation Steering Committee replaced ARG. Recruitment for an Accreditation Committee of the Whole took place with a focus on broad representation of the campus community and an effort to invite new faces to provide leadership on campus. A tentative accreditation timeline was created. ELAC recruited and hired a new faculty chair. The Faculty Accreditation Chair and the ongoing ALO became the leaders of the accreditation efforts on campus.

During the summer of 2013, Marvin Martinez began his tenure of presidency announcing accreditation as one of his foremost goals. Opening Day focused extensively on informing campus personnel about various aspects of the accreditation process and reinforcing their knowledge of ELAC’s mission statement. The theme of the Sankofa Bird, an African symbol of a bird that looks backwards while holding the egg of the future in its beak, represents ELAC’s Accreditation focus of “Looking Back, Moving Forward.” A campaign to encourage campus personnel to complete the ACCJC’s Accreditation Basic Training resulted in more than 50 faculty, staff, administrators, and students becoming certified by fall 2013.

In fall 2013, the standard committees completed a review of evidence connected to the existing standards at the time. However, in October the ACCJC announced that they would visit all nine LACCD schools in spring 2016, providing an additional year for ELAC to develop the self evaluation report.

The accreditation timeline was revised and a Cultivating Excellence Retreat was held on February 21, 2014 to focus on four primary areas of improvement that had been identified during the initial review of evidence: Teaching Innovation and Excellence, Organizational Excellence, Evidence-Based Learning, and Creating a Culture of Collaboration. Ongoing activities and goals were mapped to existing college priorities identified in the Strategic Master Plan and Educational Master Plan. Over 50 members of the campus community participated.

In June, 2014 the ACCJC announced the adoption of the “new” standards after a thorough vetting process. With a certain time for the peer visit and specific standards to follow, a clearer
direction for both the Accreditation Steering Committee and the Accreditation Committee of the Whole emerged. Coordination of accreditation efforts with the district offices occurs at the monthly District Strategic Planning and Accreditation Committee meetings. Ongoing participation at ACCJC training sessions continued and various campus members served on accreditation visits during 2014.

At the start of fall 2014, new standard leaders were identified for each of the 16 major standards. After feedback from standard leaders during Accreditation Steering Committee meetings, a revision of the mission statement and the fourth update of the Governance Policy Handbook were begun. The revision mission statement was adopted by the Board of Trustees on July 8, 2015, and the Governance Policy Handbook was adopted by the ELAC Shared Governance Council (ESGC) on July 27, 2015. The initial findings of the self evaluation also generated the reorganization of ELAC’s Planning Chart, a process for Innovation Funding, and changes to the membership of the Strategic Planning Committee.

During spring 2015, the Accreditation Steering Committee focused on the collection of evidence and writing of the four standards. The initial draft was due March 17, and the second draft on May 18. Feedback on the drafts was provided. Building on the theme of Cultivating Excellence, the Accreditation Team solicited and collected highlights of campus efforts of excellence connected to the standards. A final push for members of the campus to complete the Accreditation Basic Training yielded a total of more than 110 members receiving certification.

An initial draft of all the standards was presented to the Accreditation Steering Committee on June 29, 2015. A preliminary compilation of all the standards, including the eligibility requirements associated with the standards, was completed by September 14, 2015. A third draft of the self evaluation report was posted on ELAC’s website at the end of October, 2015 for comment by the campus community.

Additionally, over the summer, the action projects of the Quality Focus Essay (QFE) were identified. The initial draft of the QFE was completed by September 8, 2015. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement (OIEA) generated the student demographics and achievement data required in the 2014 Standards. Initial drafts of standards IV C and D and sections of III were provided by the district.

Fall 2015 focused on refining the standards and QFE as well as completing the remaining components of the self evaluation report. A detailed timeline and point people were identified and assigned tasks to ensure completion of the final draft.

Communicating the findings from the self-study remained a top priority at this time. Opening Day activities showcased the progress to date of the self evaluation and featured breakout sessions on components of the standards and a presentation by the campus accreditation leaders. Ongoing “Spotlights on Accreditation” educated campus personnel about different ELAC policies and practices discussed within the self-study. The Spotlights on Accreditation
augmented campus forums that likewise communicated aspects of the self-study throughout ELAC. Coordination with different campus governance groups for a thorough vetting of the standards occurred and timelines were developed to ensure ample venues for input. In total, presentations regarding ELAC’s self evaluation report reached over 200 faculty, staff, and students. Ongoing coordination with the district and the Board of Trustees culminated in a presentation to the BOT’s Institutional Effectiveness Committee on November 3 and final Board approval on December 9, 2015.

Prior to the team visit in March, 2016, final edits and preparation for printing of the self evaluation report occurred. Evidence for the self evaluation report is linked via endnotes. The endnote numbers in the body of the text hyperlink directly to evidence on a flash drive. The endnotes at the bottom of each standard section link to those pieces of evidence uploaded to the internet; however for evidence that needed to be scanned, the reader will not be able to directly access the information other than from the flash drive. The committee believed that this two-pronged method of attaching evidence allows readers to link to evidence whether or not they are connected to the internet.

Ongoing preparation and education of the campus community for the visit will continue for the first quarter of 2016.

The following timeline summarizes key dates of the self evaluation process.
Summer 2013
- Committee members/chairs of 4 standards identified
- Creation of web site
- Data Gathering
- Encourage campus leaders to complete ACCJC’s Accreditation Basic Training

Fall 2013
- Opening Day Kick off
- "New Blood"
- Faculty Survey
- Committee Evaluations

Fall 2013
- Organizational Charts
- Eligibility Requirements
- Response to Previous Recommendation
- Writing/Gathering data for Standards

Spring 2014
- Retreat “Push towards Excellence”
- Identify low hanging fruit (items that can quickly be corrected)
- Identify areas to be improved (Items we do somewhat, but could be better)
- Identify action items (Like SLOs)
- Link with Mission/Strategic Planning/EMP

Fall 2014
- Implement Action Items
- Evaluate

Spring 2015
- March, first Draft of Standards Due
- May 2014, 2nd Draft of Standards Due

Spring 2015
- June/July Edit
- Insert Photos/Graphics/Charts
- First Complete Draft

Fall 2015
- Open Forums
- Campus Input
- Governance Input
- Revisions/ final Draft
- Board of Trustees Approval
- Mock Visit

Spring 2016
- Count Down to Accreditation Team Visit
- Team Welcome Packets
- Team Brochure
Accreditation Committee of the Whole

STANDARD I.

A. Alex Immerblum, Selina Chi

Administration - Selina Chi, John Rude

Faculty - Barbara Dunsheath, Michelle Rodriguez, Alex Immerblum

B. Amanda Ryan-Romo, Alfred Gallegos

Administration - Ruben Arenas

Faculty - Amanda Ryan-Romo,

Staff - Bryan Ventura, Alfred Gallegos

C. Jeremy Allred, Daniel Ornelas, Tim Snead

Administration - Jeremy Allred

Faculty - Daniel Ornelas, Arpi Festekjian, Tim Snead, Barbara Dunsheath, Beatriz Tapia

Elizabeth Arroyo

Administration – Angelica Toledo

Faculty – Maria Elena Yepes, Gabriel Castro, Gisela Herrera, Erika Montenegro, Amy Guy

Staff – Elizabeth Arroyo, Cathleen Cotter, Julio Ortiz, Troy Pierce

C. Danelle Fallert, Sonia Lopez, Michelle Hernandez-Payan

Administration – Danelle Fallert, Sonia Lopez

Faculty – Chris Garcia, Michelle Hernandez-Payan

STANDARD II.

A. Carol Kozeracki, Armando Rivera-Figueroa

Administration - Carol Kozeracki, Kerrin McMahan, Chris Whiteside

Faculty - Armando Rivera-Figueroa, Sharon Allerson, Michael Colling, Rick Crawford, Paulette Daw, Rahim Faradineh, Cathleen Rozadilla, Lisa Vartanian, Amanda Ryan-Romo,

Staff - Bryan Ventura

B. Angelica Toledo, Maria Elena Yepes,

A. Vi Ly, Evelyn Escatiola, Brenda Chan

Administration – Vi Ly

Faculty – Brenda Chan, Orhan Ayyuce, Patricia Combes-Brighton, Lisa Hashimoto Stone, M. Dolores Carlos, Iris Yang, Evelyn Escatiola, Erika Blanco, Michael Kasnetsis

Staff – Natalie Wong, Brissa Palacios, Roxane Velasquez, Normita I. Alonzo

B. Laura M. Ramirez, Armida Ornelas

Administration – Laura M. Ramirez

Faculty – Armida Ornelas

Staff – Abel Rodriguez, Monica De La Parra, Denise Lara
C. Kerrin McMahan, Pauletta Daw
Administration – Kerrin McMahan
Faculty – Pauletta Daw
Staff – Mike Iwashita

D. Ann Tomlinson, Jeff Hernandez
Administration – Ann Tomlinson
Faculty – J. Edwards Stevenson, Maria Calpito, Jeff Hernandez

STANDARD IV.
A. Julie Benavides, Alex Immerblum
Administration – Julie Benavides
Faculty – Alex Immerblum
Staff – Laura E. Ramirez, Anna Ruiz-Ayala
Students – Robert Martinez, Reyna Hernandez

B. Richard Moyer, Barbara Dunsheath
Administration – Marvin Martinez, Richard Moyer, Paul De La Cerda,
Faculty – Barbara Dunsheath
Staff – Alejandro Guzman, Alfred Gallegos
Student – Jennifer Varela

Editors: Sharon Allerson, Sara Behseta
Publication: Kyle Tran, Peter Ruvalcaba, Maria Zapata, Catalina Medina, Yegor Hovakimian

Accreditation Faculty Chair: Dr. Barbara Dunsheath
Accreditation Liaison Officer: Dr. Carol Kozeracki
District/College Functional Map

The functional map was developed by the District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC), which includes representatives from the district and all nine colleges. ELAC’s Accreditation Steering Committee reviewed the District-College Functional Map at its meeting on November 10, 2015. The committee agreed with DPAC’s draft proposal except in 15 areas, which are specified below. On November 20, 2015, the colleges brought their feedback to the DPAC meeting and the allocation of responsibilities were modified in some cases to address the feedback of the colleges. Modifications are also noted below.

I.A.1: Primary responsibility belongs to the College since the district does not confer degrees or other credentials. (MODIFIED)

I.B.5 & 6: The district should NOT have secondary responsibility because it does not complete learning outcomes.

I.C.2: The College should have primary responsibility. (MODIFIED)

I.C.10 & 11: Does not apply; no mapping should occur. (MODIFIED)

II.B.4: District should have secondary responsibility because it assists with certain contracts for the library and other support services such as inter-library loans.

II.C.2: District should not have secondary responsibility because it does not complete learning outcomes.

III.B.1: College should have primary and district secondary responsibility although the district is involved with construction. (MODIFIED)

III.C.4: Some concern was expressed about the College having the primary responsibility and district secondary. It was agreed that the district does provide technology training.

III.D.13: This is only a district function. The College should not have secondary responsibility. (MODIFIED)

III.D.14: This should be a shared responsibility because the College has its own foundation. (MODIFIED)

IV.A.1 & 2 & 3: The committee felt strongly that the primary responsibility should rest with the College. The committee believes these standards refer to the College. (MODIFIED FOR IV.A.1)
District-College Functional Map

KEY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P = Primary Responsibility</th>
<th>S = Shared Responsibility</th>
<th>SH = Shared Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership and oversight of a given function including design, development, implementation, assessment and planning for improvement</td>
<td>Support of a given function, including a level of coordination, input, feedback, or communication to assist the primary responsibility holders with the successful execution of their responsibility</td>
<td>The District and the college are mutually responsible for the leadership and oversight of a given function or they engage in logically equivalent versions of a function – district and college mission statements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STANDARD I: Mission, Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, and Institutional Integrity**

**Standard I.A. Mission**

1. The mission describes the institution’s broad educational purposes, its intended student population, the types of degrees and other credentials it offers, and its commitment to student learning and student achievement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The institution uses data to determine how effectively it is accomplishing its mission, and whether the mission directs institutional priorities in meeting the educational needs of students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The institution’s programs and services are aligned with its mission. The mission guides institutional decision-making, planning, and resource allocation and informs institutional goals for student learning and achievement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The institution articulates its mission in a widely published statement approved by the governing board. The mission statement is periodically reviewed and updated as necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard I.B. Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness**
1. The institution demonstrates a sustained, substantive and collegial dialog about student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement. | P | S \\
2. The institution defines and assesses student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services. | P \\
3. The institution establishes institution-set standards for student achievement, appropriate to its mission, assesses how well it is achieving them in pursuit of continuous improvement, and publishes this information. | P \\
4. The institution uses assessment data and organizes its institutional processes to support student learning and student achievement. | P \\
5. The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of goals and objectives, student learning outcomes, and student achievement. Quantitative and qualitative data are disaggregated for analysis by program type and mode of delivery. | P | S \\
6. The institution disaggregates and analyzes learning outcomes and achievement for subpopulations of students. When the institution identifies performance gaps, it implements strategies, which may include allocation or reallocation of human, fiscal and other resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies. | P | S \\
7. The institution regularly evaluates its policies and practices across all areas of the institution, including instructional programs, student and learning support services, resource management, and governance processes to assure their effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of mission. | SH | SH \\
8. The institution broadly communicates the results of all of its assessment and evaluation activities so that the institution has a shared understanding of its strengths and weaknesses and sets appropriate priorities. | P | S \\
9. The institution engages in continuous, broad based, systematic evaluation and planning. The institution integrates program review, planning, and resource allocation into a comprehensive process that leads to accomplishment of its mission and improvement of institutional effectiveness and academic quality. Institutional planning addresses short- and long-range needs for educational programs and services and for human, physical, technology, and financial resources. | SH | SH

**Standard I.C. Institutional Integrity**

| 1. The institution assures the clarity, accuracy, and integrity of information provided to students and prospective students, personnel, and all persons or organizations related to its mission statement, learning outcomes, educational programs, and student support services. The institution gives accurate information to students and the public about its accreditation status with all of its accreditors. | P | S \\
2. The institution provides a print or online catalog for students and prospective students with precise, accurate, and current information on all | P |
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>facts, requirements, policies, and procedures listed in the “Catalog Requirements”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The institution uses documented assessment of student learning and evaluation of student achievement to communicate matters of academic quality to appropriate constituencies, including current and prospective students and the public.</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The institution describes its certificates and degrees in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, and expected learning outcomes.</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The institution regularly reviews institutional policies, procedures, and publications to assure integrity in all representations of its mission, programs, and services.</td>
<td>SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The institution accurately informs current and prospective students regarding the total cost of education, including tuition, fees, and other required expenses, including textbooks, and other instructional materials.</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. In order to assure institutional and academic integrity, the institution uses and publishes governing board policies on academic freedom and responsibility. These policies make clear the institution’s commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge, and its support for an atmosphere in which intellectual freedom exists for all constituencies, including faculty and students.</td>
<td>SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The institution establishes and publishes clear policies and procedures that promote honesty, responsibility and academic integrity. These policies apply to all constituencies and include specifics relative to each, including student behavior, academic honesty and the consequences for dishonesty.</td>
<td>SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline. They present data and information fairly and objectively.</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Institutions that require conformity to specific codes of conduct of staff, faculty, administrators, or students, or that seek to instill specific beliefs or world views, give clear prior notice of such policies, including statements in the catalog and/or appropriate faculty and student handbooks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Institutions operating in foreign locations operate in conformity with the Standards and applicable Commission policies for all students. Institutions must have authorization from the Commission to operate in a foreign location.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The institution agrees to comply with Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, Commission policies, guidelines, and requirements for public disclosure, institutional reporting, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. When directed to act by the Commission, the institution responds to meet requirements within a time period set by the Commission. It discloses information required by the Commission to carry out its accrediting responsibilities.</td>
<td>SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies, including compliance with regulations and statutes. It describes itself in consistent terms to all of its accrediting agencies and communicates any changes in its accredited status to the Commission, students, and the public.</td>
<td>SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The institution ensures that its commitments to high quality education, student achievement and student learning are paramount to other objectives such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## STANDARD II: Student Learning Programs and Support Services

### Standard II.A. Instructional Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard II.A. Instructional Programs</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education, 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.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty, including full time, part time, and adjunct faculty, ensure that the content and methods of instruction meet generally accepted academic and professional standards and expectations. 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.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The institution identifies and regularly assesses learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates and degrees using established institutional procedures. The institution has officially approved and 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.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. If the institution offers pre-collegiate level curriculum, it 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.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The institution’s 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, and 120 credits or equivalent at the baccalaureate level.</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 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.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The institution 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.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The institution validates the effectiveness of department-wide course and/or program examinations, where used, including direct assessment of prior learning. The institution ensures that processes are in place to reduce test bias and enhance reliability.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The institution awards 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</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
equivalencies in higher education. If the institution offers courses based on clock hours, it follows Federal standards for clock-to-credit-hour conversions.

10. The institution makes available to its students clearly stated transfer-of-credit policies in order to facilitate the mobility of students 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.

11. The institution includes in all of its programs, student 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.

12. The institution requires of all of 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 institution, relying on faculty expertise, determines 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.

13. All degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core. The identification of specialized courses in an area of inquiry or interdisciplinary core is based upon student learning outcomes and competencies, and include mastery, at the appropriate degree level, of key theories and practices within the field of study.

14. Graduates completing career-technical certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment standards and other applicable standards and preparation for external licensure and certification.

15. 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.

16. The institution regularly evaluates and improves the quality and currency of all instructional programs offered in the name of the institution, including collegiate, pre-collegiate, career-technical, and continuing and community education courses and programs, regardless of delivery mode or location. The institution systematically strives to improve programs and courses to enhance learning outcomes and achievement for students.

| Standard II.B. Library and Learning Support Services |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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1. The institution supports student learning and achievement by providing library, and other learning support services to students and to personnel responsible for student learning and support. These services are sufficient in quantity, currency, depth, and variety to support educational programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education. Learning support services include, but are not limited to, library collections, tutoring, learning centers, computer laboratories, learning technology, and ongoing instruction for users of library and other learning support services.

2. Relying on appropriate expertise of faculty, including librarians, and other learning support services professionals, the institution selects and maintains educational equipment and materials to support student learning and enhance the achievement of the mission.

3. The institution evaluates library and other learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services includes evidence that they contribute to the attainment of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

4. When the institution relies on or collaborates with other institutions or other sources for library and other learning support services for its instructional programs, it documents that formal agreements exist and that such resources and services are adequate for the institution’s intended purposes, are easily accessible and utilized. The institution takes responsibility for and assures the security, maintenance, and reliability of services provided either directly or through contractual arrangement. The institution regularly evaluates these services to ensure their effectiveness.

**Standard II.C. Student Support Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The institution regularly evaluates the quality of student support services and demonstrates that these services, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education, support student learning, and enhance accomplishment of the mission of the institution.</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The institution identifies and assesses learning support outcomes for its student population and provides appropriate student support services and programs to achieve those outcomes. The institution uses assessment data to continuously improve student support programs and services.</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The institution assures equitable access to all of its students by providing appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable services to students regardless of service location or delivery method.</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Co-curricular programs and athletics programs are suited to the institution’s mission and contribute to the social and cultural dimensions of the educational experience of its students. If the institution offers co-curricular or athletic programs, they are conducted with sound educational policy and standards of integrity. The institution has responsibility for the control of these programs, including their finances.</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. The institution provides counseling and/or academic advising programs to support student development and success and prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function. Counseling and advising programs orient students to ensure they understand the requirements related to their programs of study and receive timely, useful, and accurate information about relevant academic requirements, including graduation and transfer policies.

6. The institution has adopted and adheres to admission policies consistent with its mission that specify the qualifications of students appropriate for its programs. The institution defines and advises students on clear pathways to complete degrees, certificate and transfer goals.

7. The institution regularly evaluates admissions and placement instruments and practices to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases.

8. The institution maintains student records permanently, securely, and confidentially, with provision for secure backup of all files, regardless of the form in which those files are maintained. The institution publishes and follows established policies for release of student records.

STANDARD III: Resources

Standard III.A. Human Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard III.A. Human Resources</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The institution assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing administrators, faculty and staff who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support these programs and services. Criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selection of personnel are clearly and publicly stated and address the needs of the institution in serving its student population. Job descriptions are directly related to institutional mission and goals and accurately reflect position duties, responsibilities, and authority.</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty qualifications include knowledge of the subject matter and requisite skills for the service to be performed. Factors of qualification include appropriate degrees, professional experience, discipline expertise, level of assignment, teaching skills, scholarly activities, and potential to contribute to the mission of the institution. Faculty job descriptions include development and review of curriculum as well as assessment of learning.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Administrators and other employees responsible for educational programs and services possess qualifications necessary to perform duties required to sustain institutional effectiveness and academic quality.</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Required degrees held by faculty, administrators and other employees are from institutions accredited by recognized U.S. accrediting agencies. Degrees from non-U.S. institutions are recognized only if equivalence has been established.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The institution assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The institution establishes written criteria for evaluating all personnel, including performance</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>SH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of assigned duties and participation in institutional responsibilities and other activities appropriate to their expertise. Evaluation processes seek to assess effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement. Actions taken following evaluations are formal, timely, and documented.

6. The evaluation of faculty, academic administrators, and other personnel directly responsible for student learning includes, as a component of that evaluation, consideration of how these employees use the results of the assessment of learning outcomes to improve teaching and learning.

7. The institution maintains a sufficient number of qualified faculty, which includes full time faculty and may include part time and adjunct faculty, to assure the fulfillment of faculty responsibilities essential to the quality of educational programs and services to achieve institutional mission and purposes.

8. An institution with part time and adjunct faculty has employment policies and practices which provide for their orientation, oversight, evaluation, and professional development. The institution provides opportunities for integration of part time and adjunct faculty into the life of the institution.

9. The institution has a sufficient number of staff with appropriate qualifications to support the effective educational, technological, physical, and administrative operations of the institution.

10. The institution maintains a sufficient number of administrators with appropriate preparation and expertise to provide continuity and effective administrative leadership and services that support the institution’s mission and purposes.

11. The institution establishes, publishes, and adheres to written personnel policies and procedures that are available for information and review. Such policies and procedures are fair and equitably and consistently administered.

12. Through its policies and practices, the institution creates and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support its diverse personnel. The institution regularly assesses its record in employment equity and diversity consistent with its mission.

13. The institution upholds a written code of professional ethics for all of its personnel, including consequences for violation.

14. The institution plans for and provides all personnel with appropriate opportunities for continued professional development, consistent with the institutional mission and based on evolving pedagogy, technology, and learning needs. The institution systematically evaluates professional development programs and uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

15. The institution makes provision for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. Each employee has access to his/her personnel records in accordance with law.

---

**Standard III.B. Physical Resources**

1. The institution assures safe and sufficient physical resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs, and learning support services. They are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment.

2. The institution plans, acquires or builds, maintains, and upgrades or replaces its physical resources, including facilities, equipment, land, and other assets, in a manner that assures effective utilization and the continuing quality necessary to support its programs and services and achieve its mission.  

   | SH | SH |

3. To assure the feasibility and effectiveness of physical resources in supporting institutional programs and services, the institution plans and evaluates its facilities and equipment on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account.  

   | SH | SH |

4. Long-range capital plans support institutional improvement goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment.  

   | S  | P  |

---

### Standard III.C. Technology Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Technology services, professional support, facilities, hardware, and software are appropriate and adequate to support the institution’s management and operational functions, academic programs, teaching and learning, and support services.</th>
<th>SH</th>
<th>SH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. The institution 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.</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The institution assures that technology resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs, and services are implemented and maintained to assure reliable access, safety, and security.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The institution provides appropriate instruction and support for faculty, staff, students, and administrators, in the effective use of technology and technology systems related to its programs, services, and institutional operations.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The institution has policies and procedures that guide the appropriate use of technology in the teaching and learning processes.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Standard III.D. Financial Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Financial resources are sufficient to support and sustain student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. The distribution of resources supports the development, maintenance, allocation and reallocation, and enhancement of programs and services. The institution plans and manages its financial affairs with integrity and in a manner that ensures financial stability.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. The institution’s mission and goals are the foundation for financial planning, and financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning. The institution has policies and procedures to ensure sound financial practices and financial stability. Appropriate financial information is disseminated throughout the institution in a timely manner.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. The institution clearly defines and follows its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget development, with all constituencies having appropriate opportunities to participate in the development of institutional plans and budgets.

4. Institutional planning reflects a realistic assessment of financial resource availability, development of financial resources, partnerships, and expenditure requirements.

5. To assure the financial integrity of the institution and responsible use of its financial resources, the internal control structure has appropriate control mechanisms and widely disseminates dependable and timely information for sound financial decision making. The institution regularly evaluates its financial management practices and uses the results to improve internal control systems.

6. Financial documents, including the budget, have a high degree of credibility and accuracy, and reflect appropriate allocation and use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services.

7. Institutional responses to external audit findings are comprehensive, timely, and communicated appropriately.

8. The institution’s financial and internal control systems are evaluated and assessed for validity and effectiveness, and the results of this assessment are used for improvement.

9. The institution has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, support strategies for appropriate risk management, and, when necessary, implement contingency plans to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences.

10. The institution practices effective oversight of finances, including management of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contractual relationships, auxiliary organizations or foundations, and institutional investments and assets.

11. The level of financial resources provides a reasonable expectation of both short-term and long-term financial solvency. When making short-range financial plans, the institution considers its long-range financial priorities to assure financial stability. The institution clearly identifies, plans, and allocates resources for payment of liabilities and future obligations.

12. The institution plans for and allocates appropriate resources for the payment of liabilities and future obligations, including Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB), compensated absences, and other employee related obligations. The actuarial plan to determine Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) is current and prepared as required by appropriate accounting standards.

13. On an annual basis, the institution assesses and allocates resources for the repayment of any locally incurred debt instruments that can affect the financial condition of the institution.

14. All financial resources, including short- and long-term debt instruments (such as bonds and Certificates of Participation), auxiliary activities, fundraising efforts, and grants, are used with integrity in a manner consistent with the intended purpose of the funding source.

15. The institution monitors and manages student loan default rates, revenue streams, and assets to ensure compliance with federal requirements, including...
Title IV of the Higher Education Act, and comes into compliance when the federal government identifies deficiencies.

16. Contractual agreements with external entities 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STANDARD IV: Leadership and Governance**

**Standard IV.A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Institutional leaders create and encourage innovation leading to institutional excellence. They support administrators, faculty, staff, and students, no matter what their official titles, in taking initiative for improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective planning and implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The institution establishes and implements policy and procedures authorizing administrator, faculty, and staff participation in decision-making processes. The policy makes provisions for student participation and consideration of student views in those matters in which students have a direct and reasonable interest. Policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Administrators and faculty, through policy and procedures, have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Faculty and academic administrators, through policy and procedures, and through well-defined structures, have responsibility for recommendations about curriculum and student learning programs and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Through its system of board and institutional governance, the institution ensures the appropriate consideration of relevant perspectives; decision-making aligned with expertise and responsibility; and timely action on institutional plans, policies, curricular change, and other key considerations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The processes for decision-making and the resulting decisions are documented and widely communicated across the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Leadership roles and the institution’s governance and decision-making policies, procedures, and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard IV.B. Chief Executive Officer**
1. The institutional chief executive officer (CEO) has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution. The CEO provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The CEO plans, oversees, and evaluates an administrative structure organized and staffed to reflect the institution’s purposes, size, and complexity. The CEO delegates authority to administrators and others consistent with their responsibilities, as appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Through established policies and procedures, the CEO guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by:
   - establishing a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities;
   - ensuring the college sets institutional performance standards for student achievement;
   - ensuring that evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis of external and internal conditions;
   - ensuring that educational planning is integrated with resource planning and allocation to support student achievement and learning;
   - ensuring that the allocation of resources supports and improves learning and achievement; and
   - establishing procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts to achieve the mission of the institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The CEO has the primary leadership role for accreditation, ensuring that the institution meets or exceeds Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies at all times. Faculty, staff, and administrative leaders of the institution also have responsibility for assuring compliance with accreditation requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. The CEO assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies, including effective control of budget and expenditures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The CEO works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard IV.C. Governing Board

1. The institution has a governing board that has authority over and responsibility for policies to assure the academic quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The governing board acts as a collective entity. Once the board reaches a decision, all board members act in support of the decision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The governing board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the CEO of the college and/or the district/system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The governing board is an independent, policy-making body that reflects the public interest in the institution’s educational quality. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or political pressure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. The governing board establishes policies consistent with the college/district/system mission to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them. The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity and stability.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The institution or the governing board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board’s size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly assesses its policies and bylaws for their effectiveness in fulfilling the college/district/system mission and revises them as necessary.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. To ensure the institution is accomplishing its goals for student success, the governing board regularly reviews key indicators of student learning and achievement and institutional plans for improving academic quality.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. The governing board has an ongoing training program for board development, including new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Board policies and/or bylaws clearly establish a process for board evaluation. The evaluation assesses the board’s effectiveness in promoting and sustaining academic quality and institutional effectiveness. The governing board regularly evaluates its practices and performance, including full participation in board training, and makes public the results. The results are used to improve board performance, academic quality, and institutional effectiveness.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. The governing board upholds a code of ethics and conflict of interest policy, and individual board members adhere to the code. The board has a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code and implements it when necessary. A majority of the board members have no employment, family, ownership, or other personal financial interest in the institution. Board member interests are disclosed and do not interfere with the impartiality of governing body members or outweigh the greater duty to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the institution.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to the CEO to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds the CEO accountable for the operation of the district/system or college, respectively.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. The governing board is informed about the Eligibility Requirements, the Accreditation Standards, Commission policies, accreditation processes, and the college’s accredited status, and supports through policy the college’s efforts to improve and excel. The board participates in evaluation of governing board roles and functions in the accreditation process.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard IV.D. Multi-College Districts or Systems**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. The district/system CEO clearly delineates, documents, and communicates</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the operational responsibilities and functions of the district/system from those</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the colleges and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice. The</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>district/system CEO ensures that the colleges receive effective and adequate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>district/system provided services to support the colleges in achieving their</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missions. Where a district/system has responsibility for resources, allocation of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources, and planning, it is evaluated against the Standards, and its</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance is reflected in the accredited status of the institution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. The district/system has a policy for allocation and reallocation of resources</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>that are adequate to support the effective operations and sustainability of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colleges and district/system. The district/system CEO ensures effective control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of expenditures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. The CEO of the district or system delegates full responsibility and authority</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to the CEOs of the colleges to implement and administer delegated district/system policies without interference and holds college CEO’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accountable for the operation of the colleges.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. District/system planning and evaluation are integrated with college planning</th>
<th>S  P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and evaluation to improve student learning and achievement and institutional effectiveness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Communication between colleges and districts/systems ensures effective</th>
<th>S  P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>operations of the colleges and should be timely, accurate, and complete in order for the colleges to make decisions effectively.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. The district/system CEO regularly evaluates district/system and college role</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>delineations, governance and decision-making processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals for student achievement and learning. The district/system widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved by DPAC on 11/20/15
Compliance with Eligibility Requirements 1 – 5

1. Authority

The institution is authorized or licensed to operate as a post-secondary educational institution and to award degrees by an appropriate governmental organization or agency as required by each of the jurisdictions or regions in which it operates.

Private institutions, if required by the appropriate statutory regulatory body, must submit evidence of authorization, licensure, or approval by that body. If incorporated, the institution shall submit a copy of its articles of incorporation.

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 2008.1

2. Operational Status

The institution is operational, with students actively pursuing its degree programs.

In Fall 2014, ELAC enrolled 27,638 credit students, 1,424 noncredit students, and 8,642 students in its Public Service Academies. Of the credit students enrolled, 28.1 percent were enrolled full-time, with 71.5 percent of the students identifying a primary educational goal of pursuing transfer, a degree, or career preparation.2

3. Degrees

A substantial portion of the institution’s educational offerings are programs that lead to degrees, and a significant proportion of its students are enrolled in them. At least one degree program must be of two academic years in length.

ELAC has 37 Associate of Arts and Associate of Science Degrees plus 18 state-approved Associate Degrees for Transfer.3 The Catalog lists the requirements for all degrees. All degrees require a minimum of 60 units to complete and include a General Education component, as well as concentration within a major. Full-time students meeting the English and math requirements can earn the 60-unit degrees within two years.

During the 2014-2015 academic year ELAC offered 5,392 credit sections. Ninety-five percent of the sections were degree applicable.
The unduplicated credit headcount for the 2014-2015 academic year was 53,030. Nearly ninety-nine percent of students enrolled in at least one degree applicable course during that academic year.

4. Chief Executive Officer

The institution has a chief executive officer appointed by the governing board, whose full-time responsibility is to the institution, and who possesses the requisite authority to administer board policies. Neither the district/system chief executive officer nor the institutional chief executive officer may serve as the chair of the governing board. The institution informs the Commission immediately when there is a change in the institutional chief executive officer.
The Los Angeles Community College District Board of Trustees appointed the current College President, Mr. Marvin Martinez, on January 30, 2013, with an effective date of July 1, 2013. The president is the chief executive officer of the College, with full-time responsibility to the institution. Neither the college president nor the district chancellor is eligible to serve as the President of the Board of Trustees. The LACCD informed the ACCJC of the appointment of President Martinez, who replaced Interim President Farley Herzek.

5. Financial Accountability

The institution annually undergoes and makes available an external financial audit by a certified public accountant or an audit by an appropriate public agency. Institutions that are already Title IV eligible must demonstrate compliance with federal requirements.

An independent firm conducts audits of the College within the District on an annual basis. They produce the “LACCD Report on Audited Basic Financial Statements” using Government Audit Standards. The most recent result found the financial statements presented fairly, in all material respects, the net assets of the LACCD in conformity with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2014 and 2013, the District did not have any communicated appropriately through Office of Chief Financial Officer website.

The Department of Education specifies that institutions with a three-year cohort loan default rate of 30 percent or greater for three consecutive years may be subject to a loss of the Direct Loan Program and/or Federal Pell Grant Programs. According to the Department of Education’s website, the default rates for East Los Angeles College for fiscal years 2010, 2011, and 2012 are 11.6 percent, 19.2 percent, and 13.4 percent, respectively, which are well within the acceptable range.

---

1. Letter from ACCJC reaffirming accreditation 6/30/2010
2. East Los Angeles College Facts in Brief, Fall 2014
3. Catalog Listing of State-Approved Degrees and Certificates p. 86-88
4. BOT Agenda, January 30, 2013, p. 25
5. BOT Minutes, January 30, 2013, p. 5
6. Job description for ELAC President
7. LACCD Board Rule 2200
8. LACCD Basic Financial Statements and Supplemental Information, June 30, 2014
9. LACCD Basic Financial Statements and Supplemental Information, June 30, 2013
10. Department of Education School Default Rate
Compliance with Commission Policies

1. Public Notification of an Evaluation Visit and Third Party Comment [Reg 602.23(b)]

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

The draft of the East Los Angeles College Institutional Self Evaluation Report was posted on the college website\(^{11}\) on October 22 for public review. A notification was sent to the entire campus community to review the document\(^{12}\) and to attend an Accreditation Forum on October 29\(^{13}\) for a presentation on the self-evaluation. An online Accreditation Comment Form was posted on the website on October 22\(^{14}\) and a paper version of the comment form\(^{15}\) was distributed at the forum.

The Accreditation Liaison Officer and Faculty Accreditation Chair presented a summary of the Self Evaluation Report at the following campus meetings in fall 2015 and distributed the feedback form at each of them:

- Academic Senate on October 27\(^{16}\)
- Department Chairs’ Meeting on November 3\(^{17}\)
- East Los Angeles College Shared Governance Council on November 9\(^{18}\)
- Associated Student Union meeting on November 20\(^{19}\)

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

To be addressed, pending receipt of any third-party comments.

The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission Policy on Rights and Responsibilities of the Commission and Member Institutions as to third party comment.

The Commission Policy on the Rights and Responsibilities of the Commission and Member Institutions specifies in Policy Element F that when an institution is undergoing a review the college president should notify the campus community and public of the opportunity for submission of third-party comments and the process for doing so. On November 4, when the Board of Trustees met at ELAC, President Marvin Martinez announced the availability of the self evaluation report on the College website for review and invited feedback on the report at the presentation of the report to the Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success Committee, a standing committee of the Board.\(^{20}\) Comment forms were distributed to all in attendance.

---

\(^{11}\) October 22 Draft of the Self Evaluation
\(^{12}\) Flyer inviting campus community to Accreditation Forum
\(^{13}\) Accreditation Forum flyer
\(^{14}\) Online Accreditation Comment Form
\(^{15}\) Accreditation Comment Form

2. Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement [Reg 602.16(a)(1)(i); 602.17(f); 602.19 (a-e)]

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.

In 2013 the College established a set of six measures for college-wide reporting as Institution-set Standards (ISS) for student achievement. The standards were set with the intention of monitoring academic quality and maintaining performance expectations. The six measures are directly related to the College’s Strategic Plan, which establishes baselines within the plan, as well as targets for several measures of student achievement. As shown in the Strategic Plan, all measures are aligned to specific portions of the College’s Mission, specifically to “Increasing student success and academic excellence through student-centered instruction, student-centered support services, and dynamic technologies.”

The College’s ISS measures are as follows:

- Fall Course Success Rate: 63 percent
- Fall Course Retention Rate: 84 percent
- Fall-to-Fall Persistence Rate for First-Time Students: 56 percent
- Number of Degrees Awarded: 975
- Number of Certificates Awarded: 725
- Number of Transfers to a UC or CSU: 700

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.

The ISS are embedded into the College’s comprehensive planning processes – the Program Review Self-Evaluation (PRSE) and Annual Update Plans (AUP) – for ongoing evaluation.

The 2013-19 PRSE provided historical data (prior five fall semesters or years, depending on the
measure) for the following measures by course and/or discipline:

- Success rates by discipline, course, and student demographics (gender and ethnicity)
- Retention rates by discipline by student demographics (gender and ethnicity)
- Degrees and certificates awarded by discipline/department

Departments were required to evaluate the program’s performance on each of these measures and describe plans for improvement.

The 2016-17 Annual Update Plan for Academic Departments provided the College’s established standard and goal for in-course success and retention rates and provided each department with their performance on those measures for the last three fall semesters by discipline. Based on these data, the departments indicated their discipline and/or department standard (defined as minimum level of performance) and goal (aspirational measure) for these two measures. Academic programs that offer degrees and certificates were provided with the number of degrees and certificates awarded for the prior three years and were asked to indicate their completion standard and target for awards. The Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs that prepare students for licensure examinations were requested to provide the licensure pass rate standard. Employment rate standards were also requested from CTE programs using information available from LaunchBoard and Perkins Core Indicator IV data. For each of these measures, the departments were asked to evaluate their efforts to improve student achievement.

**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 (allocate) resources, and to make improvements.**

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement provided draft Institution-set Standards (ISS) with rationales to the Program Review and Viability Committee on February 26, 2013. In particular, it was suggested to use five-year averages as values for the standards.\(^{25}\) Discussion at the committee led to five-year lows generally being considered for all of the standards except persistence. This was presented to the Accreditation Response Group on March 1, 2013\(^ {26}\) and led to the final Accreditation Response Group recommended standards provided to and approved by the Academic Senate on March 12, 2013\(^ {27}\) and the ELAC Shared Governance Council on March 25, 2013.\(^ {28}\)

The College assesses how well it is achieving its Institution-set Standards in a variety of ways.

- The six ISS were presented to all faculty, staff, and administrators at the 2015 Opening Day.\(^ {29}\) The results for 2013-14 were discussed since transfer numbers for 2014-15 were not yet available.
The six ISS were presented to the Program Review and Viability Committee at the September 3, 2015 meeting. The College’s performance over the last several years with respect to those standards was discussed in detail. This discussion continued at the Strategic Planning Committee meeting on September 22, 2015, the ELAC Shared Governance Council (ESGC), and the Academic Senate.

The College’s ISS are published on the college website. The draft standards set by disciplines are posted for public viewing within the 2016-17 AUP forms.

During the 2015-16 Annual Update Plan process, each discipline was asked to set its own standards for course success and course retention while considering the college-wide standards for these measures. In addition, programs were asked to set completion standards, and CTE programs were asked to set standards for licensure pass rate and employment rate. Because of inconsistency in the way disciplines set their standards, it was recognized that one more cycle of standard setting would be required during the 2016-17 Annual Update Process along with more guidance in how to set the standards.

In the 2016-17 AUP process, budget requests were required to be linked to the department or institutional goals, or be based on the results of outcomes assessment or the analysis performed in the AUP of the department’s performance on success, retention, and completion measures.

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.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement updates the College’s performance on the ISS measures annually. As demonstrated in the most recent update of the standards, the College has been successful in attaining its institution-set standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall Course Success</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Course Retention</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall-to-Fall Persistence for First-Time Students</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Degrees Awarded</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>1,203</td>
<td>1,583</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Certificates Awarded</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>1,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Transfers to a UC or CSU</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>1,047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fall-to-Fall Persistence not available at the time of publication*
As reported in the 2015 annual report to the ACCJC, the licensure passage rates for two of the College’s CTE programs, Nursing and Health Information Technology, were more than 10 percent below the standard set by the program’s external accrediting agencies.

The Nursing Program has put into place the following practices to improve student performance:

1. Medical Surgical nursing teams have been meeting weekly looking at student performance as a primary area of focus, and the specialty teams Obstetrics, Pediatrics, and Mental Health meet on a regular basis.

2. A remediation plan is being revised to help strengthen student theoretical and clinical skills.

3. Students who have completed the program are being called to find out when and if they have taken the NCLEX-RN. Students who have not taken the exam are getting calls weekly to encourage total engagement by doing at least 100 questions per week, are encouraged to come to workshops to enhance readiness, and are invited back for a face-to-face NCLEX-RN review, provided by an outside consultant.

4. Standardized tests (Kaplan) are administered and students must meet the departmental agreed upon score in order to maintain their status. Focus tests normed to the curriculum must be completed at 100 percent prior to testing, which enhances performance.

5. Workshops were presented on a weekly basis by the MSA Simulation expert beginning in October 2015.

6. A faculty member will be assigned to work with students needing remediation in the hospital setting, which will allow other faculty to continue to enhance learning for those students prepared to move forward.

As reported to the Board of Trustees in its August 2015 letter regarding the ACCJC response to the College’s Annual Report, the Health Information Technology program has instituted the following changes to the program and has seen improvements in its outcomes.

The HIT program-set standard has been raised to meet program evaluation benchmarks submitted to the Commission on Accreditation for Health Informatics and Information Management Education (CAHIIM), the accrediting body of the Health Information Technology (HIT) Program. The HIT Program goal established a benchmark noting “75 percent of all students taking the Registered Health Information Technology (RHIT) exam will pass on the first attempt.”

The low pass rate of the RHIT exam for the Health Information Technology Program during the 2011-12 academic year was identified as a concern for the program. To resolve this issue, the College hired a new program director for the academic year 2013-2014. The new program
director, along with the faculty, implemented the following changes which contributed to an increase of passage rates for the students taking the RHIT exam status after completing the HIT coursework.

- The Program Director has taken on the responsibility for teaching the HTHTEK 241 “Professional Practice Experience” capstone course and incorporated exam prep review sessions. This includes practice test, mock exams, and student on-site directed practicum.
- The curriculum was reevaluated to make sure that all courses were sequenced correctly and a prerequisite or co-requisite was added to courses when appropriate.
- The course learning outcomes (CLOs) were realigned and all faculty received training to ensure activities were mapped to outcomes and assessed.
- The College made the commitment to purchase annual licenses for each student to access the American Health Information Management Association Virtual Lab. The use of this lab provides students with the opportunity to experience real situations within a health information management department in a healthcare organization, including the latest technology utilized in hospitals today.
- Semester advisement of HIT students was initiated to ensure educational plans are created and students are academically prepared for course advancement.

Under the leadership of the new program director and with the support of the faculty, the HIT Program was able to make a drastic improvement within one year to the RHIT pass rates. At the end of the academic year 2013-2014, the pass rate increased to 63 percent. The pass rate reports are provided to the program director on a quarterly basis by AHIMA. For the academic year 2014-2015, the program has only received data up to the third quarter of the academic year. As of June 30, 2015, the data reflects that the program has a 75 percent pass rate for that year.

---
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3. Credits, Program Length, and Tuition  [Reg 602.2(def’n of credit hour); 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.24(e-f); 668.2; 668.9]

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

The number of units of credit given for courses is based upon California Code of Regulations, Title V and district standards for minimum clock (Carnegie) hours needed per unit of credit. These sources specify that one credit hour of community college work (one unit of credit) requires a minimum of 48 hours of lecture, study, or laboratory work at colleges operating on the semester system. The College’s curriculum development process, in keeping with an 18-week semester framework, awards one credit for 18 hours of in-class lecture hours, with a minimum of two hours of out-of-class student work each week, and one credit for 54 hours of in-class lab hours.

The minimum requirements for the associate degrees, including number of units and requirements for the major and for General Education, are also set by the set by the California Code of Regulations, Title V and district Board Rules.

- Board Rule 6201.10 specifies a minimum of 60 semester units of course credit in a selected curriculum with at least 18 semester units of study in a major or area of emphasis and at least 18 semester units of study in General Education areas for a degree to be awarded. It also defines compliance with the state guidelines for Associate Degrees for Transfer.
- Board Rule 6201.10 specifies the requirement of a 2.0 grade average or better in all work attempted in the curriculum upon which the degree is based.
- Board Rule 6201.12 defines the English and math competencies for degree achievement.
- Board Rule 6201.14 outlines the General Education (GE) requirements for graduation.
- Board Rule 6202 defines students’ catalog rights.

The approval process for new degrees and certificates requires the submitting department to identify a sequence of course offerings “so that a full-time student could complete a degree program in two years, except in the case of a high-unit technical or health occupation program where a case has been made that a sequence longer than two years is definitely necessary. . . For a certificate, the sequence should be arranged so that a full-time student completes the program within the time normally needed to complete the total number of units required for the certificate.” The approval process also requires a projection of the number of completers within two and five years. The Program Review process includes an evaluation of the number of degrees and certificates that have been awarded over the last five years and an explanation of efforts being made to increase awards.

Information related to the awarding of degrees and certificates is available in the catalog, which is published and also available online.

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).

The Curriculum Committee, through its technical review process, ensures that credit hours and degree program requirements meet the requirements of the district and the state. The online Course Outline of Record (COR) form clearly defines the required credit hours for courses as does the Proposed New Program Request (PNPR), which specifies the units for degree major/area of emphasis, total units, required courses (including GE requirements), and a proposed sequence of courses that demonstrates the ability for a full-time student to complete the degree within two years (other than for high-unit technical or health degrees).

Distance education courses follow the same requirements as all other classes, with the addition of the submission of a packet of forms that include the District DE Course Offering Approval Form, the ELAC DE Course Outline Addendum, and the ELAC DE Course Accessibility Checklist.

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

The catalog specifies that California residents are required to pay $46 per unit, subject to change by the California Legislature, for all credit classes. Students who are out-of-state non-residents or residents of any country outside of the United States pay additional tuition fees of $190 and $258 per unit, respectively, above the $46. These fees are consistent across all degree programs.

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

The College does not award credit based on the clock-to-credit hour conversion formula.

The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission Policy on Institutional Degrees and Credits.

ELAC complies with the Commission Policy on Institutional Degrees and Credits. All degrees require a minimum of 60 units to complete. The College determines credit hours based on policies and procedures that meet commonly accepted practices in higher education. One unit of credit is equivalent to a minimum of 54 hours of study, with lecture classes scheduled for 18 hours in class and 36 hours out of class and lab classes scheduled for 54 hours in class. The College operates on compressed 16-week semesters. Full-time students are enrolled in at least 12 units during the fall and spring semesters.

---

39 CCR Title 5, section 5502.5, Credit Hour
4. Transfer Policies [Reg 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.17(a)(3); 602.24(e); 668.43(a)(ii)]

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

ELAC’s policies for awarding credit for courses taken at other institutions, for military service, and for credit by exam are clearly defined in the College Catalog, which is available online and in hard copy. The catalog details the criteria and process for accepting credits for each of the following categories of coursework and experience:

- Previously earned college credit from regionally accredited institutions in the United States
- Advanced Placement exam results
- College-Level Examination Program (CLEP) exam results
- International Baccalaureate Diploma
- Military service
- Credit by Exam
- Foreign transcript equivalency
- Courses completed at non-accredited institutions

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

Board Rule 6701.10 specifies that all courses and units used to satisfy requirements for graduation and transfer must be from institutions that are accredited by an agency recognized by either the U.S. Department of Education or the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation. The district’s Administrative Regulations, which are available online from the district website, provide additional information about the types of credit that can be accepted for transfer and the process for requesting approval of the credits:
• E-93 specifies that courses that can be used to meet general education requirements for an associate degree must be degree applicable, that a minimum grade of “C” is required in each course to fulfill the English and math competency requirements, and that the College will honor each course in the same GE area in which the originating institution counted the course.

• E-101 provides the criteria for granting credit for course work completed at an institution of higher education outside the United States. Requirements include an independent transcript evaluation completed by a service approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

• E-107 defines the manner in which transcripts and other types of credit (such as AP or CLEP scores or military credit) can be delivered.

• E-118 describes the process for obtaining credit for military service that will count toward associate degree requirements.

• E-119 describes the process for accepting upper division coursework.

• E-122 defines the conditions under which the district will accept the International Baccalaureate Diploma.

• E-123 describes the eligibility process for accepting CLEP exam results for meeting requirements for the associate degree and for earning unit credit.

The information in these regulations is incorporated into the catalog on the page referenced in the section above.

The institution complies with the Commission Policy on Transfer of Credit.

The district and College appropriately balance responsiveness to students’ requests for transfer of credit with the need to maintain the quality of the degrees and certificates awarded by the College. The quality assurance is accomplished through the requirement that sending institutions must be accredited by an agency approved by either the U.S. Department of Education or the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation or that transcripts sent by institutions outside of the United States must be evaluated by a state-approved transcript evaluation service.

Responsiveness to students’ interest in transferring credits to the College is facilitated by the processes in place and students’ ability to review these policies in the catalog and online.

---
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5. Distance Education and Correspondence Education [Reg 602.16(a)(1)(iv), (vi); 602.17(g); 668.38]

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.
Title V of the California Code of Regulation defines distance learning as “instruction in which the instructor and student are separated by distance and interact through the assistance of communication technology.” The ACCJC expands on that definition by specifying that distance education “uses one or more technologies . . . to deliver instruction to students who are separated from the instructor and to support regular and substantive interaction between the students and the instructor, either synchronously or asynchronously.” The Commission distinguishes Correspondence Education from Distance Education because the interaction between the instructor and the student in correspondence education is “limited, is not regular and substantive, and is primarily initiated by the student.”

LACCD Administrative Regulation E-89 defines distance education as “a formal interaction which uses one or more technologies to deliver instruction to students who are separated from the instructor and which supports regular and substantive interaction between the students and instructor, either synchronously or asynchronously. Distance education often incorporates technologies such as the internet; one-way and two-way transmissions through open broadcast, closed circuit, cable, microwave, broadband lines, fiber optics, satellite, or wireless communications devices; audio conferencing; or video cassettes, DVDs, and CD-ROMs, in conjunction with any of the other technologies.”

East Los Angeles College’s Distance Learning Program encompasses online, hybrid and web-enhanced classes and follows the principles of high standards and student-focused learning. Distance learning classes and instruction are held to the same standards regardless of delivery and must assure that student learning outcomes are communicated, assessed, and used as data for continuous improvement. East Los Angeles College only offers distance education courses and no correspondence education. Title 5, Section 55378, requires that before an online course is developed it is separately reviewed and approved according to the district’s course approval procedures. According to the District’s Administrative Regulations, distance education courses must follow curriculum approval process required for all credit classes. Course Outlines must be either created or updated before they can be submitted to the Curriculum Committee. Distance education courses should be reviewed through the six-year cycle review process of Program Review pursuant to Title 5, Section 55201.

In addition to a new or updated course outline, Administrative Regulation E-89 requires that each college’s curriculum committee must certify the following:

- The same standards of course quality are applied to the distance education courses as are applied to traditional classroom courses.

(Course Quality Standards - Title V, section 55372)
• Determination and judgments about the quality of the distance education course were made with the full involvement of the faculty as defined by Administrative Regulation E-65 and college curriculum approval procedures.
   (Course Quality Determination - Title 5, section 55374)

• Each section of the course which is delivered through distance education includes regular personal contact between instructor and students.
   (Instructor Contact - Title 5, section 55376)

The College’s Distance Education Course Approval Guidelines and Form 64 requires documentation of each course objective and an explanation of how distance learning strategies will be used to help students achieve the objective.

“Please provide representative example(s) of regular and substantive instructor/student contact and interaction in each of the following areas: (a) representative assignments, (b) instructor-initiated themed discussions/interactions between instructor and students, and (c) instructor-initiated feedback and communication of course progress to students enrolled in the course”

Approval Process
Courses are initiated by and approved at the college level by faculty in the discipline and/or department/division/cluster.

College Curriculum Committee reviews each proposed and existing course offered through distance education separately in accordance with the provision of Title 5, sections 55002, 55204, 55370, 55372, 55374 and 55376.

The review and approval of distance education courses shall follow the curriculum approval procedures outlined in Administrative Regulation E-65 – Approval of Credit Courses: Standards and Procedures.

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).

In online and hybrid courses, ensuring regular effective instructor contact guarantees that the student receives the benefit of the instructor’s presence in the learning environment both as a provider of instructional information and as a facilitator of student learning. In a face-to-face course the instructor is present at each class meeting and interacts via all class announcements,
lectures, activities and discussions that take a variety of forms. The same qualities of regular effective contact described above for face-to-face class also are applied to the distance education class.

In addition to the requirements in Title V, section 55376, East Los Angeles College ensures that, all approved courses offered as distance education include regular effective contact between instructor and students, through group or individual contact, orientation either online or face-to-face, telephone contact, e-mail contact, announcements, online office hours, online chats, voice mail, online lectures, podcast, discussions or other activities. All distance education courses at ELAC, whether online or hybrid will include weekly effective instructor contact as described below:

Instructors will regularly initiate interaction with their students to determine that they are accessing and comprehending course material and that they are participating regularly in the activities of the course. Distance education courses are considered the equivalent to face-to-face courses. Therefore, the frequency of the contact will be at least the same as would be established in a regular, face-to-face course. Instructors make certain that there are measures for instructor-initiated regular effective contact incorporated into their online and/or hybrid course design and delivery. Regular effective instructor contact means that instructors must keep in contact with students on a consistent and timely basis to both ensure the quality of instruction and verify their performance and participation.

1. In addition to the requirements in Title V, section 55376, East Los Angeles College ensures that, all approved courses offered as distance education include regular effective contact between instructor and students. Contact shall be distributed in a manner that will ensure that regular contact is maintained, given the nature of asynchronous instructional methodologies, over the course of a week and should occur as often as is appropriate for the course.

2. Title V – 55376 Instructor Contact
   The district governing board shall ensure that:
   - All approved courses offered as distance education shall include regular effective contact between instructor and students.
   - Regular effective contact is an academic and professional matter pursuant to Title V – 53200.

3. All distance education courses at East Los Angeles College, whether online or hybrid will include regular effective instructor contact as described below, but are not limited to:
   1. Lead and participate in online discussions
   2. Scheduled chat room for questions and answers
   3. Scheduled chat room for office hours
   4. Discussion board
   5. Announcements
6. Course announcements more than assignment/exam dates
7. Grading assignments and providing feedback tailored to each student
8. Gives prompt feedback
9. Web conferences
10. On campus meeting, informal or formal
11. Field trip events
12. Participate in online group projects
13. Instructor podcast
14. Voice enabled messages
15. Synchronous virtual meeting
16. Study sessions
17. Scheduled Skype sessions
18. Responding to emails, private messages, phone calls and posted questions.
19. Submitting/grading assignments
20. Attendance at scheduled chats
21. Adherence to scheduled events in the syllabus
22. Logging into the virtual classroom, reviewing messages and responding to messages
23. Web conferences or other live events scheduled for the class
24. On-campus events or other locations where instructor and students meet for class; i.e. museum, observatory, etc.

These effective instructor contact resources maintain student-instructor relationship conducive to learning, motivate students, encourage students to participate in class, and encourage critical thinking.

The College’s Distance Education Addendum requires that the department, discipline and faculty provide representative examples of: “regular and substantive instructor/student contact and interaction in each of the following areas: (a) representative assignments, (b) instructor-initiated themed discussions/interactions between instructor and students, and (c) instructor-initiated feedback and communication of course progress to students enrolled in the course.”

To help ensure the implementation of regular and substantive contact, the Faculty Contract specifies that faculty must demonstrate their proficiency with the College’s learning management system or submit evidence of prior online teaching before teaching a distance education class.

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.

Student authentication in distance education has been an issue of interest to federal policy makers for several years. The growth in enrollment and the number of educational institutions has many concerned about the ability of institutions to verify the identity of the online
student. One regulation requires accrediting institutions to assure distance education programs have a process in place to verify student identity. East Los Angeles College continues to develop new practices and resources for Academic Integrity and Student Authentication.

To verify the identities of students submitting course work online, the College relies primarily on the username/password protocols established by the Etudes course management system. To log on, a student must provide his/her Student Identification Number and birthdate. To further comply with the criteria for authentication set by the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, Etudes requires the student to change their password to a stronger password that includes a capital letter and at least one number.

The College is in the process of migrating from Etudes to Canvas in conjunction with the state’s Online Education Initiative (OEI). New protocols set by OEI and Canvas will also address student authentication, which is exploring different possibilities in authentication, such as keyboard strokes, eye scan, and skype. Updates to student authentication from the OEI are expected either late fall or early spring semester.

One or more of these methods will be used to authenticate or verify a student’s identity:

a. Secure credentialing/login and password
b. Required password change
c. Authenticate on a secure server
d. Students access distance education courses using their unique ID and password
e. Proctored exams
f. Writing style
g. Student skill level
h. Password protected assignments and exams
i. Course listed as hybrid requiring student to attend an on campus meeting
j. CCC Confer (Web conference) sessions requiring students to show ID

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

The College’s Technology Master Plan and the College’s Educational Master Plan address the growing use of computer technologies in distance education as part of offering instruction in alternative modes of delivery to increase student success and retention. Maintenance and upgrading of campus infrastructure and computers for faculty, staff and students all contribute to this effort. During the Program Review process, Distance Education identified its technology needs to support faculty. Through this process, Distance Education’s office was relocated to a spacious suite at Corporate Center. Professional cameras, video and editing equipment and instructional software have been purchased to support faculty and students.

The LACCD Distance Education Technology survey was completed in 2013. The survey
identified the needs of our faculty\textsuperscript{22} and students.\textsuperscript{23} The results was analyzed and addressed to meet the needs of ELAC faculty and students.

With the hiring of two new staff members, ELAC is able to provide a much higher level of support to online students and instructors. The Multimedia Specialist maintains the Distance Learning Program website and assist faculty with the integration of multimedia into their classes. In addition, he is supervising the use of captioning grant funds to ensure that videos in our online classes are close-captioned. The online technical support assistant, runs the Online Student Help Desk, Distance Education telephone line and assist faculty and students with Moodle and Etudes.

ELAC is in the beginning phase of participating with the Online Education Initiative to adopt Canvas as the Learning Management System. Faculty and students will receive the benefit of an enhanced teaching and learning platform beyond reading a textbook, completing assignments and taking a test. ELAC continues to work diligently to combine high-tech support including dynamic course management software, online technical support and a comprehensive website with “interactive” support.

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

ELAC’s Distance Education Program follows the mandates for the Education Code, Title 5 regulations, LACCD policies, ELAC policies and ACCJC policies.

The College creates a Strategic Master Plan,\textsuperscript{24} including Educational and Technology Plans, which reflect ELAC’s strategic priorities, goals and action plans for Distance Education (DE). These plans direct the DE Program in continued planning and decision making, as mediated through the Program Review and Annual Update processes. The DE Program reviews and assesses DE progress towards priorities, goals and action items. Distance Education Program has successfully implemented planning to support faculty and students.

The Distance Education Committee\textsuperscript{25} is charged with communicating and advising the College on its decision making regarding Distance Education issues and address DE efficacy as it relates to the total instructional program. The Distance Education Coordinator reports monthly to the Educational Planning Subcommittee, Technology Planning Subcommittee, and Distance Learning Committee. Emphasizing the important of distance education policies and procedures, the Distance Education Coordinator participates in shared governance at ELAC. Faculty and administration are updated on Distance Education policies.

The DE program is consistent with the mission of the College and conforms to the parameters outlined by ACCJC. Distance Education classes and instruction are held to the same standards “regardless of delivery” and must assure that student learning outcomes are communicated, assessed, and used as data for continuous improvement.
ACCJC standards include specific references and requirements for Distance Education Programs in both Standard I.A. and in Standard II.B. that mandate DE course be held to a standard that: “…offers high-quality instructional programs, student support services, and library and learning support services that facilitate and demonstrate the achievement of stated student learning outcomes.” ELAC’s DE Program ensures these expectations are met.
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6. Student Complaints [Reg 602.16(a)(1)(ix); 668.43]

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 District and College have established procedures for addressing student complaints. Chapter XV of the Board Rules addresses the subject of prohibited discrimination and harassment and emphasizes that the District policy is to “provide an educational, employment and business environment free for Prohibited Discrimination.” 76 The rules define prohibited discrimination, retaliation, and sexual harassment and provide the procedure for complaints. These Board Rules are available on the District website and in the College Catalog.77

The Student Grievance Procedure is designed to provide a prompt and equitable means for resolving student grievances, including grade grievances. The procedures are enumerated in Administrative Regulation E-55, which include informal and formal resolution procedures, timelines, appeals procedures, and the role of the college ombudsperson. This process shall be available to any student or applicant for admission, who believes a college decision or action has adversely affected his or her status, rights, and/or privileges as a student. This information is available to students in the College Catalog79 and on the College’s Student Complaint Process web page.80

Administrative Regulation E-55 specifies the procedures when grades may be changed because
they were given as the result of mistake, fraud, bad faith, or incompetence. Copies of the procedures are also available through the Office of the President and the Office of Student Services.

The president of each college appoints an ombudsperson to assist students with their grievances. The ombudsman is responsible for investigating student grievances in the cases where the individual has not been able to resolve his/her difficulty, or when there are no established guidelines for resolution. All matters handled are strictly confidential. This person’s responsibility is to help students reach a resolution. If an informal resolution is not obtained, the ombudsman will explain to the student the policies and procedures necessary to present a grievance to the campus’ Grievance Hearing Committee.

The Student Complaint Process page on the college website also contains links to the forms needed to document concerns: Statement of Grievance, Request for Formal Grievance Hearing, and Student Comment Form.

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.

Student complaints related to grades and other grievances are filed with and retained by the Office of Student Services. Complaints related to discrimination and sexual harassment are handled by the District Office and the files are maintained at that location.

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

To be determined by the visiting team during the site visit in March 2016.

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 College posts its accreditation status on the college website, one click away from the home page. The statement provides contact information and reference to the complaint process, including a link to the ACCJC website. The College also receives programmatic accreditation for its Nursing, Automobile Technology, Health Information Technology, and Respiratory Therapy programs. Similar statements are available on their respective websites and the main accreditation website.

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

In accordance with ACCJC policy, ELAC posts the following statement on its accreditation
website,\textsuperscript{81} which is one click away from the home page:

East Los Angeles College is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, 10 Commercial Blvd., Suite 204, Novato, CA 94949, (415) 506-0234, an institutional accrediting body recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation and the U.S. Department of Education. Additional information about accreditation, including the filing of complaints against member institutions, can be found at: \texttt{www.accjc.org}.

The accreditation site also contains the ACCJC letter reaffirming accreditation, the visiting team’s 2009 report, and the College’s related documents and reports dating back to its 2003 Self Study.

ELAC complies with the ACCJC Policy on Student and Public Complaints against Institutions, as procedures for student grievance and public complaints are reasonable, fairly administered, and publicized to students and the public on the College and District’s websites and in the College Catalog.

\textsuperscript{76} \texttt{LACCD Board Rule, Chapter XV}  
\textsuperscript{77} \textit{2015-16 College Catalog, pp. 12-13}  
\textsuperscript{78} \texttt{LACCD Administrative Regulation E-55}  
\textsuperscript{79} \textit{2015-16 College Catalog, p. 29}  
\textsuperscript{80} \texttt{Student Complaint Process}  
\textsuperscript{81} \texttt{ELAC Accreditation Website}

### 7. Institutional Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials [Reg 602.16(a)(1)(vii); 668.6]

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

ELAC communicates information about programs, locations, and policies to students and the public via the College Catalog\textsuperscript{82} and the college website.\textsuperscript{83} Details about class locations are provided in the Schedule of Classes.\textsuperscript{84} The Schedule of Classes and College Catalog are available in hard copy and on the college website. The online schedules are updated throughout the semester to reflect changes in course offerings. The Catalog is updated annually.

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

ELAC accurately represents the educational programs and services it provides. The College Catalog accurately reports the official college name, telephone numbers, and the street and website addresses. The College articulates its mission, goals, and values on the website\textsuperscript{85} and in
the general catalog. Information regarding courses and course sequencing; degree, certificate, and program completion requirements; policies regarding transfer of academic credits from other educational institutions; tuition, fees, and policies and procedures for refunds; information regarding availability of and requirements for financial aid; and the rules and regulations regarding student conduct are presented in the College Catalog.

In addition to the preceding information, students and the public may find the following in the general catalog: a list of faculty and the degrees they hold, the district academic freedom and nondiscrimination statements, members of the governing board, and references to the location or publication of other institutional policies.

The College’s statement on its accredited status is presented in the College Catalog and on the website, one click from the homepage. Information related to the accreditation status of academic programs and eligibility for licensure is available on the accreditation website. Copies of all college catalogs are archived in the college library and are available upon request.

Student recruitment is conducted by classified and unclassified staff under the supervision of an Associate Dean in the Office of Student Services. The outreach staff undergo regular, comprehensive training about the College’s programs and offerings prior to conducting campus tours or visiting feeder high schools.

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

In accordance with ACCJC policy, ELAC posts the following statement on its accreditation website, which is one click away from the home page:

East Los Angeles College is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, 10 Commercial Blvd., Suite 204, Novato, CA 94949, (415) 506-0234, an institutional accrediting body recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation and the U.S. Department of Education. Additional information about accreditation, including the filing of complaints against member institutions, can be found at: www.accjc.org.

The accreditation site also contains the ACCJC letter reaffirming accreditation, the visiting team’s 2009 report, and the College’s related documents and reports dating back to its 2003 Self Study.

82 2015-16 College Catalog
83 ELAC Website – Academic Departments and Disciplines
84 ELAC Website – Schedule of Classes
85 ELAC Mission Statement
86 2015-16 College Catalog, p. 10
87 Outreach Office Training Information for Student Ambassadors
8. Title IV Compliance [Reg 602.16(a)(1)(v); 602.16(a)(1)(x); 602.19(b); 668.5; 668.15; 668.16; 668.71]

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.

ELAC complies with the required components of the Title IV federal financial aid regulations. LACCD undergoes an external audit annually. The District office gives the College the list of any college audit findings so that it can prepare the corrective action plan. The College received no external audit findings.

The Central Financial Aid Unit (CFAU) continually monitors federal Perkins Loans and Nursing Loans. Student Financial Aid is audited annually by external auditors, as required by OMB Circular A-133, and is also subject to audits performed by grantors. The District has not received any material findings or questioned significant costs in the past ten years.

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.

The USDE has not identified any issues with ELAC’s financial responsibility, including student financial aid responsibility.

To ensure the College retains compliance with Title IV program requirements, the financial aid staff attends regular conferences and trainings offered by the U.S. Department of Education and financial aid associations to stay current on Title IV regulations.

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.

The Department of Education specifies that institutions with a three-year cohort loan default rate of 30 percent or greater for three consecutive years may be subject to a loss of the Direct Loan Program and/or Federal Pell Grant Programs. According to the Department of Education’s website, the default rates for East Los Angeles College for fiscal years 2010, 2011, and 2012 are 11.6 percent, 19.2 percent, and 13.4 percent, respectively, which are well within the acceptable range.

The College attributes its success in keeping loan default rates at an acceptably low level by
continue to educate its students regarding the various financial aid programs through financial aid awareness events and loan counseling sessions. In additional, the California Community College Chancellor’s Office launched a state wide default prevention project and has identified several tools and vendors to assist California Community Colleges in managing their default rates. The LACCD has been utilizing the Borrower Connect product from USA Funds as a tool to better target outreach with student loan borrowers. The Central Financial Aid Loan Unit (CLAU) of the LACCD conducts all the activities associated with Borrower Connect on behalf of the nine colleges.

**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.**

ELAC’s contractual relationships to offer and receive educational, library, and student support services are appropriate for an institution of higher learning. The District coordinates purchase of subscriptions for all nine campuses with the Community College Library Consortium of California. ELAC renews formal membership agreements on an annual basis. Participating in the consortium allows ELAC to expand its purchasing power, as it is able to purchase subscriptions at a reduced cost.

The Vice President of Administrative Services signs off on all contract requests after careful review to ensure all contracts are consistent with ELAC mission and goals. The Vice President of Administrative Services ensures that all contract provisions maintain the integrity of programs, services and operations from the initial contract request to final contract approval.

The LACCD Board of Trustees (BOT) require that all contracts be ratified within 60 days of the start of the contract, and the College has put in place a technical reviewer in Administrative Services to ensure all BOT Rules, District procedures, and college processes are followed.

No substantive changes have been submitted to the Commission for approval.

**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.**

ELAC demonstrates compliance with the Commission Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations. At ELAC, the president delegated the authority to approve and sign contracts to the Vice President of Administrative Services in his absence; therefore, the Vice President of Administrative Services may approve such documents.

The request for contract (RFC) follows an established procurement policies and procedures that guides the development of the contract and the contractual relationship with the outside entity. Once approved, if the contracted amount is below $5,000, the completed RPC is converted to a
contract by the Office of Administrative Services and returned for signature. If the contracted amount is $5,000 to $85,999, the RFC is sent to the ELAC Regional Procurement Specialist with the requisite supporting documentation for conversion to a contract. If the amount contracted is above $86,000, the RFC is sent to the LACCD Contracts Office to place the RFC out to formal bid.

All requests for instructional service agreements at the College must follow the requirements contained in the State Chancellor’s Office, Contract Guide for Instructional Service Agreements between College Districts and Public Agencies. These agreements must meet all of the provisions of the California Code of Regulations Title 5 and California Education Code and be reviewed by the LACCD’s Office of the General Counsel prior to the governing board approval. The agreement must detail enrollment period, enrollment fees, class hours, supervision process for evaluation, and procedures for students to withdraw. The agreement must also include references to supervision and control to protect the health and safety of the student. Instructors must maintain consistency with the course outline of record and the College must control and direct the instructional activity in its purview. In addition, the facilities must be open to the general public and enrollment in the class must be open to any person who has been admitted to the College and has met applicable prerequisites. Instructors who are hired under this agreement must submit documentation to District Human Resources for review to determine that the minimum qualifications to teach the course are met.

From March 2015 through August 2015, District wide training sessions reviewing common audit findings and giving direction on how to improve contracting performance have been sponsored collaboratively through the contracts and purchasing unit, Office of the General Counsel, and the regional procurement specialists.

---

89 Department of Education School Default Rate
90 LACCD Contract Request Form
91 LACCD Board Rule 7100.15
92 LACCD Administrative Regulation B-19
93 LACCD Procurement Policies and Procedures PDF Document
94 LACCD Administrative Regulation E-109
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I.A.1

The mission describes the institution’s broad educational purposes, its intended student population, the types of degrees and other credentials it offers, and its commitment to student learning and student achievement.

Evidence

The currently approved Mission Statement for East Los Angeles College is the following:

East Los Angeles College empowers students to achieve their educational goals, to expand their individual potential, and to successfully pursue their aspirations for a better future for themselves, their community, and the world.

Goal 1: Increasing student success and academic excellence through student-centered instruction, student-centered support services, and dynamic technologies.

Goal 2: Increasing equity in successful outcomes by analyzing gaps in student achievement and using this to identify and implement effective models and programming to remedy these gaps.

Goal 3: Sustaining community-centered access, participation, and preparation that improves the College’s presence in the community, maximizes access to higher education, and provides outlets for artistic, civic, cultural, scientific, and social expression as well as environmental awareness.

Goal 4: Ensuring institutional effectiveness and accountability through data-driven decision making as well as evaluation and improvement of all college programs and governance structures.

In collaboration with the District’s Mission, ELAC is committed to advancement in student learning and student achievement that prepares students to transfer, successfully complete workforce development programs, earn associate degrees, and pursue opportunities for lifelong learning and civic engagement.
In preparation for the self-study, a review of the Mission Statement was initiated in fall 2014 in order to delineate the types of degrees and other credentials ELAC offers.

Since a majority of the campus personnel responding to an accreditation survey in fall 2013 were familiar with the Mission Statement (4.25 on a 5-point scale) and believed that it serves as the basis of all planning efforts (3.85 on a 5-point scale), the first paragraph of the Mission Statement, which was approved by the Board on May 13, 2009, was not changed.

The first paragraph of the Mission Statement clearly states the educational purpose: “East Los Angeles College empowers students to achieve their educational goals, to expand their individual potential, and to successfully pursue their aspirations for a better future for themselves, their community, and the world.”

Published goals are a component of the Mission Statement. They have been developed to provide guidance on fulfilling ELAC’s mission and vision and to clarify the intended population, as specified in Goal 3: “Sustaining community-centered access, participation, and preparation that improves the college's presence in the community.” Through self-evaluations and research, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement (OIEA) provides information needed for guidance to continue to fulfill ELAC’s Mission, especially its commitment to student learning and student achievement. Using the Governance Policy Handbook, ELAC maintains and reviews the relevance of its Mission Statement annually.

Through the revision process, a final paragraph was added to specify the types of degrees and other credentials offered. The final paragraph states: “In collaboration with the District’s Mission, ELAC is committed to advancement in student learning and student achievement that prepares students to transfer, successfully complete workforce development programs, earn associate degrees, and pursue opportunities for lifelong learning and civic engagement.”

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard and Eligibility Requirement 6.

During the process of adopting the new Mission Statement, numerous constituent groups and committees participated in a thorough discussion and evaluation of its meaning, including the need for the Mission Statement to specify the types of degrees and credentials the College offers.
The Strategic Planning Committee reached consensus on the Mission Statement on February 15, 2015, after previous discussion at its meeting on January 20, 2015.\footnote{Mission Statement}

The ELAC Shared Governance Council approved the revision with minor edits on March 9, 2015.\footnote{2013 Faculty/Staff Survey}

The Academic Senate approved the revision on March 10, 2015.\footnote{Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement (OIEA)}

The Associated Student Union approved the revision on March 20, 2015.\footnote{Governance Policy Handbook}

An all-campus email solicited input regarding the revision on March 24, 2015, and announced two open campus forums that would be held on March 30 and April 30.\footnote{Minutes Accreditation Steering Committee/SPC}

The revised Mission Statement received approval by the Board of Trustees’ Institutional Effectiveness Committee on June 24, 2015 and final Board approval on July 8, 2015.

\vspace{2em}

\noindent I.A.2 \hspace{1em} The institution uses data to determine how effectively it is accomplishing its mission, and whether the mission directs institutional priorities in meeting the educational needs of students.

\textbf{Evidence}

Student performance data are used as the foundation for the objectives and action items created for each of the College’s Master Plans (strategic, educational, facilities, and technology) and for the Program Review and Annual Update processes that are completed by all departments, programs, and units.

Program Review\footnote{Program Review} at East Los Angeles College is a venue through which the college can evaluate its programs in relationship to the College Mission Statement and its Strategic Goals and priorities. Through comprehensive Program Review Self-Evaluation\footnote{Program Review Self-Evaluation} and annual updates, all departments and units are engaged in integrated planning, implementation, and evaluation. Moreover, the college utilizes Annual Update Plans\footnote{Annual Update Plans} and cluster update plans to guide the allocation of resources, thereby ensuring that planning guides budget decisions. All academic programs and departments are provided with longitudinal information related to student enrollment, retention,
and success in their specific courses and are asked to reflect on the outcomes and discuss their efforts to improve access and success.

The ELAC Strategic Plan serves as the central planning document for the College and includes the College Mission, College Vision, and College Strategic Directions and Values. The Strategic Planning Committee (SPC), which reports to the ELAC Shared Governance Council, is responsible for the development, implementation, and evaluation of the Strategic Plan, which in turn is used to guide the development of the other planning documents. Integral to the development of the Strategic Plan was the inclusion of a substantial amount of information, including internal and external scans, and success indicators, used to shape the strategic goals.

The Educational Master Plan details all academic and educational planning objectives, including student and administrative service objectives that relate to educational goals. The format of the Educational Master Plan, as well as the other master plans, is to link the four strategic goals through “data/underlying factors,” to objectives, action items, and evaluation targets. The Educational Planning Subcommittee (EPSC) is responsible for the development, implementation, and evaluation of the Educational Master Plan.

Similarly, the development of the ELAC Student Equity Plan relies on the generation and review of data-related differential student outcomes in specified areas, including basic skills progression and transfer. Action items are developed based on the identification of measurable equity gaps and the strategies and solutions needed to address these gaps.

The East Los Angeles College Profile and Data Book is a compilation of information about the college’s students, faculty, staff and the surrounding communities that ELAC serves. Related attendance and enrollment figures are presented, student outcomes and information about services available to students are reported, and ELAC’s main satellite campus—the South Gate Educational Center—is profiled. The data contained in this document serve many purposes, from providing general information to interested parties to assisting with institutional planning at all levels. In particular, this information has been produced for college- and district-wide strategic planning, program review, and grant writing support.

The Mission Statement for the Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) process at East Los Angeles College states the link between assessment and educational quality. The SLO Mission Statement indicates that ELAC’s SLO process is to “develop and implement innovative and effective assessments of our academic and support programs. These assessments will lead to increased student success through the improvement of our basic skills classes, general education courses, transfer programs, and workforce education programs, as demonstrated by our course completion, certificate, graduation, and transfer rates. This SLO process will serve our multicultural community with its educationally diverse needs and prepare our students for the challenges of the 21st century.”
Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Several processes exemplify data-informed decision making at ELAC. Program Review, including the Annual Update process, encompasses cyclical analysis of various data elements, including course success rates, enrollment by demographics, and learning outcomes assessment. This process also links department/unit planning to the Mission Statement and its goals. The Annual Update process is extensive. All 30 Academic units, 9 Administrative units, 15 Student Service units and 12 other programs complete the process each fall.

I.A.3
The institution’s programs and services are aligned with its mission. The mission guides institutional decision making, planning, and resource allocation and informs institutional goals for student learning and achievement.

Evidence

The College’s Master Plans, all of which are derived from the Mission Statement, form the basis of key committees, plans, actions and decisions. These plans are in turn linked to program allocation decisions, based on comprehensive reviews and annual updates. The goals of the Mission Statement are embedded within the Strategic Plan.

The Educational Master Plan\textsuperscript{114} serves as the College’s guiding strategic document on educational issues. Its objectives guide plans for all departments and units on campus. These are directly linked to the Annual Update Planning template.\textsuperscript{115}

The Educational Planning Subcommittee\textsuperscript{116} is a shared governance committee, designated in the College's Educational Master Plan. This committee ensures that action items are directly aligned with the four goals of the Mission Statement. An example of this would be the committee’s review of action plans that are aligned with the goals found within the Mission Statement.\textsuperscript{117}
Technology Planning Subcommittee \(^{118}\) addresses issues regarding the College's technology use, develops the Technology Master Plan, determines the technology needs of the college, and meets objectives articulated in the Strategic, Educational, and Technology Master Plans.

Facilities Planning Subcommittee \(^{119}\) maintains the Facilities Master Plan, determines projected space needs, reviews bond projects, provides solid documentation of funding requests to the state, restructures current facilities to conform with State Utilization Standards, and meets objectives articulated in the Strategic, Educational, and Facilities Master Plans.

Program Review consists of assessment and validation of all campus departments, units, and clusters. These assessments are reflected in self-evaluation forms describing the contribution each program is making toward fulfilling the College’s plans, mission, and vision.

Annual Update Plans \(^{120}\) monitor annual progress on action plans/goals and validation committee recommendations. These plans are useful for conducting each unit's seven-year comprehensive program review.

Resource allocations are stipulated by the Budget Committee \(^{121}\) based on comprehensive program reviews and annual updates, including unit goals which are used to prioritize unit requests for staff, faculty, equipment, facilities, and augmentations.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

The College’s master plans, all of which are derived from the mission of the college, form the basis of key committees, plans, actions and decisions. These plans are in turn linked to program allocation decisions, based on comprehensive reviews and annual updates. These procedures make the program review process more transparent and relevant for the campus community and, by extension, to the broader community which the college serves.

---

\(^{114}\) [Educational Master Plan](#)

\(^{115}\) [AUP template](#)

\(^{116}\) [The Educational Planning Subcommittee](#)

\(^{117}\) [ELAC Mission Statement](#)

\(^{118}\) [Technology Planning Subcommittee](#)

\(^{119}\) [Facilities Planning Subcommittee](#)

\(^{120}\) [Annual Update Plans](#)

\(^{121}\) [Budget Committee](#)
The institution articulates its mission in a widely published statement approved by the governing board. The mission statement is periodically reviewed and updated as necessary.
Evidence

East Los Angeles College’s (ELAC) Mission Statement was approved by the Los Angeles Community Board of Trustees (BOT) on July 8, 2015. Soon afterward, a marketing campaign was launched to widely disseminate the Mission Statement. The statement can be found at the following locations:

- As a framed document in several prominent campus locations, including the entry way to the suite of conference rooms in Bldg. G1-301, where all shared governance meetings are held, and in the Student Services internal patio area.
- On the college website (several locations), and on the inside covers of the Governance Policy Handbook (and on page 1), the Strategic Plan, the Technology Master Plan, and the Educational Master Plan.
- Within introductions to the widely-disseminated East Los Angeles 2015-2016 General Catalog and Schedule of Classes.
- As a tag line in faculty and administrators’ signature.
  Example:
  Michelle Rodriguez
  Foundation Development Assistant
  rodrigmp@elac.edu
  (323) 265-8901 phone
  (323) 260-8197 fax
  www.elac-foundation.org
  East Los Angeles College empowers students to achieve their educational goals, to expand their individual potential, and to successfully pursue their aspirations for a better future for themselves, their community and the world.

- Included in much of the College’s official literature.
- At the beginning of the Program Review process to guide the College in decision making for planning and the subsequent submission of budgeting requests.
- On Opening Days (August 2013 and 2015), where the Mission Statement has been incorporated into PowerPoint presentations for review and discussion by faculty, staff and administration.

The current Mission Statement went through a review process in spring 2015. The Mission Statement Review Process is elaborated in the Governance Policy Handbook. This process included adoption by the Strategic Planning Committee on February 15, 2015; ESGC on March 9, 2015; Academic Senate on March 10, 2015; and ASU on March 20, 2015. In addition, all employees received email notification of the revised Mission Statement on March 24, 2015 and were provided the opportunity for comments either via email or at two open forums held March 30 and April 30, 2015.

After fully vetting the Mission Statement revision at the campus level, campus leaders presented the new Mission Statement to the Board of Trustees’ Institutional Effectiveness and Student
Success Committee on June 24, 2015. It was approved and forwarded to the whole BOT for approval, which was granted on July 8, 2015.129

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard and Eligibility Requirement 6.

There has been an institution-wide effort to make the Mission Statement a living, breathing document that is widely publicized and periodically reviewed. The Mission Statement is included on the front page of the College’s Program Review template that guides the Program Review and subsequently the budgeting processes.

When new system-wide state mandates and/or initiatives are launched (for example, offering baccalaureate degree programs through community colleges), the Mission Statement is used to evaluate the viability of such initiatives at ELAC. Whether changes are prompted by external forces or from internal processes (such as Program Review), the Mission Statement is the preeminent document that serves as the foundation for making institution-wide decisions.

Agenda items prepared for accreditation meetings also include reviews of the Mission Statement and updates when the need is apparent. Departments and programs are required to show how their goals align with the Mission Statement in Program Review and Annual Updates.

I.B.1

The institution demonstrates a sustained, substantive, and collegial dialog about student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement.

Evidence

The college, through its many college-wide and departmental committees and taskforces, regularly engages in dialog related to student success and achievement. Recent examples of dialog are summarized below.

Student Outcomes Dialog

- The Student Success Committee recently undertook the charge to read Course Learning Outcomes (CLO) assessment reports and make some resource allocation decisions specifically based on needs and plans that result from CLO assessments.130
● Through the CLO assessment of active reading in ESL, the ESL instructors realized there was a significant variance in the success of individual students. The instructors determined there was a link between lack of success in active reading and subsequent lack of success in writing. Two faculty members took on the task of researching effective practices to increase success in reading and developing a presentation. These faculty members presented to the entire ESL discipline as well as several English instructors. As a result, all ESL faculty adopted a new approach to active reading which has increased student success in other student outcomes areas. The presentation was also given at the 2014 CATESOL conference and has sparked discussion of alignment of SLOs and rubrics in ESL across the district.

● The faculty teaching Theater 100, Introduction to the Theater, determined through CLO assessment that students struggled most with the module on the Greek Classical Period. They further identified that students struggling with this area were also struggling with language or reading challenges, or were students who failed to purchase the textbook in a timely manner. The faculty shared that each takes a different approach to teaching that section of the course. Over the next three years, each faculty member will track success in the Greek Classical Period module, then meet to discuss which pedagogical approach has been the most successful and to determine what approach will be the recommended standard for the discipline’s faculty.

● Through a CLO assessment, the faculty teaching Oceanography 1 determined that students do well when being asked to recall information, but they struggle with questions requiring critical thinking and mathematical reasoning. To address this issue, the faculty successfully appealed to the Student Success Committee for a budget to take students on a field trip under the assumption that students will do better when they “use mathematics to analyze real data collected during field trips.” The field trips will take place in fall 2015, during which time the Oceanography faculty will re-assess student proficiency of the Oceanography 1 CLOs.

Student Equity Dialog

● Opening Day 2014 was dedicated to educating the campus on creating equity (Opening Day Presentation, August 2014). Faculty and staff were given time in the afternoon to review equity data and to brainstorm how to address equity issues in their departments and units. The Equity Committee had several meetings, and these were outlined in the Student Equity Plan.

● The Child, Family, and Education Studies (CFES) department recognized the participation disparities between female and male students and has actively sought to increase the number of male students taking CFES classes by having the CFES Student Club participate in recruitment.

● The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement (OIEA) presented on equity in terms of transfer at the December 2014 Transfer Committee meeting. Since then, “transfer equity” has been a standing item on the Transfer Committee agenda. The dialogue resulted in the development of several activities surrounding transfer efforts, for example, Summer Experience programs with Loyola Marymount University and UCLA and the Women’s Leadership Academy scheduled for summer 2015. In addition, these projects were included in the College’s Equity Plan.
• The Strategic Planning Committee dedicated multiple meetings to the discussion of equity beginning in May 2014 and divided into five workgroups meeting throughout summer 2014. Their final contributions were linked to disproportionate impact data, and then vetted to various campus participatory committees for review during fall 2014, including the Strategic Planning Committee, the Educational Planning Subcommittee, the Academic Senate, and the ELAC Shared Governance Council. Action items of the resulting Student Equity Plan were revised based on feedback, revised again, and then finalized on November 19, 2014 by the Board of Trustees. The budget for the Student Equity Plan was released on December 19, 2014, and implementation of the plan began in January 2015.

Although the Equity Plan was vetted through the participatory governance processes, it was felt that many other faculty, classified staff, and administrators from outside those formal committees could contribute to the discussion. After the Board of Trustees approved the Equity Plan in November, an implementation team was developed to include broader participation of faculty and staff. These additional faculty and staff became part of a core planning and implementation team and a Core Planning Committee was developed in March 2015 to develop a broader vision of creating an equity-driven system that would embed equity mindedness into:

• Student outcomes
• Access and support services
• The campus culture
• College organizational structures and systems

This sustained student equity dialog resulted in a meeting with the USC Center for Urban Education (CUE) to discuss the development of a Student Equity Scorecard for ELAC. A meeting was held with the CUE representatives to delve into the definition of equity, understand the process of change beyond student outcomes, and procure assistance to become an equity-minded institution, in which all of our students have an opportunity to enter and succeed.

The proposed activities of the Equity Scorecard project will allow the campus to create faculty inquiry groups, employ critical action research, facilitate conversations about difficult and conflictual issues, and provide leadership with feedback and coaching on how to resolve them as well as to facilitate the collection and interpretation of data to inform changes in practice. Specified data needs will be identified during discussion with campus leadership.

Academic Quality Dialog

• A Cultivating Excellence series was held throughout 2014. The Cultivating Excellence events focused on teaching innovation and excellence, organizational excellence, evidence-based learning, and creating a culture of collaboration.

• The New Faculty Institute (NFI) has been running for seven years. The NFI developed a year-long Reading Across the Curriculum (RAC) program that helps new faculty incorporate pedagogical practices for reading success into their classes. Also, the NFI helps new faculty learn and implement strategies to assess student learning.
• Through an informal survey of students, Business Management students self identified gaps in the program: a lack of understanding of the role of computer and software systems in business and the role of accounting principles in business. To address these weaknesses, the Business Management faculty will work with the Computer Science and Information Technology faculty to emphasize the use of computers in business. Additionally, the Business Management faculty are working with Accounting faculty to contextualize the accounting subject material in its role in business management.

• The Distance Learning (DL) Committee and the Distance Education Program are committed to developing methods both to ensure the educational quality of Distance Education is comparable to that offered in a face-to-face format and to ensure that online students have access to comparable campus and student services. The DL Committee meets regularly to discuss practical approaches to defining and understanding online versus traditional course success and retention gaps; it also places strong emphasis on the meaningful interpretation of student data provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement (OIEA). The DL Committee meets each month to discuss online learning and thus serves as a forum where the faculty representatives, Academic Senate representatives, Information Technology staff, the dean overseeing Distance Education, and the Distance Education Coordinator discuss how to meet the evolving needs of the College’s online students through changes in instruction, curricula, programs, and services.

• In fall 2011, the Distance Education Coordinator and the DL Committee made a dramatic change in how the Distance Education Program approaches learning outcomes. They increased dialog with online students via email, increased dialog with online faculty via email and workshops, launched a log-in video, launched a learning management system instructional video, revised the Distance Education web presence by adding helpful information, and developed strategies to close the gaps in online student success and retention rates. This dialog has resulted in a shrinking gap between student online success rates and traditional success rates. Before 2011, online success rates were 20 percent lower than traditional classes. Since 2011, the gap in success rates between online and face-to-face classes has decreased to 10 percent.

• The DL Committee developed guiding principles and strategies to address equity gaps between online and face-to-face students. These principles were developed using data and analysis provided by OIEA. These resources were distributed directly to ELAC online faculty to assist in closing the gap. These principles, along with other resources the committee and coordinator developed, are available online.

Institutional Effectiveness Dialog

• In spring 2013, robust discussion regarding the development of institution-set standards occurred at meetings of the Program Review and Viability Committee, the Strategic Planning Committee, and the ELAC Shared Governance Council.

• Departments were asked to discuss and develop their own department- or discipline-set standards through the 2015-2016 Annual Update process (p.7).

• During spring 2015, there was significant sustained and substantive dialog regarding the College’s overall course completion rate. This dialog took place in the context of California’s Institutional Effectiveness Framework of Indicators – a set of 17 indicators measuring areas of
student performance, fiscal viability, accreditation status, and programmatic compliance with state and federal guidelines. In order to be in compliance with state law, the college was required to set 1-year goals for two indicators: course completion and accreditation status. While the accreditation status indicator was straightforward, the course completion indicator required significant discussion across the college’s governance structure. This was because the College has traditionally defined course completion in a manner different from the state’s reporting system. OIEA presented two options for the course completion indicator, and these were discussed at length at the following meetings:

- Educational Planning Subcommittee on April 21, 2015
- Academic Senate on April 28, 2015
- ELAC Shared Governance Council on May 11, 2015
- LACCD Board of Trustees on June 10, 2015

In the end, a 71 percent course completion target was set as the 1-year goal. Going beyond compliance, the College also designated a 6-year goal of 74 percent for course completion.

Continuous Improvement of Student Learning and Achievement Dialog

- Over the course of a year-long assessment of their program, the Philosophy department was provided data showing that many students take more than one Philosophy course, yet do not declare themselves as Philosophy majors because the department did not yet offer an associate degree. Through a student survey, they found that 73.3 percent of students would consider Philosophy as a major/minor provided that an associate degree were developed. Additionally, through their development of this degree, the Philosophy department realized that they would need to revise their Program Learning Outcomes to better encapsulate their new program. The department is in the process of this analysis and plans to meet individually with students to determine if there is a preferred track that students should follow to increase philosophical edification and whether taking Philosophy 1 or Philosophy 6 first is the best practice for prospective philosophy majors.

- After completing a student survey and realizing that students did not feel empowered to act on political issues, the full-time faculty members in Political Science held a meeting to discuss their varying approaches to teaching efficacy to students. Upon identifying three representative examples of assignments they felt would help students to develop efficacy, they called a meeting of all Political Science faculty to discuss the need to better empower students. At that meeting of full-time and adjunct faculty, the three representative samples were presented and refined through further discussion to ensure all faculty in the discipline had assignments they were comfortable with and suited the needs of students. These new assignments were adopted to be implemented in fall 2015. Students will be surveyed at the end of the semester to determine if teaching efficacy in this manner was effective.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

The institution provides many venues for dialog, including departmental and college-wide committees, thematic taskforces, and events specifically held to promote dialog. Across the
college, there has been sustained and substantive dialog in the areas of student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, student outcomes, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement. A common theme of the most successful and productive dialogs at the institution is student centeredness. The faculty, staff, and administrators are most interested in dialog when it will result in positive outcomes for the student population.

I.B.2
The institution defines and assesses student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services.
Evidence

ELAC has made significant progress in defining and assessing Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs). Progress in PLOs includes policy changes and both direct and indirect assessment. This has resulted in 100 percent PLOs developed and 93 percent assessed.

Policies affecting PLOs include refining Programs of Study and developing a schedule of completion. In fall 2014, the Program Review and Viability Committee revised the Program of Study Definition, refining it so that a Program of Study must consist of at least 12 units. The process for creating a Program of Study was also revised: Given that Programs of Study are defined by the institution rather than governed by Title 5 regulations, signatory for vetting was shifted from the Curriculum Chair to the Learning Assessment Coordinator. The SLO Sustainability Policy delineates the implementation levels, deadlines, necessary evidence, and accountability actions.

Defining Student Learning Outcomes for Instructional Programs

- PLOs for academic departments, including all degrees and certificates, are developed by discipline content experts. PLOs are developed through a process in which faculty survey their Title V certificate and degree offerings and develop a Program of Study, as defined by the Academic Senate. All full-time faculty who teach in the discipline(s) of the Program of Study must approve the PLOs before they are forwarded to the Learning Assessment Coordinator, who facilitates their entry into TracDat and ensures the Curriculum Dean receives a copy for entry into the catalog. All PLOs are also listed in the catalog.

- As of July 1, 2015, 100 percent of programs have PLOs defined and 93 percent have PLOs assessed.

Assessment and evaluation of PLOs is ongoing. Faculty and staff report on these outcomes through the Program Review Self-Evaluation and Annual Update Plan processes. PLOs are assessed by both direct and indirect measures. Direct assessment of PLOs is conducted through an assignment; indirect assessment of PLOs is generally a survey. Examples include:
• In summer 2014, the Chemistry department utilized an indirect assessment survey for their PLO #1: “Students will relate the significance of chemical principles to their respective educational field of study.” At the end of the semester, students filled out an online self-evaluation survey that focused on their communication skills, confidence in lab equipment selection and problem-solving, and ability to utilize chemical principles in explanations.

In spring 2015, the Chemistry department also administered a direct assessment, a multiple choice exam, for its PLO #2: “Students will apply major concepts and theories in chemistry to describe or explain chemical phenomena.” Questions dealt with stoichiometry, potential energy diagram, acid spill cleaning procedure, lab glassware measurements, scientific method, and experiment execution.

• In spring 2015, the Child Development discipline utilized a direct assessment, the creation of a developmentally appropriate and culturally relevant curriculum plan based on a department-approved rubric, for its only PLO: “Create a developmentally appropriate and culturally relevant curriculum of learning experiences and quality environments.” The assessment showed that although students were able to create a developmentally appropriate activity plan, students demonstrated deficiencies in critical thinking and writing skills when connecting an analysis to their plan. As a result of this assessment, the discipline decided that “additional time will be spent discussing the analysis section during the semester. Instructors will facilitate group discussion and provide hands-on activities promoting critical thinking / writing skills.”

• The English department utilized a direct assessment, a research paper, for its PLO #3: “Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze and respond to college level texts.” Rubric criteria included an examination of organization and analysis to determine student skills in close analytical reading and writing versus student ability to summarize a text.

• The Fire Technology discipline utilized an indirect assessment, a survey, for all three of its PLOs: “Student shall recognize environmental hazards that will adversely affect personal safety;” “Student will identify a patient in distress, assess the patient, and apply the appropriate treatment modality;” and “Student shall select and don the appropriate personal protective equipment based upon a given emergency incident.” Surveys were self-evaluative, and respondents were asked to rate their level of knowledge and competency based on each respective PLO.

• The credit ESL program direct assessment of its PLOs requires students to write an essay, and instructors use a rubric to grade this essay. This measures their PLO: “Students will demonstrate readiness for mainstream English classes by composing a basic, coherent academic essay.”

• The Animation discipline directly assesses students’ portfolios of work utilizing a rubric. From the spring 2015 assessment, the discipline learned that students need increased focus on drawing ability through class exercises, as well as more group discussions and exploration of animation in teams.

• The Arts Graphic Communication program conducts direct assessment through the evaluation of portfolios containing various authentic assessments, including a culminating project. Portfolio items include 15 poems, a 4-page menu for a French restaurant, a campaign for a
film, and a 60-page music magazine that students design themselves over the course of one to two semesters each.  

- The Anthropology discipline does mapping of its PLOs to its CLOs. For example, PLO 1 maps to the CLOs for Anthropology 101 and Anthropology 111, and PLO 2 maps onto the CLOs for Anthropology 101, 102, 104, 109, and 121. Through this means, the discipline learned that students have a basic understanding of human evolution but struggle with the details of the human evolutionary process.  

- The Architecture discipline uses both direct and indirect assessments and multiple measures including exams, portfolios, projects, written work from courses, a capstone project, and a survey.  

As of September 30, 2015, 93 percent of programs have assessed their PLOs. There are three programs that have not completed an assessment:

- Desktop Publishing – There are only three students in the program, and it is felt that an assessment would be of little value for such a small sample.
- Multimedia – Not all courses in this program have been offered.
- Transportation Planning – Not all courses in this program have been offered.

For the two programs that have not offered all courses, Senate policy will force the archiving of the programs in 2016 unless the needed courses have been offered.

Defining Student Service Outcomes for Student Learning and Support Services

- Student Service Outcomes (SSOs) are developed by faculty and staff in each student learning and support service unit, with the dean of each area overseeing the development and approval process before finalizing the SSO.
- As of September 1, 2015, 96 percent of student learning and support services have SSOs defined and 75 percent have assessments in place.  

Assessing Student Service Outcomes for Student Learning and Support Services

As with PLOs, SSOs are assessed via direct and indirect assessments. Results are reported through the Program Review Self-evaluation and Annual Update Processes and are posted to the College’s learning outcomes software system.  

- A significant number of student service units have completed multiple rounds of assessment, evaluation, and plan implementation. Over the last four years, Admissions and Records have assessed their SSO of on-time grade submission and have acted on the findings by analyzing and improving on their publicity and outreach to faculty. Between 2011 and 2014, on-time submission increased from 93 percent to 98 percent, with the most recent jump occurring after the Dean of Admissions added another technique to their campaign, publishing a “Top 10 Reasons to Submit Grades on Time” list.  

- The Transfer Center aids many ELAC students in the process of learning about and preparing for transfer. The Transfer Center has been conducting a Transfer Academy in a variety of forms for many years. One of the SSOs related to the Transfer Academy is: “Transfer
Academy students will find that participation in workshops is helpful to their transfer process.”

This was assessed in June 2011 through a quality of service survey administered to the Transfer Academy participants. More than 80 percent of respondents indicated that participation in workshops was helpful to their transfer process and that they would recommend the Transfer Academy to other students. Even though students found the Transfer Academy helpful, they also indicated in the survey that workshops should be offered in a variety of formats. The Transfer Center created an improvement plan in 2012 that included posting workshop PowerPoint slides on the Transfer Center webpage so that they are accessible to students at all hours and at any location.177

- The Counseling Department has an SSO aimed at measuring the effectiveness of online orientation services using traditional face-to-face orientation as a baseline. To assess this, paper surveys were administered to face-to-face students after their orientation session, and an online survey was administered to online students after their online orientation. This survey is a hybrid of direct and indirect assessments in that it includes both survey questions on student impressions of services as well as a short quiz on topics students should have learned about in the orientation. Results for the 2014 assessment showed that “the Counseling Department is providing an orientation that appears to be equally effective regardless of the method of delivery,” supported by the fact that more than 85 percent of students were able to correctly answer the quiz questions regardless of the modality of the orientation. From the service portion of the survey the Counseling department learned that students wanted more information on the financial aid process. This led to the interesting observation that the face-to-face orientation would have a difficult time adding this content because of time constraints, but the online orientation could easily add this portion. This led to an improvement plan to include additional financial aid content.178

As of September 30, 2015, 75 percent of student learning and support service areas have assessed their SSOs.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard and Eligibility Requirement 11.

The institution is proud of the progress made in the area of student learning outcomes for academic programs and student support services, which is the culmination of more than a decade of hard work by the college’s faculty, staff, and administrators. The evidence above shows that the college defines and assesses student learning outcomes for all academic programs and student support services, with the exception of three academic programs that either have enrollments of insufficient size to create a meaningful assessment or have been unable to offer all courses required for the program.

The College has defined outcomes for 100 percent of programs and these outcomes are published in the Catalog.179 All PLOs are assessed at least once every three years via direct or indirect methods. The support for indirect assessments, generally surveys, comes from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement (OIEA). Both indirect and direct assessments are administered to all students in a given target group, regardless of where or how they are taking the course. The College realizes that additional work remains to be done in assessing PLOs and utilizing the results and has prioritized this as one of its Action Plans.
The College’s Program Review and Viability Committee has defined institutional standards for six areas of student achievement (course success rate, course retention rate, new student fall-to-fall persistence, degree numbers, certificate numbers, and transfer numbers), and OIEA assesses the College’s performance against these standards on an annual basis.

I.B.3
The institution establishes institution-set standards for student achievement, appropriate to its mission, assesses how well it is achieving them in pursuit of continuous improvement, and publishes this information.
Evidence

The College established a set of six measures for college-wide reporting as Institution-set Standards (ISS) for student achievement. These six measures and their corresponding standards (minimal acceptable values) are summarized in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Institution-set Standard*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course success rate</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course retention rate</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall-to-fall persistence for first-time students</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of degrees awarded</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of certificates awarded</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of transfers</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These standards represent minimum acceptable values for the college.

The six measures above are all directly related to the college’s Strategic Plan, which establishes baselines within the plan, as well as targets for several measures of student achievement. As shown in the Strategic Plan, all measures are aligned to specific portions of the college’s Mission. The six measures above are aligned to “Increasing student success and academic excellence through student-centered instruction, student-centered support services, and dynamic technologies” as follows:

- “In-course retention” within the Strategic Plan is aligned to course retention.
- “In-course success” within the Strategic Plan is aligned to course success.
- “First-year persistence” within the Strategic Plan is aligned to fall-to-fall persistence for first-time students.
- “Certificate rate” within the Strategic Plan is aligned to number of certificates awarded.
- “Graduation rate” within the Strategic Plan is aligned to number of degrees awarded.
- “Transfer rate” within the Strategic Plan is aligned to number of transfers.

This alignment ensures that these measures are linked to the College’s Mission.

The six measures above were tied to the numeric institutional-set standards through dialog in the College’s committee structure. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement provided draft standards with rationales to the Program Review and Viability Committee on February 26, 2013. In particular, it was suggested to use five-year averages as values for the standards. Discussion at the committee led to five-year lows generally being considered for all of the standards except persistence. This was presented to the Accreditation Response Group on March 1, 2013, and led to the final Accreditation Response Group recommended standards.
The College assesses how well it is achieving its institutional-set standards in a variety of ways.

- The six college-wide standards were presented to all faculty, staff, and administrators at the 2015 Opening Day. The results for 2013-14 were discussed since transfer numbers for 2014-15 were not yet available.

- The six college-wide standards were presented to Program Review and Viability Committee at the September 3, 2015 meeting. The college’s performance over the last several years with respect to those standards was discussed in detail (LINK TO MINUTES). This discussion continued at the Strategic Planning Committee meeting on September 22, 2015, the ELAC Shared Governance Council (ESGC), and the Academic Senate.

- During the 2015-16 Annual Update Process, each discipline is asked to set its own standards for course success and course retention (Administration of Justice 2015-16 Annual Update Plan) while considering the college-wide standards for these measures. In addition, programs are asked to set completion standards, and Career and Technical Education programs are asked to set standards for licensure pass rate and employment rate (Nursing Annual Update Plan). Because of inconsistency in the way disciplines set their standards, it was recognized that one more cycle of standard setting will be required during the 2016-17 Annual Update Process along with more guidance in how to set the standards.

- Distance Education is in the process of setting its own standards for course success and course retention through the Annual Update Process mentioned above. In particular, draft standards were set for the 2015-16 process and will be reviewed and potentially revised to final figures in the 2016-17 process.

- The College’s institution-set standards are published on the college website. In addition, the draft standards set by disciplines are posted for public viewing within the 2015-16 AUP forms.

Analysis and Evaluation

The college meets the Standard and Eligibility Requirement 11.

The College’s six Institution-set Standards measure course success, course retention, fall-to-fall persistence, certificate completion, degree completion, and transfer. These measures are aligned to the College’s Mission as demonstrated in the College’s Strategic Plan. Assessment and discussion of these standards is taking place in a variety of venues, including at Opening Day, which reaches all full-time faculty, staff, and administrators, and at meetings of the Program Review and Viability Committee. With reference to the college-wide standards, disciplines are setting their own standards for success and retention, and programs are setting standards for completions, licensure rates, and employment rates when applicable. This is an ongoing process that will be central to the 2016-17 Annual Update process. Distance Education, as part of this process, is also setting its own
standards. The six Institution-set Standards and the draft discipline and program standards are published on the College’s website.

I.B.4

The institution uses assessment data and organizes its institutional processes to support student learning and student achievement.

Evidence

East Los Angeles College uses assessment data and organizes its institutional processes to support student learning and student achievement in a variety of ways. Some examples include:

Using Data to Support Transfer: The 2015 Transfer Taskforce Recommendations

In summer 2014, ELAC’s president convened the Transfer Taskforce to explore barriers to transfer for ELAC students and how those barriers might be removed. One of the first actions of the taskforce was to form a Data Analysis and Goals work group to examine transfer data. The group examined data addressing transfer, resulting in a number of goals and policy recommendations, including a goal to decrease the time to transfer for Latinas. This goal became a starting point for a number of programs to be implemented in accordance with ELAC’s Student Equity Plan.

Using Data to Increase Success and Completion: The Math Advancement Program

During the 2011-12 academic year, members of the Mathematics department analyzed student success data provided by OIEA connecting math course grades to course grades in subsequent math courses. The Mathematics department noticed a negative relationship between the amount of time a student waited to take a subsequent course and the eventual grade in that subsequent course. They further observed that the shorter intersession courses had consistently higher success rates. Based on this analysis, the department developed the Math Advancement Program (MAP), which allowed students to take two courses within a single term in sequential eight-week sections, with the students guaranteed a seat in the second course as long as they passed the first course.
The results of the first two MAP cycles were promising. The two-course success rate as of fall 2012 was 34.1 percent for MAP students compared to 29.5 percent for all other ELAC students. Since that time, MAP-style courses have sprung up in a variety of areas, including ELAC’s First Year Completion program and STEM cohort.

Using Data to Increase Success and Completion: The Elimination of English 26

Data was a guiding component in the English department’s decision to eliminate a level of developmental English. In recent times, the developmental English course sequence consisted of four courses, with the majority of students assessing into the two lowest level courses. After looking at the cohort analysis for students placing at the lower levels, the faculty were concerned that less than 17 percent of students placing in developmental courses would ever pass a degree-applicable English course.

The department initiated an experiment called the Fully Integrated Web-enhanced Instructional (FIWI) model, which entailed web-enhancing English 26, one of the developmental levels, with the hope that students would be able to engage more deeply with material and strengthen skills to the point where they could skip a full level, bypassing English 28 and moving directly to English 101, the first transfer-level course. The department found this experiment to be very successful, and it became proof that an entire level could be eliminated from the developmental English course sequence. As of spring 2015, the English department has moved from a four-course developmental sequence to a three-course developmental sequence. Every decision in this process was solidly based on student data.

Using Student Learning Outcome Data to Increase Success: Chemistry

Results of Chemistry 51 SLO assessments prior to 2014-15 demonstrated that students entering Chemistry 51 lacked needed algebra skills. The course has no math prerequisite, so to help students become better able to solve problems within the course, instructors began spending time reviewing math skills during laboratories. The Chemistry department noted that a subsequent assessment of the appropriate learning outcome showed a nine percent increase in students meeting the benchmark.

Using Student Learning Outcome Data to Support Student Achievement: Chicano Studies

The Chicano Studies department identified through the learning assessment process that students are underprepared in college-level writing conventions. The department established a study space especially for students majoring in the discipline for the purpose of increasing retention and graduation rates of Chicano Studies majors. The department also encourages students to access campus resources such as the ELAC Writing Center.

Organizing Institutional Processes to Support Student Learning: Distance Education

The Distance Learning (DL) Committee and Distance Education (DE) Coordinator, recognizing that success and retention for online courses are significantly lower than in traditional courses, have organized institutional processes to ensure that the following student support services are available online:
● Self-help form
● Help desk
● Tutoring
● Course add request portal
● Online learning pre-assessment
● Writing Lab services
● Course catalog
● Admissions services
● Schedule of classes
● Course registration
● Assessment and testing information
● Counseling services
● Orientation
● Financial aid services
● Bookstore ordering services
● Library services
● Disabled student services
● Personal counseling services
● Career counseling and placement services
● Information Technology help desk
● Transcript request services

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

The College uses a variety of assessment data, such as outcomes results and student success data, and organizing institutional practices, such as distance education services, to shape programs to support student learning and student achievement. The College is committed to continuously improving in this area by linking student learning outcome data to strategies that will result in increased student learning and achievement.

I.B.5

The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of goals and objectives, student learning outcomes, and student achievement. Quantitative and qualitative data are disaggregated for analysis by program type and mode of delivery.
Evidence

ELAC assesses its mission through Program Review and evaluation of goals and objectives. The College analyzes disaggregated quantitative and qualitative data for programs.

The Program Review process is used to substantiate the efforts made by departments to improve student learning and to identify the needs of ELAC students and the surrounding community. The College utilizes two processes as part of Program Review: A Program Review Self-Evaluation is completed every seven years, and the Annual Update Plans are completed annually between comprehensive reviews. The College began its most recent seven-year cycle in 2013 and it will conclude in 2019. The Annual Update Plans (AUPs) monitor yearly progress made toward the goals listed in the Program Review, link resources to these plans, and adjust the long-term goals based on current trends and needs.

The Program Review Self-Evaluation (PRSE) Questionnaire focuses on the manner in which each program is supporting the priorities identified in the Strategic Plan. Specifically, the questionnaire requires each department to discuss how it meets each of the four strategic goals of the mission. These goals are the broad planning objectives upon which all college planning documents and departmental plans are based.

AUPs determine the progress made in responding to Program Review Self-Evaluation recommendations and the program or department’s own unit goals. The AUPs serve as the central process for resource allocation decisions, such as hiring new faculty and staff, purchasing new equipment, and increasing or decreasing a unit’s base budget.

The Program Review Self-Evaluation and Annual Update Plans provide essential data in the development and implementation of the evaluative planning processes. This includes the success and retention rates by demographics, enrollments by demographics, and program awards. Any additional data related to Program Review may be requested from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement (OIEA).

The Program Review Self-Evaluation and Annual Update Plans utilize learning outcomes to assess the degree to which departments and programs are working to improve the student learning process and creating improvements in student outcomes.

The 2015-16 Annual Update Plan Template requires each program to establish program set standards. Program set standards include course-level, program-level, and licensure and/or employment rate, if applicable. This new component will be a standard requirement henceforth in the Program Review Self-Evaluation and Annual Update Plans.

In 2013, every Program Review Self-Evaluation report went through a comprehensive Program Review process involving multiple campus committees (Program Review and Viability Committee, Educational Planning Subcommittee, Technology Planning Subcommittee, Facilities Planning Subcommittee, Curriculum Committee, Enrollment Management Committee, Learning Assessment Committee, and Strategic Planning Committee). Recommendations, commendations, and general comments were provided for each unit to address in future planning and implementation efforts.
The final component of the college’s Program Review process aggregates the Program Review Self-Evaluations or Annual Update Plans into a Cluster Plan. The College’s cluster areas are organized by vice president. In 2013, there were four clusters: Administrative Services, Liberal Arts and Sciences, Student Services, and Workforce Education. The Cluster Review Self-Evaluation, prepared by supervising deans under the direction of the vice presidents, provides a venue through which clusters can evaluate their programs in relationship to the college mission and its strategic goals and priorities. The process promotes a self-reflective evaluation of programs in which faculty, staff, and administration can identify programmatic successes and areas in need of improvement as well as establish overarching cluster goals for enhanced programmatic and student success. In 2015, the College reorganized its academic programs under one vice president, combining the Liberal Arts and Sciences cluster with the Workforce Education cluster into a single Academic Affairs cluster.

OIEA provides all data for the Program Review process.

- All data are disaggregated by department, discipline, and time of day. This includes enrollment, success rates, retention rates, and degree/certificate outcomes by various demographic variables. These data can be found on OIEA’s Planning Data System.

- When possible, OIEA disaggregates data to allow for more specific planning efforts. For example, the Program Review data (i.e., success rates, retention rates, and enrollments by demographics) provided to our Distance Education Program, the department which oversees our online courses, is disaggregated by the mode of delivery.

- Departments may also make specific data requests (e.g., course-taking pattern analysis, highest completed Math/English courses, course subject sequence completion, etc.) to supplement Program Review and other evaluative activities.

- The Learning Assessment Office also provides an analysis of learning outcomes for Programs of Service and Programs of Study.

In addition to Program Review, the College also assesses its accomplishments toward the college mission through the Current Data Plan Report. This report contains a set of college targets based on the College’s dialog on the improvement of student outcomes and institutional effectiveness. Each individual metric is directly linked to one of the four goals in the College’s Mission Statement. These metrics represent a shared understanding of targeted improvements that the College believes are both attainable and challenging. Targets are evaluated on an annual basis.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

The College’s Program Review process fully integrates the mission and goals and guides the planning, evaluation, and implementation cycle as discussed in the Strategic Plan. The College is committed to continuously improving in this area and exploring how to incorporate more disaggregated data into the program review and other planning processes.

---

200 Program Review Self-Evaluation
201 Annual Update Plans
I.B.6

The institution disaggregates and analyzes learning outcomes and achievement for subpopulations of students. When the institution identifies performance gaps, it implements strategies, which may include allocation or reallocation of human, fiscal and other resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies.

Evidence

East Los Angeles College has a long history, both through the work of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement (OIEA), and the work of faculty and departments, of disaggregating and analyzing outcomes and achievement for subpopulations of students. When performance gaps are found, the College takes appropriate actions and then evaluates the success of those actions.

The development of the First Year Experience (FYE) program utilized student achievement data that was generated by OIEA to shape the 2012-18 Educational Master Plan's objectives and action items. One of the most compelling pieces of data shared with the campus was a "cohort-based pipeline report" that showed only 15 percent of the subpopulation of entering students completed the required math and English courses needed to earn a degree within three years. This information was foundational to the creation of the college's FYE program in the 2012-13 academic year. The program developers also followed recommendations from the literature that emphasized the importance of enhancing student success via numerous protocols and support structures: full-time enrollment, college success courses, tutoring, completion of lower-level math and English classes, and students’ completion of at least 20 units in one year. The FYE program structure stemmed from the information provided by these internal and external sources and aligned itself with the College's Educational Master Plan.

Recognizing that the population served by the College’s FYE program is primarily Latina/o, assessment of the program compares program students to other first-year Latina/o students. The most recently conducted assessment shows that FYE students have significantly better outcomes than the comparison group.

OIEA generated a data set showing success rates by discipline, comparing the ELAC main campus and online courses, for fall terms between 2007 and 2011. This data set identified significant performance gaps, with the online students often having success rates 20 percentage points below their main campus counterparts. As a result of this gap, the institution has devoted significant additional resources to Distance Education (DE). The faculty DE coordinator is now on full release and has two full-time classified staff members specializing in multimedia. Training and troubleshooting are available to faculty whether in classes, or on a one-on-one basis if they desire. Students have a helpline to call, which they primarily use for log-in difficulties.
The Communication Studies faculty linked Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) to student information in spring 2013. Through this linkage, they learned that, contrary to their assumption, placement in English courses has no bearing on successful completion of Communication Studies 101 (Speech). However, they also learned that among the criteria to achieve the outcome (to perform a persuasive speech), female students were very successful at organization and research leading up to a speech, but were weak on actual presentation skills while male students suffered a converse effect, being strong at presentation and weaker at organization and research. This led to much discussion among Communication Studies faculty about potential faculty gender biases in grading and pedagogical approaches. The faculty collectively agreed to more consciously address this gap through classroom discussion and additional engagement activities for both males and females.

In summer 2014, the college president convened the Transfer Taskforce to explore barriers to transfer for ELAC students, and how those barriers might be removed. One of the first actions of the taskforce was to form a Data Analysis and Goals Work Group to examine transfer data disaggregated for a number of subpopulations. The Data Analysis Work Group, led by a Math faculty member, included faculty from English, Reading, Social Sciences, and Life Sciences as well as representation and support from OIEA. The group generated data sets addressing the following:

- Time to transfer (years) disaggregated by student educational goal
- Time to transfer (years) disaggregated by initial math placement
- Time to transfer (years) disaggregated by initial English placement
- Time to transfer (years) disaggregated by the total number of remedial courses required to reach transfer level
- Time to transfer (years) disaggregated by gender and ethnicity

The work of this group resulted in a number of goals and policy recommendations, including a goal to decrease the time to transfer for Latinas, since it was roughly one year longer than other groups. This goal became a starting point for a number of programs to be implemented as delineated by ELAC’s Student Equity Plan.

OIEA produces the College Profile and Fact Book each year. This series of reports includes retention and success figures disaggregated by the following populations:

- Disabled students
- Extended Opportunities Programs and Services (EOPS) students
- Financial Aid awardees
- Honors students
- Veteran students
- International students

In addition, this fact book includes retention and success figures for the entire college population disaggregated by:

- Ethnicity
- Gender
Disabled Student Program and Services (DSP&S) students and Extended Opportunity Program and Services (EOPS) students were examined with regards to success and retention as compared to students not receiving those services. This data set, examining the periods of fall 2012 and fall 2013, was further disaggregated by ethnicity and gender. Analysis of this data showed that overall DSP&S and EOPS students outperformed their general population counterparts in retention and success (where numbers were large enough to make comparisons significant). In this situation, since EOPS and DSP&S students are being offered additional support, it validates their programs in that they have met or exceeded the retention and success rates for the overall campus.

At the request of the Math, Engineering, Science Achievement (MESA) Director, OIEA produced a report disaggregating the non-passing rate and withdrawal rate in STEM courses comparing Latina/o students to all other ethnicities. This document showed significant performance gaps across all STEM courses, with Latina/o students generally having much higher withdrawal and non-passing rates. These data were used to compare the efficiency of intervention programs in academic performance. Specifically, they were used to correlate (not proportionally and uniquely) the STEM Mentor program with student success. These findings were presented at the Alliance of HSI Educators 2013 Best Practices Conference in New Jersey and at the NSF 2013 STEP Grantees Meeting in Washington DC.

The transfer rate of veteran students, compared to the general student body, was examined by the College’s researchers. The Veteran Transfer Cohort Rate Report showed that the subpopulation of veterans had a consistently higher transfer rate overall; hence no gap exists at this time.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

The institution disaggregates and analyzes student outcome and achievement data for a variety of subpopulations of students, such as first-time Latina/o students, disabled students, veteran students, Latina/o STEM students, online students, students from the South Gate Educational Center, and female students. The gaps that have been found in analysis have led to the development of several innovative programs, such as the STEM Mentor Program and the First Year Experience Program, as well as significant equity-related planning and programming. These programs have proven their ability to improve student outcomes.
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I.B.7
The institution regularly evaluates its policies and practices across all areas of the institution, including instructional programs, student and learning support services, resource management, and governance processes to assure their effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of mission.

Evidence
ELAC regularly evaluates its policies and practices across various areas of the institution including instructional programs, student and learning support services, resource management, and governance to assure effectiveness, academic quality and accomplishment of mission.
Instructional Programs/Learning Support Services

The primary method of evaluating practices for instructional programs and learning support services is through the Annual Update Plan\textsuperscript{218} that “helps units monitor annual progress on action plans” of the Program Review Self-Evaluation (PRSE).\textsuperscript{219} PRSE is the comprehensive self-evaluation conducted by each unit/department during the College’s seven-year cycle. The purpose of Program Review at ELAC is to provide a venue through which the College can evaluate its programs in relationship to the mission and its strategic goals and priorities. The Program Review process coupled with the Annual Update Plans promotes a self-reflective evaluation of programs in a manner in which faculty, staff, and administrators can identify programmatic successes within their areas, identify areas in need of improvement, and establish departmental goals for enhanced programmatic and student success. ELAC believes that Program Review enhances the College’s efforts to improve student learning and achievement.

The Annual Update Plan (AUP)\textsuperscript{220} is the central vehicle through which planning and budget are connected. Each year, each department/unit submits a plan detailing current activities and future goals related to the Educational Master and Strategic Plans, as well as the efforts made to respond to the department/unit’s Program Review Self-Evaluation recommendations. A unit/department may also use the AUP to discuss any changes, internal or external, that may be helpful in conducting the seven-year PRSE. The AUPs are also an integral part of the College’s budgetary processes. All requests for staffing, equipment, and additional resources required for those unit activities must be identified in the department/unit’s AUP. This integration of planning and resource allocation is detailed in the budget and planning timeline and summarized in the LACCD/ELAC Budget Development Process timeline.

As part of the ongoing effort to align the college planning and evaluation efforts with Accreditation Standards, the College requires each academic department to develop its own discipline retention and success standards.\textsuperscript{221} These discipline-set standards will be aggregated and reported by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement (OIEA) and used as an indicator within the PRSE and AUP evaluation process starting in the 2017-18 planning period.\textsuperscript{222}

The Cluster Review Self-Evaluation (CRSE)/Cluster Update Plan (CUP)\textsuperscript{223} is the final component of ELAC’s college-wide evaluation process, which aggregates the Program Review Self-Evaluations and Annual Update Plans into a Cluster Plan. The college has four clusters—Administrative Services, Liberal Arts and Sciences, Student Services, and Workforce Education. The CRSE/CUP provides a venue through which clusters can evaluate their programs in relationship to the College Mission and its Strategic Goals and priorities. This report is prepared by supervising deans under the direction of vice presidents. The CRSE/CUPs serve as a way of communicating cluster goals to their constituent groups and provide the college with an opportunity to engage in dialog surrounding campus planning and resource allocation, while acknowledging the need for vice presidents to make budget decisions in a flexible and fluid manner to respond to district mandates and other urgent external factors. The process promotes a self-reflective evaluation of programs in which faculty, staff, and administration can identify programmatic success within their programs, identify areas in need of improvement, and establish overarching cluster goals for enhanced programmatic and student success. In 2015, the College reorganized its academic programs under one vice president, combining the Liberal Arts and Sciences cluster with the Workforce Education cluster into a single Academic Affairs cluster.
During the 2015-2016 Annual Update planning cycle, equity outcome data were provided to each of the clusters for review and inclusion as needed within the Cluster Update Plan. This ensured that the goal of student equity was integrated into the College’s ongoing planning processes.

Viability Reviews focus on ways to improve programming and student learning through formal evaluation and collegial dialog. The viability process can lead to recommendations for programmatic improvements that may, in some cases, result in the discontinuance of a college program. The review seeks to incorporate program evaluations in the shared governance structure and allow for an evaluation of a program by representative faculty, staff, and administrators focused on whether the program continues to be viable. A public forum is also held to allow feedback from the campus community. OIEA then prepares and presents a report, with both recommendations and timeline for action, to the Shared Governance Council.

In 2009, a viability review of the PACE program was conducted. The Viability Committee, in collaboration with OIEA found that PACE was no longer viable and recommended the discontinuance of the program. Viability reviews were also conducted on the Adelante program and the Men and Women’s Physical Education Departments.

An Expedited Program Viability Review is initiated when a degree or certificate program is no longer feasible because a course required for that program is archived. Under this process, the program undergoes a review to determine what actions should be taken, such as program maintenance, modification, improvement, or discontinuance.

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) are an essential part of the college evaluation process. At all levels of the SLO process, the responsibility for creating authentic assessments, analyzing the results, and developing plans rests with the faculty and staff. The College relies primarily on the four types of SLOs—Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs), Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), Student Service Outcomes (SSOs), and Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs)/General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs). CLOs are to be assessed on a regular basis, including the development of plans that close the loop on all outcomes. The practice has been for assessment and evaluation of CLOs to occur at least once within a three-year period. Reports are submitted on a semester-basis, with reporting deadlines in January and July. Assessment results from each of these SLOs are integrated and reviewed through the PRSE and AUP process. CLOs, PLOs, and SSOs, are mapped to the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and General Education Outcomes (GELOs) to determine how well the College is meeting institutional goals and to determine what the College can do to ensure student success.

Recognizing a need to accelerate SLO assessment progress, in 2013, the College approved funding to support SLO Facilitator positions. Faculty Facilitators were trained by the Learning Assessment Office and tasked with assisting departments with SLO creation/revision, assessment, and reporting. Thanks to the efforts of the Learning Assessment Office, SLO Facilitators and the faculty, the campus reports a 98.6 percent SLO participation rate for full-time faculty during the spring 2015 semester.

Continued efforts for improving the SLO assessment cycle resulted in an all-faculty SLO meeting on July 23, 2015, to discuss policies for CLO assessment. Results from a faculty SLO Survey
were presented and discussed. As a result of this meeting, faculty submitted the following recommendations to the Learning Assessment Committee (LAC) for further discussion:

- That each course have at minimum one CLO
- That each CLO “close the loop” within a three-year period, with the discipline determining how best to meet the three-year requirement

The Learning Assessment Committee refined the above recommendations. The revised recommendations passed by the Academic Senate during their September 22, 2015 meeting were:

- That each course must close the loop on all CLOs within a three-year timespan based on the CLO process described in the diagram. (August 26, 2015)
- That each discipline publish by October 31 its schedule for completing the three-year assessment cycle. (Sept. 2, 2015)
- That any course should have CLOs and assessments sufficient to analyze the course expectations of student learning in that course. Best practices are generally understood as requiring two to five CLOs per course.
  - For those courses with only one CLO, discipline faculty must provide a detailed explanation justifying why one CLO meets the quality and rigor of the course.
  - Additionally, the LAC recommends that this explanation be submitted to the Learning Assessment Coordinator no later than October 30.
  - If a discipline elects to add CLOs, those CLOs will become active the following semester. (Sept. 2, 2015)
- That deadlines for CLO reports be shifted from January 15 for fall reports and July 15 for spring reports to March 20 for fall reports and October 30 for spring reports. (Sept. 2, 2015)

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement (OIEA) regularly publishes institution-wide data on its website to inform planning, evaluation, and decision making across the campus. OIEA follows the College’s Planning Calendar to provide both formative and summative data to the college community. Examples of this include the annual reporting of the Strategic Outcomes Report, which details the College’s progress toward targets and goals set by the Strategic Plan. OIEA also provides all data for the PRSEs, AUPs, the annual College Profile, and the Fall Facts in Brief report.

The Distance Education (DE) program participates in the PRSE and AUP processes and uses a program-specific dataset to evaluate its program. Like other departments and units, DE provides updates on PRSE recommendations, reports on PLOs, and sets goals for its program. Additionally, DE staff review the program’s Online Help Log to determine which information to provide for students on its website. This website contains many resources for both students and instructors, including enrollment information, useful links, FAQs, and student service information. (DE Website)

Resource Management and Governance

ELAC evaluates its resource management and governance processes in a variety of ways.
The *Governance Policy Handbook*[^238] is the guiding publication for all policies and practices related to ELAC’s decision-making processes. The *Handbook* provides procedures and timelines for all major evaluative processes used by the College. The *Handbook* is routinely revised by the Accreditation Steering Committee[^239]. The *Handbook* recently went through its fourth revision and was fully adopted in summer 2015[^240]. A list of changes incorporated into the handbook were distributed to faculty at Opening Day and at meetings of ESGC, the Chairs, and Academic Senate[^241]. Most notably, the College’s Mission Statement was revised to more accurately incorporate ELAC’s current and future directions for students and the campus as a whole.

Each campus committee is asked to complete a Committee Self-evaluation each academic year in September[^242]. These evaluations guide committees and/or their chairs in reviewing actions and highlights from the previous year as well as areas where the committee struggles. Further, this evaluation asks the committee to consider the goals for the coming year while considering obstacles to those goals.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

ELAC has well-documented processes for ongoing evaluations. All departments/units are evaluated and allocated resources through the Program Review Self-Evaluation and Annual Update Plan. These processes are constantly being evaluated and changed to meet local needs as well as State and Accreditation requirements. The College also regularly evaluates its Strategic and Master Plans, and provides current and historical data to inform the College’s decision-making processes. Additionally, the College regularly revises its *Governance Policy Handbook* to ensure that all processes and procedures align with the College Mission Statement.
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[^223]: Program Review Self-Evaluation Cluster Update Plan
[^224]: Annual Update planning cycle
[^225]: Viability Reviews
[^226]: PACE program
[^227]: Program Viability
[^228]: Expedited Program Viability Review
[^229]: Student Learning Outcomes (SLO)
[^230]: 2013 Dept SLO Facilitator Proposal
[^231]: CLO Policy Discussion Presentation
[^232]: CLO Assessment Cycle LAC Recommendations
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I.B.8

The institution broadly communicates the results of all of its assessment and evaluation activities so that the institution has a shared understanding of its strengths and weaknesses and sets appropriate priorities.

Listed below are the College’s assessment and evaluation results communicated via the College’s website.

- Institutional General Education Learning Outcomes\textsuperscript{243} results

- Course and Program Learning Outcomes results via the software system TracDat\textsuperscript{244} (username: guest, password: guest)

- The State of California’s Student Success Scorecard\textsuperscript{245} available through a link on the lower right corner of every page on the website (Clicking the link takes visitors to a page where the Scorecard is explained, and where they can navigate to the State site. The Scorecard includes data on momentum points and completion outcomes.)
• The annual “College Profile and Data Book,” containing a chapter on “Student Outcomes and Performance Indicators” (p.75), which includes disaggregated data on retention and success, persistence, and several longitudinal cohort analyses (Reports and Presentations “Current Data Reports”)

• A link to the “Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS)” website provided within the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement (OIEA) web pages (The website, Reports and Presentations provides disaggregated information on retention and completion.)

• District-wide and campus-level student survey results on the website Reports and Presentations, under “Campus Surveys”

• 2013-2019 Program Review Self-Evaluation reports and recommendations for academic units, administrative units, student services units, and other units not falling within these categories

• The Annual Update Plans for academic units, administrative units, student services units, and other units containing yearly responses to the 2013-19 Program Review Self-Evaluation recommendations and a program assessment showing course level retention and success as well as addition, program level outcome results

• Reports and recommendations on the viability of programs

While 69.9 percent of students agreed that they knew where to find student success data online, the College would like to increase that to as near to 100 percent as possible. The Fall 2014 LACCD Student Survey, question 31.b, asked students, “To what extent do you know where to find information on . . . Student success rates for this college and my program?” Students responded as follows:

| Agreed that they can find the information | 69.9% |
| Disagreed that they can find the information | 28.8% |
| No response | 1.3% |

In addition to the College’s website, various campus committees provide a forum for discussion of assessment and evaluation results, including the prioritization of activities. Some examples are as follows:

• The Academic Senate reviewed its Program Review Self-Evaluation report, which included an evaluation of the Senate functioning and place of the Senate within the institution, on September 24, 2013. On October 22, 2013, the Senate reviewed the Adelante Program Viability Report and Program Review and Viability Committee recommendations and a similar report for Men’s and Women’s Kinesiology.

• The Educational Planning Subcommittee reviewed the Adelante Implementation Task Force recommendations on February 18, 2014. In addition, time was spent during 2013-14
reviewing the Educational Master Plan objectives, which were based on student success data, and prioritizing those objectives.\textsuperscript{255}

- The Learning Assessment Committee regularly has an “Assessment Spotlight” at their meetings where assessment results can be discussed.\textsuperscript{256}

- The Enrollment Management Committee (EMC) prioritizes the allocation of class hours based on a number of factors, including student demand and the extent to which a given department contributes to eventual student degree completion or transfer. For example, during spring 2015 the EMC met to distribute 16,909 credit hours for the 2015-16 year, and at the March 25 meeting, the committee decided to set aside a specific allocation for the South Gate Educational Center.\textsuperscript{257}

- During spring 2015, the Student Success Committee decided as a body to begin reviewing Student Learning Outcome improvement plans aligned with the committee’s mission for the purpose of distributing Basic Skills Initiative funding.\textsuperscript{258} The committee believes that they can help connect well-thought out and researched improvement plans to a funding source. The committee, as of June 2015, is in the process of developing their procedure for reviewing these plans.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Assessment and evaluation results are made available to all members of the campus community through the college website and are presented at many of the decision-making committees on campus for discussion and prioritization. Faculty and staff are able to use the data produced by OIEA and the outcomes reports available on TracDat, for example, to help set goals and make budget requests through the Program Review process and Annual Update Plans. Committees ranging from the Transfer Taskforce to the Educational Planning Subcommittee to the Academic Senate are able to review data related to student success and progress to develop and approve strategies and activities to foster student transfer.

\textsuperscript{243} Institutional General Education Learning Outcomes
\textsuperscript{244} TracDat
\textsuperscript{245} Student Success Scorecard
\textsuperscript{246} College Profile and Data Book
\textsuperscript{247} Reports and Presentations
\textsuperscript{248} Program Review Self-Evaluation
\textsuperscript{249} Annual Update Plan and Program Review Self-Evaluation webpage
\textsuperscript{250} Program Viability webpage
\textsuperscript{251} Fall 2014 LACCD Student Survey
\textsuperscript{252} Academic Senate Minutes 9/24/2013
\textsuperscript{253} Academic Senate Minutes 10/22/2013
\textsuperscript{254} Educational Planning Subcommittee Minutes 2/18/2014
\textsuperscript{255} ESPC Minutes 5/20/2014
\textsuperscript{256} Learning Assessment Committee Minutes, 4/02/2014
\textsuperscript{257} Enrollment Management Committee Minutes 3/25/2015
\textsuperscript{258} Student Success Committee Minutes 5/06/2015
I.B.9
The institution engages in continuous, broad based, systematic evaluation and planning. The institution integrates program review, planning, and resource allocation into a comprehensive process that leads to accomplishment of its mission and improvement of institutional effectiveness and academic quality. Institutional planning addresses short- and long-range needs for educational programs and services and for human, physical, technological, and financial resources.

Evidence
ELAC engages in continuous, broad based, systematic evaluation and planning. The planning process integrates Program Review with ELAC’s long term plans and resource allocation including staffing, physical, technological, and financial needs.

The foundation of long term planning at ELAC is the College’s Strategic Plan. From the Strategic Plan flow the Educational, Technological and Facilities Master Plans. These plans are systematically reviewed on a seven-year cycle.

- The *East Los Angeles College 2011-2017 Strategic Plan* serves as the central planning document for the College and contains the College Mission, Vision, and Strategic Directions. The Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) is responsible for the development, implementation, and evaluation of the Strategic Plan and reports to the ESGC. The Strategic Plan is used to guide the development of the other planning documents.

  As part of the Strategic Plan, the college developed a set of college targets based on dialog regarding the improvement of student outcomes and institutional effectiveness. These targets represent a shared understanding of targeted improvements that the college believes are both attainable and challenging. Targets are evaluated on an annual basis.

- The *East Los Angeles College 2012-2018 Educational Master Plan* details all academic and educational planning objectives, including student and administrative service objectives that...

---

(Standard I.B.9 and I.C.3)
relate to educational goals. The Educational Planning Subcommittee (EPSC) is responsible for
the development, implementation, and evaluation of the Educational Master Plan.

- The *East Los Angeles College Facilities Master Plan 2012-2018* describes all planning
  objectives related to facilities and college infrastructure. The Facilities Planning Subcommittee
  (FPSC) is responsible for the development, implementation, and evaluation of the Facilities
  Master Plan.

- The *East Los Angeles College Technology Master Plan 2012-2018* describes all objectives
  related to educational technology and technology infrastructure. The Technology Planning
  Subcommittee (TPSC) is responsible for the development, implementation, and evaluation of
  the Technology Master Plan.

All Master Plan objectives are aligned with the strategic directions and values of the Strategic Plan.
All college planning agendas are created through data-driven processes that include national, state,
local, and campus-level data.

OIEA provides comprehensive college data on student outcomes and college core indicators of
success. The college is also guided by the objectives set forth in the District Strategic
Plan. Through the use of quantitative and qualitative data, and the direction of the District
Strategic Plan, the college regularly reviews its own strategic and planning objectives.

The Program Review process is used to substantiate the efforts made by departments to improve
student learning and to identify the needs of ELAC students and the surrounding community. The
college utilizes two processes as part of Program Review: a Program Review Self-Evaluation is
completed every seven years and the Annual Update Plans are completed annually.

- The Program Review Self-Evaluation focuses on the manner in which each program is
  supporting the goals listed in the Strategic Plan.

- Annual Update Plans determine the progress made in responding to Program Review Self-
  Evaluation recommendations and the program or department’s own unit goals. The Annual
  Update Plans serve as the central process for resource allocation decisions, such as hiring of
  new faculty and staff, purchase of new equipment, and increases or decreases to a unit’s base
  budget.

- The Program Review Self-Evaluation and Annual Update Plans provide essential data in the
development, implementation, and evaluative planning processes. This includes the success
  and retention rates by demographics, enrollments by demographics, and program awards. Any
  additional data related to program review may be requested from the Office of Institutional
  Effectiveness and Advancement.

- The Program Review Self-Evaluation and Annual Update Plans utilize SLOs to assess the
degree to which departments and programs are improving the student learning process and
  student outcomes.

- The 2015-16 Annual Update Plan (AUP) required each program to establish program-set
  standards. This included course-level, program-level, and licensure and employment rate, if
  applicable. This new component will be a standard requirement in the Program Review Self-
  Evaluation and AUPs.
The AUP is the central vehicle through which planning and budget are connected. Each year, every department/unit submits a plan detailing unit activities and future goals related to the Educational Master and Strategic Plans and the efforts made to respond to the department/unit’s Program Review Self-Evaluation recommendations. All requests for staffing, equipment, and additional resources required for those unit activities are identified in the department/unit’s AUP. Thus, AUPs are an integral part of the College’s budgetary processes. This integration of planning and resource allocation is detailed in the budget and planning timeline and summarized in the LACCD/ELAC Budget Development Process timeline in the Governance Policy Handbook.267

The final component of the College’s program aggregates the Program Review Self-Evaluation or AUPs into a Cluster Plan. The College has four clusters—Administrative Services, Liberal Arts and Sciences, Student Services, and Workforce Education (reduced to three clusters in 2015 with the integration of Liberal Arts and Sciences and Workforce Education into Academic Affairs). Cluster Plans are prepared by deans under the direction of vice presidents.

The Cluster Review Self-Evaluation provides a venue through which clusters can evaluate their programs in relationship to the College Mission and its Strategic Goals and priorities. The College recognizes the need for vice presidents to make budget decisions in a flexible and fluid manner; however, the goals and priorities serve as a way of communicating cluster goals to their constituent groups and provide the College an opportunity to engage in dialog surrounding campus planning and resource allocation. The process promotes a self-reflective evaluation of programs in which faculty, staff, and administration can identify programmatic success within their programs, identify areas in need of improvement and establish overarching cluster goals for enhanced programmatic and student success.

Both OIEA and the Learning Assessment Office (LAO) provide the college community with data related to student success indicators. This data is used in the Annual Update Plans and Program Review Self-Evaluations. In addition, OIEA regularly generates and publishes data reports on its website. It also provides links to several state and federal reports, including the Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (ARCC) report and Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS).

OIEA also creates and disseminates the East Los Angeles College Profile and Fact Book.268 This document is a five-year compilation of information about ELAC, its students, faculty, staff and the surrounding communities that it serves. Related attendance and enrollment figures are presented, student outcomes and information about services available to students are reported and ELAC’s main satellite campus, the South Gate Educational Center, is profiled. The data contained in this document serve many evaluative and planning purposes, from providing general information to interested parties to assisting with institutional planning at all levels. In particular, this information has been produced for college- and district-wide strategic planning, program review and for grant writing support.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard and Eligibility Requirement 19.
The Program Review Self-Evaluations and Annual Update Plans fully integrate the College Mission and goals, guiding academic evaluation, planning, and resource allocation.

The College follows a systematic Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation (PIE) cycle. This PIE cycle is guided by the Governance Policy Handbook, which demonstrates the college’s commitment to a formal structure and accountability system for all decision-making and evaluation processes. The Governance Policy Handbook also delineates all matters of planning and evaluation, including a detailed description of how the goals of the Strategic Plan inform the Education, Facilities, and Technology Master Plans. Furthermore, the Program Review Self-Evaluation (PRSE) and Annual Update Plan (AUP) evaluative processes ensure that all college programs/units/departments, learning outcomes, and goals undergo regular formative and summative evaluation toward meeting the College Mission.

All documents related to the PIE cycle are published on the college website. Additionally, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement (OIEA) and the Learning Assessment Office (LAO) work to ensure that institutional data and related reports are updated regularly and made available on the OIEA and LAO websites. Both offices are continually strategizing on how to make data accessible to all members of the college community. These efforts have led to a broader use of data throughout the College’s planning, evaluation, and decision-making processes.

---

I.C.1

The institution assures the clarity, accuracy and integrity of information provided to students and prospective students, personnel, and all persons or organizations related to its mission statement, learning outcomes, educational programs, and student support services. The institution gives accurate information to students and the public about its accreditation status with all of its accreditors.

Evidence

East Los Angeles College (ELAC) ensures the clarity, accuracy and integrity of any information vital to the College’s mission through a multi-pronged system of checks and balances, and distribution mechanisms. First, as the fulcrum for the College’s Educational Master Plan, ELAC possesses a clearly defined College Mission Statement, which has been approved by the Board of Trustees, and further distributes this statement throughout the campus via many means. The
College publishes this Mission Statement on the campus website, in the General Catalog, and in the Schedule of Classes and further posts various printed statements throughout the hallways, classrooms and offices of its many buildings.

Second, revolving around this Mission Statement are various formal policies and procedures as well as the facilities and institutional mechanisms for achieving that mission. So, in conjunction with this Mission Statement, the College provides clear and concise statements regarding its strategic planning, including documents such as the *East Los Angeles College Educational Master Plan 2012-1018*, the *East Los Angeles College Strategic Plan 2011-2017*, the *East Los Angeles Facilities Master Plan 2012-2018*, the *East Los Angeles College Technology Master Plan 2012-2018*, and the *Governance Policy Handbook*. These documents define and convey the institution’s broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to student learning as reflected in the Mission Statement, and implementation of its Educational Master Plan. All of these documents are not only made transparent via posting on the College’s website but made public via other means such as the published College’s Master Plans. Furthermore, these plans, policies and procedures receive regular review and updates by various relevant planning committees, faculty, and administrators, and the College identifies which entities, e.g., committees and administrative arms, are directly involved in the development, review and update of these plans and documents.

Third, ELAC fosters a diverse and open environment for the free exchange and open scrutiny of its policies, procedures, and curriculum. There are various instruments by which these policies and procedures are made transparent and public. First, there is the *East Los Angeles 2016-2017 General Catalog*, in which students (and others) can access this information, including course offerings, degree and program requirements, student fees, financial aid information, refund policies, requirements for admission, program length, and information on departments and faculty, codes of conduct, etc. The Catalog has been reviewed and updated every two years; as of fall 2015 the ad hoc Catalog Committee agreed to publish an annual catalog. Much of this information is also published in the respective Schedule of Classes that accompanies each semester or session of classes. Like the Catalog, the Schedule of Classes is reviewed and updated, and also includes information for both the main campus and off-site locations. ELAC also maintains a comprehensive *Governance Policy Handbook* that is distributed regularly, and where all students, faculty, staff and administrators can refer to the various policies and procedures the College implements through the Master Plans.

Further, ELAC maintains a user-friendly and comprehensive campus website in which these same mechanisms and protocols can be easily accessed. ELAC also publishes numerous brochures, pamphlets, local newspaper articles, and newsletters throughout the year and has purchased radio and local cable television spots to inform the community of its programs and services. Many of these releases have been produced for wide distribution, while some, such as department newsletters, are for in-house use. Again, all distributed information is reviewed for accuracy by their supervising offices or programs. Moreover, a list of the Los Angeles Community College District administrators and elected Board members is included in most publications and can be found on the District website with further links to this information provided on the college website. These same District administrators and Board members as well as all ELAC administrators are
listed in all of ELAC’s official college publications. But further, in an attempt to increase a transparent atmosphere, all this information is left open to scrutiny to various on-campus committees and student organizations. For example, ELAC promotes a strong campus news organization—in particular the Journalism department’s ELAC Campus News—which reports freely on many related issues. Also, the College supports a vibrant Associated Student Union (ASU) and, with it, numerous student clubs that continually act as important contributors to campus policies and curriculum. ASU student leaders serve on campus committees where they have an opportunity to share and bring forth formal requests and student concerns.

In addition, the College provides and advertises various student services and programs that help sustain a positive and enduring learning environment. Lastly, through campus security and other related departments, the college disseminates safety procedures and practices. So whether it is through the campus website, the updated alarm system, or printed notices conspicuously posted throughout the campus, there are various means by which students and college personnel are reminded of ELAC’s commitment to campus safety as seen in the Annual Security Report.

Lastly, in alignment with the aforementioned practices, the college further makes clear its current status and compliance with respect to all ACCJC Accreditation guidelines and recommendations. It posts this information on the college website on the Accreditation page.

Together, all these avenues and instruments at ELAC foster and sustain the institutional accuracy, clarity and integrity of its information, and thus provide the tools necessary for student success.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Educational integrity is a key priority for East Los Angeles College. Each of these aforementioned plans, documents and mechanisms function together in an interdependent manner to provide an overall cohesive and integrated network that allows ELAC to fulfill its educational mission and obligations in a public and transparent manner. These aforementioned mechanisms are continually reviewed and updated by a variety of entities according to the changing needs at the College. ELAC not only produces and communicates a wide variety of clear protocols and practices, but takes the necessary steps to ensure that the people that implement them are trained to accurately share the information in an accessible and supportive manner. The College expects to continually expand and modify its training programs and services in order to better serve its constituents.
I.C.2
The institution provides a print or online catalog for students and prospective students with precise, accurate, and current information on all facts, requirements, policies, and procedures listed in the “Catalog Requirements.”
Evidence

The College maintains a General Catalog that is updated in printed format on a two-year cycle (changing to an annual cycle as of 2016) and updated online regularly. The current printed Catalog is for the 2015-2016 academic year. The printed version is complete, clear, and designed to be student friendly.

The decision to go to an annual cycle was prompted by the District’s adoption of PeopleSoft, which when implemented will make it easier to update annually than biennially.

The Catalog contains a detailed five-page Table of Contents section that is first divided into 16 major sections of critical areas related to Student Regulations, Requirements, and Student Services. These bolded sections are further subdivided into “all caps” subsections of important terms and titles for ease of identification. The subsections have indented specific information subjects that allow quick reference for students. The first 16 bolded sections of the Table of Contents are then followed by 28 bolded sections of the College’s 28 different academic departments. Each bolded academic department has up to five “all caps” subsections listing Skills Certificates, Certificates of Achievement, Associate Degree Programs, department disciplines, and source descriptions. The ease of use of the Catalog is further validated by a full-page section called “How to Use this Catalog” (p. 8) which explains the Sections and layout. The Catalog also has a Glossary of Terms (p. 288) that clearly explains academic and collegiate terms in student-friendly language. The last pages of the Catalog offer an alphabetical Index (p. 309) of the common terms, program names, and academic departments to help students and others locate the desired information quickly.

The College also offers two online versions of the current 2015-2016 General Catalog on the college website. One version is an exact copy of the printed 2015-2016 General Catalog in PDF format. The other online Catalog has “General Catalog Updates” and includes, in green print, content that has been added since the printed catalog was published while content that has since been deleted is crossed out in red. The updated online version has highly accurate and current information and is the basis for the development of the next printed Catalog. The college website also posts the two most recent archived versions of the Catalog for reference by students who started their enrollment under the terms of the older editions of the Catalog.

The production of the College Catalog is a joint effort, headed by an Academic Curriculum Dean who works with the institution’s graphic artist, Curriculum Committee Chair, college Articulation Officer, and representatives from Admissions. The Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, Student Services, and Administrative Services, along with major department and program leaders, work together to develop an accurate and current Catalog. The Catalog content is divided into sections for review and updated by the content experts in each major area. The Vice President of Student Services works with each Student Services department and program to update content for each area. The Deans of Admission and Matriculation are responsible to update college admission, registration regulations, and scholastic policies. The Articulation Officer updates the general graduation and transfer requirements sections. The Curriculum Coordinator and the Supervising Deans over the Academic Departments update each area for new or deleted courses and approved...
changes to prerequisites, certificate or degree requirements, etc. The Catalog Committee meets annually to discuss the layout, areas for improvement and any updated changes. The College Business Office is responsible for updates to the tuition and fees sections of the Catalog. The Curriculum Dean is responsible for coordinating the production of the Catalog works with the graphic artist to format content into unified fonts and layout.

The College has a very wide distribution policy for the Catalog. The college prints over 30,000 copies of each biennial edition for distribution. On campus, all faculty, academic and student services departments are given a printed copy upon publication and each new student is given a copy during the mandatory college orientation process. The college distributes copies of the Catalog in the community at local libraries and public and private high schools, and copies are always on reserve in the college library for public viewing. Additional copies are available for purchase at the college bookstore. The online version of the Catalog is available to students and potential students through their own computers or on computers at the college library.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard and Eligibility Requirement 20.

The College produces a well-organized and student friendly printed General Catalog and an updated online version of the Catalog. The transition to an annual Catalog will make it easier for new students to determine catalog rights for graduation degree and certificate requirement, since their catalog rights will correspond to the year they first enrolled.

I.C.3

The institution uses documented assessment of student learning and evaluation of student achievement to communicate matters of academic quality to appropriate constituencies, including current and prospective students and the public.

279 2015-2016 General Catalog
280 General Catalog Updates
281 Catalog Committee Notes
Evidence

ELAC uses a variety of documented assessments of student learning and evaluation of student achievement to communicate matters of academic quality to prospective students and the public. Examples include:

- The State Chancellor’s Office’s Student Success Scorecard and College Profile provide the general public with reports that outline the institution’s progress on student success, including data enrollment, persistence, and completion. The Student Success Scorecard is linked to the ELAC website.
- Currently, student achievement including rates of retention, completion, transfer, degrees/skills certificates awarded, is published on the OIEA website and made available to the general public under “College at a Glance.”
- OIEA makes student achievement data available to all college personnel through the campus intranet, a Planning Data System, allowing academic units to assess the quality of their courses and program.
- Student learning assessment data is an integral part of program planning and is included in Program Review Self-Evaluations (PRSE) and Annual Update Plans (AUPs). Every academic, student service, academic support service and administrative service unit is required to complete a PRSE and an AUP, and these are published on the Institutional Effectiveness site under PRSE and Annual Update Plans. These reports are public and available to all campus personnel, students, and the general public.

Additionally, the Student Learning Outcomes Philosophy Statement notes, “Data should be transparent. All administrators, faculty, staff, students and the community should be able to access the information.” In keeping with this philosophy, Student Learning assessment data, including course, program, institutional, and General Education learning outcomes are published and communicated through various means.
• Institutional and General Education Learning Outcomes were presented to the campus community as part of Opening Day 2013. In addition, the final report is available on the college SLO website.
• Student Learning Outcomes assessment data are collected on the TracDat system. Department chairs and department Learning Assessment Facilitators are able to access this data in order to conduct further analysis on their Programs of Study and Course Level Outcomes.
• Since 2012, ELAC’s Learning Assessment Coordinator has published a yearly report that is distributed at various meetings on campus and made available on the college SLO website. This annual SLO report includes a summary of institutional, general education, course, and program-level assessment data and plans.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard and Eligibility Requirement 19.

The evidence outlined above demonstrates that the institution meets the standard by ensuring that student achievement and Student Learning Outcomes data are documented and communicated to all appropriate constituents so that current and prospective students and the public can easily ascertain the quality of the institution’s academic programs.

The institution is working hard to ensure that all web information, reports and other documents are easily accessible on the institution’s website.

---

282 Student Success Scorecard
283 College Profile
284 College at a Glance
285 Variety of data packs
286 Annual Update Plans
287 Student Learning Outcomes Philosophy Statement
288 Social and Behavioral Sciences Presentation
289 Link to TracDat
290 SLO Status Report August 2014

I.C.4

The institution describes its certificates and degrees in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, and expected learning outcomes.

Evidence

The College publishes descriptions of degrees and certificates, along with Program Learning Outcomes, in the 2015/2016 General Catalog.

All state-approved Associate degrees and certificates are listed on p. 86 of the Catalog.

All Program Learning Outcomes are listed by department on p. 89 of the Catalog.
The specifications related to individual degrees and certificates are contained within the department listings in the Catalog. In addition to providing an overview of the department and its emphases, the Catalog provides a brief description/purpose for each degree/certificate and the course requirements.

Examples of purpose statements in the 2015-2016 include:

- Certificate of Achievement in International Trade: This program stresses those skills most sought by today’s employers in international commerce. The field of International Trade provides career opportunities for persons with specialized skills in import and export documentation, banking, sales, marketing, air-sea-truck transportation and the principles of foreign trade and business management (pp. 133-134).

- Associate of Arts Degree in Chicano Studies: The Chicano Studies major generates an awareness and understanding of Mexican Americans in the United States. It provides excellent preparation for students interested in careers in education, law, social welfare, public administration and/or business (pp. 172-173).

- Associate of Arts Degree in Desktop Publishing: This program gives students skills in the fields of Graphic Design, Journalism, and Photography and in the use of computers to produce newspapers, newsletters, advertising, and brochures (p. 238).

For each degree and certificate, the required and optional courses are listed, including the number of units per course and the total number of units required for the degree, including General Education and elective courses, as well as those required for the major.

The printed Catalog is available in the bookstore or on the college website in PDF format. All new students who participate in the assessment and orientation process receive a free copy of the Catalog.

The Catalog is reviewed and revised annually by the campus Catalog Committee to reflect changes or updates to certificates, degrees, Program Learning Outcomes, course descriptions, prerequisites, and transfer status.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

The Catalog is updated annually to provide students with accurate information about the purpose and requirements for degrees and certificates and the Program Learning Outcomes associated with these awards. The Catalog is available to students in print and electronic format.

---
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I. C.5

The institution regularly reviews institutional policies, procedures, and publications to assure integrity in all representation of its mission, programs, and services.

Evidence

The College develops and implements institutional policies and procedures that are in compliance with Los Angeles Community College District Board Rules, E-Regulations and California State laws.

The College has 15 standing shared governance committees that focus on specific campus policies and procedures for special areas, including SSSP (Matriculation), Transfer, and Off-Site. These 15 shared governance committees develop recommendations on institutional policies and procedures, forwarding them to three major shared governance groups: the Educational Planning Subcommittee; the Budget Committee and the Student Success Committee. These three groups then forward recommendations to the College President. The College President could further
consult with the Academic Senate leadership, Administrative Council (deans and directors) and Senior Cabinet (Vice Presidents) before establishing campus policy and procedures.

Each campus shared governance committee evaluates its governance and decision-making structure through the Committee Self-Evaluation Form.\textsuperscript{294} coordinated by the Accreditation Faculty Chair. The results of these evaluations are posted on the college website.

The revision of the \textit{Governance Policy Handbook}\textsuperscript{295} exemplifies ELAC’s commitment to regular review of institutional policies, procedures, and publications. The fourth edition of the \textit{Governance Policy Handbook} was initiated by the Accreditation Steering Committee as stipulated in the \textit{Handbook}. Requests were made to various committee chairs to update their sections. The Steering Committee held meetings on November 10, 2014, January 20, 2015, February 26, 2015, and April 13, 2015 to review the changes and approve their adoption into the \textit{Handbook}.\textsuperscript{296} A small editorial committee met over the summer to review accuracy, consistency, completeness and grammar. Once finalized, the revised \textit{Governance Policy Handbook} was approved by constituent groups and placed on the college website.\textsuperscript{297}

Another example of revision to policies and procedures was the reconfiguration of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC). In fall 2014, the SPC was unable to meet quorum at several consecutive meetings. A subcommittee of the ESGC met to re-organize the purpose and membership of this committee. The subcommittee presented its recommendations to ESGC where they were approved.\textsuperscript{298} The smaller reconfigured committee is made up of the chairs of the major planning committees.

The College produces three main publications related to student information of institutional policies and procedures along with LACCD Board Rules and Regulation, which are the General Catalog, the spring and fall semester Schedules of Classes, and the ELAC Academic Planner and Student Handbook.\textsuperscript{299} The Academic Dean and Catalog Committee have the primary responsibility for the update and publication of the two-year Catalog (transitioning to an annual catalog as of 2016).\textsuperscript{300} An Academic Dean, in consultation of Student Service division, is responsible for the semester publication of the Schedule of Classes, which also lists many important policies and regulations for students. The Academic Planner and Student Handbook is annually published by SSSP (Matriculation) and each new student is provided with all three, a General Catalog, Class Schedule and Student Handbook, during the mandatory freshman orientation.

The College has also produced other supporting publications to assist faculty in their academic and administrative duties. The Professional Development Program created an Adjunct Faculty Handbook and Survival Guide\textsuperscript{301} to guide faculty in attendance accounting procedures, payroll and other faculty duties. Due to the unique environment of online courses, the Distance Education program created a Distance Education Handbook.\textsuperscript{302}

\textbf{Analysis and Evaluation}

The College meets the Standard.
The College’s comprehensive and collective shared governance structure allows for diverse input on the development of institutional policies and procedures. The effectiveness of campus-wide shared governance committees is evaluated regularly, and the results are shared publicly. Publications are updated regularly to ensure their currency and accuracy.

---

I.C.6.
The institution accurately informs current and prospective students regarding the total cost of education, including tuition, fees, and other required expenses, including textbooks, and other instructional materials.

Evidence

ELAC accurately informs current and prospective students regarding all costs. The 2015-2016 General Catalog clearly lists all student fees—per unit enrollment fee for residents and non-residents, health fees, parking fee, Associated Student Union (ASU) fee, instructional materials fee, etc. It also includes conditions under which exemptions are made (per Title 5 Section 55532), and all refund policies. The schedule of classes each semester includes all fees, as well as fees for specific courses. The College communicates all student fees via the ELAC Fiscal Office. The fiscal office is charged with keeping the costs updated annually.

The Financial Aid Office website provides a link to a “Net Price Calculator,” which estimates the student’s cost of attendance for tuition and fees, books and supplies, room and board, and other related expenses.

ELAC accurately informs current and prospective students about textbook requirements and costs. The 2015-2016 General Catalog (p. 27) includes information about the location, business hours, and return policy of the college bookstore. It also indicates that instructional materials are also available in alternative formats for students with disabilities. The ELAC Bookstore is where students may buy or sell used and new textbooks, find official ELAC gear, and purchase software and gifts.
Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

I.C.7

In order to assure institutional and academic integrity, the institution uses and publishes governing board policies on academic freedom and responsibility. These policies make clear the institution’s commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge, and its support for an atmosphere in which intellectual freedom exists for all constituents including faculty and students.

Eligibility Requirements

Academic Freedom

The institution’s faculty and students are free to examine and test all knowledge appropriate to their discipline or area of major study as judged by the academic/educational community in general. Regardless of institutional affiliation or sponsorship, the institution maintains an atmosphere in which intellectual freedom and independence exist.

(Standard I.C.7)

Evidence

The Board of Trustees’ policy on Academic Freedom is contained in Article 4 of the LACCD’s Agreement with American Federation of Teachers College Staff Guild. The article states, “The Faculty shall have the academic freedom to seek the truth and guarantee freedom of learning to the students.”

The Los Angeles Community College Board’s (LACCD) position on Academic Freedom is contained within the Board Rules on Prohibited Discrimination and Harassment:

15002. Academic Freedom. The Board of Trustees reaffirms its commitment to academic freedom, but recognizes that academic freedom does not allow Prohibited Discrimination. The discussion of ideas, taboos, behavior or language which is an intrinsic part of the course
content shall in no event constitute Prohibited Discrimination. It is recognized that an essential function of education is probing of received opinions and an exploration of ideas which may cause some students discomfort. It is further recognized that academic freedom insures the faculty’s right to teach and the student’s right to learn.

Adopted February 22, 1995
Amended June 13, 2007

Academic freedom at East Los Angeles College is supported and protected by the Board of Trustees for the Los Angeles Community College District, Academic Senate, and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), the faculty bargaining unit. The District’s acknowledgement of academic freedom is included in the Catalog. The AFT negotiated contract outlines the policies and procedures for protection of academic freedom. Board rules concerning academic freedom are available to the Academic Senate. The committee on Academic Freedom and Ethics (CAFÉ) ensures that the College upholds its policies on academic freedom and ethical conduct. The Academic Senate adopted the ELAC Academic Freedom and Responsibilities Policy on March 26, 2013. The Academic Senate also adopted the ELAC Faculty Ethics Policy on October 8, 2013, and an Academic Freedom and Responsibilities Policy on March 26, 2013.

Academic Freedom is also listed in the College’s Catalog.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard and Eligibility Requirement 13.

The documents for determining, protecting, and supporting academic freedom are clear and readily available. Assistance is available from the Academic Senate, the bargaining unit, and campus administration for interpretation of the policies and procedures. Equitable recourse is available through formal procedures provided in the bargaining unit contract. The bargaining unit representative is familiar with procedures and can assist any faculty member who feels his or her academic freedom has been restricted. The documents relating to academic freedom are available to each bargaining unit member via the contract.

ELAC faculty and students are free to examine and test all knowledge appropriate to their discipline or are of major study. This is plainly stated in the Senate’s Academic Freedom and Responsibility Policy that states, “Faculty members are entitled to full freedom in teaching and research and in the publication of the results, as it pertains to their academic assignments. Nothing in this policy shall be construed to infringe upon contractual responsibilities.”

Academic Freedom at ELAC is codified in Board Rules and Senate Policies. These policies are widely distributed online and in the printed Catalog.

---

308 Faculty Guild Contract
309 Board Rules on Prohibited Discrimination and Harassment
I.C.8
The institution establishes and publishes clear policies and procedures that promote honesty, responsibility and academic integrity. These policies apply to all constituencies and include specifics relative to each, including student behavior, academic honesty and the consequences for dishonesty.

Evidence

There are District policies and procedures concerning principles of Academic Honesty and associated sanctions. The 2013-2015 General Catalog (p. 25-27) states the Board Rule 9803.12 and subsequently outlines ELAC’s policy on academic dishonesty, which was approved by the Academic Senate and Vice President of Student Services on February 28, 2006. A College Catalog is provided to each new student and is available to all continuing students. In addition, the schedule of classes every semester includes the ELAC policy on academic dishonesty. The policy on academic honesty is also available online.

In addition, student grievance procedures are detailed in the 2015-2016 General Catalog (p. 29). The website includes the contact information of the Ombudsperson, Student Comment Form and frequently asked questions of all matters related to filing a grievance.

Distance Education (DE) uses identity verification procedures to ensure that a student registered for a DE course is the same student that participates in, completes, and receives credit for the course. According to the Substantive Change Proposal from 2011 the College relied primarily on the username/password protocols established by the ETUDES course management system.

Students also complete an honor pledge before taking online assessments. To further comply with the criteria for authentication set by the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, ETUDES is in the process of developing a student authentication program which requires that before students can take an exam or submit an assignment, they will be required to answer a random question that has been pulled from their ELAC admissions form. The student who is actually enrolled in the class will know the answer. If the answer is incorrect, the student will then go through a series of personal questions to reset the student verification process before being allowed to take the exam or submit an assignment. If the student does not answer the second series of questions, he/she will be denied access and the instructor will receive notification. ELAC Distance Education instructors are will pilot this program within the year it is developed.

If the College participates in the statewide Online Education Initiative, authentication will similarly
be ensured via the Canvas LMS.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Board rules have been refined and updated. The information relating to academic honesty and the related sanctions are readily available to the entire faculty and staff, both online and in the College Catalog. In order to ensure that all faculty enforces the policies uniformly, it is recommended that every faculty member include a link to the academic honesty website on his or her syllabus. It is recommended that the East Los Angeles College Distance Learning Handbook include student verification process procedures and policies on academic honesty. The College could benefit from continuing yearly open forums on Student Policy on Academic Honesty such as those presented at Opening Day fall 2015 and the CAFÉ series.

I.C.9

Faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline. They present data and information fairly and objectively.

Evidence

The Board’s policy on Academic Freedom is contained in Article 4 of the LACCD’s Agreement with the American Federation of Teachers College Guild. This article states, “The Faculty shall have the academic freedom to seek the truth and guarantee freedom of learning to all students.” The district published a summary of the policy that provided further clarification and outlined the complaint procedure. Academic freedom at the College is supported and protected by the Board of Trustees for the Los Angeles Community College District, Academic Senate, and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), the faculty bargaining unit. Acknowledgement by the District is included in the College’s General Catalog. The AFT-negotiated contract outlines the policies and procedures for protection of academic freedom. The policy is also included in the Faculty Handbook. Similarly this policy is published on the ELAC website.

The Academic Senate’s Policy on Academic Freedom and Responsibility requests faculty to refrain from using the classroom as an area to proclaim viewpoints unrelated to their subject matter. The policy states, “Faculty members are entitled to freedom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no
In addition, in order to delineate the difference between appropriate instances of academic freedom and inappropriate behaviors, faculty and staff are regularly trained in policies concerning sexual harassment and hostile environments. Here, all supervisory employees, such as administrative, program directors, chairpersons or classroom instructors are expected to take Online Training classes specifically geared for this. In this instructional program the line between “academic freedom” and “hostile environment” is made clear and further trainees are assessed as to their understanding of this delineation. These efforts subsequently reflect ELAC’s efforts to conform to all federal and state statutes and produce a level of interpretation and enforcement that ensures educational integrity. Further, various administrative and review processes, e.g., both faculty and student grievance instruments have been implemented to insure that such policies are practiced. The College also has in place a Student Policy on Academic Honesty, which is published in the General Catalog, Schedule of Classes and college website. This policy is also distributed to individual students when they receive a class syllabus.

In the Fall 2014 Student Survey, 36.9 percent of ELAC students strongly agreed and 56.7 percent agreed that instructors present information fairly and objectively, distinguishing between personal convictions and professionally accepted views. Only 4.4 percent disagreed and 1 percent strongly disagreed.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

ELAC provides a continual and rigorous effort to make sure that the policies on academic freedom are not only widely published and disseminated to all students, faculty and staff, but the College also provides training and supervision that ensures these protocols are practiced throughout the campus. Assistance is available from the Academic Senate, the AFT bargaining unit and its campus representative, and campus administrators for interpretation and implementation of these policies and procedures. Violations and equitable recourse of these policies are met immediately and thoroughly via structured grievance policies and procedures. Ethical issues, codes of conduct, and policies concerning academic integrity are well documented, and such records are housed and disseminated via administrative offices, the library as well as the AFT contract.
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I.C.10

Institutions that require conformity to specific codes of conduct of staff, faculty, administrators or students, or that seek to instill specific beliefs or worldviews, give clear prior notice of such policies, including statements in the catalog and/or appropriate faculty and student handbooks.

Evidence

As a public community college, the institution does not seek to instill specific beliefs or worldviews. The institution values academic freedom and as such, the academic freedom statement.

The LACCD’s Personnel Commission Employee Handbook\(^\text{329}\) outlines the LACCD’s policies for employees regarding diversity, sexual harassment, computer and electronic information resources, conflict of interest, political activities, smoke free campus and workplace, substance abuse and health and safety (p. 22-26).

Standards of Student Conduct and Student Rights are published in the General Catalog (p. 25-28).

Student discipline and complaint resolution procedures are also clearly delineated in the Catalog (p. 29-30).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

\(^{329}\) Personnel Commission Employee Handbook

I.C.11

Institutions operating in foreign locations operate in conformity with the Standards and applicable Commission policies for all students. Institutions must have authorization from the Commission to operate in a foreign location.

The College does not operate in any foreign locations.

I.C.12

The institution agrees to comply with Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, Commission policies, guidelines and requirements for public disclosure, institutional reporting, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. When directed to act by the Commission, the institution responds to meet requirements within a time period set by the Commission. It discloses information required by the Commission to carry out its accrediting responsibilities.
Evidence

ELAC complies with all requirements of the ACCJC including upholding Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, Commission policies, guidelines and requirements and discloses this information publically. The College responds to all demands of the ACCJC in a timely manner.330

ELAC has been continuously accredited since its founding in 1946. The College communicates its accreditation status to students and the public via the ELAC Website. The ELAC website includes links to all reports filed with the ACCJC including 2012 Substantive Change331 and 2010 Substantive Change332 reports dealing with Distance Education. The College has consistently identified an Accreditation Liaison Officer to ensure timeliness in response to all ACCJC communications.333 ELAC has a faculty chair of Accreditation, an Accreditation Steering Committee (formerly known as the Accreditation Response Group – ARG) and an Accreditation Committee of the Whole, which has been charged with completion of the self-study.334

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard and Eligibility Requirement 21.

Accreditation compliance has been a key priority for ELAC. Both the district chancellor and the College President have communicated to college personnel the importance of achieving full accreditation status.335 Keeping focus on the accreditation process ensures continuous and ongoing compliance with all ACCJC requirements. The ongoing allocation of resources, both in terms of personnel and funding for accreditation activities, is one means of ensuring compliance with the Accreditation Commission. The creation of a specific accreditation committee which meets regularly ensures the College successfully addresses accreditation compliance. Ongoing professional development through ACCJC trainings, completion of the Accreditation Basics Training by over 110 college personnel (ACCJC Certificate of Completion) and service on accreditation visiting teams by various college individuals (Lurelean Gaines, Barbara Dunsheath,
Carol Kozeracki, Kerrin McMahan, Marvin Martinez, Ruben Arenas) keeps the College abreast of accreditation changes.

331 **2012 Substantive Change**
332 **2010 Substantive Change**
333 **Notice to ACCJC appointing ALO**
334 **Governance Policy Handbook** p. 38
335 **District Accreditation newsletter**

I.C.13
The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies, including compliance with regulations and statutes. It describes itself in consistent terms to all of its accrediting agencies and communicates any changes in its accredited status to the Commission, students, and the public.

---

**Eligibility Requirements**

**Integrity in Relations with the Accrediting Commission**

The institution provides assurance that it adheres to the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies, describes itself in identical terms to all its accrediting agencies, communicates any changes in its accredited status, and agrees to disclose information required by the Commission to achieve its accrediting responsibilities. The institution will comply with Commission requests, directives, decisions, and policies, and will make complete, accurate, and honest disclosure. Failure to do so is sufficient reason, in and of itself, for the Commission to impose a sanction, or to deny or revoke candidacy or accreditation.

*(Standard I.C.12 and I.C.13)*

---

**Evidence**

East Los Angeles College demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationship with external agencies through accurate and widely publicized information. ELAC has four academic programs that prepare students for Program Licensing, Respiratory Therapy, Health Information Technology, Emergency Medical Technician, and Nursing. Publication of the relationship with these agencies and the certification pass rate is published on the school’s website and in the General Catalog.

The General Catalog (p. 132-133) states that ELAC’s Automotive Technology Department is certified by the National Automotive Technician Education Foundation.
ELAC also has curricular programs that parallel industry standards. These programs such as Real Estate, Auto Tech and Chemical Dependency interface with external agencies and comply with regulations and statutes associated with the program. For example, the Automobile Technology Department 338 at East Los Angeles College is certified by the National Automotive Technician Education Foundation (NATEF). This information is posted online and in the Catalog. 339 This department is regularly accredited by NATEF.

As an example of aligning curriculum with industry standards, Automotive Technology stipulates improving ASE exam pass rates as its Program Learning Outcome. Annual Update Plan 2014-2015 for Academic Departments 340 This applies to all of their courses. Automotive Technology purchased computers to assist students with practicing sample exam questions in order to improve success rates. One of their instructors has participated in the Reading Across the Curriculum Program that also worked to integrate ASE exam objectives especially terminology with classroom practice.

ELAC keeps the public and students aware of its relation with external agencies through various methods in addition to its website. For example, publication of eligibility to take licensing exam for nursing is also printed in the Catalog. The General Catalog states, “The Nursing Department offers three state-approved programs for both generic students and licensed vocational nurses to become registered nurses. At the conclusion of our programs, the student is eligible to take the registered nurse licensure examination, NCLEX-RN.” 341

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard and Eligibility Requirement 21.

Recent certifications have been achieved by ELAC’s Respiratory Therapy, Health Information Technology, Emergency Medical Technician, Nursing and Automotive Technology programs. Certificates are posted on the website. In fall 2015, ELAC notified ACCJC that its nursing program was placed on warning due to its low pass rates of the NCLEX-RN.

336 Program Licensing
337 General Catalog p. 257
338 Automobile Technology Department
339 College Catalog p. 156
340 Annual Update Plan 2014-2015 for Academic Departments
341 General Catalog p. 257

I.C.14

The institution ensures that its commitments to high quality education, student achievement and student learning are paramount to other objectives such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests. No such conflicts exist at the College.
STANDARD II

Student Learning Programs and Support Services
II.A.1

All instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education, 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.

Evidence

Instructional Programs/Mission

ELAC’s instructional programs are consistent with its mission statement. ELAC’s recently revised Mission Statement specifies the preparation of students “to transfer, successfully complete workforce development programs, earn associate degrees, and pursue opportunities for lifelong learning and civic engagement.”

As of the preparation of this report, the College offers 58 state-approved associate degrees, 68
state-approved Certificates of Achievement, and 11 noncredit Certificates of Completion programs. Of the associate degrees, the College has 18 state-approved Associate Degrees for Transfer in the “recognized higher education fields of study” that have been developed by the state Chancellor’s Office as the model pathway for students interested in transferring to a California State University. The College also offers 47 college-based Skills Certificates that are not state approved. These certificates, all fewer than 18 units, are internal to the campus and do not require alignment with state curriculum. In 2013-14, 1646 Associate Degrees, 1107 Certificates of Achievement, and 1006 Skills Certificates were awarded.

Degrees and certificates offered by the CTE departments are designed with the input of advisory committees and labor market information to shape the courses and degree requirements to meet the needs of the workforce, in keeping with the College Mission to prepare students for the workforce.

Instructional Programs/Quality Assurance

The College’s Curriculum Committee is the primary vehicle for assuring course and program quality at the College. The committee consists of faculty from four academic clusters representing all academic departments, in addition to a counselor, a librarian, a faculty union representative, and the articulation officer. It operates under the auspices of the Academic Senate and follows a strict process for the approval of credit and noncredit courses through the review of a detailed Course Outline of Record (COR) submitted by faculty/content experts in the discipline. Courses and programs approved at the college level are forwarded to the District Curriculum Committee and then to the State Chancellor’s Office for final review and approval.

The Curriculum Committee ensures that degree and certificate requirements are appropriate and that courses within any program have the expected level of rigor. LACCD Board Rule 6201 specifies the unit requirements for an associate degree, English and Math competency requirements, and General Education (GE) requirements. Board Rule 6201.14 specifies that GE units are selected from courses in the following areas: Natural Sciences, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Humanities, and Language and Rationality. In addition, the College requires General Education units in Health and Physical Education. The number of GE units required for a degree depends on the number of units required for the major. Students following Plan A must complete at least 30 units of GE courses; students following Plan B must complete at least 18 units of GE courses.

Noncredit classes “provide adults with skills that are critical to their ability to succeed in college or on the job. These courses help students learn English, learn to read and write, prepare for the GED (General Educational Development) test, gain American citizenship, and learn a job skill.” Basic skills classes in math, English, and ESL are offered through both credit and noncredit departments.
A total of 115 courses have been approved by the Curriculum Committee to be offered using distance education or hybrid methodologies. All approved distance education and hybrid courses must have an approved Distance Education Addendum in addition to an approved Course Outline of Record. The College does not offer any correspondence courses.

Courses offered off campus, whether at local high schools or community agencies, at the South Gate Educational Center, through contract education, or online must follow approved Course Outlines of Record and be taught by faculty who meet the same minimum qualifications as courses taught on the main campus and in face-to-face classes. Faculty must be certified in the college-approved learning management system for online classes (at the time this self-study was prepared, Etudes) before teaching a hybrid or online class.

In 2014-15, the President of the College created a taskforce to evaluate the course offerings and support services at the South Gate Educational Center (SGEC) and make recommendations to ensure that students taking classes at that location had access to courses needed to complete degrees and certificates in a timely manner. Based on this process, the Enrollment Management Committee has allocated additional course hours to the SGEC to facilitate enrollment in courses required for completion or IGETC.

Instructional Programs/Program Learning Outcomes
ELAC faculty have identified Program Learning Outcomes for each of the College’s instructional programs. The College has clustered the academic disciplines, degrees, and certificates into 54 programs of study. Program Learning Outcomes have been developed for 100 percent of these programs of study, are listed in the College Catalog, and are published on the website. In addition the College has defined General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs) that correspond to the five General Education areas—Natural Sciences, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Arts and Humanities, Language and Rationality, and Health and Physical Education—and Institutional Learning Outcomes. Each general education course is mapped to at least one GELO. All other courses are mapped to one or more Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs). The most recent assessment of the ILOs and GELOs took place in May 2015, resulting in a number of recommendations for instructional departments.

Program Learning Outcomes are assessed through capstone courses, student surveys, direct assessment, and mapping of Course Learning Outcomes to Program Learning Outcomes. GELOs and ILOs are assessed through college-wide assessment forums, the most recent of which was conducted in Spring 2015.

Instructional Programs Leading to Degrees, Certificates, Employment, or Transfer
ELAC’s instructional programs lead to the achievement of degrees, certificates, employment or transfer to other higher education programs. Courses recommended for articulation with the public universities in California are meeting a statewide standard as defined in the IGETC Standards CSU Executive Order 1100, or C-ID. For new degrees and certificates to be
established, the departments must submit the Proposed New Program Request for review by the Curriculum Committee. District administrative regulations guide the development and approval process for courses and programs.

Courses that are approved for transfer to a University of California or California State University campus meet the requirements set by the four-year institutions. The College’s Articulation Officer keeps these relationships current. Courses that are part of a CTE degree or certificate are also developed with the input of advisory committees that include industry representatives.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard as well as Eligibility Requirements 9 and 11.

ELAC’s mission places a priority on preparing students to transfer, successfully complete workforce development programs, earn associate degrees, and pursue opportunities for lifelong learning and civic engagement as stated in its mission.

Numerous curricular processes at ELAC ensure educational programs are high quality, culminate in identified learning outcomes, and provide a consistent experience for students regardless of location or modality. The curriculum approval process provides the framework for faculty control and quality assurance.

ELAC’s Shared Governance Council (ESGC) has approved achievement standards in six areas: course success, course retention, new student persistence, degrees awarded, certificates awarded, and transfer numbers to the in-state universities. These numbers are tracked regularly by the College and the district. This information is shared with committees, such as the Educational Planning Subcommittee and the Student Equity Committee and in the development of programs to improve student outcomes. The standards are also included in the data provided to programs in the AUP (Annual Update Plan) process.

Many of the Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) are created by mapping Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs). As the quality of the CLOs improve, so the quality of PLOs will improve. As an action plan, the College will strive for continuous improvement of both the CLO and the PLO assessment process.
II.A.2
Faculty, including full time, part time, and adjunct faculty, ensure that the content and methods of instruction meet generally accepted academic and professional standards and expectations. 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.

Evidence

Instructional Standards

Faculty, regardless of full-time, part-time, or adjunct status, ensure that content and methods of instruction meet generally accepted academic and professional standards and expectations.

The primary method of ensuring instructional quality is through a rigorous curriculum approval process, producing Course Outlines of Record (CORs) which are to be followed by all instructors. The COR establishes course content, and, where applicable, methods of instruction that follow industry standards. Curriculum is developed by the discipline faculty/content experts using the approved Course Outline of Record template which provides a detailed list of components to be followed for each COR, including content and objectives, sample texts, critical
thinking assignments, and Course Learning Outcomes. As required in Title 5, each course is updated at least once every six years, CTE courses are updated every two years, and any course not offered in three years is archived. The archiving of a class will result in a program viability study if it impacts the availability of a degree or certificate program. This assures that all programs are current and meet academic and professional standards.

The Curriculum Committee includes 16 faculty members and one non-voting administrator. The faculty represent the sciences, social sciences, humanities, arts, counseling, and the library. In addition, the College’s Articulation Officer, who coordinates the transferability of courses with local universities, and a union representative are also active members of the committee. Three distinct committee meetings are held each month to ensure the submitted CORs meet expectations: a formal technical review; a review of revised outlines and prerequisites/corequisites/advisory validations; and the full Curriculum Committee to vote to approve, disapprove, or return for revision all CORs.

The process for approval of Course Outlines of Record at ELAC is one of the most detailed and comprehensive in the LACCD. The CORs undergo comprehensive technical review, which focuses on course content and objectives; critical thinking activities; representative assignments; opportunities for developing self-reflective learning, computer competency, and information competency, if applicable; methods of instruction and evaluation; and SCANS competencies. Distance education requests and Course Learning Outcomes are appended to the CORs. After technical revision, the COR comes back to the committee for a second review and final recommendation to be approved and adapted by the Senate. This comprehensive process ensures the integrity and quality of the course content.

Continuous Improvement of Instruction

ELAC continuously improves instruction through a variety of established practices, including advisory committee input for CTE courses, program review, formal evaluation of faculty in accord with the collective bargaining agreement, and ongoing professional development.

For CTE courses, industry-based Advisory Committees provide input on content and methods of instruction to align student preparation with industry needs. Transferable courses that are recommended for articulation for IGETC, CSU GE and C-ID also meet a statewide standard set in the IGETC Standards, CSU Executive Order 1100 or C-ID.

Each academic program participates in Program Review (PR) and the Annual Update Plan (AUP) processes. These processes are designed to ensure the quality of programs, demonstrate alignment with College Mission and goals, provide evidence of increasing student success, encourage faculty to reflect on goals and accomplishments, and determine program needs. The results of Course Learning Outcome (CLO) assessment are included in the Program Review Self-Evaluations (PRSEs) and AUPs, and faculty review them regularly to modify courses, as appropriate, in order to promote student success. Program Review and AUPs also require...
departments to define standards of achievement and report on their progress toward meeting those standards. All Program Review Self-Evaluations completed in 2013 were reviewed by the governance committees of the College, including the Learning Assessment Committee, the Educational Planning Subcommittee, and the Program Review and Viability Committee, and all departments were required to respond to the recommendations in their 2014-15 Annual Update Plans.  

The formal evaluation process for all instructors is faculty driven, as provided for in the collective bargaining agreement. It includes classroom observations by both faculty and administration, and the completion of the Basic and Comprehensive Evaluation Summary form assessing classroom performance and fulfillment of college and department responsibilities. As part of that form, faculty are evaluated on knowledge, skills, and abilities as a classroom instructor, e.g., “ensuring that course content is current and appropriate” and “promotes active involvement of students in learning activities.” This evaluation process leads to dialogue about and improvement of teaching, classroom management, and integration into the College. Faculty receiving an overall evaluation of “needs to improve” or “unsatisfactory” are provided with an improvement plan.

The District requires all full-time and part-time faculty members to participate in professional development to “promote a quality education and student success.” The professional development obligation for full-time classroom faculty is 33.5 hours annually; for adjuncts it is half the total annual number of weekly classroom hours. ELAC provides financial support for conference attendance through the Professional Development Committee.

A faculty and staff survey conducted in fall 2014 revealed that 89 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that faculty and others with responsibilities for instructional programs act continuously to evaluate currency, improve teaching and learning, and promote student success.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

ELAC has established processes and practices that ensure instructional standards and quality as well as continuous improvement. These processes and practices are well documented, involve faculty input, and are widely followed.

Each academic program participates in Program Review and the Annual Update processes, which provide a regular opportunity to review the effectiveness and relevance of courses, degrees, and certificates, including the analysis of course and program learning outcomes.

Full-time and part-time faculty are evaluated regularly and given feedback on their teaching. All faculty are required to participate in ongoing professional development related to their discipline and/or pedagogical issues.
Through the strict guidelines of the Curriculum Committee, the intensive review undergone during the Program Review and Annual Update processes, the analysis and dialogue of the results of course and program learning outcomes assessment, the professional development required of all faculty, and the feedback provided during the faculty evaluation process, the College ensures the academic quality of courses, programs, and services.

377 Curriculum Committee Guidelines Processes
378 COR and CLO
379 Senate Policy about curriculum update, offering course every 3 years
380 Program Viability Process
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382 Curriculum Guidelines and Procedures
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384 Catalog page 76-83
385 Annual Update Plans by year
386 Find your course learning outcome see: Spanish, History and Chicano Studies
387 Annual Update Plans 2016-2017
389 LACCD & AFT Agreement 2014-2017 p. 189-191
390 LACCD & AFT Agreement 2014-2017 Appendix Q Faculty Duties/Obligations p. 278
391 LACCD & AFT Agreement 2014-2017 Article 23 p. 81 **note ELAC calls this the Conference/Tuition Committee
II.A.3

The institution identifies and regularly assesses learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees using established institutional procedures. The institution has officially approved and 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.

Evidence

ELAC identifies and regularly assesses learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates and degrees using established institutional procedures including officially approved and current
course outlines.

The College has a full-time Learning Assessment Coordinator and provides reassigned time for two campus SLO (Student Learning Outcomes) facilitators and stipends for 38 department SLO facilitators to provide support for departments engaging in the process. The Learning Assessment Office also offers regularly scheduled trainings on the SLO process.

For every course, ELAC has a Course Outline of Record (COR) that includes Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) approved by the discipline faculty. The institution ensures all faculty have the approved course outlines and CLOs by requiring department chairs to disseminate them to faculty when courses are assigned.

Course Learning Outcomes are developed by discipline faculty experts. CLOs undergo two methods for approval. When done in conjunction with formal course approval by the Curriculum Committee, the CLOs are vetted against the Technical Review Guidelines by Campus SLO Facilitators who serve on the Curriculum Committee. When CLOs are changed at a time other than when the COR is updated, the CLOs are vetted by Department SLO Facilitators. The Learning Assessment Office team enters all CLOs into TracDat, the College’s official repository for SLO-related information and data.

Students and faculty are able to access all active approved CLOs at the “Find Your CLOs” website. The district, the Faculty Guild Contract, and the Academic Senate have all approved policies requiring the inclusion of CLOs on all course syllabi.

A fall 2014 district student survey revealed that 93 percent of students agreed or strongly agreed that instructors inform them about the types of skills or learning outcomes they are expected to master through their classroom activities and assignments and 90 percent agreed or strongly agreed that they were aware of the learning outcomes for their courses.

CLOs are on an assessment cycle allowing three years from the beginning to the close of the cycle. Currently 90 percent of courses have completed the CLO assessment cycle. Disciplines have taken a variety of approaches to assessing CLOs. These include:

- Rubrics attached to embedded assignments
- Tests and quizzes
- Oral presentations
- Portfolios
- Demonstrations of skill proficiency

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for academic departments, which include all degrees and certificates, are developed by discipline experts. Program Learning Outcomes are developed through a process whereby faculty review their Title 5 certificate and degree offerings and develop a Program of Study, which goes through an approval process before PLOs are entered into TracDat and submitted to the Curriculum Dean. All full-time faculty members of the Program of Study must approve the PLOs before they are submitted to the Learning Assessment Coordinator, who facilitates their entry into TracDat and ensures the Catalog Dean receives a copy for entry into the catalog.
Assessment of PLOs is done through assessment of capstone courses, student surveys, direct assessment, or faculty discussion and analysis of the Course Learning Outcomes that are mapped to the program and related PLOs. The results of these assessments are reported in TracDat, which are then posted on the SLO web page. They are referenced in the Program Review Self-Evaluations and Annual Update Plans.

As of the preparation of this self study, 96 percent of Programs of Study have assessed their PLOs. The Fall 2014 Student Survey revealed that 79 percent of students agreed or strongly agreed that they were aware of the PLOs for their program, a lower level of awareness than for courses.

The Academic Senate Policy on SLO Sustainability, approved in May 2014, created a timeline for CLO and PLO assessment. The policy required CLOs to be assessed and reports submitted by July 15, 2015. The President weighed in with a firm endorsement of the Senate’s policy in spring 2015. As a result of this unequivocal leadership support for outcomes assessment, course assessment percentages moved from 73 percent to 90 percent at the end of the semester.

Board Rule 6703.10 requires the inclusion of Course Learning Outcomes on every syllabus. The faculty evaluation process requires that faculty distribute a syllabus for every course that includes CLOs and the Faculty Guild Contract requires faculty to “participate in the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle.”

Policies for collecting and reviewing syllabi have been shared with the department chairs. A centralized repository for syllabi has been set up on a shared drive. Department chairs and facilitators review the syllabi to ensure that the CLOs are present. When omissions or inaccuracies are found, these have been brought to the attention of faculty and corrected.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

District and college policies are in place that require the identification and assessment of learning outcomes at the course, certificate, and degree levels.

All courses and programs of study have officially approved learning outcomes, which are accessible online (for the courses) and in the catalog (for the programs). The Curriculum Chair and Learning Assessment team have made concerted efforts to ensure all CORs include the CLO addendum in the Electronic Curriculum Database (ECD). However, TracDat currently serves as the official repository of CLOs. The College is preparing for the implementation of CurricuNet, at which time that system will become the official repository for CLOs.

The College has improved its assessment practices; currently 90 percent of Course Learning Outcomes, 93 percent of Program Learning Outcomes, 100 percent of General Education Learning Outcomes, and 100 percent of Institutional Learning Outcomes have ongoing assessment.
Two of the projects selected for the Quality Focus Essay—Strengthening the Transfer Culture and Streamlining the Basic Skills Math Pathway—will incorporate the assessment of course and program learning outcomes to measure their effectiveness.

The College recognizes that closing the loop on CLOs and PLOs needs to be a continuing process and has identified this endeavor as a formal action plan. The College will build on the substantial progress to date. Faculty leaders from the Academic Senate, administrators, and the Learning Assessment team, are evaluating the effectiveness of current policy and practices with the goal of moving toward fostering a culture that embraces the value of outcome assessment in course and program improvement.

II.A.4

If the institution offers pre-collegiate level curriculum, it 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.

Evidence

At ELAC, more than half the entering students assess into pre-collegiate English or math courses. As a result, they have a long pathway to follow in order to earn an associate degree or transfer. The support given to these students, both inside and outside the classroom, is critical to their long-term success.

The pathway for ELAC distinguishes pre-collegiate level curriculum from college level through coordination with the State Chancellor’s office. At ELAC, pre-collegiate courses, which are defined by the State Chancellor’s Office Data Element Dictionary, include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>LACCD &amp; AFT Agreement 2014-2017 Appendix L page 261; BR 6703.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>Senate policy – Clarifying Approval and Implementation of Student Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>Technical Review Verification Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>Find your CLOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td>College Policy on SLO sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>Student Survey, Q. 23H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>CLO Progress Validation Chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>Find your course learning outcome see: ESL, RT, Spanish, Comm Studies, Art and Auto Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Program of Study Declaration Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>Catalog p. 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>Program Learning Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>Business Management TracDat PLO Report; Psychology TracDat PLO Report; Philosophy PLO report; Chemistry PLO report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>PLO Progress Validation Chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>2014 Student Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>SLO Sustainability Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>BR 6703.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>LACCD &amp; AFT Agreement p.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>Syllabus Centralized Repository</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• All noncredit classes except Citizenship and Vocational Education classes
• English Department: Reading 20; Learning Skills 16; English 21, 33, and 96
• Math Department: Math 102, 103, 105, 110, and 112

These courses are listed in the catalog as noncredit or non-degree applicable (NDA). Between summer 2013 and fall 2015, 57% of ELAC students taking an assessment test placed into one of these basic skills math classes and 47% of students (excluding ESL placements) placed into one of these basic skills English classes.

Data compiled by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement (OIEA) for the current Educational Master Plan indicated that 7% or fewer of students initially enrolling in the two lowest levels of pre-collegiate math (Math 105 or 110/112) and English classes (Reading 20 or English 21), were able to complete a degree, certificate, or transfer program within three years. The statewide Student Success Scorecard report indicates that 38% of ELAC students enrolled in a pre-transfer math class completed a transfer level class in math within six years and 42% of ELAC English students achieved the same measure, compared to 31% and 43% statewide.

ELAC supports students in advancing to and succeeding in college level curriculum through developing strategies for academic success. Students in pre-collegiate English and Math courses receive tutoring assistance through the Learning Assistance Center, the Math Lab, and the Writing Center. All three centers have demonstrated that students who attend tutoring sessions regularly earn higher grades. In 2014-15, the Writing Center redesigned its approach to tutoring students to allow it to serve more students. By spring 2016, the Writing Center and Learning Assistance Center will move to the new Language Arts and Humanities building with added space for serving students. The Math Lab is scheduled to move into larger space in 2017.

In addition, the First Year Experience program specifically targets students placing into the pre-collegiate English and math courses, and provides additional counseling and tutoring support for the students. Initial results from the first two years of the program have shown that its students are more likely than other first-time students to complete English 101 and Math 125 in their first year. Due to limitations on budget and space, this program serves fewer than 20% of first-year students. Expansion of the program will be done incrementally due to its resource requirements.

The Math and English departments have taken steps to improve students’ outcomes in these classes. The English department began the process of streamlining and realigning the curriculum leading up to the transfer-level course in 2014 in order to facilitate student progress through the pre-collegiate classes. Preliminary analyses of student outcomes comparing the student success and retention rates in the English classes have been run and are being reviewed by the English department chair and faculty. The Math department offers accelerated classes (lasting 8 weeks rather than 16 weeks) that allow students to enroll in and complete two courses in one
semester and provides supplemental instruction for students in the STEM and First Year Experience programs. The math strategies have proven effective in increasing success and persistence rates for the students participating in these programs.421

The Noncredit department offers a range of math, English, and ESL classes designed to provide students with foundational knowledge and skills in these areas in a low-pressure environment. Students do not receive grades and may repeat the classes as often as they deem necessary.422 Two part-time counselors were recently hired specifically to work with noncredit students and advise them about appropriate courses to take based on their assessment test results and goals, the availability of support services across the campus, and their potential to move from noncredit to credit courses. During 2014 and 2015, the noncredit faculty have begun meeting with the English faculty to explore pathways for students. Similar discussions are planned for math in 2015-16. In 2016, the Noncredit department will be moving into the new Language Arts and Humanities building, which will provide students with state-of-the-art technology and easier access to many other support services.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

College documents and practices clearly distinguish developmental and noncredit classes from collegiate ones. In addition, the College has in place a range of student support services and academic programs to directly support basic skills students in learning.

Although ELAC students are at or above the statewide Student Success Scorecard results for progress in developmental courses, the institution recognizes the need to support students placing at the lowest levels of English and math. These students face tremendous challenges in completing awards and transfer requirements. Therefore, the College has prioritized the progress of students through the basic skills math sequence as one of the QFE projects.

410 Data Element Dictionary
411 2015-2016 General Catalog p. 208, 232, 284
412 Educational Master Plan p. 10
413 Educational Master Plan (p. 8)
414 Learning Assistance Center
415 Math Lab
416 Writing Center
417 Annual Update Plans
418 Guided Practice Tutoring
419 2013-14 FYE Outcomes reports
420 Reading and English Skills Alignment Matrix
421 Impact of SI Spring 2015 in STEM; STEM Summer Academy Outcomes
422 Catalog p. 284
II.A.5
The institution’s 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, and 120 credits or equivalent at the baccalaureate level.

Evidence
ELAC’s Curriculum Committee ensures that curriculum practices, as stated in Title 5 and the LACCD Board Rules, are appropriately followed. The Curriculum Committee has representation from all academic areas—liberal arts, natural sciences, humanities and Career and Technical Education—appointed by the Academic Senate, faculty union and administration. The Curriculum chair is a non-voting member of the Academic Senate executive board, and keeps the Senate informed of all policies, both district and statewide, for which the College needs to maintain compliance. A representative from administration attends the meetings as a non-voting member.

The Curriculum Committee ensures that degree requirements are appropriate and that courses have the expected level of rigor. LACCD Board Rule 6201 specifies the minimum number of units for an associate degree as being no less than 60 (6201.10), a minimum GPA of 2.0 (6201.11), the English and Math competency requirements to be met (6201.12), and the General Education (GE) requirements (6201.14). The number of General Education requirements varies by the degree plan, but the minimum number of GE units to be taken is 18, in compliance with Title 5 requirements.

Each new degree and certificate to be offered by the College must be submitted to the
Curriculum Committee using the Proposed New Program Request (PNPR), which specifies the TOP Code, units for degree major/area of emphasis, total units, projected annual completers, and the annual labor demand (for CTE programs).\textsuperscript{425} The PNPR form requires an extensive narrative that the department faculty, as the content experts, must submit to address the following topics:

- Goals and objectives of the program and its link to the College Mission
- Catalog description
- Required courses (including GE requirements), recommended course sequence, and number of units
- Background and rationale for program, describing its role and specific niche in the College’s general offerings
- Projections for enrollment and completions for the next two and five years
- Relationship of the program to existing curriculum
- Similarity to programs at neighboring colleges
- Labor market information, employer survey results, explanation of employer relationship (if appropriate), and advisory committee minutes for CTE programs
- Proposed sequence of courses that demonstrates the ability for a full-time student to complete the degree within two years (other than for high-unit technical or health degrees) and copies of approved CORs
- Transfer documentation (when appropriate)
- The adequacy of resources (library, facilities, equipment, financial support, and faculty qualifications) to offer the program
- Compliance with applicable laws, regulations, licensing requirements, and student selection and fees

The Academic Senate’s General Education Philosophy Statement\textsuperscript{426} identifies General Education as a “robust academic foundation” for students that helps them “become lifelong learners who can think critically, analyze issues, and make reasoned judgements in the spirit of open-mindedness and personal growth.”

The General Education requirements for approved Associate Degrees are presented in the catalog and address the following areas of knowledge:

- Area A: Natural Science
- Area B: Social and Behavioral Sciences
- Area C: Humanities
- Area D: Language and Rationality: English Composition and Communication/Analytical Thinking
- Area E: Health and Physical Education\textsuperscript{427}

Eligible courses provide an introduction to these fields and are specified in the Catalog. The number of GE units to be taken range from 18 to 30, depending on whether Plan A or Plan B is
followed.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard and Eligibility Requirement 12.

The approval process for all degrees and certificates complies with district and state requirements. Each department submitting an application for a new program (PNPR) must demonstrate that an appropriate number of units are required for the program and that the program is of appropriate length, breadth, depth, rigor, and content, as agreed by the faculty in the department. All associate degrees require a minimum number of General Education units, ranging from 18 to 30, depending on the plan selected, that provide an introduction to the fields of Natural Science, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Humanities, Language and Rationality, and Health and Physical Education.

---

423 [Curriculum Guidelines and Procedures](#), p. 2
424 [Board Rule 6201](#)
425 [Proposed New Program Request Form](#)
426 [General Education Philosophy Statement](#)
427 [College Catalog](#)

**II.A.6**

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.

---

**Eligibility Requirements**

Educational Programs

The institution’s principal degree programs are congruent with its mission, are based on recognized higher education field(s) of study, are of sufficient content and length, are conducted at levels of quality and rigor appropriate to the degrees offered, and culminate in identified student outcomes.

*(Standard II.A.1 and II.A.6)*

**Evidence**

The approval process for new degrees and certificates requires the submitting department to identify a sequence of course offerings “so that a full-time student could complete a degree
program in two years, except in the case of a high-unit technical or health occupation program where a case has been made that a sequence longer than two years is definitely necessary. . . For a certificate, the sequence should be arranged so that a full-time student completes the program within the time normally needed to complete the total number of units required for the certificate.” The approval process also requires a projection of the number of completers within two and five years.

The Program Review process includes an evaluation of the number of degrees and certificates that have been awarded over the last five years and an explanation of efforts being made to increase awards.

Federal regulations require all institutions receiving Title IV Aid to provide public access to gainful employment information about their CTE degrees and certificates. This includes a report of the length of time to complete the program and the proportion of awards (for programs with at least 10 completers) that were made within the intended time frame.

The number of hours allocated to each department for scheduling is based on a rubric that prioritizes degree and certificate completion as one of its four components. Completion Points take into account the following factors: certificate completion, workforce economic data, degree completion, and transfer completion. Points are awarded based on the number of units (courses) students complete in each department.

In order to ensure that courses are offered on a schedule that facilitates program completion, courses that are not offered at least once in a three-year period must be archived. If this action affects a student’s ability to earn a degree or certificate, the affected program would be required to undergo a viability review.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard and Eligibility Requirement 9.

As part of the approval process for new degree and certificate programs, the department must specify the proposed schedule for offering the required courses, and must ensure that a full-time student with adequate preparation should be able to earn the degree within two years (and the appropriate amount of time for a certificate). This document, including the proposed schedule of course offerings, is approved by the district and state before the program can be offered. In addition, the federal government’s gainful employment regulations require the College to post the proportion of awards made within the prescribed timeframe.

---
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II.A.7

The institution 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.

The College engages in numerous activities that are designed to meet the needs of its diverse student body and foster their success.

Evidence

Equitable success for all students is a fundamental goal at ELAC. ELAC’s Mission Statement incorporates the goals from the Strategic Plan. Goal Two, “Increasing equity in successful outcomes by analyzing gaps in student achievement and using this to identify and implement effective models and programming to remedy these gaps,” is paramount to all core planning.

The College utilizes data about student demographics and needs to guide classroom offerings and academic support services. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement (OIEA) publishes an annual profile of the student population, which includes demographics (age, gender, and ethnicity), goals, placement results, and outcomes.

Every two years, the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) conducts a student survey, which provides information about student backgrounds and needs. The results are published on the OIEA website and were shared with the campus during an Opening Day breakout session.

During the 2013-14 academic year, the College developed its Student Equity Plan, which focuses on improving equity among students in the areas identified by Title 5, sections 54220 and 51026: Access, Course Completion, ESL and Basic Skills Completion, Degree and Certificate Completion, and Transfer. The plan was developed by a broad committee of faculty and staff, with input from students, using information provided about the current student population and outcomes by OIEA.

During the fall 2014 Opening Day general session, OIEA introduced the entire College to the data that had been used to develop the Student Equity Plan. The data were disaggregated by age, gender, and ethnicity, and addressed areas ranging from placement scores to progress through basic skills courses to degree and certificate attainment. Later that day, each department developed a plan in response to information they received about the outcomes of their students by ethnicity, gender, and age.

Based on data about its students, ELAC has responded in the following ways to improve the success of students and lessen equity gaps.
• Collaboration between academic programs and learning support services has resulted in such things as the development of Supplemental Instruction (SI) programs and specialized tutoring approaches to support the needs of students. The College has developed a matrix in which it evaluates and measures proposed SI and tutoring activities against helping the College close identified equity gaps. SI Coaches are trained to be both academically competent and also culturally inclusive.

• In conjunction with the California Community College Success Network (3CSN), ELAC hosted a training on Culturally Responsive Teaching designed to help faculty better understand and support their students. Additional training on the topic occurred as a breakout session on Opening Day, fall 2015.

• ELAC offers classes according to flexible schedules (early morning/day/evening, Friday and Saturday, 16-week and 8-week), at multiple locations (main campus, South Gate Educational Center, local high schools, community organizations), and during summer and winter to accommodate the needs of students, especially non-traditional students.

• ELAC offers specialized academic and student services programs, to meet the needs of students with different interests and abilities. These include the MESA/STEM programs for students interested in science, math, engineering, and technology, the First Year Experience Program, the Honors Program, the Veterans Program, the Disabled Student Program and Services (DSP&S), and the Extended Opportunity Program and Services (EOPS)/CalWORKs Program.

• The College offers a range of CTE programs that serve the needs of students interested in short-term certificates and immediate employment as well as associate degrees and transfer opportunities in career-oriented fields for students expressing these interests.

• Through the Student Equity Plan process, the College has the opportunity to implement professional development for faculty that is focused on pedagogical approaches that address equity gaps, it is also hiring additional tutors and supplemental instruction (SI) coaches to work with students to improve outcomes and retention in challenging courses and courses identified as gate keepers, and to develop workshops and courses to better contextualize learning and incorporate study skills that students need to succeed.

One of the ways the College responds to diverse needs of students is by scheduling classes online. ELAC offers hybrid and online classes and many web-enhanced classes to engage students for whom learning is inextricably tied to technology and the Internet. Through the East Los Angeles College Distance Education Program, the College offers online courses that reach students who may not otherwise be able to attend face-to-face classes due to a range of circumstances, or who may simply find this suits their learning style. In spring 2015, the College offered 136 online/hybrid courses using the learning management system Etudes; in addition 170 faculty web-enhanced their courses with either Etudes or Moodle. The East Los Angeles College Distance Education Program meets the needs and learning styles of its online students in several ways.

• The Distance Education (DE) Coordinator collaborates with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement (OIEA) in gathering data on online student success and
retention. The data is then used by the DE Coordinator to inform scheduling of workshops for online faculty to improve their teaching and learning strategies.  

- The DE Coordinator and the DE Committee evaluate the teaching and learning needs of ELAC online students each semester and provide ongoing training, workshops and professional development opportunities for ELAC online faculty, such as Instructor Resources and Etudes Training.

- The Distance Education Program website provides access to a comprehensive collection of online resources for faculty and students. The website is a dynamic portal which includes multimedia such as screencasts, audio podcasts, videos, and access to online course listings. The website is compatible with mobile devices such as iPads, iPhones and/or any android-enabled devices. There is also an Etudes app for mobile devices which gives students direct access to their online/hybrid course.

- A range of support services are available online to students. They include synchronous or asynchronous interactions with a counselor, librarian, or writing tutor.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

ELAC’s Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement (OIEA) regularly provides updates about student backgrounds and preparation, demographics, and outcomes to faculty and staff. During 2014-15, the College was broadly engaged in the development of its Student Equity Plan, which utilized the data provided about student outcomes, disaggregated by ethnicity, age, and gender, to identify gaps among students and propose solutions to address inequitable outcomes. Although there were some surprises in the results, many long-standing challenges were confirmed. In spring 2015, departments and programs were able to begin implementing their ideas with funds made available through the Student Equity process. The results are being tracked and actions will be evaluated after each semester.

Attendance at the Opening Day breakout sessions on equity reached over 80 faculty who were enthusiastic to continue the discussion. More efforts are in progress as part of the Equity Plan in hopes that bringing awareness of the diversity of student needs will facilitate improved services. These interests are reflected in the inclusion of the development of a Welcome Campaign in the Quality Focus Essay. One of the activities included in this project is to offer Culturally Responsive Training to front-line staff and faculty who interact most closely with students.

The College has provided ongoing professional development related to teaching in areas such as distance education and culturally responsive training. During the past two years, the College has experienced difficulty staffing the faculty position of Professional Development Coordinator, the one who leads professional development activities. As a result, expectations for the creation and implementation of a comprehensive professional development plan have been delayed. The College identifies the need for an appropriately staffed and supported professional development
II.A.8

The institution validates the effectiveness of department-wide course and/or program examinations, where used, including direct assessment of prior learning. The institution ensures that processes are in place to reduce test bias and enhance reliability.

Evidence

Common finals are used in only two departments at ELAC: Nursing and Mathematics.

The Nursing program uses a standardized Clinical Evaluation Tool (CET) to assess the cumulative progress of students in Nursing courses with clinical components. Minor adjustments are made to the CET to account for the variation in nursing content areas of study. Weekly progress is tracked as part of formative clinical evaluation while the CET is the summative evaluation. All individual student CET files are maintained by the Nursing Department.

- All Nursing students are provided a program handbook that delineates the program policies and procedures, and provides copies of the CET and weekly clinical evaluation form.
- All Nursing modules are developed and revised each semester to outline the content students are expected to learn in lecture and apply in the clinical setting.
- The Nursing Chair/Director and faculty meet bi-annually to discuss all Nursing program processes, including CET outcomes. Any areas for improvement are discussed, including those related to the development of new clinical curriculum or new standards from the Board.
of Registered Nursing. A new Clinical Evaluation Tool is currently being implemented in the clinical setting for every course that has a clinical component beginning February 2015.

- More immediate CET issues, including those related to courses, students, or faculty, are discussed with the Nursing Chair/Director. Each party is given an opportunity to explain the issue. The Chair/Director, in consultation with the faculty and student, makes a recommendation and plan for resolution.

The Mathematics department utilizes a common final for Math 110: Introduction to Algebraic Concepts, a developmental (non-degree applicable) class. This final accounts for 25 percent of the final grade. The assessment’s multiple-choice questions are derived from the textbook publisher’s (Pearson) test bank.

- Each year, approximately 2,300 students are assessed using this common final. Results are analyzed topically and by section. This allows for an examination of areas for improvement and a comparison of performance across course sections.
- An additional analysis comparing final grades with the common final is also conducted. The proportion of passing grades is compared to the common final grades to determine the assessment’s reliability.
- Results are shared with the department chair and the pre-algebra committee composed of three to six faculty members.
- Any incongruent results or identified areas for improvement are made known to the department chair and faculty for course refinements.
- Since moving to the common final, the department faculty have made significant changes to the Math 110 curriculum.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

II.A.9

The institution awards 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. If the institution offers courses based on clock hours, it follows federal standards for clock-to-credit-hour conversions.
Evidence

ELAC awards credit in a manner that is consistent with institutional policies that reflect the generally accepted norms of higher education and student attainment of learning outcomes. Grading policies and criteria for awarding credit are based on policy established in the California Education Code.\(^{455}\)

The Course Outline of Record (COR) is the official document containing course content, objectives, and methods of assessment used for grading and awarding credit. In compliance with the California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Chapter 6, the Curriculum Committee requires these elements for each outline.\(^{456}\) It includes, as an approved addendum, the Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) for each course.\(^{457}\) The CLOs “describe an overarching ability rather than something minute or a list of objectives”\(^{458}\) and reflect the culminating knowledge, skills, and abilities linked to the objectives of the course. Credits and grades are awarded based upon demonstrated proficiency of the elements outlined in the COR: CLOs, objectives, and specified competencies.

The number of units of credit given for courses is based upon district and state standards for minimum clock (Carnegie) hours needed per unit of credit. In keeping with an 18-week semester framework, the College awards one credit for 18 hours of in-class lecture hours and one credit for 54 hours of in-class lab hours.\(^{459}\)

Degree Requirements are specified in LACCD Board Rules Chapter VI Article II:

- Board Rule 6201.10 specifies a minimum of 60 semester units of course credit in a selected curriculum with at least 18 semester units of study in a major or area of emphasis and at least 18 semester units of study in General Education areas for a degree to be awarded. It also defines compliance with the state guidelines for Associate Degrees for Transfer.\(^{460}\)

- Board Rule 6201.10 specifies the requirement of a 2.0 grade average or better in all work attempted in the curriculum upon which the degree is based.\(^{461}\)
• Board Rule 6201.12 defines the English and math competencies for degree achievement.  
• Board Rule 6201.14 outlines the General Education (GE) requirements for graduation.  
• Board Rule 6202 defines students’ catalog rights.

Degrees and certificates are awarded based on the successful completion of required courses (including GE requirements) and number of units. All degrees and certificates are, or are a part of, a program of study with defined PLOs, which were created to integrate the abilities, skills, and knowledge identified in the CLOs. While the assessment methods for the PLOs vary by discipline, degrees and certificates will not be awarded unless students successfully complete all required courses, which includes attainment of CLOs.

Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) reflect the culmination of knowledge, skills, and abilities, as defined in the Course Outline of Record that the students will take from the course. Many disciplines have moved to embedded assessment tasks whereby the instructor is collecting assessment data on CLOs while also providing the student with feedback and a grade on the assessment task. Credits and grades are awarded based upon demonstrated proficiency of the elements outlined in the COR: CLOs, objectives, and specified competencies.

Information related to grading and the awarding of degrees and certificates is available in the catalog, which is published and also available online.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard and Eligibility Requirement 10.

ELAC awards credit in a manner that is consistent with institutional policies that reflect the generally accepted norms of higher education and student attainment of learning outcomes.

The College is in the process of developing a more comprehensive and sustainable policy to encourage the embedding of CLO assessment results into the grading practices and will address the need to more explicitly link student attainment of learning outcomes to course completion and the awarding of degrees and certificates as part of its action plan on learning outcomes.

---
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II.A.10
The institution 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.

Evidence
The College’s transfer-of-credit policy is dictated by policies established by the LACCD, the UC and CSU systems, and other educational bodies. These policies are implemented in order to guarantee successful transfer of credit between institutions; however, as dictated by these policies, learning outcomes are not evaluated during the process of granting credits for transferred courses. These policies include the following:

- AA-2014-21 CSU System-wide Credit for External Exams\(^{467}\)
- CSU EO-1100 General Education Breadth Requirements\(^{468}\)
- Administrative Regulation E-93 Acceptance of Courses to Meet Associate Degree and General Education Requirements\(^{469}\)
- Administrative Regulation E-101 Credit for Courses Taken in Institutions of Higher Learning Outside the United States\(^{470}\)
- Administrative Regulation E-110 Advanced Placement Credit\(^{471}\)
- Administrative Regulation E-118 Military Credit\(^{472}\)
- Administrative Regulation E-119 Acceptance of Upper Division Credit to Meet Associate Degree Requirements\(^{473}\)
• Administrative Regulation E-122 International Baccalaureate Credit

• Administrative Regulation E-123 CLEP Credit

• IGETC Standards, Policies & Procedures Version 1.6

These policies, as established by the LACCD, cover the acceptance of courses at regionally accredited institutions in the U.S, and acceptance of foreign coursework completed outside the U.S. These policies also dictate how courses are to be applied towards General Education requirements for the Associate Degree.

All policies governing transfer-of-credit processes can be found in the College Catalog. The ELAC Catalog includes LACCD Administrative regulations pertaining to district transfer credit policies, explanation of IGETC Standards, CSU GE Breadth, Advanced Placement Credit applicability towards IGETC and CSU GE Breadth, and International Baccalaureate (IB) Credit as it relates to IGETC and CSU GE Breadth. Course descriptions in the catalog model catalog language for C-ID and include UC: CSU or CSU symbols indicating transferability. Definitions of IGETC and CSU symbols are also included in the catalog glossary. The IGETC and CSU GE patterns for the College are updated annually and are published in the catalog, in the schedule of classes and posted online.

Any CCC course that falls into one of these categories has been reviewed and given a statewide GE Area or C-ID descriptor. A counselor reviews courses transferred from other institutions to ensure placement in the correct Associate Degree, IGETC or CSU General Education areas; and it can be assumed that the course outcomes are similar, as the state has already looked into these courses and their articulation. Furthermore, courses that are approved for IGETC, CSU GE and C-ID all have to be reviewed by a statewide committee. The courses are given approval based on meeting a statewide standard set in the IGETC Standards, CSU Executive Order 1100 or C-ID. CSU Executive Order 1100 does mention that GE courses at the CSUs are supposed to fit in the framework of the four “Essential Learning Outcomes.”

The “pass-along” policy set by the CSU and UC systems is adhered to by counselors for courses to be applied towards IGETC and CSU GE requirements. Courses must be placed in the same area for which they were approved at the originating campus, and technically no further review is required. Courses used toward Associate Degree major requirements are reviewed for equivalency by a counselor using the originating college’s course descriptions. In addition, courses from other community colleges that have approved courses with C-ID designation will articulate with any ELAC course with the same designation for course content credit. These courses may be applied to a major requirement without additional review by the College based on this statewide designation.

For local associate degrees, the College uses the LACCD Administrative Regulation E-93 Acceptance of Courses to Meet Associate Degree and General Education Requirements. The College “honors each course in the same General Education area in which the originating
institution placed each course.” Again, we do not specifically review CLOs. ELAC honors the approval that the originating institution gave the course—in essence accepting the process that institution went through in approving the course. Counselors may also consult with the Articulation Officer or departmental faculty. If further review is necessary, then a petition for equivalency is sent to the academic department for review.

The Articulation Officer enters into agreements with regionally accredited institutions and maintains articulation agreements. ELAC courses are articulated for major requirements by the universities based on the content and objectives in the official Course Outline of Record, in addition to the other items defined in the COR, such as textbooks and critical thinking skills. The college has articulation agreements with many departments and disciplines within all the UC and CSU campuses. They are available online at www.ASSIST.org. Specifically, the college maintains robust agreements in ASSIST with the UC/CSU Campuses in Region 7 (CSULA, CSUDH, CSUN, and UCLA) and outside the region (UCB, UCR, UCI, CSULB, Cal Poly Pomona, etc.). New articulation agreement requests may be initiated by the Articulation Officer or by the four-year institutions. The development of articulation agreements is in keeping with the transfer emphasis of the college mission.

Learning outcomes are not evaluated during the process of granting credits for transferred courses because most colleges do not have their learning outcomes readily available in their catalogs; however, every effort is made to ensure that courses transferred from other institutions are equivalent in prerequisites, content, and knowledge to courses offered at the college.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard and Eligibility Requirement 10.

The college catalog contains clearly stated information for students about its transfer-of-credit policies that have been developed through a collaborative process between the Articulation Officer and regionally accredited institutions that follow district and state guidelines. The college awards academic credits based on generally accepted practices for community colleges in accordance with statutory and district requirements. The institution provides appropriate information about the awarding of academic credit in the catalog.

---
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II.A.11

The institution includes, in all of its programs, student 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.

Evidence

Analysis and dialog comparing the College’s 2012 Institutional General Education Learning Outcomes (IGELOs) to the Accreditation Standards published in 2014 revealed missing
competencies. The Learning Assessment Committee fully revised the IGELOs, splitting them into two distinct entities: eight Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and five General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs). The new ILOs and GELOs were approved by the Academic Senate and the ELAC Shared Governance Council (ESGC) in early spring 2015. The approved ILOs reflect the required competencies.

Institutional Learning Outcomes

As students complete required or elective coursework or participate in campus life, they will gain our core academic values:

- Exploring ethical reasoning by understanding, analyzing, and resolving moral dilemmas.
- Demonstrating information competency and research skills by identifying, locating, evaluating, and effectively and responsibly using and sharing information.
- Engaging diverse perspectives through exposure to a breadth of ideas and to fellow students, faculty, staff, and administration with individual racial, ethnic, gender, and sexual orientation differences and physical, mental, and emotional disabilities and practicing tolerance to those who express differing views.
- Demonstrating technological competency skills by producing academic work using computing devices or adapting to new computing environments or programs.
- Participating responsibly in civil society by demonstrating a strong commitment and responsibility to work with others towards public purposes.
- Developing, evaluating, and refining academic and/or career goals.
- Developing oral communication skills by demonstrating the ability to speak coherently and appropriately for various audiences and situations and to present ideas and information effectively for specific purposes.
- Developing analytic inquiry skills by demonstrating the ability to analyze text, data, or issues before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

Each General Education course is mapped to one or more of the GELOs, and all other courses are mapped to one or more of the ILOs. Disciplines ensured that every competency described within the ILOs was met and that, at minimum, the communication competency and the quantitative competency were met.

The ILOs reflect the expected outcomes of communication competency, information competency, quantitative competency, analytic inquiry skills, ethical reasoning, and the ability to engage diverse perspectives. The communication competency is covered by the ILO for oral communication as well as the GELO for written communication, and quantitative competency is covered by the GELO for quantitative reasoning. Program learning outcomes measure the other program-specific outcomes.
In addition, each Program of Study establishes Program Learning Outcomes that reflect the specific outcomes associated with the approved degree or certificate. As part of the Program of Study Declaration process, the discipline clusters any Title 5 programs it is responsible for and determines which courses belong in the Program of Study. Any courses that are part of a Title 5 program must be accounted for within a Program of Study. Disciplines without Title 5 programs determine the most likely pathway a student might take to transferring in that discipline and develop a Program of Study around a set of courses. Program Learning Outcomes specific to the discipline are also developed and approved by all discipline members. The Program of Study is then accepted by the Department Chair, the Learning Assessment Coordinator, and the Academic Senate President. Once all signatures are secured, the Learning Assessment Coordinator enters the PLOs into TracDat and also provides a copy to the Catalog Dean for publication.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

The eight Institutional Learning Outcomes address the required competencies and have been assessed. All academic programs have identified Program Learning Outcomes, of which 93 percent have been assessed. The College recognizes that closing the loop on CLOs and PLOs needs to be a continuing process and has identified this endeavor as a formal action plan.

---
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**II.A.12**

The institution 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 institution, relying on faculty expertise, determines 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.
Evidence

In 2013, the Academic Senate approved the following General Education Philosophy Statement:

“East Los Angeles College offers all students a robust academic foundation through the General Education program, whether or not a student has decided upon a particular program of study. In recognition of that which East Los Angeles College values for our students and the community we serve, the Faculty of this College affirms that the primary purpose of our General Education is to help students become life-long learners who can think critically, analyze issues, and make reasoned judgments in the spirit of open-mindedness and personal growth. We strive to imbue our students with a sense of self-awareness and self-confidence so that they have an opportunity to pursue their full potential and come to understand how they can contribute to their surroundings and society in general. Furthermore, we encourage our students to appreciate and value multiple perspectives and backgrounds so that they can participate successfully in an increasingly diverse global community.”

Board Rule 6201.14 specifies the rationale for the inclusion of courses as General Education (GE) curriculum. These include the cultivation of an ability to evaluate and appreciate the physical environment, the culture, and the society in which they live; the creation of a coherence and integration among the separate requirements; and the active involvement of students in examining values inherent in proposed solutions to major social problems. The number of GE requirements varies by the degree plan, but the minimum number of GE units to be taken is 18, in compliance with Title 5 requirements.

The College’s Curriculum Committee determines the appropriateness of each course for inclusion in the General Education curriculum. It also requires that the College address GE requirements in every new degree proposal that is submitted for review and provide the
background and rationale for the program, including its role and specific niche within the College’s General Education offerings.  

The GE areas which the courses can fulfill include the following: Natural Sciences, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Humanities, Language and Rationality, and Health and Physical Education. In 2015, the General Education Learning Outcomes were updated by the Learning Assessment Committee and Academic Senate to align with the Board Rules and the Accreditation Standards. In addition to the Institutional Learning Outcomes, five General Education Learning Outcomes, which correspond to the GE areas defined by the Board Rule, were approved. All GE courses must map at least one Course Learning Outcome (CLO) to at least one of the following General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs):

- In the area of Natural Sciences, students will be able to demonstrate an understanding of natural phenomena and the fundamental laws of science AND do one of the following: Describe how scientists within the course discipline approach and solve problems OR apply scientific knowledge/theoretical models used in course discipline to solve problems and draw conclusions.

- In the area of Social and Behavioral Sciences, students will be able to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the theories, sources, and interpretations of human behavior and organization AND do one of the following: Describe contemporary or historical perspectives on individual or collective human behavior OR explain the scientific/interpretive methods used in the acquisition of knowledge and the testing of competing theories in the social and behavioral sciences.

- In the area of Arts and Humanities, students will be able to do one of the following: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of how creating different forms of art engages multiple sensory experiences OR communicate a recognition and understanding of diverse forms of expression across the globe, past and present OR demonstrate an understanding of the research and creative methods used in the construction and knowledge of the arts or humanities OR demonstrate a critical recognition of the historical and philosophical approaches to the formation of culture, including the impact of technology on aesthetic experience OR identify how different theories and practices, over time, shape our interpretation of cultural or creative expression.

- In the area of Language and Rationality, students will be able to: Develop written communication skills, demonstrating the ability to use language to convey logical thought in both expository and argumentative writing AND develop quantitative reasoning skills, demonstrating the ability to compute and organize data effectively and to use mathematical, symbolic, and graphical techniques to evaluate and present information.
In the area of Health and Physical Education, students will be able to do one of the following: Develop strategies for enhancing physical, social, or psychological well-being OR examine the behaviors and actions needed in order to acquire a healthy lifestyle OR demonstrate improvement in cardiovascular endurance, muscular strength, muscular endurance, body composition and/or flexibility OR demonstrate proper technique, skills, and/or strategies for the designated activity.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard and Eligibility Requirement 12.

The Academic Senate approved a General Education Philosophy Statement in 2013, which emphasizes the importance of general education as a robust academic foundation. The statement is available on the Senate website and in the 2015-16 catalog.

Board rules and the Curriculum Committee guidelines and approval process determine the appropriateness of courses to meet General Education requirements. All degree programs require between 18 to 30 units of General Education, depending on the focused area of inquiry.

The College recently revised its General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs) and requires every GE course to map one or more CLOs to one or more of the GELOs.

---

482 General Education Philosophy Statement
483 Board Rule 6201.14
484 Curriculum Committee Guidelines and Procedures
485 Proposed New Program Request Form
486 Institutional Learning Outcomes and General Education Learning Outcomes

II.A.13

All degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core. The identification of specialized courses in an area of inquiry or interdisciplinary core is based upon student learning outcomes and competencies, and include mastery, at the appropriate degree level, of key theories and practices within the field of study.

**Evidence**

ELAC offers 58 state-approved associate degree programs in a variety of CTE and liberal arts fields, each with a focused area of study. Board Rule 6201.14 defines the Major Requirements as at least 18 semester units of study taken in a “major or in an area of emphasis approved by the State Chancellor’s Office” (Graduation Plan A) or 36 semester units in an approved major or
area of emphasis (Graduate Plan B), in addition to General Education (GE) requirements and elective courses. 

The Proposed New Program Request (PNPR) requires departments to provide the Curriculum Committee with a Statement of Program Goals and Objectives, as well as the Background and Rationale for any new program that focuses on how the area of focused study will prepare students either for transfer or for a specific occupation. Copies of the Course Outlines of Record, which include the specific objectives, topics and central theories to be addressed, and learning outcomes for the core courses, must be included in the application.

In an effort to enhance transfer between the community colleges and the California State Universities, the state Chancellor’s Office has developed 32 Transfer Model Curriculum Templates, which specify the major courses to be offered for students to earn the degrees. As of the date this self-study was prepared, the College had 18 state-approved Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADT).

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) are required for each new program before it is approved by the Curriculum Committee, and the PLOs for all programs are listed in the catalog. Assessment of PLOs is done through mapping, assessment of capstone courses, student surveys, direct assessment, or faculty discussion and analysis of the Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) that are linked to the program and related PLOs. The results of these assessments are reported in TracDat, which are posted on the SLO web page.

Recent examples of PLO assessment include:

**Animation:** The Animation Program of Study calls for the student to enhance his/her visual literacy through the acquisition of observational, technical, and analytical skills. The assessment, which involved a review of the students’ portfolios, revealed that students are learning through practical application of drawing and software integration to create animated work. However, because many of them do not have formal art training, they find the animation work to be difficult. The improvement plan includes increased student-based mentorship, more time on task in labs to work with the software, an increased focus on drawing ability through class exercises and more group discussions, more exploration of animation in teams, and further exposure to professional animators and needs of the Animation Industry.

**Modern Languages:** The Modern Languages PLO assessment called for students to speak/sign and write clearly and accurately in a variety of contexts and formats in the target language. The assessment involved a rating of student presentations. Instructors found that students performed very effectively in all three target languages. For both Spanish and French, students performed in pairs, which allowed them to feel more confident in front of the class. They were also peer reviewed in both these disciplines. Vocabulary and intermediate grammar were mastered in all three target languages: accuracy, clarity, and emotional expression and eye contact were incorporated into their presentations. However, students struggled to produce spontaneous
speech in French and Spanish (non-heritage students, specifically), especially those areas that are different from English syntax. ASL students also struggled with syntax and specifically with ASL discourse. Since these areas improve with more authentic exposure to the speech/signing patterns, students need to be more fully immersed in the target language so that they can improve in these areas. The improvement plan was to offer more opportunities so students can produce an increasingly authentic register and/or discourse, targeting areas such as syntax and vocabulary.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

The inclusion of key theories and practices within the field of study is ensured through the faculty role in development of PLOs, CLOs, and curriculum. The faculty serve as the content experts throughout the development and implementation process within their respective discipline. Learning outcomes are identified and assessed for the courses and programs that comprise the degree. PLOs are either mapped from the courses, are captured in a capstone course, or assessed student surveys or direct assessment.

The multi-layer approval process via the College’s Curriculum Committee, the District Curriculum Committee, the regional CTE consortium, and the state Chancellor’s Office ensures that the major courses in the degree address the most critical topics and theories and provide students with an appropriate level of mastery to move on to upper division courses after transfer or to a job.

II.A.14

Graduates completing career-technical certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment standards and other applicable standards and preparation for external licensure and certification.

Evidence

Career-technical certificate and degree programs are developed by applying curricular standards that ensure the scope and content of the course of study provide the framework for students to
acquire the necessary knowledge to effectively prepare them for certification, external licensure and career placement. Sources that provide oversight and guidance to ensure a quality curriculum are advisory committees; Curriculum Committee; accrediting agencies; professional development; professional organizations; and government agencies.

Advisory Committees

One way that career-technical education (CTE) disciplines ensure that new courses, certificates or skills certificates are consistent with skills and knowledge required by industry is through the use of advisory committees, which include employees in the field of study, employers who regularly employ ELAC graduates, internship supervisors, city council members, retired professionals in the particular field, and colleagues from similar programs in the LACCD or other district. Members of the advisory committee come together once a year to provide feedback to the CTE program regarding student competency upon entry into the workforce after completing ELAC programs. The advisory committee also provides information about current trends in the field and ensures that the ELAC curriculum addresses the current employment standards. The information gathered from the advisory meetings is then utilized to update, revise and improve curriculum, skills certificates, and certificates of achievement components. For example, the members of the advisory committee for the Chemical Dependency Counselor Certificate Program noted the increase in the number of patients with an eating disorder in addition to the substance abuse disorder. The advisory committee suggested that students receive additional training in the area of eating disorders. As a result, a course is being developed to address this population. Other departments that made changes to curriculum based on recommendations from the advisory boards included Engineering, Theater, Business, and Administration of Justice.

Curriculum

CTE courses must be reviewed every two years, as mandated by the state, to determine whether the program is still viable, and if what is being taught is current. Through Program Review and Annual Update Plans (AUPs), the graduates of CTE programs are being assured that the knowledge they are obtaining meets employment standards.

Each career-technical program is composed of sequences of courses with specific learning outcomes that are clearly defined in the Course Outlines of Record and posted on TracDat. These programs are designed to provide educational competencies not only for general knowledge, but also for ultimate employment.

Accrediting Agencies

The course sequences of many CTE certificates are directly linked to state or county certification standards. For example, the Administration of Justice department’s Fingerprint Identification Skill Set is identical to that of the Los Angeles Police Department and the Los Angeles County
Sheriff’s department entry-level equivalency. By completing this Skill Set, students are qualified to sit for entry-level employment examinations; therefore, students successfully completing the program meet employment competencies. Similar parallels exist in Child and Family Education Studies (CFES), Computer Applications and Office Technology (CAOT), and Health Information Technology (HIT).

Outside accrediting and licensing agencies mandate requirements and assessment for several of ELAC’s programs, including Emergency Medical Technician (EMT), Nursing, Respiratory Therapy (RT), and the Chemical Dependency Counselor Program. Reports from accrediting agencies provide passage rates for students and sometimes for the College overall. Examples of programs meeting employment competencies, external certification, or licensure requirements include Automotive Technology, HIT, Fire Technology, and CFES, in addition to the programs listed above.

Students who complete certain CTE programs must pass state/national examinations before they can practice in the field. These examinations reflect what the industry deems as the most important information that students must know upon completing a program of study. Some programs of study maintain percentage of pass rates compared to other state programs, such as Respiratory Therapy, Nursing, and EMT. The data gathered from the pass/fail rates are used to enhance the programs. If students are consistently scoring low in a particular area of an exam, the ELAC program of study re-evaluates the manner in which the information in this particular area is taught, including the time allotted toward its teaching as well as the examination process. This ongoing data review allows the College to strengthen its CTE programs.

Professional Development

To further ensure that the CTE programs meet industry standards, faculty members for the CTE programs regularly attend training classes (continuing education) and conferences to stay abreast of current technologies and industry trends. Examples of such training courses and conferences include: California Association of Alcohol and Drug Educators (CAADE) for the Chemical Dependency Counselor Certificate Program, as well as relevant conferences in Journalism, CAOT, CFES, and HIT.

Industry Partnerships

Many of the faculty members in ELAC’s CTE programs have extensive job experience in the field of study. Many faculty members are licensed by the state in their field of study, and consequently, must remain current on the trends in the field for the purpose of maintaining their licensure. These include full-time and part-time instructors in Administration of Justice, Theater, HIT, Fire Technology, RT, Engineering, Business, and CFES. Therefore, skills certificates and certificates of achievement are developed with the industry’s core competencies at the forefront.

Another source that helps ELAC ensure that graduates of CTE programs demonstrate technical
and professional competencies that meet employment standards is the involvement of the Los Angeles Orange County Regional Consortia (LAOCRC) in the approval of courses. CTE courses must be approved by LAOCRC, whose role is to “lead and support the alignment of educational institutions, non-profits, and government agencies with the needs of business and industry.” With this outside agency’s involvement, any course added to the curriculum must be in the best interest of students and will help enhance their ability to be competitive in their field of study.497

Internships and job shadowing opportunities in programs enhance and reinforce learned classroom concepts. Students get first-hand experience with current trends in the industry, which provides another catalyst for curricular changes, if appropriate. Internships are part of several CTE programs, including Nursing, RT, Chemical Dependency Counselor, CFES, Theater, Engineering, HIT, and Journalism.498

Student Feedback

Many of the ELAC programs also do informal data collection through graduate surveys. For example, RT provides graduating students with questionnaires to assess the quality of their program of study. Other programs obtaining feedback from their students include Journalism and HIT.499 This method of evaluation allows the program director and faculty to assess both quantitative and qualitative data regarding the appropriateness of their CTE programs.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

All of the CTE programs at ELAC are developed with the primary purpose of providing their graduates with technical and professional competencies that meet the standards for state/national accreditation, employment, and preparation for transfer to four-year institutions. Through a process of meetings with advisory committees, quantitative state/national data, qualitative data from graduates, continuing education for faculty and involvement of LAOCRC, the CTE program directors continually update their curriculum to ensure that all competencies are met.

Moreover, CTE programs evaluate their programs through the College’s Program Review and Annual Update processes to include an analysis of their state-negotiated core indicators/state minimum performance standards in several categories, including skill attainment, rate of course completions, job placement, job retention, gainful employment, as well as nontraditional job placement and program completions. During this process departments may request Perkins funding to implement proposals/activities to address any deficiencies. In addition, chairs are required to prepare a Perkins VTEA Report and Proposal that outlines progress against the previous year’s plan/proposal using core measures provided by the State Chancellor’s Office.500
II.A.15

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.

Evidence

The College’s Program Review and Viability Committee (PRVC) established a policy for initiating and conducting a program viability study in May 2008. It specifies the criteria and process for requesting a viability review and the steps to be followed by the PRVC, including the examination of data, the solicitation of input from the public and the current chair or director of the program, and the format of the report. The viability review process requires that the report include an “assessment of the impact of the recommendations on the college, students, faculty and staff.” A Viability Review may be initiated when a program is perceived to be ineffective, not meeting student or industry demand, not in keeping with the College’s mission, not receiving adequate resources from the College, or experiencing other unresolved issues. A request for viability review can be initiated by the College President or Vice President, or the Academic Senate president, acting on behalf of the Senate.

In accordance with Board Rule 6803.10, when recommending program discontinuance, the College must consider the following:

- The effects on students and student success if the program is discontinued
- Provisions that can and should be made for students in progress to complete their training

Two Viability Reviews have been conducted since the last accreditation visit, resulting in the recommendation of the termination of the PACE program (2009) and modification of the Adelante program (2013).

- The PACE report was approved by the Senate.
- The Adelante report was formally approved by the College President on December 4, 2013.
- Both studies include recommendations for addressing students currently in the program.
Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

The PACE Program Review and Viability Committee recommended the termination of the PACE program. It laid out a series of ten steps to follow, including the continuation of PACE classes for currently enrolled students for four additional semesters and the appointment of a counselor to assist them with their future educational plans. These recommendations were specifically designed to ensure the PACE students would be able to complete the courses needed to graduate and transfer.

The Adelante Program Review and Viability Committee concluded that the Adelante program should be continued, but with a change in its target student population. It further recommended that the program be coordinated with the newly established First Year Experience program, and be given appropriate support and resources. The final report, approved by the President in December 2013, included the recommendation that “the commitments to the current students in the Adelante Program for counseling and courses be honored for the 2013-14 academic year.” Students who were in the second year of the program in 2013-14 would be able to complete the courses that had been promised to them. Students in the first year of the program were informed that they would not be offered classes for a second year.

II.A.16

The institution regularly evaluates and improves the quality and currency of all instructional programs offered in the name of the institution, including collegiate, pre-collegiate, career-technical, and continuing and community education courses and programs, regardless of delivery mode or location. The institution systematically strives to improve programs and courses to enhance learning outcomes and achievement for students.

Evidence

All instructional programs are regularly evaluated for quality and currency through the Program Review Self-Evaluation (PRSE), the Annual Update Plan (AUP), and Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) assessment conducted by each department. Board Rules 6801 and 6802 define the required process for Program Review and Biennial Vocational Program Review.  

---

501 Program Viability Process
502 Board Rule 6803.10
503 Program Review Viability Reports
504 Academic Senate Minutes 10/27/2009
505 Program Review Viability Reports

---
The College ensures that all programs, including Community Services, Noncredit, and Distance Education, participate in Program Review. The Program Review process is coordinated by the Program Review and Viability Committee and results in a series of questions/statements that each area addressed in its subsequent annual updates.

The 2013 Program Review Self-Evaluation included the following components:

- A description of the link between the program and the College Mission.
- Current personnel and their campus involvement.
- Equipment and facility needs.
- Recent trends and changes that have impacted the program and what has been done to address these changes.
- Program assessment, including an analysis of program-specific enrollment and outcomes data.
- An evaluation of the number of degrees and certificates awarded over the last five years.
- Plans for developing new courses and programs.
- Challenges for students in completing their program of study within two years.
- A discussion of how the program has addressed inequitable outcomes of students by gender or ethnicity and how the program has reached out to underrepresented and nontraditional students.
- A reflection on what has been learned from the assessment of PLOs.
- The creation of six-year goals, with links to the College’s master plans, expected outcomes, and resources required.

The PRSEs of all programs were validated through a year-long process involving multiple committees on campus. Final recommendations and commendations from the Program Review and Viability Committee were returned to programs to be reflected upon in subsequent AUPs. For example, the Business Department received a general recommendation for all six of its programs that the department should work to offer all of its programs fully before embarking on developing new programs. The Noncredit department received a recommendation to work with the Math and English departments to develop integrated curricular pathways from noncredit courses to credit courses. The Administration of Justice department was commended for developing and implementing orientations for its Administration of Justice and Fire Technology programs.

Program Review will be administered on a seven-year cycle beginning in 2020, with an Annual Update Plan (AUP) due every September. The AUP form focuses on critical areas for improvement. The 2015-16 form (completed in Fall 2014) required the departments and programs to respond to the recommendations about the prior year’s Program Review Self Evaluation that were consolidated by the Program Review and Viability Committee. For fall 2015, the AUP was updated to more clearly link the budget requests to CLO and PLO.
Improvement Plans. In the AUP, the departments reflect on the progress made towards each program's goals. They identify any critical changes or trends that have affected each program. Finally, they share changes that have occurred as a result of CLO or PLO assessment or changes that are planned as a result of CLO or PLO assessment. CLO and PLO assessment results provide one possible justification for budget augmentation requests.

The Program Review/Annual Update process was recently revamped to include significant data analysis and to link resource allocation. For the past two years, 100 percent of programs and departments have submitted their Program Review Self-Evaluations and Annual Update Plans on time, creating a strong foundation for evaluating department goals, progress, and resource requests.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

ELAC regularly evaluates and improves the quality and currency of instructional programs through a robust seven-year cycle of Program Review and Annual Updates. These processes include analyses of both student learning outcomes and student achievement. The College recognizes that closing the loop on CLOs and PLOs needs to be a continuing process and has identified this endeavor as a formal action plan. The College will build on its substantial progress to date and continue to improve learning outcomes and achievement for students.

506 Board Rules 6801 and 6802
507 Annual Update Plans 2015-2016
508 PRSE template
509 AUP template 2016-2017 p.3
510 2015-16 AUP augmentation request
II.B.1

The institution supports student learning and achievement by providing library and other learning support services to students and to personnel responsible for student learning and support. These services are sufficient in quantity, currency, depth and variety to support educational programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education. Learning support services include, but are not limited to, library collections, tutoring, learning centers, computer laboratories, learning technology and ongoing instruction for users of library and other learning support services.

---

Information and Learning Support Services

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

*(Standard II.B. and II.B.4)*

---

Evidence

Overview of the ELAC Libraries

Students, staff and faculty have access to a library collection with sufficient breadth, depth, and variety to support the courses offered at both the East Los Angeles College Main Campus and the South Gate Educational Center.

Main Campus

Newly renovated in 2012, the Helen Miller Bailey Library is a popular study space for students, staff and faculty. As of the fall 2015 semester, students, staff and faculty have access to the following resources:

- 100,000+ print books
- 30,000+ electronic books
- 80+ online article databases
- 1500 audio-visual materials
- 70+ print periodicals
- A course reserve collection with over 500 course textbooks and other materials
- First floor: 3 computer stations, 160 open access computers, 7 public use printers, and one 5-minute print station
• Second floor: 15 stand-up open access computers
• 3 computer stations and a printer for community users
• A workstation for library users with disabilities
• 7 copy machines and 2 library classrooms equipped with a total of 86 library computers
• 25 study rooms that can accommodate groups ranging from 2 – 8 students

South Gate

• 2,000+ print books
• 30,000+ electronic books
• 40+ online article databases
• 280+ audio-visual materials
• 15+ print periodicals
• A course reserve collection with over 80 course textbooks and other materials
• 10 open access computers and 2 public use printers
• A workstation for library users with disabilities
• 1 copy machine
• 1 library classroom equipped with a total of 40 computers) See the Library Services and Policies web page for more details.

Services

Both libraries provide accesses to library and research instruction through a variety of means. Distance Education students also have access to these services.

• Library Collections

• Course Reserve Desk: Students have access to more than 500 textbooks and other supporting materials on loan or donated to the library by classroom instructors. Most items can only be used in the library for a 2-hour loan period.

• Research Help Desk and Live Online Chat Reference: The research help desk, staffed by a librarian during regular hours of operation, provides research assistance to students, staff and faculty both face-to-face and by telephone. Students can also access live online reference chat services, provided in collaboration with the Question Point 24/7 Cooperative, with a librarian during both normal business hours and after hours.

• Orientations for Courses: Classroom faculty can also schedule an orientation for their students during class time with a librarian in a library classroom equipped with student computers. Orientations are typically tailored to a specific course assignment. Students receive a customized handout to help them with the research assignment.
• Drop-In Workshops for Students: The library generally offers more than 60 drop-in workshops per semester to teach students research skills and to introduce them to the library’s print and electronic resources. The following workshops are repeated throughout the semester: Find Books, Find Articles, Go Digital with E-Books, and Cite Right. The workshops are limited to 20 students and require online registration. Instruction includes hands-on practice and students receive proof of attendance. 519

• Library Science Credit Courses: Students can enroll in Library Science (LS) 101: “Library Research Methods” and LS 102: “Internet Research Methods.” LS 101 is transferrable to both the UC and CSU systems, but LS 102 is only transferrable to the CSUs. The courses are taught by both full-time and part-time librarians. 520

• Online Research Guides: Students can access over 50 general, discipline-specific, and course-tailored online research guides. Instructors can request a guide tailored to a specific assignment that typically provides links to useful databases and other online resources selected by a librarian. 521

Services for Students with Disabilities

The East Los Angeles College libraries are committed to providing services to students with disabilities. The law requires that reasonable accommodations be provided to students with disabilities, to ensure equal access to the libraries’ facilities and services. Accommodations may vary based upon the type of disability involved. Librarians are on duty at the research help desk during all library hours and will provide research assistance to locate and demonstrate the use of library resources to students with disabilities. An ADA compliant computer station is available in the library classroom where library workshops and orientations are conducted.

Although photocopiers are self-service, one photocopier with wheelchair access is available at the main campus library. If students with disabilities require assistance, they can request help from library staff at the circulation desk. As needed, library staff will retrieve materials for students with disabilities from the book shelves. If library staff cannot provide immediate assistance, students can leave their requests at the circulation desk and return at a later time to pick up the retrieved materials. An ADA compliant computer workstation is available for students with disabilities. CCTV, Jaws and ZoomText Magnifier/Screen Reader are also available for visually impaired students at the ELAC main campus library. The library makes every effort to maintain the library website and make it accessible to students with disabilities in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act. 522

Support Services for Faculty

Instructors at both campuses have access to the following research and course support services:
• Research Help Desk and Live Online Chat Reference: The research help desk, staffed by a librarian during regular hours of operation, provides research assistance to faculty both face-to-face and by telephone. Faculty can also access live online reference chat services, provided in collaboration with the Question Point 24/7 Consortium, with a librarian during both normal business hours and after hours. 523

• Research Orientations for Courses: Instructors can schedule an orientation for their students during class time with a librarian in one of the library’s computer classrooms. Most orientations are tailored to a specific research assignment. Instructors can request an orientation via phone, in-person or submit an online request form. 524

• Course Reserve Collection 525 (Library Policy): The library maintains a course reserve collection comprised of textbooks and other supporting course materials. Instructors can place textbooks and other course materials on course reserve. While most instructors provide their own copies of textbooks for the reserve collection, they can also ask staff to place library materials on reserve for their courses. In spring 2013, the library received Proposition 20 Lottery Funds for the first time and spent a portion of those funds on textbooks. As distribution of lottery funds has continued, the library has allocated a portion of that budget to the purchase of textbooks for the reserve collection.

• Professional Development for Faculty: ELAC librarians strive to offer library-related professional development opportunities for faculty every academic year. Librarians facilitate workshops that market library services to faculty, such as new databases and other electronic resources as well as ideas for integrating information competency into course curriculum and assignments. During Opening Day, librarians have facilitated breakout sessions on topics ranging from library resources to integrating information competency into the classroom. 526

• Library Newsletter: The library publishes a faculty and staff newsletter during the spring and fall semesters. The newsletter is emailed to all faculty and staff at the beginning of each semester to keep them abreast of new and existing services and resources. 527

Hours of Operation and Staffing Levels

During the spring and fall semesters, the hours at the main campus library are Monday through Thursday, 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m.; Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.; and Saturday, 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. The Library is open on Sundays during the last five weeks of the semester and until 11:00 p.m. Monday through Thursday during finals week. The library began piloting extended hours in November 2015. At the South Gate Educational Center (SGEC), the library hours are Monday through Thursday, 9:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. and Friday, 9:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. during the semesters. During the summer and winter sessions, the SGEC Library opens at 11:00 a.m. on Monday and Wednesday and at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday and Thursday, closing at 5:00 p.m.
Monday through Thursday.

The staffing for the main campus library consists of six full-time librarians, at least three part-time librarians shared between the main campus and SGEC libraries, six library technicians and assistants, one instructional assistant, and several part-time student workers. The SGEC library has one full-time librarian, one library technician, and one student worker.

Overview of the ELAC Learning Assistance Center (LC)

The ELAC Learning Assistance Center (LC) offers support services that are sufficient in quantity, currency, depth and variety to support students in their pursuit of excellence at East Los Angeles College. Supervised Learning Assistance, section numbers 8950 and 5950, are available to students so they may register in order to receive tutoring or computer-assisted instruction in more than 17 different subjects.

Tutoring Services in the following subjects are available: Anatomy and Physiology, Biology, Accounting, Economics, Modern Languages, all levels of English, all levels of English as a Second Language (ESL), Reading, Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, American Sign Language, Child Development, Social Studies, Statistics, and Chicano Studies.

Tutoring sessions include one-to-one and small group sessions (2 or 3 students) as well as workshops in high-demand courses such as Accounting, Economics, Chemistry, Biology, Anatomy, Statistics and Physics. Course-specific workshops in basic skills are provided by knowledgeable tutors. In order to ensure the students are receiving the best possible learning assistance, the LC has a variety of anatomy models as well as books, CDs and DVDs in the various subjects. The materials are recommended, and often donated, by the instructors of the subjects, and are cleared through the Information Technology department to ensure they can provide support if needed. These materials support the courses tutored in the Learning Assistance Center. Each semester, the Learning Assistance Center publicizes tutoring services and tutors’ schedules for these courses through tutoring flyers.

In addition, class orientations in the Computer Aided Instruction (CAI) laboratory are conducted by instructors with the help of LC staff. Orientations are offered for the following:

- Access to the district-wide email system and the Academic Computing Environment (ACE), and basic Internet skills
- Access to web-based materials for various courses
- Diet Analysis software

How to log in and use the PLATO system? The Learning Assistance Center has a variety of books and materials, including anatomy models, reference books, textbooks, CD’s, and DVD’s that are instructor-donated and cleared through IT. These materials support the courses tutored
in the Learning Assistance Center. Each semester, the Learning Assistance Center publicizes tutoring services and tutors schedules for these courses through tutoring flyers.535

In addition, class orientations in the CAI laboratory are conducted by instructors with the help of LC staff. Orientations are offered for the following:

- Access to the district-wide email system and the Academic Computing Environment (ACE), and basic Internet skills
- Accessing Web-based materials for various courses
- Diet Analysis software
- How to log in and use the PLATO system.536

The Learning Assistance Center also provides online tutorials for students and helps them to access these tutorials as needed.537 The list is purged and updated annually.

At the South Gate Educational Center, the Learning Assistance Center assigned two tutors in Social Sciences and Biology for 20 hours per week during winter session in 2015. For Spring 2015, this has been increased to three tutors to augment learning assistance for South Gate students in those subjects.538

Additionally, to help fulfill the College’s mission to serve the community, the Learning Assistance Center offered tutoring for 10 hours per week in English, mathematics and science at Griffith Middle School in Spring of 2014, and is offering tutoring in English and mathematics for 15 hours per week at the Hilda Solis Learning Academy.539

As LC-Enrollment and PA Hours 2011-2015 Spreadsheet illustrates, each year, the LC offers support services to over 5,000 ELAC students.540 ELAC’s student tracking system, CI-Track, has been problematic from time to time; however, the enrollment numbers still show consistency for the Learning Assistance Center’s Computer Aided Instruction (CAI) Lab and Tutoring section numbers, 5950 and 8950.

Distance Education

The LC supports distance education by housing ITV videos and DVDs, and by offering online tutorials. (2b1-LAC and ITV Video and DVD List). There is also a Supervised Learning Assistance course that will go live via the student portal soon.541

The staff and tutors are available for questions via the lacenter@elac.edu email address.542

Services for Students with Disabilities

The Learning Assistance Center collaborates with Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSP&S) to ensure that students with disabilities receive the help they need. The Center also has a special desktop computer for disabled and sight-impaired students. This computer is located
Collaborative Efforts

The Learning Assistance Center collaborates with a number of departments and programs to provide services to as many students as possible. Workshops, class orientations and visitations, LC tours and access to our tutoring space have been the principal activities.\textsuperscript{544} The departments and programs that regularly collaborate with the LC include:

- Business Administration (via the Accounting and Economics clubs)
- Financial Aid (FAFSA workshops)
- EOP&S
- Engineering (SI Coaching)
- Nursing (state exam practice testing)
- Family and Education Studies and Kinesiology (Diet Analysis software)

Every semester, the LC sends out invitations to instructors to bring their students to the Center for course-specific workshops and Center tours. The LC staff and tutors assist during these workshops. Instructors may reserve the CAI Lab for their workshops as needed.\textsuperscript{545} The schedule showing class and instructor participation is posted in the CAI during the semester, and reservations are accepted at least a week in advance. These instructors are from a number of departments and disciplines including Reading, Counseling, Kinesiology, Biology, EOP&S, Adelante, First Year Completion and Financial Aid.

For the Spring 2015 semester, with Equity funding, the LC is able to collaborate with Engineering, Business Administration, Foreign Languages and Mathematics to provide tutoring in high-atrisk courses. Data obtained from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement (OIEA) shows that these departments have a 63 percent success rate overall, and that the Learning Assistance Center students have a 74.7 percent success rate (which is 4.7 percent above the College’s goal of 70 percent success rate).\textsuperscript{546}

The Learning Assistance Center is also collaborating with Veterans Services to provide support in their special workshops, and to hire veterans as tutors who will work at the Veteran’s Center to provide tutoring to veterans.\textsuperscript{547}

Hours of Operation and Staffing Levels

During the semester, the hours at the Learning Assistance Center are Monday – Thursday, 9:00 a.m. – 9:00 p.m. Friday, 9:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. and 3:00 – 5:00 p.m. and Saturday, 10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. Hours during summer and winter sessions are Monday – Thursday, 9:00 a.m. – 7:00 p.m. 
The staffing consists of one full-time director (consulting instructor) and one full-time instructional aide, liberal arts. The LC employs between 25 and 30 tutors each semester, depending on student demand, the budget allocation, and the availability of special grants.

Overview of the ELAC Writing Center

The Writing Center offers supervised learning assistance (tutoring) on the main campus both by appointment and on walk-in basis, and on the South Gate campus, on a walk-in basis. The center assists students in developing critical thinking, reading, and writing skills at all stages of the writing process from brainstorming to drafting and revising. Since the center aims to guide students through one-on-one tutoring by asking questions rather than providing answers, tutors do not edit or proofread written assignments. Through this approach, students can assume responsibility for organizing their thoughts in clear, focused, and convincing arguments.

Through thirty-minute one-on-one tutoring, open-ended guided practice tutoring, and ninety-minute workshops, the Writing Center offers free help at any stage of the writing process such as those that follow:

- Understanding an essay assignment
- Constructing a thesis statement
- Focusing paragraphs
- Developing thoughts
- Analyzing texts
- Finding a strong voice
- Revising a draft
- Using MLA format
- Typing an essay
- Targeting Error Patterns in Grammar
- Conducting research on the Internet
- Improving reading comprehension

Writing Center Tutoring Services

Thirty-Minute One-on-One Sessions: To reserve a thirty-minute one-on-one session, students make an appointment through the online appointment system. While students may walk in to seek assistance any time without an appointment, they may have to wait depending on student attendance.

Walk-in Guided Practice Tutoring: Initially developed to serve a large number of students in the First Year Experience (FYE) program, Guided Practice Tutoring is now available to all students.
Monday through Thursday from 9:00 am to 9:00 pm, and Friday as well as Saturday from 10 am to 4:00 pm.

In this tutoring approach, students work at their own pace on activities that help them complete their assignments. After assessing students’ needs, the tutor creates a sequence of activities that will guide students to complete their assignment while teaching them to improve their overall writing skills and studying habits. While at the Writing Center, students work on a small part of their essay at a time until they have completed at least a portion of their essay. Initially, only FYE students could stay as long as they needed to brainstorm, type up drafts, and discuss those drafts with tutors. This Guided Practice approach has now evolved to include all students, who now may stay as long as they like to participate in these activities.

The Writing Center also offers students opportunities to practice and improve grammar, writing, or reading skills using various software programs, always with trained tutors there to supply technical assistance.

This semester, through Equity funding, the Writing Center is collaborating with Engineering, Business Administration, Foreign Languages, and Mathematics to provide tutoring in high-attrition courses.

The Writing Center also offers ongoing workshops, which are small-group discussions that focus on a particular topic such as thesis development, essay outlining, close reading of texts, and MLA formatting. Other workshops focus on grammar issues like run-on sentences and fragments. The schedule of workshops is available online and students may sign up for the workshops on the website.

Online Tutoring: Until last semester, the Writing Center also offered online tutoring sessions that simulated face-to-face sessions. However, because students did not take advantage of this service and because the center is in the midst of restructuring its tutoring approach to Guided Practice, the Writing Center temporarily stopped offering this service. Online chat is still available, which allows students to ask questions that will be answered by e-mail or on the platform, depending on staffing.

**Hours of Operation and Staffing Levels**

During the semester, the hours at the Writing Center on the main campus are Monday – Thursday, 7:00 a.m. – 9:00 p.m. Friday, 10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. and Saturday, 10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. Hours during summer and winter sessions are Monday – Thursday, 8:00 a.m. – 8:00 p.m., Friday, 10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m., and Saturday, 10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

The hours at South Gate are Monday – Thursday, 9:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m. Friday, 10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. and Saturday, 10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. Hours during summer and winter sessions are Monday – Thursday, 9:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m. and Friday, 10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Overseen by one full-time director and one full-time Assistant Director, the Writing Center at the main campus and South Gate employs one full-time Instructional Aide, Liberal Arts, one Computer Lab Assistant, 30-35 tutors, and 2-4 student workers to assist in check-in procedures. The number of tutors varies depending on student use, annual budget allocation, and special grants.

Overview of the Mathematics Tutoring Center

The Mathematics Tutoring Center assists students in the development of their mathematical skills. These skills include critical thinking, mathematical writing and problem solving in all levels of Mathematics offered at the College.

Since the center aims to guide students through one-on-one tutoring by asking questions to the student rather than providing answers, we guide the students with an open-ended approach work through their assignments. Through this approach, students begin to organize their thoughts and start to understand the mathematical process.

The one-on-one, open-ended tutoring available at the main campus and the South Gate Educational Center allows the students to give us detailed responses. The Mathematics Tutoring Center offers free help at any stage of the mathematical process by:

- Understanding mathematical vocabulary
- Developing logical reasoning
- Constructing equations/system of equations
- Evaluating expressions
- Solving equations
- Analyzing/constructing graphs
- Determining results of applications
- Formulate mathematical proofs
- Learn to read Mathematical textbooks
- Using computer programs for various courses such as statistics and calculus

Mathematics Tutoring Center Services

The Mathematics Tutoring Center offers walk-in, open-ended tutoring: In this tutoring approach, students drop in to the center and work on assignments at their own pace. When students need assistance, they notify a tutor and the tutor gladly assists them. Tutors sit with students, on average, for five minutes. This gives the students enough time to develop their questions and the tutor to guide the students. There is no time limit on how long a student can stay in the center.

Hours of Operation and Staffing Levels

During the semester, the hours at the Mathematics Tutoring Center on the main campus are
Monday – Thursday, 10:00 a.m. – 7:00 p.m. Friday, 10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. and Saturday, 10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

The hours at South Gate are Monday – Thursday, 12:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.

Overseen by one director, two full-time Instructional Assistants and a Computer Technician, the Mathematics Tutoring Center at the main campus employs 10 - 15 tutors some of whom attend four-year universities, and 2 - 4 student workers to assist with the check-in procedures. The number of tutors/student workers varies depending on annual budget allocation. Three tutors, who report to the Dean of Academic Affairs, are employed at South Gate. A position has been approved for the hiring of a classified staff person to oversee the South Gate Math Tutoring Center.

Other Academic Support Programs on Campus

In addition to the Library, Learning Assistance Center, Writing Center and Math lab, East Los Angeles College houses over 20 departmental and specially funded program learning support labs. These labs provide students with access to general and discipline-specific software and technical equipment.

A number of additional programs and departments on the ELAC campus also offer tutoring and/or supplemental instruction for students.552

Among the learning support programs are the following:

- Adelante First Year Experience Program553
  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 FYE staff. Today, the Adelante FYE program continues to serve first year students by providing English, math, and general education classes, as well as tutoring and counseling support for new students.

- GANAS 554
  GANAS, "Goals and Needs to Accelerate STEM", is the name of ELAC’s US Department of Education Hispanic Serving Institutions STEM Grant, where ELAC is implementing a broad campus-wide strategy to attract more students into STEM disciplines and careers, and to assist them to be successful in achieving completion (with a degree or transfers). The program includes (a) a Math Academy supporting students through the math pipeline in a timely manner, (b) Media-Assisted Instruction, adding active cooperative learning and web-enhanced class resources, (c) adding Mentors, a dedicated Counselor, Faculty Advising, and Supplemental instruction Coaches strengthening the students resolve and success, and (d) Increased Articulation/Transfer Development to 4 year colleges, with USC as a partner in the grant.
• MESA 555
The MESA program at ELAC enables educationally disadvantaged students to prepare for and graduate from a four-year college or university with a math-based degree in areas such as engineering, the sciences, computer science, and mathematics. Through MESA, students develop academic and leadership skills, increase educational performance, and gain confidence in their ability to compete professionally. MESA has particular interest in and focuses on students from those groups who historically have had the lowest levels of attainment to four-year and graduate level programs. By closing this achievement gap, MESA students and graduates will be better able to make significant contributions to the socioeconomic well-being of their families and their communities.

• Mathematics Supplemental Instruction 556
The Mathematics Supplemental Instruction (SI) Program puts outstanding students, called "SI coaches", into our STEM courses on the main campus and developmental courses at the South Gate Educational Center. These coaches hold several SI sessions each week where they cover material relevant to the course using active learning methods that encourage students to think critically about the material. They also hold an office hour each week where students are free to come ask questions and ask for help with specific problems. Finally, the SI coaches attend class with their students, taking notes and assisting the professor as needed.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard and Eligibility Requirement 17.

The institution supports student learning and achievement by providing library and other learning support services to students and to personnel responsible for student learning and support. These services are offered at the main campus and the South Gate Educational Center, are open sufficient hours to serve both day and evening services, and provide web support and e-mail-based support for online students. The librarians and directors of the tutoring centers work closely with the instructional faculty to ensure that the services are meeting the needs of students in their classes.

The library and centers have equipment and resources sufficient in quantity, currency, depth and variety to support educational programs. The College is in the process of hiring an instructional assistant to oversee the math tutoring at the South Gate Educational Center. This will bring an element of added stability and oversight to the tutoring services in that area.

511 Database List, Library’s Database Usage Stats
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II.B.2

Relying on appropriate expertise of faculty, including librarians, and other learning support services professionals, the institution selects and maintains educational equipment and materials to support student learning and enhance the achievement of the mission.
Evidence

All learning support centers and the library are staffed by faculty who meet minimum qualifications in the respective discipline. The College relies on the faculty expertise to ensure that the College’s mission of empowering students to achieve their educational goals and increasing student success and academic excellence are fostered by the support centers.

Library Equipment and Materials

Collection Development

Over the past 10 years, both libraries have significantly expanded their print and electronic collections. The library’s collection development team ensures that the libraries have the most current and cutting-edge academic and popular materials by consulting standard bibliographic resources and reviews such as Library Journal, American Libraries, and Choice, as well as bestseller lists, book reviews published in major newspapers and publisher catalogs. The collection development team also regularly consults the California Community College Consortium’s Electronic Access and Resource’s Committee website to keep abreast of new databases. These additional methods are also used to expand the collection:

- Securing book budget increases and external grants
- Recommendations from classroom instructors
- Student and staff input

Students, staff, and faculty checked out more than 24,000 circulating materials between fall 2012 and fall 2014. Also, numerous classroom instructors have collaborated with the library to supply textbooks and other materials required for their courses to the textbook reserve collection comprised of over 500 textbooks. Close to 50,000 reserve textbooks and other supporting course materials were checked out between fall 2012 and fall 2014. Additionally, the distribution of Prop 20 Lottery funds has allowed the library to purchase textbooks used in the major general education courses, such as Math 115, expanding the reserve collection and allowing students to complete course readings and assignments.

The library also works closely with the campus Curriculum Committee to ensure that the library owns materials sufficient for student learning and success. A full-time librarian serves on the committee to ensure that instructors who are updating and developing new course outlines are integrating information competency into their course work. The Library’s Department Chair also reviews the outlines of all new courses to ensure that the library has sufficient materials to support student learning in new courses.

Equipment

Main Campus
The following technology is available to library users:

- 2 computer classrooms equipped with a total of 86 computers (used to teach library workshops, orientations and courses)
- First floor: 3 community computer stations, 160 open access computers, 7 public use printers, and one 5-minute print station
- Second floor: 1 copy machine and 15 stand-up open access computers
- 137 open workstations
- 16 express workstations available for quick use
- See ADA equipment details above
- 3 computers for community users (non-students) and new students without IDs or students who need to use scanners or computer DVD players may sign up to use a community computer
- 3 document scanners

South Gate

The following technology is available to library users:

- 1 computer classrooms equipped with over 35 computers (used to teach library workshops, orientations and courses)
- 10 open workstations and 1 printer
- Scanner

Software

In both libraries, computers are equipped with Microsoft Office; Web Browsers: Internet Explorer, Firefox, Chrome; Adobe Reader; and GoPrint Account Management: Student Printing System. The Information Technology department works closely with library staff to complete annual software updates.\textsuperscript{560}

Learning Assistance Center Equipment and Materials

The Learning Assistance Center acquires materials and maintains currency via faculty recommendations and student requests. Furthermore, the LC Director and Instructional Aide keep current in learning assistance materials by continually reviewing periodicals and e-magazines, and by touching base with other professionals, faculty and staff. In addition, the Director and Instructional Aide research textbooks that involve the learning processes of college students, the needs of underprepared students, and the latest trends in college preparatory instruction.\textsuperscript{561} Recent acquisitions that were spurred by the Director’s knowledge of learning assistance and support are Edmentum’s PLATO and American Sign Language dictionaries.

Services for Faculty and Students
The Learning Assistance Center (LC) supports student learning and achievement by providing academic support services to personnel responsible for student success and support. Every semester, the LC extends invitations to instructors to bring their students to the LC for course-specific workshops and LC tours. LC staff and tutors assist with workshops, and instructors may reserve the CAI Lab for class orientations and workshops as needed.

Class orientations in the CAI laboratory are conducted by instructors with the help of LC staff on the following: access to the ACE system, the District e-mail system, and the Internet; sessions on accessing Web-based materials for various courses; use of the Diet Analysis software, and login to the PLATO system. The Learning Assistance Center has developed instruction guides, such as ELAC Learning Platforms, the PLATO student guide and the LACCD Student Email Guide, to accompany these workshops as well as for individual student use.

The anatomy models, books and electronic materials are primarily instructor recommended or donated. Learning Assistance Center purchases are based on instructor or department requests and student needs. The Learning Assistance Center’s RSVP Brochure encourages instructors to make recommendations or store materials for their students to access in the CAI-lab. The LC consults with IT on all electronic acquisitions for support and approval.

Equipment

The Learning Assistance Center has 64 desk-top computers for student use, three scanners, three printers, one overhead and one portable projector, an instructor lectern with a desktop computer, and a large screen for workshops and training sessions. The LC also has 10 licenses for PLATO, new anatomy models, and the following software: Microsoft 365, ACE, Moodle, Diet Analysis, C++, The Nursing Practice Exam, and Foreign Language CDs.

The Fall 2014 Student Survey reflects student satisfaction with the learning support services such as computer labs and tutoring and technological resources offered by the Learning Assistance Center and other locations at East Los Angeles College. Section IIIC reflects a high satisfaction rate with the quality and quantity of technology equipment and labs. For statement 21m, “Facilities and services on this campus: equipment and labs are adequate and up-to-date,” 71 percent of responses were “agree” or “strongly agree,” and another 17 percent expressed that the statement was not applicable to them. Comparable responses were provided for statement 21n, in which 69 percent of students taking the survey agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “Sufficient labs are available to meet my needs,” and 19 percent selected “not applicable.”

The Writing Center Equipment and Materials

The Writing Center houses 55 student computers, which support the following software: Merit’s Grammar and Writing Software, Writers Resources, Adobe Creative Suite CS6, and Office 2010.
The number of computers will increase significantly when the Center opens in the new building in 2016.

The Writing Center collaborates with various departments to improve writing tutoring across the curriculum, and with the Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSP&S) to insure effective service to special needs students. In addition, a special desktop computer for disabled students is available.

**The Mathematics Tutoring Center Equipment and Materials**

The Mathematics Tutoring Center has 52 computers equipped with mathematical software. This allows math students to complete their assignments using the appropriate programs. These programs include Mathematica, Maple, and Minitab. If computers are available, students who need to write papers or do online research for other classes are welcome to use the center.

The tutoring center understands that some students may not have the financial resources to purchase books or other materials that they may need for their classes. In certain courses, such as statistics, the use of a graphing calculator is required. Students may rent a Texas-Instruments 83 graphing calculator for a semester. The center also lends math textbooks for in-center use only.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

The library and tutoring centers, under the guidance of the faculty, including librarians, provide appropriate books, materials, and technology support for the students and in support of the mission. One of the full-time librarians is a member of the curriculum committee and helps to provide guidance to instructors creating new courses about the integration of information competency into their course work. The Library’s Department Chair also reviews the outlines of all new courses to ensure that the library has sufficient materials to support student learning in new courses. An inventory project is tentatively planned for summer 2016 to facilitate removing outdated materials and identify areas that can expand.

The directors of the Math and the Writing Centers are professors in the math and English departments, which allows them to remain informed about the needs of their respective departments and students. The director of the Learning Assistance Center is a full-time professor who works with the departments to acquire appropriate resources and materials, in such areas as the sciences and nursing, to support student learning.
II.B.3.

The institution evaluates library and other learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services includes evidence that they contribute to the attainment of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

Library Learning Outcomes

The ELAC Libraries have created and are assessing the following program of service outcomes on a regular basis. For more information visit the official Assessment website.567

- **PSO 1. Customer Service:** Seventy-five percent of library users will report satisfaction with customer service at the Circulation, Reference and Tech Help desks

- **PSO 2. Collections:** Seventy-five percent of library users will report satisfaction with the library's print and electronic resources

- **PSO 3. The Building/Space:** Seventy-five percent of library users will report satisfaction with the library's study space.

- **PSO 4. Technology:** Seventy-five percent of library users will report satisfaction with the library's technology.

- **PSO 5. Research Help Desk:** Eighty percent of students recognize that they need to use the library catalog to find books and online databases to find periodical articles

- **PSO 6. Instruction:** Seventy-five percent of instructors and students will report overall satisfaction with the quality of instruction in the workshops and orientations

Program of Service Outcomes Assessments

A student survey was administered via email to all students in May of 2013 to measure PSOs 1, 2, 3, and 4. The benchmark was 75 percent and was met in all cases. Several areas received 100 percent satisfaction levels (customer service at the Circulation, Tech Help, and Research Help Desk) while the lowest level of satisfaction (over 85 percent) was with the Library’s Friday hours. In addition, the LACCD Student Survey administered in 2014 also showed that 86 percent
of students are satisfied or very satisfied with Library services.\textsuperscript{569}

The librarians reviewed current library policies and practices in light of the student comments provided in the May 2013 Student Satisfaction survey. Students made the following suggestions: more study spaces, quieter conditions, longer hours, cleaner tables and bathrooms, more staff at the Research Help and Circulation Desks, limited computer usage during peak hours, and more textbooks for the reserve collection.\textsuperscript{570} In response, the library implemented the following actions:

- The library extended its hours for the 204-2015 academic year.
- The campus Facilities Department has increased janitorial staff to improve restroom conditions.
- In spring 2013, we received Proposition 20 Lottery Funds for the first time and spent a portion of those funds on textbooks, which is not an appropriate use of the regular book budget. If we receive a distribution of lottery funds for FY 2013-14, we will consider allocating a significant portion of that budget to the purchase of textbooks for our reserve collection once again.

Library staff is still discussing and planning the following actions:

- Creating a designated quiet area in the library
- Consulting with IT to install time-limiting programs on the computers
- Re-assessing and enforcing drink and food policy for cleaner tables
- Requesting more study carrels and tables through one-time funding

**PSO Assessment 5: Research Help Desk Survey**

**Method:** The library administered a direct assessment of its Reference Services during the 2012 spring semester.\textsuperscript{571}

**PSO Measured:** Eighty percent of students recognize that they need to use the library catalog to find books and online databases to find periodical articles.\textsuperscript{572}

**Results:** The online database benchmark was met but the library catalog benchmark was not met

- The majority of the students can correctly identify which research tools are used to find books and periodical articles
- 32.5 percent of the respondents did not know that the library catalog is used to search for books
- 20 percent did not know that an online database is consulted to find articles

**Use of Data Plan: Research Help Desk Effectiveness**

Staff reviewed current research help desk practices in light of the responses gleaned from the
2012 Research Help Desk survey. In response, the following practices were implemented:

- Use the dual monitors to show students how to use online tools and resources when providing research assistance
- Encourage students to conduct searches independently at the student research computer
- Provide instructional materials to reinforce research skills taught at the Research Help Desk
- Refer returning students to library workshops and Library Science courses

A description of the remaining assessments, results, and plans for use of data are available at the official Assessment website.

The Learning Assistance Center (LC) evaluates its support services annually to ensure adequacy in meeting identified student needs.

Evaluation methods include:

- Student Learning Outcomes (SLO)
- Semester evaluations of tutors
- Student satisfaction surveys

Learning Assistance Center Student Learning Outcomes

The Program Learning Outcome for the LC is “Students who receive tutoring at the LC will pass their classes with a grade of C or better.” For Fall of 2014, the data supports this standard. *Students who received tutoring at the LC had a success rate of 74.7 percent, according to OIEA, which is 4.7 percent higher than ELAC’s goal of 70 percent.*

The Learning Assistance Center Director shares the SLO results with tutors every semester to ensure continued excellence so that students continue to succeed in their classes.

Other Evaluation Methods

The LC evaluates its services every semester in the following ways:

- Tutoring satisfaction survey
- CAI Lab satisfaction survey
- Evaluations of tutors by the staff
- Instructor evaluations of tutors

While all internal results are reviewed each semester, not all of them are recorded each semester as a PLO, due to time constraints. For example, in Summer 2014, the Learning Assistance Center submitted two Program Learning Outcomes on TracDat evaluating the effectiveness of tutoring in the Computer Assisted Instruction (CAI) Laboratory. Students expressed great satisfaction (98 percent) with the tutoring received, an increased level of skill in using the computer (90 percent),
and a willingness to recommend other students to the LC tutoring services (95 percent). However, these results are from Spring 2007 to Spring 2011 since the Director had to count and interpret 167 surveys with 22 questions in each survey.

External surveys completed recently show that the services offered by the LC are sufficient in quantity, currency, depth and variety. The *Fall 2014 Student Survey* reflects student satisfaction with the learning support services such as computer labs and tutoring and technological resources offered by the Learning Assistance Center and other locations at ELAC. On page seven, section IIB, the results for question 19.O “How satisfied are you with instructional or computer labs?” indicate that 74 percent of ELAC students who took the survey are somewhat to very satisfied, and another 20 percent selected a response of “not applicable.” Similarly, question 19.u indicates that 67 percent are somewhat to very satisfied with tutoring services, and 26 percent selected a response of “not applicable”.

**Writing Center Learning Outcomes**

The Writing Center has three Learning Outcomes:

As a result of supplemental learning:

1. Students will have a clearer understanding of the expectations of writing and/or a specific writing task.
2. Students will accept responsibility to seek appropriate assistance to improve their writing skills.
3. Students will apply the skills they acquire or strengthen at the Writing Center to academic courses.

A random sample of 1710 students were surveyed after participating in one-on-one tutoring or attending a workshop. In total, 1130 students responded about individual tutoring, and 518 responded for workshops.

**Outcome 1**

- 1118 (98.8 percent) out of 1130 students felt that the center assisted them understanding the subject matter; 5 disagreed; 7 stated that the question was not applicable; this is an excellent result.
- 1087 felt (96.2 percent) felt that the tutor assisted them in practicing skills they needed; 18 disagreed, and 25 felt that the question was not applicable.
- 514 out of 518 (99.2 percent) students who attended workshops felt that the tutor helped them understand the subject better.

**Outcome 2**

The survey asked the students how frequently they attended workshops or individual tutoring
sessions.

Of the 518 students who answered the question about how many workshops they attended, 302 (58.4 percent) students stated that they attended a workshop twice or more per week. In addition, 111 (21.4 percent) students attended a workshop once a week, which means that 79.8 percent attended workshops regularly during the semester.

For individual tutoring sessions, 763 (47.4 percent) students attended tutoring sessions twice or more per week and 401 (52.6 percent) attended sessions once a week.

**Outcome 3**

1040 out of 1130 (92 percent) saw a connection between the Writing Center tutoring assistance and their classroom success (18 students disagreed, and 72 (.9 percent) stated not applicable).

**Mathematics Tutoring Center Learning Outcomes**

The Mathematics Tutoring Center has one Learning Outcome:

Students who receive services from the Mathematics Tutoring Center for at least 16 total hours in a semester will pass their respective math class with a grade of C or better

Students who received services from the Mathematics Tutoring Center for at least 16 total hours in a semester, 72.67 percent of them passed their respective math class with a grade of C or better. This compares to an overall success rate of 51 percent in math classes for the 2014-15 academic year.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

The library and tutoring center staff are actively involved in the assessment of student learning outcomes. All centers have completed multiple assessment cycles. The vast majority of the assessments have resulted in outcomes that met or exceeded the benchmark. In cases in which the benchmark was not met, plans were developed to improve the results.

---
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II.B.4

When the institution relies on or collaborates with other institutions or other sources for library and other learning support services for its instructional programs, it documents that formal agreements exist and that such resources and services are adequate for the institution’s intended purposes, are easily accessible and utilized. The institution takes responsibility for and assures the security, maintenance and reliability of services provided either directly or through contractual arrangement. The institution regularly evaluates these services to ensure their effectiveness.
The following reciprocal borrowing agreements are in place at both the Main Campus and the South Gate Libraries.

- **Cal State LA Reciprocal Borrowing**
  
  The East Los Angeles College Library has a reciprocal borrowing agreement with the California State University, Los Angeles Library. ELAC students can check out books from their library by going directly to the Cal State LA campus with a current ELAC ID and class schedule. Students must physically go to the library to check out and return the books. No delivery service is available.

- **UCLA TAP Cards for ELAC’s Honor Students**

  Students enrolled in the Honors Program are eligible for a Transfer Alliance Program (TAP) card that allows students to check out books from UCLA’s College Library.

- **Los Angeles Community College (LACCD) Reciprocal Borrowing**

  The ELAC Library has a reciprocal borrowing agreement with the other libraries in the Los Angeles Community College District. Students can make intra-library loan requests for circulating books that are available in other LACCD libraries; the books are delivered via postal mail. The wait time is generally about one week. Students can also go directly to other LACCD campus libraries to check out circulating books in person with a current ELAC ID.

**Safety Measures**

- **Main Campus:** The library purchased a state-of-the-art Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) system in 2012. RFID tags are inserted in each book to prevent theft. If an undesensitized book passes through the RFID security gates, a security alarm is triggered and the library user must return to the Circulation Desk for clearance. DVDs are placed in protective cases that are removed upon checkout. Cadets employed by the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department regularly patrol the library and maintain a regular security post.
outside the library’s security gates.

- South Gate: Each library item has a security strip at the SGECL. In addition to the security strips, DVDs are placed inside lockable KWIK cases, which can only be opened with a special device, which is virtually indestructible. The library has a 3M security gate in operation at the front entrance. In addition to these measures, the library relies on the Security office, which is located next to the library.

Security and Maintenance

The Information Technology department provides security to the LC by housing the programs and software in the campus servers. Maintenance of software and websites is provided by IT; the Learning Assistance Center staff provides regular maintenance of desk top computers, scanners, and printers through cleaning and checks the equipment’s working condition and notifies IT if their help is needed for repairs.

To prevent theft of equipment, the LC is adequately staffed during open hours, and the doors are electronically opened and closed. The LC will be moving to the new language arts building in the next academic year where access to individuals not associated with the center will decrease.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard and Eligibility Requirement 17.

The library has formal agreements with external libraries to provide extensive learning support to ELAC’s students, staff and faculty. The institution takes responsibility for and assures the security, maintenance and reliability of services and equipment. The IT department maintains websites and software on the campus and solicits feedback from departments and units after each work order is completed. Books and library materials are secured through RFID technology on the main campus and security strips at South Gate. With the range of library and learning support services available, with the adequacy of materials monitored by the faculty experts in these facilities, and with the assessment of effectiveness being undertaken on an ongoing basis.
II.C.1

The institution regularly evaluates the quality of student support services and demonstrates that these services, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education, support student learning, and enhance accomplishment of the mission of the institution.

Evidence

East Los Angeles College supports student services include the following departments and programs: Admissions, Assessment/Matriculation, Associated Student Union (ASU), Athletics, CalWORKs, Career & Job Services, Child Development Center, Counseling Department, Disabled Students Program and Services (DSP&S), 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).

The institution relies on various forms of evaluation to ensure continuous improvement of student support services. The Program Review ELAC 2013-2019 Program Review, Annual Update Plan and Student Services Cluster Plan assist in the evaluation, planning, and implementation process. The 2013-2014 Cluster Annual Update provides a broader perspective of the goals, and action plans to meet the needs of students regardless of location or means of delivery. Support services are designed and implemented to promote student success and learning. The Program Review process for student service units includes the use of a program review validation committee that is made up of faculty, administrators, classified and student representatives. In addition to the committee, comments from faculty, students, and staff are solicited prior to initiation of the program review. In this manner, the campus community is involved in the program review process and a campus-wide dialogue is initiated on how student services can be improved. Examples of continuous improvement within the student services unit derived from the program review process include hours of operation, accessibility and customer
service to our students.

The Student Comment Form provides students an opportunity to provide positive or negative comments and concerns related to quality of service within student services. Student services administrators review and address any immediate concerns identified in the Student Comment Form. Faculty and staff also provide input on quality of service within their respective units during regular staff and committee meetings.

The campus adopted the Scheduling and Records System (SARS) system to assess student counseling needs and demands within general counseling, Transfer Center, Job & Career Services, Puente, MESA, Veterans, and in the EOPS Program. The number of scheduled and attended counseling appointments and workshops is used as a measure of efficacy and efficiency within the Counseling Department. LACCD is currently transitioning to PeopleSoft and exploring the GradesFirst! software system to schedule appointments and keep track of student to counselor contact data.

Most student service offices are open Monday through Thursday from 8 a.m. to 7 p.m. and Fridays from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. Additionally, many offices extend their hours of service during peak time periods. During the 2013-2014 academic year, the Counseling and Admissions offices and the Assessment Center were open on the first Saturday of the month and during the 2014-2015 academic year, counseling services were available on Saturdays. In efforts to assist students preparing for transfer the counseling department extends service during the period leading up to fall transfer applications. Moreover, counseling services are offered in many offices and programs outside of general counseling, including CalWORKs, Career & Job Services, DSP&S, EOPS/CARE, FYE/Adelante, International Students Program, MESA, Puente Program and the Transfer Center.

The quality and level of service at the South Gate Educational Center (SGEC) are comparable to the main campus. Financial Aid, Admissions and Records, the Assessment Center, and the Counseling department have full time staff and unclassified support at SGEC. EOPS and DSP&S have a counseling and service presence. In 2014, an additional full time counselor was assigned to the SGEC. Additionally, while career counseling is offered on a limited basis at SGEC, the College is in the process of hiring a full time career counselor, for a total of 4 full time counselors specifically for the SGEC.

ELAC continues the commitment to hire counselors for both general counseling and specialized programs and services. The International Students Program and First-Year Experience have full-time counselors assigned to the program. The College is poised to hire additional counselors to meet the growing student demand. Online services have increased including online advising and e-chat with a counselor in 2014. In the 2013-2014 school year there were 735 online advising student contacts. E-Chat has generated 611 contacts since its inception in June 2014.
Student services faculty and staff work closely with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement (OIEA), the Academic Senate, and the Student Success & Support Program committee to assure the quality of its support services. The Counseling Department continually engages in a process of self-evaluation and inquiry as a means to ensure effective delivery of services. Notable examples of this include: focus groups by OIEA for students who completed the in-person New Student Orientation (2013), the student success committee’s commissioning of a Faculty Inquiry Group (FIG) to explore the delivery of ELAC’s Counseling services (2010-2011), and the Ed Planning Committee’s inquiry into the effectiveness of the in-person and online New Student Orientations (2013-2014). Additionally, the Counseling Department utilizes the 2011 Point of Service Survey administered by OIEA as another avenue to gauge the quality of its support services.

As a result of these surveys, numerous interventions and a greater online presence were adopted by the Counseling Department. The Counseling Department looks forward to administering the Point of Service survey again in 2015. Point of Service Surveys have also been administered to students utilizing the Admissions Office, Matriculation Office, EOPS Office, and attending ELAC Welcome Day.

The Child Development Center (CDC) maintains the quality of its program through compliance with regulations, policies and procedures set by Community Care Licensing and the State of California Department of Education, Early Education Services Division. Annual student-parent surveys are conducted for feedback on the Program. As discussed in 2016-2017 Annual Update, the results of the survey inform planning and initiate necessary changes needed to better support the families/student-parents needing childcare. Due to budget constraints, the CDC is unable to accommodate student-parents’ request to offer extended and evening childcare.

The Veterans Resource Center (VRC) also engages in regular evaluation of student support services. VRC students were invited to participate in a "Think Tank," during the Winter 2014 session. This provided students an opportunity to express their concerns and needs and suggestions on how to better serve the unique needs of student veterans. The Think Tank, which is an equivalent to a Student Veteran Advisory Board, is a practice the VRC intends to revisit and offer at least once per semester. Data produced by the Think Tank is complemented by open-ended surveys on the quality of VRC services. These open-ended surveys are available year-round along with an anonymous suggestion box found in the VRC.

As non-traditional students, student veterans are older and frequently demonstrate leadership and teamwork as acquired through the military. Hearing the needs of this unique population directly from VRC students is vital to ensuring the delivery of effective veteran services.

The Distance Education office and the Distance Education Committee systematically assess student support services using faculty, staff and students input to improve the effectiveness of the online student support services. The Distance Education Coordinator continues to evaluate
and modify the Distance Education online home page to ensure user-friendly access. The DE Coordinator also takes steps to ensure equitable access to enroll in DE courses.

Distance education (DE) student support services are comparable to face-to-face course/program student support services. Distance Education’s website provides access to a variety of comprehensive online services, including academic counseling and library support. Resources include both academic and student services based. The website meets the World Wide Web Consortium’s (W3C) markup validation service requirements and complies with Section 508.

Student support services provided online assistance to students in attaining their educational goals. ELAC offers free online Writing Lab and Tutorial Services. The Online Writing Lab (OWL) is available to any registered student at ELAC. The OWL offers support for any course required writing assignments or other student needs such as college applications and scholarship essays. Online Tutoring for Writing Needs ELAC offers an Online Writing Center (OWL) to students enrolled in any course. Online tutoring is delivered using an online course management system similar to ETUDES, with an interactive interface where students can view their tutor and vice versa via webcams. Thus, the online session is just like the Writing Center’s person-to-person session. The student can see the tutor providing guidance through an interactive white board. Instructors can link directly to OWL from their online courses.

The Moodle platform used for OWL complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The student schedules an appointment and submits his/her paper prior to the appointment. The tutor has an opportunity to review the paper. During the appointment, the student and tutor discuss and work directly editing and modifying the student work (depending on the sophistication of the student’s computer software). The Writing Center has two trained tutors working in OWL. Online tutoring is provided five days a week, including evenings and Saturdays. The online services provided by the Writing Center are accessible via the college website.

Financial Aid, Counseling, the Bookstore, Library, and Admissions and Records offer comparable services to distance education students. Each of these programs leverages the use of telephone and internet technology to extend access to students. Distance education students can complete their Financial Aid process, order books, contact a counselor, add/drop classes, request transcripts, and utilize library databases through the ELAC website. The Counseling Department augments its Online Quick Question service with the use of a third-party software to provide an E-Chat with a Counselor. This service allows students to engage in real-time chat with a Counselor to receive guidance on various topics. The Online New Student Orientation utilizes YouTube videos to assist students in navigating the campus website and understanding how to use the Student Information System for things like adding/dropping courses and accessing LACCD student e-mail.

Each student services area created Student Service Outcomes (SSOs) to identify areas for
improvement as identified by Student Services Point-of-Service Surveys. Data generated by these evaluation methods are supplemented with information gathered directly from students. Campus services and programs use student surveys created by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement to gather data. Data gathered via student surveys are triangulated with information and records from the SARS student appointment booking system. An example of this can be found by the division’s use of student feedback/evaluation forms distributed during individual Counseling appointments, online and in-person New Student Orientations, and at the conclusion of special events.

Many programs in student support service units also comply with external evaluations and/or audits. CalWORKs, Financial Aid, International Students, EOPS, DSP&S, 3SP (Formerly Matriculation), and the Child Development Center comply with state regulations and guidelines.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard and Eligibility Requirement 15.

ELAC offers academic instruction predominately at the main campus, SGEC and through distance learning. The College has made a great effort to provide comparable support services regardless of the means and location of instruction.

ELAC engages in various means of evaluating student services including participation in a robust program review and annual update process, numerous points of service surveys and service student outcome cycles. Student support services align with ELAC’s mission in that they are a means of assisting students in pursuing their educational goals, particularly via goal 1: “increasing student success and academic excellence through student-centered instruction, student-centered support services, and dynamic technologies.”
II.C.2
The institution identifies and assesses learning support outcomes for its student population and provides appropriate student support services and programs to achieve those outcomes. The institution uses assessment data to continuously improve student support programs and services.

Evidence

The institution identifies learning support outcomes and uses assessment data to improve student services. Student Support Service units identify Student Services Outcomes (SSOs) and successfully complete the SSO process including: Admissions Office, Assessment Center, ASU, Career & Job Services, Counseling, DSP&S, EOPS/CARE, Financial Aid, FYE, International Students Program, MESA, Outreach/Offsite and Recruitment, Student Activities, Student Health Center, Transfer Center and Veterans Services. 607

There are several innovative examples of how student support outcomes ensure ongoing improved quality in its support services and programs. The Counseling Department establishes student support outcomes and improves the quality of its services as a result of these outcomes. One noteworthy example of a Counseling Department SSO:

SSO 1: To increase student knowledge and awareness of online counseling services such as appointment booking, advising and orientation.

The Counseling department’s use of technology has significantly affected student learning and achievement. Prior Student Service Outcome data indicated a lack of awareness of online services provided by the Counseling Department. In response, the Counseling Department revised its online new student orientation, created a YouTube Channel with informative videos, and began delivering real-time E-Chat services. 608

Students are often referred to each of these three services as a way to supplement information given in the traditional counseling format. These services are first publicized in the students’ acceptance e-mails and again throughout the Assessment, Orientation, and Counseling process that is mandated in their first semester. 609 Both the online and in-person new student orientations heavily publicize the Counseling Department’s E-chat, online quick questions, and appointment booking services. 610 Since its launch in January 2014, more than 2,000 students have completed ELAC’s online New Student Orientation. A survey developed by the Counseling Department, in collaboration with OIEA, provides data indicating students’ satisfaction with the online New Student Orientation. Students report a strong sense of educational options and resources necessary for
success as they start their college careers.\textsuperscript{611} It is also worth noting that ELAC’s YouTube Channel has reached nearly 9,000 unique user views.

Another great example of how student support outcomes are used to enhance services is evident in the Transfer Center activity. The Transfer Center collaborated with Student Activities and hosted a Transfer Student Success Conference.\textsuperscript{612} A survey was developed and implemented to assess the success of the event and also to assess student learning of the transfer process. The student survey responses from the Transfer Student Success Conference indicate that workshop sessions met the expectations of students by providing applicable information of the university transfer process.\textsuperscript{613} The conference included Personal Statement Writing Workshops. Follow up sessions resulted in group meetings and individual one-on-one appointments with English faculty members.

\textbf{Analysis and Evaluation}

The College meets the Standard.

Student service units identify and assess learning support outcomes and use assessment data to continuously improve programs and services. This unit has been actively engaged in outcomes assessment for multiple years and has successfully implemented plans evolving from assessment results for continuous improvement. One noteworthy example would be admission’s outcomes assessment unit planning.\textsuperscript{614} Admissions embarked on a campaign for on-time submission of grades that resulted in an increase of on-time grade completions from 75 - 96 percent between 2012 and 2014.

---
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\textbf{II.C.3}

\textbf{The institution assures equitable access to all of its students by providing appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable services to students regardless of service location or delivery method.}
Evidence

The institution assures equitable access by identifying and working towards meeting the needs of students at the main campus, South Gate Educational Center (SGEC), off-site, dual-enrollment campuses, and online services. On the main campus the majority of Student Services offices are housed in the E1 Student Services building. The remodeling of the building was completed in 2012. In 2016 the Student Campus Center housing the bookstore, cafeteria, student activities, student government, Student Health Center, and Veterans Center will open.

The registration process is completely online using Student Information System (SIS). Prior to the first day of school the system allows students to, add and or drop classes, check for class availability, pay their fees, and check grades.615

Orientations are conducted on the main campus and at South Gate by counseling faculty. As of spring 2015, they are also available at off-site locations and online.616

At the SGEC students have access to all services. The plans for the Firestone Education Center, replacing the current SGEC, include upgraded facilities and expansion of student services to include a Student Health Center.617

The College has committed to a robust online student services program. Online services are linked directly to the college and district websites which provide comprehensive student information and services. Each respective student service unit is responsible for ensuring accurate and current information. Current and perspective online students have access to information and direct contact to college admissions, enrollment, support services, programs, directories, class offerings, academic calendar, student transcripts, bookstore services, College Catalog, open classes, financial aid, clubs, and student government. Students are able to complete the admission application, add and drop classes, access assessment placement results, and access unofficial transcripts via the Distance Education website. Furthermore, students are able to send inquiries via e-mail to departments such as Counseling and can expect a response.
Outreach and Recruitment efforts involve visiting elementary, middle, and high school campuses as well as community centers and attending recruitment fairs. As of spring 2015, the College had reached out to 14 elementary schools, 5 middle schools, and 35 high schools. ELAC plays a leadership role in the Community Partnership Organization involving more than 50 organizations. Additionally, staff visits over 10 community centers and attend approximately 20 recruitment fairs. The geographical area of the locations listed above covers feeder schools at both the main campus and the SGEC.

ELAC has partnered with other educational institutions in the area to create the Greater Outcomes for East LA (GO ELA) campaign. GO ELA is a pathway for college and career success to promote greater outcomes for all East L.A. students, focusing on college awareness, preparation and completion, and career readiness. The initiative will support students throughout their educational careers. GO East LA offers all Garfield and ELAC students guaranteed admission to ELAC and California State University for those who meet minimum requirements.

Student support services foster student learning and development through extensive and reliable delivery of services. The use of Annual Updates, Program Review, surveys, and the Unit Cluster Plan are used to routinely gauge the extent to which students are being served in accord with the overall mission of the College and specifically the four institutional goals. Services are provided at the main campus, SGEC, off-site, dual-enrollment campuses, and online.

All Student Support Services reflect the mission of the College, and are evaluated using Student Success outcomes, which in turn align with the four institutional goals. As stated in the Mission Statement, “ELAC empowers students to achieve their educational goal”. The 2014 Facts in Brief indicates that the most cited educational goal of students is transfer to a four-year institution (49 percent up from 42.5 percent in 2012). The second highest educational goal, is Career Prep/Advancement (16.4 percent), and the third highest is the undecided group (16.1 percent).

Student achievement data demonstrated a need to improve institutional transfer rates. The Transfer Taskforce was created and is actively working to increase the number of successful transfers. An estimated 130 students participated in the first Transfer Student Conference in the fall 2014 semester. In spring 2015, more than 200 students attended the conference. Also in spring 2015, the College hired an Instructor Special Assignment (ISA) in the area of Campus Engagement. The main job description for this employee is to assist the Transfer Center director with implementing the recommendation as identified by the Transfer Task Force.

Student services such as DSP&S and EOPS meet the needs of a unique group of students. In fall
2015, DSP&S serves about 1800 students and EOPS serves 1400 students. Services are offered at both the main campus and the SGEC. The institution complies with the Americans with Disability Act of 1990 and uses this regulation to ensure that services meet the needs of the students. Services include, but are not limited to, dedicated counseling staff, supplemental tutoring, specialized lab equipment and computer software, and testing accommodations.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard and Eligibility Requirement 15.

The College assures that students have access to comprehensive and reliable services at all locations and regardless of delivery mode. In efforts to prepare for the Firestone Education Center, the College leadership launched a taskforce to evaluate current and future needs of the SGEC and Firestone Education Center. The task force met during the 2014-2015 academic year and made recommendations to the College President. The institution will hire two administrators to oversee both the academic and student services needs at this location.

ELAC’s student services provide appropriate, comprehensive and reliable services to students that foster learning and development. ELAC’s revised mission statement lists student goals as transfer, successful completion of workforce development programs, earn associate degrees, and pursue opportunities for lifelong learning and civic engagement. Several efforts to provide targeted student services for the goal of transfer are ongoing led by the Campus Engagement Specialist. A commitment to continue the renewed focus on transfer, begun through the Transfer Taskforce remains ongoing. These efforts are addressed as one component of the Quality Focus Essay.

One example linking the institutional mission and goals to student support services is demonstrated in Goal 2: “Increasing equity in successful outcomes by analyzing gaps in student achievement and using this to identify and implement effective models and programming to remedy these gap.” The Strategic Planning Committee identified a significant gap in the transfer rates of Hispanic/Latina students. Data show that female students in this ethnic group take an average of ten year or more to transfer. Intervention strategies and activities are under discussion aimed at reducing this time. These efforts are addressed as one component of the Quality Focus Essay.

---
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II.C. 4
Co-curricular programs and athletics programs are suited to the institution’s mission and contribute to the social and cultural dimensions of the educational experience of its students. If the institution offers co-curricular or athletic programs, they are conducted with sound educational policy and standards of integrity. The institution has responsibility for the control of these programs, including their finances.

Evidence

Student Activities
The institution offers co-curricular and athletics programs that are well suited to the mission of the College and overall experience of the student. Co-curricular programs achieve this goal by providing a dynamic, student-driven, and highly respected student leadership program through the Associated Student Union (ASU). The board is comprised of twenty students, all of whom must meet LACCD S-9 requirements in order to participate. The vast majority of ASU student leaders surpass the minimum requirements for participation. Students must be enrolled in at least 5 units during the fall and spring semester, maintain at least a 2.0 GPA during their term of office, and have fewer than 80 units completed. Under the supervision of the Dean of Student Services, student leaders gain valuable educational experiences, such as planning weekend training/retreats, implementing Robert's Rules of Order, extensive training in LACCD Student Regulations, attendance at local, state and federal student leadership conferences, and hands-on experiences in organizing and implementing campus events. One noted event is the Transfer Student Conference, held each semester starting in fall 2014. This event requires students to plan, organize, and implement a student-led conference for 200 peers. Student leaders chair meetings, identify tasks, and take center stage on the day of the event.

ASU also runs a successful book rental program. The program began in 2007-2008 with fifty Math 115 and 125 books. The program now offers more than 1,200 books and more than ten books titles. The purpose of the program is to offer peer support in offsetting the high cost of books, thus giving students a better opportunity to succeed in class. With the ongoing focus on student success, the book rental program is truly an example of a support service that is contributing to educational excellence and the College Mission.

Inter Club Council operates under the umbrella of the ASU, with more than 80 clubs on campus. Each chartered club gets one-time unrestricted seed funding upon completing the charter process. These clubs provide students with opportunities to enhance their educational experiences by allowing them to explore their interests outside of the classroom setting. Clubs
exist to give students an opportunity to network with fellow students, gain exposure to mentors in their field, build their leadership skills, and expose them to a wide range of social and cultural experiences. Students have an opportunity to join an existing club or create new clubs of their interest. Each club is assigned a faculty advisor who serves as a mentor to students.

For several years ASU has funded opportunities for students to experience and participate in a number of external activities. ASU has funded campus tours for club members interested in transferring to either a public or private university. ASU also funds conferences and competitions for several clubs. These include both in-state and out-of-state travel. For example, engineering students represented the College in an engineering completion and traveled to Canada. They were the only community college students participating in the competition. They went on to place second for their project. For the past two years, ASU has funded students from the Speech and Debate team to participate in local, regional, and national competitions. The team has continued to place in the top three ranks of all their categories. This year will mark the fifth annual Husky Bowl, a friendly competition among clubs designed to bring students together so they may learn from each other. In addition, ASU supports campus wide multi-cultural and special events. Some of these events include Mexican Independence Day Parade, Domestic Violence Awareness Month, Dia De Los Muertos, Chinese New Year, Black History Project, Women’s History Month, Sexual Assault Awareness Month, Cinco De Mayo, Graduation, Habitat for Humanity, job fairs, resource fairs, workshops, speakers, and food sponsorships. ASU funds are also used to fund twelve scholarships each semester.

Co-curricular programs are integrated with institutional planning. The 2015-2016 operating budget for ASU is currently at $210,000 for the academic year. The budget is supported with membership dues and return on budget reserves. The Business office handles all business transactions for ASU and clubs per LACCD policy. One key integrated institutional support is the sale of priority parking which allows participating ASU members to park in the covered parking structures. ASU funds also include revenue from the Student Representation Fee (SRF). This is a $1.00 mandatory fee enacted in winter 2013. Fees are collected year-round at the beginning of each semester including inter-sessions. Unlike the operating budget stated above, unused fees roll over to the next semester. Funds are monitored closely by the Dean of Student Services to make sure they meet the required use and ensure the overall balance remains under $500,000. The Business office provides monthly statements showing the balance and activity in the account. Funds are available to any individual student, group of students, club, or classroom interested in advocating for student rights at the local, state, or national level. Spring 2015 was the first year that ELAC students attended a national student leadership conference on advocacy. This was a four-day conference held in Washington D.C. The purpose of the conference is to teach student leaders how to advocate for their educational rights. Students were able to meet with legislative representatives and share their personal stories and educational journeys. The opportunity to travel to the nation’s capital is priceless and life changing for many of the participants. In the fall 2014 semester, four male students were
selected to attend the Men of Color Conference held in San Francisco. This gave students an opportunity to network with students from around the country and from various socio-economic and cultural backgrounds.

ASU board members as well as club members are held to the highest standards of integrity. Students must adhere to California Ed Code, LACCD Student Code of Conduct, ASU Constitution, ICC Bylaws and board policy respective to student travel. As mentioned above, students often travel off campus to attend conferences and competitions. Students must verify they acknowledge rules and regulations. Should students violate any of the standards, they are subject to disciplinary charges ranging from written warning to dismissal from programs to expulsion from the district.

Athletics

The Athletics Department at ELAC is dedicated to providing quality educational opportunities, programs and support services to a culturally diverse community. It supports the College Mission and strategic goals by stressing the importance of student-athlete success, equity, access and accountability. Intercollegiate athletics provides students with opportunities to experience the valuable life lessons of self-discipline, competition, leadership, teamwork, sportsmanship, character building, and community involvement through athletic participation. Athletics is an integral dimension of this educational institution. The responsibility of the Athletics Department is to provide athletically oriented students, regardless of race, religion, color, creed or sexual orientation, with opportunities to enhance their collegiate education, provide and develop educational leadership, physical wellness, sports and participation, recreational pursuits and athletic excellence through a competitive intercollegiate athletic program. In order to insure a full range of opportunities for participation and competition, the athletics program must be as broad in scope as possible; however, the availability of various sports is dependent on sufficient student interests and adequate financial resources. Currently supported athletic programs include: badminton (women) baseball (men) basketball (men and women), cross country (men and women), football (men), soccer (men and women), softball (women), swimming (women), track and field (men and women), volleyball (women), water polo (women), wrestling (men).

This Athletics Department is student-athlete focused. To promote student access and success the College provides its student-athletes with support services to enhance their academic and athletic processes both while at ELAC and in preparation for their continued education and athletic participation beyond the institution. The coaching staff serves as both character and academic mentors to student athletes. At least seven of the sixteen teams have received the honor of having the coach be recognized as “Coach of the Year”.

Student-athletes are able to meet with one of two specially designated student-athlete academic counselors before, during and after each (respective) sport season and off-season. They provide "early” registration for student-athletes. This effort provides ELAC student-athletes with the
opportunity to set success benchmarks for themselves and for the institution. Each ELAC student-athlete is required to meet with either athletic counselor, (or if a student-athlete is a part of the EOPS program, the EOPS counselor), to prepare an educational plan. For the past 13 academic years, at the end of the spring semester, the student athletes who have performed well academically, (2.75 GPA or better), are invited, along with their families, to a luncheon in their honor. The event recognizes current student–athletes and a student-athlete alumni serves as the keynote speaker.

The ELAC Athletics Department is integrated with the institutional budget planning process. The budget process is tied to academic planning through program review. All budget requests must be a result of planning efforts and must include a justification. Each spring semester, the athletic department will formulate an annual budget assumption, (budget preparation) for review and discussion by the Vice President of Student Services. With the exception of coaching stipends, which is set contractually, all aspects of the department's budget are part of this review.

The values associated with participating in intercollegiate sports at East Los Angeles College include student-athlete discipline, values, trust and respect for the educational process. Student-athletes contribute to the local community with various outreach activities and the success of student-athletes has created a greater positive image of ELAC as a whole. None of these would be ever come to fruition if academic achievement and athletic participation were not connected.

Student-athletes throughout the State of California are required to maintain full-time (12 units) academic status with at least 9 units counting toward the Associate Degree, remediation, transfer, and/or certification as defined by the College Catalog. In addition, each student-athlete competing in a second sport or a second season must also have completed 24 units and maintain a 2.5 grade point average. Weekly, the ELAC Director of Athletics and the Athletics Eligibility Clerk ensure each and every ELAC student-athlete is progressing as required.

Appropriate conduct by all participants in the East Los Angeles College athletics program is expected at all times. This includes student-athletes, coaches, personnel, staff and volunteers. As highly visible members of the institution, all personnel are expected to act with integrity, civility and self-discipline, and uphold high standards in all aspects of an athletic program. The goal is to set examples for the College in the classroom and on the playing field.

A. Citizenship --all student-athletes are expected to: 1. act responsibly on and off campus, 2. respect the rights of others, 3. follow all ELAC, CCCAA and team rules, follow all community laws, and 5. win or lose with "class".

B. Class Attendance-- student-athletes are required to: 1. follow the department policy on mandatory class attendance, 2. make every effort to succeed academically, and 3. respect the syllabus of each instructor.

C. ELAC Training Rules --student-athletes are required to: 1. respect and follow accepted rules regarding rest, proper nutrition, hygiene and physical fitness, 2. abstain from
alcohol, tobacco, drugs and performance enhancing substances per CCCAA and East Los Angeles College Guidelines, and 3. follow advice from athletic training staff and team physicians.

D. Team Rules and Information--for his/her team, the coach will: 1. develop, explain and apply rules of conduct and participation, 2. provide each team member of said rules in writing, 3. follow advice from the athletic training staff and team doctors, and 4. not attempt to request a "grade change" from any academic instructor.

E. Discipline Policy--for his/her team, the coach will: 1. supply his/her disciplinary decisions regarding inappropriate behavior in a fair, consistent and equitable manner, 2. notify the athletic director in the event a student-athlete has been dismissed from the team, a class or the institution, and 3. notify the athletic director if any student-athlete or staff member has been suspended from a contest or been charged with a criminal offense while being a member of this program.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Both ASU and athletics programs align with the College’s mission, specifically goal 3, which is “Sustaining community-centered access, participation, and preparation that improves the College’s presence in the community, maximizes access to higher education and provides outlets for artistic, civic, cultural, scientific, and social expression as well as environmental awareness.”

Policies and procedures are evaluated on a regular basis to insure compliance with local, district, and state policy. Co-curricular participation has increased by about 7 percent every year. Club sponsored activities are more visible on campus and in the community. With more than eighty clubs on campus, students are able to explore a wide range of interests. Club categories include but are not limited to academic, social, environmental, political, and self-improvement. As a result of a campus-wide focus on increasing transfer rates, the Associated Student Union has increased funding to club interested in organizing university campus tours. Students have a strong presence in the community as is evident by clubs such as the Respiratory Therapy Club attending Wellness Fairs, or the Nursing Student Association taking blood pressure and heart rates at local events, or clubs volunteering with Habitat for Humanity.

Athletic programs continue to improve their competitive ranking by increasing their participation in playoffs games. The 2014-2015 was a very successful season for Athletics.652

With the multitude of student activities occurring throughout the school year, there is always room for continued improvement communicating and advertising these events. The Athletics Department is currently undergoing a major redesign of its web presence to better publicize the events. This effort is part of the broader Action Plan of improving Communication campuswide.
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II.C.5
The institution provides counseling and/or academic advising programs to support student development and success and prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function. Counseling and advising programs orient student to ensure they understand the requirements related to their programs of study and receive timely, useful, and accurate information about relevant academic requirements, including graduation and transfer policies.

Evidence

East Los Angeles College provides counseling and academic advising programs to support student development and success. Formal advising services for students are provided by the Counseling, Transfer Center, Career and Job Services, Extended Opportunities Programs and Services (EOPS), International Student Program, Noncredit department, CalWORKs, Athletics, Puente, Adelante, First Year Completion, Math Engineering Science Achievement
The Counseling Department has 28 full-time counselors and 16 additional adjunct counselors working anywhere from 3 hours to 21 hours per week. Counseling services are provided at the South Gate Educational Center. In addition to general counseling services, the DSP&S and EOPS programs also provide counseling services at the South Gate campus. Similarly, programs such as CalWORKs, MESA, Career & Job Services, Adelante, and First Year Completion all provide representation via outreach and/or offering of services at the South Gate campus. Numerous programs also use technology to offer services for distance education students. The Counseling Department offers an Online Quick Question service and E-Chat with a counselor, Career & Job Services offers online career assessments and a job database, and numerous other services make their e-mail addresses available in order to field questions:

- Online Quick Questions
- E-Chat with a Counselor
- Online Job Database
- Career Assessments

Counseling and academic advising is delivered in myriad forms ranging from one-on-one appointment to group-based settings. Computerized resources such as ASSIST, EUREKA, the Strong Interest Inventory and Myers-Briggs aid counseling faculty in delivering counseling and advising that promotes student development and learning. Additionally, counseling faculty working with populations such as international students and military veterans to ensure student support is tailored to meet the specific needs of these specialized student populations.

The Counseling Department ensures the delivery of accurate, timely, and pertinent information as part of the counseling and advising services by conducting trainings for all full-time and part-time faculty. Trainings cover a variety of topics including: degree, certificate and transfer requirements; properly using LACCD DEC to update and maintain student records; SB-1456 compliance training; and training on completing electronic Student Educational Plans.

On a district-wide level, ELAC Counselors participate in LACCD’s Counselor Conference to gain a grander scale understanding of state-wide legislation on the Counseling discipline. Counselors annually attend conferences at University of California, California State University, and the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities that provide updated information on transfer advising.

Counseling-based programs continue to innovate and experiment with the use of technology and group-based interventions in their day-to-day delivery of services. Each of the aforementioned programs works closely with OIEA to gauge the effectiveness of existing and newly
incorporated counseling interventions. This is achieved through each unit’s participation in the 2013-2014 Program Review process, focus on areas for improvement requested in the 2014 Annual Update, and administration of surveys/evaluations after appointments, group counseling, and special events. Additionally, grant and special funded programs such as the VRC, MESA/STEM, EOP&S, and DSP&S receive their own external evaluations to gauge the effectiveness of counseling services provided by their respective programs.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Legislation introduced in recent years has placed greater emphasis on students receiving accurate and timely information from the time they first step foot on campus for their New Student Orientation all the way through attainment and completion of their educational goal. Lead counselors provide training to counseling faculty and related personnel understand the fluid and changing nature of degree/certificate requirements, transfer admission policy, and campus academic regulations. Counseling faculty and related support personnel receive frequent training to ensure they remain abreast of the constant changes and new regulations impacting associate degree/certificate eligibility, transfer policies, and other academic regulations. ELAC’s student support services that incorporate a counseling component make it a priority to ensure that the counseling and advising services it provides remain up to date and relevant. The Counseling Department chair ensures that counselors from student support service programs (EOPS, DSP&S, CalWORKs, MESA, etc.) participate in monthly meetings as well as training sessions. All content, policies, and procedures covered in counselor trainings are developed via a work group of full-time counseling faculty. Once content is agreed upon, training is constantly provided to both full-time and adjunct faculty to review the latest changes impacting students’ successful matriculation, major/program of study selection, and completion of their goals is absolutely critical. Information covered in counselor trainings is archived on a shared computer drive accessible by the entire department. Trainings are well received by full-time and adjunct counselors. District-wide reporting data show a heavy increase in reported student contacts compared to previous years when reporting was not as heavily emphasized.

Training material is revised, reviewed, and improved to ensure compliance with state and local regulations. Similarly, counseling faculty meet regularly to ensure information and practices are uniform and consistent. A New Counselor Guide serves as a resource and reference for all counseling faculty.

Counseling services at ELAC place a great emphasis on having each point of contact serve as a critical juncture in a student’s success and development. Student service and counseling’s prioritization of student success and development is in line with the College’s Mission Statement. Any program on campus providing counseling services readily engages in a process.
of development, implementation, and evaluation of its counseling services. General Counseling along with programs such as CalWORKs, MESA, and Career & Job services incorporate various forms of individual and group based interventions to efficiently serve more students. An excellent example of this is the Assessment, Orientation, and Counseling campaign (A+O+C) created to publicize new students’ need to complete these three critical matriculation steps. This campaign has spread awareness and created a brand that students identify as a critical step in their enrollment at ELAC. Students’ participation in the Counseling component of A+O+C ensures they receive timely, accurate, and tailored information to assist them in completing their educational goal.

The efforts of the VRC and International Student Program are particularly noteworthy. In fall 2014, the Veterans Counselor offered a number of workshops and orientations tailored to meet the needs of ELAC VRC students. The Veterans Counselor and Certifying Official ensure that topics and information covered in these workshops and orientations addressed needs demonstrated by ELAC VRC students. In addition, the VRC works closely with DSP&S to ensure all VRC students experiencing service and non-service related disabilities (PTSD, TBI, mental health issues, visual and hearing impairments, etc.) receive appropriate accommodations to complement their success at ELAC. Similarly, the International Student Program demonstrates the College’s commitment to the success of specialized student populations. The ISP provides comprehensive student services and legal documentation to more than 700 international students. ELAC ISP provides all pre-admission information along with the necessary international application and documentation required to grant an I-20 visa to secure an international student acceptance. As of July 2014, a full-time counselor works exclusively with international students to promote increased awareness of campus academic support resources and resources that allow students to better navigate the transition to the United States higher education system. The program also added four Introduction to College courses (PERSDEV 1) in fall 2014 and 2 in spring 2015 as a means to decrease the number of students on academic/probation and increase retention rates. The International Student Program anticipates increasing the amount of Counseling courses offered in the Fall 2015 semester.

These newly developed innovations and modalities for providing counseling services augment the traditional one-on-one counseling format. The Counseling division also understands the importance of properly utilizing the OIEA and other measure of evaluation to gauge the effectiveness of its interventions. For example, after revising the structure of the in-person and online versions of the New Student Orientation, the Counseling Department and the OIEA sought to demonstrate the orientations’ effectiveness in acclimating students to the College. This was evidenced by a Likert scale item asking students to rate the overall usefulness of information covered in the orientation. The result showed 96 percent of students found the information useful/very useful. Similarly, counseling-focused initiatives from the VRC, ISP, Career & Job Services, MESA/STEM, and the Puente program all have taken great efforts to gauge the effect...
counseling services has on student development and success. Each of these programs through a combination of survey items, external evaluation, and program design and development generated convincing data on how their various initiatives aided student development and success.

With so many new activities that are constantly emerging, getting the correct information to new students is challenging. Efforts to create a Welcome Campaign aim to address this challenge and continuously improve counseling services. These efforts are included as part of the QFE and the Action Plan to strengthen college-wide communication.

II.C.6.
The institution has adopted and adheres to admission policies consistent with its mission that specify the qualifications of students appropriate for its programs. The institution defines and advises students on clear pathways to complete degrees, certificate, and transfer goals.
Evidence

East Los Angeles College is an open access college that welcomes nearly all potential students. The College’s general admission policies are consistent with its mission statement of open access, reflective of Los Angeles Community College District Board rules that follow California State regulations. Board Rule 8100 “allows students who are high school graduates or equivalent to attend East Los Angeles College.”

Students who are 18 years or older without a high school diploma or its equivalent are admitted as provisional students. Students who are concurrently enrolled in K-12 grades can attend East Los Angeles College part time or full time, with parental consent, concurrent elementary or secondary permit and approval of the President or his designee and the Dean of Admissions. For students who are not yet enrolled in high school, approval is needed from a college special admissions committee, made up of faculty and administrators. The only exception to the open admissions policy applies to potential students in the United States under a travel visa (B-1 or B-2). This exception in Board Rule 8100 responds to increased Federal regulation and tracking on non-resident attendance in American schools. All other students are welcome to attend. Non-California residents may attend; however a nonresident tuition rate is applied.

Information published in the General Catalog and Catalog updates serves as the preliminary source of information used to guide students towards degree, certificate, and transfer completion.

Counseling faculty use information published in the General Catalog and Catalog Updates when advising students on completion of their degree, certificate, and transfer goals at ELAC. Information published in the General Catalog is supplemented by counselors’ participation on campus committees that allows them to remain abreast of any major changes to policy and requirements relating to the completion of degree, certificates, and transfer. Additionally, departments across campus are regularly invited to Counseling Department meetings to share new information pertaining to their certificate and/or degree programs.
Counseling Faculty in the Transfer Center and Career & Job Services offer individual appointments to assist students in exploring and identifying their certificate, degree, and transfer ambitions at ELAC. Additionally, Counseling Faculty in both offices coordinate events, workshops, and committees whereby other faculty and staff contribute to students’ process of identifying their educational pathway at ELAC. Similarly, academic disciplines often coordinate workshops to highlight different career pathways associated with completion of certificates and degrees in their discipline.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard and Eligibility Requirement 16.

The depth and breadth of programs offered at ELAC supports the open access mission of the community college. Enrollment continues to grow as students recognize that ELAC provides pathways towards upward social mobility and global citizenship. Information on the various certificates, degrees, and transfer pathways available to students is widely available on the campus website. Students receive an overview of the educational opportunities available when completing their mandatory New Student Orientation. Shortly after completing this step, Counseling faculty develop an Abbreviated Student Educational Plan tailored to a student’s particular educational goal.

As a whole, counseling faculty remain abreast of the various degree, certificate, and transfer pathways available to students at ELAC. While there are a number of counselors who liaise with specific departments on campus, the structure of the Counseling Department necessitates that each Counselor have a working knowledge of every possible educational objective attainable at ELAC. Dissemination of this information continues throughout a student’s educational journey via individual counseling appointments and group workshops. Given the ever-changing nature of transfer admission requirements, counselors frequently attend transfer conferences about the UCs, CSUs, and private schools to remain abreast of the latest trends and requirements pertinent for community college students wishing to transfer.

The information students receive about pathways to completing their educational objectives is complemented by the services offered in the Career & Job Services office and the Transfer Center. Career & Job Services offers career services to assist students to explore and identify their respective pathway to degree, certificates, and/or transfer completion. Career counseling sessions are scheduled for one hour to discuss majors, occupations, and pertinent career options for students. Career assessments and inventories, such as Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, Strong Interest Inventory, and Motivated Skills Card Sorts, are also available for students to take, depending on the Career Counselor's recommendations. As a means to address
ELAC’s many Career & Technical educational objectives, Career & Job Services collaborates with all 33 CTE disciplines and ASU clubs to host an annual Career & Technical Education Pathway Fair. This has proven a successful event for the past two years with more than 500 students participating. The Career & Technical Education Pathway Fair is an excellent example of the College’s collaborative efforts to inform students on the many certificates, degrees, and transfer paths available. Many other disciplines across campus host their own respective workshops/open houses to highlight career pathways tied to pursuing certificates, degrees, and/or transfer in their respective subjects.

The Transfer Center assists students in defining transfer pathways via appointments with the Transfer Center Counselor as well as university representatives from surrounding institutions. Workshops, university tours, and events like the Transfer Student Success Conferences allow the Transfer Center to provide clarity on transfer pathways to students en masse. The Transfer Center serves as a hub for Transfer focused programs like Adelante, FYC, Honors, Puente, MESA/STEM, UCLA CCCP, and LMU Partnerships. Campus staff, faculty, and administration promote these programs by directing students towards the transfer center for information on these programs.

In summer 2014, the College President created a Task Force on Transfer to evaluate and increase university transfer rates. The Task Force members included student leaders, classified personnel, faculty, transfer program directors, and administration. The Task Force on Transfer developed events and activities to increase campus and community engagement in the Transfer Mission. Efforts of the Task Force on Transfer resulted in 2014 Opening Day Convocation focusing on the school’s transfer mission. Faculty and staff were informed of the Task Force’s work and received invitations to participate in work-groups to implement events and activities created by the Task Force on Transfer. The Task Force on Transfer also requested data to identify students approaching eligibility for transfer. Identified students were then contacted and invited to meet with a Counselor to solidify their transfer plans. Lastly, the Transfer Center continues to engage in conversations to create transfer pathways with schools like UCLA, UCLA Law, Cal Poly Pomona, and LMU. Strengthening the transfer culture at ELAC is one of the components that will be addressed in the Quality Focus Essay.

The institution has adopted and adheres to admission policies consistent with its mission that specify the qualifications of students appropriate for its programs. 675

---

670 Board Rule 8100
671 Registration and Fees
672 2015-2016 General Catalog p. 70, 78, 86
673 Academic Senate Membership; Curriculum Committee; Counseling Agenda
674 CTE Fair; Transfer Task Force; Transfer Fair; Chicano Studies, Psych, AJ Dept. Information Workshops
675 2015-2016 General Catalog p. 17; Online Admissions
II.C.7

The institution regularly evaluates admissions and placement instruments and practices to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases.

Evidence

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of practices and tools of admissions, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement (OIEA) provides all the Assessment Placement research and evaluation for the Assessment Placement Process. The assessment instruments were thoroughly researched when switching from paper/pencil instruments to computerized instruments in 2010. Research includes but is not limited to cut-score validation, curriculum alignment and disproportionate impact.

With implementation of SB1456--The Student Success and Support Program Act and the College's Student Equity Plan, the institution will require research in equity and proportionality in the following areas: admissions registration patterns; assessment services, validation, and disproportionate impact studies; orientation participation patterns; student education plan completion, including disproportionate impact; follow-up on Early alert process, particularly of...
the students who receive early alert services, and whether certain groups are disproportionately less likely to succeed in their classes; and the potential disproportionate impact of prerequisites on student access to course. Multiple measures are also used to reduce potential bias.678

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

The Assessment Placement Process, the assessment instruments and the multiple measures questionnaire are evaluated as part of the research cycle for consistency and effectiveness. The Assessment Center uses an established daily task protocol to ensure that the placement process is consistent and effective.

The disproportionate impact studies have not revealed any cultural or linguistic bias in the Accuplacer nor the Compass placement instruments that are being used at ELAC.

Cultural and linguistic bias in the Assessment Center is also minimized by providing bilingual staff that are fluent in Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese. In addition, the Assessment center provides the Assessment Lab Entry form in English, Chinese, Spanish and Vietnamese. This has all proven to be most helpful to students at ELAC.

676 Accuplacer and Compass info link
677 Integrated Placement Model – Math; Integrated Placement Model - English
678 Multiple Measures Questions

II.C.8
The institution maintains student records permanently, securely, and confidentially, with provision for secure backup of all files, regardless of the form in which those files are maintained. The institution publishes and follows established policies for release of student records.

Evidence

All Student Services units adhere to Board Rules 7708 (Classification of Records) and 7709 (Destruction of Records).679 These two board rules provide guidelines for student record are classification, storage, and destruction. Each record is classified into one of the following; Class 1 – Permanent, Class 2 – Optional, and Class 3 – Disposable. Since the last accreditation report, all records classified as permanent, once stored in a fire-proof vault, have been scanned to electronic format. Currently, the collection of records is in an electronic format since the enrollment process requires students to submit their application online. However, in certain areas, there is a need to submit paper documents. In such cases, each office is responsible for making sure documents are maintained appropriately. In the Admission and Records Office,
student records are maintained securely. Most historic paper records were scanned into electronic format years ago. Current student records in paper format are stored in fire-proof and locked cabinets within a fire-proof vault that has limited staff access, until the documents are scanned to electronic format and then reclassified to Class 3 – Disposable Records and destroyed properly after Board approval.

In the Financial Aid office, all data reside in the DEC system are backed up on a daily basis. In addition to Board Rules, this follows the federal and state financial aid regulations that govern the maintenance of the financial aid records and its record retention requirement. All records are scanned into the imaging system, that which is backed up on a nightly process. Financial Aid records reside in the District DEC or the campus jukebox systems. It manages by IT department that maintains a backup schedule to ensure these data are secure.680

The Student Health Center is operated by Mosaic Health Services via a three-year contract. Mosaic is responsible for securing health-related documents. The office is equipped with lockable file cabinets in which paper documents are stored. Electronic documents are stored on a secured server, and access to information is protected by username and password login. The institution adheres to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA). This is a federal legislation that protects the privacy of the students' personally identifiable information. The act applies to all institutions that receive federal funding.

Board Rule 8401.11 outlines the District policies related to release of student records; ELAC strictly adheres to policy. Authorized release is allowed for student release, judicial order or subpoena, college or district officials with legitimate educational interest, authorized State or Federal agencies, potential schools in which the student intends to enroll, agencies related to the student’s financial aid, educational studies, health or safety emergency, and selected information to the military. All student services offices follow state and district mandates.

The Fall 2014 Student Survey and ACCJC Accreditation Standard Analysis indicate that 47.4 percent of students surveyed were very satisfied and 41.6 percent were somewhat satisfied with the current standard of practice in this area.683

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

All Student Services units adhere to the board rules specifying processes for storing, destroying, and disseminating student records.

679 Board Rules 7708 (Classification of Records) and 7709 (Destruction of Records)
680 IT backup policy
681 Student Health Center Contract
682 Board Rule 8401.11
683 Fall 2014 Student Survey
STANDARD III
Resources
III.A.1
The institution assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing administrators, faculty and staff who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support these programs and services. Criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selection of personnel are clearly and publicly stated and address the needs of the institution in serving its student population. Job descriptions are directly related to institutional mission and goals and accurately reflect position duties, responsibilities, and authority.

Evidence

Hiring policies and processes for administrators, full-time and adjunct faculty, and classified staff are developed, defined, established, and consistently practiced. The policies work as a guide to ensure integrity, fairness, and consistency in the hiring processes. The processes are in place to ensure the College hires the most qualified applicants who meet the instructional or service needs of the institution.

There are two hiring systems in the district: one for certificated and one for classified. The District Human Resource Officeplans and reviews the Faculty Obligation Number-FON with the colleges for faculty hires. The Academic Senate Hiring Prioritization Committee (HPC) ranks replacement and growth hiring requests via a template that evaluates needs identified in the Annual Update Plan. Secondly, the District Personnel Commission oversees the classified hiring, which is a merit system of testing, ranking, career ladder and transfer opportunities. The College has hired 70 faculty and staff to meet the instructional and service needs of the institution and keep pace with seven percent growth in the student population since 2013.

Administrators and Faculty

East Los Angeles College follows the state minimum qualifications criteria set by the California Community Colleges Board of Governors for its certificated administrative and faculty hiring. The College also has its own set of qualifications that meet the needs of specific service areas. The minimum requirement for administrators includes the completion of a Master’s degree and one full year of administrative or managerial experience. Faculty members must meet the California State minimum qualifications for their discipline. Additional discipline-specific requirements, if applicable, are defined by the District Discipline Committees representing each discipline taught in the district. These discipline committees are composed of representatives from all nine colleges within the LACCD. All additional qualification requirements are vetted with and agreed upon by the nine college representatives on the committee.

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 HPC, which consists of faculty and administrators, meets annually during the fall semester to evaluate the requests
submitted by all departments. The evaluation is based on quantitative data representing student demand for departmental offerings and qualitative justifications presented by the department chair in the original written request as well as in a face-to-face meeting with the HPC. The HPC ranks the positions requested, groups them into two groups (replacement and growth), and submits the list to the Academic Senate with attached brief explanations regarding the priority placement. 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. These policies and procedures can be found in the East Los Angeles College Faculty Hiring Policies and Procedures. Adjunct faculty hiring does not require a committee. Adjunct hiring is at the discretion of the department chair based on department needs to meet student demand beyond the courses taught by full-time faculty.

Faculty and Administrator selection processes follows the policy set forth by the East Los Angeles College Academic Senate, which mirrors similar Policy and Procedures required by the Los Angeles Community College District. All required application materials are screened for State Minimum Qualifications. All finalists for faculty and administrator positions must submit official sealed transcripts at the final interview. All applicable Verification of Experience (VOE) must be submitted during this same period. Verifications of Experience must be on company letterhead stationery and include the following:

- Dates of employment.
- Position title.
- Statement of whether experience was full- or part-time (if part-time, the weekly percentage or hours worked).

Classified Staff

Employment opportunities for classified staff positions, job descriptions, and salary schedules are publicly available through the Personnel Commission on the district website. The Los Angeles Community College District Personnel Commission sets the minimum qualifications for classified staff. The selections of classified employees follow the California Merit System inclusive of the job classifications and the minimum qualifications for each position. Qualifications for a position are demonstrated through an established series of examinations that may include written tests and/or interviews. The system allows for career ladder moves and transfer opportunities for current employees within the district. The Personnel Commission maintains lists of qualified candidates for each of these positions. As positions become available at individual colleges, and the campus
requests to fill a particular position, the Commission provides the top candidates for interview. These candidates are then interviewed at the college by the hiring department and the final recommendation for hire is forwarded to the campus president for final approval. Classifications for existing positions are listed on the district website under the Personnel Commission link.

The Vice Presidents’ Council may request a new position or a change in a job classification. When such requests are made, the Personnel Commission conducts a review to determine if the changes are warranted by comparing relevant labor market analyses across similar institutions. This process is a collaboration among the colleges, the respective classified bargaining unit representatives, and the Personnel Commission.

East Los Angeles College recently established a Human Resources Committee (HRC) for classified hiring that serves as the counterpart to the Hiring Prioritization Committee, which reviews and prioritizes faculty-hiring requests. The HRC is made up of college staff, non-voting faculty, and non-voting administrators. The HRC is charged with prioritizing staff position requests based on department/unit and college needs utilizing quantitative data provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement (OIEA) and qualitative justification provided by division vice presidents. Although the committee is made up of set constituencies, the committee serves to prioritize based on a global view of college need.

The need for new or replacement hires is justified in each department/unit’s goals and objectives within their PRSE or AUP. A staff or faculty position request form is required for each position.

The HRC meets in October, following the submission of PRSE or AUP documents, to review and prioritize the staffing requests. The committee works with OIEA to develop appropriate data for use in evaluating position requests. The committee submits the prioritized list to the ELAC Shared Governance Council (ESGC) for its December meeting. The ESGC then forwards the approved prioritized list to the college president for review. The president, in consultation with the cabinet, determines which positions will be included in the budget. The president reviews all requests and provides a written response to ESGC when he or she chooses to diverge from the recommendations.

Positions required by contract or deemed critical, as determined by the committee, are to be filled as soon as possible. Positions made available by the departure of an incumbent employee are reviewed by the appropriate supervising vice president to determine whether a replacement is needed. If the supervising vice president chooses not to fill a non-critical replacement position immediately, the department/unit manager may request that position through the PRSE and AUP processes. In these cases, the positions are to be treated as any other staffing request and will go through the standard prioritization process developed by the committee. In all cases, the committee is to be notified of the vacancies and the resulting decision of the vice president.
For categorical funding, requests go through the same prioritization process, but are noted as categorical. This allows the prioritization process to take into account funding outside the College’s traditional budget. Specially Funded Program (SFP) positions, which are supported by a grant or other external funds, do not go through the prioritization process. However, the committee is notified that such positions have been filled in order to incorporate this information in the prioritization process.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

East Los Angeles College has policies and procedures in place to ensure that all faculty and administrators meet the state minimum requirements and additional requirements as deemed desirable for programmatic and institutional needs. Classified staff meet minimum qualifications established by the Personnel Commission, which is a merit system whereby candidates are screened for appropriate experience and skills. The process allows for transfer and promotion across the district and builds upon valuable institutional knowledge.

III.A.2

Faculty qualifications include knowledge of the subject matter and requisite skills for the service to be performed. Factors of qualification include appropriate degrees, professional experience, and discipline expertise, level of assignment, teaching skills, scholarly activities, and potential to contribute to the mission of the institution. Faculty job descriptions include development and review of curriculum as well as assessment of learning.
Evidence

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. 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.

All selection committees include a representative from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), who serves as a non-voting member. Throughout the hiring process, the EEOC representative’s role is to:

1. Serve as a consultant regarding district and state guidelines.

2. Monitor the district’s diversity procedures, including but not limited to a review of the job description and announcement, composition and procedures of the Selection Committee, and the adequacy of the applicant pool.

3. Conduct hiring workshops for members of a selection committee prior to its first meeting. Topics shall include (but are not limited to) appropriate district and state guidelines, roles of committee members, the confidentiality and integrity of the hiring process, and a basis on which to judge a candidate. Training should be provided for the following:

   a. Committee members who have no prior service on a selection committee.
   
   b. Committee members who are new to East Los Angeles College.
c. Committee members who have not attended a training session in the preceding five years.
d. All committee members after any substantive change in laws, policies, or regulations related to diversity or hiring.

If applicable, additional discipline-specific requirements are defined by the District Discipline Committees representing each discipline taught in the district. These discipline committees are composed of representatives from all nine colleges within the LACCD. All additional qualification requirements are vetted with and agreed to by the representatives from all nine colleges on the committee.

The composition of the job announcement is the responsibility of the selection committee. Per District Human Resource Guide HR R-120, the job announcement fully describes the desirable academic preparation, experience and other characteristics sought in a candidate, and the duties and responsibilities the contract faculty member will be expected to assume. The minimum qualifications specified in the announcement are the same as the state minimum qualifications.

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 selection committee consults the EEOC representative for language relating to diversity for job announcements. Selection committees also consult the campus Learning Assessment Coordinator (LAC) for appropriate language relating to the assessment of SLOs.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard and Eligibility Requirement 14.

East Los Angeles College adheres to the state minimum qualification criteria as well as to District hiring policies and procedures. Hiring committees represent the faculty within the respective department and do not limit participation on the hiring committee, which allows for maximum participation in this important decision-making process.

Due to the large number of faculty hired at East Los Angeles College in recent years, an increase in the number of EEOC representatives has been needed. In March 2015 over 40 staff members received a two-hour EEOC training to prepare them to become EEOC representatives on campus.
hiring committees. This process recognizes the importance of ensuring the hiring process is fair and impartial and that the best candidates will be hired.\(^{706}\)

III.A.3

**Administrators and other employees responsible for educational programs and services possess qualifications necessary to perform duties required to sustain institutional effectiveness and academic quality.**

**Evidence**

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.\(^{707}\) The minimum requirement for administrators includes the completion of a Master’s degree and one full year of administrative or managerial experience. Additional desirable qualifications are listed to match the needs of the specific positions. Faculty members must meet the California State minimum qualifications for their discipline. Additional qualifications and/or experiences may be determined by the selection committee for the applicable program or service area. Institutional effectiveness, academic quality, and service merit are sustained through each department/unit’s Program Review Self-Evaluation (PRSE) and Annual Update Plan (AUP). In addition to following the state minimum qualifications, all position announcements for faculty and administrators include a set of desired qualifications as applicable to the unit and campus needs.

Regular faculty members through Instructor Special Assignments (ISA) fill academic supervisory positions responsible for educational programs and services and follow the same hiring process and procedures as that of a regular faculty member.\(^{708}\) In instances where an ISA position is unable to be staffed by a full-time faculty member, the college follows the LACCD Human Resources Guide R-121 which states that in special circumstances hiring may be utilized as specified under Article 33 of the 2011-2014 LACCD and Faculty Guild Agreement.\(^{710}\)

Further, LACCD requires each district location to establish internal written procedures governing the selection of academic administrators that ensure that candidates meet Academic Service minimum qualifications hiring requirements, and that all assignments are processed according to
Board Rule 10307.\textsuperscript{711}

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

At East Los Angeles College, all administrators fulfill the state requirement of possessing a minimum of a Master’s degree and one year of administrative experience, as well as additional, position-specific desirable criteria, as appropriate. For example, a recent posting for a dean overseeing the science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) disciplines included the following desirable qualifications:

- Demonstrated leadership experience in planning, organizing and implementing STEM programs
- Subject expertise in one of the STEM areas
- Experience working in traditional labs and with diverging technology in the STEM field
- Experience working with professional organizations, 4-year universities, and industry related to the STEM field.\textsuperscript{712}

Similarly, all educational programs and service areas that are managed by a faculty member on re-assigned time meet not only the minimum faculty qualifications set by the California Community Colleges Board of Governors but the specific desirable criteria identified for the position. For example, the job description for the Learning Assessment Coordinator ISA position included the following desirable qualifications:

- Experience teaching in community college
- Experience with utilizing the learning assessment process to improve programs in a community college or university setting
- Training or experience with accreditation
- Ability to explain assessment processes and basic research frameworks
- Excellent technology skills and the ability to provide instruction on the use of technology-based applications
- Dedication to building a culture of evidence and creating data-driven improvement plans.\textsuperscript{713}

\textsuperscript{707} \textit{CCCCO Minimum Qualifications Handbook}
\textsuperscript{708} \textit{Sample ISA position announcement}
\textsuperscript{709} \textit{Human Resources Guide R-121}
\textsuperscript{710} \textit{AFT Faculty Contract} p. 135
\textsuperscript{711} \textit{LACCD Human Resources Guide} R-110; BR 10307
\textsuperscript{712} \textit{STEM Dean job announcement}
\textsuperscript{713} \textit{Learning Assessment Coordinator Job Description}
III.A.4
Required degrees held by faculty, administrators and other employees are from institutions accredited by recognized U.S. accrediting agencies. Degrees from non-U.S. institutions are recognized only if equivalence has been established.

Evidence

Faculty, administrators and other employees must hold degrees from appropriately accredited institutions. The job description for every faculty and administrator position includes the following language: “Degrees: All degrees must be granted by an accredited college or university in the United States. Transcripts from foreign institutions must be submitted with an approved evaluation of equivalency from a foreign evaluation service approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.” 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.

These organizations are private enterprises that charge a fee for their services. Individuals seeking a foreign transcript evaluation must follow the procedures outlined by the organization providing the evaluation. In all instances, original, official documentation will be required when requesting the evaluation. This evaluation is required any time foreign course work is used to meet any credential requirement, even if a college or university in the United States has previously accepted the foreign course work. The only exception to this is for those individuals applying for an Emergency 30-Day Substitute Permit, for which a general report is sufficient.

In the case where a Verification of Experience (VOE) is needed, finalists must submit proof of verification on company letterhead stationery that includes the following:

1. Dates of employment.
3. Statement of whether experience was full or part-time (if part-time, the weekly percentage or hours worked).

Equivalency reviews are only undertaken for candidates who have been offered employment by a college. Any applicant selected for a position but deemed not to meet the State minimum qualifications for that discipline will need to request a District Academic Senate equivalency review. This review process involves two separate faculty committees and typically requires two to three months, but may take up to six months to complete. If the applicant is denied equivalency, he or she will not be offered employment for that position.

Analysis and Evaluation
The College meets the Standard.

All administrators, faculty and other employees at East Los Angeles College have attained required degrees from accredited institutions in the United States. In the rare exception when a required degree is from a non-U.S. accredited institution, an equivalency process has been followed by an approved agency that verifies and documents that the degree from the foreign institution is comparable to the required degree from an accredited U.S. institution. All faculty and administrators meet the minimum requirement for faculty positions as listed in the handbook Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges. In academic year 2014-15, ELAC hired 30 full-time faculty, 5 administrators, and numerous adjunct faculty. A digital copy of all required degrees and credentials are posted within each applicant’s application file.

---

III.A.5

The institution assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The institution establishes written criteria for evaluating all personnel, including performance of assigned duties and participation in institutional responsibilities and other activities appropriate to their expertise. Evaluation processes seek to assess effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement. Actions taken following evaluations are formal, timely, and documented.

Evidence

East Los Angeles College has effectively collaborated with the respective collective bargaining units representing faculty, administrators, and classified staff over many contract cycles to create fair and comprehensive evaluation processes. In addition, the District has a Personnel Commission that provides another level of oversight to the evaluation process. The commission assists in assuring that employees are working within job descriptions and employment rules.

Evaluation processes for faculty can be found in Article 19 of the AFT contract. Significant elements of the process include:

- Probationary faculty are comprehensively evaluated every year for the first four years. These evaluations require forming a committee of three faculty peers, a non-voting
Academic Senate representative, and a non-voting administrator. The committee reviews the evaluatee’s teaching materials, student comments in the form of comprehensive evaluative surveys, and classroom observation notes from committee members. The committee also looks at the evaluatee’s professional development activities, professional activities within her/his subject discipline, record of required document submission, punctuality, active participation in the SLO process, and other factors. These evaluative documents can be found in the AFT contract in Appendix C Section 2.719

- 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.

- Other employees covered by the AFT contract receive their own version of these evaluation processes, including counselors, librarians, ISA/consulting instructors, college nurses, disability specialists/instructors, and child development center instructors.

- There is also a provision for an “Administrative evaluation,”720 which provides a direct method for administration to address evaluation issues with a faculty.

- Faculty have the option to respond to evaluations, point by point, in the form of a written response. These responses are attached to the evaluation and become part of the faculty’s permanent record.

- Temporary adjunct faculty members without seniority are not eligible to receive a comprehensive evaluation following a basic evaluation. Nevertheless, any temporary adjunct faculty member with seniority rights may request a comprehensive evaluation following a basic evaluation, and that request is granted if it follows an evaluation in which the temporary adjunct faculty member’s performance was rated “needs to improve” or “unsatisfactory” based upon two evaluations under Article 19.721

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 Employees722
- Classified staff, Local 99: Performance Evaluation for Classified Employees723
- Classified staff, Building Trades: Performance Evaluation Form724
The managing supervisor or designee conducts an annual evaluation of staff using the appropriate form. A conference is held between the managing supervisor/designee and the evaluee to discuss the outcome of the evaluation. The conference is the appropriate place and time to discuss reasons for the evaluation, job content, expectations, the basis for the evaluation, and areas where work performance may be improved, if any. There is an opportunity in the evaluation to also note outstanding work performance.

There is a section of the evaluation for classified staff that asks if the employee feels that he or she may be doing work outside of the designated job description, in which case the District’s Personnel Commission may initiate an audit of the job to determine if any action should be taken.

College administrators represented by the California Teamsters receive annual performance evaluations by their respective supervisor following established contract guidelines. The performance evaluation process is designed to assess accomplishments, communicate standards and expectations, and set goals for future performance.

In all of these evaluation processes an outcome is to establish clear goals for improvement as well as a timeline for improvement.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

East Los Angeles College has a contractual formal evaluation process in place for each position. Faculty evaluations closely follow the procedures outlined in their contract. The majority of evaluation committees adhere to the Suggested Evaluation Plan Time Table and Worksheet contained in Article 19 of the AFT 1521 Contract that spells out the steps of the process to ensure timely completion of the evaluation process. This section of the contract is highlighted on the ELAC website under AFT, during Chairs’ meetings, and at a special workshop prior to the start of fall 2015 semester to ensure fair and timely administration of evaluation protocol.

---

718 AFT Contract Article 19 p. 67
719 Appendix C
720 Administrative evaluation
721 AFT Contract Article 19 p. 71
III.A.6

The evaluation of faculty, academic administrators, and other personnel directly responsible for student learning includes, as a component of that evaluation, consideration of how these employees use the results of the assessment of learning outcomes to improve teaching and learning.

Evidence

The evaluation of all faculty—including those reassigned as Instructor Special Assignment (ISA) to oversee academic programs—and academic administrators directly responsible for student learning includes expectations for participation in and/or utilization of the assessment of learning outcomes to improve teaching and learning.

As contained in the collective bargaining agreement for the faculty, the Professional Responsibilities section of the faculty evaluation form specifies an expectation for all instructors to participate in the Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Assessment Cycle and, for classroom faculty, to include approved SLOs on course syllabi. In addition, the Faculty Duties/Obligations/Activities specified in the contract require all faculty to participate in the SLO Assessment Cycle. The same forms are used to evaluate any faculty who have oversight of academic programs as an ISA.

Academic deans and vice presidents are evaluated according to more general categories, such as their communication skills, reliability and effectiveness, leadership, planning, and managerial qualities. These evaluation results are strongly linked to the outcomes and activities of the academic programs they oversee, which includes the assessment and utilization of learning outcomes. In spring 2015, deans were asked to track and follow up with department chairs and faculty to ensure that learning outcomes results had been submitted. They also review budget requests from their departments through the annual update process to ensure that the requests are substantiated by learning outcomes assessment results or are otherwise tied to the College’s educational master plan. These expectations, which are intended to improve teaching and learning.
at the College, are among the activities considered during the evaluation processes.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

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.

III.A.7
The institution maintains a sufficient number of qualified faculty, which includes full-time faculty and may include part-time and adjunct faculty, to assure the fulfillment of faculty responsibilities essential to the quality of educational programs and services to achieve the institutional mission and purposes.

Evidence

East Los Angeles College is dedicated to providing quality education to all students and affirms this goal in its Mission Statement. In conjunction with the district office, ELAC has made great effort to meet the 75/25 mandate of AB 1725. Continuous efforts are made to provide for the hiring of qualified full- and part-time instructors to meet the high demand for sufficient courses
to match the high student enrollment. The challenge is keeping hiring priorities in line with budget limitations as they exist within a large multi-campus district. Although the College will exceed 300 full-time faculty positions, including the fall 2015 cohort of approximately 30 new hires, there are still gaps in the full-time to part-time faculty ratio. ELAC recognizes the importance of full-time faculty to student success and will continue to meet the demand in hiring as it has done for the last two years.

Hiring decisions are made using information provided in the departments/unit’s Program Review Self-Evaluation (PRSE) and Annual Update Plan (AUP)\textsuperscript{737} These documents serve as the basis for resource allocation decisions, such as hiring of new faculty and staff. Every department has the opportunity to substantiate the need for new full-time faculty hires. Included in the PRSE and AUP documents is a template for requesting a position. This process has become an important part of the development of a coherent planning process since it allows for each department to represent its needs using data, evaluation and quality improvement. 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.\textsuperscript{738} An example of an effective faculty position request through the AUP was submitted by the Computer Applications and Office Technology (CAOT) department in fall 2014.\textsuperscript{739}

To assure the fulfillment of faculty responsibilities essential to the quality of educational programs and services to achieve institutional mission and purposes, all full-time, part-time and adjunct faculty receive orientation, oversight, and evaluation directly from their department chair. Faculty responsibilities are clearly delineated in the job announcement. Additional responsibilities are also indicated in the AFT contract and specifically itemized within the faculty evaluation forms. This is reflected in the AFT contract, article 19.E.1.\textsuperscript{740} New full-time faculty participate in a one-year New Faculty Institute (NFI) that addresses the responsibilities of faculty and provides professional development in areas such as basic skills and student equity.\textsuperscript{741}

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard and Eligibility Requirement 14.

East Los Angeles College continues to make strides in hiring more full-time faculty while maintaining a sufficient number of qualified adjuncts. Department chairs and administrators make every attempt to reduce the hourly assignments as greater numbers of classes are assigned to newly hired full-time faculty. Both the PRSE and AUP are used as means to request and justify new staffing. This process allows for integrated planning in the prioritization of staffing requests based on a shared understanding of the needs of the College, its students, and the community. The College continues to make progress by hiring close to 30 tenure-track faculty for the 2015-16 academic year.
III.A.8
An institution with part-time and adjunct faculty has employment policies and practices which provide for their orientation, oversight, evaluation, and professional development. The institution provides opportunities for integration of part-time and adjunct faculty into the life of the institution.

Evidence

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.

Most adjunct faculty bring extensive, current knowledge about their discipline to the College and the classroom. For these faculty members, professional development opportunities are focused on the areas of curriculum design, Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and assessments, institutional learning goals, and other administrative procedures with which they may not be as familiar. To that end, department chairs and the Professional Development Office, along with Learning Assessment Coordinator, department SLO Facilitators, and the Accreditation Faculty Chair, have provided information to the new adjunct faculty through flex activities at Opening Day and other ongoing workshops. The monthly AFT meeting also provides new adjunct faculty with information on payroll, health benefits Joint Labor Management Benefits Committee (JLMBC) and other contract related issues. Additional professional development opportunities are available to all full-time and part-time faculty. Workshops and seminars are offered on campus and advertised on the Professional Development/Teaching & Learning Center (TLC) web page.

Adjunct Faculty workshops, offered during winter intersession, provide additional opportunities for professional development for the adjunct faculty. In addition, the New Faculty Institute (NFI) also welcomes adjunct faculty to attend its meetings to receive information along with the new
full-time faculty.

Student-based activities, i.e., those sponsored by student clubs, offer a great way to integrate new adjunct faculty into the institution. Adjunct faculty can also participate in campus committees and decision-making processes. They are also invited to faculty meetings, CTE Appreciation Day, advisory meetings and various campus committees.

In addition, Article 17.B.3 of the AFT contract lays out a process for a department adjunct representative to be elected during the spring term of an even year. These representatives are eligible to participate in decision making, along with regular and contract faculty, on all matters within a department, including election of the chair.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Multiple processes are in place to introduce new adjunct faculty to the campus, provide adjuncts with available resources and services, and allow opportunities for campus involvement. Orientations are provided at the department level by department chairs and at the institutional level by the Professional Development Office. Oversight and evaluation of adjunct faculty are provided by the department chair.

Adjunct faculty are encouraged to participate in Opening Day activities so that they can be introduced to the mission and vision of the campus, meet fellow colleagues in the disciplines and receive the latest campus updates. All adjunct faculty have access to the AFT Adjunct Survival Guide which is available through ELAC’s website. The adjunct faculty are encouraged to participate in campus committees and be part of the decision-making processes, all of which enhance their integration into the College.

III.A.9

The institution has a sufficient number of staff with appropriate qualifications to support the effective educational, technological, physical, and administrative operations of the institution.
Evidence

The College utilizes the Program Review Self-Evaluation (PRSE) and Annual Update Plan (AUP) processes to determine whether additional staffing is required to meet the mission and programmatic goals of each department or unit. The department/unit’s goals and objectives are supported by data provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement (OIEA) and the results of outcomes assessments. If the attainment of these goals and objectives justifies additional staffing, a staffing request, including relevant data and links to the College Mission, is attached to the PRSE and the AUP submissions.

Administrative and support staff requests are considered either growth or replacement positions. Both growth and replacement requests must be submitted with the PRSE or AUP documents. The newly created Human Resources Committee (HRC) reviews the classified staffing requests and provides input from different perspectives into the hiring prioritization process. The HRC is composed of college staff, non-voting faculty, and non-voting administrators. The HRC forwards the prioritized classified staff request list to the ELAC Shared Governance Committee (ESGC) for approval. The President and his cabinet review the ESGC approved lists and make a final decision on which positions to include in the budget. Once positions are approved at the campus, the district’s Office of Human Resources, for certificated positions, or Personnel Commission, for classified positions, is formally notified and the process to fill new or vacant positions begins.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard and Eligibility Requirement 8.

ELAC’s utilization of the PRSE and AUP processes and the work of the Human Resources Committee effectively ensure the campus has the appropriate information and processes needed to determine whether there is sufficient staff with appropriate qualifications to support the effective educational, technological, physical, and administrative operations of the institution.

During the 2015-16 academic year, the College is hiring additional administrative and support
staff to accommodate its growing student population and fulfill the College’s Mission. Utilization of the PRSEs and AUPs as the basis for new staffing requests and their review by the Human Resources Committee ensure that prioritization for staffing requests is based on integrated planning and a shared understanding of the needs of the College, its students, and community.

As the institution continues to grow, the College will need to evaluate the validity and necessity of some existing programs and units to maintain the efficiency and fiscal well-being of the institution.

III.A.10
The institution maintains a sufficient number of administrators with appropriate preparation and expertise to provide continuity and effective administrative leadership and services that support the institution’s mission and purposes.

Evidence
The College currently employs a president, three vice presidents, three associate vice presidents, sixteen deans and associate deans, and seven classified managers. Searches for two deans are underway.

Staffing requests for administrator roles are done through each Cluster’s Update Plan. As stated in the ELAC Governance Policy Handbook, the purpose of the Cluster Update Plan is to help:

1. Utilize department/unit plans to develop priorities within each cluster;

2. Utilize priorities in the budget development process;
3. Monitor progress on department/unit plans and Program Review Validation Committee recommendations; and

4. Document any changes within the cluster, College, state, or surrounding community.

Each cluster’s request is then negotiated through the President’s Cabinet. All new or replacement administrator positions are announced by the College President and the appropriate Vice President during the annual State of the College forum. The College President consults with the campus representative for the Administrators’ bargaining unit, the AFT, and the Academic Senate on any organizational shifts as a result of additional administrators. The current hiring processes underway for a STEM dean, a new dean at the South Gate Educational Center, and an associate dean of Student Services came out of the cluster plans developed in 2014-15.

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. College administrator hiring committees are established and reflect participation from faculty, administrators, and staff. The minimum qualifications for administrators include the completion of a Master’s degree and one full year of administrative or managerial experience. Additional requirements, if applicable, are defined by the selection committee. Minimum qualifications for administrators are listed on the California Community College Chancellor’s Office link Instructional Programs and Services Unit, section 53420. Minimum Qualifications for Educational Administrators.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard and Eligibility Requirement 8.

The institution maintains a relatively large number of administrators with appropriate preparation and expertise to provide continuity and effective administrative leadership and services that support the institution’s mission and purposes. Administrators supervise daily operations in addition to representing the administration and College on additional campus, district, and regional, and state committee commitments.

As reflected in the cluster plans, additional administrators have been requested for the following reasons:

1. The campus has hired an average of 20 full-time faculty for the past three years. Full-time probationary faculty require more focus and attention on time-consuming annual comprehensive evaluations.

2. The main campus and the South Gate location are in operation until 10 p.m. daily as well as on Saturdays. This requires the presence of an administrator during all hours of
3. Since his arrival, the College President has launched a number of new initiatives, such as GO ELA and the Transfer Task Force. This requires administrators’ presence and leadership.

4. The 2014 AFT contract negotiated for Department Chairs to cease serving as supervisors to their classified staff. This means the administrators in charge of any department/unit that has a classified staff must now take on the role of supervisor to said staff. For some administrators, this equates to an additional 10-plus staff that now require supervision and evaluation.

The College approved a number of new administrative hires in spring 2015, which are in process. The annual updates submitted on October 2, 2015 will serve as the basis to develop new cluster plans and an assessment of whether additional administrators will be requested.

III.A.11

The institution establishes, publishes, and adheres to written personnel policies and procedures that are available for information and review. Such policies and procedures are fair and equitably and consistently administered.

Evidence

The College adheres to the District’s personnel policies and procedures, which are available for review online at both the LACCD Human Resources website and the ELAC Human Resources web page. The District’s website provides comprehensive information on employment opportunities, human resources guides, union contracts and other related resources related to work at the District. ELAC’s website is not as comprehensive, but provides links to much of the same information listed above.

The District Human Resources Publications provides links to policies and definitions for:

- Departments and Organizational Hierarchy
  - Employee units and personnel sub-areas
  - Pay scales
  - Work year and academic terms
- Recruitment, Selection and Employment
o Academic minimum qualifications
o Adjunct faculty selection and pay
o Classified employees
o Unclassified Employees

- Personnel Actions
  o New hire
  o Rehire
  o Resignation
  o Employee exit processing
  o Retirement

- Work Schedules, Leaves and Absences
  o Catastrophic leave donation

- Benefits
  o Retirement and tax models
  o Medical benefits
    ▪ Regular employee and adjunct faculty eligibility
    ▪ Vesting

- Evaluation and Discipline
  o Probation and permanent status
  o Achievement awards and employee recognition
  o Unsatisfactory service notices

The list above is not comprehensive, but highlights many of the personnel policies to which ELAC adheres. These policies are clearly outlined and thoroughly defined using tables and flowcharts. They reference a myriad of sources such as the California Code of Regulations, LACCD Board Rules, California Education Code, U.S. Department of Labor, and California Labor & Workforce Development Agency, California Division of Labor Standards Enforcement, California Labor Code, Personnel Commission Rules, and LACCD Collective Bargaining Agreements.

One way ELAC administers its personnel policies and procedures is by following the LACCD Collective Bargaining Agreements. Chapter chairs, union stewards/representatives and grievance representatives from the various bargaining units at the College are available on campus to assist employees who feel they have been unfairly treated. Union representatives have a seat on all shared governance committees. Union representatives communicate with their unit members to keep them informed and updated about work-related news, especially if there are changes in personnel policies and procedures.

The College complies with the District’s Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) guidelines when hiring employees. District representatives from the Office of Diversity Programs come to ELAC to train and certify college employees to become EEOC representatives and adhere to the guidelines. At the training, employees are provided with extensive checklists for hiring academic administrators, faculty and classified staff. These checklists ensure not only
consistent hiring processes, but also that ELAC is in compliance with approved District regulations, state and federal law, and EEOC hiring procedures.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Personnel policies and procedures are easily available and can be accessed online and from home at the District’s Human Resources (HR) website. In addition, the District’s Human Resources Office is available by phone or email to provide clarification or guidance regarding personnel policy and procedures.

III.A.12
Through its policies and practices, the institution creates and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support its diverse personnel. The institution regularly assesses its record in employment equity and diversity consistent with its mission.

Evidence

The College offers services and programs for its personnel to support diversity through various avenues, as listed below.

- Employee Assistance Program (EAP)\textsuperscript{759}
  In addition to monthly newsletters and a 24-hour hotline, the EAP sponsors monthly one-hour seminars addressing physical/mental/financial health. It is open to all employees, faculty and staff.

- District Office for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion\textsuperscript{760}
  This office cites as its goal as the promotion of diversity and equal employment opportunity throughout the Los Angeles Community College District and affirms, “We aim to guarantee your education and employment environment is free from discrimination and harassment.”

- Professional Development Committee\textsuperscript{761}
  This committee plans workshops and seminars on campus and online. It discusses professional development-related practices and matters. Committee members include administrators, faculty, and staff. The Professional Development Coordinator works out of the Teaching and Learning Center (TLC), a computer lab for both faculty and staff.
Professional Development Coordinator facilitates the planning and implementation of many training/workshops that are specifically targeted for staff. This committee recently hosted a classified staff equivalent to Opening Day, which dedicated specific attention to the professional learning needs of the staff.\[762\]

- **The Teaching and Learning Center (TLC)\[763\]**
  The TLC offers a variety of programs for faculty/staff development that focus on diversity issues. In particular, ELAC hosted a workshop on Culturally Responsive Training on March 27, 2015.\[764\] A follow-up session entitled, “Culturally Responsive Training: It’s Not All Black and White” was offered at 2015 Opening Day. Over 80 faculty and staff participated.

- **Project MATCH (Mentors Act to Change History)\[765\]**
  This District-wide mentoring program is dedicated to promote quality instruction and diversity in community college teaching. It won the John W. Rice Diversity and Equity Award in 2013. Gabriella Lopez, faculty at ELAC and past Project MATCH intern, was on that winning team. The purpose of the program is to prepare and recruit a diverse community college faculty who are sensitive to the needs of the students and the community it serves. One of its main goals is to improve the diversity of the faculty pool in the District to better reflect the diversity of the surrounding community.

- **East Los Angeles College ADA Compliance\[766\]**
  In accordance with the requirements of Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 ("ADA"), the Los Angeles Community College District and East Los Angeles College will not discriminate against qualified individuals with disabilities on the basis of disability in its services, programs, or activities. LACCD and ELAC will make all reasonable modifications to policies and programs to ensure that people with disabilities have an equal opportunity to enjoy all college programs, services, and activities. For example, individuals with service animals are welcomed in college facilities, even where pets are generally prohibited.

- **AFT 1521a Staff Guild Meetings\[767\]**
  This staff guild meets once a month to discuss affairs related to health care insurance, salaries, contract agreement updates, and any campus updates.

- **Classified Social Association**
  This association participates in fundraising activities to sponsor an annual holiday social that gives classified staff the opportunity to network and team-build in a social environment.

Additionally, the College works with the Associated Student Union (ASU) to host a variety of cultural celebrations such as the display of Dia de los Muertos altars, the Black History Project
and the Cinco de Mayo Festival. These events allow faculty, staff, and students to join together in their celebration of diversity.

Diversity in the academic environment fosters cultural awareness, promotes mutual understanding and respect, and provides suitable models for all students. The College seeks to make understanding and appreciation of diversity a central feature in the hiring process. This leads to a faculty and staff who are able to promote campus-wide diversity and cultural awareness.

The District Office for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion collects ethnicity data from all new employees, including academic, classified and unclassified personnel. The District SAP system tracks the demographics of all hires and is available for local access at the College. To assure equity in employment, the College follows District guidelines for hiring classified staff and academic administrators and the Faculty Hiring Policies and Procedures. District Compliance Officers and the College’s own Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) compliance officer offer EEOC training workshops at the College on a regular basis. Attendees learn EEOC Representative Responsibilities and receive their EEOC Representative certification. During the training, attendees are provided with examples of “Diversity Sensitive Questions” as suggested by the Office of Diversity Programs. The goal is to maintain a consistent hiring process that is monitored by an EEOC Representative who certifies that selection processes are in compliance with approved district regulations, state and federal law and EEOC hiring procedures. The College’s EEOC Hiring Checklists include documentation regarding the District’s Non-Discrimination requirement. These practices assure that all candidates are assessed fairly in the hiring process.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

East Los Angeles College supports an environment of understanding and appreciation for the diversity of the campus and surrounding community. ELAC seeks to ensure that all employees have an understanding of diversity issues and are dedicated to enhance student and employee appreciation of diverse cultures. In faculty job notices, desired qualifications include an understanding of diversity and the ability to teach to a diverse student population. Additionally, hiring committees determine whether applicants are able to demonstrate their ability to effectively teach to and serve a diverse student body. Equal Employment Opportunity Representatives complete a report on the diversity of faculty and administrators at the conclusion of every interview.
III.A.13
The institution upholds a written code of professional ethics for all of its personnel, including consequences for violation.

Evidence

The institution aims to ensure that all employees behave in an honest and appropriate manner and maintain a high standard of ethical conduct. An extensive written code of professional ethics is clearly defined and established by Board Rule 1204 Code of Ethics. Contained within the Board Rule is the District Academic Senate’s Ethics Policy that states,

“Their primary responsibility to their subjects is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end faculty members devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty.”

These written standards provide employees with a foundation on which to adhere, fostering professionalism and accountability.

The expectations for faculty list basic ethical behavior regarding academic rights and responsibilities including, but not limited to, the obligation to practice intellectual honesty, to show respect for and serve as intellectual guides for their students, to restrain from discriminating or harassing colleagues, to pursue scholarly competence and seek revisions where appropriate, and to promote free inquiry and further academic freedom. The code was adapted for the College by the Academic Senate in 2013. The elements of the ELAC Faculty Ethics Policy include fostering a culture of respect and civility, encouraging the free pursuit of learning by securing student access and success, maintaining honest academic conduct, maintaining scholarly and academic competence, creating a learning environment of trust and sensitivity, and establishing...
academic standards.

Outside of the classroom, the District code for employees is inclusive and not limited to the following standards: exercising due diligence in the ethical performance of duties, facilitating a climate of trust and mutual support, using care and integrity in guarding the privacy of all individuals, and avoiding entering into relationships that create or sustain conflicts of interest. Additionally, standards of conduct are detailed in the classified employees AFT Staff Guild Contract.

The institution does not tolerate prohibited discrimination, sexual harassment, retaliation, or false allegations. Procedures that must be taken regarding a breach of the code of ethics are clearly written including, but not limited to, initiation of a complaint, investigation of the violation, notification of offender, effort for an informal resolution, or a formal hearing.\textsuperscript{779}

If appropriate, the College will initiate disciplinary action including, without limitation, a verbal warning, probation, suspension, expulsion, and letter of reprimand, notice of unsatisfactory service, demotion, or dismissal.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

In order to develop a culture of collaboration and conflict resolution in a positive manner, the president has called for a campus-wide retreat in spring, 2016. Efforts to improve communication and civility are identified in Action Plans.

\textsuperscript{776} Board Rule 1204 Code of Ethics  
\textsuperscript{777} Board Rule 1204.12 District Academic Senate Code of Ethics p.4  
\textsuperscript{778} ELAC Faculty Ethics Policy  
\textsuperscript{779} AFT Contract p. 3
III.A.14

The institution plans for and provides all personnel with appropriate opportunities for continued professional development, consistent with the institutional mission and based on evolving pedagogy, technology, and learning needs. The institution systematically evaluates professional development programs and uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

Evidence

As of March 2015, East Los Angeles College has 998 total full-time and adjunct faculty and over 300 classified staff. The College encourages the professional growth and development of faculty and staff in several ways including, but not limited to offering conference and tuition reimbursement through the Conference/Tuition Committee; providing multiple opportunities for faculty and staff to improve their abilities to enhance teaching through the Professional Development Committee process; hosting workshops to assist in skills development through the Teaching and Learning Center; providing training for the implementation of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) through the Learning Assessment Committee; informing new faculty of...
methods to improve student learning through the New Faculty Institute; presenting faculty with the most current trends in education through the Opening Day activities; and offering training for the Microsoft Office Specialist (MOS) certification.

Fall Opening Day, usually the last Thursday of August, is the biggest professional development event of the year. All faculty and staff are invited to attend and the maximum number of flex hours a faculty member can earn is 6.5 hours. All college offices are closed in the morning from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon, so that all staff can attend. In addition, there is a half-day staff development workshop in the first week of August to focus on the staff development needs of classified staff.

The ELAC Conference/Tuition Committee evaluates faculty and staff requests and awards appropriate funding. Because different disciplines have varying professional development needs and interests, the College encourages faculty and staff to seek skills/knowledge-building events outside of the campus to find the latest information, technology, techniques, and training. Attending networking events expands outreach opportunities with professionals, which in turn benefits students.

Faculty and staff apply to attend appropriate conferences, symposia, workshops, industry gatherings, activities, events, classes, or training by submitting an ELAC Request for Conference Attendance form to Academic Affairs at least two months prior to the conference, including a justification of how the activity will enhance the applicant’s professional development. A report on conference attendance must be submitted to the President’s Office within ten days following the completion of the conference.

The ELAC Professional Development (PD) Committee plans and develops activities and workshops for faculty to participate in development activities related to staff, student, and instructional improvement. The PD Coordinator chairs the Professional Development Committee and acts as a facilitator for the Staff Development Committee to assess the professional development needs of the faculty and staff; plans and coordinates professional development activities based on needs assessments and recommendations from the committees; and forwards the educational planning to the Academic Senate for review and final approval. The PD Coordinator also is a member of several significant campus committees including the ELAC Shared Governance Council (ESGC), the Student Success Committee, the Accreditation Steering Committee, and the Student Success and Support Program (SSSP or 3SP) Committee. The PD Coordinator is a faculty member with 0.8 release time and reports to the Dean of Institutional Advancement.

According to the ELAC Professional Development Handbook, “Time away from teaching and administrative duties allows instructors to function as learners for a period of time as they update skills and fulfill the need to stay abreast of continual changes in curriculum advancement, instructional improvement, pedagogy, and technology. In turn, this brings a wider perspective to
teaching, enhances teaching effectiveness, prevents burnout, and renews enthusiasm.”

The PD Coordinator develops professional development program goals guided by the Educational Master Plan. The PD Coordinator also supervises the daily operations of Teaching and Learning Center (TLC). Workshops and trainings are provided at the TLC to assist faculty and staff to meet their professional development (flex) obligations. Other professional development workshops allow faculty and staff to learn new skills to enrich teaching/learning, professional, and personal development.

Other opportunities offered by the PD Committee include instruction and evaluation; instructional improvement; program and course curriculum or learning resource development and evaluation; student personnel services; learning resource services; student advising, guidance, orientation, matriculation services; student, faculty and staff diversity; and institutional research.

The New Faculty Institute has been implemented for a few years with great success. A new cohort is formed in the fall, and participants attend monthly three-hour meetings to discuss needs and concerns as new faculty members and how to incorporate pedagogical skills into their discipline.

An adjunct faculty program is offered on Fridays in the winter intersession. Topics usually include best teaching practices, technology use in the classroom, learning styles, assessments, and evaluations. It is generally well received and attended.

The Distance Education (DE) multimedia specialist conducts entry and intermediate level computer software training. Additionally, the DE Coordinator assesses, plans and coordinates professional development activities for faculty who teach online or who are interested in teaching online or hybrid classes. The DE Coordinator regularly provides workshops on Online Teaching Pedagogy and Learning Management System training (Etudes/Moodle). The DE Coordinator collaborates with the PD Coordinator to identify training needs.

A professional development monthly calendar is available via email distribution and on the ELAC website. It provides on-campus and off-campus professional development opportunities for faculty and staff. There are also online professional development venues included on the monthly professional development calendar to allow faculty and staff to access the resources 24/7. In addition, professional development events organized by the California Community Colleges’ Success Network (3CSN) are also posted on the calendar with web links for registration.

An online needs survey was distributed via OIEA to identify professional development needs of faculty and staff. The PD Coordinator reviewed the results and incorporated suggestions into future workshop offerings. All workshops have evaluations to be collected at the end to assess the success of the activity. Evaluation results are shared with presenters and the PD Coordinator.
Workshop participants are asked to provide topics of interest for future presentations. In the New Faculty Institute, needs assessment results are used to reassess and evaluate learning needs for new faculty on campus. Assessment results from new faculty provide valuable information for future program improvement.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Faculty and staff have many opportunities to participate in professional development activities and increase their ability to meet student needs and improve student learning. Faculty members are able to select professional conferences that match their own disciplines, allowing them to remain current on subject-specific knowledge and new methods for improving teaching efficacy.

A current effort is underway to expand and enhance the professional development program at ELAC. The proposed plan is for professional development to address several items from the Educational Master Plan that have been set as priorities for the 2015-16 academic year and secure necessary staff, location, and funding. ELAC has identified this as an ongoing Action Plan. ELAC should consider coordinating its plan with the District Academic Senate’s comprehensive Professional Development program for faculty.

Additionally, the need for developing a Math Adjunct Academy to provide professional development opportunities for those teaching basic skills math courses has been identified. Since 91 percent of basic skills math courses are taught by adjuncts, a need exists to create a faculty inquiry group to examine effective practices in developmental math pedagogy.

Lastly, ELAC desires to expand its Culturally Responsive Training. In conjunction with the Equity Plan, ELAC is planning a series of workshops based on the models of City College of Baltimore and LA Harbor College. Both the Math Adjunct Academy and the Culturally Responsive Training are discussed in the QFE.

Working with OIEA, the PD Coordinator can systematically assess data and evaluation results to ensure that professional development activities meet the needs of faculty and staff. In addition, the PD Committee reviews and discusses assessment results and re-evaluates professional development goals and action plans to be in line with College’s mission.
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III.A.15

The institution makes provision for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. Each employee has access to his/her personnel records in accordance with law.

Evidence
The College follows rules and regulations established by the District’s Department of Human Resources to ensure the security of personnel records. Confidentiality of records begins with the hiring process. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) representatives and hiring committee members must agree to keep all candidates’ information and materials confidential.\footnote{Form C589-7, Campus Review Committee Members’ Agreement}

The District’s Employee Information Release\footnote{HR P-102} specifically defines various types of employee information: 1) directory information, 2) personal information and 3) work-related information.

Directory information is work-related contact information that is the property of the district and does not require employee permission for release. All District employees have access to this information. Employees who are authorized in their role as Personnel Assignment Approvers or Initiators have access to additional employee information (not accessible by all) as specified in the Employee Information Release.

The release of personal information must be submitted in writing. Groups of requesters are defined in the Employee Information Release (HR P-102). They include:

- Any individual who submits a written request in order to inspect public records
- A management employee of the District
- The employee himself/herself (including union representatives)
- Collective bargaining representatives
- District-related organizations
- Outside potential employers
- Government agencies

Employees may access their personnel records by written request in accordance with the Employee Information Release Guide.

Confidentiality and security of employee information is imperative at ELAC. Only authorized employees may enter the Personnel Office workstations by scanning their ID cards. Questions are answered through a glass wall with small slots through which documents may be passed, like at a bank. ELAC grants employee information only if a written request has been made by a recognized requester (see bulleted list above). Employees at ELAC are confident that their personal information is secure.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

\footnote{Form C589-7, Campus Review Committee Members’ Agreement}  
\footnote{HR P-102}
III.B.1
The institution assures safe and sufficient physical resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs, and learning support services. They are constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment.

Evidence

ELAC has been serving the East LA and Monterey Park communities since 1945. The College enrolls more than 35,000 students every semester and ensures that its physical resources meet a constant cycle of needs assessment, planning, implementation, evaluation, and improvement. The guiding documents are the Strategic Master Plan, the Educational Master Plan, and the Facilities Master Plan.

The College currently has three sites: the ELAC main campus at 1301 Avenida Cesar Chavez, the ELAC South Gate Educational Center at 2340 Firestone Boulevard, and an ELAC building at 1055 Corporate Center Drive. There are two new buildings, the Language Arts and Humanities (formerly the Student Success and Retention Center) and the Bookstore/Student Union Building, opening in 2015-16. A third building, the Math/Science Complex, is also under construction. These buildings are designed to provide students with access to the latest technology and equipment that will support them in their studies and prepare them for university programs and careers.

In 2014-15 the Maintenance and Operations staff also completed three building renovation projects: Ingalls Auditorium, the South Gate Educational Center building, and the Corporate Center. These projects were identified by the campus as priority needs and Maintenance and Operations and Information Technology planned and deployed the projects to completion within the year. It was a major effort that involved the whole campus community and has been well received.

The community also benefits from two unique venues at the main campus: the ELAC Weingarten Stadium (B5 Building), with seating for up to 20,000, and Ingalls Auditorium, with seating for up to 2,000. They provide accessible venues for the community. The College hosts an average of 20 graduations a year for many of the surrounding educational institutions which come to ELAC because of campus location, safety and accessibility.

ADA Compliance
In accordance with the requirements of Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, the Fair Employment & Housing Act (FEHA), Government Code Section 11135, and other applicable codes, the Los Angeles Community College District and East Los Angeles College do not discriminate against individuals on the basis of disability in its services, programs, or activities.
• Employment: The Los Angeles Community College District and East Los Angeles College do not discriminate on the basis of disability in hiring or employment practices and comply with all regulations promulgated by the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission under Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

• Effective Communication: The Los Angeles Community College District and East Los Angeles College will generally, upon request, provide appropriate aids and services leading to effective communication for qualified persons with disabilities so they can participate equally in programs, services, and activities, including qualified sign language interpreters, documents in Braille, and other ways of making information and communications accessible to people who have speech, hearing, or vision impairments.

• Modifications to Policies and Procedures: The Los Angeles Community College District and East Los Angeles College will make all reasonable modifications to policies and programs to ensure that people with disabilities have an equal opportunity to enjoy all programs, services, and activities. For example, individuals with service animals are welcomed in college facilities, even where pets are generally prohibited.

• Anyone who requires an auxiliary aid or service for effective communication, or a modification of policies or procedures to participate in a college program, service, or activity, should contact the office of the East Los Angeles College ADA Coordinator as soon as possible but no later than 48 hours before the scheduled event.

• The ADA does not require the College to take any action that would fundamentally alter the nature of its programs or services, or impose an undue financial or administrative burden.

• The College will not place a surcharge on a particular individual with a disability or any group of individuals with disabilities to cover the cost of providing auxiliary aids/services or reasonable modifications of policy, such as retrieving items from locations that are open to the public but are not accessible to persons who use wheelchairs.

Security and Safety
ELAC contracts with the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department for all law enforcement services. The staff includes a Sergeant, a Team Leader, a Campus Deputy, and 14 armed Los Angeles County Sheriff Security Officers. Los Angeles County Security Officers undergo training with the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Academy. They are classified under 832 PC as security officers. They provide 24-hour, seven-day-a-week security coverage for the campus. The Sheriff’s team’s major objective is to provide a safe and secure campus community for students, faculty and staff. An additional resource for the Sheriff’s Department is the Student Cadet Program. The campus employs student workers under the supervision of the Sheriff’s
Department to assist the campus station. Security officers and cadets continuously patrol using bicycle, foot and vehicle patrols 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. The Sheriff’s Department’s jurisdiction covers all property owned and/or operated by the College.

ELAC has compiled a thorough Annual Security Report that outlines various safety and security practices for the campus. This report includes crime statistics for the campus, security procedures including prevention, emergency evacuation plans, and other important information.

ELAC participated in the Great American Shake Out on October 15, 2015 and will conduct an unannounced drill in spring 2016.

Work Environment
The ELAC Work Environment Committee meets once a month. The committee ensures the College provides conditions for a safe, healthful, and sanitary work environment conducive to effective teaching and learning. The committee is also committed to ensuring a safe, healthful, and sanitary work environment conducive to the effective performance of the administrative functions necessary to support ELAC’s educational activities.

Analysis and Evaluation
The College meets the Standard.

East Los Angeles College provides access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment for both students and employees.
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III.B.2

The institution plans, acquires or builds, maintains, and upgrades or replaces its physical resources including facilities, equipment, land and other assets, in a manner that assures effective utilization and the continuing quality necessary to support its programs and services in order to achieve its mission.

Evidence

Maintenance

ELAC, along with its Plant Facilities Department, has developed strategies and schedules for the timely delivery of maintenance and operations of buildings, grounds, and operations services to assure the effective utilization of its facilities, support programs and services. The institution delegates to the department the application and execution of those parts of the Educational Master Plan. This document is a broad-based effort to ensure that the institution builds,
maintains, and upgrades its physical resources.

The Educational Master Plan broadly identifies the institution’s facilities needs based on the District’s Facilities Master Plan. Using statistical reports on growth projections, space needs and projections over the last 18 months, the College completed a Facilities Master Plan to see that these needs are met.

In addition to the Facilities Master Plan, the College reviews and updates a Five Year Construction Plan annually. The plan is submitted in accordance with the California Community Colleges Facilities Planning Manual and includes statements regarding educational plans, energy conservation plans, disabled persons barrier removal plans, all program delivery locations, locations of other owned lands, district-wide priority lists, district-wide capacity and load ratios and all supporting detail required by the California Community College Chancellor’s Office. The Board of Trustees reviews and adopts the Five Year Construction Plan prior to submission.

Program Review provides departments the opportunity to identify equipment needs, corresponding maintenance schedules, achievements, challenges, and improvements. During the Program Review process, faculty, administrators and classified staff outline their resource allocation needs. The requests are then prioritized and ranked through the strategic planning process for funding consideration. The College President requests that the Director of College Facilities visit all the administrators, managers and department chairs asking them to express any known needs for facilities support. The director then develops a list of college needs and wants, which are reviewed and prioritized by a group of college constituency representatives. This is an innovative means to discover areas to target facilities services. Communication with college constituency bodies is critical to identify short-term maintenance and operational needs. The Facilities Planning Subcommittee and Work Environment Committee are two important groups that keep the flow of information fresh and timely. There are other means used to distinguish the needs of programs and services when planning buildings, maintenance, upgrades, or necessary replacements. Requests for equipment and maintenance are prioritized and considered based on the integration with the institutional plans and goals.

The College’s Program Review Self-Evaluation and Annual Update Plan processes are used to determine department needs for equipment in order to respond to planned and ongoing facilities Maintenance and Operations plans for the upcoming year. The Information Technology department also includes the needs for personnel, equipment, and maintenance to support distance education programs. Unexpected emergency needs to replace equipment are processed through the area vice presidents and forwarded to the president for action. The president and vice presidents take great care in these circumstances to evaluate the need for replacement equipment and maintenance.

ELAC also evaluates the effectiveness of its physical resources by utilizing the facility reports in
the FUSION database. FUSION provides a report showing the efficiency percentage for each building. The Space and Capacity/Load Ratio report identifies current classroom space, laboratory and office space, and projects future instructional space based on enrollment growth trends. The reports within FUSION are used to develop the District’s Five Year Construction Plan, submitted annually to the California Community College Chancellor’s Office. When developing the Five Year Construction Plan, the Educational Master Plan and departmental Program Reviews are consulted to determine the greatest facility needs. Based on the data in FUSION and the College Five Year Construction Plan along with the Facilities Master Plan, the College has adequate facilities to teach up to 15,000 students in its current facilities.  

The Maintenance and Operations department receives, creates, and tracks work orders through the Facilities Help Desk program. The reports from this program provide the evidence of preventive and scheduled maintenance. This online work order system provides all employees with a means for reporting facility and equipment issues, particularly those pertaining to health and safety. The Physical Plant department assigns work orders to the appropriate staff on a daily basis. Indirect evidence of effectiveness comes in the form of work orders for facility repairs, requests for equipment, and periodic surveys. To evaluate the effectiveness of facilities and equipment in meeting the needs of programs and services provided by the maintenance and operations staff, surveys are used to assess the satisfaction of the responsiveness, cleanliness, maintenance, and safety of college facilities.

Faculty, classified staff and administrators work collegially in the facilities planning process. A participatory governance committee, the Work Environment Committee works closely with the campus to ensure that upgrades and replacements to physical as well as technological infrastructure take place to continually support the high quality programs that the College offers its students.

**Bond Projects**

In an effort to keep the public and the campus community informed as to the status of ongoing construction projects funded under Propositions A, AA, and Measure J, the LACCD employs a Campus Project Manager/Construction Manager, who prepares a monthly progress report. These reports are available on the ELAC website.

**The Strategic Plan**

The strategic planning structure at East Los Angeles College reflects the College's commitment to participatory governance and obtaining campus wide and community input on college goals and objectives that will shape ELAC’s future. The first objective of the college planning structure was to revise and modify the existing College Mission to better reflect changes in the College, the surrounding community, and pedagogical developments. The culmination of this process was a revised *Strategic Plan* that was based on campus wide dialog and discussion on relevant campus data. The Strategic Plan was developed through:
• Extensive review of ELAC institutional reports on all its administrative modules including budgetary, operational, demographic, and research data.
• Consultation with ELAC leadership and Shared Governance bodies.
• Consultation with the Academic Senate and its leadership and the Curriculum Committee.
• Interviews and focus groups with 164 ELAC students, administrators, faculty members, and classified staff.
• Internal analysis of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Challenges (SWOC).
• Multiple workshops on Flex Days in May 2011 and August 2011.
• Distillation of the issues raised into opportunities for change.

The Strategic Plan outlines the vision, mission, values, planning assumptions, and strategic priorities for East Los Angeles College. The Educational Master Plan, a separate document, presents the detailed Action Plans for making the vision a reality and implementing the necessary actions to address the strategic priorities in the next one to three years. These plans are available on the ELAC website.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

East Los Angeles College maintains its physical resources, assuring the effective utilization and the continuing quality of assets necessary to support its programs and services in order to achieve its mission.

III.B.3

To assure the feasibility and effectiveness of physical resources in supporting institutional programs and services, the institution plans and evaluates its facilities and equipment on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account.
Evidence

The Budget Committee is the central body through which college budget decisions are vetted and recommendations to the ELAC Shared Governance Council (ESGC) are sought.811 The committee also recommends budget policies and adjustments to the budget development process and develops policies that link resource allocation with the planning agenda presented in the Educational Master Plan and Strategic Plan. The ELAC budget development process effectively links resource allocation to planning and provides a general timeline toward achieving that goal: coordinating college budget activities; developing and managing a comprehensive, integrated, and continuous planning and budgeting process; and oversight of program review. Moreover, the process lends itself to opportunities to evaluate and develop more effective and efficient budget processes.

The committee establishes an annual planning and budgeting calendar; recommends institutional fiscal priorities within funding parameters; informs the college community of overall budget matters, including the identification of key indicators of the College’s fiscal health; and identifies potential areas for analysis of cost savings or effective use of resources.

Program Review

The Program Review and Viability Committee812 (PRVC) has the primary responsibility of developing the policies and structure related to comprehensive program review, annual updates, and program viability. Program Review (PR) at East Los Angeles College is a venue through which the College evaluates its programs in relationship to the College Mission and its strategic goals and priorities. For example, the PR process promotes a self-reflective evaluation of academic departments whereby faculty can identify programmatic successes within their disciplines, identify areas in need of improvement and establish departmental goals for enhanced programmatic and student success. Ultimately, through comprehensive program self-evaluation and annual updates, all departments and units are engaged in integrated planning, implementation, and evaluation at ELAC. Moreover, the College utilizes Annual Update Plans and Cluster Update Plans to guide the allocation of resources, thereby ensuring that planning guides budget decisions.

Meeting the College mission and goals of success, equity, access, and accountability requires that programs remain relevant and viable for student completion. To deal with instances where the feasibility of offering a program is compromised and the requirements of the applicable state laws and Board Rules are not met, the PRVC has established a process for program viability.813 Program viability involves in-depth analysis, evaluation by a representative committee, public input, and vetting by shared governance bodies of recommendations that may include departmental reorganization or program modification, improvement, initiation, or discontinuance.

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/units and programs. The committee addresses any issues that arise throughout the year, thereby ensuring that processes are continually reviewed and improved. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement (OIEA) works with the PRVC to develop and refine the structure, process, and documentation of Program Review and to provide necessary data appropriate for program evaluation. The PRVC submits policy recommendations to the East Los Angeles College Shared Governance Council (ESGC) for approval.

**Work Environment Committee**

The Work Environment Committee (WEC) recommends policies and monitors all work environment matters including, but not limited to, grounds and facilities, including parking, conditions of classrooms, allocation and conditions of faculty and staff office space, air quality, temperature control, lighting, Video Display Terminal (VDT) usage, health, safety, and sanitation. Specific responsibilities include:

- Examining college facilities periodically to identify issues related to WEC’s role and to assist in monitoring the quality of the work environment.
- Assisting the college administration’s efforts to implement policies or procedures recommended by WEC.
- Helping to program or design new facilities and to develop plans regarding the renovation of existing buildings.
- Making recommendations for Prop A, AA, & J projects.
- Coordinating or directing the College’s procedure for allocating faculty and staff office space.
- Monitoring campus Builders User Group (BUG) committees.
- Planning and organizing campus clean-up activities each semester.
- Organizing and staging annual Town Hall meetings and regular surveys of employees and students.
- Reporting to the college community results of meetings and pertinent information on a regular basis.

The Work Environment Committee is a required committee as specified in Articles 9 and 32 of the *Agreement between the Los Angeles Community College District and the Los Angeles College Faculty Guild.*

ELAC has ongoing obligated expenses that are carried over each fiscal year. Distribution of
additional resources is facilitated through a prioritization process to assure the effectiveness of allocating physical resources in supporting institutional programs and services.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

The ELAC budget development process effectively links planning to resource allocation and provides a general timeline toward achieving that goal: coordinating college budget activities; developing and managing a comprehensive, integrated, and continuous planning and budgeting process; and oversight of program review.

III.B.4

Long-range capital plans support institutional improvement goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment.

Evidence

The Educational Master Plan and the Facilities Master Plan are the overarching plans that guide facility and long range capital development. The ability of physical resources to support institutional programs and services is planned and evaluated on an annual basis through the review of overall college plans as well as program data and enrollment data. The College uses its FUSION database to update and track Space Inventory Reports and Space Load Ratios. FUSION provides the College the means by which to identify classroom, laboratory, and office space and make projections about the types of instructional spaces that will be required in the future based on anticipated enrollment growth according to the Educational Master Plan.

Procedures are in place to make the necessary modifications and improvements to facilities to keep up with the institutional requirements. Equipment needs are systematically identified, prioritized, and resolved through the resource allocation process and as funds permit. Facilities improvements and construction follow a similar planning, prioritization, and allocation process in response to the needs identified through the College’s planning processes, i.e., Program Review, Educational Master Plan and Facilities Master Plan.

Since 2001, voters have approved General Obligation Fund Proposition A, Proposition AA, and Measure J to finance projects totaling $5.7 billion that should accommodate the growing number of students in the College and the District. Proceeds from the bond were designated to help pay for the acquisition, construction, improvement, and renovation of various college facilities as
outlined in the ballot measure. The College has been able to provide new facilities and make improvements to the existing facilities as the institution continues to serve its students and increase student success.

The October 2011 Master Building Program Budget Plan laid the foundation for an integrated planning and budgeting process driven by the Educational Master Plans of each of the nine colleges. These Educational Master Plans served as the basis for development of the colleges’ Facilities Master Plans, each of which addressed the long-term, often 20-25 year, building and infrastructure needs of the applicable college.\textsuperscript{816}

The District has worked to strengthen its long-range capital planning and ensure that projections include the total cost of ownership for new facilities and equipment. In January 2012, the Review Panel concluded that “…overall, the Building Program has achieved a good level of success in that a substantial majority of the projects have been successfully completed–compared to the projects experiencing problems (e.g., cost or time overruns, sunk-costs and re-design, litigation, etc.)…the Building Program has the potential to achieve the Program’s goals within the funds provided.”\textsuperscript{817}

The District’s April 2013 Special Report to the ACCJC addressed the Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) issue raised in the LACCD Bond Audit issued by the State Controller. The report clearly demonstrated the District’s consideration of TCO systematically. The district defined the Total Cost of Ownership elements as 1) acquisition, 2) daily maintenance, 3) periodic maintenance, 4) utility costs, 5) capital renewal costs, and 6) end-of-life costs to inform its decision making about facilities and equipment.\textsuperscript{818}

The District continues to research Maintenance and Operations (M&O) costs to identify more cost-effective and cost-saving measures for adoption, to reduce TCO. Examples include the District Technology Implementation Strategy Plan, the Connect LACCD Project, the Facilities Lifecycle and Custodial and Building Maintenance Analysis, the Custodial Services Enhancement Program, and the District-wide Energy Measurement and Demand Response Analysis.\textsuperscript{819}

In April 2014 the Board approved the Facilities Master Planning and Oversight Committee’s (FMPOC) resolution to “Affirm its Commitment to Protect Capital Investments through Understanding and Management of Total Cost of Ownership” to ensure this policy guides the District’s long-range planning.\textsuperscript{820}
Analysis and Evaluation

The College and the District meet the Standard.

Propositions A and AA and Measure J gave the District unprecedented funding, but also required an unanticipated level of planning and oversight. Total cost of ownership issues raised in 2012 have been resolved, and as a result, the District has strengthened its long-range capital planning process, leading to better oversight, coordination, and ongoing efficiencies in support of its educational and strategic goals. The Board of Trustees’ April 2014 passage of a resolution related to Total Cost of Ownership demonstrates its ongoing commitment to controlling and reducing these costs for the benefit of the District and students.

At the campus level, the Educational Master Plan and the Facilities Master Plan are the overarching plans that guide facility and long range capital development. The ability of physical resources to support institutional programs and services is planned and evaluated on an annual basis through the review of overall college plans as well as program data and enrollment data. The College uses its FUSION database to update and track Space Inventory Reports and Space Load Ratios. FUSION provides the College the means by which to identify classroom, laboratory, and office space and make projections about the types of instructional spaces that will be required in the future based on anticipated enrollment growth according to the Educational Master Plan.

Procedures are in place to make the necessary modifications and improvements to facilities to keep up with the institutional requirements for equipment and facilities. As the College continues to refine the “total cost of ownership” there will be a procedure and guidelines developed which will be routinely used by college leadership when new equipment or facilities are acquired or built.

815 FUSION (Facility Utilization Space Inventory Option Net)
816 LACCD Master Building Program Budget Plan, 10/19/2011, p. ii-vii
820 BOT Minutes, 4/30/2014
III.C.1

Technology services, professional support, facilities, hardware, and software are appropriate and adequate to support the institution’s management and operational functions, academic programs, teaching and learning, and support services.

Evidence

East Los Angeles College’s Information Technology (IT) department and Distance Learning (DL) Office serve the technology needs of the College, the South Gate Educational Center, the online learning management system (Moodle/Etudes), and online/hybrid/web-enhanced courses for all students. The College is committed to providing up-to-date technology to all areas of instruction, supporting student learning programs and services and improving institutional effectiveness. Technology planning is integrated into the College’s planning through the Technology Planning Subcommittee (TPSC)\(^\text{821}\), the Distance Learning Program, the Distance Education Committee, the Educational Planning Subcommittee, the IT Committee, the Off-Site Committee, Information Technology Faculty Advisory Committee, Learning Assessment Committee, the Strategic Planning Committee, the Program Review and Viability Committee and the ELAC Shared Governance Council (ESGC)\(^\text{822}\). The Technology Master Plan\(^\text{823}\) plays a key role in the development, implementation, and evaluation of the College’s technology planning. The District’s Technology Master Plan, *LACCD Technology Implementation Plan Vision 2020*\(^\text{824}\), is focused on supporting the College’s campus programs as well as administrative services.

The campus provides both Outlook and web-based email systems for students, faculty, staff, and administrators. Each full-time faculty member and adjunct faculty member, and each classified employee whose work requires it, has a desktop or laptop computer with network Internet access, and either a personal or shared network printer. Adjunct faculty members have access to computers, Internet, and printers in shared spaces. The Teaching and Learning Center (TLC)\(^\text{825}\) provides faculty member access to computers, projectors, laptops for checkout, and workshops.

Information Technology Department

The IT Department is responsible for servicing about 2,600 computers across the College.\(^\text{826}\) For students, there are 40 computer labs/computer classrooms (33 on the main campus and 7 at South Gate). Some computer labs are application specific, where only software related to a specific course is installed on the machines. For example, software licenses for AutoCAD, Visual Studios, Adobe Master Collection, and Math and Writing programs are bought for specific programs. Currently for Office 2013 and Adobe Creative Suite Cloud, IT has campus-wide site licenses for faculty, staff and administration. The College has also acquired the Adobe Creative Suite Master Collection 5.5 for departments needing graphic design software for their classes and laboratories. Laboratory software needs are addressed prior to the start of each semester to
ensure that the labs are prepared to educate the students with no delay. The goal is to recycle/replace computers every three years. TPSC and ESGC approved the policy to replace all computers on a three-year cycle in 2014.

Technology has been incorporated into 156 existing classrooms that support some form of audiovisual technology. There are currently 59 “completely smart” classrooms which include a ceiling mounted projector, drop down screen, a computer and monitor, DVD/VHS video player with wall mounted speakers, a laptop connection and a document camera. All these devices are controlled by a touch screen panel. There are currently, 42 small classrooms which have a ceiling mounted projector and drop down screen, a computer and monitor, and document camera equipment. There are 31 classrooms with wall controls and projectors (half setup) and 88 rooms with DVD/VCR players. The South Gate campus currently supports technology in 8 classrooms. The IT department is in the process of incorporating technology into an additional 11 classrooms. Within the next few years, the new Language Arts and Humanities (Student Success and Retention Center) and the Science Career and Mathematics buildings, currently being built, will add an additional 96 completely smart classrooms to the facilities.

IT launched a new ELAC website in spring 2015. The enhancement of the ELAC website provides viewable access to multiple device platforms and is essential to achieving the College’s Mission and strategic goals. A strong web presence will allow the College to send a global message that ELAC is a conduit of educational excellence and is committed to student success. Additionally, a strong web presence can eliminate redundancy and unnecessary work for staff and faculty members by displaying essential information and procedural instructions on department and unit websites, and reduce printing budgets by digitizing information and putting it up on the college websites.

IT proactively oversees network security, has deployed centralized configurations, manages relevant policies, and provides automatic updates. IT also conducts security assessments to comply with best practices and regulations. IT continues to improve on the deployment of Anti-Malware and Anti-Virus applications for scanning, detecting and removing security threats. As a result, users have improved access to critical applications and high reliability, and benefit from the shift of the responsibility to maintain the operating system and security to the IT Department. In addition to increased data security, the IT oversight of network security makes restores easier to do and facilitates software upgrades.

Technology resources are located in a variety of locations serving multiple functions. Academic computer laboratories are available for student use to support various academic disciplines. The Writing Center, which accommodates English composition students, is equipped with 40 work stations, login kiosks, and pay-for-print services. All computer stations are equipped with the proper computer hardware and software needed to support student success.

Instructional media staff provide and maintain the audio/visual (A/V) technology, equipment and services to support the courses, instructional activities and academic events. Services include
faculty instructional media support and training, including audio/video technology, video recording and editing, video-conferencing, graphic presentations, document scanning, digital signage, new technology research, and implementation of all classroom A/V technology. The staff offer video production services to faculty and staff for instructional purposes.

The IT Department, under the direction of the Associate Vice President of Facilities, is composed of 14 staff members providing hardware and software installation and support, audio and visual support, and classroom troubleshooting. Each computer laboratory has its own dedicated Instructional Assistant, reporting to IT, to keep the operation running smoothly and assist students in a timely manner. IT is the initial contact for ELAC employees and students who need technical assistance. Faculty, staff, administrators, and students may obtain support via walk-in, telephone or the helpdesk ticket (helpdesk@elac.edu). The office is open Monday through Thursday from 8:00 a.m. – 9:00 p.m. and Friday from 8:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. For quick answers, ELAC employees can visit the IT website and review FAQ’s for common questions and answers.

Since the creation of the 2012 Technology Master Plan, IT has completed the following activities:

**Campus wide:**

- Deployment of the Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) phone system.
- Content Digital Management Collection server for Campus News and ELAC historical archives.
- Deployment of campus-wide Mass Notification System.
- Deployment of Emergency Notification system to notify students and employees via text messaging in the event of an emergency on campus. (Blackboard)
- Building Announcement System
- Expansion of the campus video surveillance system.
- Upgrade of the network connection to the South Gate Educational Center.
- Update of the campus standards for technology hardware and software.
- Expansion of the campus wireless network to allow for more users (from 500 to more than 6,000).
- Online orientation for first time online students.
- Enhancement of the ELAC website.
- Usage of the content management to provide access to updating departmental websites.

**Administrative Network:**

- Upgrade from Microsoft SharePoint 2007 to SharePoint 2010.
Development and deployment of CAPSTONE network security system to monitor network usage and address issues.

Computer power management system (Surveyor).

Development of Faculty Online Printing system.


Creation of a virtual private network (VPN) system for remote access to campus resources.

Emergency Advisor and Panic Buttons.

Queuing system for Student Services area.

Digital signage.

Academic Network:

Installation of Microsoft Office 2010 in all academic computer labs.

Computer power management system (PowerPro).

Development of online Library Workshop Registration System.

Development of online Counseling Appointment Registration System, Online Student Educational Planning System, Online Counseling.

Development of an online Matriculation Orientation.

Development of Student Online Add Module for adding classes online.

The District Office of Information Technology provides technology infrastructure support to the College. With a staff of more than 40 full-time and part-time employees, Information Services (headed by the Chief Information Officer) provides the following services:

Plans and maintains a reliable and robust network for local area inter-and-intra campus networks, as well as institutional access to the public Internet and the World Wide Web.

Provides a comprehensive enterprise level administrative system capable of recording, storing and reporting on data for student, financial, academic, and administrative transactions.

Supports hardware and software in all District computers for staff, academic computing labs, and related servers.

Provides the development, deployment, and support of centralized administrative functions and "middleware" platforms necessary to support connectivity between software services delivered by other District resources.

Information Services is composed of the following subgroups:
• Microcomputer Support: Provides front-line microcomputer support to College’s user community (students, staff, faculty, and administration). IT analysts and computer technicians conduct ongoing maintenance and upgrades of hardware and software for both administrative and academic computing.

• Software Development: Plans, implements, maintains, and supports all District wide administrative systems. Additional systems supported by the Software Development group include SARS GRID (appointment/calendaring), Microsoft Outlook Exchange (employee e-mail), and Office 365 (student email).

Distance Learning Office

The Distance Learning (DL) Office is dedicated to assisting and supporting students and faculty in the two learning management systems presently supported on campus, Etudes and Moodle. The DL Office assists students via telephone, a website and walk-in assistance. During summer 2015 the DL Office launched a new interactive Online Self-Help form. Students are guided through an intuitive question and information form to assist resolving Etudes logging in problems.

The DL Office is open Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. in the Corporate Center. The DL Coordinator, a faculty member on 100 percent reassignment, supervises two classified employees—a Multimedia Specialist and an Online Technical Support Assistant—to assist students and faculty. The Distance Learning Committee serves to communicate with and advise the College on its decision making regarding distance learning issues. The DL Committee reports to the College’s Educational Planning Subcommittee. The College’s Curriculum Committee and DL Committee address DL efficacy as it relates to the overall instructional program. Per the collective bargaining agreement, the DL Committee has the responsibility of determining proficiency in an LMS and serves as a resource to the College on distance learning issues. To carry out its primary purpose as stated above, the DL Committee provides guidance to faculty in various learning modalities including online, hybrid/blended and web enhanced courses. In addition, the DL Committee participates in the development and evaluation of all distance learning policies and procedures, and oversees the implementation of such policies and procedures.

The Technology Planning Subcommittee (TPSC) has a standing agenda item to discuss ongoing completion of the Technology Master Plan (TMP) objectives. For example during the February 26, 2015 meeting the following points were discussed:

Objective:

Develop and implement automated technology to improve student-centered support services.
Action item:

1. Develop and transition to online forms for students to request, submit, and track transcripts, verifications, petitions and other forms.
2. Implement a plan to ensure consistent and timely delivery of information technology support.

Objective:

Enhance institutional effectiveness and promote student success through flexible access to technology.

Action item:

3. Promote district implementation of technology that will allow for the electronic development and tracking of student educational plans and student milestone achievement.

In spring 2007, the College deployed the Academic Computing Environment (ACE) allowing faculty members to collaborate with students by sharing files online, creating calendars of class-related deadlines, broadcasting announcements, viewing rosters, and enabling other facets of the learning management tool. Students who would like to enroll/add in an online class that is closed for regular enrollment can use the ACE portal to request adding a class.\textsuperscript{842}

The Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) provides ELAC faculty with professional development activities. Professional development is a continuous part of ELAC activities which assist ELAC employees in improving their skill sets through training, workshops, resources and conferences. A complete list of activities is posted on TLC web page.\textsuperscript{843}

**Disabled Student Program and Services (DSP&S)**

The Disabled Student Program and Services (DSP&S) Center provides students with disabilities necessary technology support. Adaptive technology can be found in the DSP&S Center.\textsuperscript{844} Students receive training on the needed equipment upon completion of a Needs Assessment form with an Adaptive Technology Specialist or other qualified staff member. Students have access to the latest innovations in adaptive technology including scan and read technology, screen readers, voice recognition, CCTVs, screen magnification software, alternative keyboards, talking dictionaries, and visual idea mapping software.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

The importance of technology is well recognized by the College, and ELAC is committed to
providing up-to-date technology for all areas of instruction. The goal is to refresh hardware every three years to ensure that student classrooms, labs, and library spaces run the latest software applications. With over 2,600 computers to replace every three years, a cycle of replacement has been implemented. The current IT facility houses all the computer technical support staff, except for the web services staff, who are located in the Administration building. IT has outgrown its current facility and is in need of a larger more up-to-date facility where all services are obtainable in one location. In addition to allocating space for IT current staff and for superior support for faculty, staff and students, IT needs to hire additional IT staff to address growing needs of the College.

The DL Office is committed to providing support services in all areas of the two learning management systems on campus, Etudes and Moodle. The DL Office offers professional development workshops on trouble shooting problems with Etudes and Moodle, training, new features and walk in for assistance.

III.C.2

The institution 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.
Evidence

College planning is conducted using evaluation cycles focused on continuous quality improvement for all instruction, student services, and administrative programs. ELAC has been using six-year planning cycles in which the College progresses through phases of Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation (PIE). By incorporating formative evaluations into operational decision making, ELAC ensures that these annual processes are subject to self-reflective examination on an ongoing basis and that lessons learned contribute to improvements in these processes. Data-driven measures and formative evaluations contribute to a summative evaluation of the strategic plan implementation at the end of its six-year cycle.

Planning for technology needs is a multi-faceted process. Department chairs, the ELAC Shared Governance Council (ESGC), the Technology Planning Subcommittee (TPSC), the Distance Learning office, and the Information Technology (IT) department collaborate in identifying technology needs on and off campus. All stakeholders are represented through program reviews and annual updates. In these program reviews and updates, departments and programs can identify and justify their technology needs. TPSC reviews each and every program review document annually in order to prioritize technology requests. The purpose of the TPSC is to address issues regarding the College’s technology use and to review, revise and officially adopt the Technology Master Plan.

The Technology Master Plan serves as the College’s guiding strategy on technology related issues and seeks to fulfill the College Mission and Strategic Goals through the implementation of technology planning objectives. All plan objectives, which are related to educational technology and technology infrastructure, are aligned with the Strategic Plan’s objectives and values. TPSC is responsible for the development, implementation and evaluation of the Technology Master Plan.

An annual TPSC Self-Evaluation Report, along with the Technology Master Plan, also assist in identifying the needs on campus. Finally, an annual technology survey, administered to administrators, faculty, and students, checks satisfaction with technology services and solicits suggestions as to unmet needs.

TPSC’s voting membership is composed of faculty and administrator co-chairs, three additional administrators, nine classified staff members, 11 faculty members, and two students. Its focus is to implement, develop, execute and evaluate the Technology Master Plan and address campus technology needs. The goal of the subcommittee is to work with the IT department, administration, faculty, staff and students to achieve and maintain campus-wide technology to enhance instruction and services to students. TPSC functions in an advisory capacity to the East Los Angeles College Shared Governance Council (ESGC).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.
Existing policy stipulates that computers be updated on a regular 3-year cycle. The ESGC approved this policy on July 27, 2015.  

While computer replacements are occurring throughout the campus, a written schedule would improve monitoring practices. The Associate Vice President of Administrative Services, who oversees the IT department, recognizes the need for full implementation of IT policies vetted through shared governance. ELAC launched its new website on February 9, 2015 and is committed to continual updating of content.

Communication regarding technology works well because TPSC allows for standing committee reports from Distance Education, Professional Development and IT. As evidenced in the minutes, forward thinking planning occurs to help ELAC continuously plan for and implement technology in support of its mission, operations, programs and services.

III.C.3

The institution assures that technology resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs, and services are implemented and maintained to assure reliable access, safety, and security.

Evidence

ELAC’s Information Technology (IT) department serves the technology needs of the College on its main campus and satellite locations at the South Gate Educational Center and the Corporate Center. IT services are also available to students and faculties online. The College is committed to providing current technology to all areas of instruction, supporting student learning programs and services, and improving institutional effectiveness. The IT department accomplishes its wide breadth of support through its help desk system which ensures timely support and maintains reliable technology services. The IT Helpdesk follows up each service order with an online survey to obtain additional feedback for continuous improvement. These surveys are reviewed at each TPSC meeting monthly.

ELAC utilizes various systems to ensure safety and security in all its technology functions. The IT department maintains the College’s own security monitoring, analysis, and response system, called Next Generation Firewall, to allow the IT staff to monitor the level of network traffic,
threats and troubleshoot issues. The College owns and IT maintains the Access Control Server which helps the College comply with regulatory requirements by authenticating and authorizing wireless users, and works with the Virtual Private Network to enforce access policies. The Intrusion Prevention System, which the College owns and IT maintains, allows IT to identify, classify, and prevent malicious traffic such as worms, spyware, adware, network viruses and application abuse.

Next Generation Firewall, the Access Control Server, the Virtual Private Network, and the Intrusion Preventive System are hardware systems the College owns and the IT department maintains. A list of all software and hardware purchased by the IT department can be found on SAP. Inventory for all computers and laptops purchased through the IT department are tracked and recorded on WASP.

Computers on campus that store sensitive information are encrypted so that if a computer’s hard drive were to be stolen, the data would be protected.

Analysis and Evaluation
The College meets the Standard.

The IT department maintains network security through Cisco Security Monitoring. Campus computers connected to the college systems need to be on private IP addresses to ensure a secure network for data. Computers that contain sensitive data are encrypted which protects all data in the hard drive. The IT department needs to continue reviewing and implementing the latest security technology to maintain system and network integrity.

---

853 TPSC Minutes
854 Next Generation Firewall Application
855 SAP list of technology purchases
856 Encryption Policy
857 CISCO Security Monitoring

III.C.4
The institution provides appropriate instruction and support for faculty, staff, students, and administrators in the effective use of technology and technology systems related to its programs, services, and institutional operations.

Evidence
The College makes technology a priority through training and support to all of its constituencies. The IT department and technology staff provide technology training to students, faculty, staff, and administrators. The technology training is disseminated in different mediums such as
workshops, online tutorials, and informational materials.

There are two main sources of training for faculty, staff, and administrators in the effective use of technology. They are the Distance Learning (DL) Office and the Teaching and Learning (TLC) Center, which serves as the Professional Development Office.\textsuperscript{858} DL trains and supports faculty in teaching online, hybrid, and web-supported classes.\textsuperscript{859} Such training includes certification in learning management systems, online pedagogy, MS Excel, MS Outlook web access, PowerPoint, launching a department’s website, and quality control. The TLC/Professional Development office provides numerous workshops and training for faculty on use of technology, including instruction for new faculty on how to develop an online portfolio.\textsuperscript{860} Together, the two offices support training in aspects of Microsoft Office.

IT, the DL Office, and Professional Development all offer technology training on campus. In spring 2015, the DL Office offered a TechFest, a series of technology workshops for faculty and students.\textsuperscript{861} It was well attended and will be repeated.

Faculty members who teach online or who are interested in doing so are encouraged to attend conferences organized around this topic. For example, on June 17, 2015, many faculty from ELAC, along with the Distance Education Coordinator, attended the Online Teaching Conference held in San Diego. The three-day program featured 40 speakers that included representatives of the California Online Education Initiative, effective practices, support and resources, technology innovation and leadership and evaluation.\textsuperscript{862} Etudes also offers a yearly conference that several ELAC faculty have attended in the past.\textsuperscript{863}

For students, Instructional Assistants in computer labs—whether open labs, such as the Library, or classroom labs, such as in Engineering—assist students with computer operations. These staff members are part of the IT department. Students taking online, hybrid, and web-supported classes have technical support available at the DL Office and from their own instructors.\textsuperscript{864}

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Training in the use of technology for students, faculty, and staff is conducted by three complementary operations: the IT department, the DL Office, and Professional Development. IT staff are available in labs to provide support to students and the DL Office employs two classified employees—a multimedia specialist and a technician—to assist students and faculty as needed.

\textsuperscript{858} Online Training  
\textsuperscript{859} DE Instructor Resources  
\textsuperscript{860} Distance Education Workshops  
\textsuperscript{861} Tech Fest  
\textsuperscript{862} California Online Education Initiative  
\textsuperscript{863} Etudes Summit
III.C.5
The institution has policies and procedures that guide the appropriate use of technology in the teaching and learning processes.

Evidence

ELAC has policies and procedures in place that guide the appropriate use of technology in the teaching and learning process. The IT department maintains procedures and policies for work order tickets, request for technological equipment, password resets, equipment checkout, telephone service, purchasing of new equipment with technology, and new software requests.

For technology in the classroom, ELAC abides by District IT policies for appropriate use of campus and district resources. 865

This District policy is comprehensive, including:

1. District and College Computing Policy: All employees and students using computing facilities are expected to operate within the bounds of federal and state law and of the District policies and standards. 866

2. Copyright Policy

3. Digital Media Policy

4. Email Policy

5. Computer Use Policy

6. Website Policy

7. SharePoint Usage Policy

8. Network Security 867

One example of a college technology-related policy is the identification of two learning management systems that will be officially supported. One is required for online and hybrid courses, and may be used for web-enhanced courses. The other is used only for web-enhanced courses. 868 Instructors who web-enhance are free to use either one or free services, such as Google Docs, or publisher-provided material.

In the curriculum process, ELAC’s Distance Education Addendum 869 ensures academic integrity and quality for all online courses. Where contact hours are all or partly replaced by online instruction, the official Course Outline of Record must include a DE Addendum that specifies how course objectives will be achieved via distance learning. This includes a requirement for regular, instructor-initiated contact with students. The addendum is required for both distance education (DE) course outlines (i.e. those with all contact hours conducted online) as well as
hybrid course outlines (i.e. those with some required off-line/face-to-face contact hours). Face-to-face courses using web-enhancements are not required to complete a DE addendum, as there is no replacement of contact hours.

The DE Addendum accomplishes three very important objectives: 1) it assures that the educational objectives of the course can be achieved via distance delivery; 2) it makes clear how instructors maintain regular and substantive contact and interaction between themselves and students as required by Title 5, section 55204, examples of which can include, but are not limited to, asynchronous office hours conducted via the course management system and/or scheduled office hours and review sessions, monitoring a forum for posted student questions, facilitating student-to-student contact and virtual student groups, and posting prepared instructional materials to the course site via the course management system; and 3) it makes clear how instructor-initiated contact as required by Title 5, section 55204 is consistently maintained via course announcements published via the course management system and disseminated to all students enrolled, regular and prompt feedback regarding student assignments and work, and leading themed discussions regarding the course materials and objectives via the course management system.

This Addendum is the department’s opportunity to demonstrate to the Curriculum Committee that its proposed DE course offering can fully comply with these requirements. Specific course descriptions, particularly the representative examples chosen to demonstrate regular and substantive contact and instructor-initiated interaction between instructor and students, increase the chances that the course will be approved as a DE course offering. Examples of regular and substantive instructor/student contact and interaction are required in each of the following areas: (a) representative assignments, (b) instructor-initiated themed discussions/interactions between instructor and students, and (c) instructor-initiated feedback and communication of course progress to students enrolled in the course. When submitting this form, the department chair certifies that all information in the DE Addendum is complete and accurate by submitting the DE Addendum via ECD. The DE Addendum is available through Campus Applications under Forms on faculty desktops and on the District’s website through the Electronic Curriculum Development (ECD) system.

Additional policies assure new DE faculty are trained in the required course management system for online/hybrid classes, scheduling of online classes, training in pedagogical practices, guarantee quality control, and assistance of students.

In the collective bargaining agreement, there are stipulations pertaining specifically to DL faculty, which are designed to help assure the quality of education via distance learning as well as recognize the considerable time and effort expected of online instructors. Article 40 is an agreement between the Los Angeles Community College District and the Los Angeles College Faculty Guild which defines distance learning.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

ELAC complies with district and campus policies for appropriate use of technology in the
teaching and learning process. While faculty academic freedom allows them to choose whether or not to use technology in the classroom, policies are in place to promote the efficient, ethical and lawful use of computers and network resources for the faculty who choose to take advantage of this mode of instruction. The current updated DE Addendum to Course Outlines of Record explains how distance delivery strategies will be used to assist students in achieving each listed course objective and follow the guidelines of Title 5, Section 55204.

---
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III.D.1

Financial resources are sufficient to support and sustain student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. The distribution of resources supports the development, maintenance, allocation and reallocation, and enhancement of programs and services. The institution plans and manages its financial affairs with integrity and in a manner that ensures financial stability.
Evidence

The annual budget for the College is sufficient to meet instructional needs, student support needs, and operations. For 2015-2016 the unrestricted budget is $106.5 million as of September 22, 2015. This figure includes a carry-forward balance of $9.8 million. The 2015-2016 budget is sufficient to cover projected expenditures of $100 million as well as provide for a 1 percent contingency to be used as needed. In addition, restricted funds supplement the instructional services, student support services and operations. Prior year-end balances accrued by the College have contributed $25.2 million to the District’s General Reserve and Contingency Fund. Each year the College has fixed costs which amount to approximately 86 percent of the annual budget.

The institution’s prudent fiscal management has helped ensure financial stability for the entire district. In 2012, prior year-end balances and reserves accrued by the College contributed $25.2 million to the District’s General Reserve and Contingency Reserve. These funds will remain in the District’s reserves and paid back to East Los Angeles College in future years when additional funding is available.

The College utilizes the Program Review and Annual Update processes to distribute resources to support the development, maintenance, allocation and reallocation, and enhancement of programs and services. In addition, support for student learning programs and services is buttressed with additional restricted funds, such as the Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) and the Noncredit Student Success and Support Program.

The College plans and manages its financial affairs with integrity and in a manner that ensures financial stability. The District’s integrated financial system, called Systems, Applications, and Products (SAP), and other district processes are essential for meeting this standard.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard and Eligibility Requirement 18.

The budget is composed of multiple sources, including self-generated revenues. The College
anticipates a substantial projected year-end balance, as has been the case at East Los Angeles College for several years due to the College’s ability to grow and provide quality education efficiently and effectively. These contributions provide long-term stability to the District and the College.  

In light of the fiscal sound ratio of fixed costs, the College is regularly able to use discretionary funds to fund educational improvements and innovative curriculum and services. Some examples of projects receiving this funding include the College Transfer Initiative, the GO East LA partnership, the Student Success Program, and the First Year Experience Program.

The College annually distributes resources to support the development, maintenance, allocation and reallocation, and enhancement of programs and services. This begins by ensuring that fixed costs are included in the operational plan. Moreover, every department and unit report in their Program Review Self-Evaluations (PRSEs) and Annual Update Plans (AUPS) how their programs and services promote student success, equity, access, and institutional effectiveness. These PRSEs and AUPs include requests for positions and budget augmentations that are incorporated into the College’s distribution of resources.

Additionally, as the state has restored funding for the community colleges, it has chosen to restrict a significant portion of the new monies to support specific activities, such as funding for the Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) and the Student Equity Plan. Overall, restricted funds have enabled the College to further develop and enhance programs and services.

An analysis of district processes reveals how the institution ensures financial integrity. For instance, the SAP system has a built-in single point of contact which provides for checks and balances so that no single person can authorize and spend funds from the beginning to the end of the process. Redundancy in accounting for funds is built in to financial processes. The integrity of these processes is verified by district oversight, internal audits, and external audits. Moreover, all administrators authorized to sign checks have signed conflict of interest statements. Adhering to these processes ensures that the College does not overspend and maintains the aforementioned stability.
III.D.2
The institution’s mission and goals are foundation for financial planning, and financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning. The institution has policies and procedures to ensure sound financial practices and financial stability. Appropriate financial information is disseminated throughout the institution in a timely manner.

Evidence
The College’s mission and goals are the foundation for financial planning. Within the Program Review and Annual Update processes, departments and units identify and evaluate how budget augmentation requests advance the College’s mission and goals. For example, faculty position requests made in the Annual Update Plans (AUPs) are evaluated and prioritized by the Hiring Prioritization Committee (HPC) based on alignment with the College’s institutional plans. Similarly, staff requests are evaluated and prioritized by the Human Resources Committee (HRC). The faculty and staff prioritization lists are forwarded to the President for approval. For other requests, administrators evaluate the AUP augmentation requests for departments/units under their supervision and work with their vice presidents to prioritize requests that align with the College Mission and institutional plans, and then incorporate those priorities into their Cluster Plans. The prioritized requests are reviewed for approval collectively by the Cabinet, i.e., the President and Vice Presidents. In this way, the aggregation of all department and unit AUPs thereby establishes the foundation for financial planning.

This process also ensures that financial planning is integrated with institutional planning. This process for integrating the planning priorities into financial planning includes participation by shared governance bodies and the broader campus community. The policies and procedures have ensured sound financial practices and resulted in financial stability as demonstrated by a healthy year-end balance and reserve.

The District is largely responsible for ensuring long-term financial planning, particularly with regard to long-term construction needs. The College ensures that appropriate financial information is disseminated throughout the institution in a timely manner through the SAP system and through College and District shared governance bodies, and the District’s Chief Financial Officer’s website.

Analysis and Evaluation
The College meets the Standard.

The Program Review and Annual Update processes ensure that the planning process is aligned with the College’s mission and goals.

Additionally, financial planning is integrated with institutional planning. The primary mechanism for this integration is the program plan within each AUP. As part of their program plan, each department and unit plans activities that are aligned with the Educational Master Plan, Facilities Master Plan, and/or Technology Master Plan. These institutional plans are aligned with the College’s Strategic Plan. For each activity, the department or unit identifies resources
needed for successful implementation. Accompanying the AUP is the budget worksheet where augmentation requests align with the resource needs identified in the program plan. Working with their administrators, vice presidents prioritize requests in alignment with the College Mission and institutional plans, and then incorporate those priorities into their Cluster Plans.

By establishing budget priorities for special initiatives and projects to implement the College’s Mission and institutional plans, shared governance committees further ensure that financial planning supports institutional planning by establishing budget priorities for special initiatives and projects to implement the College’s Mission and institutional plans. For example, at the College Budget Forum preceding the 2014-15 fiscal year, the President proposed initiatives to advance the College Mission and institutional plans. The initiatives were evaluated by the Budget Committee and the East Los Angeles College Shared Governance Council (ESGC) and recommended as budget priorities for the 2014-15 fiscal year. With these initiatives and the approval of department/unit augmentation requests, financial planning advances institutional planning.

In addition to the Annual Update process and other shared governance committees, the formation of a Grants Committee is a new development that will further sound financial practices. This shared governance body will further the College’s commitment to sound practices by collaboratively vetting potential grant applications and ensuring alignment with the College’s Mission and institutional plans. Through the Grants Committee, the College will be more focused and effective in its grant activities. Through active pursuit of external support, the College has leveraged external resources and, thereby, allows its unrestricted funds to enhance the quality of programs and services, and implement innovations to support student success.

Based on its formative evaluation of the 2014-15 budget development process, the College recognized that it could ensure greater consistency in providing feedback in response to augmentation requests. As part of the 2015-16 budget development process, all vice presidents will hold meetings within their clusters to discuss decisions made on augmentation requests in a timely manner. This revision and the rest of the budget development process will be reviewed by the Budget Committee so that improvements can be made before the next budget cycle.

The College ensures that appropriate financial information is disseminated throughout the institution in a timely manner. For instance, personnel authorized to make decisions for their departments/units have immediate access to financial information for their cost centers through the District’s integrated financial system called Systems, Applications, and Products (SAP). The Budget Committee and ESGC receive monthly budget updates from District Budget Committee representatives. The District website publishes current and past tentative and final budgets as well as expenditure reports. Additional updates are emailed to Budget Committee members and any other interested members of the campus community.

---
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III.D.3

The institution clearly defines and follows its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget development, with all constituencies having appropriate opportunities to participate in the development of institutional plans and budgets.

Evidence

The Budget Committee annually reviews and revises the budget development process, which is then formally approved by the East Los Angeles College Shared Governance Council (ESGC). The budget development process provides guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget development, identifying the roles of responsible parties. Once approved, the revised budget development process is incorporated into the *Governance Policy Handbook*. All constituencies of the College are represented on the Budget Committee and ESGC as well as the District Budget Committee. In this way, constituency representatives participate in the development of institutional plans and budgets.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

It is noteworthy that the participation on the College Budget Committee and ESGC is broad based and the meetings are well attended. A review of the committee minutes demonstrates active engagement by a cross-section of the college community in the budget development process and in recommending priorities for resource allocation. For example, the ESGC discussed and supported funding upgrades at the South Gate campus that had been recommended by the Facilities Planning Subcommittee.

Responses to the faculty/staff survey rated 3.28 on a 5-point scale that “processes for financial planning and budget development are clearly defined and followed.” This indicates general agreement that planning and budget development processes occur with constituent input.

---
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III.D.4

Institutional planning reflects a realistic assessment of financial resource availability, development of financial resources, partnerships, and expenditure requirements.

Evidence

The College’s institutional planning priorities are integrated into the College financial planning processes. In addition, both the College Budget Committee and the District Budget Committee receive realistic assessments of available funds, including ongoing and anticipated fiscal commitments within the annual budget. The Budget Committee reviews revenue reports and projections of ending balance to assess the financial resources being developed by the College to supplement the state allocation for the upcoming budget year. Of course, in planning for the upcoming budget year, the Budget Committee receives an assessment of the ongoing expenditure requirements, including fixed costs.  

The institution assesses resource availability through grants and partnerships in order to maximize service to students. Moreover, before applying for grants or entering partnerships, the institution’s “intent to apply” process realistically assesses the matching requirements, staffing/facility needs, and other commitments. In this way, the College is aware of its expenditure requirements and engages in responsible and stable fiscal practices.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

When the Cabinet reviews augmentation requests, decisions are made on the basis of the base allocation and projected carry-forward balance for the general fund as well as anticipated restricted funds. The Budget Committee is provided with reports on these available funds, which enables it to vet the total amount of budget augmentation approved by the Cabinet. More recently, Cabinet decision making has become more complex as the state has channeled increased monies through restricted funds.

The budget is comprised of multiple sources, including self-generated revenues. The College anticipates a substantial projected year-end balance as has been the case at East Los Angeles College for several years.

---
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III.D.5

To assure the financial integrity of the institution and responsible use of its financial resources, the internal control structure has appropriate control mechanisms and widely disseminates dependable and timely information for sound financial decision making. The institution regularly evaluates its financial management practices and uses the results to
improve internal control systems.

Evidence

The College provides monthly and quarterly reports to the District’s Chief Financial Officer (CFO). The District’s CFO and budget staff visit the College each quarter to advise the College on its financial management practices. The District budget staff provides the College senior staff with an evaluation of its budget expenditures in an effort to ensure appropriate control mechanisms are being followed.893

Moreover, the single point of contact built into the Systems Applications and Products (SAP) system provides for checks and balances so that no single person can initiate a purchase, authorize the expenditure, or spend the funds. Purchases cannot be encumbered unless the account is adequately funded on the SAP system, which is why all SAP users have access to dependable and timely information about their accounts. The SAP training manual is on the district website.894 Procurement forms indicate multiple signatures and instructions.895 On a regular basis, the District provides procurement training materials to update the Procurement Training Manual, which serves as the basis for the college workshops made available to all departments.896 In addition, redundancy in accounting for funds is built in to financial processes.

The integrity of these processes is verified by district oversight, internal audits, and external audits. Moreover, all administrators authorized to sign checks have signed conflict of interest statements. Adhering to these processes ensures the College does not overspend and maintains the aforementioned stability.

The Board of Trustees establishes and regularly updates Board Rules which address financial management and internal control structures. Board Rule 7608897 requires the Chief Financial Officer/Treasurer (CFO) to generate interim financial reports, including current income and expenditures, which are submitted to the Chancellor monthly from October through June.898 The Chancellor, in turn, provides a District quarterly financial status report to the Board of Trustees, in addition to monthly reports provided to the Budget and Finance Committee (BFC). These reports are widely disseminated and inform sound financial decision making at the District and colleges.899

Board Rule 7900.900 establishes the Internal Audit Unit as “an independent appraisal function within the LACCD to examine and evaluate the activities of the District…Internal Audit will report audit findings to the Board of Trustees’ Audit/Budget Committee no less than annually.” This Board Rule requires the Internal Audit Unit to ensure that “…financial statements and reports comply with Board policy, applicable government regulations and generally accepted accounting practices…internal accounting controls are adequate and effective…[and] operating policies promoting compliance…are enforced.”901
The District Budget Committee (DBC), Board Budget and Finance Committee (BFC), Board of Trustees, and the colleges receive financial information on a set schedule. Information on resource allocation, debt management, and financial management is routinely provided to the BFC and DBC so their committee members can be fully informed when making policy recommendations to the Board of Trustees and Chancellor.  

The Office of Budget and Management Analysis develops district-wide revenue projections and is also charged with the management of District resources. Since 1993, the District has followed a set budget development calendar, which ensures full engagement of the colleges, Board of Trustees, and District office staff. The budget development calendar is evaluated and updated annually; the current version reflects oversight enhancements brought about by upgrades to the District’s financial operational system (SAP). The District also disseminates and trains employees to use its “Budget Operational Plan Instructions” manual to reinforce internal control procedures. (See Standard III.D.10.)

The District received an unmodified external audit, with no identified material weaknesses, for 2013 and 2014. The District has consistently had unqualified financial statements and unmodified external audit reports for the past 30 years.

To ensure financial integrity of the District and the responsible use of its financial resources, District and college financial staff review best practices with both internal and external auditors, and revise procedures to strengthen internal controls.

To ensure the District’s internal control structure has the appropriate level of oversight, the Internal Audit Unit sets yearly review plans, providing Corrective Action Plan updates to the Board Budget and Finance Committee (BFC) on a quarterly basis.

The Internal Audit unit conducted a District-wide risk assessment study and determined the need for a comprehensive database which would strategically identify, and mitigate, risks. This project is scheduled for implementation in FY 2015-2016.

The Central Financial Aid Unit (CFAU) continually monitors federal Perkins Loans and Nursing Loans. Student Financial Aid is audited annually by external auditors, as required by OMB Circular A-133, and is also subject to audits performed by grantors. The District has not received any material findings or questioned significant costs in the past ten years.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College and the District meet the Standard.

The College provides monthly and quarterly reports to the Chief Financial Officer. The Chief Financial Officer and budget staff visit the College each quarter to advise the College on its financial management practices. The District budget staff provides the College senior staff with an evaluation of its budget expenditures in an effort to ensure appropriate control mechanisms are being followed.
The District has a well-integrated financial management process that regularly evaluates its financial practices and internal control structure to ensure the financial integrity of the District. The Chief Financial Officer/Treasurer and colleges work together to ensure that dependable and timely information for sound financial decision making is consistently available to all parties. The provision of accurate financial information on a regular schedule has enabled the District to make sound financial decisions and ensure the responsible use of its financial resources.

III.D. 6
Financial documents, including the budget, have a high degree of credibility and accuracy, and reflect appropriate allocation and use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services.

Evidence
Departments through the Program Review and Annual Update processes assess the financial resources necessary to support student learning programs and services annually. Departments can submit augmentation requests as needed to ensure the institution is directly and indirectly supporting its stated goals for student learning. These augmentation requests are vetted by the President’s Cabinet and the College’s shared governance bodies. Augmentation requests are approved as appropriate given the financial constraints of the College. Concurrently, fixed and ongoing costs and approved augmentations are inputted for each cost center to develop the operational plan, i.e., the basis for the Tentative Budget. The Tentative Budget, Final Budget, and LACCD Financial Audit document how the institution and the district allocate financial resources to support student learning programs and services.
The high credibility and accuracy of the Final Budget are evident to “budget owners” who access the SAP system. In addition, through the monthly reports and quarterly reports, the District validates the appropriate use of financial resources on an ongoing basis. The SAP training manual is on the district website. On a regular basis, the District provides procurement-training materials to update the Procurement Training Manual, which serves as the basis for the workshops made available to all departments.  

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

With the change in department chairs, the College is reinstituting its annual budget workshop so that chairs may have increased proficiency in accessing the SAP system. In addition, the District has developed a Planning Budget Formulation (PBF) Security Manual, which will be used to designate the users at the College or location that will have access to the forms required for setting up the budget for the new fiscal year. Colleges will need to ensure that for every Fund/Fund Center combination they use and each Stage that will be used, there is a college user assigned to it.

III.D.7

Institutional responses to external audit findings are comprehensive, timely, and communicated appropriately.

Evidence

KPMG LLP audits the District on an annual basis. They produce the “LACCD Report on Audited Basic Financial Statements” using Government Audit Standards. The most recent result found the financial statements presented fairly, in all material respects, the net assets of the LACCD in conformity with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles. The external audit findings are communicated appropriately through Office of the Chief Financial Officer website.

Analysis and Evaluation

Recent audits indicate that the College meets the Standard.

III.D. 8

The institution’s financial and internal control systems are evaluated and assessed for validity and effectiveness, and the results of this assessment are used for improvement.

Evidence
The District evaluates its financial and internal control systems on a continuous cycle to ensure validity and effectiveness. Results from internal and external audits are used for improvement. When any deficiencies or material weaknesses are identified, the District promptly implements corrective action plans to resolve the deficiency. Where deficiencies are the result of issues with internal controls, policies, or procedures, remedial steps are taken before the next audit cycle.

The District’s financial and internal control systems are evaluated and assessed annually by external auditors and internally on an ongoing basis and reported quarterly by the Chief Financial Officer (CFO)/Treasurer. The District has had unqualified financial statements and unmodified audit reports for over 30 years (see Standard III.D.5). For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2014, the District did not have any material weaknesses identified in any of its external audits. (see Standard III.D.5).

Material weaknesses were identified in the District’s external financial audits ending June 30, 2008 through 2012. In response, the District significantly improved its internal controls and implemented corrective actions. The District’s corrective actions resulted in the identification of less severe and fewer weaknesses during this same period. The June 30, 2011 audit found the District had one material weakness and four significant deficiencies (see Standard III.D.5). By June 30, 2014, the District had no material weaknesses and one significant deficiency (see Standard III.D.5). It is worth noting that the single deficiency identified in both 2013 and 2014 was not related to internal financial controls (see Standard III.D.5).

Information from external District audits is provided to the Budget Finance Committee (BFC), District Budget Committee (DBC), Executive Committee of the District Budget Committee (ECDBC), Board of Trustees and the CFO, and is used to evaluate and improve the District’s financial management and internal control systems. 911

All audit reports are reviewed and progress towards implementation of corrective action plans for the Office of the CFO tracks all audit findings on an ongoing basis. External auditors review progress of corrective actions annually (see Standard III.D.5).

The District has annual external audits for its Bond Program. Bond expenditures have been consistent with regulatory and legal restrictions since the Program’s inception. The Bond Program has never received a qualified or modified audit. 912

Material weaknesses were identified in the Bond Program’s financial audits ending June 30, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2012. In response, the District implemented corrective actions and strengthened internal controls and. No material weaknesses were subsequently identified in Bond Program financial audits for 2013 and 2014. 913

Financial and performance audits for the Bond Program are reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees, the Board’s FMPOC, and the District Citizens’ Oversight Committee (DCOC). These committees also oversee and approve corrective actions to improve internal controls as needed. 914

The Board recently amended BR 17300, which authorizes the Director of the Internal Audit unit,
as the Bond Program Monitor, to ensure the Bond Program is performing with the utmost integrity.\textsuperscript{915}

The District’s Internal Audit unit regularly reviews all business and finance systems to ensure compliance with relevant policies, procedures, laws, and statutory regulations. During the FY 2014-15, this unit conducted procurement audits for all nine colleges and the ESC. In response to findings, the District undertook a series of procurement trainings, which were mandatory for college and ESC staff.\textsuperscript{916}

In 2003, the District implemented the Systems, Applications and Products (SAP) financial software system, as a result of the District’s evaluation of its financial and internal control systems. Initially, SAP integrated and automated accounting and financial transactions. In 2005 the system was expanded to include personnel and payroll functions. The resulting integrated system allows real-time tracking, approval and posting of all expenditures, and strengthens the District’s financial and internal control systems.\textsuperscript{917}

In FY 2011, the District updated and reissued its accounting manual, which was designed to “…assist campus personnel with the preparation and management of documents, requests, and procedures that are handled in the Accounting and Business Office.” The manual is disseminated and used district-wide and has resulted in better internal controls along with a reduction in transaction processing time.\textsuperscript{918}

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 and ensures all activities meet the policies and procedures that comply with federal, state, local, and district guidelines and regulations. Moreover, compliance with internal controls and procedures include approvals by all levels of management.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College and the District meet the Standard.

The District regularly evaluates its financial and internal control systems and assesses them for validity. The District substantially increased its internal controls in response to the ACCJC visiting team’s recommendation that “…the resolution of the material weakness and significant deficiencies cited in the 2010 financial audit be fully effected by the completion of next year’s audit and appropriate systems be implemented and maintained to prevent future audit exceptions…” \textsuperscript{919}

By February 2014, the ACCJC stated, “the LACCD has provided evidence that it has addressed District Recommendations 1 and 2 and…resolved the material weaknesses and significant deficiencies cited in the 2010 financial audit. Appropriate systems have been implemented to prevent future audit exceptions.” \textsuperscript{920} The District continues to use the results of its assessment for improvement by implementing corrective actions for any findings or deficiencies noted in external audits, program audits, and grant funding sources. District policies and procedures are
III.D. 9
The institution has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, support strategies for appropriate risk management, and, when necessary, implement contingency plans to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences.

Evidence
Between Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and 2012-13, the District experienced more than $100 million in funding cuts. The District made significant reductions in class offerings; changed employee health benefits plans, and instituted stringent spending controls. Through these actions, and by maintaining healthy reserves, the District was able to weather the recession without furloughing or laying off permanent employees. The District reviews cash flow on a regular schedule and has maintained a sufficient cash flow, and healthy reserves, which range from 13 percent to 17 percent.

Cash Flow
The District has a strong financial position. The Board reviews and adopts the District’s Final Budget every September.922

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015-2016 Budget</th>
<th>2014-2015 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget</td>
<td>2.87 billion</td>
<td>$2.96 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop A, AA &amp; Measure J Bonds in the building fund</td>
<td>$1.61 billion</td>
<td>1.87 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$929.58 million</td>
<td>$751.52 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted General Fund</td>
<td>$748.18 million</td>
<td>$618.61 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

921 (III.D.8-1 BOT agenda-audit, 12/3/2014); (III.D.8-2 – BFC minutes-audit, 12/3/2014)
912 (III.D.8-3 LACCD Bond Financial Audit, 6/30/2009); (III.D.8-4 LACCD Bond Financial Audit, 6/30/2010); (III.D.8-5 LACCD Bond Financial Audit, 6/30/2011); (III.D.8-6 LACCD Bond Financial Audit, 6/30/2012)
913 (III.D.8-7 LACCD Bond Financial Audit, 6/30/2013); (III.D.8-8 LACCD Bond Financial Audit, 6/30/2014)
914 (III.D.8-9 BOT agenda, 12/3/2014); (III.D.8-10 FMPOC agenda, 11/19/2014); (III.D.8-11 DCOC agenda, 1/302/2015); (III.D.8-12 DCOC agenda, 3/13/2015)
915 (III.D.8-13 BOT agenda, 6/24/2015)
916 (III.D.8-14 DBC Procurement Audits Summary Report, 6/10/2015); (III.D.8-15 Procurement Training 6/25/2015)
917 (III.D.8-16 SAP Business Warehouse Finance Screenshot); (III.D.8-17 SAP Business Warehouse HR Screenshot); (III.D.8-18 SAP Business Warehouse Instructional Screenshot); (III.D.8-19 SAP Business Warehouse Procurement Screenshot); (III.D.8-20 SAP Business Warehouse Time Screenshot)
919 (III.D.8-26 ACCJC letter to District, 7/3/2013)
920 (III.D.8-27 ACCJC letter, 2/7/2014)
921 (III.D.8-23 ACCJC letter, 2/7/2014)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>June 30, 2014</th>
<th>June 30, 2013*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net position</td>
<td>$743.6 million</td>
<td>$700.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted net position</td>
<td>$34.7 million</td>
<td>$19.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted net position</td>
<td>$295.5 million</td>
<td>$238 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current and other assets (not capital)</td>
<td>$906 million</td>
<td>$1.2 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Balances presented as restated due to implementation of GASB Statement No. 65

In December 2014, the District’s bond rating was upgraded by Standard and Poor’s from AA to AA+. Strong fiscal controls, coupled with an improved State economy, have left the District in a healthy financial condition. The District’s financial position and its planning activities to maintain financial stability for the past six years are described in the Executive Summary and Overview sections in the District’s Final Budgets.

The District issued $80 million in Tax Revenue Anticipation (TRANS) notes in 2012-2013 to provide operating cash for working capital expenditures prior to receipt of anticipated tax payments and other revenue. At the end of June 2013, $80 million in principal and $1.275 million in interest was due the next year. As of June 30, 2014, the TRANS debt was paid in entirety. Prior to this, the District had not issued any TRANS debt since 2004. Current cash flow projections do not indicate the District will need to issue any TRANS debt in the near future.

**Reserves**

District reserve levels have increased in recent years. Each year, the District Budget Committee and the Board review reserve levels as part of the planning process to ensure financial stability for the District. Prior to 2012, the District maintained “…a District Contingency Reserve of 5 percent of total unrestricted general fund revenue at the centralized account level, and 1 percent of college revenue base allocation at the college level.”

In FY 2012-2013, the District had increased that to a “…District General Reserve of 5 percent and a Contingency Reserve of 7.5 percent of total unrestricted general fund revenue at the centralized account level, and 1 percent of college revenue base allocation at the college level.”

In the same year, the Board committed to increasing the deferred maintenance reserve fund from 1.5 percent of its annual budget to 2 percent.

Since FY 2013-2014, the District has maintained “…a District General Reserve of six and a half percent (6.5 percent) and a Contingency Reserve of three and a half percent (3.5 percent) of total unrestricted general fund revenue at the centralized account level, and 1 percent of college revenue base allocation at the college level.”

For 2015-2016, the District’s General Reserve is $41.48 million and represents 6.5 percent of the Unrestricted General Fund revenue budget. The District’s Contingency Reserve is $23.42 million and represents 3.5 percent of the Unrestricted General Fund revenue budget.
The District Contingency Reserve is used to “…meet emergency situations or budget adjustments due to any revenue projection shortfalls during the fiscal year.” Use of reserves must be approved by a super-majority of the Board in accordance with Title 5, Section 58307.  

Risk Management

Adequate property and liability insurance protects the District from unexpected costs due to property loss or legal action. The District has property and liability insurance, per occurrence, up to $600 million and $40 million respectively. The District’s “All Risk” property deductible is $25,000 per occurrence, and liability self-insurance retention is $1.5M per occurrence. Trustees are covered by the District’s liability insurance.  

The District is self-insured for up to $750,000 for each workers’ compensation claim, $1 million per employment practices claim, and $1.5 million for each general liability claim. The District maintains workers compensation insurance coverage through USI, with an excess workers compensation policy underwritten by Safety National.  

For the year ending June 30, 2014, the District made total premium payments of approximately $2.9 million for general liability and property claims.  

The Board adopted a policy on liability claims (Board Rule 7313) which requires that “all claims against the District for damages or injuries be reported to the Board of Trustees and administered by either the Office of General Counsel, the Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Human Resources or the Director of Business Services, or their designees, as directed by the Chancellor.”  

A report of pending litigation is made monthly to the Board of Trustees and potential settlement funds are set aside. General Counsel or Risk Management then communicates any settlements approved by the Board of Trustees in writing to the CFO’s office to formally allocate those funds.  

The DBC is charged with developing strategies to maintain financial stability for each of the district’s colleges. The College President, Vice President of Administrative Services, and Academic Senate Vice President serve on the DBC ensuring ELAC is directly involved in decisions that impact it and the other colleges of the LACCD. The ESC maintains adequate insurance, and the ESC and College together maintain adequate reserves to cover the college’s risks.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College and the District meet the Standard.

The District has fully demonstrated its ability to maintain adequate reserves, and continues to raise targeted levels to address future unforeseen needs. There has only been one instance of issuing TRANS debt within the last decade, and the District does not anticipate doing so again in the foreseeable future.
III.D.10

The institution practices effective oversight of finances, including management of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contractual relationships, auxiliary organizations or foundations, and institutional investments and assets.

Evidence

The District practices effective oversight and management of all financial resources. It also continually evaluates and, where needed, improves its oversight of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contracts, foundations, auxiliary organizations and institutional investments and assets. The District has both centralized and decentralized practices to ensure effective oversight.

Centralized District Oversight

Purchasing: The District’s Contracts and Purchasing department procures goods and services not purchased directly by colleges. All contracts are reviewed to ensure they are in the District’s best interest in accordance with Board Rule 7100, as well as District policies and procedures related to procurement.  

Institutional Investments and Assets: The District provides oversight in compliance with Board rules, District asset management policies and procedures, regulations, and any all contractual and funding requirements.

Budget Oversight: In accordance with Board Rule 7600, the Budget and Management Analysis
Unit develops internal budget operational plans and provides guidance to colleges during the budget development process. The District budget calendar is updated and approved by the Board annually, and budget procedures are revised regularly to comply with federal, state, and local laws. The Unit designates a financial liaison for each fund and program at the colleges to safeguard against overspending.  

Financial Aid: The Central Financial Aid Unit 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.  

Specialized Employees: The District has specialized employees who manage categorical, grants, and externally funded programs. Employees in the Specially Funded Program (SFP) classification establish operational policies and procedures for externally funded programs, and ensure compliance with all applicable rules and regulations.  

All grant and externally funded programs also have a dedicated SFP (Specially Funded Program) accountant assigned to fiscal monitoring and oversight.  

Audits: Annual external audits are performed on all special or external funds, including Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) funds, categorical program funding, and capital bond programs (see Standard III.D.5). All special funds are regularly audited and demonstrate the integrity of financial management practices. Expenditures from special funds are made in a manner consistent with the intent and requirements of the funding source.  

Auxiliary Organizations: The District Foundation is the sole auxiliary organization for which the District is directly responsible. In March 2015, the Chancellor created a Senior Director of Foundation position for the District. This position is tasked with strengthening and standardizing foundation operations, procedures and policies; improving compliance with nonprofit regulations; strengthening the District and College Foundation’s infrastructure, and coordinating District-wide advancement efforts.  

Decentralized District Oversight  
Fiscal and Enrollment Management: District fiscal and attendance accounting staff meet with college senior staff on a quarterly basis to review FTES (enrollment) and college fiscal projections, providing a framework for sound college enrollment and financial practices.  

Auxiliary Organizations: All college foundations have operating agreements with the District. Foundations are required to provide regular financial reports, reimburse the District for services, and operate in accordance with State law and District and nonprofit regulations.  

College foundations receive annual external audits as required by law. Any identified deficiencies result in a Corrective Action Plan, which is implemented in a timely fashion. In addition, all LACCD foundations received internal audits in 2013-14, which will continue on a recurring basis. Internal auditors highlighted findings common to all foundations, and recommended corrective actions, which are scheduled to be completed by Fall 2015.  

Student ASO Funds: Finances for Associated Student Organizations (ASOs) are governed by
Board Rules 9200–9300 and Administrative Regulations S-1 to S-7. College Presidents review and approve all proposed ASO expenditures. Beginning in 2014-15, a schedule of internal audits for college ASOs was established by the Internal Audit unit. As the internal audits are completed, outcomes will be completed and reported to the BFC.  

At ELAC, the vice president of Administrative Services reviews the status of all funds, restricted and unrestricted, on a regular basis and report any concerns to the college president. The College Budget Committee receives regular reports of the College’s fiscal status.

The College manages a large number of categorical programs, grants, and auxiliary services in support of the College Mission and strategic plan.

The funding agency, external and internal auditors periodically audit categorical programs, specially funded programs, and auxiliary services. All audit reports are provided to the College President and Vice President of Administrative Services to ensure ongoing compliance and any corrective action where necessary. The college has a history of sound financial stability and fiscal management practices as exhibited by internal and external audits.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College and the District meet the Standard.

The District has a long history of compliance and sound financial management and oversight practices. Both the colleges and the Educational Services Center (ESC) identify and correct deficiencies in internal controls and financial management practices when they are identified. Improved communication and coordination between District staff and the nine colleges will help ensure improved fiscal responsibility and compliance with all rules and regulations.

939 (III.D.10-1 BR 7100); (III.D.10-2 Board agenda, 6/10/15); (III.D.10-3 Business Operations Policy and Procedures PP-04-00, PP-04-01, PP-04-07, PP-04-08, PP-04-09)
941 (III.D.10-6 Board Rule 7600); (III.D.10-7 District Budget Operational Plan Instructions 2015-2016); (III.D.10-8 District Budget Calendar, 2015-2016); (III.D.10-9 College Financial Liaison Contact List, 2015-2016)
943 (III.D.10-11 SFP classifications)
944 (III.D.10-12 SFP Accountant List, June 2015)
945 (III.D.10-13 LACCD Annual Audit, June 30, 2014 and 2013, p. 73-81, 86-90)
946 (III.D.10-14 Senior Director of Foundation job description, 3/24/15); (III.D.10-15 LACCD Foundation Summit, 4/17/15); (III.D.10-16 Presidents’ Council, 6/5/15)
947 (III.D.10-17 Budget Expenditure Projections, 2nd Qtr 2008-09); (III.D.10-18 ELAC2Q RecapPkt, 3/12/15)
948 (III.D.10-19 LACC Foundation Contract, 6/2015)
949 (III.D.10-20 Foundation Internal Audit Summary, 4/23/14); (III.D.10-21 Foundation Corrective Action Plans, 9/17/14)
950 (III.D.10-22 BR 9200-9300); (III.D.10-23 Admin Regs S-1 to S-7); (III.D.10-24 Internal Audit Plan 2014-2015); (III.D.10-25 BFC docs 4/15/15-ASO Audits)
III.D.11

The level of financial resources provides a reasonable expectation of both short-term and long-term financial solvency. When making short-range financial plans, the institution considers its long-range financial priorities to assure financial stability. The institution clearly identifies, plans, and allocates resources for payment of liabilities and future obligations.

Evidence

The District has a well-coordinated and integrated budget planning system that takes into consideration both short-term and long-term financial issues. The District creates comprehensive income and cost projections on a regular basis that are used for budget planning, resulting in a long-standing culture of fiscal responsibility and solvency.

The District maintains financial solvency by ensuring that all obligations are identified with accurate valuations. The District systemically identifies and evaluates its obligations on an annual basis. When needed, third party actuaries are engaged to establish the amounts of obligations. 951

The District has maintained a history of positive net position. As of June 30, 2014, the District’s total net position was $743.6 million, an increase of $43.1 million over June 30, 2013 (see Standard III.D.9).

As of June 30, 2014, the District’s working capital (current assets minus current liability) was $132.9 million, with a cash and cash equivalent balance of $138.6 million. The District’s non-current assets are greater than non-current liabilities. The balance is sufficient to cover all obligations payable by the District including compensated absences, general liability workers’ compensation, and other post-retirement employee benefits. 952

The District uses its existing governance structure to exchange information and seek recommendations from the Board’s Budget and Finance Committee (BFC) in order to ensure budget priorities align with the District’s Strategic Plan’s goals, Board of Trustees’ goals, and the Chancellor’s recommendations. 953

The BFC reviews the five-year forecast of revenues, expenditures and fund balances to inform the District’s next fiscal year’s budget. 954

Similarly, the District Budget Committee (DBC), the Chancellor’s Cabinet, and the Chancellor make budget recommendations to the Board Budget and Finance Committee, prior to adoption of the final budget. 955

The District’s budget planning priorities are informed by the Chancellor’s proposed recommendations, the funding of the District’s reserve policy, the alignment with the District’s Strategic Plan’s goals for restoring access and improving student success and equity, and securing the short-term and long-term financial strength of the District. 956
The District’s final 2015-2016 budget priorities address long-range financial obligations such as meeting the Full-time Faculty Obligation, addressing increases in CalSTRS and CalPERS contribution, expansion of basic skills program delivery, covering salary increases, and ensuring funding is adequately provided for facilities, maintenance, instructional support, and other operation needs.957

In June 2015, the Chancellor recommended that the Board Finance Committee (BFC) approve $3.9 million for the completion and roll-out of the District’s Student Information System (SIS), an essential electronic system that delivers student services and supports teaching and learning and $2.5 million in critical facility infrastructure repair and maintenance at the ESC in the 2015-2016 budget. This $6.5 million investment is in line with District’s Strategic Plan and Board goals which support student success. The Board’s subsequent approval involved consideration for the District’s long-range financial priorities while balancing short- and long-term operational needs.958

The College’s short-range financial decisions are well integrated with long-term financial plans in the areas of facilities maintenance and development, instructional technology, enrollment management, and hiring decisions. The College’s annual budget allocation process is integrated into the Program Review/Annual Update Planning process. Budget requests from departments and units are aligned with the college plans (Strategic Plan, Facilities Master Plan, Educational Master Plan, Technology Master Plan). The College continues to maintain fiscal stability and ensures financial obligations are met.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College and the District meet the Standard.

The District adheres to well-considered reserve and fiscal management policies which are congruent with the District’s Strategic Plan, and ensure financial solvency in the short- and long-term. The proposed 2015-16 budget reflects a $65.43 million projected ending balance.

III.D. 12

The institution plans for and allocates appropriate resources for the payment of liabilities and future obligations, including Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB), compensated
absences, and other employee related obligations. The actuarial plan to determine OPEB is current and prepared as required by appropriate accounting standards.

Evidence

The District takes appropriate and timely action in planning and allocating payment of liabilities and future obligations. It continuously monitors for potential increases in OPEB and other employee-related obligations and takes action accordingly.

Budget planning includes funding of contingency reserves (3.5 percent), general reserves (6.5 percent), and a deferred maintenance reserve (1.5 percent). There are also special reserve set-asides for future obligations; a set aside for 2015-2016 salary increase as well as STRS and PERS contribution increases, and a set-aside for new faculty hires to meet FON obligations (see Standard III.D.11).

The District carefully calculates payment of its short and long-term liabilities. As of June 30, 2014, the District’s total long-term liabilities were $3.8 billion. The majority of this amount was general obligation (G.O.) bonds, but it also included workers’ compensation claims, general liability, compensated absences, and capital lease obligations.

The District calculates debt service requirements based on maturity for its three general obligation bonds. The District has issued various G.O. bonds from the authorization of its three bonds. Each bond issuance has its own debt service payment schedule and is paid and serviced by the County of Los Angeles.

The District regularly reviews and analyzes the impact of OPEB, retirement rate increases, and affordable health care reforms. In July 2013, Aon Hewitt provided the District with an Actuarial Valuation Report for its postretirement health benefits.

In February 2015, the BFC reviewed budget impacts of assumed rate increases over the next seven years for CalSTRS and CalPERS, including annual required contributions based on these assumptions, and reviewed an analysis of the Affordable Health Care program (Cadillac Tax) and its impact on CalPERS health premiums.

In every year to date, the District’s employer contributions to CalSTRS, CalPERS, Cash Balance, and PARS-ARS met the required contribution rate established by law.

The District has taken significant steps to address the issue of its unfunded liability for retiree healthcare. An agreement, approved by the District’s six unions and the Board of Trustees, was negotiated to begin pre-funding a portion of unfunded obligations. In 2008, the Board adopted a resolution to establish an irrevocable trust with CalPERS to pre-fund a portion of plan costs. The District funds the trust at a rate of approximately 1.92 percent of the total full-time salary expenditures of the District. An amount equivalent to the federal Medicare Part D subsidy returned to the District each year will also be directed into the trust fund.

As of March 31, 2015, the District had set aside approximately $57.3 million in an external trust fund and its fair market value for this same period was approximately $77.5 million. In June 2015, the BFC approved the Chancellor’s recommendation to increase the District’s OPEB
contribution as part of its 2015-16 budget (see III.D.11).

The District has allocated appropriate resources for the payment of workers’ compensation. The District is self-insured for up to a maximum of $750,000 for each workers’ compensation claim and $1 million per employment practices claim (see Standard III.D.9).

The balance of all outstanding workers’ compensation is estimated based on information provided by an outside actuarial study performed in 2014. The amount of the outstanding liability as of June 30, 2014 includes estimates of future claim payments for known causes as well as provisions for incurred, but not yet reported, claims and adverse development on known cases which occurred through that date (see Standard III.D.9).

Because the process used in computing claims liability does not necessarily result in an exact amount, liabilities for incurred losses to be settled over a long period of time are reported at their present value using an expected future investment yield assumption of 1.5 percent. The current portion (due within one fiscal year) of the District’s current workers’ compensation liability is $5 million (see Standard III.D.9).

Board Rule 101001.5 limits the accrual of employee vacation leave to no more than 400 hours, which provides a measure of control over employee-related expenses. The District also “…does not provide lump-sum payment for any unused accumulated illness, injury or quarantine allowance to an employee upon separation of service…”

Analysis and Evaluation

The College and the District meet the Standard.

The District’s short-range financial decisions are well integrated with long-term financial plans for facilities and infrastructure development, technology investments, and hiring. Long-term obligations, specifically debt repayment of general obligation bonds arising from the construction program and control of insurance expenses, are effectively managed. Health benefit costs for active employees are fully funded every fiscal year.

III.D.13

On an annual basis, the institution assesses and allocates resources for the repayment of any locally incurred debt instruments that can affect the financial condition of the institution.

Evidence

The District does not currently have any locally incurred debt, nor has it had any during the past thirty years.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College and the District meet the Standard.

III.D.14

All financial resources, including short- and long-term debt instruments (such as bonds and Certificates of Participation), auxiliary activities, fund-raising efforts, and grants, are used with integrity in a manner consistent with the intended purpose of the funding source.

Evidence

The District has numerous rules, regulations, and standing procedures to ensure proper use of funds consistent with their intended purpose. Regulations are updated regularly, and both internal and external audits are conducted on an annual basis, allowing the institution to identify and promptly correct any deficiencies in internal controls and ensure financial resources are well managed and used with integrity and in accordance with their intended purpose.

Board Rules 7608 and 7900 articulate the authority and responsibility of the CEO in overseeing compliance of the District’s financial management and internal control structure with existing Board policy, State and Federal laws and regulations, and generally accepted accounting practices (see Standard III.D.5).

District annual external audits have had unmodified opinions during the past 30 years. External audits include single audits of categorical and specially funded programs as well as all nine Associate Student Organizations (see Standard III.D.5). None of the audits have identified any misuse of financial resources and have confirmed that audited funds were used with integrity in a manner consistent with the intended purpose of the funding (see Standard III.D.5).

The District conducts internal audits throughout the year in order to identify any weaknesses and potential misuse of financial resources. Corrective Action Plans are promptly developed and implemented for any findings or areas of concern (see Standard III.D.5).

Administrative Regulations governing auxiliary organizations’ management of funds, audits, grants, insurance, etc. are detailed in AO-9 through AO-19. Administrative Regulations governing Associated Student Organization funds, accounts, and expenditures are detailed in S-1 through S-7 (see Standard III.D.10). The District’s “Business Office & Accounting Policies and Procedures Manual“ is widely disseminated and followed throughout the District to ensure all financial resources are used with integrity and for their intended purposes (see Standard III.D.8).

The Board reviews and approves issuance of additional general obligation bond funds. The District’s annual external audits for its Bond Program demonstrate that bond expenditures have been used with integrity and for their intended purposes (see Standard III.D.8).
Student loan default rates, revenues and related matters are consistently monitored to ensure compliance with federal regulations. The Central Financial Aid Unit (CFAU) ensures the segregation of duties in a manner consistent with the requirements of Title IV: student eligibility is determined at the college level; fund management is handled by District Financial Aid Accounting; disbursements are made by District Accounts Payable; disbursement record reporting is performed by the CFAU; and reconciliation is performed jointly by the college, CFAU and District Accounting. Individual colleges receive ad hoc program reviews by federal and state agencies. Any findings related to standardized procedures are resolved with the assistance of the CFAU, who then ensures all colleges are also in compliance.

The District has not issued any Certificates of Participation since December 2009.

The financial resources of the College are used with integrity and in a manner consistent with goals and requirements of the funding source. The College maintains ASO accounts and oversees the associated liabilities in the trust accounts. Oversight of the accounts in the ASO is provided by the vice president of Student Services and the Vice President of Administrative Services. Grant and categorical program administration is overseen by the appropriate dean of Academic Affairs or Student Services, the grant’s principal investigator, and the College’s Business Office. All expenditures and activities are managed by the project director and supervising dean to ensure compliance with funding source requirements. Furthermore, external and internal audits serve to monitor compliance with both district and funding agency guidelines. The College follows district policy and procedures for establishing, managing, and monitoring funding sources from outside the district.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College and the District meet the Standard.

Internal and external audits help confirm that the District uses its financial resources with integrity and for their intended uses. The District has not received any modified audit opinions for its financial statements for over twenty years, and has received unqualified opinions for bond performance and financial audits since the inception of its bond program. The District has a strong internal control system and set of policies and procedures that help ensure its financial resources are used with integrity and for their intended purposes.

\[967\] (III.D.14-1 LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/14, p. 82-85); (III.D.14-2 LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/13, p. 83-85); (III.D.14-3 LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/12, p. 74-82); (III.D.14-4 LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/11, p. 72-73); (III.D.14-5 LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/10, p. 70-74); (III.D.14-6 LACCD Financial Audit, 6/30/09, p. 78-81)

\[968\] (III.D.14-7 Administrative Regulations AO-9 to AO-19); (III.D.14-8 Administrative Regulations S-1 to S-7); (III.D.14-9 Business Office & Accounting Policies and Procedures Manual, updated 2/21/12)

\[969\] (III.D.14-10 LACCD Bond Financial Audit, 6/30/14, p. 8-10); (III.D.14-11 LACCD Bond Financial Audit, 6/30/13, p. 8-9); (III.D.14-12 LACCD Bond Financial Audit, 6/30/12, p. 8-10); (III.D.14-13 LACCD Bond Financial Audit, 6/30/11, p. 8-9)
III.D.15

The institution monitors and manages student loan default rates, revenue streams, and assets to ensure compliance with federal requirement, including Title IV of the Higher Education Act, and comes into compliance when the federal government identifies deficiencies.

Evidence

In compliance with the federal requirement, the Financial Aid office educates students with informative documentation, counseling, and workshops. Moreover, the 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 percent to 19.2 percent. 970 While this rate is below the federal requirement, specific strategies have been implemented to address this trend. For example, the “Financial Aid Pathway to Success” workshop was instituted after recognizing that many students were unaware of goal setting, budgeting, and academic tracking. 971

The District Chief Financial Officer handles monitoring and management of revenue streams and assets.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

970 Financial Aid & Scholarship Office: Cohort Default Rate Review Spring 2015, page 2
971 Financial Aid Pathway to Success Workshop Calendar
III.D. 16

Contractual agreements with external entities 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

The College has contractual agreements with external entities for grants, outside agency contracts for personal and professional services, consultant agreements, contracts for informational technology and facilities, and instructional service agreements.

Per the district policy on procurements, all contracts are submitted to the Office of Administrative Services for review. The College procurement staff reviews each contract to ensure it complies with statutory requirements and institutional policies, and contains appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the institution and quality control standards. Typical concerns include risk, termination, standards of conduct, and potential exposure. Following review by the procurement team, the Administrative Services Vice President approves contracts for further review by the District legal counsel before submission to the Board of Trustees for final approval.
All contractual agreements are created to advance the mission and goals of the College. Indeed, there are several instructional service agreements and facility use agreements that maximize community’s access to higher education. For example, the College has a facility use agreement that allows its Jaime Escalante Math Program to teach classes at the KIPP Los Angeles College Preparatory School (Kipp LA Prep) in Boyle Heights.\footnote{Civic Center Use of School Facilities Agreement with KIPP LA, 4500210241, 03/19/2015} These instructional service agreements and facility use agreements are critical to the planning and program review processes of the departments involved as well as the Student Services Office of Outreach and Recruitment.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

\footnote{Procurement Training Manual; Procurement Training Workshop}
STANDARD IV
Leadership and Governance
IV.A.1

Institutional leaders create and encourage innovation leading to institutional excellence. They support administrators, faculty, staff, and students, no matter what their official titles, in taking initiative for improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective planning and implementation.

Evidence

The campus leadership promotes a climate for shared decision making and contributions to innovation in order to empower the students to successfully pursue their academic and career aspirations. Innovation is promoted through several mechanisms, including but not limited to the following:

The most common means for faculty, staff, and administrators to participate in innovation is the Program Review process, which, as mentioned earlier, provides departments and units with an opportunity to pursue new ideas or follow up on best practices. In particular, Perkins Grants proposals from Career Technical Education disciplines support innovation through the elicitation of ideas and the development of work plans based on district, college, and departmental data on applicable core indicators. Interventions, projects, and activities are created and vetted to address these data sets.

The Grants Committee promotes innovation by supporting the campus in its processes of project development, proposal writing, project implementation and reporting (as delineated in its flowchart). Each innovative idea is linked to the College’s goals. Examples of innovation development are the Engineering and Design Linked to Learning Integration and the Title 5 Hispanic Serving Institutions grant. To prepare for the latter, the College’s Resource Development office sponsored two Innovation Forums. A committee distilled ten faculty presentations into the grant proposal. The U.S. Department of Education awarded the College $2.6 million in September 2015. The College will receive an additional $1 million in Title 5 funding from a collaboration grant submitted by Los Angeles Valley College.

Another example of the promotion of innovation is through the First Year Experience (Formerly called First Year Completion) Taskforce initiated in 2012, which resulted in the First Year Completion Program (FCE) that addresses the persistence, retention, and completion of freshmen with fewer than ten units. The goal of FYE is that students complete any required developmental English and math classes, the first transfer level class in these disciplines, and a number of GE/CTE courses to ensure they are successfully launching their academic and career pathways.
More recently, the promotion of innovation has been supported through the College President’s leadership in the development of various taskforces to address needs – whether raised from the campus at large or a constituent committee. When such a need occurs, a college-wide call is made for interested parties to join the taskforces to participate in the discussion and brainstorming sessions. Taskforces were initiated on issues of Transfer, Student Equity, Innovation, and the South Gate Center. The taskforce membership includes students, staff, faculty, and administration. These taskforces had and continue to have widespread participation by the faculty, staff, administration, and students.

The Transfer Taskforce was initiated in spring 2014 with more than 40 volunteers -students, staff, faculty, and administrators--engaged in four key workgroups of Developmental Education, Campus Engagement, Marketing, and Data/Vision Planning. Recommendations were made to increase the Transfer Center’s budget, hire an Instructor Special Assignment (ISA) as a Campus Engagement Coordinator, conduct a Faculty and University Partnership Kick-Off, conduct two Transfer Conferences, and target 2,200 students who had completed English 101 and college level math but seemed to be in a holding pattern to graduate. The taskforce developed implementation plans that included, but were not limited to, providing assistance to students on the university application process and writing personal statements, training a cadre of Student Transfer Ambassadors to conduct classroom presentations, and presenting a Scholars Conference at which students will be able to present their scholarly work to invited educational leaders from the campus community, university partnerships, students, and community members at large.

The Transfer Taskforce met for four months and resulted in the outcomes of increased university partnerships, creation of a Transfer Student Conference Committee, increased participation of staff and faculty on the College’s Transfer Committee, and most recently the positive change in transfer rates to the universities. The CSU transfer rate has increased by twenty-four percent and the UC rate by thirteen percent.

Additional campus wide taskforces are the South Gate Taskforce and the Adult Education/AB86 Taskforce. The South Gate Taskforce was initiated in fall 2014 and established three subgroups: Facilities, Integrated Planning, and Student Services. The campus is excited not only about moving into a larger facility in the future, but also reorganizing the current facility and its operating plan to meet growing needs. The workgroups provided planning charts that included short-term, intermediate, long-term objectives that addressed facility, budget, and staffing. The recommendations have been turned over to an appointed faculty member and vice president for implementation. The Adult Education/AB86 Taskforce was recently initiated in March 2015 and workgroups will soon be formulated.

The Accreditation Steering Committee and Professional Development led the Cultivating Excellence workshops held in February 2014 and fall 2014 focusing on teaching and excellence,
organizational excellence, evidence-based learning, and creating a culture of collaboration. These workshops fostered conversations about improving practices across campus.\textsuperscript{983}

An innovation subcommittee of ESGC, initiated in fall 2014, looked at ways to both support and fund innovative ideas outside of the program review process. This sub-committee created a formal funding process for the campus community to support innovative projects aligned with the College’s Strategic Master Plans (Evidence 13 – Innovation Application and Rubric).\textsuperscript{984} The process for awarding innovation grants will be melded into the Grants Committee preview.

The Associated Student Union (ASU) contributes to the promotion of innovation, decision-making and leadership through its Executive Board\textsuperscript{985} and the ELAC Inter-Club Council\textsuperscript{986} (ICC). The ASU developed a process for student innovation funding through the submission of a funding proposal by student organizations (Clubs\textsuperscript{987}) to the ASU Budgetary Affairs Committee. The ASU Budgetary Committee judges whether the proposal is fiscally responsible, and if so, forwards it to the ASU board for review. The student organization, with the guidance of its staff or faculty advisor, presents its proposal, and the ASU board postpones, amends, or approves it. If approved, the student organization then implements the project. A larger funded ASU project requires a presentation and report back to the ASU. The ASU communicates its decisions and support of student innovations through webpages on the campus website and posting on various ASU information bulletin boards throughout campus. This information is also disseminated at campus events and via ASU officers.

\textbf{Analysis and Evaluation}

The College meets the Standard.

ELAC has multiple venues for allowing innovative ideas to percolate through the system. All constituencies – faculty, staff, administrators and students – are openly invited and encouraged to contribute their perspectives, suggestions, and recommendations for institutional excellence. Student attendance and participation is consistently strong.

The Transfer Taskforce is just one example of an exemplary demonstration of collaboration between the various campus stakeholders. It has set a model of inclusivity and its values of respect, cooperation, and collaboration are evident. The productive workgroups of this taskforce have contributed greatly to increase transfer rates to the universities. The College takes great pride in the increased transfer rates and is committed to continuing improvement through actions projects contained in the Quality Focus Essay.

\textsuperscript{974} Program Review
\textsuperscript{975} Innovation Grant Application
IV.A.2

The institution establishes and implements policy and procedures authorizing administrator, faculty, and staff participation in decision-making processes. The policy makes provisions for student participation and consideration of student views in those matters in which students have a direct and reasonable interest. Policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose committees.
Evidence

ELAC is committed to participatory governance that involves students, staff, faculty, and administrators in decision-making processes. The policy and procedures for decision-making are delineated in the *Governance Policy Handbook*, which clarifies the roles and responsibilities of the constituent groups.

The working relationship among college constituencies—faculty, staff, administrators, and students—is designed to be collegial, cooperative, and collaborative. The *Governance Policy Handbook* states, “The College encourages collegial dialog among all stakeholders that focuses on empowering students to achieve their educational goals. Within shared governance committees, the collaborative process is to work with others in making decisions that are in the best interest of the College instead of one constituency or one individual.”

Participatory Governance

The College follows the AB1725 mandates for participatory governance, the Education Code, Title 5 regulations, collective bargaining agreements, LACCD Board Rule 18200, and its own Shared Governance Agreement.

Participatory governance is promoted through the College’s central governing body, the East Los Angeles College Shared Governance Council (ESGC), and various campus committees that promote the means of achieving the College’s goals.

“The ESGC recommends to the College President on campus decision-making processes and on a variety of policy matters regarding academics, business, and personnel. It vets recommendations from the Strategic Planning Committee, Educational Planning Subcommittee, Facilities Planning Subcommittee, Technology Planning Subcommittee, Program Review and Viability Committee, and Budget Committee. ESGC also receives regular reports from the Associated Student Union, Accreditation Liaison Officer & Faculty Chair of Accreditation, construction project managers, and the Work Environment Committee.”

ESGC ensures the representation and involvement of all groups and constituencies in the development of policies in a participative, objective, and constructive manner. Members include the constituencies of Academic Senate, AFT Faculty Guild, Work Environment Committee, Educational Planning Subcommittee, AFT Staff Guild, Associated Student Union, Buildings and Trades Union, Local 99, Teamsters, SEIU 721 Classified Supervisors, and Vice Presidents of the Academic Affairs, Student Services, and Administrative Services. The Members of ESGC and their constituencies are posted on the ESGC website. Students participate as full voting members on ESGC.
ELAC has developed a *Governance Policy Handbook*, which delineates the shared decision-making processes and committees, with defined policies and procedures that promote widespread participation of administrators, faculty, staff and students. The ESGC committees have bylaws that delineate their purpose, functions, and membership.

The following ESGC sub-committees report regularly to ESGC, include members from various campus perspectives, and allow sufficient participation from their membership.

- The Educational Planning Subcommittee reports on all matters that pertain to the Educational Plan, including review and approval of the completed educational plan, vision, and mission, before it is forwarded to the Board for approval.

- The Technology Planning Subcommittee provides updates on technology issues as well as all matters pertaining to the Technology Master Plan;

- The Budget Committee monitors the college budget to ensure that it supports the College Mission and promotes innovation through innovation requests;

- The Work Environment Committee elicits input from faculty, staff, and administrators to handle issues involving campus space utilization, the work environment, and the Facilities Master Plan;

- The Facilities Planning Subcommittee addresses issues regarding the Facilities Master Plan as well as day-to-day issues in consultation with the Work Environment Committee and representatives of current construction projects on campus.

- The Strategic Planning Committee works with ESGC and the President to give a broad vision for the campus as a whole, with action plans and benchmarks taken from the Educational Planning Subcommittee, Technology Planning Subcommittee, and Facilities Planning Subcommittee.

The College also has numerous committees, subcommittees, and consultation meetings through which members of the campus community (students, staff, faculty, and administrators) can provide input for improvements. Examples of campus-wide opportunities that exist for contribution to institutional excellence include, but are not limited to:

- Town Hall Meetings to discuss selection of College President, financial aid, First Year Completion, and accreditation.
• Chairs’ Meetings, held on a monthly basis, discuss updates, policy development, and provide a forum for discourse.

• The Learning Assessment Committee, including instructional and non-instructional constituencies, participates in setting policy and providing guidance in the student learning outcome process.

• The Student Success Committee engages in formulating goals and timelines to improve campus wide student learning and success. A large number of campus constituencies are participating in this effort.

• The Student Success and Support Program Committee supports the core matriculation services of orientation, assessment, counseling and advising, and development of education plans.

Befitting its position as flagship College of the Los Angeles Community College District, members of the ELAC community are active in district wide participatory governance committees, including the District Budget Committee, the Joint Labor-Management Benefits Committee, the Advisory Council on Student Learning Outcomes, the Equal Employment Opportunity Advisory Committee, the Student Success Initiative Steering Committee, the District Research Committee, the District Planning and Accreditation Committee, and the District-wide Professional Development Committee.

The Academic Senate, which includes representatives from all academic departments, meets on a bimonthly basis to consider academic and professional issues affecting the campus and forwards recommendations to the College President or other 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 related to faculty roles, faculty roles and 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, for example, ESGC, through their representatives from their bargaining units.

In addition to the committee process, ideas, suggestions, and concerns are also discussed at
academic department meetings. Department chairs have two formal avenues for offering recommendations to the college leaders: Chairs’ Committee and Chairs’ Council. The Chairs’ Committee is an administrative body overseen by the vice president of academic affairs to inform the chairs of issues and policies and listen to their feedback. The Chairs’ Council is a Senate-sponsored committee that enables chairs to share and forward departmental concerns to the Chairs’ Committee and the Academic Senate. Department chairs can also—and frequently do—simply call, email, or drop by to see their deans, the vice president, or the president to express concerns or seek guidance.

Administrators participate on the majority of the committees and designate members to chair specific participatory governance committees based on their areas of expertise. In committees in which Teamsters representation is needed, the Teamsters Campus Representative selects the administrator to participate on the committee. Deans also participate in the various campus committees either through appointment or to represent their respective divisions.

**Students**

Board Rule 1800 specifies “students shall be provided an opportunity to participate in formulation and development of district and college policies and procedures that have or will have a ‘significant effect on students.’” Student voices are strongly desired and their valuable contributions are elicited and respected by each of the ESGC Committees. Each participatory governance committee has student representatives appointed by ASU. For example, the ASU president is a voting member of the ESGC and provides a bimonthly report. A student trustee provides an advisory vote for the Board of Trustees.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

ELAC has established and implemented policy and procedures that promote participation from all campus constituencies. These policies make provisions for student participation and consideration of the student perspective when appropriate. Governance policies are documented in the *Governance Policy Handbook*. In the newly revised *Governance Policy Handbook - 4th Edition*, phrasing was added that encourages collegiality among participants. ELAC makes a deliberate effort to create a robust participatory structure in which all voices can be heard.

The President hopes to further a spirit of collaboration and collegiality during a campus wide retreat being planned for spring, 2016. Ongoing efforts to improve communication and cooperation are part of the College’s Action Plans.

---

998 *Governance Policy Handbook* p. 4-5.
IV.A.3

Administrators and faculty, through policy and procedures, have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise.

Evidence

Faculty and administrators have many opportunities to participate in governance and to serve on committees. They also have a substantive voice in institutional policies, planning and budget relative to their areas of responsibility and expertise. These policies and procedures are clarified in the Governance Policy Handbook and the bylaws of the committees.

The Academic Senate and the Faculty Guild promote faculty involvement in governance in a variety of ways that provide voices from faculty’s perspective. The Academic Senate informs faculty about college governance by providing a list of all the campus committees on the college website, along with designated leadership roles and committee meeting days and times. Each year, or when otherwise appropriate, the Senate sends email announcements of vacancies and solicits faculty to serve.

The LACCD & AFT Agreement 2014-2017 emphasizes the importance of faculty representation from the union and Senate on certain participatory governance committees. Committee work is considered part of a contract faculty member’s responsibilities, and faculty evaluations consider performance of responsibilities, which includes committee participation. The LACCD & 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.

For key participatory governance leadership positions--for example, the Academic Senate, Curriculum, Student Success, and Student Learning Outcomes--that require intensive use of time, the College provides reassigned or released time. Faculty, both full time and part time, are always welcome to attend and participate in committee meetings even if not official members of...
Adjunct faculty participate on governance committees in several ways. An adjunct representative has a vote in each of his/her department’s decision-making processes if the adjuncts in the department choose to elect a representative. An adjunct representative serves on the Academic Senate.

In addition to the committee process, faculty participate regularly—though less directly—through department meetings and department committees, where ideas, suggestions, and concerns are shared. Department chairs communicate faculty members’ recommendations to the Chairs’ Committee and Chairs’ Council. Department chairs can also communicate faculty recommendations informally by calling, emailing, or dropping by to see their deans, the vice president, or the president.

The Vice Presidents participate on the majority of the committees and designate other administrators to chair specific participatory governance committees based on their areas of expertise as delineated in the Governance Policy Handbook, which states, “Administrators are included in the general participatory governance process and recommend policies, procedures, and priorities for the College to the president.” In committees in which Teamsters representation is needed, the Teamsters Campus Representative selects the administrator to participate on committee. Deans also participate in the various campus committees either through appointment or to represent their respective division.

Faculty and administrators participate in budgetary decisions by serving on the Budget Committee and ESGC as well as actively participating in program review, annual updates, and departmental budget requests. Department chairs are responsible, in consultation with department members, for submitting annual budget requests based on departmental needs and goals. In the past, department chairs have been directed to prepare departmental needs and goals based on their Program Reviews. In order to improve the linking of budget requests to program review goals, in advance of the budget requests, department chairs are to submit annual updates on their progress toward Program Review goals.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Faculty and administrators have ample opportunity through committee involvement, participation in task forces, and departmental activity to exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relates to their areas of responsibility and expertise. The Academic Senate publishes a list of campus committees and announces openings via email.

Long-established faculty leadership needs to be balanced by the enthusiasm of new perspectives. Thus, in the past year, committees have been recruiting new faculty to serve on shared governance bodies, including the Academic Senate. The College is optimistic this trend will continue.
IV.A.4
Faculty and academic administrators, through policy and procedures, and through well-defined structures, have responsibility for recommendations about curriculum and student learning programs and services.

Evidence
Faculty and academic administrators through policy and procedures and well-defined structures are responsible for curricular and student learning programs and services.

The roles of the faculty and administrators are clearly defined in the Governance Policy Handbook and, even more specifically, in the SLO Philosophy Statement.

Curriculum
The Chair of the Curriculum Committee attends all Senate meetings and brings forward all of the Committee’s actions for final approval by the Academic Senate before sending to the Board of Trustees. The responsibilities of the Curriculum Committee, composed of faculty representatives from department clusters, include reviewing all new curricula prior to approval by the Board of Trustees. The Committee also oversees revision of existing courses and programs. To accomplish these tasks, the committee meets at least three times per month.

Faculty play a vital role in the development and revision of programs and curriculum. New and revised Course Outlines of Record (CORs) are uploaded to the Electronic Curriculum Development System (ECD) and sent out to be vetted by department members as well as respective academic or student services deans prior to being sent to the Curriculum Chair and the Curriculum Committee. The campus Articulation Officer and Curriculum Dean (non-voting) sit on the Curriculum Committee. The Articulation Officer has the crucial role of ensuring proposed new courses and existing course updates align with our transfer partners.

Student Learning and Services
Faculty also play a substantial role on faculty hiring committees, in faculty evaluations, and in departmental program reviews, which directly affect student learning programs and services. In
fact, when departments submit their budget requests, such requests must be linked to the department’s Program Review goals.

Academic and student services administrators serve on all participatory governance bodies as active participants or as information resources.¹⁰¹³

One way faculty and administrators contribute to the learning environment is through the SLO cycle. The Learning Assessment Committee (LAC), chaired by the LAC Coordinator, meets monthly to develop and review policy for the student learning outcomes cycle. Every college unit is encouraged to send one representative to the meetings. The Vice President for Academic Affairs, as well as deans, regularly attends the meeting. The LAC Handbook, *Learning Outcomes Fundamentals for Faculty*¹⁰¹⁴ provides guidelines for the SLO and SSO process. The LAC website states,

“As experts in their discipline, instructors are aware of the latest trends and information that students need to be aware of to be competitive in those areas of study. SLOs provide a great opportunity for instructors to focus their efforts in ensuring that students are learning that which is up-to-date and necessary to be successful.”¹⁰¹⁵

Faculty and administrators contribute to student services through the Student Success and 3SP committees and serving as counselors and leaders of numerous programs. Membership for both the Student Success Committee and 3SP is composed of both faculty and administrators. The goals of these committees support student success by providing exemplary services.¹⁰¹⁶ Other committees on which faculty and administrators play a key role are the Distributive Learning/Distance Education Committee and the Off-Site Committee.

ELAC provides a wide array of student services that are staffed by counselors, faculty on re-assigned time and administrators.¹⁰¹⁷ The faculty play a proactive role in developing outreach strategies with the Financial Aid and Scholarship Office so that a greater number of students receive federal and state financial assistance.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard.

Faculty and administrators play a central role in decision making regarding curriculum and student learning programs and services. Their principal involvement in program review, SLOs, curriculum development, and financial aid are examples of this process. Administration and faculty actively participate in the development and oversight of student support and academic services. Most of these structures are well defined through the *Governance Policy Handbook*, committee bylaws and information on ELAC’s web page. In-person outreach efforts—for
example, tables and flyers art campus entrances—concentrated during the first two weeks of class are designed to make this information nearly impossible to miss; however, there is always room for improvement. The College is committed to ensuring all students are aware of and take advantage of services provided for their benefit.

IV.A.5
Through its system of board and institutional governance, the institution ensures the appropriate consideration of relevant perspectives; decision making aligned with expertise and responsibility; and timely action on institutional plans, policies, curricular change, and other key considerations.

Evidence

Structures from both LACCD and ELAC embed participatory governance that ensure appropriate consideration of relevant perspectives. For example, Board Rule Article XVIII, Section 18102 delineates the role of the faculty senate stating, “The Board of Trustees recognizes and affirms its obligations to consult collegially with the District Academic Senate when adopting policies and procedures on academic and professional matters.” Board Rule 18200 specifies the role of student participation at both the College and district: “Students shall be provided an opportunity to participate in formulation and development of district and college policies and procedures that have or will have a significant effect on students.” These are, of course, simply rules and regulations. However, both the College and district take them seriously and follow them. The District Academic Senate is highly active and influential. Student voices are heard wherever they are to be heard de jure, but also de facto as our students are encouraged to feel empowered by contributing their ideas and perspective to the discussion at hand.

At the campus level, appropriate consideration of relevant perspectives and roles of faculty, staff, and students is clarified in the Governance Policy Handbook. “The College encourages collegial dialog among all stakeholders that focuses on empowering students to achieve their educational goals. Within shared governance committees, the collaborative process is to work with others in making decisions that are in the best interest of the College instead of one
constituency or one individual.” This philosophy is implemented through the committee structures where faculty, staff, students, and administrators participate.

Additionally, widespread perspectives are shared at various taskforce meetings such as those for Transfer, Adult Ed, and Academic Programing at South Gate.

Decision making at ELAC is aligned with expertise and responsibility. The College has formally identified the decision-making entities in the Governance Policy Handbook, which explains the roles of the board of trustees, district chancellor, college president, faculty, classified staff, administrators, and students.

The bylaws of the various committees identify the participation of experts. For example, the Professional Development Committee membership includes the perspectives of faculty, staff, and administrators. Deans are also assigned to oversee programs according to their expertise as evidenced by the revised organizational chart.

ELAC ensures timely action on institutional plans, policies, curricular changes, and other key considerations at various committees that meet regularly. ESGC and the Academic Senate routinely address action items dealing with planning and policies bimonthly. In particular, the Academic Senate reviews curricular changes as a standing item at every meeting. With a campus culture devoted to vigorous participation by all, the shared-governance process itself will make things less efficient than they might be—however, things get done in a timely fashion.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

Processes for participatory governance are well developed. A formal survey among faculty, staff, and administrators in 2013 reveals that faculty and administrators perceive they have sufficient participation in decision-making processes that effectively represent their constituencies. While administrators and, to a lesser extent, faculty believe all constituencies have opportunities for participation, staff clearly does not agree. All shared governance committees have representation from certificated (faculty) and classified staff, which is documented in each committee’s bylaws.

An informal survey collected on July 27, 2015 at ESGC reveals that the shared governance process is a good vehicle for considering various perspectives.

In order to make sure decisions are not unnecessarily delayed by failure to reach a quorum, the President has reviewed committee assignments with his staff to assure more consistent attendance at various meetings, and committee chairs make a point of listing, as part of their
agendas, “future meeting dates” to assure regular attendance. In addition, most active committees have created or revised their bylaws, often focusing on making sure the membership is as appropriate as possible and that dates and times of the meetings are realistic and afford the best opportunity to meet quorums.\textsuperscript{1029}

When the approval process for some policies takes additional time—even when quorums have been achieved—this delay is actually a result of a true, shared governance process and is simply unavoidable.
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IV.A.6

The processes for decision-making and the resulting decisions are documented and widely communicated across the institution.

Evidence

The College maintains an environment of inclusive participatory governance to promote its mission and vision. The College’s structures bring all of the constituent groups together to participate in planning, decision making, and provide leadership for implementation. The processes for decision-making are documented in the Governance Policy Handbook.\textsuperscript{1030} The decision-making processes are widely communicated throughout the College through the handbook’s posting on ELAC’s website.

Resulting decisions are communicated via regularly scheduled committee meetings and minutes posted online, along with “all campus” emails. 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 bulletin (distributed electronically), The Husky Herald.\textsuperscript{1031}

Through the committee self-evaluation process and the launch of the new ELAC website in February 2015, a concerted effort has been made to encourage more committees to post bylaws,
meeting agendas and minutes and other pertinent information online.\textsuperscript{1032}

The Accreditation Steering Committee coordinated the process of eliciting campus-wide input to revise ELAC’s \textit{Governance Policy Handbook}, thereby eliciting a review of the decision-making processes and hence refreshing knowledge of these processes. Handouts regarding the decision-making processes were distributed at 2015 Opening Day.\textsuperscript{1033}

\textbf{Analysis and Evaluation}

The College meets the Standard.

The participatory governance process is a productive element for advancing the greater interests of the College; an equally important aspect is communicating the results of actions and processes and keeping the campus at large informed. Some committees have long been doing this informally. The practice of campus-wide email, in particular, has been effective. However, the campus community, in undertaking this self-evaluation has agreed on the need to maximize regular, up-to-date communication through websites and portals.

\textsuperscript{1030} \texttt{Governance Policy Handbook}
\textsuperscript{1031} \texttt{Husky Herald}
\textsuperscript{1032} \texttt{Committee Self Evaluation Guidelines}
\textsuperscript{1033} \texttt{Accreditation Handouts Opening Day 2015}
IV.A.7

Leadership roles and the institution’s governance and decision-making policies, procedures, and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

Evidence

The Governance Policy Handbook\textsuperscript{1034} establishes the PIE process (Planning, Implementation, Evaluation) whereby evaluation is cyclical and ongoing. Page 17 of the Governance Policy Handbook illustrates the seven-year cycle by which the timeframe for ongoing evaluations is designated. The Governance Policy Handbook is routinely evaluated, and is currently on its fourth edition, approved by ESGC on July 27, 2015. \textsuperscript{1035}

Effective practices of ongoing evaluation occur at several committee levels, including major planning committees such as EPSC, FPSC, and TPSC. Illustrations of ongoing evaluative efforts include:
• The Program Review and Viability Committee annually reviews and revises Annual Update Plan Templates. During the revision process, the PRVC solicits input from the campus community, particularly the Academic Senate and department chairs.  

• The Academic Senate routinely reviews and evaluates policies and practices and shares them via publication on its website. Discussions regarding revisions are documented in Senate minutes. For example:
  o The document Faculty Hiring Policies and Procedures was revised on May 8, 2012.
  o The Academic Freedom and Responsibilities Policy was revised on February 28, 2006.
  o The SLO Sustainability Policy was issued June 3, 2014.

• The Hiring Prioritization Policy is annually reviewed by both the Hiring Prioritization Committee (HPC) and the Academic Senate. Once revised, the application for new probationary positions folds into the revised AUP template.

• The Budget Committee annually reviews and revises the Campus Budget Timeline and processes.

The Accreditation Steering Committee collaborates with the College’s Shared Governance Council (ESGC) and Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement (OIEA) to complete the ELAC Committee Self-Evaluations, which are posted on the website. Webpages for each of the committees are being developed on the College’s website.

The Accreditation Steering Committee guides a campus-wide effort in continuous improvement to engage in self-evaluation and analysis. The Governance Policy Handbook on page 55 states,

“‘The Accreditation Steering Committee verifies the system by which ELAC continually evaluates and improves its operations to achieve institutional effectiveness and ensure student-centered learning and achievement.”

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

The Governance Policy Handbook captures the planning processes at ELAC and widely disseminates the process throughout the college community. Ongoing revisions of the Governance Policy Handbook illustrate the campus commitment to ongoing improvement of its decision-making policies and practices. The process of the Governance Policy Handbook revisions is thoroughly vetted by numerous campus committees including ASU, Academic Senate and ESGC.

In fall 2013, ELAC completed the program review cycle following a newly established process. During the 2013-2014 year, as opposed to previous program review cycles, 100 percent of the programs submitted their self-evaluations on time. Another improvement in the PR process was
the ability for PRVC to collect and review feedback to provide recommendations and commendations for all units by the end of the academic year. While the new PR process improved, the lack of a uniform template for committees in their efforts to conduct the evaluations created some inconsistent ways to provide feedback. Aware of this problem, the PRVC has reviewed ways to improve the process for the upcoming cycle.

In fall 2013, the Accreditation Steering Committee initiated a process for committees to conduct self-evaluation. Between fall 2013 and fall 2014 committee participation in the self-evaluation process increased, and committees posted their evaluations on their websites. However, ELAC is striving for 100 percent participation. Most importantly, the committee self-evaluation process has spurred reflection and dialog regarding previous accomplishments and challenges that enable improvement.

Currently, there is an effort to clarify the SLO process, specifically regarding aspects of policy and decision making, and ensure that all members involved in this process are aware of expectations. An SLO sustainability policy was established in June, 2014. LAC, OIEA, and the Academic Senate held a forum in July 2015 to gain consensus for the development of a policy to address ongoing SLO requirements. The outcome of this effort is to have a policy established by fall 2015. The need for continuous improvement of the SLO process is part of ELAC’s Action Plans.
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IV.B.1
The institutional chief executive officer (CEO) has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution. The CEO provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness.

Evidence
The president is responsible to the chancellor and serves as chief executive officer (CEO) of the College. He plans, develops, and recommends college and district-wide policies in conjunction with senior administrative officers.¹⁰⁴⁶

Overall Responsibility for Planning
The President provides overall leadership and direction to college personnel through strategic planning, goal setting, and evaluation, as well as direction for sound fiscal management. He is responsible for implementing district policies and procedures, the California Education Code, and collective bargaining policies and procedures for well-balanced, high-quality instructional programs and student services at the college level. He is responsible for developing and maintaining an effective program of community outreach and relations for the College and district, and reports to the chancellor on matters of policy and planning.¹⁰⁴⁷

Budgeting
The president plays an active role in the financial stability of the College and effective budget oversight. He works with the Vice President of Administrative Services to review the budgeting process to ensure that appropriate resources support institutional effectiveness. The president and his administrative role in the budgeting process is delineated in the Governance Policy Handbook. The president holds an annual “State of the College” (formerly called, “Budget Forum”) to discuss the goals and budget priorities for the following year each May.¹⁰⁴⁸

Selecting and Developing Personnel
The current president began work in July of 2013, and has provided stable leadership for the College. He is actively involved in hiring processes and in selection of personnel on campus. His role in selecting faculty is delineated in the Faculty Hiring Policies.¹⁰⁴⁹ The president also makes final hiring selection of all administrators, full-time faculty, and key staff personnel.

Assessing Institutional Effectiveness
The President plays a vital role in assessing institutional effectiveness. His most direct method is via weekly meetings with the Dean of Institutional Advancement who oversees the OEIA.¹⁰⁵⁰ An example of presidential oversight of institutional effectiveness would be consistent reporting and updates on enrollment data and coordination with enrollment strategies.¹⁰⁵¹

Analysis and Evaluation
The College meets the Standard.

The new president assumed his role of maintaining the quality of the institution quickly and has moved East Los Angeles College forward in his brief tenure. He understands the need to provide leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, personnel and institutional effectiveness and has made these his priority.

ELAC’s president provides leadership that engenders open communication. Across the campus and at all meetings, various opinions and points of view can be expressed. The president uses the college researcher (Dean of Institutional Advancement) to determine the effectiveness of marketing and outreach, enrollment patterns, and education program effectiveness.

In the 2013 Faculty/Staff Survey, most individuals ranked the president above average, 3.95 on a scale of 5 with administrators ranking the president highest.1052

| The College President provides effective leadership to define goals, develop plans, and establish resource priorities for the College. | 4.47 | 3.89 | 4.00 | 3.98 | 3.94 | 3.54 | 4.00 | 3.95 |

1046 District Governance and Functions Handbook p. 4-5
1047 President’s Job description/Announcement
1049 Faculty Hiring Policies p. 6, 7
1050 Org charts Governance Policy Handbook p. 8-11
1051 Winter 2016 Credit Enrollment
1052 Faculty/Staff Survey 2013

IV. B. 2

The CEO plans, oversees, and evaluates an administrative structure organized and staffed to reflect the institution's purposes, size, and complexity. The CEO delegates authority to administrators and others consistent with their responsibilities, as appropriate.

Evidence

The President plans, oversees and evaluates ELAC’s administration. The president attends biweekly meetings of the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) Board of Trustees to represent the interests of the College and to serve as a resource to the Board. The Chancellor’s Cabinet meets the first Friday of the month. The Cabinet includes the presidents of the nine district colleges and selected district officers.1053

The East Los Angeles Shared Governance Council (ESGC)1054 is an established shared governance committee that includes systemic participation by representatives of all campus constituencies.1055 The shared governance structure is comprised of several committees in which different constituencies are represented. ESGC, which meets biweekly, makes recommendations.
to the president of the College.

The College’s administrative structure continuously adapts as the College changes in size and complexity. Presently the main divisions are the Office of the President, Academic Affairs/Workforce Education, Student Services, and Administrative Services. The three vice presidents represent these divisions. Each division has academic and/or classified managers who are responsible for the day-to-day oversight of academic or service programs. Administrative positions are assigned responsibilities appropriate for the size and purpose of the College. The President has lately added the positions of Public Information Officer, STEM Dean, and two deans to manage the South Gate Center (one specifically as an evening manager).

The president plans, oversees and evaluates a stable administrative structure that is led by Executive Cabinet members who report directly to him. The Performance Evaluation Process for College Vice Presidents articulates the procedures and criteria for regular and effective evaluations of vice presidents including self-reflection, peer review and goal setting. Evaluations for Academic Deans are performed as stipulated in the Contract for California Teamsters Public and Professional and Medical Employees Union. Similarly, Classified Deans Performance Evaluation is elaborated in their contract under Article 11.

The president meets with the vice presidents weekly and with the entire management team monthly. This monthly meeting with his Administrative Council composed of all administrators both certificated and classified. The council provides updates on their respective areas and advises the president on issues affecting the College.

These meetings serve as the primary formal communication forum to discuss relevant issues. The vice presidents annually provide the president with their yearly goals based on the ELAC Strategic Plan and the District Strategic Plan. The president delegates responsibility and authority to carry out activities to achieve the College’s goals and improve institutional effectiveness.

To oversee implementation of the Facilities Master Plan, faculty and staff members join administrators in a monthly Facilities Planning Sub-Committee meeting. The IT Department has also included on each faculty/staff computer an information webpage that includes alerts concerning ongoing college construction projects.

The president meets monthly with the ELAC Foundation. The Foundation is composed of members who represent community businesses and organizations who work on fundraising events to support the College’s Mission for student access and success. The Dean of Resource and Institutional Development assists the president with the Foundation.

A review of professional resumes, performance, and experience reveals that the administrators are highly qualified to perform their responsibilities. The published job announcements clearly state the required training and experience for each position.
Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

The president meets with academic and classified administrators regularly. There is evidence of significant communication within the administrative structure through regular meetings. The president delegates authority to administrators in alignment with their roles at the College.

As college enrollment has grown, additional administrative positions have been added to ensure availability of oversight whenever instruction is taking place. Covering day and evening instruction at two campuses is a challenge that should be mitigated with the arrival of the new South Gate dean.

---

IV.B.3

Through established policies and procedures, the CEO guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by:

- Establishing a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities;
- Ensuring the college sets institutional performance standards for student achievement;
- Ensuring that evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis of external and internal conditions;
- Ensuring that educational planning is integrated with resource planning and allocation to support student achievement and learning;
- Ensuring that the allocation of resources supports and improves learning and achievement; and
- Establishing procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts to achieve the mission of the institution.

Evidence

ELAC’s president guides the improvement of the teaching and learning environment through...
various efforts.

**Collegial process for setting values, goals and priorities**

The role of the president is described in the *Governance Policy Handbook*, which states, “The president has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution. The president provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selection and developing personnel and assessing institutional effectiveness.”

The president establishes a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities through a variety of efforts such as:

- Opening Day remarks
- Regular reports that convey his goals
- Articulation of the President’s goals at the annual, college-wide “State of the College” (formerly known as the Budget Forum)
- The President’s establishment of three taskforce groups illustrating his emphasis on the areas of adult education, long-range planning for the South Gate Center and re-invigorated efforts to increase transfer
- Weekly discussions at the President’s Cabinet meetings, held every Monday, and monthly discussions at the Administrative Council meetings

ELAC sets institutional performance standards that ensure the College uses data for planning in alignment with state and district requirements. The president works closely with OIEA to calculate and monitor various performance indicators, including:

- **Scorecard**
- **Institutional Effectiveness Framework of Indicators**
- **Strategic Planning Goals**
- **Transfer Workforce**

The president receives and reviews reports from OIEA including the annual “Facts in Brief” and quarterly updates. Additionally, the president initiated the formation of taskforces, such as FYC and Transfer, and monitors initiatives emanating from them through a data rich dialog. The president directs OIEA to provide data sets at a variety of meetings to inform planning. Other areas providing data to the president include the Educational Planning Subcommittee, the Strategic Planning Committee, and grants-funded programs, such as GANAS.

A team from ELAC, led by the president, reported to the BOT’s institutional effectiveness committee on February 15, 2015 about progress on college goals as related to district goals.
Linking planning with resource allocation to support student achievement and learning

The East Los Angeles College Strategic Plan serves as the central planning document for the College and contains the College Mission, College Vision, and College Strategic Directions and Values. The Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) is responsible for the development, implementation and evaluation of the Strategic Plan and reports to the ESGC. The Strategic Plan is used to guide the development of the other planning documents.

The President ensures that the allocation of resources supports and improves learning and achievement. He participates in the budgetary process at both the college and district level. He co-chairs the District Budget Committee and serves as the presidential liaison to the BOT Budget Subcommittee. He is an ad hoc member of ELAC’s Budget Committee.

The president’s role in the allocation of resources to support and improve learning and achievement is stated in ELAC’s Budget Committee Bylaws.

“The Budget Committee focuses on budget management by setting broad policies that optimize the financial resources available to meet the goals of the College and reviews how these policies are implemented.”

Establishing overall instructional planning and implementation efforts to achieve the mission of the institution

Planning processes are delineated in the Governance Policy Handbook, as indicated in the chart on page 14. The president’s role was emphasized in the Spring 2015 revision of the Governance Policy Handbook by placing the president at the top of the planning process in the chart, and adding the language, “The president has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution.”

The President presented his State of the College address 2015-16 in May, 2015. The PowerPoint presentation was distributed campus wide and published on OIEA’s website.

ELAC’s president delegates most of the planning process through a well-established planning structure that includes:

- Program Review evaluates programs in relationship to the College Mission and its Strategic Goals and priorities. Through comprehensive Program Review Self-Evaluation and Annual Updates, all departments and units at ELAC are engaged in integrated planning, implementation, and evaluation. Moreover, the College utilizes annual update plans and cluster update plans to guide the allocation of resources, thereby ensuring that planning guides budget decisions.
The Educational Master Plan details all academic and educational planning objectives, including student and administrative service objectives that relate to educational goals. The Educational Planning Subcommittee (EPSC) is responsible for the development, implementation, and evaluation of the Educational Master Plan.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

The president provides ELAC the stability for institutional planning and the setting of values, goals, and priorities to move forward. He interacts with administrators, faculty, classified staff, and students concerning the successes or apparent weaknesses of programs and enrollment goals and concerning the delineation of initiatives that reflect the needs of the student body and the community. The topics of such interactions have included Educational Master Plan development, Annual Plan/Program Review, and Student Learning Outcome workshops and training, data analysis, Facilities Master Plan development, and new program development.

The president develops annual goals and plans for the College in consultation with the multi-constituency participatory governance committees: the Shared Governance Council and the Budget, and Facilities Committees. The goals and plans are reviewed by the representative constituencies at the College and then presented to the Shared Governance Council and Budget Committees. These goals are then reviewed and approved by the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees at the district level to ensure consistency with the District’s mission and goals. Goals are evaluated at the end of each year and used to establish new goals for the coming year. These goals are included in the president’s evaluation.

The President recognizes the need for data to inform the operations, program, and performance of the College. He directs the Dean of Institutional Advancement to collect data that clarifies college performance and the educational needs of the student body.

The College recognizes that the success of previous taskforces under the President’s leadership signal that additional ones would be worthwhile, as the college community works to boost student success in every way possible.

---
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IV.B.4
The CEO has the primary leadership role for accreditation, ensuring that the institution meets or exceeds Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies at all times. Faculty, Staff and Administrative leaders of the institution also have responsibility for assuring compliance with accreditation requirements.

Evidence
The President of East Los Angeles College has the primary responsibility for meeting all accreditation standards including continuous compliance of all Eligibility Requirements and Commission policies. Through the President, faculty, staff and administrators ensure that accreditation standards are met.

The President has consistently stated that Accreditation is one of his most important goals as evidenced in his remarks at Opening Day August 2013, 2014, and 2015. Accreditation is listed as a priority for 2015-6 in the State of the College address in May 2015 (slide #3). He informs the campus of progress related to accreditation through his President’s Report at the ESGC. In his PowerPoint presentation to the Academic Senate, the President also reiterates his goal and support for complete reaffirmation of accreditation in 2016.

The President has convened an accreditation workgroup consisting of key participants in the process to ensure success of the accreditation process. He sent an email March 13, 2015 that outlines campus SLO progress and encourages faculty participation in the SLO process. Consequences for not complying are also indicated.

President Martinez’ active participation with the ACCJC assists him in keeping abreast of ACCJC standards and policies. The President has served on two team visits: In fall 2013 he visited Canada College; and in spring 2014 he chaired the team visit to Moreno Valley College. In addition he serves on ACCJC’s Nominating Committee that selects commissioners.

The District supports the president’s role with accreditation in numerous ways. A District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC) meets monthly to share strategy and best
practices in relation to accreditation. The District publishes an Accreditation Newsletter that communicates the Chancellor and the District Academic Senate roles with accreditation. The Board of Trustees also supports the president’s efforts with accreditation. A special board subcommittee focuses on Institutional Effectiveness including accreditation. In addition, Board rule 6300 provides financial support to each of the colleges in order to meet additional costs of Accreditation.

The President has delegated a dean to act as the Accreditation Liaison Officer and a full-time faculty member to serve as the Accreditation Faculty Chair. The duties of the Accreditation Faculty Chair were delineated in the job description. Specifically the Accreditation faculty Chair “will work collaboratively with the college Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) to lead the accreditation self-evaluation process that requires a thorough examination of the College’s policies and practices with regard to the accreditation standards.” Sufficient reassigned time supports the Accreditation Faculty Chair in her duties.

An Accreditation Steering Committee and an Accreditation Committee of the Whole ensures widespread participation in the accreditation process. ELAC’s Shared Governance Council Academic Senate, Chairs Council, and Educational Planning Subcommittee all provide time on their agendas for continual updates regarding progress with the accreditation self-study and assurance of compliance with all standards.

The Accreditation Liaison Officer is the delegated point person for all contact with the ACCJC. Completion of the midterm report and annual report are channeled through her office.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

East Los Angeles College’s president is dedicated to abiding by all accreditation standards, Eligibility Requirements and Commission policies at all times. The District provides extensive assistance with the accreditation process in multiple ways including providing financial assistance, district coordination through the District Planning and Accreditation Committee, its newsletter, the development of a SharePoint site for the collection of evidence.

The President assists the College with accreditation compliance through appointing the ALO and the Faculty Chair. The President, the ALO and Faculty Chair have each served on accreditation team visits and remain current with Accreditation Standards. Their knowledge of the accreditation process, performance of accreditation duties, adherence to deadlines and efforts to involve and inform the College about accreditation is exemplary.

The faculty’s involvement in the accreditation process is evidenced by the role of ELAC’s Academic Senate. The Senate lists successful reaccreditation as one of its goals for 2014-5 in its
committee self-evaluation, and it is an item on their agenda.

The staff’s role in the accreditation process is ensured through their membership on the accreditation steering committee, as members of various committees including ESGC and through their input in the open forums that reviewed the standards. A special meeting with classified staff and the ALO and Faculty Accreditation Chair that provided input regarding the accreditation process was held in fall 2014 and solicited staff’s involvement in the process.

---
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IV.B.5

The CEO assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies, including effective control of budget and expenditures.

Evidence

The President of East Los Angeles College works closely with the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to insure that all statutes, regulations and governing board policies are implemented and consistent with the institutional mission including control of budget and expenditures.

Board Rule 6500 Article V directs the district office to act as a liaison with the colleges. This policy states, “The Chancellor shall meet with Chancellor’s Cabinet,” consisting of the college presidents and Vice Chancellors.

Board Rule 5300 defines the president’s role broadly to include oversight of statutes, regulations and control of budget.

A series of board rules reflect the commitment of the college president, working through the Chancellor and the district, to ensure compliance of various laws. A sample of such board policies that ensure compliance with state or federal statutes include:

Board Rule 4001 – Legal Counsel. “Office of General Counsel shall be considered a board
support unit and report to the BOT through the chancellor.”

Board Rule 4002 – Contracts with Public Agencies. This rule authorizes the Chancellor to establish the procedures to be followed pertaining to the relationship of the district to federal, state, county and city departments and to inquiries regarding federal and state laws and city and county ordinances.

Board Rule 4004 – Claims for money.

Board Rule 2406 – Outlines request to inspect public record, and procedures for maintaining public records.

Board Rule 6300 – Identifies the role of accreditation and specifies adherence to Title 5, CCR 51016.

Board Rule 101301 – Article XIII outlines adherence to Affirmative Action.

Board Rule 14000 – Chapter XIV outlines LACCD’s guidelines for conflicts of interest in order to comply with the Political Reform Act, Government Code Section 81000.

Board Rule 18109 Chapter XVIII – Shared Governance Policies ensure compliance with Title 5 of Administrative Code of California sections 53200 to 53204. This policy states that the BOT delegates authority to the college president in dealings with the Academic Senate to ensure collegial consultation regarding academic and professional matters (the 10 + 1 items).

The president handles allegations of non-compliance with laws through the district counsel. Examples of discussions of such cases are found in the BOT minutes under closed session. For example, The January 28, 2015 minutes for LACCD BOT meeting discuss compliance with the Ralph M. Brown Act; Public Employees Employment (pursuant to government Code Section 54957); Conference with labor negotiation (pursuant to government Code Section 54957); and Public Employee Discipline/Dismissal/Release/Charges/Complaints (pursuant Government Code Section 54957). Similar legal claims are discussed at each board meeting in closed session.

The budget process at East Los Angeles College is delineated in the Governance Policy Handbook and on the ELAC Budget Committee webpage under Resources. It specifies that the college president controls the budget.

The President leads campus dialog on a variety of laws, especially Adult Education and Student Success. The President has been an active participant with the Adult Education Consortium and created a taskforce at East Los Angeles to address AB 86.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.
The role of the president of East Los Angeles College to ensure compliance of statutes, regulations and governing board policies and effective control of budget and expenditures and to ensure consistency with the mission is multifaceted. Following practices of good leadership, this authority is often a collective voice with participation of many entities.

Reliance on legal counsel is effectively guided through the Board of Trustees, as delegated to the president through the chancellor. A correlation between Board Rules and statutes is evident, and changes in laws are reflected in the updating of Board Rules. Coordination of the president with district counsel in legal matters works to ensure compliance.

The president’s role in ensuring institutional practices align with the College mission is iterative. The college mission and institutional practices both emanate from the president via his goals and decisions, and are carried forward to him through the collection of data and needs via the shared governance process. The ultimate decision making rests with the president; however, a certain tug and pull regarding authority over campus governance exists. Various constituencies often consult with him and present their points of view. The president faces a delicate balance between a healthy reliance on multiple inputs required in collegial consultation and needing to make courageous decisions even if they differ from others.

IV. B. 6

The CEO works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution.

Evidence
The President maintains strong ties with external partners and regularly communicates with community stakeholders to ensure that the College is perceived as accessible to students, and promises positive outcomes for anyone who engages with East Los Angeles College.
External Communication

As mentioned in his 2015 “State of the College,” communication is one of the President’s top priorities. The President oversees external communications through direct supervision of the Public Information Officer, the Graphic Designer, and Web Developer. It is the goal of these and other staff members to ensure that staff, students and external audiences are fully engaged and aware of the College’s programs and services.

The College uses multiple channels to engage the surrounding community, including:

- A website (www.elac.edu) that, in just the month of August 2015, served 200,000 individual users, and had 1.48 million page views. Nearly 28 percent of visitors have clicked through two or more pages to receive information about college events, programs and services.

- Social media platforms, such as Facebook, Twitter and YouTube, reach new audiences and consistently engage a younger, more tech-savvy audience. Because these channels are new, the number of users is small; however, they are growing by 2-3 posts per week, and successful pages reach thousands of viewers. Strategic use of these platforms allows the College to coordinate messages across all major social media channels.

- Print media (fliers, brochures, newsletters, posters, newspaper inserts, etc.) promote the school’s services, events and activities at numerous locations on campus and throughout several communities. Feature stories about the College appear frequently in the Los Angeles Times, La Opinion and San Gabriel Valley newspapers.

- Advertising in Chinese, Spanish and English language outlets helps the College reach new audiences and continue enrollment growth at the beginning of each semester.

Partnerships

The President maintains close contact with local businesses, schools, nonprofits and government agencies. These partnerships lead to expanded services and create new educational and employment opportunities for students. A few examples:

GO EAST L.A. is a partnership between the Presidents of East Los Angeles College and California State University L.A. and Los Angeles Unified School District board member Monica Garcia. These CEOs demonstrated their commitment to a “college attendance culture” in East Los Angeles by touring nearby elementary, middle and high schools several times each year to promote college opportunities in the community.

Univision, the nation’s largest Spanish-language TV network, is one of many local media partners, The President and senior staff members appear regularly on Univision, and the campus has been the site of national programing hosted by anchor Jorge Ramos.

The City of Monterey Park (in which the ELAC campus is located) hosts community events, town halls and workshops on campus to promote education, voting information and civic engagement.
participation. Several city council meetings have been scheduled on the campus. The President’s office is instrumental in scheduling and promoting such events. The President frequently hosts area events, receptions and meetings (several of which he chairs/is a member), including:

- Joint meeting between UCLA and ELAC faculty and staff, Fall 201
- Latino Policy Forum with State Senator (now California Secretary of State) Alex Padilla, Fall 2013
- California School Board Association Regional Conference (San Gabriel area)
- Reception for newly elected LA County Supervisor, Hilda Solis
- Investiture for Los Angeles Community College Chancellor Francisco Rodriguez
- Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities International Education Committee (President is a member.)
- Los Angeles Adult Education Consortium (President serves as Chair.)
- East Los Angeles Foundation Board, which raises money for $315,000 in scholarships annually (President is a voting member.)
- White House Asian-Pacific Initiative on Cyber-security
- Meetings of Executive Latino Leadership Association (ELLA)
- Keck Medical Center’s Dean’s Community Council (President is a member.)

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

The President communicates effectively with various constituencies and communities. A recently hired Public Information Officer has improved internal and external communications, developed college branding, and leveraged new communication channels.

As new buildings are completed and more community events are sponsored on campus, the primary challenge is to avoid becoming overextended. The President envisions an Office of Communications that would provide full support to staff, faculty and administration in accomplishing the College’s mission. With increasing requests to use the College as a venue for concerts, sporting events and film production, the President must monitor community outreach and ensure that the focus is fixed on the College’s educational mission. The need for better internal communication to link students, faculty and staff with various community resources surfaced as a primary concern during accreditation meetings and surveys.

The President, through the Dean of Community Partnership and Student Equity, has initiated numerous new programs of community outreach including ELAC Live, GO ELA, and KinderCamineta. These initiatives have assisted in strong enrollment growth and better student
awareness of academic and student support services as well as the establishment of positive ties with the community.

Cultivating Excellence

GO East LA

Promoting college access and involvement is vital to a successful college life. At ELAC, Student Ambassadors, representing the College and the Outreach Office, go into the community to foster awareness of the importance of obtaining a college education and its economic link to the community. Student Ambassadors make presentations to various civic organizations, visit parks, malls, libraries, and community centers, and invite families to the campus.

One formal approach to this process is Greater Outcomes for Los Angeles (GO ELA), a partnership between the Los Angeles Unified School District, Garfield High School, East Los Angeles College, and Cal State University Los Angeles. GO ELA aims to create a College and Career Pathway of awareness, preparation, retention, completion, and transfer. It started as a community forum to discuss the dismal college access, retention, and degree completion rates in our community.

GO ELA’s first year, which focused on raising awareness, entailed promoting a college-going culture by informing the community and the Garfield HS feeder schools of the importance of completing high school and transitioning to higher education. Historic visits to 20 feeder schools were made by a delegation comprised of the Presidents of ELAC and CSU LA, board members of the school districts, and Student Ambassadors. They met with the students and families and delivering a commitment that the college and university will provide guaranteed admission if they finish their high school and become college ready.
IV.C. 1

The institution has a governing board that has authority over and responsibility for policies to assure the academic quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution.

Eligibility Requirements

Governing Board

The institution has a functioning governing board responsible for the academic quality, institutional integrity, and financial stability of the institution and for ensuring that the institution’s mission is achieved. This board is ultimately responsible for ensuring that the financial resources of the institution are used to provide a sound educational program. Its membership is sufficient in size and composition to fulfill all board responsibilities.

The governing board is an independent policy-making body capable of reflecting constituent and public interest in board activities and decisions. A majority of the board members have no employment, family, ownership, or other personal financial interest in the institution. The board adheres to a conflict of interest policy that assures that those interests are disclosed and that they do not interfere with the impartiality of governing body members or outweigh the greater duty to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the institution.

(Standard IV.C.1, IV.C.4, and IV.C.11)

The Los Angeles Community College District’s Governing Board (Board) was authorized by the California Legislature in 1967, in accordance with Education Code sections 70902 and 72000. The Board consists of seven members elected by voters of the school districts composing the District. The Board of Trustees approves all courses, both for credit and noncredit, as well as degree and certificate programs. The Board, through policy and action, exercises oversight of student success, persistence, retention, and the quality of instruction.1117

Evidence

The Board sets policies and monitors the Colleges’ programs, services, plans for growth and development, and ensures the institution’s mission is achieved through Board Rules, Chancellor Directives, and Administrative Regulations.1118 1119 1120

In addition, the Board establishes rules and regulations related to academic quality and integrity, fiscal integrity and stability, student equity and conduct, and accountability and accreditation. 1121 1122

The Board, through its standing and ad hoc committees, receives and reviews information and sets
policy to ensure the effectiveness of student learning programs and services, as well as the institutions’ financial stability.\textsuperscript{1123}

The Board exercises responsibility for monitoring academic quality, integrity, and effectiveness through (1) the approval of all new courses and programs, (2) regular institutional effectiveness reports, (3) yearly review of offerings to underprepared students, and (4) in-depth policy discussions related to student achievement.\textsuperscript{1124}

The Board receives quarterly financial reports, allowing it to closely monitor the fiscal stability of the District. Board agendas are structured under specific areas: Budget and Finance (BF items), Business Services (BSD items), Human Resources (HRD items), Educational Services (ISD items), Facilities (FPD items), Chancellors Office (CH items) and Personnel Commission (PC items). This structure allows for full information on individual topics to be provided in advance of Board meetings.\textsuperscript{1125}

Analysis and Evaluation

The College and the District meet the Standard and Eligibility Requirement 7.

The LACCD Board of Trustees has authority over, and responsibility for, all aspects of the institution as established in policy and documented in practice. The Board exercises its legal authority and fulfills the responsibilities specified in policy and law. Board agendas are highly detailed and Board members closely monitor all areas of their responsibility, as evidenced in Board meeting calendars, meeting agendas, Board information packets, reports, and minutes.

Board policies governing academic quality are routinely reviewed by designated ESC divisions for compliance and effectiveness and, where needed, updated. The Board routinely reviews student outcomes and, with input from the faculty, student and administrative leadership, sets policy to strengthen institutional effectiveness. The Board receives monthly, quarterly and semi-annual financial information, including enrollment projects and bond construction updates, and acts in accordance with established fiscal policies.

\textsuperscript{1117} (IV.C.1-1 BR 2100)
\textsuperscript{1118} (IV.C.1-2 BR 2300-2303)
\textsuperscript{1119} (IV.C.1-3 Chancellor Directives, 8/3/15)
\textsuperscript{1120} (IV.C.1-4 Administrative Regulations, 8/3/15)
\textsuperscript{1121} (IV.C.1-5 BR 2305-2315)
\textsuperscript{1122} (IV.C.1-6 Add Revisions to 6300)
\textsuperscript{1123} (IV.C.1-7 BR 2604-2607.15)
\textsuperscript{1124} (IV.C.1-8 BOT agenda & minutes for 2/9/11, 3/7/12, 4/3/13, 4/23/14, 1/14/15
\textsuperscript{1125} (IV.C.1-13 BOT agenda & minutes for 11/2/11, 11/7/12, 11/6/13, 5/14/14, 4/15/15)
IV.C.2

The governing board acts as a collective entity. Once the board reaches a decision, all board members act in support of the decision.

The Board of Trustees is a highly engaged entity. Board members bring differing backgrounds and perspectives to their positions. At meetings, they engage in full and vigorous discussion of agenda items and share individual viewpoints. However, once a decision is reached and members have voted, they move forward in a united fashion.

Evidence

The Board’s commitment to act as a unified body is reflected in their Code of Ethical Conduct where Trustees “recognize that governing authority rests with the entire Board, not with me as an individual. I will give appropriate support to all policies and actions taken by the Board at official meetings.”

Consent agenda items are frequently singled out for separate discussion or vote at the request of individual Board members. Once all members have had a chance to make their views known and a vote is taken, the agenda moves forward without further discussion. Examples of decisions where Trustees have held divergent views, yet acted as a collective entity, include approval of Van de Kamp Innovation Center, the approval of the lease for the Harbor College Teacher Preparatory Academy, student expulsions, ratification of lobbying service contracts, and revision to graduation requirements.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College and the District meet the Standard.

Board policies and procedures provide a framework for members’ collective action and guide Board discussion, voting, and behavior during and outside of Board meetings. Board members are able to engage in debate and present multiple perspectives during open discussion but still come to collective decisions and support those decisions once reached. Minutes from Board actions from recent years substantiate this behavior.

---

1126 (IV.C.2-1 Board Rule 2300.10)
1127 (IV.C.2-2 BOT Minutes Consent Items Discussions, 2012-2015)

IV.C.3

The governing board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the CEO of the college and/or the district/system.
The Board follows California Education Code, Board policies, and the District’s Human Resource Guide R-110 in the selection and evaluation of the Chancellor and college presidents.

Evidence

Selection of Chancellor
The hiring of a Chancellor starts with Board action authorizing the Human Resources Division to launch a search. The Board then hires an executive search firm and oversees the Chancellor Selection process.1128 1129

The most recent Chancellor search (2013) illustrates the process. The Board hired an executive search firm, which then convened focus group/town hall meetings at all colleges and the Educational Services Center. During these meetings, employee and student input was solicited to develop a “Chancellor’s Profile” describing the desired qualities and characteristics for a new leader. The Chancellor’s Profile was used to develop a job description and timeline for selection and hiring of the new Chancellor.1130 1131 1132

The Board’s search committee began meeting in August 2013 and began interviewing candidates in October 2013. The Board held closed sessions related to the selection of the Chancellor from October 2013-March 2014. On March 13, 2014, the Board announced its selection of Dr. Francisco Rodriguez. Dr. Rodriquez began his tenure as LACCD Chancellor on June 1, 2014.1133 1134 1135

Evaluation of Chancellor
The Chancellor’s contract includes a provision for an annual evaluation to be conducted by the Board of Trustees. General Counsel is the designated District entity who works with the Board during this process.1136

Chancellor’s Directive 122 Evaluation of the Chancellor indicates that the Board may solicit input from various constituents, typically including the college presidents, District senior staff, the Academic Senate presidents and union representatives. It also states the Chancellor will prepare and submit a written self-evaluation, based upon his or her stated goals.1137 1138

Once submitted, the Board discusses drafts of the evaluation in closed session. When their assessment is complete, the Board meets with the Chancellor and s/he is provided the final, written document. A signed copy of the Chancellor’s evaluation is maintained in the Office of General Counsel.1139

Selection of College Presidents
The Board shares responsibility with the Chancellor for hiring and evaluating the performance of college presidents. Board Rule 10308 specifies the selection procedures, which typically involve national
searches.\textsuperscript{1140}

Board action is required to initiate the presidential search process, directing the Chancellor to begin the process pursuant to Board Rule 10308. Recent Board actions authorizing president searches include Harbor, Southwest and Valley Colleges in June 2014, and West Los Angeles College in June 2015.\textsuperscript{1141 1142}

Per the timeline set by Board action, the Chancellor convenes a Presidential Search Committee comprised of representatives of all stakeholder groups per Board Rule 10308. After consultation with the Board and Presidential Search Committee of the applicable college, the Chancellor oversees the recruitment and advertising plan, which may include the retention of a search firm upon Board approval. The Presidential Search Committee forwards at least three unranked semifinalists to the Chancellor.

After conducting interviews, the Chancellor compiles information from background and reference checks and forwards the names of the finalist(s) to the Board of Trustees for consideration. The Board holds closed Board sessions on presidential selection when interviewing candidates.\textsuperscript{1143}

**Evaluation of College Presidents**

As detailed in Chancellor’s Directive 122, contracts for college presidents include a provision for an annual evaluation conducted by the Chancellor. College presidents complete an annual Presidential Self-Assessment, update their goals for the following year, and meet with the Chancellor to review both documents. In addition, presidents undergo a comprehensive evaluation at least every three years. In this process, the president’s self-evaluation is supplemented by an evaluation committee, which collects input from peers and completes the Presidential Evaluation Data Collection form. The Chancellor then prepares a summary evaluation memo which is shared with the college president.\textsuperscript{1144 1145}

The presidential evaluation process is used to determine salary increases, as well as recommendations to the Board on the renewal of contracts. Corrective action, if needed, can include suspension, reassignment, or resignation.\textsuperscript{1146}

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College and the District meet the Standard.

The Board takes its responsibility for selecting and evaluating the Chancellor very seriously, following a set selection and evaluation process. In turn, the Chancellor is responsible for selecting and evaluating those who directly report to him/her (including college presidents, general counsel, the deputy chancellor and vice chancellors). With the assistance of the Human Resources division, the Chancellor and Board have followed selection and evaluation requirements for its senior administrators.

\textsuperscript{1128} (IV.C.3-1 HR R-110)
IV.C.4

The governing board is an independent, policy-making body that reflects the public interest in the institution’s educational quality. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or political pressure.

Eligibility Requirements

Governing Board

The institution has a functioning governing board responsible for the academic quality, institutional integrity, and financial stability of the institution and for ensuring that the institution’s mission is achieved. This board is ultimately responsible for ensuring that the financial resources of the institution are used to provide a sound educational program. Its membership is sufficient in size and composition to fulfill all board responsibilities.

The governing board is an independent policy-making body capable of reflecting constituent and public interest in board activities and decisions. A majority of the board members have no employment, family, ownership, or other personal financial interest in the institution. The board adheres to a conflict of interest policy that assures that those interests are disclosed and that they do not interfere with the impartiality of governing body members or outweigh the greater duty to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the institution.

*(Standard IV.C.1, IV.C.4, and IV.C.11)*
The Board of Trustees consists of seven members elected for four-year terms by qualified voters of the school districts composing the Los Angeles Community College District. The Board also has a Student Trustee, elected by students for a one-year term. The Student Trustee has an advisory vote on actions other than personnel-related and collective bargaining items.\textsuperscript{1147, 1148}

Evidence

Board rules mandate that the Board act as an independent policy-making body reflecting the public interest. Board policy states that the Board, acting through the Chancellor, or designee, monitors, supports, and opposes local, state and national legislation to “...protect and to promote the interests of the Los Angeles Community College District.”\textsuperscript{1149, 1150}

The Board independently carries out its policy-making role through four standing committees: Budget and Finance, Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success, Legislative and Public Affairs, and Facilities Master Planning and Oversight.\textsuperscript{1151}

The Board forms additional ad hoc committees and subcommittees to investigate and address specific policy issues. They formed the following ad hoc committees during the 2014-15 year: (1) Campus Safety and Emergency Preparedness; (2) Outreach and Recruitment; (3) Environmental Stewardship; and (4) Summer Youth Employment. Two subcommittees were formed during this same period: Campus Safety and Emergency Preparedness. Previous years’ ad hoc committees have included Adult Education and Workforce Development (January 2014), Contractor Debarment (November 2011) and the Personnel Commission (January 2014).\textsuperscript{1152}

The Board maintains its independence as a policy-making body by studying all materials in advance of meetings, being well-informed before engaging in District business, and asking questions and requesting additional information as needed. Before each Board or committee meeting, members receive a Board Letter, detailing all pending actions, follow-up on previous requests, and information related to personnel, litigation, and other confidential matters.\textsuperscript{1153}

Board members engage with local communities across the District. They receive a wide range of input from community and constituent groups by holding meetings at the nine colleges in addition to the District office. This practice helps broaden Board members’ perspectives on colleges’ diversity and the educational quality issues affecting individual colleges. Members of the public have the opportunity to express their perspectives during the public comments section of each Board meeting, when individual agenda items are under consideration, and through direct correspondence with the Board. Such input contributes to the Board’s understanding of the public interest in institutional quality and is taken into consideration during deliberations.\textsuperscript{1154, 1155}
Additionally, members of the public can submit direct inquiries to the Board via the District website and will receive a response coordinated by the Chancellor’s Office.\footnote{1156}

The Board’s role in protecting and promoting the interests of the LACCD is clearly articulated in Board Rules. The Board has historically defended and protected the institution from undue influence or political pressure. For example, the Board heard from numerous constituents who spoke against the Van de Kamp Innovation Center and the discontinuance of LA Pierce College’s Farm contractor during public agenda requests at Board meetings. The Board follows Board Rules in considering these issues, then makes independent decisions based on the best interest of the institution, educational quality, and its students.\footnote{1157 \footnote{1158}}

The Board engages in advocacy efforts on behalf of the District in particular, and community colleges in general, through its legislative advocates in Sacramento and in Washington, DC. Annually, the Board sets its policy and legislative priorities in consultation with the Chancellor, their State legislative consultant, McCallum Group Inc., and federal lobbyist firm, Holland and Knight. The Board regularly discusses and takes action, either in support of or against, state and federal legislation with the potential to affect the District and its students.\footnote{1159} \footnote{1160} \footnote{1161}

Analysis and Evaluation

The College and District meet the Standard and Eligibility Requirement 7.

Board members work together collaboratively to advocate for and defend the interests of the District. Public input on the quality of education and college operations is facilitated through open session comments at Board meetings, and through the Board’s consistent adherence to open meeting laws and principles. The LACCD service area is extremely dense and politically diverse, and members of the public advocate strongly for their respective interests. Regardless, through the years, the Board of Trustees has remained focused on its role as an independent policy-making body and diligently supports the interests of the colleges and District in the face of external pressure.

\footnote{1147} \footnote{1148} \footnote{1149} \footnote{1150} \footnote{1151} \footnote{1152} \footnote{1153} \footnote{1154} \footnote{1155} \footnote{1156} \footnote{1157} \footnote{1158} \footnote{1159} \footnote{1160} \footnote{1161}
IV.C.5

The governing board establishes policies consistent with the district mission to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them. The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity and stability.

The Board sets and updates policies consistent with the District’s mission, and monitors their implementation to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services. Recent Board actions include revising and strengthening rules governing academic probation and disqualification (BR 8200); graduation, General Education and IGETC/CSU requirements (BR 6200); and academic standards, grading and grade symbols (BR 6700). Active faculty participation through the District Academic Senate provides the Board with professional expertise in the area of academic quality.

Evidence

Educational Quality, Integrity and Improvement

The Board’s policies regarding educational programs and academic standards help ensure that the mission of the Los Angeles Community College District is realized in providing “…our students [with] an excellent education that prepares them to transfer to four-year institutions, successfully complete workforce development programs designed to meet local and statewide needs, and pursue opportunities for lifelong learning and civic engagement.”

Chapter VI of LACCD Board Rules (Instruction, Articles I-VIII), establishes academic standards, sets policies for graduation, curriculum development and approval, and sets criteria for program review, viability, and termination. Regulations governing educational programs are implemented as detailed in Section IV of LACCD Administrative Regulations (“E-Regs”) (see Standard IV.C.1).

The Board’s Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success (IESS) Committee “…fulfills an advisory, monitoring and coordinating role regarding accreditation, planning, student success and curriculum matters. The committee’s responsibilities include the coordination of accreditation activities, oversight of District-wide planning processes and all issues affecting student success, academic policies and programmatic changes. Its specific charge is to: 1) Review and approve a coordinated timeline for institutional effectiveness and accreditation planning processes throughout the District; 2) Review and provide feedback on indicators of institutional effectiveness so that common elements, themes, and terms can be identified, reviewed and agreed upon; 3) Monitor college compliance with the Standards of Accreditation of the Association of Community Colleges and Junior Colleges; 4) Monitor existing
planning and evaluation practices relative to student completion initiatives; and 5) Facilitate the review, update and revision of the long-range strategic plan and goals every five years; and 6) Discuss potential new or revised curricular programs and services within the District, and encourage the development of new programs and services as may be appropriate."

The IESS Committee reviews, provides feedback on, and approves reports containing institutional effectiveness and student success indicators. For example, this Committee reviews colleges’ Student Equity Plans, Strategic Plans, and mission statements. Board members are actively engaged in asking for clarification on college reports, presentations, and plans to better their understanding and support of the colleges (see Standard IV.C.8).

Ensuring Resources
The Board ensures colleges have the necessary resources to deliver quality student learning programs and services. Board support is evidenced in budget policies, the budget development calendar, and the tentative and final budgets, which are reviewed and approved after substantial discussion. Allocation formulas are implemented to ensure appropriate distribution of funds are made that are consistent with the District’s and colleges’ mission to support the integrity, quality and improvement of student learning programs and services (see Standard III.D.11).

The Board’s Legislative and Public Affairs Committee monitors legislative initiatives and pending legislation which may affect the District, and advocates for policies which will have a positive impact. The Chancellor and Board members meet regularly with state lawmakers and educational leaders to promote legislation and other initiatives intended to improve student access and secure funding for community colleges and specific programs.

Financial Integrity and Stability
The Board is responsible for the financial integrity and stability of the District. The Budget and Finance Committee (BFC) is a standing committee of the Board whose charge is to review and recommend action on fiscal matters prior to full Board approval. As articulated in Chapter II, Article IV, 2605.11.c, the Committee recommends action on the tentative and full budget; general, internal and financial audits; quarterly financial reports, and bond financing (see Standard III.D.5).

The BFC monitors the financial stability of each college and reviews annual District financial reports as required by Board Rule 7608. The Committee critically reviews and approves monthly enrollment and FTES reports which involve members asking college presidents to elaborate on fiscal fluctuations and enrollment trends. The Committee also sets annual goals that are consistent with their role and mission to maintain financial stability for the District.

Board policy mandates a 10 percent District reserve. Use of contingency reserves is only authorized upon recommendation of the Chancellor, the (Chief Financial Officer (CFO) and the District Budget
Committee, and requires a super-majority vote by the full Board.\textsuperscript{1175, 1176}

The Board approved Fiscal Accountability policies in October 2013. These policies hold each college, and college president, responsible for maintaining fiscal stability. Board members evaluate and authorize college’s requests for financial assistance for fiscal sustainability.\textsuperscript{1177, 1178}

The Board’s Facilities Master Planning and Oversight Committee (FMPOC) oversees the Bond Construction Program. Based on recommendations made in 2012 by both an independent review panel and the ACCJC, the Board embarked on a wide range of activities to strengthen fiscal control of the Program. These actions were subsequently determined by the Commission to have resolved the issues identified in its February 7, 2014 letter to the District.\textsuperscript{1179}

Legal Matters

The Board is apprised of, and assumes responsibility for, all legal matters associated with the operation of the nine campuses and the Educational Services Center. The Board closely monitors legal issues that arise in the District, reviewing them in closed session, and approving decisions during open session as required by law. The District’s Office of General Counsel provides legal counsel to the Board and ensures the District is in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations.\textsuperscript{1180, 1181}

Analysis and Evaluation

The College and the District meet the Standard.

As documented above, the standing policies and practice of the Board of Trustees demonstrates that they assume the ultimate responsibility for policies and decisions affecting educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity and stability of the Los Angeles Community College District. The Board holds college presidents and the Chancellor, publicly accountable for meeting quality assurance standards associated with their educational and strategic planning efforts.

\textsuperscript{1162} (\textsuperscript{IV.C.5-1} Board Rule 2300-2303.16 and 2305)
\textsuperscript{1163} (\textsuperscript{IV.C.5-2} Board Rule 1200)
\textsuperscript{1164} (\textsuperscript{IV.C.5-3} BR Ch. VI, Articles I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII Instruction)
\textsuperscript{1165} (\textsuperscript{IV.C.5-4} Board Rule 2605.11)
\textsuperscript{1166} (\textsuperscript{IV.C.5-5} BR 2314)
\textsuperscript{1167} (\textsuperscript{IV.C.5-6} Board Rule 2305 and 7600-7606)
\textsuperscript{1168} (\textsuperscript{IV.C.5-8} 2015-2016 Final Budget)
\textsuperscript{1169} (\textsuperscript{IV.C.5-9} District Allocation Mechanism amendment, 6/3/12)
\textsuperscript{1170} (\textsuperscript{IV.C.5-10} LPA minutes 2014-2015)
\textsuperscript{1171} (\textsuperscript{IV.C.5-4} BR 2605.11)
\textsuperscript{1172} (\textsuperscript{IV.C.5-11} Board Rule 7608)
\textsuperscript{1173} (\textsuperscript{IV.C.5-12} BFC minutes 11/5/14, 3/11/15 and 5/13/15)
\textsuperscript{1174} (\textsuperscript{IV.C.5-13} BFC agendas 2014-15)
\textsuperscript{1175} (\textsuperscript{IV.C.5-14} 2015-2016 Final Budget, Appendix F, Reserve policy, p. 3)
IV.C.6

The institution or the governing board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board’s size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures.

Chapter VI of LACCD Board Rules delineates all structural and operational matters pertaining to the Board of Trustees. Board rules are published electronically on the District website. The Office of General Counsel also maintains, and makes available to the public, paper (hard) copies of all Board rules and administrative regulations. Board rules are routinely reviewed and updated.

Evidence

Board membership, elections, mandatory orientation and annual retreats, and duties and responsibilities of the governing board are defined in Chapter II of the LACCD Board Rules.1182 1183 1184

Article I – Membership – includes membership, elections, term of office, procedure to fill vacancies, orientation, compensation and absence of both Board members and the Student Trustee.

Article II – Officers – delineates the office of president, vice president, president pro tem, and secretary of the Board.

Article III – Duties of the Board of Trustees - includes powers, values, expectation of ethical conduct and sanctions for failure to adhere thereby; governance, self-evaluation, disposition of District budget, calendar, monuments and donations; acceptance of funds; equity plans, and conferral of degrees.

Article IV – Meetings – Regular, closed session and annual meetings; order of business, votes, agendas and public inquiries; number of votes required by type of action, and processes to change or suspend Board rules.

Article V – Communications to the Board – written and oral communications; public agenda speakers; expectations of behavior at Board meetings and sanctions for violation thereof;

Article VI – Committees of the Board of Trustees – delineates standing, ad hoc, citizens advisory and student affairs committees.

Article VII – Use of Flags - provisions thereof.

Article VIII – Naming of College Facilities – provisions to name or re-name new or existing facilities.

Article IX – General Provisions – including travel on Board business; job candidate travel expenses, and approval of Board rules and administrative regulations.

Article X – Student Trustee Election Procedures – including qualifications, term of office, election, replacement and other authorizations.

Analysis and Evaluation
The College and the District meet the Standard.

The Board publishes bylaws and policies which are publically available, both electronically and on paper. These policies are routinely reviewed and updated by the Office of General Counsel under the supervision of the Chancellor and the Board.

IV.C.7
The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly assesses its policies and bylaws for their effectiveness in fulfilling the college/district/system mission and revises them as necessary.

The Board of Trustees is aware of, and operates in a manner consistent with, its policies and bylaws. The Board is actively engaged in regularly assessing and revising its policies and bylaws for their effectiveness in fulfilling the colleges’ and District’s mission and commitment to educational quality, institutional effectiveness, and student success.

Evidence

In accordance with Board Rules, the Board meets regularly during the academic year. Closed sessions, special, emergency, and annual meetings are held in accordance with related Education and Governance Codes.

As stipulated by Board rule, the Board conducts an annual orientation and training for new members; an annual self-assessment and goal-setting retreat, and an annual review of the Chancellor. Board goals are reviewed and updated annually during the Board’s annual retreat.

The Board of Trustees is responsible for the adoption, amendment or repeal of Board rules in accordance with Board Rule 2418. The process for adoption, or revision, of Board rules and the administrative regulations which support them is outlined in Chancellor’s Directive 70. As the Board’s designee, the Chancellor issues Administrative Regulations. The District adopts other procedures, such as its Business Procedures Manual and Chancellor’s Directives, to establish consistent and effective standards.

The Chancellor, as the Board’s designee, assigns rules and regulations by subject area to members of his/her executive team for the triennial review. Administrative regulations stipulate the process for the cyclical review of all policies and regulations. Regulations are coded by a letter prefix which corresponds to the administrative area and “business owner,” e.g. Educational Regulations (“E-Regs”) and Student Regulations (“S-Regs”) are under the purview of the Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness division.
Under the guidance of the Chancellor, the Office of General Counsel conducts periodic reviews of Board Rules and Administrative Regulations and maintains master review records. The OGC monitors changes to Title 5 as well as State and federal law, and proposes revisions as needed. Changes to Administrative Regulations are prepared by the “business owner,” then consulted per Chancellor’s Directive 70. Formal documentation of the revision is submitted to OGC and subsequently posted on the District website.

During the 2014-15 academic year, the Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE) division reviewed and updated twenty-eight Educational Services regulations.

As noted in item ‘d’ above, designated ESC administrative areas bring proposed Board Rule revisions for review and comment to key District-level councils, committees and stakeholders prior to being noticed on the Board agenda. Board members themselves, or individuals who were not part of the consultation process, have the opportunity to comment or request more information before the rule is finalized. Approved changes are posted on the District website.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College and the District meet the Standard.

Trustees act in accordance with established policies. Board meeting minutes and agendas provide clear evidence of the Board acting in a manner consistent with policies and bylaws. Board rules and administrative regulations are subject to regular review and revision by both District administrative staff and the Office of General Counsel, and are fully vetted through the consultation process. The District recently subscribed to the Community College League of California’s (CCLC) Board Policy and Administrative Procedure Service. The receipt of CCLC notifications on State regulation and policy changes will further strengthen the District’s regular update of Board policies and procedures.

IV.C.8
To ensure the institution is accomplishing its goals for student success, the governing board regularly reviews key indicators of student learning and achievement and institutional plans for improving academic quality.
At set intervals throughout the year, the Board of Trustees reviews, discusses and accepts reports which address the quality of student learning and achievement. The primary, but by no means only, mechanism for such inquiry is the Board’s Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success Committee (IESS).

Evidence

The Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success Committee “fulfills an advisory, monitoring and coordinating role regarding accreditation, planning, student success and curriculum matters” and fulfills its charge to “review and provide feedback on indicators of institutional effectiveness so that common elements, themes, and terms can be identified, reviewed and agreed upon.” Committee reports are received on behalf of the full Board, and the Committee has the authority to request revisions or further information before recommending items to the entire Board for approval. 1198

The Board reviews and approves colleges’ academic quality and institutional plans annually. The Board also participates in an annual review and analysis of the State’s Student Success Scorecard, which reports major indicators of student achievement. It reviews and approves colleges’ Educational and Strategic Master Plans every five years, or sooner if requested by the college. At its recent retreat, the Board reviewed national and District student completion data for the past six years. The Board discussed factors that may contribute to low completion rates and possible goals focusing on improving students’ completion rates across the District. 1199 1200 1201 1202 1203 1204 1205 1206 1207 1208 1209 1210 1211 1212 1213

The Board has taken a special interest in the performance of underprepared students. In June 2014, the Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success Committee (IESS) requested a presentation on the success rates and challenges faced by underprepared student’s districtwide. In addition, the Board was updated on the number of basic skills offerings relative to the number of underprepared students by college. In response, the Board urged that more basic skills sections be offered to support the success of these students. 1214 1215

The Board annually reviews student awards and transfers to four-year colleges and universities. 1216 1217 1218 1219

The Board reviews students’ perspectives on learning outcomes and key indicators of student learning as a part of the District’s biennial Student Survey. The Survey provides an opportunity for students to share their educational experiences and provide feedback to colleges and the District. 1220 1221

In Spring 2015, the Board reviewed and approved college and District-level goals for four State-mandated Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) indicator standards on successful course completion, accreditation status, fund balances, and audit status. 1222

During the approval process, accreditation reports are reviewed, especially with regard to college plans for improvement of student learning outcomes. 1223 1224 1225

In Fall 2015, the Board revised Board Rule 6300 to expressly affirm the District’s commitment to integrated planning in support of institutional effectiveness. 1226
Analysis and Evaluation

The College and the District meet the Standard.

The Board is regularly informed of key indicators of student learning and achievement, both as a whole and through its Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success Committee. Board agendas and minutes provide evidence of regular review, discussion and input regarding student success and plans for improving academic quality.

The Board’s level of engagement, along with knowledge about student learning and achievement, has continued to grow over the years. Board members ask insightful questions and expect honest and thorough responses from the colleges. The Board sets clear expectations for improvement of student learning outcomes.

1198 (IV.C.8-1 BR 2605.11)
1199 (IV.C.8-2 IESS minutes and PPT 6/24/15)
1200 (IV.C.8-3 IESS agenda 12/17/14)
1201 (IV.C.8-4 IESS minutes 11/19/14)
1202 (IV.C.8-5 IESS minutes 9/17/14)
1203 (IV.C.8-6 IESS Min 1/29/14)
1204 (IV.C.8-7 IESS minutes 12/4/13)
1205 (IV.C.8-8 IESS minutes 11/20/13)
1206 (IV.C.8-9 BOT agenda and PPT 9/2/15)
1207 (IV.C.8-10 BOT agenda and DAS Board meeting notes 8/19/15)
1208 (IV.C.8-11 BOT agenda and PPT 5/13/15)
1209 (IV.C.8-12 BOT agenda 4/15/15)
1210 (IV.C.8-13 BOT agenda 3/11/15)
1211 (IV.C.8-14 BOT agenda 1/28/15)
1212 (IV.C.8-15 BOT minutes 8/20/14)
1213 (IV.C.8-16 BOT agenda, CH1, 2/26/14)
1214 (IV.C.8-17 IESS Agenda and Underprepared Students PPT, 6/11/14)
1215 (IV.C.8-18 IESS agenda 1/28/14)
1216 (IV.C.8-19 IESS agenda and minutes 3/26/14)
1217 (IV.C.8-20 District certificate report and degree reports, 3/26/14)
1218 (IV.C.8-21 Certificates Attached to Degrees, Summary by College, 4/29/14)
1219 (IV.C.8-22 2014 Student Survey Question 25 and results)
1220 (IV.C.8-23 IESS minutes & student survey PPT, 5/27/15)
1221 (IV.C.8-24 BOT agenda and PPT, 6/10/15)
1222 (IV.C.8-25 BOT minutes 3/28/13)
1223 (IV.C.8-26 IESS 9/25/13)
1224 (IV.C.8-13 BOT agenda, 3/11/15)
1225 (IV.C.8-27 BOT agenda - TBD)
IV.C.9

The governing board has an ongoing training program for board development, including new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.

The District has a clear process for orienting Board members, which includes an overview of District operations, a review of ethical rules and responsibilities, a briefing on compliance with the Ralph M. Brown and Fair Political Practices acts, a review of the roles of auxiliary organizations and employee organizations, and a discussion about preparing for, and conduct during, Board meetings. The Chancellor, in consultation with the president of the Board, facilitates an annual Board retreat, and schedules regular educational presentations to the Board throughout the year.

Evidence

Board Development

The Board has had a formal orientation policy since 2007. There are also long-standing procedures for the orientation of the Student Trustee. All new Board members are oriented before taking office. Most recently, orientation sessions for new members who began their terms on July 1, 2015 were conducted in June 2015.

Board member orientation also includes an overview of the functions and responsibilities of divisions in the District office. Presentations on accreditation, conflict of interest policy, and California public meeting requirements (Brown Act) are also included in the orientation.

A comprehensive and ongoing Board development program was implemented in 2010. Topics include Trustee roles and responsibilities; policy setting; ethical conduct; accreditation, and developing Board goals and objectives.

In affirmation of their commitment to principles developed during their retreats, the Board revised their Rules to include a statement that Board members should work with the Chancellor to obtain information from staff, and avoid involvement in operational matters. Board rules were further revised to facilitate member training, conference attendance, and educational development.

Trustees are encouraged to expand their knowledge of community college issues, operations, and interests by participating in Community College League of California (CCLC) statewide meetings and other relevant conferences. Trustees also complete the online ACCJC Accreditation Basics training, with new Trustees completing this training within three months after taking office (see Standard IV.C.11).

Continuity of Board Membership

Board Rule Chapter II, Article 1, Section 2103 specifies the process the Board will follow in filling a vacancy which occurs between elections. The procedure ensures continuity of Board membership, as demonstrated. The Board followed the process when it appointed Angela Reddock (2007) to complete Trustee Waxman’s term, who resigned to accept a position outside of the District. The Board again followed this process when it appointed Miguel Santiago (2008) to fill the unexpired term of Trustee.
Warren Furutani, who was elected to another office. More recently, when Trustee Santiago was elected to the State Assembly, the Board determined not to fill his unexpired term, as the length of time between his departure (December 2014) and the next election (March 2015) was allowed by law. The Board subsequently voted to appoint the individual elected to fill the vacant seat, Mike Fong, for the period remaining in the unexpired term (March 2015 to June 2015).

Trustee elections are held on a staggered basis, with members serving four-year terms. An election is held every two years to fill either three or four seats. Three new Board members were elected in March 2015 with terms beginning July 1, 2015. A districtwide student election is held annually to select a student member, who has an advisory vote, in accordance with Board Rule Chapter II Article X.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College and the District meet the Standard.

The Board has a robust and consistent program of orientation as well as ongoing development and self-evaluation. Board members have demonstrated a commitment to fulfilling their policy and oversight role, and a responsibility for ensuring educational quality. The Board had followed policy in ensuring continuity of Board membership when vacancies have occurred. The staggering of Board elections has provided consistency in recent years and incumbents are frequently re-elected to their positions, providing continuity of governance.

1227 (IV.C.9-1 Board Rule 2105)
1228 (IV.C.9-2 Student Trustee Orientation procedures)
1229 (IV.C.9-3 BOT agenda and orientation packet, 6/4/15)
1230 (IV.C.9-4 BOT agenda and orientation packet 6/18/15)
1231 (IV.C.9-5 BOT Agenda, minutes & handouts, 1/20/10)
1232 (IV.C.9-6 BOT Agenda, minutes & handouts 12/10/10-12/11/10)
1233 (IV.C.9-7 BOT Agenda, minutes & handouts, 8/25/11-8/26/11)
1234 (IV.C.9-8 BOT Agenda, minutes & handouts, 4/19/12)
1235 (IV.C.9-9 BOT Agenda and minutes, 9/24/12)
1236 (IV.C.9-10 BOT Agenda and minutes, 11/13/12)
1237 (IV.C.9-11 BOT minutes & Action Improvement Plan, 3/19/13)
1238 (IV.C.9-12 BOT minutes & handouts, 10/22/13)
1239 (IV.C.9-13 BOT Agenda, minutes & handouts, 8/23/14)
1240 (IV.C.9-14 BOT Agenda, minutes & handouts, 12/10/14)
1241 (IV.C.9-15 Board Rule 2300.10-2300.11)
1242 (IV.C.9-16 BOT agenda and minutes, 11/19/14 and 5/13/15)
1243 (IV.C.9-17 ACCJC training certificates from 2012)
1244 (IV.C.9-18 Board Rule 2103)
1245 (IV.C.9-19 BOT minutes 4/11/07)
1246 (IV.C.9-20 BOT Agenda 3/11/15)
1247 (IV.C.9-20 BR 2102)
1248 (IV.C.9-21 BR 21000)
IV.C.10

Board policies and/or bylaws clearly establish a process for board evaluation. The evaluation assesses the board’s effectiveness in promoting and sustaining academic quality and institutional effectiveness. The governing board regularly evaluates its practices and performance, including full participation in board training, and makes public the results. The results are used to improve board performance, academic quality, and institutional effectiveness.

The Board of Trustees consistently adheres to its self-evaluation policies. Board members routinely assess their practices, performance, and effectiveness in promoting and sustaining academic quality and institutional effectiveness. The Board’s self-evaluation informs their goals, plans and training for the upcoming year.

Evidence

In 2007 the Board adopted Board Rule 2301.10, which requires the Board to assess its performance the preceding year, and establish annual goals, and report the results during a public session. Since then, the Board has regularly conducted an annual self-evaluation of its effectiveness in promoting and sustaining academic quality and institutional effectiveness, as well as setting goals which are in alignment with the District Strategic Plan.1249

The Board has regularly sought specialized expertise in conducting their self-evaluation. For the past two years, the Board contracted with Dr. Jose Leyba to assist in ensuring a comprehensive and consistent self-evaluation process, in alignment with ACCJC standards.1250

In May 2015, the Board conducted a leadership and planning session where they reviewed their plans for self-evaluation, along with ACCJC standards on Board leadership and governance, their previous (2014) self-assessment, and their proposed 2015 self-assessment instrument.1251 1252

Also in May 2015, Board members completed individual interviews with the consultant, where they candidly assessed the Board’s effectiveness. The Board’s interview questions were adapted from the Community College League of California’s publication, “Assessing Board Effectiveness.”1253

The Board conducted a facilitated self-evaluation at their June 2015 meeting. Topics included a summary of the Board’s individual interviews, along with a self-assessment of their internal practices and effectiveness in promoting academic quality and institutional effectiveness. The Board also reviewed their progress in light of their 2014-2015 priorities and attainment of their 2013-2014 goals. Their individual self-assessments, group assessment, and data informed their plans for Board improvement and strategic initiatives and goals for 2015-2016 which included a focus on academic quality and institutional effectiveness.1254

The Board conducted a similar self-evaluation process with Dr. Leyba in 2014. Members evaluated their participation in Board training, their role in accreditation, adherence to their policy-making role, and received training on accreditation process and delegation of policy implementation to the CEO/Chancellor. The Board has used qualified consultants in prior years to facilitate their self-evaluation, ensuring that they meet the requirements of the Board Rule and this standard.1255 1256 1257 1258 1259 1260
Analysis and Evaluation

The College and the District meet the Standard.

The Board’s self-evaluation process has facilitated a focus on appropriate roles and responsibilities in the policy-making and accreditation activities of the District; and in helping promote and sustain educational quality, institutional effectiveness, and student success. All Board members regularly participate in training, orientation, goal-setting, and self-evaluation activities, which increased their knowledge of appropriate engagement in policy-making and oversight of student success and educational quality outcomes.

The Board and Chancellor are committed to continuously improve the Board’s self-evaluation process to ensure the District achieves better outcomes in promoting and sustaining academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and student success.

IV.C.11

The governing board upholds a code of ethics and conflict of interest policy, and individual board members adhere to the code. The board has a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code and implements it when necessary. A majority of the board members have no employment, family ownership, or other personal financial interest in the institution. Board member interests are disclosed and do not interfere with the impartiality of governing body members or outweigh the greater duty to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the institution.
The Los Angeles Community College District has clear policies and procedures which govern conflict of interest for Board members as well as employees. Board Rule 14000 spells out the Conflict of Interest Code for the District and the Board. Board members receive an initial orientation before taking office, updates throughout the year, and file a yearly conflict of interest statement.  

Evidence

Board rules articulate a Statement of Ethical Values and Code of Ethical Conduct, along with procedures for sanctioning board members who violate District rules and regulations and State or federal law.

Trustees receive certificates from the California Fair Political Practices Commission for conflict of interest training they complete every two years. Incoming Trustees are also trained on the District’s conflict of interest policy during orientation sessions (see Standard IV.C.9).

The LACCD’s electronic conflict of interest form (California Form 700, Statement of Economic Interests), ensures that there are no conflicts of interest on the Board. The District’s General Counsel is the lead entity responsible for ensuring Trustees complete forms as required. Completed conflict of interest forms are available to any member of the public during normal business hours of the Educational Services Center.

Board members follow the code of ethics and conflict of interest policy by recusing themselves from Board discussion or abstaining from a Board vote where they have a documented conflict.
Analysis and Evaluation

The College and the District meet the Standard and Eligibility Requirement 7.

The Board has a clearly articulated code of ethics and processes for sanctioning behavior that violates that code. Board members are required to electronically file conflict of interest forms, which remain on file in the Office of General Counsel. Board members are fully aware of their responsibilities and, to date, there have been no reported instances of violation by any Trustee or any sanctions discussed or imposed. A majority of the Board members have no employment, family ownership, or other personal financial interest in the institution.

1261 (IV.C.11-1 Board Rule 14000)
1262 (IV.C.11-2 Board Rule 2300.10 – 2300.11)
1263 (IV.C.11-3 Trustee Ethics Certificates, 2013)
1264 (IV.C.11-4 Trustee Ethics Certificates, 2015)
1265 (IV.C.11-5 Trustees Form 700)
1266 (IV.C.11-6 BOT minutes, 12/13/14)

IV.C.12

The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to the CEO to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds the CEO accountable for the operation of the district/system or college, respectively.

The Board of Trustees delegates full authority to the Chancellor, who in turn, has responsibility for oversight of District operations and the autonomy to make decisions without interference. Per Board rule, Trustees specifically agree to participate in the development of District policy and strategies, while respecting the delegation of authority to the Chancellor and Presidents to administer the institution. Trustees pledge to avoid involvement in day-to-day operations.

Evidence

The Board “authorizes the Chancellor to adopt and implement administrative regulations when he/she finds regulations are necessary to implement existing Board Rules and/or a particular policy is needed which does not require specific Board authorization.”

The Board delegates full responsibility to the Chancellor and recognizes “that the Chancellor is the Trustees’ sole employee; [pledging] to work with the Chancellor in gathering any information from staff directly that is not contained in the public record.”

The Board’s delegation of full responsibility and authority to the Chancellor to implement and administer Board policies without Board interference is also evident in the Functional Area maps for the Board and for the Chancellor. The Board and Chancellor review their respective Functional Area maps on a regular basis, and update them as needed.

To avoid any perception of interference, Board member inquiries are referred to the Chancellor and his
designees for response. The Board office documents information requests in a memo to the Deputy Chancellor’s Office, which in turn, enters it into a tracking system. Responses are then provided to all Trustees via the Board letter packet sent one week prior to each Board meeting.  

In accordance with Chancellor’s Directive 122, the Board holds the Chancellor accountable for District operations through his/her job description, performance goals, and annual evaluation (see Standard IV.C.3). The Board works with the Chancellor in setting annual performance goals guided by his/her job description and the District Strategic Plan. Chancellor evaluations have been conducted in accordance with District policies (see Standard IV.C.3).  

Analysis and Evaluation

The College and the District meet the Standard.

In 2012, the ACCJC recommended that Trustees improve their understanding of their policy role and the importance of following official channels of communication through the Chancellor. The Board then commenced a series of trainings (see Standard IV.C.9). In Spring 2013, after a follow-up visit to three LACCD colleges, the visiting team found the District to have fully addressed the recommendation, stating “…the Board of Trustees has provided clear evidence to show its commitment to ensuring that Board members understand their role as policy makers [and] …the importance of using official channels of communication through the Chancellor or assigned designee.”  

The Chancellor and his executive team continue to support the training and focus of the Board on its policy-making role. The Board adheres to existing policies when evaluating the performance of the Chancellor and appropriately holds him, as their sole employee, accountable for all District operations. These practices have effectively empowered the Chancellor to manage the operations of the District and provide a structure by which the Board holds the Chancellor accountable.

IV.C.13

The governing board is informed about the Eligibility Requirements, the Accreditation Standards, Commission policies, accreditation processes, and the college’s accredited status, and supports through policy the college’s efforts to improve and excel. The board participates in evaluation of governing board roles and functions in the accreditation process.
The LACCD Board of Trustees has a strong, and ongoing, focus on accreditation. All Board members are made aware of Eligibility Requirements and accreditation Standards, processes, and requirements. The Board takes an active role in reviewing colleges’ accreditation reports and policy-making to support colleges’ efforts to improve and excel.

Evidence

To ensure that Board members are knowledgeable about the Eligibility Requirements, Commission policies, and all aspects of accreditation, Trustees receive annual training on accreditation, which includes a review of the ACCJC publication Guide to Accreditation for Governing Boards, their role and responsibilities therein, and presentation on the accreditation status for each of the nine colleges. All Board members complete the ACCJC’s online Accreditation Basics training within three months of entering office (see Standard IV.C.9).

The Board has had a consistent focus on accreditation. The Board supports through policy the colleges’ efforts to improve and excel. The Board created an Ad Hoc Committee on Accreditation in December 2013 in acknowledgement of the Board’s goal to have all colleges gain full reaffirmation of accreditation.

In order to engage and support faculty, staff and students at colleges undergoing accreditation, the Ad Hoc Committee on Accreditation visited Mission, Valley and Southwest colleges to meet with their accreditation teams and campus leadership to review and discuss their accreditation status and reporting activities in early 2014. In Fall 2014, the duties of the Ad Hoc Committee were formally incorporated into the charge of the Board’s Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success (IESS) Committee.

During the 2014-2015 academic year, the IESS Committee held special committee meetings at the four colleges that were preparing Follow-Up or Midterm Reports. The IESS committee met with each college’s accreditation team, received a formal presentation on their accreditation report, and discussed accreditation-related issues. This committee has decided to utilize this same process for their review and approval of all colleges’ Self-Evaluation reports in the Fall 2015 semester.

The Board’s focus on accreditation is evident as it is a standing agenda item for the IESS Committee. Formal presentations and updates on colleges’ accreditation status and accreditation activities at the District level have been made regularly. In addition to monthly District-level updates, the Committee reviews and approves all college accreditation reports.

In 2013 and 2014, the Board committed funding to support the colleges and the Educational Services Center (ESC) in their accreditation activities. These funds are dedicated to fund faculty accreditation coordinators, provide college-wide training, and offer technical support to help each college strengthen its accreditation infrastructure.

Each year the Board devotes one meeting to an accreditation update under the direction of the Committee of the Whole (COW). In April 2015, the Committee received an update on Districtwide accreditation activities and benchmarks achieved over the past year. Additionally, the EPIE division gave an accreditation update to the Board in January 2015.
In addition to its IESS committee, the Board reviews and approves all accreditation reports.\textsuperscript{1296}

The Board participates in the evaluation of its roles and functions in the accreditation process during its annual self-evaluation (see Standard IV.C.10). This includes their review and approval of their updated Functional Area map and evaluation of their adherence to the stated roles and responsibilities.\textsuperscript{1297}

Analysis and Evaluation

The College and the District meet the Standard.

Through active oversight by the Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success Committee, Board members have become more engaged in and aware of the accreditation process. Board members receive regular trainings and presentations on accreditation. The Board of Trustees reviews and approves all accreditation reports prior to their submission to the ACCJC. Decisions and discussion of policy frequently reference their impact in helping the colleges meet accreditation standards.

\textsuperscript{1277} \textsuperscript{(IV.C.13-1} BOT Accreditation Training Minutes, 11/3/12\textsuperscript{)}
\textsuperscript{1278} \textsuperscript{(IV.C.13-2} BOT Accreditation Training Minutes, 10/22/13\textsuperscript{)}
\textsuperscript{1279} \textsuperscript{(IV.C.13-3} BOT Accreditation Training Minutes, 12/10/14\textsuperscript{)}
\textsuperscript{1280} \textsuperscript{(IV.C.13-4} Board Rule 6300\textsuperscript{)}
\textsuperscript{1281} \textsuperscript{(IV.C.13-5} BOT minutes, 12/11/13, p. 4\textsuperscript{)}
\textsuperscript{1282} \textsuperscript{(IV.C.13-6} Accreditation Ad Hoc Committee agendas 2014\textsuperscript{)}
\textsuperscript{1283} \textsuperscript{(IV.C.13-7} IESS Minutes, 12/9/14; IESS Minutes, 12/11/14; IESS minutes, 2/2/15\textsuperscript{)}
\textsuperscript{1284} \textsuperscript{(IV.C.13-8} IESS committee agendas for 2013-2015\textsuperscript{)}
\textsuperscript{1285} \textsuperscript{(IV.C.13-9} IESS Accreditation Update PPT, 11/19/14\textsuperscript{)}
\textsuperscript{1286} \textsuperscript{(IV.C.13-10} IESS Accreditation Recap PPT, 2/25/15\textsuperscript{)}
\textsuperscript{1287} \textsuperscript{(IV.C.13-11} IESS Accreditation Update PPT, 3/25/15\textsuperscript{)}
\textsuperscript{1288} \textsuperscript{(IV.C.13-12} IESS Accreditation Update PPT, 4/29/15\textsuperscript{)}
\textsuperscript{1289} \textsuperscript{(IV.C.13-13} IESS Accreditation Update PPT, 6/24/15\textsuperscript{)}
\textsuperscript{1290} \textsuperscript{(IV.C.13-14} IESS committee minutes for 2014-2015\textsuperscript{)}
\textsuperscript{1291} \textsuperscript{(IV.C.13-15} IESS Minutes 8/21/13\textsuperscript{)}
\textsuperscript{1292} \textsuperscript{(IV.C.13-16} BOT minutes, 6/11/14\textsuperscript{)}
\textsuperscript{1293} \textsuperscript{(IV.C.13-17} COW PPT, 4/29/15\textsuperscript{)}
\textsuperscript{1294} \textsuperscript{(IV.C.13-18} BOT Minutes, 8/22/12\textsuperscript{)}
\textsuperscript{1295} \textsuperscript{(IV.C.13-19} BOT Accreditation Update, 1/28/15\textsuperscript{)}
\textsuperscript{1296} \textsuperscript{(IV.C.13-20} BOT Agendas, 3/12/14, 2/11/15 and 3/11/15\textsuperscript{)}
\textsuperscript{1297} \textsuperscript{(IV.C.13-21} BOT Functional Area map, 9/17/15\textsuperscript{)}

IV.D.1

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

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

Evidence

CEO Leadership
The Chancellor demonstrates leadership in setting and communicating expectations for educational excellence and integrity through his participation in various faculty, staff, and student events at the nine colleges and the Educational Services Center. He shares his expectations for educational excellence and integrity through his columns in two District quarterly newsletters: Synergy and Accreditation 2016. Both newsletters are disseminated to District employees through email, posted on the District’s website and distributed at campus and District meetings. The Chancellor’s newsletter columns focus on his vision and expectations for educational excellence and integrity, support for effective college operations, and his expectation for all employees to engage in and support District and college accreditation activities.1298 1299

The Chancellor exhibits leadership at his regular monthly meetings with both the Chancellor’s Cabinet (senior District administrators and college presidents), as well as the Presidents Council, where he communicates his expectations, reviews and discusses roles, authority, and responsibility between colleges and the District, and assures support for the effective operation of the colleges. In general, Cabinet meetings address operational effectiveness and alignment between the District office and the colleges, while the Presidents Council focuses on overall District policy and direction and specific college needs and support.1300 1301

The Chancellor conducts regular retreats with the Cabinet to facilitate collaboration, foster leadership, and instill team building and mutual support. These retreats also provide the Chancellor with a forum to clearly communicate his expectations of educational excellence and integrity with his executive staff and college presidents.1302

The Chancellor communicates his expectations of educational excellence and integrity during the selection and evaluation process for college presidents. The Chancellor holds presidents to clearly articulated standards for student success, educational excellence, and financial sustainability. He emphasizes educational excellence and integrity in their annual evaluations, goal-setting for the upcoming year, and review of their self-evaluations (see Standard IV.D.4). The Chancellor assures support for effective operation of the colleges when meeting individually with each college president on a regular basis to discuss progress on their annual goals and any concerns, needs, and opportunities for their individual campus.1303

The Chancellor communicates his expectations for educational excellence and integrity with faculty through regular consultation with the 10-member Executive Committee of the District Academic Senate (DAS). Meetings address academic and professional matters, including policy development, student preparation and success, District and college governance structures, and faculty professional development activities. The Chancellor also addresses educational excellence, integrity and support for college operations with faculty, staff and administrators through consistent attendance at Academic Senate’s annual summits.1304 1305 1306
The Chancellor assures support for the effective operation of the colleges through his annual Budget
Recommendations to the District Budget Committee and the Board of Trustees. His most recent actions
ensured the distribution of $57.67M from the State Mandate Reimbursement Fund and alignment of
expenditures with the District’s Strategic Plan goals.1307 1308

In instances of presidential vacancies, the Chancellor meets with college faculty and staff leadership to
discuss interim president options. Most recently, he met with West Los Angeles College leadership and
accepted their recommendation for interim president, prioritizing college stability and support for
effective operations in his decision-making process.1309

Clear Roles, Authority and Responsibility
The Los Angeles Community College District participated in the ACCJC’s multi-college pilot program
in 1999, and has continuously worked since that time to ensure compliance with this standard. In 2009,
ACCJC visiting teams agreed that the District made great strides in developing a functional map that
delineates college and district roles, and encouraged it to further “…develop and implement methods for
the evaluation of role delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes for the
college and the district [as well as] widely communicate the results of the evaluation and use those
results as the basis for improvement.” In response, the District renewed its dedication to, and focuses on,
these activities.1310

In October 2008, the Board of Trustees approved the first District/college Functional Area maps, which
clarified the structure of District administrative offices and their relationship to the colleges, aligned
District administrative functions with accreditation standards, and specified outcome measures
appropriate to each function identified.1311

In March 2010, the Board of Trustees approved an initial Governance and Functions Handbook, which
expanded upon the previous District/College Functional Area maps to more clearly define District and
college responsibilities and authority along accreditation standards. This was the culmination of a two-
year project led by the District Planning Committee (DPC), which engaged faculty, staff, administrators
and student leaders in this update. During this process, all administrative units in the Educational
Service Center (ESC) updated their earlier functional descriptions and outcomes. Over 50 Districtwide
council and committee descriptions were also updated to a uniform standard. Functional Area maps
were expanded to clarify policy formulation processes, roles and responsibilities of stakeholder groups,
and the handbook evaluation process was defined.1312 1313 1314

In 2013, the 2010 Governance Handbook underwent an internal review by the Educational Programs
and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE) division to ensure it matched current processes, organizational
charts, and personnel. As of August 2015, the Handbook is being updated under the guidance of the
District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC) and the EPIE division.1315

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

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

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

Analysis and Evaluation

The College and the District meet the Standard.

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

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

Update of the District’s Governance and Functions Handbook as part of the District’s regular review and planning cycle, will further strengthen its usefulness in providing clear roles, responsibilities, and authority for employees and stakeholders across the District.
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IV.D.2

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

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

Evidence

In 1998, the Board of Trustees adopted a policy of partial administrative decentralization. Colleges were given autonomy and authority for local decision-making to streamline administrative processes, encourage innovation, and hold college decision-makers more accountable to the local communities they serve. Since that time, the District has continued to review and evaluate the delineation of responsibilities between the colleges and the Educational Services Center.

Delineation of Responsibilities and Functions

Functional Area maps detail the division of responsibilities and functions between the colleges and the Educational Services Center (ESC), as well as Districtwide decision-making and planning (see Standard IV.D.1). The District developed its first functional maps in 2008, and they have been widely communicated and regularly updated since that time. In Fall 2014, the Chancellor directed all ESC units to review and update their Functional Area maps to accurately reflect current processes, roles, and responsibilities as part of a comprehensive program review process (see Standard IV.D.1). Revised maps are currently under review by all colleges, the Executive Administrative Councils, and major stakeholders across the District. The Chancellor engages the college presidents and the cabinet in the discussion and review of the Functional Area maps. The Functional Area maps will be finalized in Fall 2015.
Effective and Adequate District Services
The Chancellor directs the Educational Services Center staff to ensure the delivery of effective and adequate District services to support the colleges’ missions. Services are organized into the following units: (1) Office of the Deputy Chancellor; (2) Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness; (3) Economic and Workforce Development; (4) Chief Financial Officer/Treasurer; (5) Facilities Planning and Development; (6) Human Resources; (7) Office of the General Counsel; and (8) the Personnel Commission.

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

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

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

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

Facilities Planning and Development is responsible for the long-term planning, management, and oversight of capital improvement and bond projects, as well as for working collaboratively with college administrators to identify creative, cost-effective solutions to facility challenges.

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

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

The Personnel Commission is responsible for establishing and maintaining a job and salary classification plan for the classified service; administering examinations and establishing eligibility lists, and conducting appeal hearings on administrative actions, including demotions, suspensions, and dismissals.
Evaluation of District Services
Beginning in 2008, each ESC service area unit evaluated its own District Office Service Outcomes (DOSOs) as part of unit planning. In Fall 2014, the Chancellor directed the Educational Services Center to implement a comprehensive program review to expand DOSOs into a data driven evaluation process in support of the colleges. Each unit participated in a series of workshops on conducting a program review, led by an external consultant. Units identified and documented their core services, then created projected outcomes. Resulting Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) were based on Districtwide needs and priorities, with clear links to district-level goals. The program review process requires each unit to consider its main contributions to the colleges’ missions, goals, effectiveness, and/or student achievement or learning. Simultaneously, the ESC moved towards adopting an online program review system, currently in use at two of the District’s colleges.

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

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

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

Analysis and Evaluation

The College and the District meet the Standard.

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

The District continues to evaluate its resource allocation and financial accountability policies to ensure colleges receive adequate support and are able to meet accreditation standards related to financial resources and stability.
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IV.D.3

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

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

Evidence

Allocation and Reallocation of Resources
The District Budget Committee (DBC) provides leadership on District-level budget policies. Membership includes all nine college presidents, the District Academic Senate, and collective bargaining unit representatives. Its charge is to: (1) formulate recommendations to the Chancellor for budget planning policies consistent with the District Strategic Plan; (2) review the District budget and make recommendations to the Chancellor, and (3) review quarterly District financial conditions.\(^{1337}\)

In 2007, the District instituted a budget allocation policy which paralleled the SB 361 State budget formula. Funds are distributed to the colleges on a credit and noncredit FTES basis, with an assessment to pay for centralized accounts, District services, and set-aside for contingency reserves. In an attempt at parity, districtwide assessments were changed from a percentage of college revenue, to a cost per FTES basis, and the small colleges (Harbor, Mission, Southwest and West) received a differential to offset their proportionately-higher operational expenses.\(^{1338}\)
In 2008, the Fiscal Policy and Review Committee (FPRC) was created to address ongoing college budget difficulties and to consider new approaches for improving their fiscal stability. The FPRC and the DBC reviewed their roles and, in Spring 2011, the FPRC was renamed the Executive Committee of the DBC (ECDBC). The charges for both committees were revised to ensure that budget planning policies were consistent with the District Strategic Plan.\textsuperscript{1339}

Also in 2011, the District undertook a full review of its budget allocation formula and policies, including base allocations, use of ending balances, assessments for District operations, growth targets, and college deficit repayment. A review of other multi-college district budget models and policies was also conducted. The resulting recommendations were to adopt a model with a minimum base funding. The model had two phases: Phase I increased colleges’ basic allocation to include minimum administrative staffing and maintenance and operations (M&O) costs. Phase II called for further study in the areas of identifying college needs (including M&O), providing funding for colleges to deliver equitable access for students, and ensuring colleges are provided with sufficient funding to maintain quality instruction and student services.\textsuperscript{1340}

The Board of Trustees adopted an updated Budget Allocation policy on June 13, 2012. An evaluation of the policy was completed in late 2014, and additional policy recommendations were forwarded.\textsuperscript{1341, 1342}

The Board adopted new District Financial Accountability policies on October 9, 2013 to ensure colleges operate efficiently. These policies called for early identification and resolution of operating deficits required each college to set aside a one percent reserve, and tied college presidents’ performance and evaluation to college budgeting and spending. The Board’s Budget and Finance Committee regularly monitors colleges’ costs per FTES and deficits.\textsuperscript{1343, 1344}

The District’s adherence to the State-recommended minimum 5 percent reserve has ensured its continued fiscal sustainability. In June 2012, the Board’s Finance and Audit Committee (now known as the Budget and Finance Committee) directed the CFO to set aside a 5 percent general reserve and an additional 5 percent contingency reserve to ensure ongoing District and college operational support.\textsuperscript{1345}

Effective Control Mechanisms

The District has established effective policies and mechanisms to control expenditures. Each month, enrollment updates and college monthly projections are reported (see Standard IV.D.1). The Chancellor and college presidents work together in effectively managing cash flow, income and expenditures responsibly to maintain fiscal stability.\textsuperscript{1346}

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

The District provides comprehensive budget and financial oversight, including an annual finance and budget report (CCFS-311), a final budget, an annual financial audit, a bond financial audit report, a performance audit of bond construction programs, year-end balance and open order reports, full-time Faculty Obligation Number (FON) reports and targets, enrollment projections, and year-to-year comparisons with enrollment targets (see Standard III.D.5).
Each college president is responsible for the management of his or her college’s budget and ensures appropriate processes for budget development and effective utilization of financial resources in support of his/her college’s mission (see Standard IV.D.2).  

Analysis and Evaluation

The College and the District meet the Standard.

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

[References]

IV.D.4

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

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

Evidence

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

The framework for CEO accountability is established through annual goal-setting between the
Chancellor and each college president. College presidents then complete a yearly self-evaluation based on their established goals. At least every three years (or sooner if requested), presidents undergo a comprehensive evaluation, which includes an evaluation committee, peer input, and, if needed, recommendations for improvement. Unsatisfactory evaluations may result in suspension, reassignment, or dismissal. Evaluations are reviewed with the Board of Trustees in closed session.1349 1350

In October 2013, the Board adopted fiscal accountability measures which explicitly hold college presidents responsible to the Chancellor for their budgets, ensuring that they maintain “a balanced budget, as well as the efficient and effective utilization of financial resources.” These measures also require that the Chancellor “…review the college’s fiscal affairs and enrollment management practices as part of the college president’s annual performance evaluation…[and] report to the Board of Trustees any significant deficiencies and take corrective measures to resolve the deficiencies up to and including the possible reassignment or non-renewal of the college president’s contract.”1351

The role of the Chancellor, as well as that of the presidents and the levels of authority within, is clearly delineated in the LACCD Functional Area maps, which explicitly state “...the Chancellor bears responsibility and is fully accountable for all operations, programs, and services provided in the name of the district...The Chancellor delegates appropriate authority to the college presidents and holds them accountable for the operations and programs offered at District colleges.” Functional Area maps are regularly reviewed and updated, and published in the Governance and Functions Handbook and on the District website.1352

Analysis and Evaluation

The College and the District meet the Standard.

The Chancellor delegates full authority and responsibility to the college presidents to implement District policies without interference. College presidents serve as the chief executives and educational leaders of their respective colleges. They ensure the quality and integrity of programs and services, accreditation status, and fiscal sustainability of their colleges.
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IV.D.5

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

College strategic plans are integrated with the District Strategic Plan (DSP), Vision 2017, through alignment of goals between the two. Colleges develop goals for their strategic and educational master plans during their internal planning process, and reconcile alignment with the District Strategic Plan on an annual basis. The structure of the DSP allows colleges to maintain autonomy and responsibility for
implementing the goals and objectives of the District plan, based on their local conditions and institutional priorities.\textsuperscript{1353}

Evidence

**District Strategic Plan, Planning Integration**

LACCD has established district-level integrated processes for strategic, financial, facilities and technology planning. These processes provide a coherent framework for district-college planning integration with the goal of promoting student learning and achievement. The District’s Integrated Planning Manual is currently being updated by the District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC) and the District’s Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE) division and will be reviewed and approved by the colleges and Board of Trustees in Fall 2015.\textsuperscript{1354}

DSP measures were developed for each college, and the District as a whole, to create a uniform methodology and data sources. Colleges compare their progress against the District as a whole using the most recent three year timeframe as the point of reference. Colleges assess progress and establish targets to advance both local and District objectives. Colleges’ annual assessments are reported to the Board of Trustees using a standard format, allowing for an apples-to-apples Districtwide discussion.\textsuperscript{1355} \textsuperscript{1356}

College institutional effectiveness reports inform the Board of Trustees on the advancement of District goals which, in turn, informs the Board’s annual goal setting process and shapes future college and District planning priorities. The District Strategic Plan is reviewed at the mid-point of the planning cycle, and a final review is conducted in the last year of the cycle.\textsuperscript{1357} \textsuperscript{1358} \textsuperscript{1359}

The District Technology Plan created a framework of goals and a set of actions to guide Districtwide technology planning. The District Technology Implementation Plan established measures and prioritized deployment of technology solutions in consideration of available resources. The District Technology Plan promotes the integration of technology planning across the colleges by establishing a common framework for college technology planning.\textsuperscript{1360} \textsuperscript{1361}

District-college integration also occurs during operational planning for districtwide initiatives. Examples include joint marketing and recruitment activities, implementation of the Student Success and Support Program, Student Equity Plans, and the new student information system. These initiatives involve extensive college-district collaboration, coordination with centralized District service units, and interaction with an array of District-level committees.\textsuperscript{1362} \textsuperscript{1363} \textsuperscript{1364} \textsuperscript{1365}

Planning is integrated with resource allocation at the District level through annual enrollment growth planning and the budget review process. The individual colleges, and the District as a whole, develop enrollment growth and budget projections and confer on a quarterly basis to reconcile and update enrollment, revenue, and cost projections. Updated projections are regularly reported to the District Budget Committee and the Board’s Budget and Finance Committee. This high-level linkage of enrollment planning and resource allocation provides a framework for the District budget process.\textsuperscript{1366} \textsuperscript{1367} \textsuperscript{1368} \textsuperscript{1369}

**Planning Evaluation**

Various mechanisms are used to evaluate the effectiveness of college-district integrated planning: The Biennial District Governance and Decision-Making Survey assesses budget development and resource
Allocation, enrollment management, and FTES and facilities planning (see Standard IV.D.7). District-level planning and policy committees assess their effectiveness through an annual committee self-evaluation process (see Standard IV.D.1). The ESC Program Review process assesses performance and outcomes through an annual User Survey and information specific to each service unit (see Standard IV.D.2). Evaluation of District-level plans includes both an analysis of plan outcomes and a review of plan currency, relevancy, and alignment with external accountability initiatives; e.g. the Student Success Scorecard and the Statewide Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College and the District meet the Standard.

The District has established mechanisms for integrated District-level strategic and operational plans. This integration involves collaboration and cooperation between colleges, the ESC service units, and District-level shared governance and administrative committees. Assessment mechanisms include direct assessment of governance and decision-making, governance committee self-evaluation, ESC program review, and review of District-level plans.

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

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

---
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IV.D.6

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

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

Evidence

In total, the District has 46 districtwide 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 Districtwide 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.

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

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

In 2013, the governance committees agreed to a common format for their webpages. Each committee’s
The webpage contains a brief description of its function, committee charge, who it reports to, who it consults with, chairs, membership, meeting information, and resources. Results of the District-wide Governance Committee Self Evaluation as well as meeting agendas, minutes, and resource documents are posted on the webpage, which is accessible to the public.

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

Five Academic Initiative Committees coordinate Districtwide academic programs. These committees are primarily led by faculty, but also include administrators and classified staff. These committees focus on broader goals in various areas, including labor issues, articulation, transfer, and student success.

Information Technology maintains 78 active list serves. These list serves include the Districtwide consultative bodies, administrative councils, and operational committees as well as subject-specific groups such as articulation officers, curriculum chairs, counselors, and IT managers. Each list serve has a coordinator/owner charged with maintaining an accurate list of members.

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

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

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

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

The District Academic Senate (DAS) represents the faculty of the District in all academic and professional matters. In this capacity, the President and Executive Committee regularly inform faculty of District policy discussions and decisions related to educational quality, student achievement, and the effective operation of colleges.
In 2011, District Information Technology (IT) undertook a complete redesign of the District website. The updated website, which allows each division/unit in the ESC to manage its own content, launched in Fall 2012. In 2013, the District updated its public interface and in December 2014, the District upgraded its internal software systems to better support the online needs of the District. Creation of web links to Board, committee, council, and program information has improved the publics and District employees’ access to information about the District.\textsuperscript{1394}

Analysis and Evaluation

The College and the District meet the Standard.

The District ensures regular communication with the colleges and front-line employees through its committees and councils, websites, list serves, newsletters and bulletins, and email. Meeting agendas and minutes are posted online or distributed electronically. The District’s revamped website has facilitated easier access for employees to maintain, and for the public to access, District and college information.

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

In September 2015, District Educational Program and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE) staff and District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC) members co-presented a workshop at the annual DAS Summit. The workshop addressed districtwide 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.\textsuperscript{1395}
IV.D.7

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

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

Evidence

Governance and Decision-Making Assessment, Effectiveness and Communication

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

The District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment Survey continues to be administered on a two-year cycle. Survey participants evaluate the quality of District-level governance in the following areas: Appropriateness and effectiveness of the roles played by stakeholder groups, including administration, District Academic Senate, collective bargaining groups, and Associated Students organizations; Effectiveness of district-level decision-making processes in relation to five primary governance areas: budget and resource allocation, enrollment management, strategic planning and goals setting, bond program oversight, and employee benefits; Quality of district-level decision making (e.g., the extent to which decisions are based on data and are effectively communicated, implemented, and assessed), and Overall assessment of administrative and Board support of participatory governance as well as the effectiveness of districtwide decision making in relation to the District’s stated mission.

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

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

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

The District Governance and Functions Handbook is regularly reviewed and updated by District stakeholders under the coordination of the District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC). A section of the Handbook describes all districtwide councils, committees, and consultative bodies. These entities were first formalized in 1994 by Chancellor’s Directive (CD) 70: Districtwide Internal Management Consultation Process. Updates to CD 70, and its related committee/council structure, committee/council charge, membership, meeting schedule, leadership and reporting structure are underway as of Fall 2015.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College and the District meet the Standard.

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

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

The IE unit reported these findings and activities to DPAC, which, through its own self-examination and goal-setting process, undertook development of a comprehensive, and consistent, evaluation framework as part of its 2015-16 work plan. Adherence to the work plan will be ensured through the Committee’s expanded oversight role, as reflected in its revised charter, and by assigning a specific ESC staff member to maintain District governance committee websites.
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PLANS
Arising Out of Study
Changes and Plans Arising out of the Self-Evaluation Process

East Los Angeles College is committed to continuous improvement to increase academic quality and institutional effectiveness as evidenced in the Mission Statement, “ELAC is committed to advancement in student learning and student achievement that prepares students to transfer, successfully complete workforce development programs, earn associate degrees, and pursue opportunities for lifelong learning and civic engagement.”

In the process of writing and reviewing the responses to the standards, ELAC has identified three action plans to support institutional improvement:

- **Building a sustainable SLO process** in which assessment results inform continuous quality improvement and are more fully linked to resource allocation;
- **Creating a robust professional development program** for faculty, staff and administration that promotes student success;
- **Expanding communication efforts** that utilize current technologies and enhance collegial dialog.

These action plans align with existing items in ELAC’s planning documents, particularly the Educational Master Plan and the Technology Master Plan. Following is a brief discussion of existing efforts in these areas as well as proposed changes for the future.

**Building a Sustainable SLO Process**

ELAC has made significant progress in assessing learning outcomes since the 2012 Midterm Report. The chart illustrates the strides made over the past three years. In addition to the assessment results reported, an extraordinarily high level of faculty participation – 98.6 percent of full-time faculty and 93 percent of part-time faculty – was achieved during the Spring 2015 semester. The majority of courses not reporting CLO assessment results in spring 2015 were not offered that semester.

Under the leadership of the faculty and the President, the college continues to demonstrate its commitment to this process through the following activities:

- A significant investment in faculty staffing to support outcomes assessment,
- The ongoing training of department facilitators and department chairs to coordinate the assessment efforts,
- The purchase and evaluation of SLO tracking software, which has recently resulted in the decision to switch from TracDat to eLumen, and
- The development of policies by the Learning Assessment Committee and the Academic Senate to create a sustainable process.
ELAC increased staffing resources for SLOs including hiring a full-time faculty member, two campus facilitators and dozens of department facilitators. The Learning Assessment Coordinator is a faculty member within the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement (OIEA) and is provided with the assistance of a college researcher when needed to support the SLO process.

In fall 2013, the Academic Senate and Department Chairs Council put forward a proposal to create Department SLO Facilitators who would receive training in order to manage the day-to-day running of the SLO process within departments. The president supported the initiative, and the Learning Assessment Coordinator provided a 20-hour training course for an initial group of 52 Department SLO Facilitators from 25 of 29 Departments.

One critical caveat of becoming a Department SLO Facilitator was regular attendance at the Learning Assessment Committee (LAC) meetings. Having a large number of faculty well-trained in the theory and application of the process allowed the committee to develop and approve policy recommendations for the Academic Senate in a systematic and well-informed manner. By the end of spring 2014, guidelines and a process for Technical Review of CLOs were developed, approved at LAC, and forwarded to and approved by the Academic Senate. The Technical Review process provided an avenue for vetting CLOs as part of the Curriculum process by including the Campus SLO Facilitators on the Curriculum Committee and for reviewing the CLOs for the faculty in the disciplines when Course Outlines of Record are not due for a revision. New or revised CLOs are not entered into TracDat, the campus SLO software, unless they are sent by a Department SLO Facilitator.
The Department Facilitators spent a considerable amount of time in spring 2014 revising CLOs and developing stronger assessment methods. In many cases, the Department Facilitators helped discipline faculty to find ways to embed assessments into their course material and existing course evaluation methods. As a result, CLO assessments have yielded stronger data, which has led to better dialog and more interesting approaches to addressing gaps.

The Academic Senate passed a Policy on SLO Sustainability in May 2014 that required all CLOs to be assessed and reports submitted by July 15, 2015 or be removed from the schedule of classes for spring 2016. In spring 2015 the President sent a letter to all faculty establishing an enforcement process for the Academic Senate policy stating that any faculty not assessing courses in spring 2015 could face loss of hourly assignments (beyond contractually-defined minimums) and be subject to an administrative review. In July 2015, an All Faculty SLO meeting was held to discuss the evolving expectations of the CLO process. At this meeting, the timeframe for completing the CLO process was discussed and refined.

Policies affecting PLOs, include redefining Programs of Study and developing a schedule for assessment completion, continue to evolve. In fall 2014, the Program Review and Viability Committee revised the Program of Study Definition, defining a Program of Study as a minimum offering of 12 units. The process for creating a Program of Study was also revised; given that Programs of Study are defined by the institution rather than governed by Title 5 regulations, the signatory for vetting was shifted from the Curriculum Chair to the Learning Assessment Coordinator.

Significant progress in PLO assessment was made over summer 2015 once disciplines were able to review all the data collected in the spring CLO assessment process. The Learning Assessment Team worked with a large number of disciplines, helping them analyze the CLO results to determine how well the PLOs were being attained and what gaps or trends existed, if any.

The Institutional General Education Learning Outcomes (IGELOs) were revised in fall 2014 after a review of the new Accreditation Standards by the Learning Assessment Committee. The IGELOs were found to be missing some critical components. As part of that review, the Learning Assessment Coordinator, a Campus Facilitator, and a Department Facilitator attended a workshop at Bakersfield College to learn about the alignment movement between community colleges and the public universities in the state. As a result of that workshop, the Learning Assessment Committee fully revised the IGELOs, splitting them into two distinct entities: Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs). The new ILOs and GELOs were approved by Academic Senate and the ELAC Shared Governance Council in early spring 2015. Departments then embarked on the process of mapping all CLOs to GELOs and ILOs, as appropriate.

The Learning Assessment Team hosted a Dialog Day on May 8, 2015 which brought faculty together to review and discuss the mapping that was done. For each ILO and GELO area, faculty identified strengths and weaknesses of student outcomes and brainstormed approaches for increasing success. At the end of that meeting, a list of more than twenty recommendations...
were created for addressing issues. These recommendations were narrowed down through a survey of the Learning Assessment Committee.

Ultimately, the committee identified four recommendations as being most critical:

- Professional Development should provide faculty with guidance on how to be more supportive of students, especially during the first two weeks of the semester;
- Faculty need training in acknowledging students’ experience and history and in finding ways to help students relate their ELAC course material to their own lives;
- Faculty should receive training in how to scaffold reading assignments; and
- Faculty should be encouraged to incorporate math into all classes.

The Learning Assessment Committee also provided ideas for implementing the recommendations. As a result, two workshops were hosted on Opening Day: one on Culturally Responsive Training to address the second recommendation, and one on Reading across the Campus to address the third recommendation. These workshops were well-attended and will be repeated during the year to provide ongoing training and support. The New Faculty Institute has a track specifically dedicated to Reading across the Campus that new full-time faculty can elect to follow over the course of their first year at the college.

Departments and programs are expected to use the results of outcomes assessment in their planning processes. The most recent Annual Update Plans, submitted in fall 2015, required the department chairs and unit heads to align all budget requests with either a goal or an improvement plan based on the assessment results of course or program learning outcomes.

**Action Plans**

In addition to these efforts, ELAC believes that future efforts at improving the process must include:

1. Completing multiple cycles of SLO assessments at the course, program, and institutional level, following the policies recently approved by the Learning Assessment Committee and Academic Senate.
2. Regularly reviewing the assessment reports to ensure the assessment methods are appropriate for measuring the outcome.
3. Engaging in dialog within departments and units to ensure that the assessment results are used for continuous improvement.
4. Continuing to use assessment results as one criterion for resource allocation through the Program Review and Annual Update processes.
5. Providing ongoing professional development regarding teaching/learning theories that demonstrate the critical link between outcomes assessment and student learning.
Creating a Robust Professional Development Program

Currently, ELAC’s Office of Professional Development, in collaboration with other offices and departments on campus, sponsors numerous professional development activities, such as the New Faculty Institute, the Adjunct Winter Institute and Opening Day workshops. In addition, a number of college plans, including the Student Equity Plan and the Educational Master Plan, include objectives and action items related to professional development. For example, the Educational Master Plan includes the following action items:

- **Action Item 17.** Develop a year-round professional development program that provides faculty with effective instructional strategies related to the needs of first-year students.
- **Action Item 18.** Develop a comprehensive series in research-based principles of instruction.
- **Action Item 21.** Work with faculty in providing effective and proactive intervention strategies to assist those who are struggling earlier in the semester.
- **Action Item 30.** Provide professional development training to support faculty in identifying the unique academic needs of the student population and addressing identified equity gaps.

However, over the past year, the Office of Professional Development has been unsettled by turnover in leadership. The two faculty most recently reassigned to this position decided not to continue, based on a number of personal and professional reasons. In addition, a classified staff person who assisted faculty with technology needs in the Teaching and Learning Center was recalled by the Information Technology Office. As a result, it has been difficult for the college to fulfill all of the expectations set by the campus, the district, and the state.

At the state level, the 2012 Student Success Taskforce emphasized in recommendation six the need to revitalize and re-envision professional development:

6.1. Create a continuum of mandatory professional development opportunities
6.2. Direct professional development resources toward improving basic skills instruction and support services.

The District, through its student success initiative, offers a variety of professional development activities. These district-wide student success efforts include:

- Achieving the Dream Initiative (AtD)
- Faculty Teaching and Learning Academy (FTLA)
- The proposal of a Professional Development College, which is intended to provide courses on such topics as adult teaching and learning and instructional design
- Regularly scheduled workshops for deans, which are the successor to the Administrative Leadership Program offered for two years prior to 2010.
- California Community Colleges’ Success Network (3CSN) which is the statewide professional development initiative funded through a California Community College Chancellor’s Office grant that was awarded to LACCD in 2009 and renewed in 2013 for five more years. 3CSN’s efforts include:
  - BSILI—Annual Leadership Institute for Curricular & Institutional Transformation
  - California Acceleration Project (CAP)
To ensure the stability and effectiveness of the Office of Professional Development, the Professional Development Committee, Academic Senate and OIEA collaborated on a concept paper that identifies the need for additional staffing, a permanent facility, and an adequate budget. These plans respond not only to the concerns resulting from transitions in staffing and priority items identified in the Educational Master Plan and Student Equity Plan, but also some of the action programs identified in the Quality Focus Essay, including an Adjunct Academy for Math and plans to offer Culturally Responsive Training. Creation of a robust Professional Development program would also assist faculty and staff in closing the SLO loop.

**Action Plans**

1. Develop a comprehensive professional development program that
   a. Promotes student success and equity,
   b. Serves faculty, staff, and administrators,
   c. Is based on best practices and teaching/learning theory, and
   d. Will be evaluated according to best practices for professional development.
2. Secure appropriate staffing, space and funding for professional development to allow for ongoing and consistent training opportunities for faculty and staff.
3. Collaborate with state and district initiatives to avoid duplication and ensure coordinated efforts that complement and enhance the training process.

**Expanding Communication Efforts**

In the process of the accreditation self evaluation, various efforts to improve communication were undertaken. These efforts included revising documents, such as the Governance Policy Handbook, and the Faculty Handbook (in progress); codifying existing practices such as the creation of the Human Resource Plan and the Curriculum Guide; and the dissemination of these documents on the website.

A concerted effort toward updating and expanding a web presence coincided with the launch of the new website in spring 2015 that is aimed at greater transparency. This effort targets all committees to put agendas, minutes, bylaws, policies, committee self-evaluations and resources on the web so that decisions are documented, archived and widely understood.

In addition, at the early phase of the self evaluation process, the Accreditation Steering Committee sponsored a Cultivating Excellence workshop that offered as a component, “Creating a Culture of Collaboration.” Efforts to work across constituency groups for the good of the college were encouraged and additional programs and activities, such as a campus-wide retreat proposed by the president, are being developed.
The necessity of embracing a shared understanding of the mission of the college and working together to increase student success, equity, access and institutional effectiveness remains paramount. The key to collaboration is communication.

**Action Plans**

1. Develop a Values Statement for the college.
2. Hold a campus-wide retreat involving a cross section of campus leaders, including faculty, staff, students and administrators, to foster a culture of collaborative conflict resolution.
3. Celebrate achievements and recognize innovation.
4. Utilize technology, including the college website, Facebook sites, Twitter, and YouTube to improve transparency and effectively communicate campus activities, policies and achievements.
### Changes and Plans Arising out of the Self-Evaluation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change, Improvement, and Innovation</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>College Leads</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Anticipated Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building a sustainable SLO process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Complete multiple cycles of SLO assessments at the course, program, and institutional level.</td>
<td>I.B, II.A, II.B, II.C</td>
<td>Department Chairs &amp; Program Directors</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>The institutionalization of learning outcomes assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Regularly review the assessment plans to ensure assessment methods are appropriate.</td>
<td>I.B, II.A, II.B, II.C</td>
<td>LAC; Department Chairs &amp; Program Directors</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>A consensus among faculty and unit members on meaningful assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Engage in dialog within departments and units to ensure that the assessment results are used for continuous improvement.</td>
<td>I.B, II.A, II.B, II.C</td>
<td>Department Chairs &amp; Program Directors</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>The development of improvement plans with measurable outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Continue to use assessment results as one criterion for resource allocation through the Program Review and Annual Update processes.</td>
<td>I.B, II.A, II.B, II.C</td>
<td>Department Chairs, Program Directors, &amp; Senior Staff</td>
<td>Every Fall (as part of Program Review and AUP)</td>
<td>Clear rationales for resource requests that link to outcomes results and/or college goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Provide ongoing professional development regarding teaching/learning theories that demonstrate the critical link between outcomes assessment and student learning.</td>
<td>II.A, III.A</td>
<td>Professional Development Committee</td>
<td>Begin Fall 2017</td>
<td>Increased faculty support for learning outcomes assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creating a robust professional development program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Develop a comprehensive professional development program that promotes student success and equity; serves faculty, staff, and administrators; is based on teaching and learning theory; and will be evaluated according to best practices.</td>
<td>III.A</td>
<td>Professional Development Committee</td>
<td>Begin Fall 2016</td>
<td>An ongoing calendar of professional development activities meeting the needs of faculty, staff, and administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Secure appropriate staffing, space, and funding for professional development.</td>
<td>III.A, III.B, III.D</td>
<td>Dean of Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>Sustainable PD program in adequate location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Collaborate with state and district initiatives to avoid duplication and ensure coordinated efforts.</td>
<td>III.A</td>
<td>Professional Development Committee</td>
<td>Begin Fall 2016</td>
<td>Coordinated calendar of district and college PD activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expanding communication efforts</th>
<th>1. Develop a values statement.</th>
<th>Accreditation Steering Committee; ESGC</th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
<th>The creation of a values statement that emphasizes community and collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Hold a campus-wide retreat to develop a culture of collaborative conflict resolution.</td>
<td>III.A</td>
<td>President's Office</td>
<td>Winter 2016</td>
<td>Execution of a successful retreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Celebrate achievement and recognize innovation.</td>
<td>III.A</td>
<td>Public Information Officer</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>Regular reporting of innovative and successful programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Utilize technology to improve transparency and effectively communicate campus activities, policies and achievements.</td>
<td>III.B</td>
<td>IT Office; Public Information Officer; ESGC</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>Updated website and a variety of technology-based channels for communicating with students, faculty, and staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quality Focus Essay

Introduction

As part of the accreditation self-study and ongoing efforts towards increasing student success and academic excellence, ELAC has engaged in thoughtful discussion and reflection on future endeavors that would improve student learning and achievement. The following actions projects have emerged from multiple discussions analyzing areas of needed change as well as increased efforts that would better fulfill ELAC’s Mission. The action projects align with existing campus planning agendas and reflect our understanding of effective practices.

ELAC has identified three action projects: Strengthening the Transfer Culture, Streamlining the Basic Skills Math Pathway, and Creating a Welcome Campaign.

This essay will discuss:

- The method of selecting the action projects
- Anticipated outcomes and impact on academic quality and institutional effectiveness
- Timeline
- Resource allocation
- Re-evaluation process

The description of the action projects will contain:

- The rationale for selecting the action project and its components
- Connection with ELAC’s mission
- Data and analysis used as the basis for selecting the action project
- Description of action project components
- Manner of implementation
- Expected outcomes
- Responsible party

A summary table will discuss:

- Integration with ongoing campus planning efforts
- Timeline for implementing action projects
- Estimated budget
- Methods of evaluation

The choice of the three action projects was an iterative process. The Accreditation Steering Committee held a campus wide Dialog Day on April 30, 2015. Information from the Manual for Institutional Self Evaluation (February 2015 edition) was shared and the committee conducted a brainstorming exercise using the prompt: “ELAC would be a great college and better serve our students if….”
By June 29, 2015, a draft of the responses to the standards was ready for review by the Accreditation Steering Committee. The analysis and evaluation sections of several standards in the self evaluation identified needed areas for either continuation of ongoing efforts or areas for improvement. The specific standards are listed in the tables describing the action projects.

The Accreditation Committee of the Whole met again on July 27, 2015 for further discussion regarding the QFE. At that time the committee reviewed the ACCJC requirements for the QFE and integrated the requirements with existing campus planning efforts. The group reached consensus identifying the three action projects: Strengthening the Transfer Culture, Streamlining the Basic Skills Math Pathway and Creating a Welcome Campaign. Three subgroups were identified to provide additional information to the Accreditation Steering Committee and a draft was completed by September 8, 2015. The action projects were vetted more broadly at a forum held on October 29.

**Strengthening the Transfer Culture**

**Overview/Connection to Mission**

For 70 years, East Los Angeles College (ELAC) has served the community by empowering students to achieve their goals, especially goals related to university transfer. With a renewed state and nation wide focus on transfer from community colleges to universities, ELAC has amplified current successful efforts and implemented long-range, innovative practices to enable students to successfully transfer.

Transfer is the stated academic goal of nearly 50 percent of ELAC students. The ELAC mission reinforces the ongoing commitment to the thousands of transfer students and their transfer goals: “ELAC is committed to advancement in student learning and student achievement that prepares students to transfer...”

The commitment to student advancement has led naturally to an ongoing emphasis on self-evaluation. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement (OIEA) compiled related research and shared responses from student surveys. Using these data, members of the campus wide Taskforce on Transfer identified several important concerns:

- A lack of direct engagement and direct support for transfer-ready students
- Limited utilization of available transfer resources and services by students and faculty
- A lack of information about transfer and knowledge of how to access information
- Limited faculty knowledge and involvement in transfer (outside of classroom instruction)
- Limited collaboration between and among transfer programs
- Need for dedicated personnel to bring action projects to light
Subsequently, specific transfer-related projects were developed and launched to address the limitations and challenges mentioned above. The specific projects are summarized below. It is important to note, these projects require ongoing evaluation, improvement, and expansion. Over the course of the next seven years, the faculty and staff expect to further develop and improve the projects to achieve optimal results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Party/Relation to Standards/ Sources of Data/Action Project/Anticipated Outcomes</th>
<th>Relation to the Standard</th>
<th>Data used to identify needs</th>
<th>Specific Action Project Proposal</th>
<th>Anticipated Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer-ready Student Engagement</strong> (Transfer Center Director)</td>
<td>II.C.3 II.C.5 II.C.6</td>
<td>- Research Office</td>
<td>-Invite transfer-ready students on campus to receive guidance on transfer</td>
<td>-Transfer ready students will apply for university admission. -Transfer ready students will identify and complete the remaining lower division coursework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Speaking-Transfer Ambassadors</strong> (Campus Engagement Specialist)</td>
<td>II.C.6 II.A.2 II.A.7</td>
<td>-Student Survey -Faculty Inquiry</td>
<td>-Send Public Speaking Students (COMM 101) to classes across campus to inform students about the transfer process and requirements.</td>
<td>-COMM 101 students increase content knowledge and skill. -All students and faculty involved will receive direct messages about transfer pathways and success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Transfer Advocates</strong> (Transfer Center Director)</td>
<td>II.C.5 II.C.6 III.A.14</td>
<td>-Student Survey -Faculty Dialog</td>
<td>-Recruit and train faculty to be transfer leaders within their specific discipline.</td>
<td>-Faculty led transfer efforts within the classroom. -Students are supported not only by the SS division but also by classroom faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Latina Completion and Transfer Academy</strong> (Student Equity Coordinator)</td>
<td>I.B.6 II.C.3 II.C.5 II.C.6</td>
<td>- Research Office</td>
<td>-Provide Latina students with a pathway to academic success</td>
<td>-Latina students will actively participate in LCTA and campus and community activities. -Members will develop learning/educational skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus Engagement Specialist</strong> (Transfer Center Director)</td>
<td>II.C.1 III.A.1</td>
<td>-Faculty Inquiry</td>
<td>-Select a faculty member to facilitate, lead, and evaluate the campus-wide transfer efforts.</td>
<td>-The Specialist will be the point person who follows through with action plans. -The Specialist in will achieve aforementioned outcomes across the divisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Components of Strengthening Transfer Culture

Transfer-ready Student Engagement

Rooted in research questions posed to the members of the Transfer Taskforce, the Transfer Ready Project is the result of an inquiry that revealed that “transfer-ready” students, those with 30 or more units who completed either transfer-level English and/or math, were not being tracked or proactively encouraged to prepare for transfer.

In the summer of 2015, OIEA prepared reports to identify these students who, based University of California and California State University transfer requirements, could complete the transfer process in one academic year. More than 1200 students met these parameters. These students were invited to the ELAC Transfer Center for personalized peer mentoring and to the counseling office for an evaluation and, if necessary, revision of their educational plans.

Transfer-ready Student Engagement is being developed to provide equitable access to transfer information through personalized interaction with a peer mentor. Peer mentors are required to participate in training and receive ongoing support and guidance from Counseling faculty and classified staff. The central aim of the project is to show students a clear pathway to transfer.

In all, the expectation is that students who are contacted as part of this effort will be empowered through access to resources and information to complete the university admissions application in the fall.

Communication Studies Transfer Ambassadors

During the winter and summer intersessions of 2015, faculty from the Communication Studies department surveyed students enrolled in the transfer-level Communication courses about transfer-related topics. In the open-ended questions, survey respondents identified the need for more information about transfer and, specifically, more information presented in the classroom or during class about transfer. Currently, the college offers a variety of workshops and online resources to meet the need for information. However, there is no systematized way for connecting students with transfer information in classrooms.

In this project, selected instructors from the Communication 101- Public Speaking (COMM 101) course have agreed to incorporate the same speech assignment at the beginning of the term that focuses on the topic of transfer. The assignment requires students to deliver an informative speech about the university transfer process and the transfer resources. The speech is to be delivered both in class and, uniquely, to two classes outside of their COMM 101 course. Staff from the Campus Engagement office will coordinate the logistics of presenting the speeches to other classes and will provide supporting handouts.

Because the content of the speeches will be drawn directly from Counseling support services and the Transfer Center, this project helps orient students to ELAC’s transfer process and related requirements. Additionally, it is a unique instructional activity that is the result of ongoing
inquiry and work to improve content delivery and students’ experiences. It is a method that employs an important, real-world teaching methodology that challenges students to be successful both inside and outside of the classroom. Students’ participation in this project is a form of service learning in that they assist the ELAC community as they apply course content to public speaking situations.

Within the first seven weeks of the fall and spring terms, nearly half the class sections offered at ELAC will have had a Comm 101 student present a short informative message about transfer. Therefore, more students will directly receive a transfer message that would have not otherwise been heard. It is anticipated that more students will take advantage of transfer resources offered, levels of faculty awareness about transfer will increase, and the Public Speaking students will achieve the student learning outcomes of the Comm 101 course.

Faculty Transfer Advocates

Group discussions by the President’s Transfer Taskforce indicated that the discontinuance of a popular faculty transfer advising program had left a significant void. Faculty enthusiastically expressed their desire to reinstate such a program. Additional investigation revealed that faculty had little up-to-date knowledge on the vital specifics of the transfer process but were eager to learn. Also, as reflected in the description of the project above, students wanted more information about transfer to be available during class.

Faculty Transfer Advocate is a designation given to an ELAC faculty member who is trained in understanding the transfer steps and requirements and who provides students with guidance on completing degrees in the faculty member’s specific field. The program not only brings interested faculty together on a monthly basis around the topic of transfer but prepares faculty to successfully guide students. A key part of the faculty preparation is making sure faculty can clearly identify transfer pathways for students. With classroom faculty highly engaged, students in their courses will benefit by having access to transfer information and to someone who can provide a personal perspective regarding the process and requirements.

Latina Completion and Transfer Academy

Based on data collected by OIEA, Latina students have been identified as taking longer to transfer than other groups on campus. In response to these findings, members of the ELAC Equity Team sought to create a space to help address the educational needs of this student population. The project links with the following Equity Plan objective and goal:

**Goal E**: Increase the number of Hispanic/Latino/a students transferring to four year schools, through revised curriculum that eliminates academic barriers and targeted student support services.

**Objective #2**: Decrease the time to transfer of Hispanic/Latina students who require more than ten years to transfer

Action Items included the following:
1. Create and implement an accelerated cohort program for working adults
2. Develop an accelerated Math and English bridge program to prepare students for a cohort model
3. Include Tri-Math and Supplemental Instruction models
4. Ensure that the Child Development Center support services align with cohort model

Originally called Women’s Leadership Academy, the Latina Completion & Transfer Academy exhibits great promise and potential. Based on the students’ feedback, many involved in the LCTA are delighted at the prospect of participating in an educational program that is gender based, and culturally relevant to their particular needs and experiences, both on an educational and personal level.

In light of the fact that Latina students at ELAC take longer to transfer than other groups on campus, the need for innovative programs, such as the LCTA, are warranted. Indeed, it is the hope of those involved in the early formation of the LCTA that it will improve the academic status of Latinas and foster social empowerment and self-worth among its members.

**Campus Engagement Specialist**

In light of the gaps, the action projects, and the vision for quality improvement, there was a clear need to identify an individual to lead and collaborate with others in guiding these projects to completion. Previous efforts that lacked a clearly identified and agreed-upon responsible party had not been successful. Thus, a new job position and related description was drafted to address the need.

The Campus Engagement Specialist, as explained in the job announcement, "will provide day-to-day leadership to the college’s Transfer Initiatives. The selected individual will work with the Office of Student Services and work closely with the Transfer Center, Transfer Program leadership teams, Student Activities, Outreach & Recruitment and Faculty."

The creation and filling of this role reflect the college's commitment to quality programming by employing faculty who are qualified to lead important efforts, such as those presented here. Additionally, ongoing assessment of the Campus Engagement efforts is crucial in evaluating the quality of the transfer services offered.

The expected outcome for the Campus Engagement Specialist is directly linked to the outcomes of the action projects mentioned previously. The Specialist will complete projects, assess their effectiveness, implement changes, and continue the cycle of quality improvement.
Streamlining the Basic Skills Math Pathway

Overview/Connection to Mission

ELAC’s mission statement focuses the college’s priorities on preparing students “to transfer, successfully complete workforce development programs, earn associate degrees, and pursue opportunities for lifelong learning and civic engagement.” Central to student achievement in all these areas is the need to meet the math and English requirements associated with these outcomes. At ELAC, the inability of many new students to progress from basic skills courses through the courses that meet degree and transfer requirements, particularly in math, hinders their ability to meet their goals.

The expectation for a community college to provide the necessary support for students to be able to successfully complete their academic courses, including their basic skills classes, is woven throughout Standard IIA. Thus, ELAC has prioritized these issues in the development of its Educational Master Plan goals, Student Equity Plan priorities, and Transfer Taskforce recommendations.

The college used several key data sources in these plans to underscore the need for a more focused effort to improve the success rates in our basic skills classes, particularly the math classes, which have proven to be especially challenging for students to complete successfully. These challenges are not unique to the students at ELAC. California’s Student Success Scorecard shows that only 31 percent of students statewide who began in a remedial math class in 2008-09 had successfully completed a college-level course within six years. At 38 percent, ELAC students score better than the state average, but that result leaves too many students behind.

On a consistent basis, close to 60 percent of ELAC students taking a math placement test are assessed into Math 105 (Arithmetic) or Math 110 (Introduction to Algebraic Concepts), which are four and three levels below transfer, respectively. Most recently, between Summer 2013 and Spring 2015, 57 percent of the more than 23,000 math assessment tests taken resulted in students placing into one of these two levels. Data generated for the Fall 2013 Program Review process revealed average in-class success rates for Math 105 at 45 percent and Math 110 at 47 percent. ELAC students who start in Math 105 and 110 are highly unlikely to complete the requirements for earning a degree or transferring within three years. The data compiled for the 2012-2018 Educational Master Plan show that:

- of the students enrolling in Math 105 for the first time in Fall 2008, 7 percent completed Math 125, the associate degree requirement, and 4 percent completed a transferable math course within three years; for students beginning in Math 110 that fall, less than 15 percent met the math degree requirement and less than 6 percent met a math transfer requirement within three years.
• for students beginning in Math 110 that fall, less than 15 percent met the math degree requirement and less than 6 percent met a math transfer requirement within three years.

Based on these outcomes, a number of action projects have been identified by the college and the math department to foster student success and progress in math.

| Responsible Party/Relation to Standards/ Sources of Data/Action Project/Anticipated Outcomes |
|---|---|---|---|
| **No Cold Assessment** (SSSP Coordinator and Math Chair) | II.C.1 II.C.2 II.C.5 | Placement Results - Math faculty discussion | -Develop online and on-ground assessment preparation modules for students to use prior to assessing -Students will be expected to participate in assessment preparation prior to assessing | -An increased proportion of students will place into Math 115 and Math 125 rather than Math 105 and Math 110 |
| **Adjunct Academy** (Math Chair) | II.A.4 II.A.7 III.A.14 | Research Office - Math faculty discussion | -Full-time faculty to develop sample syllabi, assignments, and pedagogical approaches for Math 105 and 110 -Trainings and ongoing support to be provided for adjuncts teaching these classes -All adjunct faculty teaching these courses will participate in these professional development activities | -Collection of course materials for Math 105 and 110 emphasizing the established standards of the ELAC Math Department and best practices in best skills education -Success rates in Math 105 and 110 will increase -Increased awareness of the ELAC Math Department standards among all full- and part-time faculty |
| **Supplemental Instruction / Tri-Math Model** (Associate Dean of FYE and STEM Dean) | II.A.4 II.A.7 II.A.11 II.B.1 II.C.3 | OIEA data - FYE and STEM Program Outcomes | -Expand the existing SI program to have a greater focus on Math 105/110 classes -Develop a process for offering large-scale case management counseling support to Math 105/110 students in conjunction with SI -Offer sufficient college resources to support SI, including space | -Success rates in courses with SI will exceed those in other sections |
Components of Streamlining the Basic Skills Math Pathway

No Cold Assessment

New ELAC students are required to take a placement test before enrolling in any math or English class. Despite the information provided to all students about the significance of their placement score and the advisability of preparing for the test, many students take the math placement test “cold,” sometimes after not having taken a math class for one or more years. ELAC is working on two approaches, one face-to-face and one online, to help students prepare for the math placement tests. The online version, which is close to being pilot tested, gives students the chance to take a mini-version of the placement tests, provides them with an estimated placement result and emails them targeted resources to address specific questions they did not answer correctly. The intent is for every student to be directed to this website prior to taking the assessment test.

In addition, a face-to-face workshop has been developed as an option for students to take before they assess. The workshops are designed to familiarize students with the format and content of the test and to make students aware of topics that they should review more thoroughly before taking the placement test. Two pilot sessions of this workshop were offered in 2013-14, and the format is being piloted in Fall 2015. Student ID numbers will be collected from all students who participate in these activities, and the distribution of their scores will be compared to historical data and the students who do not participate in these activities to determine their impact.

Adjunct Academy

The vast majority of Math 105 and Math 110 sections are taught by adjunct faculty. In fall 2015, 17 out of 19 Math 105 sections, or 89 percent, were taught by adjunct instructors. The situation is similar for Math 110, where 31 out of 34 sections, or 91 percent, were taught by adjunct instructors. Due to their limited amount of time on campus, many of these faculty find it difficult to participate in professional development opportunities that will expose them to effective, research-based approaches to working with the least prepared students. The Math Department is proposing a two-step process to address this need. They are planning to bring
together a faculty inquiry group to examine effective practices at this level of math and develop sample syllabi, assignments, and activities. Once these materials are created, all faculty teaching the targeted courses will be invited to participate in collaborative trainings on incorporating these materials and approaches into their classes. Funds from Student Equity and the Basic Skills Initiative will be used to support the development of the materials and participation in the professional development activities. The adjunct faculty will be organized into an ongoing faculty inquiry group to continue to share challenges and best practices in their classes.

**Supplemental Instruction/Tri-Math Model**

For the past four years, the STEM program has used Supplemental Instruction (SI) to provide math students with in-class facilitators who provide additional targeted work, discussion, guidance and activities after classes. SI coaches are trained and monitored by math faculty who receive stipends or reassigned time for their work, and who are themselves trained in the SI model. The results have shown that students participating fully in 10 sessions were much more likely to pass their math class. The number of students served per year in this program is currently less than 400. An enhanced version of the SI model was developed in summer 2014 by the college’s first-year experience program. The Tri-Math Model added a counseling component to the SI model. In this approach, each math class was assigned to a counselor intern (a graduate student from a local master’s program in counseling under the supervision of the program counselor) who would follow up with students to ensure they attended the SI sessions and to respond to attendance issues and other problems identified by the teaching faculty in the class. During summer 2014 and summer 2015, the success rates in the math classes averaged above 85 percent, which is far above average for these level math classes, but the results were not as positive for the fall and spring sections. The college wishes to explore which components of the SI and Tri-Math models are most effective and to determine how to expand the availability of SI to more math classes.

**Math Advancement Program (MAP)**

In addition to the challenges faced by students in successfully completing a single math course, students who pass a class do not always enroll in the subsequent course for the next semester. The longer they wait to take the next class, the less likely they are to enroll and complete that class successfully. As a solution, the Math Department developed the Math Advancement Program (MAP), which has students enroll in two math classes in one semester. The advantage of this approach, in addition to avoiding a loss of momentum, is that the students are largely focused on math for the entire semester (most of the math classes below transfer level are five units), so they do not have to juggle academic priorities. Results have shown that the 2-course completion rate for MAP students is nearly double that of non-MAP students. The challenge the department has faced in expanding this program is the reluctance of students to take 10 units of math in one semester, especially entering college students, and the difficulties they face in retaining students who do not pass the first 8-week course and may be reluctant to retake the
same intense class immediately. The department will examine the characteristics of the students who successfully completed MAP and develop strategies for program recruitment and retention so that a strategic expansion of the program can be made. The department will also design a full program of coherent offerings that can be brought to scale. Outcomes for students will continue to be tracked against similar students taking semester-long classes.
Creating a Welcome Campaign

Overview/Connection to Mission

The ELAC Welcome Campaign is a campus wide effort to support new, continuing, or re-entry students by providing access to information, resources, and following-up on requests. The goal is to assist incoming and current students to better navigate ELAC and to increase their sense of belonging at ELAC.

Entering students at ELAC face numerous challenges when transitioning from high school or work to the college environment. While the majority of students claim their educational goal is transfer (49 percent), an A.A. Degree (6.1 percent) or Career Prep/advancement (16.4 percent), ELAC students struggle to complete their educational and career goals. Many do not complete the first semester. Many do not return after one semester.

The concept of creating a Welcome Campaign is to thoughtfully examine practices of campus personnel and policies that affect students during their initial contact with the campus, then build a support system to better connect them to the numerous services and programs that exist. This campaign aligns with the college mission that states, “East Los Angles College empowers student to achieve their educational goals…to successfully pursue their aspirations.” It also corresponds to ELAC’s strategic goals of “increasing student success and academic excellent through … student-centered support services …”; “increasing equity in successful outcomes”; and “sustaining community-centered access, participation, and preparation.”

The premise of correlating student retention with student engagement is a widely accepted best practice in student retention literature. Hence, if ELAC focuses greater attention on students during the initial weeks of the first semester with greater emphasis on personal assistance, one could hypothesize that student success and retention rates will increase.

Various data illustrate the need to reduce the large number of students who do not demonstrate successful academic progress early in their college career. For example, the Educational Master Plan presents data from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement, which conducted an analysis of the 2007 and 2008 cohorts of entering students, and identified several “leakage points” that revealed where students were most likely to be delayed in their educational trajectory. Findings include the following:

- 26 - 32 percent of students in these cohorts did not complete units in the first semester.
- 33 - 37 percent of students did not persist into the spring semester.
- 43-47 percent of students did not persist into the next year (fall semester).

The evidence from the Spring 2010 Student Survey as reported in the Strategic Plan (pg. 44) reveals that students are not familiar with various student services and programs at ELAC. More
than 50 percent of students indicated that either they did not at all or only slightly were familiar with the Child Development Center, DSP&S, EOPS, International Student Services, Matriculation/Assessment, student activities, Student Health Center or the Transfer Center.

| How familiar are you with the following student services and programs at ELAC? | All Respondents |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not at all | Slightly | Moderately | Substantially | Extremely |
| Admissions and Records | 12.37% | 22.78% | 28.83% | 21.02% | 15.00% |
| Career and Job Services | 3.95% | 15.86% | 45.83% | 27.63% | 6.73% |
| Child Development Center | 58.75% | 17.81% | 12.40% | 5.79% | 5.26% |
| Counseling | 20.26% | 19.51% | 23.18% | 20.22% | 16.82% |
| DSPS | 65.01% | 15.97% | 9.21% | 4.55% | 5.26% |
| EOPS | 46.36% | 18.02% | 13.72% | 9.65% | 12.25% |
| Financial Aid | 19.86% | 15.02% | 20.50% | 19.56% | 25.05% |
| International Student Services | 64.01% | 14.31% | 9.92% | 5.86% | 5.90% |
| Matriculation/Assessment | 42.03% | 21.52% | 18.36% | 10.86% | 7.24% |
| Student Activities | 38.08% | 23.95% | 20.83% | 10.62% | 6.52% |
| Student Health Center | 46.77% | 21.44% | 16.22% | 9.38% | 6.20% |
| Transfer Center | 40.19% | 23.40% | 17.62% | 11.06% | 7.74% |

Similarly, responses from the Fall 2014 Student Survey, Question #31A, also revealed a gap in student knowledge regarding campus resources. The question asked, “To what extent do you know where to find INFORMATION on college policies and procedures that affect me as a student.” More than a quarter of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed they knew where to find this information.

SLO data from the Writing Center indicates a connection between student use of the service and academic success. As reported in this Self Study, 92 percent of students surveyed saw a connection between the Writing Center and classroom success.

From the Facilities Master Plan, English and math student focus groups indicate the “need for more study space, lack of access to Writing Center, Learning Center and English tutors” (p. 11).

Additionally, in conducting research for the Master Educational Plan, OIEA found it difficult to ascertain the impact of counseling services on students because of a lack of a computerized system for recording content of counseling sessions, student education plans, etc. The only data that was available the SARS system, which tracks appointments, but even this available data was limited since it did not provide any information other than who made appointments. Hard copies of students’ educational plans are kept on file, but because of space limitations, these are kept only for three years and since many students take longer than that to transfer or complete, this is clearly insufficient. Additionally, the lack of data makes consistent follow-up with students difficult, especially since they will often see various counselors several areas, general, transfer,
A review of this data forms a pattern. ELAC students fade away within the semester and between semesters. Students are not aware of student services. Those students who utilize services believe the services equate to increase academic success. The initial review of data initiates further inquiries of student behavior requiring additional research.

What follows is a description of the specific action items aimed at ensuring that the college fulfills its mission to increase student success and academic excellence through student-centered support services, increase equity in successful outcomes, sustain community-centered access, participation, and preparation that improves the ELAC’s presence in the community, maximizes access to higher education, and reinforces the commitment to advance student learning and student achievement that prepares students for successful transfer, degree completion and career.

### Responsible Party/Relation to Standards/ Sources of Data/Action Project/Anticipated Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Space, Signage, Marketing (VP of Student Services and Director of College Facilities)</th>
<th>Relation to the Standard</th>
<th>Data used to identify needs</th>
<th>Specific Action Project Proposal</th>
<th>Anticipated Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.C.3 II.C.5 II.C.7 III.B.2</td>
<td>-Facilities Master Plan -Educational Master Plan</td>
<td>-Redesign approved, existing spaces in E1 to create a welcoming space with high visibility. Utilize allocated space in new Student Union to create second site. -Institute signage that invites all potential, new and continuing students to make the Welcome and Support Center the place they go to with question about ELAC and their educational and career goals.</td>
<td>-Establishment of a Welcome and Support Center, a resource office to welcome and support new students. -Signage throughout the campus informing students of support services. -Improved student knowledge of campus services, as measured on the district and college student surveys.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culturally Responsive Training (Professional Development Coordinator)</th>
<th>Relation to the Standard</th>
<th>Data used to identify needs</th>
<th>Specific Action Project Proposal</th>
<th>Anticipated Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III.A.1 III.A.14 I.B.6 I.B.7 II.C.3</td>
<td>-Student Survey -Student Equity Plan</td>
<td>-Culturally responsive training for service personnel and faculty in how to effectively and sensitively respond to student needs and questions. -Training for interested faculty and staff on establishing their offices as “Safe Zones.”</td>
<td>-10 campus facilitators trained in CRT. -Minimum of 2 CRT sessions presented each semester to faculty/staff. -Change in classroom or service area practice emanating from CRT. -Development of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Services, Intake and Referrals (VP of Student Services) | II.C.3 | II.C.4 | II.C.5 | Educational Master Plan | -Finalize Welcome and Support Form that would identify students’ interests and needs early in college experience.  
-Connect students with appropriate programs and services, both academic and student support, that respond to their needs.  
-Inform campus of trends in student needs to consider whether broader, programmatic responses should be included in planning efforts (e.g., financial literacy training). | -Increased number of students completing Welcome and Support Form.  
-80 percent of students completing Welcome and Support Form would receive information and/or referrals to areas of service within two weeks.  
-Welcome Center Satisfaction Survey  
-Increased student knowledge of ELAC services, as measured on the district and college student surveys.  
-Formalize a work group of categorical programs/services to provide input on planning efforts. |
| Tracking and Follow-up (VP of Student Services) | II.C.1 | II.C.2 | II.C.5 | Educational Master Plan | -Pilot the use of an electronic database to track service usage after referrals.  
-Follow up with personalized contact with students who requested services at the Welcome and Support Center. | -Increased student knowledge of ELAC services, as measured on the district and college student surveys.  
-Higher course completion/retention by students who are engaged w/ campus services compared to students not participating in services. |
Components of a Welcome Campaign

Physical Space and Signage

Several locations on the campus (two adjacent offices in the Student Services Building and a space on the second floor of the soon-to-be-opened Student Union building) are being considered for this purpose. One possible point of entry for Welcome and Support Center will be the Student Services Building Information Booth and adjacent office for new, re-entry, and/or continuing students. When the new Student Union Building is opened, an additional Welcome and Support Center could be housed in the middle of campus primarily for continuing and transfer students.

Signage will be developed at the entry points to the campus and throughout the campus to welcome students and guide them to the locations where services are offered and to inform and connect them to resource activities and workshops. Additional signage will include pop-ups, signs in each classroom, resource signs throughout campus, posting in college schedule, and information on the college website.

Culturally Responsive Training

As part of the Student Equity Plan, a core group of campus leaders will be trained to initiate discussion and awareness of the college’s diverse students’ needs. This cadre of leaders would develop and present a series of workshops for faculty and staff based on the Baltimore City College Culturally Responsive Training (CRT) program. Participants in CRT would initiate changes in teaching/learning and/or student services based on CRT. These practices would be shared through the development of a “best practices” website.

With the understanding that 85 percent of the college’s student population has self-identified as low-income, another professional development goal is to offer training on the community cultural wealth model and to work in collaboration with the Financial Aid Office, EOPS and CalWORKs to offer financial literacy workshops and financial aid counseling and coaching. Faculty and staff will also have the opportunity to participate in cross training in Safe Zone and SAAVE to promote a campus culture in which everyone feels they belong.

Services, Intake and Referrals

The Welcome and Support Center will offer various services that include a universal student services form, a resource and information bank, comprehensive orientations, financial literacy workshops, classroom visits, family involvement, and campus tours. The Welcome and Support Center workgroup has completed a draft of a universal form entitled Welcome and Support Form in collaboration with student services, categorical programs, and special programs that provide ongoing services to students. The universal Welcome & Support form would focus on interests and needs of the students and is intended to be available digitally on website as well as in walk-
up services.

Based on the information provided on the Welcome & Support Form, students would be provided with relevant information and/or linkage to the various campus departments and units, including counseling, financial aid, Veterans Resource Center, Transfer Center, student life activities, Health and Mental Health Center, EOPS, career and employment services, scholarship resources, and various academic or career technical programs of study.

An Extended Orientation (as a follow-up to the Assessment/Orientation/Counseling - AOC) will be offered as a Welcome Day in collaboration with the various categorical programs and the Student Life and Leadership Department.

The Extended Orientations will offer specialized information to specific student groups and will include, but not be limited to: first generation students, athletes, Men of Color, STEM, EOPS, CalWORKs, single parents, and Career and Technical Education majors. During the Extended Orientation and/or through the student intake process, the WSC will refer students to specialized workshops that are developed collaboratively with other student services offices on topics of financial aid/financial literacy, career exploration, and student life options. The WSC staff will conduct classroom visits to inform students of services available on campus and in community.

The WSC promotes the educational support of family and friends of students by organizing family orientations and college tours. In addition, the WSC will work with Student Life and Leadership Department to encourage communication and help facilitate student focus groups on issues and topics, which impact a student’s educational experience.

Plans are being developed for Center staff to offer additional services, such as Individual/Family, School/Groups, and Self-guided Tours; parent workshops; and other student engagement activities.

**Tracking and Follow-up**

The WSC work group is meeting with OIEA to utilize an Efforts-to-Outcomes (ETO) database to track student interest and need inquiries. Staff will follow-up by referring students to appropriate services and serve as a conduit between the student and various programs and services. Staff will coordinate tracking and follow-up with the various student services departments to determine the extent to which the students followed the referrals and, ultimately, benefited from the services.
**Timeline/Evaluation Methods (Resources)**

(Budget Projections are subject to the ELAC’s budget approval process as embedded in Program Review and Annual Updates.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Master Plan Updates</th>
<th>Transfer Culture</th>
<th>Math Basic Skills</th>
<th>Welcome Campaign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Assemble support resources for Student Engagement. Recruit, train, coordinate faculty for public speaking Transfer Ambassadors. ($1,500) Recruit/train Transfer Advocates ($57,000) Secure personnel/resources for LCTA. ($55,000 – Student Equity Funds) Hire Engagement Specialist. ($80,000) Costs should be consistent each year.</td>
<td>Pilot revised No Cold Assessment online Math refresher. Form math faculty inquiry group around Math 105/110 practices ($20,000) Analyze previous Tri-Math and SI results (Cost of SI, Pay for instructors) Survey MAP students and develop characteristics of successful students.</td>
<td>Utilize existing physical space in E1 Bldg. for WSC. Program the WSC in new Student Union building. Coordinate staffing for Welcome &amp; Support Campaign. Secure signage ($10,000) Pilot Welcome Form with categorical programs that provide continuing services to students. Link students to AOC process Develop comprehensive Student Orientation workshop. Hire and train Equity Researcher (Student Equity Funds)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 2016-7 |
| 2017-8 | Student Equity Plan SSSP Plan | Identify, Assist and Track Students Conduct speeches in classes Assist, track faculty/student interactions Hold LACTA student meetings Ongoing campus dialogues related to transfer | Launch version 1.1 No Cold Assessments based on student feedback from pilot. Provide training sessions to faculty inquiry group. Revise Tri-Math and SI model based on feedback Design a coherent set of MAP offerings. Increase numbers of students participating | Train personnel of WSC and implement <em>Welcome Form</em>. Recruit and train team of CRT facilitators. ($40,000 – Student Equity Funds) Create and present workshops in CRT to build best practices. Implement comprehensive Welcome to College workshops. Begin tracking <em>Welcome Forms</em> and referrals. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Department/Plan</th>
<th>Full Project Evaluation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-9</td>
<td>Educational Master Plan Facilities Master Plan Technology Master Plan Student Equity Plan SSSP Plan</td>
<td>Full project evaluation: student service evaluations; tracking referrals from Comm 101 students and Faculty Advocates; review of Campus Engagement job description; Student surveys – knowledge of transfer services; Overall transfer rate. Coordination of projects with college master planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>Accreditation Mid-term Report – including QFE Student Equity Plan SSSP Plan</td>
<td>Ongoing activities incorporating adjustment of actions based on evaluation data following the continuous quality improvement model. Successful activities should be brought to scale – increasing numbers of student participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-1</td>
<td>Student Equity Plan SSSP Plan</td>
<td>Ongoing Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2</td>
<td>Accreditation Self-Study Student Equity Plan SSSP Plan</td>
<td>Full project evaluation as completed in 2018-9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022-3</td>
<td>Accreditation visit including review of QFE Student Equity Plan SSSP Plan</td>
<td>Incorporation of successful activities into regular operations of college including resource allocation (staffing and expenses).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Identification of Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3CSN</td>
<td>California Community Colleges’ Success Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SP</td>
<td>Student Success &amp; Support Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCJC</td>
<td>Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>Academic Computing Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>Americans with Disabilities Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT</td>
<td>Associate Degree for Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFT</td>
<td>American Federation of Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALO</td>
<td>Accreditation Liaison Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC</td>
<td>Assessment/Orientation/Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCC</td>
<td>Accountability Report for Community Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARG</td>
<td>Accreditation Response Group (currently Accreditation Steering Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASO</td>
<td>Associated Student Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASU</td>
<td>Associated Student Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AtD</td>
<td>Achieving the Dream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUP</td>
<td>Annual Update Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFC</td>
<td>Budget and Finance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFC</td>
<td>Board Finance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOT</td>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Board Rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUG</td>
<td>Builders User Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAADE</td>
<td>California Association of Alcohol &amp; Drug Educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFE</td>
<td>Committee on Academic Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalPERS</td>
<td>California State Public Employees Retirement System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalSTRS</td>
<td>California State Teacher Retirement System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalWORKS</td>
<td>California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAOT</td>
<td>Computer Applications &amp; Office Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE</td>
<td>Cooperative Agencies Resource for Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATESOL</td>
<td>California Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCCL</td>
<td>Community College League of California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC</td>
<td>Child Development Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CET</td>
<td>Clinical Evaluation Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFAU</td>
<td>Central Financial Aid Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFES</td>
<td>Child, Family Education Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFO</td>
<td>Chief Financial Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLO</td>
<td>Classroom Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COR</td>
<td>Course Outline of Record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COW</td>
<td>Committee of the Whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRSE</td>
<td>Cluster Review Self-Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>Culturally Responsive Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>California State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTE</td>
<td>Career Technical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUE</td>
<td>Center for Urban Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>Cluster Update Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAS</td>
<td>District Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBC</td>
<td>District Budget Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL</td>
<td>Distance Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOSO</td>
<td>District Office Service Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPAC</td>
<td>District Planning and Accreditation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPC</td>
<td>District Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSP</td>
<td>District Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSP&amp;S</td>
<td>Disabled Student Programs &amp; Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECD</td>
<td>Electronic Curriculum Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECDBC</td>
<td>Executive Committee of the District Budget Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEOC</td>
<td>Equal Employment Opportunity Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELAC</td>
<td>East Los Angeles College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLA</td>
<td>Executive Latino Leadership Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMC</td>
<td>Enrollment Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMT</td>
<td>Emergency Medical Technician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOPS</td>
<td>Extended Opportunity Programs &amp; Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPIE</td>
<td>Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSC</td>
<td>Educational Planning Sub-Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>Educational Services Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESGC</td>
<td>East Los Angeles College Shared Governance Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>English as Second Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETO</td>
<td>Efforts-to-Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERPA</td>
<td>Family Educational Right &amp; Privacy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG</td>
<td>Faculty Inquiry Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIWI</td>
<td>Fully Integrated Web-enhanced Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMPOC</td>
<td>Facilities Master Planning and Oversight Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FON</td>
<td>Faculty Obligation Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPRC</td>
<td>Fiscal Policy and Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPSC</td>
<td>Facilities Planning Sub-Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTES</td>
<td>Full-time Equivalent Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTLA</td>
<td>Faculty Teaching and Learning Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYC</td>
<td>First Year Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYE</td>
<td>First Year Experience (Formerly First Year Completion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O.</td>
<td>General Obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GANAS</td>
<td>Goals and Needs to Accelerate STEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>General Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED</td>
<td>General Education Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GELO</td>
<td>General Education Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO ELA</td>
<td>Greater Outcomes for East Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT</td>
<td>Health Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPC</td>
<td>Hiring Prioritization Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRC</td>
<td>Human Resource Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSI</td>
<td>Hispanic Serving Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>Inter Club Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEPI</td>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IESS</td>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGELO</td>
<td>Institutional General Education Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGETC</td>
<td>Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>Institutional Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPEDS</td>
<td>Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISA</td>
<td>Instructional Service Agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISA</td>
<td>Instructor Special Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISS</td>
<td>Institution-set Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JLMBC</td>
<td>Joint Labor Management Benefits Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Learning Assessment Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACCD</td>
<td>Los Angeles Community College District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAO</td>
<td>Learning Assessment Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAOCRC</td>
<td>Los Angeles Orange County Regional Consortia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCTA</td>
<td>Latina Completion &amp; Transfer Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;O</td>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>Math Advancement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATCH</td>
<td>Mentors Act to Change History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESA</td>
<td>Math Engineering and Science Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOS</td>
<td>Microsoft Office Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>New Faculty Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF</td>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OGC</td>
<td>Office of General Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIE</td>
<td>Online Education Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIEA</td>
<td>Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEB</td>
<td>Other Post Employment Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWL</td>
<td>Online Writing Lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE</td>
<td>Program for Adult College Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARS-ARS</td>
<td>Public Agency Retirement Services-Alternate Retirement System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIE</td>
<td>Planning, Implementation, Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO</td>
<td>Program Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNPR</td>
<td>Proposed New Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRSE</td>
<td>Program Review Self-Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRVC</td>
<td>Program Review &amp; Viability Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA</td>
<td>Public Service Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QFE</td>
<td>Quality Focus Essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAC</td>
<td>Reading Across the Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC</td>
<td>Request for Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIDO</td>
<td>Resource &amp; Institutional Development Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Respiratory Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAAVE</td>
<td>Sexual Assault Awareness and Violence Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAO</td>
<td>Service Area Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAP</td>
<td>Systems Applications and Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARS</td>
<td>Scheduling and Records System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEIU</td>
<td>Service Employees International Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFP</td>
<td>Specially Funded Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Supplemental Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>Student Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPC</td>
<td>Strategic Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRF</td>
<td>Student Representation Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSO</td>
<td>Student Success Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSSP</td>
<td>Student Success &amp; Support Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOC</td>
<td>Strengths Weaknesses Opportunities &amp; Challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T &amp; L</td>
<td>Technology and Logistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCO</td>
<td>Total Cost of Ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC</td>
<td>Teaching and Learning Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPPC</td>
<td>Technology Planning and Policy Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPSC</td>
<td>Technology Planning Sub-Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANS</td>
<td>Tax Revenue Anticipation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>University of California Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDE</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDT</td>
<td>Video Display Terminal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOE</td>
<td>Verification of Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VoIP</td>
<td>Voice over Internet Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3C</td>
<td>World Wide Web Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASC</td>
<td>Western Association of Schools &amp; Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEC</td>
<td>Work Environment Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSC</td>
<td>Welcome and Support Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>