

EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

**Los Angeles Valley College
5800 Fulton Avenue
Valley Glen, CA 91401**

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

**This report represents the findings of the External Evaluation Team that visited
Los Angeles Valley College March 6 – March 10, 2016**

**Thomas Greene, Ph.D.
Chair**

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

DATE: July 8, 2016

INSTITUTION: Los Angeles Valley College
6201 Winnetka Avenue
Woodland Hills, CA 91371

TEAM REPORT: Comprehensive Evaluation Report

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

SUBJECT: Commission Revisions to the Team Report

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

1. The Commission notes that references to a business continuity and/or disaster recovery plan should not be capitalized as in District Recommendation 4. The team’s reference is to a general plan and not a specific plan with that title.

Table of Contents

List of Team Members.....	3
Summary of the External Evaluation Report.....	4
Major Findings and Recommendations of the 2016 External Evaluation Team.....	7
Introduction.....	11
Eligibility Requirements.....	12
Checklist for Evaluating Compliance with Federal Regulations and Related Commission Policies.....	14
STANDARD I.....	20
Standard I.A: Mission.....	20
Standard I.B: Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness.....	22
Standard I.C: Institutional Integrity.....	25
STANDARD II.....	30
Standard II.A: Instructional Programs.....	30
Standard II.B: Library and Learning Support Services.....	35
Standard II.C: Student Support Services.....	37
STANDARD III.....	40
Standard III.A: Human Resources.....	40
Standard III.B: Physical Resources.....	49
Standard III.C: Technology Resources.....	54
Standard III.D: Financial Resources.....	59
STANDARD IV.....	68
Standard IV.A: Decision-Making Roles and Processes.....	68
Standard IV.B: Chief Executive Officer.....	73
Standard IV.C: Governing Board.....	75
Standard IV.D: Multi-College Districts or Systems.....	78
Quality Focus Essay Feedback.....	86

List of College Team Members

Dr. Thomas Greene (Chair)
President
American River College

Dr. Adam Karp (Team Assistant)
Dean, Planning, Research, and Technology
American River College

Dr. Donna Floyd
Senior Dean of Instruction/Accreditation Liaison
Officer
Contra Costa College

Mr. Kenley Neufeld
Dean, Library, ESL, Languages, PE,
Distance Education
Santa Barbara City College

Dr. Judy Kasabian
Professor, Mathematics
El Camino College

Dr. James Thornburgh
Professor, Drafting
Merced College

Mr. Steven Auerbach
Director Pacific Ctr. for Adv. Tech. & Cont. Ed.
Honolulu Community College

Ms. Beth Gomez
Vice President of Business Services
Norco College

Dr. Victoria Hinds
Vice President, Student Support Services
West Valley College

Dr. Lisa Aguilera Lawrenson
Associate Vice President of Instruction
American River College

Mrs. Michelle Johnson
Institutional Research Coordinator
Clovis Community College

Los Angeles Community College District Team Members
Monday, March 7-Thursday, March 10, 2016

Chair

Dr. Helen Benjamin
Chancellor
Contra Costa Community College District

Assistant

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

Ms. Linda Beam
Vice President Human Resources
El Camino College
Dr. Jannett Jackson
Chancellor
Chabot-Las Positas Community College
District

Ms. Deborah Ludford
District Director of Information Services
North Orange County Community College District
Dr. Jamey Nye
Associate Vice Chancellor of Instruction
Los Rios Community College District

Mr. Dustin Johnson
Trustee
Los Rios Community College District

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

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

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

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

Summary of the External Evaluation Report

INSTITUTION: Los Angeles Valley College

DATES OF VISIT: March 6 – March 10, 2016

TEAM CHAIR: Dr. Thomas Greene

An eleven member accreditation team visited Los Angeles Valley College (LAVC) March 6 – March 10, 2016 for the purpose of determining whether the College continues to meet Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and USDE regulations. The team evaluated how well the College is achieving its stated purposes, providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement, and submitting recommendations to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the accredited status of the College.

In preparation for the visit, the team chair attended a team chair training workshop on December 2, 2015 and conducted a pre-visit to the campus on January 25, 2016. During this visit, the chair met with campus leadership and key personnel involved in the self-evaluation preparation process. The entire external evaluation team received team training provided by staff from ACCJC on January 26, 2016.

The evaluation team received the college's self-evaluation document and related evidence a few weeks prior to the site visit. Team members found it to be a generally acceptable written document that adequately described some of the processes used by the College to address Eligibility Requirements, USDOE requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission Policies. Other areas of the document were less complete, requiring significant effort on the part of the team to corroborate the report's assertions. The team confirmed that the self-evaluation report was compiled through broad participation by the entire College community including faculty, staff, students, and administration. Further, it contained several self-identified action plans for institutional improvement as part of the Quality Focus Essay.

On Tuesday morning March 7, 2016, team members visited Los Angeles Valley College located in Valley Glen, California. Upon arrival to the College on Tuesday morning, the team was introduced to the College community at a reception, and provided a tour of the campus.

During the evaluation visit, team members conducted approximately 65 formal meetings, interviews, and observations involving College employees, students, and board members. Myriad, less formal interactions with students and employees took place outside of officially scheduled interviews, as did observations of in-session classes and other learning environments. Two open forums provided the community members and College personnel opportunities to meet with members of the evaluation team.

The team reviewed numerous materials supporting the self-evaluation report in the team room and electronically, which included documents and evidence supporting the Standards, Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and USDE regulations. Evidence reviewed by the team included, but was not limited to, documents such as institutional plans, program review procedures and reports, student learning outcomes evidence, distance education classes, College policies and procedures, enrollment information, committee minutes and materials, and College governance structures. Said evidence was accessed via hard-copy in the team room and electronically via provided flash drives, internal College systems (e.g., eLumen, etc.), and the College's internal and public website pages.

The team greatly appreciated the enthusiasm and support from College employees throughout the visit. The team appreciated the assistance of key staff members who assisted the team with requests for individual meetings and other needs throughout the evaluation process. College staff met every request.

The team found the College to be in compliance with all Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies and Standards and USDE regulations. The team found a number of innovative and effective practices and programs. The team also issued a number of commendations to the College. It also issued several recommendations to increase effectiveness. The district-assigned team found the district to be in compliance with all Eligibility Requirements and most of the Commission Policies and Standards. This team also issued several compliance and improvement-related recommendations.

Major Findings and Recommendations of the 2016 External Evaluation Team

College Commendations

College Commendation 1

The team commends the College for its steadfast commitment to students, which creates a culture of engagement that inspires students to advance their education, personal development, and quality of life. (Standard I.A.1-4, ER 6)

College Commendation 2

The team commends the College for its exemplary instructional programs and support services, specifically Adaptive PE, Career Guidance Counseling Assistance, the Child Development Program and Center, and Student Health Center. These programs and services exemplify the College's core values of inclusion and respect, and serve to empower all students to reach their academic and career goals and become an integral part of the college and community. (Standard II.A.1, II.C.3)

College Commendation 3

The team commends the College's Library and Academic Resource Center for its proactive approach to identifying and expanding opportunities that enrich the learning environment. (Standard II.B.1)

College Commendation 4

The team commends the college for its commitment to environmental sustainability exemplified through its innovative new facility designs, resource conservation efforts, and the nationally recognized urban forest and its contribution to the learning environment. (Standard III.B.1)

College Commendation 5

The team commends the college in their efforts to decrease the student loan default rate by over 50% during the last three years. (Standard III.D.10, III.D.15)

College Commendation 6

The team commends the college for its commitment to maintaining quality services for students while making significant sacrifices over the past two years in order to repay its prior fiscal obligations to the district. (Standard III.D.1)

College Commendation 7

The team commends the college in its efforts to revitalize participatory governance which has fostered greater transparency and inclusiveness. (Standard IV.A.1)

College Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

College Recommendation 1 (Improvement)

In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College systematically analyze learning outcomes assessment results and other qualitative and quantitative data by meaningful demographic disaggregation and by instructional delivery method to enhance dialogue and prompt appropriate action. (Standard I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, II.A.3, II.A.11, II.B.3, II.C.2, ER 11)

College Recommendation 2 (Improvement)

In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the college make more accessible through electronic and printed publications, its transfer-of-credit policy for students who have completed college coursework at other postsecondary institutions. (Standard II.A.9, II.A.10, ER 10)

College Recommendation 3 (Improvement)

In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College develop a total cost of ownership model to identify and prioritize the staffing, college-technology, and facility needs to effectively support the learning environment. (Standard III.A.9, III.B.4, III.C.2, III.D.1)

College Recommendation 4 (Improvement)

In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College increase professional development opportunities for classified staff and faculty, and fully integrate professional development efforts across the College. (Standard III.A.14)

District Commendations

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

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

District Commendation 3: The team commends the technology staff from the nine colleges and the District for their teamwork and collaboration in the areas of shared staff resources, development of standards, collaborative training opportunities and deployment of integrated systems resulting in effective and efficient use of technology resources to improve academic quality and institutional effectiveness. (III.C.1, III.C.4)

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

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

District Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

District Recommendation 9 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the District review the membership of institutional governance committees

to ensure all employee groups, particularly classified staff, have formal input on institutional plans, policies, and other key considerations as appropriate. (IV.A.5)

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

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

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

Introduction

Los Angeles Valley College was officially chartered by the Los Angeles Board of Education in June of 1949 and opened its doors on September 12th of that year on the campus of Van Nuys High School. During its founding academic year, it had 439 students, 23 faculty members, and five bungalows. Today, the College serves approximately 18,000 students through the provision of transfer education, career technical education, and lifelong learning needs of communities within the San Fernando Valley region of Los Angeles.

The College is located in the center of the San Fernando Valley, with the majority of its students residing within a 15 mile service area characterized by average and low-income neighborhoods: North Hollywood, Van Nuys, Panorama City, Burbank, Sherman Oaks, Sun Valley, Arleta, and North Hills. Many of these communities comprise a high percentage of people of Hispanic descent. Consequently, the College has a sizable Hispanic population and is designated as a Hispanic-serving institution (HSI).

Many of the College's students face financial hardship and academic challenges. The majority (almost 2/3rds) of students receive some form of financial aid. Over 40% are first generation college students. The majority (70%) of students assessed in English or math place below college-level in English and math assessments.

Significant facilities modernization, new construction and infrastructure improvements are taking place at the College currently through a \$626 million voter-passed Propositions A, AA and Measure J facilities bond.

Since 2013, the College has experienced a limited number of administrative changes, including a new Vice President of Administrative Services and a new College President. Under the new president's leadership, the College was able to address the one outstanding recommendation from its 2013 comprehensive reaffirmation process. As a consequence, the ACCJC removed the College from Warning and reaffirmed its accredited status in June 2015.

Eligibility Requirements

1. Authority

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

The College meets the ER.

2. Operational Status

The team confirmed that the College is operational and provides educational services to approximately 18,000 students each year who are enrolled in degree applicable credit courses. Of these students, approximately 18 percent are enrolled full-time. Almost two-thirds (64%) of students are pursuing educational goals that relate to degree, certificate, or transfer.

The College meets the ER.

3. Degrees

The team confirmed that the vast majority of courses offered lead to a degree and/or transfer. A majority of the College's students are enrolled in the 79 AA/AS degree, or 22 Associate Degree for Transfer programs offered by the College.

The College meets the ER.

4. Chief Executive Officer

The District's current chief executive officer is highly qualified for the position and has served as chancellor since June 1, 2014. His full-time responsibility is to the District; he possesses the requisite skills and authority to provide leadership for the District.

The College President/CEO of Los Angeles Valley College reports directly to the District Chancellor. The College President/CEO does not serve as a member of the board nor as the board president. Since the last full accreditation visit, there have been changes in both the Chancellor and College President/CEO positions, each of which were appropriately reported to the ACCJC.

The College meets the ER.

5. Financial Accountability

The District Office Accounting Office staff oversees District wide audits and is responsible for coordination of all site visits. The District also has a Central Financial Aid Unit that monitors and helps control the Perkins Loans default rates. The District has Perkins Loans outstanding (over 240 days in default) totaling \$1.8 million, but when compared to total loans outstanding for the District of \$270 million, the default rate is only approximately one

Checklist for Evaluating Compliance with Federal Regulations and Related Commission Policies

Public Notification of an Evaluation Team Visit and Third Party Comment

Evaluation Items:

- The institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comment in advance of a comprehensive evaluation visit.
- The institution cooperates with the evaluation team in any necessary follow-up related to the third party comment.
- The institution demonstrates compliance with the *Commission Policy on Rights and Responsibilities of the Commission and Member Institutions* as to third party comment.
[Regulation citation: 602.23(b).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The team confirmed that the College solicited third-party comment via open forums, email communication, website postings and public comment during a Board of Trustee meeting. The team found no third party comment related to this visit.

Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement

Evaluation Items:

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

STANDARD I
MISSION, ACADEMIC QUALITY AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS,
AND INTEGRITY

Standard I.A: Mission

General Observations

Los Angeles Valley College (LAVC) has a clearly defined and institutionally applicable mission statement, approved by the Board of Trustees in February 2013. The Educational Planning Committee (EPC) reviews the mission statement each spring semester. The mission statement addresses serving as a leader for student success through pathways for certificates, degrees, transfer, and continuing education. The mission statement indicates a commitment to empowering students to be productive and engaged members of the global community. All constituent groups are involved in any revision and it is evident the mission is the beginning of creating the Educational Master Plan and is referred to often as part of committee processes.

The College emphasizes the role of the mission, vision statement and core values in planning and decision-making, and they are widely publicized throughout the College via a variety of means, including displays, on the website and in various college publications. Through interviews with College personnel, the team found the presence of a strong commitment to the engagement of students and a palpable sense of commitment to their learning and success.

Findings and Evidence

The College's mission is appropriate for a degree-granting institution of higher education as it specifies pathways for certificates, degrees, transfer, and continuing education. Its core commitments are the guiding principles that support the College in accomplishing its mission. These statements convey the College's commitment to access, success, quality educational programs, a rich campus life, diversity, and concern about the environment. Comprehensive Program Review and Annual Program Planning provide a mechanism for determining if the College is fulfilling its mission. Program reviews are used to help participatory governance committees identify trends, themes, and institutional patterns that inform institutional decision making. The provision of enrollment, student success/achievement, and learning outcomes assessment data in these planning processes allows the College to determine the extent to which it is accomplishing the mission. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) is responsible for providing these data in support of planning, goal-setting, and decision-making, including key student achievement data disaggregated by delivery format and demographic characteristics at the course and institutional levels. (Standard I.A.1, I.A.2)

Comprehensive Program Review is utilized to determine whether the College's educational programs meet the needs of its student population and support its mission. A review of these processes provides evidence that departments and service unit are prompted to provide a

Standard I.B: Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations

The College is aware of and demonstrates a commitment to continuous quality improvement. The team found evidence and examples of this in a variety of places, including the transition and integration of older initiatives into alignment with new plans and processes. For example, the College participated in Achieving the Dream (Preparing All Students for Success - PASS locally) beginning in 2011. Over the last year, while completing the annual Achieving the Dream (PASS) progress report, it was noted that the College moved away from this initiative and continued improvements on a larger scale by way of its Student Equity Plan and SSSP. Through extensive interviews, the team validated that the participatory governance process is working as described.

Findings and Evidence

Los Angeles Valley College structures its dialogue with an intricate tiered system that includes an overarching shared governance body, the Institutional Effectiveness Council (IEC) and second tiered committees such as Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee (PEPC) and Technology Committee. Dialogue about continuous improvement of student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continued improvement of student learning and achievement is evidenced formally through committee meeting notes and agendas, discussions at the department and division levels, Academic Senate Summits, and the development of the student equity plan among other areas. Informally, it is evidenced thorough faculty lunches and the Strategic Team for the Advancement and Retention of Students (STARS) resources. (Standard I.B.1)

The team confirmed that the College has invested a great deal of time and effort improving the process involving the development and assessment of student learning outcomes as well as using the associated assessment results to assist in planning and implementing program and institutional improvements. Student learning outcomes and assessments have been established for both credit and non-credit courses, programs, certificates and degrees and learning support services. The team verified that all courses, program pathways, and service units have been fully assessed at least once and are currently in a second assessment cycle. To support the collection of the assessment data, the college has adopted eLumen (Fall 15) to support its three-year cycle of assessment which began in 2014-15. Limited evidence was provided that supports disaggregation of these assessment data at the course learning outcome level with regard to special populations or modality.

Institutional set standards (ISS) of student achievement (below) were identified via a ten-year trend analysis and subsequently approved in 2013 after being vetted through various campus committees.

- Course completion rate: 64% (successful completion – A,B,C,P/ all grades including Ws)
- Student retention percentage: 32% (Fall to Fall – all students)
- Student degree completion: 722 (annual)
- Student transfer to 4-year colleges/universities: 618 (annual; to UC & CSU only)
- Student certificate completion: 260 (annual)

Standard I.C: Institutional Integrity

General Observations

The College demonstrates institutional integrity through a variety of means, including maintaining appropriate relationships with Federal, State, and other agencies; through striving to act in accordance with all applicable regulations, statutes, policies, and guidelines, etc.; and through the timely disclosure and communication of accurate information. The team found that the College strives to adhere to Commission policies, guidelines, and other requirements and is responsive to its directives. Established Board policies and rules further demonstrate a clear commitment to maintaining the integrity of its internal and external relationships and the quality of the learning environment. This commitment is further evidenced in the broad disclosure and dissemination of important information via such means as the College catalog, various handbooks, the Schedule of Classes, and the College and District website.

The Los Angeles Community College District has well-developed Board Rules that promote academic honesty, responsibility, and academic integrity that *ensure a faculty's right to teach and a student's right to learn*. These Board policies are posted on the District and college websites. The Board Rule 9803 requires that the college president annually publicize the Standards of Conduct. The District also has a comprehensive policy on student discipline that delineates the process for student due process in the event of a violation of the student code of conduct. This information is available to students in the college catalogs as well as online via the college websites.

Findings and Evidence

Information pertaining to the College's mission statement, learning outcomes, educational programs, and support services is provided to the campus community and the public via a variety of means, including the College Catalog, Schedule of Classes, course syllabi, various handbooks, and the College and District websites. The accredited status of the College and its programs is provided on the College website, in the College Catalog, and the Schedule of Classes.

In addition, the College's Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) collects and publishes information related to quality assurance. The team confirmed that the OIE publishes numerous achievement and learning outcomes assessment reports from program pathways. These reports were accessible on the College website and published annually in the College Student Profile brochure. Further, the team found that the OIE provides departments/programs with Student Data Profiles and regularly facilitates the design, administration, and analysis of various student surveys for program review and outcomes assessment. This information, along with outcomes assessment data, is integrated into both the Comprehensive Program Review and Annual Program Planning. In addition, the team confirmed that program review narratives are posted on the Program Effectiveness & Planning Committee (PEPC) webpage, and program learning outcomes assessment data and annual plan reports are posted on the Outcomes Assessment Committee webpage.

STANDARD II STUDENT LEARNING PROGRAMS AND SUPPORT SERVICES

Standard II.A: Instructional Programs

General Observations

The College offers a wide range of programs for students, including transfer, certificate, pre-college, and continuing education. The Program Review process ensures that programs are effective and meet the needs of students. The College has approved a flowchart, which documents the decision-making process, linking program review and planning to resource allocation.

The College has made significant headway in developing and evaluating learning outcomes for courses, programs, and the institution. The College has policies, procedures, and a timeline in place to examine the learning outcomes (SLO, PLO, ILO). The seven Institutional Learning Outcomes are embedded in each of the three academic/career pathways (GE/Transfer, Foundational Skills, and CTE). One hundred percent of the SLOs have been assessed, and PLOs for each of the three pathways have been assessed. The process of SLO implementation and review is in place. The pathway includes program review preparation, validation from the dean, revision by proposers, and validation and prioritization of requests for funds determined by the vice president in the related area. It also includes a decision made by the vice president in the related area and discussion communicated to the department chair. A variety of data sets are used during the prioritization process. Department chairs are notified of approved resource allocation requests.

The College has made progress to promote open dialogue among constituents regarding the data from learning outcomes, and the discussions are reported using a variety of means. The College utilizes the findings to make informed decisions to improve teaching and learning.

The College has a well-documented transfer policy to ensure that its courses will be readily transferable to other community colleges and baccalaureate institutions. The transfer policy is presented in the college catalog, website, and schedule of classes along with postings at pertinent locations on campus. The College provides limited information about the policies and protocol to assess transcripts for students entering the College.

Findings and Evidence

The team found that the College has established and documented its processes for program review, annual plans, curriculum review, SLO assessment, and pathways outcomes. The College's 101 associate degree programs lead to associate degrees in areas consistent with its mission. The College's 52 Certificates of Achievement, 13 Skills Certificates, and 11 Noncredit Certificates of Completion are also in areas consistent with the College's mission. All degree programs were found to contain at least one area of inquiry, with the courses in these areas reflective of the appropriate level of mastery and based upon student learning outcomes.

Standard II.B: Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations

The Library and Academic Resource Center (LARC), comprised of the library, Computer Commons, reading and writing labs, and tutoring center, provides a central meeting place where students can receive a variety of services to promote their educational attainment. The Computer Commons offers students a comprehensive amount of software that is not available in the discipline specific computer labs located across campus. The library and learning support services are robust, undergo routine evaluation, and make changes based on the data from formal assessments.

Findings and Evidence

The library and learning support services play an important role in ensuring that students receive the support they need to reach their academic goals. The quantity, quality, depth, variety, and effectiveness of library and learning support equipment and materials are currently sufficient to support the College's educational programs as assessed against Title 5 regulations and ACRL trends and statistics for community colleges. The library staff informs the college community about print and digital resources through the LibGuides website. Recently, the library has scaled up the instruction program and done more campus outreach in order to establish a greater diversity of faculty using library services. Distance education students may access library resources, library services, and tutorial services through the respective websites, including a large selection of eBooks using student login. Students have the ability to ask reference questions through a remote service, or with the on-site librarian. Recently, all courses in Etudes have direct links to the online tutoring system and assessment of its effectiveness is forthcoming. Additionally, the team noted the existence of a proactive approach to identifying and expanding learning support opportunities for students on the part of LARC faculty and staff. (Standard II.B.1, ER 17)

Computers in the library and student services area are supported by the Information Technology department using primarily bond and block grant funds. The college currently has a sufficient number of computers for students. However, program review and action planning documents indicate that maintenance of computers continues to be an area for further improvement. (Standard II.B.1, II.B.2, II.B.3)

Library and discipline faculty share the responsibility for selecting books and materials and determining when resources are outdated. Faculty play a key role in determining the books added to discipline collections through the program review process and independent communication. The Collection Development Policy delineates the priorities for the section of materials and resources and documents how they align with the college mission. In addition, students are encouraged to contribute to the selection of books and resources through the college website. Faculty confirm that their requests are considered and are typically purchased in a timely manner when requested at the beginning of the academic year; however, delays occur due to mid-year budget allocations rather than funding allocation at the beginning of the fiscal year. The Computer Commons provides access to software applications that are specific to many disciplines, and the selection of these programs is

Standard II.C: Student Support Services

General Observations

The College provides a wide variety of student services both in-person and online, with a number of exemplary programs that reflect a strong culture of inclusion having been identified by the team. The College's Virtual Valley serves as comprehensive source of online services. Student services personnel are dedicated and trained for their specific assignments, and they appear to have the support of managers and administrators. Collaboration across student services is evident particularly since they are now housed in one building. The College and District have high standards for the confidentiality, maintenance, release, and destruction of student records that adhere to state and federal law.

Findings and Evidence

Student support services regularly evaluate the effectiveness of their programs, services, and delivery methods. The college utilizes student satisfaction surveys to better understand student needs and trends. For example, evidence shows that the hours of operation sufficiently meet students' needs as reflected in student satisfaction surveys. Many departments such as counseling, health services, DSP&S, and EOPS also utilize survey data to make improvements in their daily operations and quality of services in support of student learning. The team reviewed evidence that indicates that the student support and service programs participate in program review and annual planning processes. These processes include the analysis of qualitative and quantitative data. Interviews and document review provide evidence that the College's student support and services programs have developed and are assessing learning support outcomes, and are using assessment results to inform improvement efforts. For example, Admissions and Records assesses students' knowledge of the graduation process. The analysis of this learning/service outcome and subsequent dialogue assisted staff in better informing students about graduation processes and procedures, including making this information more accessible to students. The team confirmed a number of other examples wherein student services programs utilized learning outcomes assessment to inform improvement efforts. Student services administrators, counselors, and staff also stated that, while making continual improvements with data collection and analysis, there is room for improvement in examining how these data, particularly their outcome assessment data, can be considered and inform student learning and success. Student services personnel regularly participate in a variety of training opportunities including staff meetings, annual district training, and professional conferences. (Standard II.C.1, II.C.2, ER 15)

The College provides appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable student support services through programs such as Admission & Records, the Bookstore, EOP&S, TriO, CalWORKs, Counseling, Career/Transfer Center, Veteran's Services, Health Services, Child Development Center among others. The team identified a number of exemplary programs, including Career Guidance Counseling Assistance, the Child Development Center, and Student Health Center. Specifically, the team found these programs highlighted the institution's commitment to the value of inclusion.

STANDARD III RESOURCES

Standard III.A: Human Resources

General Observations

Human resources functions are centralized at the district level, with primary responsibility for personnel records and evaluation assigned to the college. College practices for hiring faculty and staff are clearly articulated in procedure manuals. The College employs sufficient numbers of administrators, faculty and staff to support the mission and effective educational, technological, physical, and administrative operations of the institution, and ensures that they are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience. All personnel are evaluated and faculty and academic administrator's evaluations include a component of assessment of student learning outcomes to improve teaching and learning. The District and College upholds a written code of professional ethics for all of its personnel, including consequences for violation. The College plans for and provides all personnel with 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. 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. All human resource functions are compliant with regards to distance education (DE).

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

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

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

Findings and Evidence

Hiring criteria for faculty are determined by state and local policies. The College uses the state minimum qualifications of the State Chancellor's Office Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in the California Community Colleges, which are subject to

review by the District Academic Senate (DAS) in case of ambiguous equivalencies. In addition, the college has developed a Hiring Handbook, which includes College-wide Student Learning Outcomes. The college follows District procedures with regards to faculty selection, and the College's Academic Senate, in consultation with administration, developed a hiring policy for academic employees. The Academic Senate and the College president hold joint responsibility for assuring that the District and local hiring policies and procedures are observed. Both parties retain the right to review and, if necessary, revise these procedures. Criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selection of faculty are stated in the job announcements which are posted on the LACCD website. Open academic positions are advertised on the LACCD employment page, the CCC-Registry and, if appropriate or specifically requested by the college, in publications that advertise employment opportunities to a diverse educational community. It is the shared responsibility of the district and college to broadcast academic employment opportunities to the largest possible pool of potential applicants.

The District verifies applicant qualifications before their names are submitted to the College for consideration of employment. In the case of classified positions, candidates must meet the minimum entrance qualifications before they are allowed to take civil service exams. Equivalency of degrees from non-U.S. institutions are evaluated by agencies approved by the California Commission of Teaching Credentialing. Faculty job announcements include a description of an expectation of level of teaching skills and potential to contribute to the mission of the college. Each faculty job description includes the expectation to assist in curriculum development and assessment of learning. Staff, faculty, and administrators are trained in EEO procedures to ensure that the hiring procedures are in place and are consistently applied. Contract language ensures that the College faculty whose assignment involve DE, are trained to effectively deliver instruction in that modality. This Curriculum Committee is responsible to ensure that the DE mode of delivery is acceptable for specific classes. (Standard III.A.1)

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

Due to the dynamic staffing needs encountered at the college level, decentralization of the recruitment and selection process for part-time/adjunct faculty was implemented. The District's HR department verifies the qualifications of recommended part-time/adjunct faculty prior to hire. HR R-130, entitled "Adjunct Faculty Selection and Pay," requires the College president and Academic Senate to develop written procedures governing the search and selection of adjunct faculty to ensure that a thorough and deliberate search for the most qualified

candidate is conducted well in advance of the starting date of the assignment. Procedures and processes for the selection of part-time/adjunct faculty are not clearly and publicly stated. College-level adjunct hiring processes result in inconsistent notification and advertisement of employment opportunities. HR reviews part-time/adjunct qualifications upon receipt of candidates from the colleges. Candidates' qualifications are evaluated and verified as meeting the job description requirements. (Standard III.A.1)

Faculty qualifications are clearly stated on job descriptions, including education, skills, experience, and/or certifications. Job descriptions include professional responsibilities beyond teaching expectations. Student learning outcomes, curriculum development, and college-level committee requirements are included in responsibility expectations when developing full-time faculty job descriptions. HR reviews the draft job descriptions for competencies, compliance and consistency. Faculty candidates are required to meet all published job qualifications. Candidates for full-time faculty positions are asked to present a lesson to demonstrate their teaching methods. Involvement of faculty on hiring committees ensures that candidates demonstrate expertise in their discipline and excellent teaching skills. Department chairs and supervising deans review and confirm official transcripts and work experience for the hiring of adjunct faculty. A faculty-led process for determining equivalency for stated qualifications exists, but is generally limited in utilization. Faculty performance evaluations include the assessment of multiple measures of these job-related requirements. (III.A.2 and ER 14)

Job descriptions for administrators and other positions supporting institutional effectiveness and academic quality include requisite education and experience requirements. Job descriptions are updated by HR and the PC to include evolving institutional responsibilities. HR and PC personnel verify candidate qualifications prior to employment consideration.

The College's hiring committees adopt appropriate questions and conduct interviews for staff and administrators. Activities in the interview include demonstrations, skills, or other simulated job duties relevant to the position to assess the applicant's qualifications and academic quality. The inclusion in the job description of learning outcomes assessment ensures institutional effectiveness and continuous improvement. (Standard III.A.3)

LACCD has established policies and procedures regarding the evaluation of educational degrees earned by faculty, administrators, and support personnel. Applicants and employees seeking promotional opportunities are required to submit official transcripts from accredited institutions. Degrees earned from non-U.S. institutions are required to be evaluated by an established state-recognized evaluation organization for equivalency. (Standard III.A.4)

The District has established a system of performance evaluation for faculty, staff, and administrative personnel. The evaluation process is dictated by individual collective bargaining agreements and District policy. Faculty evaluation tracking is delegated to individual colleges. The PC distributes evaluation notices to classified employees and their respective supervisor during the employee's probationary period. Thereafter, HR uses an automated system to notify supervisors of upcoming and past-due performance evaluations. Current District wide completion rates average approximately 50 percent.

LAVC faculty evaluations are based primarily on peer review. In addition, students evaluate classroom instructors. To focus on improvement, the collective bargaining agreement includes the use of a written improvement plan with appropriate professional growth activities when a faculty member receives a less than satisfactory evaluation. Language in the contract emphasizes evaluation as “a way to provide positive reinforcement, constructive advice, and specific recommendations for improvement and professional growth.” To ensure that faculty evaluations are completed systematically, a tracking system is used. As of December 2015, most (96%) of faculty evaluations were current. Classified personnel are evaluated annually. If an employee receives a less than satisfactory evaluation, the supervisor and the employee jointly develop a performance improvement program. Any negative evaluation must include specific recommendations for improvements and provisions for assisting the employee in achieving them. As of December 2015, most (85%) of classified evaluations were current. Administrators and classified supervisors are evaluated annually.

The District Human Resources Division utilizes a web application with workflow to remind supervisors to complete evaluations for their direct reports. The Evaluation Alert System (EASY) follows the organization structure at each location; all nine colleges and the Educational Services Center (ESC). The current programming includes alerts for all permanent classified employees and deans. Evaluations for faculty are administered in accordance with the provisions stipulated by the collective bargaining agreement. The administration of these evaluations is managed locally at the college. Evaluations for Vice Presidents are conducted annually every spring. The Human Resources Division provides the forms and completion timelines to the college presidents. Evaluations for Senior Executives are administered by Human Resources, in conjunction with the Office of the Chancellor. As a member of the Southern California Community Colleges Employment Relations Consortium, the Human Resources Division encourages managers and supervisors to participate in the various workshops on performance management.

The annual/basic evaluation reviews the performance of the College president through the use of the District’s Self-Assessment Instrument. The individual being evaluated is provided the opportunity to assess his/her performance over the past year, to assess his/her progress or attainment of the prior year’s annual goals, and to update annual goals for the upcoming year. The comprehensive evaluation reviews the performance of the College president using the components of the annual/basic evaluation as described above, and incorporates information gathered from a contributor group of District employees through a structured data collection process. The data collection process uses the District’s Senior Academic Executive Evaluation Data Collection Instrument. Working within these parameters, the Human Resources Division provides guidance to the managers and supervisors on recommended practices for performance management, including formal commendations and work improvement plans. Human Resources also offers trainings on various aspects of performance management through the Southern California Community College Employment Relations Consortium. If an employee has a less than satisfactory evaluation, steps are taken to assist the employee to improve per the applicable collective bargaining agreement. (Standard III.A.5)

Criteria in the evaluation of faculty address the teaching of appropriate course content, leading to effective student achievement. Faculty evaluations include the assessment of learning outcomes. The negotiated evaluation process and related forms include requirements for the utilization of learning outcomes in the improvement of teaching and learning. Participating in the process of assessing course SLOs includes identifying remedies to address student weaknesses and allows faculty to measure the impact of changes implemented. Academic Affairs administrators work with their departments to utilize achievement data to improve teaching and learning. The faculty member's evaluation includes reflection on how they perform that function. Academic administrators' evaluations do not include the assessment of responsibilities related to learning outcomes. (Standard III.A.6)

The College maintains sufficient numbers of qualified full and part-time faculty. The course schedule is developed by reviewing a wide range of data to complete a two-year scheduling program for each discipline. Courses are offered to lead to transfer, degree and certificate completion as aligned with the institutional mission. All classes are staffed based on transcript review, interviews and evaluation of all faculty members. The College uses its program review process to decide whether positions should be added or replaced based on the viability of that program. Data such as fulltime to part-time ratio is also utilized when considering faculty positions.

The DE function is managed at the college level, beginning with the determination of which courses are to be offered as DE courses. The college makes the decision on teaching in the DE modality and provides the requisite training, if necessary, to prepare faculty to provide online instruction. Staffing to support the DE function at the college is requested through the annual planning process. Annual assessment of DE services is the responsibility of the college shared governance committees. Recent assessment at the college has identified the need for additional support for the DE function, which resulted in an increase in FTE for the DE Coordinator (.4 to .6) as well as existing staff (part-time to full-time) and additional part-time support. (Standard III.A.7, ER 14)

LACCD employs a substantial cadre of over 3,300 part-time/adjunct faculty among the nine colleges and academic organizations. LAVC is delegated the responsibility for orientation, oversight, evaluation, and professional development of adjunct faculty. Opportunities for part-time faculty participation in the teaching and learning aspects of college operations and decision-making are provided and encouraged. For example, the College periodically provides Adjunct Faculty orientation to discuss duties and responsibilities, college resources, classroom management, providing help for students, the professional development obligation, and ways to get involved in the life of the campus. Evaluation of adjunct faculty is the responsibility of department chairs. Incentives are offered in the form of tuition reimbursement to encourage professional development and for postsecondary education. In addition, the Academic Senate has established an elected position for an Adjunct Representative and offers adjunct faculty the opportunity to apply for the rank of Adjunct Assistant Professor. Adjuncts are encouraged to serve on college committees and opportunities are available to participate in campus life. (Standard III.A.8)

The College employs approximately 209 classified employees and 426 unclassified workers (including students and professional experts). The District Personnel Commission ensures that staff who are hired possess the necessary qualifications to perform their duties. The College Administration performs analysis of current staffing needs based on the annual plan modules. The team did not find that the College possesses a mechanism for adequately identifying future staffing and other needs associated with the total cost of ownership of its facility and technology infrastructure. Strategies to address the gaps in staffing associated with the recent expansion of facilities and technology are discussed in Action Project #2 in the Quality Focus Essay. (Standard III.A.9, ER 8)

The College also employs 21 administrators. The District budget allocation model provides for a base allocation to the college to fully fund the minimum administrative staffing for the President, Vice Presidents, the Institutional Research Dean, a Facilities Manager, and a number of Deans, based on the size of the College. (Standard III.A.10, ER 8)

Written personnel policies and procedures are available online for information and review. A process of regular policy review and updating has been established. The HR Council meets monthly to review and recommend proposed changes in Board Rules and Administrative Regulations. The HR Council's membership includes college presidents, the Vice Chancellor of HR, college vice presidents (academic affairs, student services, and administrative services), and resource personnel, as needed. The PC regularly reviews its policies and procedures regarding the employment of classified staff. These rules and regulations provide fair and equitable employment conditions. The Employment Relations Department is responsible for addressing allegations of inconsistent application of District policies. (Standard III.A.11)

The College supports the needs of its diverse personnel. In 2014, for example, the College integrated the Diversity Committee into the SSSP Advisory Committee, a sub-committee composed of faculty, staff, administrators, and students. The College has continued its tradition of holding campus diversity/cultural events and activities promoting inclusion. The College uses survey data to assess the support needs of its personnel. Efforts in support of the LAVC Equity Plan provide opportunities to explore diversity and increase awareness of the needs of the diverse population. The District maintains statistics on each college's record of diversity. The District is responsible for recruitment of candidates and keeps a record of the characteristics of its applicant pool.

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

The College adheres to a clearly defined code of professional ethics exists. The Academic Senate, for example, lists on their webpage the procedures that must be taken in case of breaches in ethics, including initiation of complaints, investigation and reporting of charges,

informal resolutions and formal hearings, rights of the accused, and actions the Senate may decide to take. The College investigates any suspected violations and takes the appropriate action. LAVC adheres to the District Academic Senate (DAS) Policy on Faculty Ethics, along with Board policy, Code of Ethics-Board Rule #1204, both of which have been adopted by the Board of Trustees. Appropriate corrective actions and consequences are addressed in the Board Rule. All other personnel are covered by District Board Rules. (Standard III.A.13)

Faculty and staff participate in professional development programs to enhance teaching strategies, technology, and the needs of students. Professional development also focuses on improving institutional effectiveness by providing training on administrative procedures, personal development, and workplace issues. In order to determine the needs of its faculty and personnel, evaluations and feedback from prior sessions are used by the Professional Development Advisory Committee (PDAC) to decide on future offerings. Surveys from staff and faculty are also considered on the decision on future training. In addition, departments indicate their needs for training on the professional development module of their annual plans. PDAC ranks requests that involve funding and forwards them to the IEC for funding consideration.

The District has long-established professional development programs. Existing programs and new opportunities for District employees are continually identified, evaluated, and developed, i.e., “Dean’s Academy,” “Professional Development College,” and “The President’s Academy.” The introduction of a partnership with the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) to create the “President’s Academy” provides relevant training for aspiring LACCD executive leaders. The District Academic Senate provides faculty representatives the ability to work collaboratively in providing content in support of student learning and success. The District also explores methods to increase opportunities for its classified staff. Campus-level trainings are provided by District personnel as part of the regular communication and educational support. The District Educational Service Center (ESC) initiates training or educational programs for ESC personnel when appropriate. Through the Office of Diversity, the District also provides training for compliance issues and EEO oversight for hiring.

Although the College provides development opportunities to faculty and staff, the team found that said efforts could be better aligned and enhanced, particularly for classified staff. The College has formed a Professional Development Inquiry Group, with faculty, staff, and administrator representation, which began meeting in fall 2015 to explore ways to integrate professional development activities across the campus. As a result, the college has made plans to devote more focus and direct more resources in this area as discussed in Action Project #3 in the Quality Focus Essay. (Standard III.A.14)

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

College Conclusion

The College effectively uses its human resources to achieve its mission and to improve academic quality and institutional effectiveness. It demonstrates that personnel policies and procedures are clearly articulated and well documented. Hiring processes roles and responsibilities are coordinated between the college and the district. It has established policies and procedures for fair and equitable practices in hiring and maintaining its staff. Earnest attempts have occurred to diversify its faculty and staff. The district reinforces the importance of the code of ethics. Faculty job descriptions and evaluations include substantive attention to assessment of SLOs.

While the College analyzes current staffing needs through annual planning processes, the opportunity exists to strengthen processes for determining future staffing needs associated with the total cost-of-ownership of its facility and technology investments. However, the team did not find that the College has developed or utilizes consistently, a total cost-of-ownership model for its long-term facility and technology resource investments. Additionally, while the provision of professional development exists, the team encourages the College to continue its efforts to integrate and expand their efforts across the college.

Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

College Recommendation 3 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College develop a total cost of ownership model to identify and prioritize the staffing, college-technology, and facility needs to effectively support the learning environment. (Standard III.A.9, III.B.4, III.C.2, III.D.1)

College Recommendation 4 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College increase professional development opportunities for classified staff and faculty, and fully integrate professional development efforts across the College. (Standard III.A.14)

District Conclusion

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

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

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

Faculty evaluations include an assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) as a

Standard III.B: Physical Resources

General Observations

Los Angeles Valley College is the 4th largest college in the LACCD and is located on 105 acres in the Los Angeles suburb of Valley Glen in the heart of the San Fernando Valley. As part of the voter-passed Propositions A, AA, and Measure J, the College continues its \$626 million renovation and construction projects to improve and replace campus facilities. The College represents a very unique urban oasis, existing within a beautiful park-like setting with over 1,600 trees and plants, and it is the first community college in California to earn a Tree Campus USA designation. This novel setting and associated values it represents are further augmented by sustainable building designs and approach to space utilization. A strong commitment to sustainability is also evidenced in the very innovative, green approach to the design of its various new buildings.

In general, the College provided evidence to substantiate its awareness and understanding of the continuous quality improvement process along with developing and applying physical resources to review and improve educational quality and institutional effectiveness. The team found evidence of this in campus and district documentation and plans and documented meetings that include representatives of all College and District constituents.

The College utilizes various processes to plan and evaluate its facilities and the needs of the district. These processes include the Facilities Master Plan, the Educational Master Plan, Security Master Plan, and the Program Review process. The College also employs several mechanisms to assure the safety and security of the College's learning and working environments. Opportunities exist at the College to identify the total cost of ownership with regards to its facilities.

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

Findings and Evidence

The College has made progress in assuring safe and sufficient physical resources where it offers courses, programs, and learning support services. The College has a dedicated ADA coordinator, and it was validated through interviews that they have a rigorous process to assess compliance. The facilities are constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment. The LAVC Maintenance and Operations (M&O) Department is responsible for maintaining a safe, clean, and accessible environment by providing facility and grounds maintenance and custodial service for all

Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

See College Recommendation 3 (Improvement)

District Conclusion

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

Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

None

Standard III.C: Technology Resources

General Observations

Los Angeles Valley College provides technology resources that promote student success in their educational and career goals and for their access to instruction and student support services. With 12+ employees, the Offices of Information Technology and Media Services provide the resource management, support the technology, and provide a secure technology environment. In addition, support for students and employees is provided through the Virtual Valley staff, Office of Professional Development, and the Dean for Distance Education. Technology resource planning is outlined in the Technology Plan and aligns with the Educational Master Plan and Los Angeles Community College District Technology Plan.

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

Findings and Evidence

Technology services, support, hardware, and software are currently adequate to support the institution's programs and services. Four areas – audio, visual, computer and network and telephone and web – are provided by the Offices of Information Technology and Media Services. The Information Technology Help Desk provides and tracks service needs for campus media, hardware and software; and the Distance Education Coordinator and the Virtual Valley Help Desk provide support for distance education faculty and students. Other services for students include online orientation and online student educational planning tools. The College relies upon the Technology Plan and Program Review to determine planning and resource allocation. The College evaluates the technology resources primarily through user surveys distributed to faculty, staff, and students. The surveys indicate general satisfaction with the services and infrastructure, but the opportunity for improvement exists and the technology staff have made changes to better support faculty, staff, and students. Using technology for teaching, learning, and support services is evident throughout campus. Increasingly, the Information Technology staff are supporting additional infrastructure needs such as security and facilities systems, and this has placed a strain on their capacity to more fully meet the needs of the College.

As noted in the District/College Functional Map, technology resources to support student learning, student services, and institutional effectiveness is a shared responsibility between the colleges and the District. At the District level, the LACCD Information Technology

department provides the wide area network infrastructure, an enterprise resource planning system for finance and human resources (SAP), a student information system (DEC/PeopleSoft), an educational planning system (DegreeWorks), email for students and staff (Office 365/Microsoft Exchange), a helpdesk ticketing system (CMMS), a scheduling system for faculty class and room assignments (Protocol ESS), an electronic curriculum development system (ECD), and other related systems. In addition, it was noted in interviews with campus technology managers that LACCD Information Technology assists with contract optimization, District wide technology standards, best practices, data interface to campus specific systems such as distance education systems and staff augmentations when needed to assist the colleges. (Standard III.C.1)

The Technology Plan (2012-2017) along with the comprehensive and annual program planning processes represent the means by which the College plans for and maintains its technology infrastructure. The quality and capacity of the infrastructure currently appear adequate to support the mission, operations, programs, and services of the College. Evidence suggests that a sufficient number of computers are available for students and employees. Recent improvements have been made to this infrastructure, specifically the wireless network.

The Technology Committee plays a central role in the creation, monitoring, and analysis of the Technology Plan. The College has a solid process – through comprehensive program review and annual planning – to identify and prioritize campus technology needs. In addition to the Technology Committee, the other key players in planning campus technology are the Information Technology Manager and the Vice President of Academic Affairs. The Technology Plan includes four levels of prioritization beginning with “needed for compliance” to “desirable for institutional effectiveness.” All recommendations in the plan are given one of four priority levels. Technology needs not funded through instructional categorical funds or proposition 20 funds and which remain as a recommendation, are sent to the Budget Committee and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee for review. It is evident the College’s technology decisions are the result of the evaluation of program and service needs through the Program Review and through user (students, faculty, and staff) surveys.

The infrastructure for distance education courses and programs are provided by hosted services such as Etudes, NetTutor, and other state-supported services. In the current academic year, the College agreed to move from Etudes to the Online Education Initiative platform (Canvas) beginning in June. In a review of the 50 recommendations of the Technology Plan, the College has completed 25 projects, removed 10 projects, and has 15 remaining projects in process. Total cost of ownership for all campus-technology is not clearly identified; the plan for the replacement of aging college technology lacks comprehensiveness, and no ongoing college technology budget exists to address replacement needs. This may become critical in future years as the technology purchased with bond funds age and when the increased number of computers age. To date, the institution has relied primarily upon bond funds, block grant and Proposition 20 funds to pay for technology needs.

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

The College maintains two data centers on campus, providing local redundancy, maintains a disk backup of critical databases, and also distributes the data backups to District servers. Network safety and security are provided through the Palo Alto Networks firewall solution and commercial antivirus software. The IT Manager and her staff follow internal guidelines and District policy for network access. Information Technology staff continuously monitor and analyze network systems for stability. The College recognizes that reliable wireless access on campus is a challenge. A significant number of both students and employees have identified this as unsatisfactory despite 230 access points on campus and the recent addition of 40 new access points this past year. Wireless coverage and support was identified by the College as one of the action plans in the Quality Focus Essay.

The District shares responsibility with the College for the provision of reliable, safe, and secure technology resources. Through interviews, the team determined that the LACCD Information Technology department has developed Disaster Recover/Business Continuity plans which include local backup to disk, immediate backup to a second data center at one of the college sites about 25 kilometers away, with a final encrypted copy to tape. The tapes are moved off site to a specialized tape vault service, and the tapes are rotated out of state to Nevada for greater protection. Each campus is responsible for the security and reliability of the systems and data they support locally. All nine colleges indicate varying levels of security for locally supported systems, with six doing local campus backup only, two having local backups at a second on-campus data center, and one college doing backup to the District. None of the colleges indicate the existence of a Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery plan in their respective Institution Self Evaluation Reports. Interviews with campus and District technology staff confirmed that student and staff data are stored both at the District and campus servers and should be protected. (Standard III.C.3)

Technology related instruction and support for faculty, staff, students, and administrators are provided from several sources: Information Technology Help Desk (employees), Virtual Valley Help Desk (students), Dean for Distance Education (faculty), and through the Professional Development Center (employees). The assessment of needs for professional development are determined primarily through an annual survey distributed to all user groups. The survey includes questions related to distance education as well as campus technology needs. Most training is provided in person and on campus through one-on-one interactions, workshops throughout the academic year, and during the Opening Day, Annual Staff Day, and the Annual Tech Fest. Based on requests for more online training, the College has begun to provide online tutorials and/or recordings of campus trainings on their website. In addition, a Professional Development Summit took place in January 2016 to explore better methods to integrate professional development for faculty, staff, and administrators. The Virtual Valley website contains significant resources for both students and faculty engaged in distance education. Online tutorials and links to policies and best practices are easily discoverable.

Districtwide training is scheduled as part of any new systems deployment. The established strategy is to create super-users for all District wide systems so that the local campus can maintain the training after initial system deployment. The District will also schedule trainings on an as-requested basis when a significant need is identified. Campus technology staff also indicates that the District Information Technology unit provides funds for off-site training in deployed technology solutions. (Standard III.C.4)

College procedures related to appropriate use of technology for teaching and learning are established by the College Distance Education Committee, the Subcommittee for Distance Education of the Curriculum Committee, and the Technology Committee (especially as it relates to 508 compliance). A network security policy and computing policy exists for the College. Policies and administrative regulations in place at the District which guide the appropriate use of technology in the teaching and learning process include B-27 Network Security Policy, B-28 Use of District and College Computing Facilities, B-33 Web Accessibility Standards and Guidelines, B-34 ADA Self Evaluation and Transition Plan, E-89 Distance Education Policy, E-105 Student Privacy/FERPA, and E-114 Identity Theft Prevention Program. The colleges acknowledge that they abide by these policies to guide operations as evidenced in their respective Institution Self Evaluation Reports. The team confirmed in interviews that the TPPC and TPC suggest policies as needed to aid in the appropriate use of the technology. In addition, the colleges have additional local policies for campus technologies such as websites and distance education systems. (Standard III.C.5)

College Conclusion

Technology services, support, hardware, and software are currently adequate to support the institution's programs and services with the achievement of excellence in this area limited only by resource constraints. Despite these challenges, the faculty, staff and managers supporting information technology at the College are passionate and creative in finding solutions that improve the services for the students and their colleagues. The College's efforts in this area could be improved through the development of a more comprehensive total cost of ownership model for all college technology. The College meets the Standard.

College Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

See College Recommendation 3 (Improvement)

District Conclusions

Technology resources are adequate to support the institution's management and operational functions. Tremendous effort has been put into integrated planning within each college and is guided by planning processes District wide. The institution plans for District-level technology replacement using a Total Cost of Ownership model for District systems. Sound decisions about technology are being made as a result. None of the colleges acknowledge a Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery plan although all indicate redundancy on campus data centers and local backups. The District and campuses provide appropriate instruction and support in the effective use of technology solutions. The District has appropriate policies and procedures that guide the appropriate use of technology in teaching and learning processes. The District meets all the Standards in III.C except Standard III.C.3.

The team commends the technology staff from the nine colleges and the District for their teamwork and collaboration in sharing staff resources, developing technology standards, collaborative training, and deployment of integrated systems which result in effective and efficient use of technology resources to improve academic quality and institutional effectiveness. (III.C.1, III.C.4)

District Recommendation for Improvement and Compliance

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

Standard III.D: Financial Resources

General Observations

The College's general unrestricted fund budget is approximately \$59 million. Currently, the College has sufficient revenues to support educational improvements. As of June 30, 2015, the college set aside ten percent of expenditures in reserve. The college's recent prudent approach to fiscal management has ensured financial stability for the future. The College's strategic plan focuses on student success. The goals and strategic directives emphasize the importance of budget and planning with the focus on institutional effectiveness, student success, and excellence and equity. Documents, including budget and financial audits, indicate that the College has financial resources sufficient to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. The resource allocation model supports the development, maintenance, and enhancement of programs and services. Internally prepared budgets and financial statements, annual external audited financial statements, annual external audit findings and other related documents reflect the College's commitment to maintaining financial integrity. The financial audits of the institution, with continued unqualified opinions, support the assertion that the institution manages its financial affairs with integrity and continues to remain financially stable. The college has recently made tremendous strides in achieving a positive fund balance at the end of the 2014-15 fiscal year having over \$1.3 million in reserve which represents approximately 2.4 percent of its operating budget. The prior two fiscal years the college experienced budget deficits. Recent changes in fiscal oversight at the college indicate that the college addresses the need to remain financially solvent in the future.

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

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

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

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

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

Findings and Evidence

The College currently has sufficient revenues to support and sustain educational programs and services and improve effectiveness. Over the past two years, the College has worked diligently to realign their budgets to operate within their allocated resources. The team recognizes that the College has made significant sacrifices during this time to achieve this realignment, having done so while remaining committed to maintaining quality services for students. Through the program review process, the College allocates resources based on assessments that demonstrate the need for improvement; connecting to the mission and Educational Master Plan (EMP). The team did not find a mechanism for identifying future resource needs.

Finances are managed with integrity to ensure financial stability by projections provided in a Multi-year Balanced Budget Plan, which included identifying budget reductions bringing financial stability to the College. In addition, an Enrollment Management Plan was developed to optimize scheduling of classes in a manner that will realize efficiencies and meet growth targets. Recent changes in administrative leadership coupled with involved college stakeholders and updated plans help to ensure long-term financial stability. Specific resources needed for distance education (DE) programs and services are requested through the annual program review process.

In October 2013, the Board of Trustees adopted the District Financial Accountability Measures in response to a 2013 Accreditation Evaluation Report for Los Angeles Valley College, which recommended that accountability measures be put in place to ensure long-term fiscal stability and financial integrity of the college. The District Financial Accountability Measures are used to ensure sound fiscal management and provide a process to monitor and evaluate the financial health of all colleges within the District and require that each college president include provisions for (1) a balanced budget; (2) long-term enrollment plans; (3) position control for personnel; (4) an annual financial plan; (5) quarterly reporting on expenditures and overall fiscal status; (6) a college reserve policy; and (7) action plans. (Standard III.D.1, ER 18)

Budgetary decisions are driven by college goals, beginning at the departmental level through program review and annual planning, and vetted through the participatory governance process. All requests for funding are justified by their connection to the EMP, institutional plans, department goals, or assessment improvement plans through the program review and annual planning process. The team verified that resource requests are reviewed by division administrators, using the lens of the College mission, EMP goals, and other relevant college plans. Requests not associated with one-time state funding for supplies and equipment and those not already funded by the fixed costs of the operational budget are given to the Budget Committee for prioritization and recommendation on funding. Budget Committee recommendations are sent to the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) for review and approval with final decision by the President. The Budget Committee's primary purpose is to strategically guide fiscal planning and develop procedures, policies, guidelines, timelines, and evaluation metrics for determining allocations and or reductions of budget expenditures. The committee meets monthly and reports to the IEC. With the college experiencing constrained resources, the team found evidence to confirm that it has reviewed its budgets and determined where to realign and redirect their resources with an emphasis on student learning. The Budget Committee and the IEC receive monthly updates on the results of fiscal operations as well as projections on current year activity as well as budget planning for the following year. The college receives the majority of their revenue through a budget allocation model in the District. The college does not have any outstanding loans. (Standard III.D.2)

The College's financial planning process, which includes monthly and quarterly projections on fiscal, enrollment, and resource allocation, gives all constituencies, through their representatives on the Budget Committee and the IEC, a chance to participate in budget planning. (Standard III.D.3)

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

\$57.67 million of State Mandated Reimbursement Revenues and how they were tied to the District's Strategic Plan Goals. (Standards III.D.3, III.D.4, III.D.6)

Informational monthly and quarterly financial reports on the College's financial status, which include revenue and expenditure projections, are provided for discussion to the IEC and posted on the College Budget Office webpage. Interviews and review of documentation provide evidence that resource requests are prioritized and vetted through the participatory governance process to insure that they are aligned with the college's mission and goals and that items which impact student learning are given priority. The college is working to strengthen this process by the development of a rubric that will assist in aligning this process.

While the District's Financial Accountability Measures require that the colleges maintain position control for personnel, upon discussion with finance staff, it was noted that the District's information system does not currently have a tool to track and maintain personnel costs. While the District's percentage of salaries and benefits compared to overall expenditures is approximately 85 percent, several of the colleges significantly exceed this amount. (Standard III.D.4, III.D.5)

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

Monthly reports, including financial projections and scenarios are used for sound financial decision-making by the Budget Committee. These are posted on the Budget Office website for dissemination and review. The College manages its finances in a responsible manner as evidenced the absence of external audit findings particular to the College for the past several years. (Standard III.D.5, III.D.6)

The annual Board-Approved Final Budget document from the LACCD Office of the Chancellor outlines the cost of carrying out the College's plans to offer educational programs and services. As a prelude to the Final Budget, the College prepares an annual Operational Plan which details to college constituents the allocation of financial resources, including those to support student learning programs and services. (Standard III.D.6)

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

District audit reports are available for review on the District's website, and the last three years' reports all included "unmodified" opinions rendered by the District's external auditors,

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

The District’s audit reports for the bond program are posted on the District’s website. There are two separate reports, one for performance audits and the second for financial audits. The performance audit reports (2006-07 through 2013-14) are quite detailed and address such things as analysis of change orders, completeness of operating procedures, and evaluation of the project close-out process. The financial reports (2007-08 through 2014-15) are broken down between Proposition A, Proposition AA and the Measure J bond programs, each with a separate opinion. For the 2014-15 financial report, all three opinions were all unmodified and the results of the auditor tests disclosed no instance of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under Government Auditing Standards. For the performance audits, it was noted that there were several substantial improvements over key capital project delivery processes compared to what was found in previous years. There were several areas where additional improvements could be made which included two medium-priority opportunities and three low-priority opportunities. No high-priority opportunities were identified.

The College’s financial management processes are evaluated and audited by the District’s Internal Audit Department (IAD). If they find any discrepancies or deficiencies, personnel from those areas are required to attend mandatory meetings with the Internal Audit Department to discuss the findings and take corrective actions. The College responds to external audit findings by ensuring that the reports are comprehensive and communicated appropriately in a timely manner. Responsible parties are notified and to address issues and implement corrective action. The College did have an audit finding from the Child Care Food Program Audit and the finding was appropriately addressed. (Standard III.D.8)

The cash available to the District is sufficient as evidenced by the District not participating in Tax Revenue Anticipation Notes (TRANs) since the 2012-13 year, and the cash balance reported to the State Chancellor’s Office in the CCFS-311Q. Over the last three years, the report showed a low of \$51,116,662 and a high of \$262,061,404 for cash balances. For fiscal year 2014/15 the College’s Contingency Reserve is \$509,585. For fiscal year 2014/15 the College had a positive ending Unrestricted Funds balance of \$1,359,369. (Standard III.D.9)

The College utilizes its program review and annual planning processes to assess the effective use of its financial resources. By using this process, it allows the college to document and

evaluate results and make any necessary changes for the following cycle. The College maintains regular and effective contact with its students to ensure Title IV financial funds that are disbursed to eligible financial aid students are properly utilized or are returned timely to the US Department of Education. (Standard III.D.10)

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

The College's primary future liability is its debt repayment obligation to the District. The repayment is taken up front annually from its budget allocation. The District is responsible for allocating resources for the payment of certain liabilities and future obligations. (Standard III.D.11)

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

The College does not have any locally incurred debt instruments. The District's long-term debt schedule reflects a liability of \$4.3 billion with most of the debt being General Obligation Bonds where debt payment resources will come from taxes on local property. Other long-term debt reported is Workers' Compensation claims, general liability claims, compensated absences, and capital lease obligations. One liability that is not recorded is for load banking, an option available to faculty as part of the faculty collective bargaining agreement, Article 39. Discussion with District managers confirmed that the colleges have load banking obligations, but a liability has not been booked into the District's financial

statements. (Standards III.D.12, 14) District audits reveal no locally incurred debt instruments. (Standard III.D.13)

The District does not have any Certificates of Participation outstanding. Auxiliary activities, fund-raising efforts, and grant monitoring are done at the colleges, with some oversight from the District. Claims are done through the District’s Accounting Office. For example, the District’s Internal Audit department has spent significant hours auditing the Colleges’ Associated Student Organization funds and college foundations. The District also coordinates the external financial audits for the college foundations. The Los Angeles Community College District Foundation has not had much activity over the last several years. The last audit report was for the years ended June 30, 2012 and 2013; at that time, cash assets were \$328,845. Reviewing the District’s Financial Summary, the cash balance as of February 29, 2016, is \$384,975. There is a Representation Letter with the auditors to do a review of the financial statements for the years ended June, 30, 2014 and 2015. A review is proposed instead of an audit due to the limited activity. (Standard III.D.14)

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

Perkins Default Rates

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

As the above table indicates, the default rate for LAVC is within federal guidelines, having decreased significantly from the levels in 2011-12. The College plans to utilize default management services provided by the California Community Colleges State Chancellor’s Office. Student loan default rates, revenues and related matters are consistently monitored to ensure compliance with federal regulations. The team found the College’s progress in reducing their default rate to be commendable. (Standard III.D.10, III.D.15, ER 5)

The College follows a tiered approach to contracting with low cost contracts reviewed and approved by college administration. Higher cost contracts go through a more detail District process with possible review of legal counsel. This ensures necessary provisions are included to provide for termination and amendment to maintain control over the goods and services provided. For example, the College contracts with Valley Presbyterian Hospital for LAVC Health Center services. LAVC Job Training contracts with the City of Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles, State Chancellor’s Office, and Workforce Investment Board to conduct specialized training. Contracts are reviewed by the appropriate area vice president, who ensures that the agreements are consistent with the mission and goals of the College before they are forwarded to the VP of Administrative Services and the College president for approval. Effective procedures and processes protect the District and the College from unnecessary exposure to risk when entering into contractual arrangements. Contracts are reviewed, approved, and ratified by the Board of Trustees to ensure compliance with laws and regulations. (Standard III.D.16)

College Conclusion

The College has financial resources sufficient to support student learning and improve institutional effectiveness. The College has established a multi-year fiscal plan to continue to serve students and remain fiscally stable, which is a priority for the College. The integrated planning at LAVC has been fully implemented and assessed. The team commends the College in their efforts to decrease the student loan default rate by over 50% during the last three years as well as for its commitment to maintaining quality services for students while making significant sacrifices over the past two years in order to repay its prior fiscal obligations to the district. The College meets the Standard.

College Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

See College Recommendation 3 (Improvement)

District Conclusion

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

District Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

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

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

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

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

STANDARD IV LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE

Standard IV.A: Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations

The LACCD has a seven-member Board that presides over nine colleges serving more than 225,000 students. The LACCD Board of Trustees establishes policies that are consistent with its mission statement and exercises oversight of the college's educational programs by means of its Board Rules and Administrative Regulations (Board Rules, Chapter 1, Article 2). The chancellor of the District executes policies and procedures and presides over the daily operations of the colleges. The College president reports to the chancellor of the District.

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

The College has developed and utilizes a governance process that encourages and includes wide participation and innovation leading to institutional excellence and student success. Governance roles are defined in policy and designed to facilitate improvements and support student learning. Through extensive interviews, it was evident to the team that the decision-making process has continued to improve and that managers, faculty, and staff feel included in planning and providing input to decisions. The leadership of the College, moreover, continues to stabilize with the appointment of the current president whose tenure began nineteen months ago.

The environment at the College promotes participation in decision-making and provides multiple opportunities for representatives from constituent groups to serve on participatory governance committees. A well-defined committee structure allows for campus participation and input and it appears that employees care about institutional effectiveness and are willing to participate in governance structures that ensure quality outcomes. Personnel interviewed expressed optimism about the recent changes in the governance structure and its potential for strengthening planning, evaluation, and resource allocation. A centralized College communication web page provides public access to information about shared governance committees, their processes, and their actions. Email and others communication mechanisms provide employees with notification of committee updates and postings.

Findings and Evidence

The College encourages innovation leading to institutional excellence by supporting

administrators, faculty, staff, and students in their efforts to improve practices, programs, and services. Review of the Mission Statement and Goals of the College reveal their intentional focus on academic success and empowerment as well as an emphasis on inclusion. The governance process is designed to include faculty, staff, students, and administrators in improving practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. Governance structures, processes, and practices take into account institutional performance data that is current and readily available on the College website. The primary participatory governance committee is the IEC who, along with the Academic Senate, make recommendations to the College president. However, committees under the IEC have solid foundations with which they may move plans or motions forward. The team confirmed that these governance committees have specifically outlined membership described in the *Shared Governance Handbook* thus providing the opportunity for open participation by all College, faculty, administration, employees, and students. Interviews with the IEC and the PEPC representatives confirms that committee membership is consistent and has increased in recent years, and affirmed the effectiveness of the governance structure. Interviews with classified staff members confirmed that the structure works for soliciting information from and disseminating back to staff is appropriate and ample. Interviews with College personnel were consistent in expressing that the improvements in the participatory governance process have engendered a much greater sense of transparency and inclusiveness.

When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution wide implications, the College has processes to assure effective planning and implementation from all constituent groups. For instance, the grant approval process provides an avenue to present implications to constituent groups while aligning to the College Mission, EMP, or other planning documents prior to approval. Included in this process is the review of institutional data and planning documents by all governance groups for input. In one example, the Associated Student Union (ASU) brought forward a smoking policy that began with the WEC and moved through the IEC to the President for approval. The policy was recently updated to include the use of e-cigarettes. (Standard IV.A.1)

The District has a culture that encourages participation by all constituencies, described by the chancellor as “The Power of NINE!” in reference to the District’s nine colleges. Constituent participation includes the District- and college-level Academic Senate, the six collective bargaining units, the Associated Students, a seven-member Board of Trustees, and District/college management. These constituent bodies have the opportunity to provide input into decision-making as outlined in the *District Governance and Functions Handbook*. The governance functional map outlines the lines of authority and delineates the colleges and District roles. The *District Governance and Functions Handbook* describes the overall governance and decision-making structures for the colleges and the District.

The College also has thorough and detailed written policies and procedures for faculty, staff, administrators, and students to participate in decision-making. *The Shared Governance Handbook* describes the institutional policies and procedures for the roles of each governance group and describes the membership, role, and product of each. The ASU has designated seats on all councils and committees (although not all are filled). In addition, the student survey indicated 73 percent agree or strongly agree that student needs are taken into consideration by the College when making decisions. The annual Committee Interests Survey

is used for inquiry as to where faculty and staff might want to serve. Since there is no Classified Senate at the College, classified staff are appointed to governance committees through the Union representative with the information from the survey driving appointments. Motions are brought forward in the same manner for all groups and there is a process that is well developed in the *Shared Governance Handbook*. The team confirmed that information goes back to all groups via College email and weekly governance updates. There are also individual group actions that result in more communication. For instance, classified staff who serve on committees are required to complete a report for each meeting attended. That is sent to the Union Representative who holds a monthly meeting that reports back as to all meetings. The team found Policies regarding attendance in these committees to be noted and consistent. (Standard IV.A.2)

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. Faculty and administration also have substantive representation on District councils and committees, which allows for a voice on District policies affecting the College. The number of designated slots for administrators, faculty, staff, and students on governance committees is determined by the IEC and in some cases, by union contracts. For example, the LACCD and AFT (American Federation of Teachers) Agreement 2014-2017 (Agreement) emphasizes the importance of faculty representation from the union and senate on participatory governance committees. The LACCD and AFT Agreement specifies which committees require faculty representation and those for which it is recommended. The Agreement requires faculty membership for both Budget and Strategic Planning Committees.

Administrators are appointed by their division heads based on areas of expertise, supervision, or interest. Faculty members are jointly appointed to governance committees by the Academic Senate President and the Faculty Guild Chapter President. (Standard IV.A.3)

Faculty and administrators follow well-defined structures in making recommendations about curriculum and student learning programs and services. Administrative regulation E-65 lays out in great detail a step-by-step process for curriculum development and approval. This process recognizes the primacy of faculty members in making curriculum recommendations while also ensuring administrative input in the curriculum process. The LAVC Academic Senate meets once a month during the fall and spring semesters and makes recommendations on a wide range of academic issues. Its president brings motions directly to the College president or the IEC. The Academic Senate's Valley College Curriculum Committee (VCCC) makes recommendations on College policies concerning curriculum and monitors all curriculum changes, additions, and deletions. It includes as voting members a dean and the Vice President of Academic Affairs, is chaired by the Academic Senate Curriculum VP, and is comprised predominantly of faculty. Curriculum recommendations approved by the Academic Senate are forwarded to the Board of Trustees.

The *Shared Governance Handbook* is reviewed annually to ensure that the structure is functioning as designed. A review conducted in 2015 resulted in a number of significant improvements to College governance structures and processes. The team confirmed that the

handbook and organizational chart were revised accordingly, and distributed to the campus community. (Standard IV.A.4)

College governance processes, as delineated in the associated handbook, ensures relevant perspectives, expertise, and areas of responsibility inform and align with decision-making. There are well-defined processes for communication before internal administrative and external Board decisions are made that impact faculty, staff, and students. Recommendations from governance and contractually mandated committees are solicited before decisions are made.

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

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

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

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

The process for decision-making is clearly outlined in the *Shared Governance Handbook*. The IEC oversees College planning and making recommendations to the President. As is specified in the handbook and on the motion forms, a rationale is required if a recommendation is not accepted by the IEC or the College President. If the motion is approved, the IEC chair circulates the motion forms and fiscal analysis forms for any motions to be considered with the agenda for that meeting and uses the motion form to

document actions taken. After approval, the motion form is then forwarded to the College President, who documents the action taken and reports back to the IEC. Each IEC member is responsible for disseminating relevant information to his/her constituency group. Additionally, information is posted on the IEC webpage as well as circulated through College wide email. The team confirmed that the College follows the processes as described herein. (Standard IV.A.6)

The team confirmed, through document review, that the College evaluates its governance structure, leadership roles, and decision-making policies on a regular basis. Participatory governance committees, for example, complete annual self-evaluations. Meeting minutes provide evidence that these evaluations are reviewed by IEC and inform the establishment of IEC annual goals. They also confirm that constituency groups actively participate through discussion on the IEC, Tier 2 committees, and workgroups. (Standard IV.A.7)

College Conclusions

The team commends the College in its efforts to revitalize participatory governance which has fostered greater transparency and inclusiveness. The College meets the Standard.

District Conclusions

LACCD has clearly defined the roles and responsibilities of not only the colleges and the District, but also the Board members, the chancellor, and the college presidents. The District has completed and revised its governance structures and procedures which demonstrate a commitment to continuous improvement. The District meets this standard.

District Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

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

Standard IV.B: Chief Executive Officer

General Observations

The CEO/President is actively engaged in the institution and is providing leadership in budgeting, organizational structure, and planning, as well as in selecting and developing personnel and assessing institutional effectiveness. The College president reports to the Chancellor and is held accountable for leadership, planning, and management of the College. The president arrived at the College at a time when it faced significant budgetary, accreditation, morale, and participatory governance challenges. The team found evidence of the president having led campus wide discussions on critical issues in regard to both governance and fiscal matters, including how those two issues intersect. As a result, there appears to be a greater sense of transparency, openness, and trust under the president's leadership.

Findings and Evidence

The president meets weekly with her executive staff, and she meets with other College leadership on a regular basis. The College's primary participatory governance body, the Institutional Effectiveness Council (IEC), is charged with making recommendations regarding planning, budgeting, and institutional effectiveness directly to the president. The Dean of Institutional Effectiveness reports directly to the president, and the president utilizes institutional research to ensure institutional integrity. The president hired two deans, one of whom was specifically focused on student success, as well as 26 full-time faculty. The president has ensured a New Faculty Orientation provide professional development for new personnel. (Standard IV.B.1)

The administrative structure is appropriately staffed and organized relative to the purpose, size and complexity of the institution. The senior-level administrative structure is funded according to a District-wide budgeting model. The College recognizes the potential for growth in the Workforce Development and Job Training Center, yet also recognizes the budgetary constraints on hiring new administrative staff in this area. (Standard IV.B.2)

The College president utilizes established policies and procedures in providing leadership to institutional improvement efforts. Through existing administrative and governance structures, the President oversees institutional effectiveness efforts, from setting values, goals, performance standards and priorities to establishing, utilizing and evaluating an integrated planning and resource allocation processes that support student achievement and learning. For example, the team found that the president provided leadership in addressing the recent Commission's sanction related to fiscal issues. The president has also made a concerted effort to improve communication and transparency through various means, including College-wide emails, Twitter announcements, and holding open office hours. The president also led efforts to improve College governance, having recognized constraints associated with the previous committee structure and processes and a need to strengthen the connection between annual planning, program review and resource allocation. (Standard IV.B.3)

The job description for the CEO assigns primary responsibility for the accreditation process

to the president. The team found that the president was instrumental in addressing the fiscal issues associated with the most recent Commission sanction, and for ensuring timely and thorough follow-up reporting. In addition to the president's leadership role, the team found the appropriate delegation of responsibilities are assigned to the Accreditation Liaison Officer and that participation in the accreditation process is appropriately shared across constituencies. (Standard IV.B.4)

The president assumes primary responsibility for ensuring consistent implementation of board policies, statutes and other regulations as well as for budget oversight and management. The president delegates authority for day-to-day budget management to the Vice President of Administrative Services, and her authority over the budget process is clearly delineated in the *Shared Governance Handbook*. Producing a balanced budget is a component of the president's evaluation by the Chancellor. (Standard IV.B.5)

The president is engaged and participates effectively in the communities served by the College. For example, she serves on the Valley Industry and Commerce Association Board, the Valley Economic Alliance Board and the Intelcom Board of Directors. The team also found that the College is engaged in partnerships with the local high school and California State University to develop a "Valley Promise" transfer pathway. (Standard IV.B.6)

Conclusion

The College meets the Standard.

Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

None

Standard IV.C: Governing Board

General Observations

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

Findings and Evidence

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

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

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

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

The Board consists of seven members elected at-large for terms of four years. Elections are held every two years, alternating with three members being chosen in one election and four

members at the other. The president and vice president of the Board of Trustees are elected by the Board for a one-year term at the annual organizational and regular meeting in July, and a nonvoting student trustee is elected annually by students for a one-year term beginning June 1. The student trustee has an advisory vote on actions other than personnel-related and collective bargaining items. (IV.C.6)

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

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

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

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

The Board is in compliance with establishing a policy on Board member code of ethics and conflict of interest with Board Rule 14000, Chapter XIV, and the implementation of these standards is captured in the 2013 Actionable Improvement Plan (March 19, 2013). This plan outlines specific actions that Board members should take to reinforce these standards and to

demonstrate its support as a collective entity by adoption of its Code of Ethical Conduct. (IV.C.11)

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

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

Conclusions

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

District Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

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

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

Standard IV.D: Multi-College Districts or Systems

General Observations

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

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

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

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

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

Findings and Evidence

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

effective operation of the District as a whole and individual colleges. The Board of Trustees has approved a District/college functional area map, developed in consultation with all major stakeholders across the District. The functional map clarifies the structure of District administrative offices and their relationship to the colleges, aligns District administrative functions with Accreditation Standards, and specifies outcome measures appropriate to each function identified. (IV.D.1)

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

In 2011, the District undertook a full review of its budget allocation formula and policies, including base allocations, use of ending balances, assessments for District operations, growth targets, and college deficit repayment. DBC Minutes show that a review of other multi-college District budget models and policies was also conducted. This review led the District to adopt a model that established minimum-based funding. The Board of Trustees approved Phase I of the new allocation model in June 2012. This phase focused on the annual allocation of resources. During spring 2013, the District worked on Phase II, which covered the review of college carryover funds, reserve balances, college growth formula, and college debts, and operating deficits. DBC minutes from September 18, 2013, show that these changes were all reviewed and discussed at the DBC and approved by the Board of Trustees at their October 9, 2013.

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

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

The framework for CEO accountability is established through annual goal-setting between the chancellor and each college president. College presidents then complete a yearly self-evaluation based on their established goals. At least every three years (or sooner if requested), presidents undergo a comprehensive evaluation, which includes an evaluation committee, peer input, and, if necessary, reassignment or dismissal. Evaluations are reviewed with the Board of Trustees in closed session. College presidents are also given full authority over their budgets and in allocating resources at their campuses. In October 2013, the Board adopted fiscal accountability measures which explicitly hold college presidents responsible to the chancellor for their budgets, ensuring that they maintain "a balanced budget, as well as the efficient and effective utilization of financial resources." (IV.D.4)

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

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

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

District/college integrated planning also occurs during operational planning for District wide initiatives. Examples include joint marketing and recruitment activities, implementation of the Student Success and Support Program, Student Equity Plans, and the new student information system. These initiatives involve extensive District/college collaboration, coordination with centralized District service units, and interaction with various District-level committees. Interviews during the visit confirmed intra-District discussions that impacted integrated planning had occurred during the Council of Academic Affairs, Council of Student

Services, the District Academic Senate, Student Information System Development Team, and the District Research Committee. (IV.D.5)

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

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

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

In 2011, District Information Technology (IT) undertook a complete redesign of the District website. The updated website, which allows each division/unit in the ESC to manage its own content, launched in fall 2012. The District planned to implement a new intranet site in December 2015 to improve employee access to Educational Services Center divisions, units, and services; however, as of the evaluation visit, the intranet was still in the latter stages of implementation. Information Technology maintains 78 active listservs. These listservs

include the District wide consultative bodies, administrative councils, and operational committees as well as subject-specific groups such as articulation officers, curriculum chairs, counselors, and IT managers. Each listserv has a coordinator/owner charged with maintaining an accurate list of members. Interviews during the visit revealed that while subscriptions to the listservs are typically comprised of members to the committees and councils, the subscriptions are open to any interested employee of the District. (IV.D.6)

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

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

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

Role delineations are evaluated during the regular review of functional area maps. Revisions are made based on input from governance committee members, governance surveys, ESC administrative units, the Chancellor’s Cabinet, and college stakeholders. Functional area maps were expanded and revised in 2015 and are currently under review prior to finalization. (IV.D.1, IV.D.2, IV.D.7)

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

Conclusions

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

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

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

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

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

District Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

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

Quality Focus Essay Feedback

The Los Angeles Valley College (LAVC) Quality Focus Essay (QFE) appears to be a relatively well-developed document that provides a framework for identifying areas for improving institutional effectiveness via three distinct Action Projects (AP) summarized below.

The APs clearly relate to Accreditation Standards, and align closely with the overarching themes that emerged from the College's examination of its own effectiveness in accomplishing its mission in the context of student learning and student achievement. Further, the focus of these APs appears appropriate in that they parallel those opportunities for improvement specifically identified by the team in this report. In an effort to support the College's commitment to achieving the goals of these AP, the team offers for consideration, the following observations and feedback.

The first AP represents a focused effort aimed at improving the utilization of data to build a strong culture of innovation. This specific action project is adequately broad and overarching in scope, involving myriad College wide operations. It clearly articulates the intended activities, timelines, responsible parties, and the resources the College believes is necessary to achieve what are relatively clearly described and measurable outcomes. The team invites the College to consider emphasizing in this AP, the systematic collection, dissemination and utilization of learning assessment data and qualitative data that reflects as directly as possible, students' voices and perspectives (e.g., student focus groups) and those activities that are specifically designed to develop and/or strengthen individuals' and groups' capacity to discern appropriate and actionable meaning through its examination of available data.

The second AP is comprised of four loosely related strands intended to improve the physical learning environment through fully utilizing and maintaining facility and technological investments as well as enhancing safety and emergency training. The third AP recognizes the opportunity to expand, integrate and focus professional development efforts. The specificity and thoroughness of the intended activities, timelines, resources and outcomes of AP2 and AP3 vary somewhat. The team invites the College to consider bringing more specificity to the intended activities and to incorporate where possible as part of the measurable outcomes, quantifiable performance indicators.

Lastly, the team appreciated that the plan to assess progress in the implementation of the APs was ongoing and incorporated specifically, the opportunity to make adjustments based upon assessment results. With that in mind, the team invites the College to consider through ongoing assessment that an appropriate balance exists between the scope of the APs and the resources available to achieve the intended outcomes.