

# **EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT**

**Los Angeles Trade Technical College  
400 West Washington Blvd.  
Los Angeles, CA 90015**

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

**This report represents the findings of the External Evaluation Team that visited  
Los Angeles Trade Technical College March 7 – 10, 2016**

**Erika L. Lacro, 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 Trade-Technical College  
400 West Washington Blvd  
Los Angeles, CA 90015

TEAM REPORT: Comprehensive Evaluation Report

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

SUBJECT: Commission Revisions to the Team Report

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

1. The Commission finds that Los Angeles Trade-Technical College meets Standards II.B.3 and II.C.2, and these Standard citations should be deleted from College Recommendation 1.
2. 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.

### **List of College Team Members**

#### **Chair**

Dr. Erika Lacro  
Chancellor  
Honolulu Community College

Mr. Mario Tejada, Jr.  
Faculty  
Diablo Valley College

Mr. Georg Romero  
Library Director  
Cabrillo College

Dr. Matt Wetstein  
Asst. Superintendent/Vice Pres of  
Instruction/ALO  
San Joaquin Delta College

Dr. Sandra Caldwell  
President  
Reedley College

Mr. Yulian Ligioso  
Vice-President, Finance and Administration  
Solano Community College

#### **Assistant**

Dr. Katy Ho  
Vice-Chancellor Academic Affairs  
Honolulu Community College

Dr. Ann Doty  
Associate Faculty  
Saddleback College

Dr. Gail Zwart  
Professor of Business  
Norco College

Dr. Teresa Ward  
Instructor, Language Education  
and Development  
Butte College

Mr. W.C. Yanda  
Director of Finance  
Southwestern College

Mr. Michael Tuitasi  
Vice-President of Student Affairs  
Santa Monica College

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

**Chair**

Dr. Helen Benjamin  
Chancellor  
Contra Costa Community College District

**Assistant**

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

Ms. Linda Beam  
Vice President Human Resources  
El Camino College

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

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

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

Mr. Dustin Johnson  
Trustee  
Los Rios Community College District

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

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

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

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

## **Summary of the External Evaluation Report**

INSTITUTION: Los Angeles Trade Technical College

DATES OF VISIT: March 7 – 10, 2016

TEAM CHAIR: Dr. Erika L. Lacro

A ten member accreditation team visited Los Angeles Trade Technical College (LATTC) March 7 – 10, 2016 for the purpose of determining whether the College continues to meet the 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 the visit, the chair met with the campus leadership and key personnel involved in the self-evaluation preparation process. The entire external evaluation team received team training provided by the staff from ACCJC on January 26, 2016.

The evaluation team received the college's self-evaluation documentation and related evidence several weeks prior to the site visit. Team members found it to be comprehensive and a well written document. The campus made every attempt to make the process transparent while encouraging broad participation from the College community including, faculty, staff, students, and administration.

On March 5 and 6, 2016, select members of the campus evaluation team began meeting with District personnel. On March 7, 2016, the evaluation team began the site visit at the LATTC campus. Upon arrival, the team was provided with a short orientation about the campus, met with campus leadership and those that led the accreditation self-study process. The meeting ended with a short tour of the campus.

During the evaluation visit, team members conducted about 45 individual interviews and meetings, and observations involving College employees, students, board members, and community members. The team also visited a total of 37 different programs / departments. There were numerous less formal interactions with students and employees outside of officially scheduled interviews and there were also informal observations of active classes and other learning venues. Two open forums provided the College community and members of the LATTC community opportunities to meet with members of the evaluation team.

The team reviewed numerous materials supporting the self-evaluation report in the team rooms and electronically, which included documents and evidence support 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, course syllabi, distance education classes, College policies and procedures, enrollment information, committee minutes and materials, and College governance structure.

The team greatly appreciated the organization and hospitality the College showed during the visit. It was apparent that the College constituents have a great deal of pride in their institution. The team appreciated the assistance of key staff members who assisted the team with requests for individual meetings and additional evidence throughout the evaluation process.

The team found the College to be compliance with the Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and USDE regulations. The team found a number of innovative and effective practices and programs and issued a number of commendations to the College. The team found the College satisfies the vast majority of the Standards, but issued some recommendations to increase effectiveness and/or to meet some of the Standards, ERs, policies, and regulations.

### **Commendation 1**

The Bridges to Success Center provides students with a menu of services designed to make the onboarding process seamless. In spring 2104, student satisfaction for this area for assessment and placement services and orientation was 76.7% and 77.3%, respectively, compared to 45% and 40.8% in 2012.

### **Commendation 2**

The College has been innovative in the creation, implementation, and scale of the Pathways to Academic, Career, and Transfer Success (PACTS) program. This reflects an intentional effort on the part of the College to identify structured pathways for students to pursue their educational and vocational goals, thus impacting student success.

### **Commendation 3**

The College has demonstrated its commitment to student success through the collaborative work with its many partners. This includes the institutions relationship and work with the University of Southern California's Center for Urban Education (CUE), working towards full implementation of PACTS as an institutional priority.

### **Commendation 4**

In an effort to change the climate and culture of the campus to drive student success, the College has demonstrated a commitment to maintaining a high percentage of full-time faculty and providing the professional development needed to affect change.

### **Commendation 5**

The College exhibits exemplary practices in campus-wide communication. This has taken place through Campus Climate, Convocation Monday, E-mail Blasts, and Open Office Hours.

### **Commendation 6**

The College has invested in the creation and maintenance of first class facilities to support student engagement, retention, and success.

## **Recommendations**

### **Recommendation (Compliance) 1**

In order to meet Standard, the assessment of program learning outcomes (PLO's and SAO's) throughout the institution must be accelerated to comply with College processes to ensure, that assessment results are analyzed, used to improve institutional effectiveness, and broadly communicated. (I.B.2; I.B.8; I.C.3; II.A.3; II.B.3; II.C.2)

### **Recommendation (Improvement) 2**

In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the College should develop new methods for calculating institution-set standards of completion and transfer rates that reflect on the College's efforts to move students toward degree and certificate completion and transfer. The College should also examine and establish reasonable benchmarks for standards of job placement for students completing career technical programs. (I.B.3)

**Recommendation (Compliance) 3**

In order to meet Standard, the College should implement methods that allow the college to consistently examine and document patterns of learning and achievement within all programs, disaggregating data along the lines of standard demographic characteristics, mode of delivery, and other relevant sub-populations of students. (I.B.5; I.B.6)

**Recommendation (Improvement) 4**

In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the College should engage in regular oversight of course syllabi and information contained in distance education courses. The visiting team was not able to document the inclusion of academic dishonesty statements across all course syllabi in the online platform. (I.C.4)

**Recommendation (Improvement) 5**

In order to improve effectiveness, the College should revamp its method of presenting program fact sheets for gainful employment programs to include in one prominently accessible location with accurate information on program costs, program length, and employment prospects for students who complete each applicable program. (I.C.6)

**Recommendation (Compliance) 6**

In order to meet Standard, the College should ensure programs are following the approved program review process in a timely manner, as identified by the College. Program reviews should utilize appropriate data to support assessment of student learning outcomes and identify continuous improvement actions. (II.A.3)

**Recommendation (Improvement) 7**

In order to improve effectiveness, the College should perform an analysis of library usage, unmet student demand, appropriateness and size of the collection needed to support student learning, and staffing levels. This analysis should also include an assessment of the Library's service area outcomes. Actionable items resulting from this analysis should be addressed. (II.B.1)

**Recommendation (Compliance) 8**

In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College review its evaluation process for all positions and ensure that all staff and faculty, including post-tenure faculty, are evaluated systematically and at stated intervals. Actions taken following evaluation are formal, timely, and documented. (III.A.5)

**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)

## **Eligibility Requirements**

### **1. Authority**

The team confirmed that Los Angeles Trade-Technical College (LATTC) 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.

In addition, the College operates under the authority of the State of California Education Code, which establishes the California community college system under the leadership and direction of the Board of Governors (State of California Education Code 70900-70901).

The College meets the ER.

### **2. Operational Status**

The team confirmed that LATTC is operational and provides educational services to 8,228 unduplicated student enrollments within degree applicable credit courses for the fall 2014. For 2014-2015, LATTC enrolled 13,716 students with 31% as full-time. Fifty one percent 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 majority of courses lead to a degree and/or transfer. A majority of LATTC students are enrolled an Associate's degree program in career technical or transfer.

The College meets the ER.

### **4. Chief Executive Officer**

The team confirmed that the Board of Trustees employs a Chancellor as the chief executive officer of the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) that has direct oversight to the President of Los Angeles Trade-Technical College (LATTC). The President of LATTC serves as the chief executive officer of the campus. Neither CEO serves as a member of the Board of Trustees nor as the board president. The team found that the Board of Trustees vests requisite authority in the President to administer board policies.

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 meets the ER.

**5. Financial Accountability**

The team confirmed that LATTC works in conjunction with the district to conduct audits of all financial records. All audits are certified and all explanations or findings are documented appropriately. Audit reports are made publically available.

The College meets the ER.

The District Office Accounting Office staff oversees District wide audits and is responsible for coordination of all site visits. The District also has a Central Financial Aid Unit that monitors and helps control the Perkins Loans default rates. The District has Perkins Loans outstanding (over 240 days in default) totaling \$1.8 million, but when compared to total loans outstanding for the District of \$270 million, the default rate is only approximately one percent of their outstanding principal. District staff continue to make collection calls to help reduce the default rates throughout the District. Discussion with staff revealed that the District is phasing out the Perkins Loan Program.

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

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

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

The District meets the ER.

**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:**

LATTC posted information on its college website on November 3, 2015 about the process for third party comment. In addition, the college reviewed this process at the May 23, 2013 Accreditation Kick-Off 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.

- The institution analyzes its performance as to the institution-set standards and as to student achievement, and takes appropriate measures in areas where its performance is not at the expected level.

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(i); 602.17(f); 602.19 (a-e).]

**Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):**

- 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:**

LATTC provided evidence that it has established institution-set standards in 2013 for course completion, job placement rates for instructional programs, and limited licensure passage rates for select instructional programs. The college process for setting institutional-set standards could be improved through diversifying the use of external data collection and analysis in multiple areas including: student engagement, student success, and industry recognized certifications.

**Credits, Program Length, and Tuition**

**Evaluation Items:**

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

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

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

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

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

[Regulation citations: 600.2 (definition of credit hour); 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.24(e), (f); 668.2; 668.9.]

**Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):**

- 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:**

Course credit calculations are described in the LATTC Curriculum Guidebook. A student enrolled full-time can complete degree requirements within two years. Tuition is set via the California Board of Governors.

**Transfer Policies**

**Evaluation Items:**

- Transfer policies are appropriately disclosed to students and to the public.
- Policies contain information about the criteria the institution uses to accept credits for transfer.
- The institution complies with the Commission *Policy on Transfer of Credit*.  
[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.17(a)(3); 602.24(e); 668.43(a)(ii).]

**Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):**

- 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 process for submitting transcripts to be evaluated for LATTC credit is described on the FAQ list on the Admissions webpage and in the College Catalog. Students must mail an official transcript to LATTC showing successful completion of lower-division courses at an accredited institution. The transcript review process includes evaluation of course description and/or syllabus from originating institution.

**Distance Education and Correspondence Education**

**Evaluation Items:**

- The institution has policies and procedures for defining and classifying a course as offered by distance education or correspondence education, in alignment with USDE definitions.
- There is an accurate and consistent application of the policies and procedures for

determining if a course is offered by distance education (with regular and substantive interaction with the instructor, initiated by the instructor, and online activities are included as part of a student's grade) or correspondence education (online activities are primarily "paperwork related," including reading posted materials, posting homework and completing examinations, and interaction with the instructor is initiated by the student as needed).

- The institution has appropriate means and consistently applies those means for verifying the identity of a student who participates in a distance education or correspondence education course or program, and for ensuring that student information is protected.
- The technology infrastructure is sufficient to maintain and sustain the distance education and correspondence education offerings.
- The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education*.  
[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(iv), (vi); 602.17(g); 668.38.]

**Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):**

- 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 found the college to have met the regulations for compliance in the area of distance education. This is an area for growth and development for LATTC and team found evidence that the college is being proactive in alignment with the statewide Online Education Initiative (OEI) which will allow them to provide additional support to students through multiple modalities.

**Student Complaints**

**Evaluation Items:**

- The institution has clear policies and procedures for handling student complaints, and the current policies and procedures are accessible to students in the college catalog and online.
- The student complaint files for the previous six years (since the last comprehensive evaluation) are available; the files demonstrate accurate implementation of the complaint policies and procedures.
- The team analysis of the student complaint files identifies any issues that may be indicative of the institution's noncompliance with any Accreditation Standards.



- The institution posts on its website the names of associations, agencies and governmental bodies that accredit, approve, or license the institution and any of its programs, and provides contact information for filing complaints with such entities.
- The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Representation of Accredited Status* and the *Policy on Student and Public Complaints Against Institutions*.  
[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(ix); 668.43.]

**Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):**

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

**Narrative:**

The college has a student complaint process. The process is outlined online under the heading Student Complaints and Conflict Resolution and in the catalog. Complaints and suggestions are logged and maintained by the Vice President of Student Services.

**Institutional Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials**

**Evaluation Items:**

- The institution provides accurate, timely (current), and appropriately detailed information to students and the public about its programs, locations, and policies.
- The institution complies with the Commission *Policy on Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status*.
- The institution provides required information concerning its accredited status as described above in the section on Student Complaints.  
[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1))(vii); 668.6.]

**Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):**

- 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:**

Information about programs, locations, and policies are communicated to students and the public via the following: the catalog, the schedule of classes, and the college website. The college has a robust website that discloses information about data gathering, planning, and

status on accreditation, including the annual reports. LATTC does not misrepresent programs costs or job placement and employment opportunities, offer money in exchange for enrollment, or guarantee employment in order to recruit students. Scholarships are awarded based on specified criteria to support students in pursuit of their educational goals.

### **Title IV Compliance**

#### **Evaluation Items:**

- X The institution has presented evidence on the required components of the Title IV Program, including findings from any audits and program or other review activities by the USDE.
- X The institution has addressed any issues raised by the USDE as to financial responsibility requirements, program record-keeping, etc. If issues were not timely addressed, the institution demonstrates it has the fiscal and administrative capacity to timely address issues in the future and to retain compliance with Title IV program requirements.
- X The institution's student loan default rates are within the acceptable range defined by the USDE. Remedial efforts have been undertaken when default rates near or meet a level outside the acceptable range.
- Contractual relationships of the institution to offer or receive educational, library, and support services meet the Accreditation Standards and have been approved by the Commission through substantive change if required.
- X The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations* and the *Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV*.  
[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(v); 602.16(a)(1)(x); 602.19(b); 668.5; 668.15; 668.16; 668.71 et seq.]

#### **Conclusion Check-Off:**

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

#### **Narrative:**

The college provided evidence in the Self-Evaluation Report to demonstrate it complies with all given items of the Title IV requirements. LATTC is one of the largest providers of Title IV federal financial aid in the California Community College system. Its student population is drawn from one of the poorest sectors of the Los Angeles basin, including students from South-Central Los Angeles. As a result, the economic conditions that ravaged the community during the 2008-2011 economic downturn played a dramatic part in the college's

student loan default rate ballooning over the 30% benchmark set by the USDE. The college has contracted with a loan default consulting firm and the visiting team learned that the college has had some initial success in bringing its 3-year default rate down under the 30% benchmark. However, team members are concerned that another economic recession could have a significant impact on the loan default rate once again. The college should closely monitor the relationship between local economic conditions and its patterns of student loan disbursement.

## **Standard I.A Mission**

### **General Observations**

Los Angeles Trade Technical College's (LATTC) mission statement reflects a broad educational purpose that provides students of the Los Angeles region with "educational opportunities" to meet their "career development and academic goals; foster a climate of life-long learning; prepare... students to participate effectively in society; and generate economic development with...educational, governmental, community and business partners." The college identified in its self evaluation report the need to revise its mission statement and was in the process of that review during the spring term of 2016.

Program review processes are in place to ensure that data are used to promote the accomplishment of the College mission and the College's office of Institutional Research provides relevant data to College constituents to help programs determine their effectiveness. The College has also established institution set standards for student achievement that appear to be widely circulated and used at both an institutional and program level. The visiting team has recommendations for improvement related to program review and institution set standards in the narrative section focusing on Standard I.B

### **Findings and Evidence**

The College's mission statement was approved by a shared governance process in 2012. In line with Standard I.A.1 and Eligibility Requirement 6, it reflects a broad educational purpose that focuses on the mission of career development, academic goals, and technical and professional education. Team members validated that the mission is appropriate for its student population, although evidence suggests that the students served by the College are drawn from a wide geographic area that goes beyond the College's traditional service area boundaries. The College has identified two gaps in its current mission statement: 1) its failure to accurately reflect the geographic scope of its intended student population, and 2) its failure to identify the types of degrees and other credentials it offers. The mission statement also does not capture the spirit of its innovative pathways approach to promote student completion (Pathways to Academic, Career, and Transfer Success [PACTS]). I.A.1, ER 6

In the Quality Focus Essay, the College identifies this and states,

“Although PACTS is at the core of the College's Strategic Educational Master Plan, it is not explicit in the College's current mission statement. The mission statement reflects LATTC's mission and role in the community, but it does not reference and align with PACTS. The mission statement needs to be updated to directly reflect the College's broad educational mission, its intended population, types of degrees/credentials offered, and its commitment to Pathways to Academic, Career, and Transfer Success (PACTS) for student learning and achievement.”

Thus the College notes the discrepancy in its current mission statement and the pieces that are missing to make its mission statement clearly describe its intended purpose and population. (I.A.1, ER 6)

The College's Strategic Educational Master Plan identifies five strategic priorities for the College. A cornerstone of the strategic plan is the College's PACTS program. PACTS reflects an intentional effort on the part of the College to identify structured pathways for students to pursue their educational and vocational goals. This links directly with the College mission statement and its focus on career and academic goals. Indeed, the evidence presented by the College indicates a close alignment between all five of the strategic priorities and the institution's mission statement. (I.A.2, I.A.3)

Programs of study are aligned with the college's mission statement through the annual program review process. Faculty and staff must identify the ways in which programs align with the four main elements of the mission statement and establish goals that clearly focus on student learning and achievement. (I.A.3)

The team was able to validate that the college has a program review process that ensures resource requests are linked to the mission statement and institutional goals focused on student success and achievement. The college's rubric for evaluating program review resource requests provides a useful tool for ensuring alignment between program review requests, the allocation of resources, and institutional mission. Interviews with campus constituent group leaders confirmed that they are satisfied with the program review process. The 2014-15 program review process identified more than 180 resource requests that were ranked by various constituency groups. High priority items in the most recent resource cycle included on-going funding for tutoring services at the college and funding to support the maintenance of smart classroom technology in Aspen Hall. Other high priority requests included specific academic program needs and \$100,000 worth of security cameras for the campus. Each of these resource allocations align with the mission and a focus on improving student success and the learning environment of the College. (I.A.3)

The College's mission statement was last approved by the governing board in July 2012. It is widely published across the campus and is featured prominently in the College Catalog, website, and major publications, including the Strategic Educational Master Plan. The District's mission statement contains all the required elements and was approved by the LACCD Board of Trustees on February 6, 2013. (I.A.4)

The college's last formal revision of the mission statement in 2012 suggests that there may need to be a more frequent analysis and periodic review of the mission statement. The College recognizes the need for an updated mission statement, and team members were able to confirm that the mission statement is under review in the 2015-16 academic year. The mission statement has been reviewed by the College Council and it will be the focus of a campus Days of Dialogue during the spring 2016 term. (I.A.4, ER 6)

## **Conclusions**

The College meets the standard. As stated in the Quality Focus Essay, College representatives are aware that their mission statement is in need of improvement and have an action plan to address the College's mission. At the time of the comprehensive visit, the College had not yet completed a revision of its mission statement through governance review. The College plans to have a revised mission statement ready to take to the Board during summer 2016.

## **Recommendations**

None.

## **Standard I.B Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness**

### **General Observations**

LATTC provided evidence to document widespread patterns of dialog and interest in continuous improvement, including learning assessment reports, program review reports, institutional effectiveness reports, and planning documents. The College has invested a great deal of time and energy into the instructional program review process that feeds into resource allocation requests. The pattern of evidence pertaining to student learning assessment was strong in some places, while spotty in other places. While learning assessment processes are in place and the college is moving toward a learning assessment and program review platform using eLumen as a system for reporting and data collection, the institution's Quality Focus Essay rightfully proposes to address the overall quality of learning assessment throughout the institution.

The College has used Days of Dialog and its Program Review and Assessment Committee and Student Success Committee to engage in widespread discussion of key processes for institutional effectiveness and improvement. The College disaggregates data based on subpopulations of students and uses that information to guide discussions of program improvement. Even so, the visiting team found areas for improvement in the institution's documented use of disaggregated data.

The College has established institution set standards (ISS) of learning at a broad level and is using the standards for benchmarking purposes at the program level. Team members expressed concerns about the quality of several of the ISS's and believe they are in need of thoughtful review and revision.

The College provided some evidence in its self-evaluation report to document a regular process for evaluating its policies and practices across all segments of the College. Program review processes are obviously pivotal for this documentation. Even so, the evidence could have been stronger. Visiting team members had to inquire about documentation of actual program changes, policy revisions and Board meeting minutes in order to reach a conclusion about how the college meets this standard.

### **Findings and Evidence**

Team members found widespread evidence of collegial dialog about student outcomes, equity and academic quality at LATTC. Instructional and student services program review documents reflect substantive discussion about outcomes and concern for improving student learning. The minutes of the Student Success Committee (which met weekly during the fall 2014 and 2015 semesters) and the convening of more than 20 campus "Days of Dialog" demonstrate a keen interest in student outcomes and equity gaps at the college. Key reports about student success have been the subject of discussion at college convocations. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness has played a major role in providing reports to support this pattern of institutional dialog. Institutional effectiveness indicators are discussed within the Board of Trustees as well as through the vehicle of an annual report. That document provides a useful model for reporting on college progress and for reflecting on the strengths

and weaknesses of the College's efforts. Institution Set Standards (ISS) of student achievement have been established and discussed widely within the institution. Dialog on ISS's occur in college-wide committees, within the governance committees, and within individual departments of faculty in the course of their learning assessment cycle and program review process. (I.B.1)

The College's focus on continuous improvement is evident in the changes that have been made to its program review process in recent years. Members of the Program Review Assessment Committee have not altered the fundamental process of program review, but discussion of the process has resulted in some modifications to the content and format of program review documents and the dialog that they generate among faculty members and staff. (I.B.1)

The College provided evidence to document the definition and assessment of learning outcomes across the institution's academic and student support programs, but much of the evidence was out of date. Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) and Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) assessment in the instructional units are on a three year cycle and faculty have been partially, but not universally responsive in meeting deadlines to complete the most recent cycle. Evidence presented to the team during the visit indicates that 67 of 98 instructional programs had yet to complete their assessment of PLO's during the current cycle of assessment (2013-2016). Many program assessment reports (65) were dated from the prior assessment cycle (2010-2013). For student services programs, 13 of 32 had yet to complete a program assessment report in the current cycle of assessment, in part because of organizational changes in the unit. The college's self evaluation report indicates an understanding that learning assessment processes need to be significantly improved at the college, and it is a major focus of LATTC's Quality Focus Essay. (I.B.2, ER 11)

College policies and procedures ensure that learning outcomes are communicated to students through the course syllabus. LATTC uses an effective syllabus checklist that faculty can rely on to ensure their course features approved SLOs. The institution has expressed its own concerns about the need for strengthened learning assessment processes and devotes one of its major action plans in the Quality Focus Essay to this topic. (I.B.2, ER 11)

Student support services have also established learning outcomes and the team found evidence that the appropriate units are engaging in learning assessment to track institutional effectiveness in meeting those learning objectives. The College uses a survey of students to assess indirectly how well institutional learning outcomes are being met by students. Evidence from the 2014 survey indicates that between 56 percent and 81 percent of the students agreed that the particular ILO's were being met "very much" or "quite a bit." While some might question the lower levels on some of the ILO items (such as only 56 percent on "improving a student's ability to contribute to the welfare of the community"), the survey is administered to all students -- not just students completing their education at LATTC. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness might consider disaggregating student responses on the number of units completed in order to get a better barometer of student assessment of the ILO's near graduation (versus first term freshmen). (I.B.2, ER 11)



The instructional assessment process requires faculty to gather data and write an action plan for each course. A review of assessment results on the College's web site uncovered some unevenness in terms of faculty responses to the assessment results. Some of the action plans are quite strong in demonstrating thoughtful dialog and proposed revisions to improve teaching and learning. Other action plans reflect spotty coverage of courses and little reflection on the part of faculty on their results (for example, the Child Development report indicates five courses missing action plans). Even so, some exemplary work is noted by the College that documents effective assessment practices and responses by particular departments. For example, the Fashion Design program uncovered evidence that students were not acquiring sewing skills at an acceptable level, resulting in the posting of video vignettes on YouTube to better showcase sewing techniques to students. In response to a learning assessment, the Bridges to Success program shifted its focus to a universal access approach rather than focusing on targeted populations of students. A visit to the Bridges to Success Center demonstrated that staff in the center, who have been well trained, utilize a "genius bar" approach to guide new students through an on-boarding process at the college. In yet another example, the Physical Plant assessment uncovered evidence that staff were not providing timely responses to "trouble calls" that had been reported in work orders. This resulted in a better expectation of completion times by staff in that unit (I.B.2, ER 11).

While assessment cycles are in place, the faculty and the College's Office of Institutional Effectiveness have struggled with varied approaches to assessment across the various departments. As indicated earlier, a significant number of programs have not provided evidence of PLO assessment in the current assessment cycle. The processes have featured as many as 15 different types of forms or documents, complicating the college's ability to aggregate information and disaggregate learning assessment results. Just recently, the College has purchased and installed eLumen to harness all of its assessment data into one web platform. By the fall of 2016, LATTC expects to have eLumen working for all departments, resulting in an improved learning assessment and program review process that will feature a powerful ability to connect data to student records and to disaggregate data in more meaningful ways. (I.B.2, ER 11)

The College's Institution Set Standards (ISS's) evolved out of conversations about student performance in 2013. Five major metrics appropriate for a college like LATTC were identified for the institution: 1) overall course completion rate; 2) percentage of students retained; 3) certificate completion; 4) degree completion; and 5) transfer to four year universities. The standards were established by the Education Policy Committee of the Academic Senate and ratified by college governance groups. Indicators for each metric are based on an analysis of trend data across prior years. In 2014-15, the College met its ISS benchmarks for four of the five metrics. Retention exceeded the ISS standard, as did the proportion of students completing a certificate, degrees, and the percentage of students transferring. Successful course completion rates fell below the established ISS (67 percent instead of 70 percent). Discussion of ISS's and progress in meeting them has occurred in College governance meetings and at Days of Dialog. The College' self-study also identified Institutional Set Standards for Licensing Pass Rates, where appropriate, and Job Placement rates by cohort year. (I.B.3)

The institution set standards (ISS's) of academic quality identified by LATTC are appropriate for its mission and there has been widespread discussion of college progress on the ISS's. Even so, the College's Office of Institutional Effectiveness may want to consider new methods of calculating and tracking the ISS's. Currently, the metrics related to certificate completion, degree completion, and transfer are calculated as a percentage of the overall student population enrolled in the three prior years. The current method results in a deflated percentage when compared against other possible ways to calculate completion rates (in the California Student Success Scorecard [30% completion rate across 6 years] or the IPEDS data set). Moreover, the completion and transfer metrics are bound to improve in eras of declining enrollment (which LATTC has experienced in recent years), simply because the size of the denominator has declined. This raises the question of whether the improved levels of completion and transfer are merely an artifact of the declining size of the denominator, and have nothing to do with institutional improvements. Calculation of the percentage of an entering cohort of students would correct for this concern. Fundamentally, the completion rates of 10 percent (for certificates) and 3 percent (for associate degrees) are not likely to inspire confidence from the public at large and are deceptively lower than other standard ways to calculate these metrics. (I.B.3)

New ISS's have recently been discussed that better represent the reality of campus opportunities for graduation and success and focus on job placement at an institutional and program level. The job placement rates identified in the College's ISER are very low for some programs. For example, the expected job placement rates for real estate and commercial art are 16 percent and 18 percent respectively -- despite recent placement rates that exceed those levels by wide margins. (I.B.3)

The College relies on its assessment and program review processes to demonstrate student learning and student achievement and to focus institutional planning around those themes. Program review documents require faculty and staff to perform an assessment of how well their program is meeting the college mission and producing student learning. The College's planning model describes a process wherein program plans roll up to unit plans, which subsequently roll up to department plans, and division plans (i.e., Instruction, Student Services, Administrative Services). Program reviews require both qualitative and quantitative analysis of student learning or assessment of department outcomes. Resource requests are embedded within a module of the program review document and faculty are expected to make the connection between new resource allocations and learning outcomes. Moreover, faculty are asked to rank order their requests, so that higher level plans and institutional committees can see the priorities identified at the ground floor level. The resource request rubric used by the college gives better scores to program reviews that make a direct link to learning assessment results and meeting the strategic priorities of the college (I.B.4-6). The program review and learning assessment processes are organized within institutional silos and ultimately integrated at the Planning and Budget Committee and senior management level. Team members were able to confirm that program reviews are being completed at the administrative level, though the reports are embedded within the student support services tab of the assessment website. Several other administrative program review documents were located in a separate tab (for the college services office, information

technology (2 reports) and the physical plant). Three of those documents were one page long and only addressed one of the program review modules. (I.B.4)

The program review system in place at LATTC is built in a modular format, and asks stakeholders to assess how their program meets the mission of the College. Each program review examines prior goals, asks individuals to close the loop by analyzing prior activities, and addresses levels of student learning and achievement. Evidence of closing the loop within program review is spotty. Interviews with college officials indicates that they believe the modules are effective in forcing staff and faculty to report on prior work. (I.B.5)

The program review system has been under iterative modification since its adoption in 2010, resulting in refined improvements in the program review process ever since. The instructional program review documents in place today at LATTC are much briefer than the 30 page documents of the past. The program review process asks faculty to reflect on patterns of achievement, prior goals and activities, and to present resource requests that would improve the program. The program reviews require analysis of both quantitative and qualitative information, and data are disaggregated by program type, course, and mode of instructional delivery. The program review process does not appear to require faculty to analyze patterns of success and course completion broken out by important demographic characteristics such as ethnicity or gender. Visiting team members inquired about this missing feature and were informed that faculty have the opportunity to analyze data along these lines within the program review data packs provided to faculty. However, the program review data packs presented to the team did not feature data that could produce disaggregated patterns of success along gender or ethnicity lines. (I.B.5-9; I.B.5)

In prior years, assessment data and program review information were found in different Microsoft Word or PDF documents. As was indicated earlier, this placed a significant workload burden on certain College departments. The move to eLumen as a platform for assessment and program review will help improve the College's processes and ensure greater fidelity to the use of assessment data in institutional processes to support learning and achievement. (I.B.5)

The efforts to strengthen program review processes have resulted in positive movement by the College, resulting in a streamlined process. In interviews, faculty leaders expressed satisfaction with the program review process and its connection to resource allocation decisions. When asked to do so, faculty leaders and student support managers could easily describe examples of program review requests that had led to a funding request, and ultimately to institutional improvements that were important for student success initiatives. Some examples that were noted by the visiting team: 1) a visit to the architecture classroom lab that was outfitted with new computers and software after a program review request was fulfilled; 2) a visit to the Bridges to Success Center, where more streamlined on-boarding services were being provided to students as a result of the program review process; 3) an increase in tutoring service funding after a 2014-15 program review request noted this deficiency in student support services. All of these examples provide evidence of a college attuned to using the program review process to analyze student success, make changes in service delivery where appropriate, and to allocate resources to accomplish its mission and

objectives. Yet even the college's self evaluation report raises concerns about learning assessment processes and how assessment data are used to shape improvement processes. LATTC's Quality Focus Essay clearly expresses a desire to improve and better standardize learning assessment at the college. (I.B.5)

There are several administrative support areas of the college that appear to be operating with only minimal attention to program review documentation and practices of institutional improvement. Having said that, it was comforting for the visiting team to find evidence of a President's Office program review and resource request documenting the need for greater professional development funding at the college. (I.B.5)

The main sources of evidence to document the use of disaggregated data to drive discussions of program improvement are the College's program review data packs, student equity reports, and the institution's report on institutional effectiveness to the College community and Board of Trustees. Through its disaggregation of data, LATTC has uncovered equity gaps. One of the main gaps is in the realm of online versus face-to-face classes, with online sections having significantly lower rates of successful completion. The College has used that information to shape policy changes toward distance education, with a 20 percent gap in any course requiring a faculty plan to address the gap of successful completion before the course can be offered again online. Other program changes are noted in the Math department, which features several ideas for change in its 2014-15 Program Review. (I.B.6)

When focusing on disproportionate impacts across ethnic, gender, age, and other group lines, the College uses the Proportionality Index (PI) that is commonly found within the California Community College system. The PI data for LATTC are overwhelmingly positive – there are very few areas where the figures report significant disproportionate impacts in college-level analyses of degree and certificate completion and transfer. The College's efforts should now move to a deeper use of the PI measure in programs of study. At present, the College is requiring faculty to examine completion data that are disaggregated at the program and course level within its program review process – but only at a very minimal level. No attention is paid in the program review data packs to completion data broken out by ethnicity, gender, and age groups, for example. This added feature would improve the College's effectiveness and enrich the dialog about student completion at the College. The full implementation of eLumen and its ability to connect to the college's student information system will enhance this possibility in the near future. (I.B.6)

The college has a good practice of examining data in disaggregated formats, although the full complement of information is not embedded within program review documents themselves. The college could improve the effectiveness of its program review process if it required faculty to examine patterns of learning and achievement disaggregated by standard demographic characteristics. Without doing so, the college is left to analyze patterns of equitable achievement within its Equity Plan, but not within programs themselves. (I.B.6)

The LATTC Equity Plan data, presented in Evidence I.B.5-14, suggests that at an institutional level, the College has done a very effective job in providing equitable completion rates to various subpopulations of students. Using the proportionality index score commonly found within the California Community College system, there are no noticeable

significant equity gaps among LATTC students for overall successful course completion, successful completion of transfer level courses, basic skills courses or vocational courses. The only significant gap that emerge in their disaggregated data are for degree and certificate completion rates, with white students having significantly **low** rates of degree and certificate attainment (only 3 out of 47 in the 2008-09 cohort of students studied. (I.B.5-14) College officials should work to unpack that unique finding. It may be due to white students having a greater tendency to attend the college for one or two courses in order to build vocational skills or acquire life-long learning goals, which would necessarily imply that the students never intended to pursue a degree or certificate in the first place. (I.B.6)

In order to document regular review of policies and practices to assure their effectiveness in supporting academic quality and the accomplishment of its mission, the College relied on evidence from its integrated planning process and program review. The collection of program review documents provides evidence of regular evaluation of college practices and an effort to ensure college programs are accomplishing the mission of the college. Policy changes are the purview of the District Board of Trustees, and there is evidence that the Board has not been active in reviewing policies on a regular . The College engaged in a meta-analysis of its planning processes by contracting with an external evaluator in the summer of 2015. It was unclear from the report what the major findings of that analysis were, and whether the College acted on the findings. Interviews with key staff at the college suggested that the results of the meta-analysis are informing program review changes that are being built into the new eLumen modules for learning assessment and program review that will be launched in the fall of 2016. (I.B.7)

Another source of evidence presented by the College is the evaluation of governance committee processes. Several examples of committee reviews were presented in the report (for example, the Educational Policies Committee, Academic Senate, and Curriculum Committee). It is not clear that all committees are being evaluated for their effectiveness. Finally, the College has completed an extensive effectiveness survey of individuals who participate in governance committees. Results from that survey indicate widespread satisfaction with planning and program review functions, and document extensive understanding of the College's planning documents. Interviews with key faculty and staff at the college during the visit also documented satisfaction with the program review process. (I.B.7)

The College uses several mechanisms to broadly communicate its findings about assessment and evaluation, including its Days of Dialog, assessment website, report on institutional effectiveness, and strategic educational master plan. Having said this, the college's self-evaluation process turned up evidence of documented gaps in the quality and timeliness of program assessments, resulting in detailed focus on the need to strengthen assessment within the College's Quality Focus Essay. Program learning assessment reports for 2014 and 2015 indicate that some faculty are engaged in the practice of regular assessment of program learning outcomes and the results are reported on the college website. The assessment process, however, is depicted by the College as in need of strengthening. Evidence presented in Section I.B.8 indicates that "student learning and achievement outcomes are not substantial because of lack of in-depth assessments and inconsistent use of assessment results

for improvement”. Review of learning assessment reports by the visiting team identified the validity of this concern. The quality of the assessment is mixed, with some programs doing good work, while others are struggling to assess program learning outcomes. For example, the Barbering and Administration of Justice programs have not completed curricular maps to identify program learning outcomes that are associated with course learning outcomes. As reported earlier, other programs do not appear to have completed assessment reports associated with their PLO’s.

Broad-level communication of assessment results is accomplished through the College’s Institutional Effectiveness Report and its on-going Days of Dialog. (I.B.8) As indicated in the self evaluation report, the college’s process for the assessment of learning outcomes is in need of improvement. Its communication of learning assessment results is not at fault. Assessment reports, while out of date for many programs, are available and appear to be widely discussed within appropriate governance committees, at Days of Dialog, and at a broader institutional level before the Board of Trustees. The College’s QFE indicates that assessment processes will be improved in the coming months. (I.B.8)

The College relies on a planning model for integrating program review and resource allocation processes that was developed in 2009. It currently is reviewing the model for continued use. In the planning model, resource requests flow out of program review reports written at the department and unit level. The requests are prioritized within each department, then prioritized within the larger administrative units of the college, with each prioritization honored from the prior level. The College’s Planning and Budget Committee uses a rubric to score resource requests on the basis of the demonstrated needs of the department, how the resources contribute to planned program improvements, how they align with strategic priorities of the college, whether they are sustainable over time, their documented accountability, and how they reflect collaboration with other departments. The rubrics used by the college provide a useful framework for making decisions when there are many requests for scarce resources. Team members examined program review documents and analyzed rubrics used by the college. As indicated earlier, in a few cases program reviews in the administrative units of the college are not very strong. The team also examined minutes of meetings and prioritization documents to validate the processes used by the College to make short-term and long-term decisions about resources and to improve programs. The institutional self-study did not present overwhelming evidence of program improvement, but a few examples have already been noted earlier. There are other examples of program improvements flowing out of the program review and integrated budgeting process. For instance, the Cosmetology program started a new Barbering program as a result of program review processes. The 2014-15 ranking of resource requests indicates that the college has focused its resources in the short-term on spending that benefits student learning. Highly ranked projects include improving the smart-room installations of the classrooms in Aspen Hall and providing tutoring services, including Net-Tutor for online students. Team members were able to validate another program review request that had been funded recently: an upgraded Architecture lab with computers and software that provides state of the art design software to LATTC students. Data from the most recent budget allocations indicate an appropriate emphasis on improving the student learning experience at the college. Longer-range planning is evident in the College’s Strategic Educational Master Plan

(SEMP) and its Facilities Plan, with bond funding allowing the College to modernize and build several new buildings in recent years. (I.B.9)

Institutional planning is clearly documented in the 2013 *District Governance and Functions Handbook*. As shown in the handbook, integration with District planning starts with the LACCD Strategic Plan Vision 2017 (DSP). Created collaboratively among key constituent groups from the college, the DSP generally integrates all 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.

## **Conclusions**

The College does not meet the standard.

## **Recommendations**

### **Recommendation 1 (Compliance)**

In order to meet Standard, the assessment of program learning outcomes (PLO's and SAO's) throughout the institution must be accelerated to comply with College processes to ensure, that assessment results are analyzed, used to improve institutional effectiveness, and broadly communicated. (I.B.2; I.B.8; I.C.3; II.A.3; II.B.3; II.C.2)

### **Recommendation 2 (Improvement)**

In order to improve effectiveness, the College should develop new methods for calculating institution-set standards of completion and transfer rates that reflect on the College's efforts to move students toward degree and certificate completion and transfer. The College should also examine and establish reasonable benchmarks for standards of job placement for students completing career technical programs. (I.B.3)

### **Recommendation 3 (Compliance)**

In order to meet Standard, the College should implement methods that allow the college to consistently examine and document patterns of learning and achievement within all programs, disaggregating data along the lines of standard demographic characteristics, mode of delivery, and other relevant sub-populations of students. (I.B.5; I.B.6)

## **Standard I.C Institutional Integrity**

### **General Observations**

In general, LATTC provided evidence to document clear and accurate information about the college and its programs that reflect well on its integrity. Even so, the college provided spotty evidence of assessment of student learning, specifically program learning outcomes and service area outcomes. The general quality of the self-evaluation is moderate. The description of the college processes and the evaluation of their effectiveness are clear and self reflective, but not always supported by evidence.

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

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. 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.

The LACCD Board of Trustees establishes policies that are consistent with its mission statement and exercises oversight of the colleges’ educational programs by means of its Board Rules and Administrative Regulations (Board Rules, Chapter 1, Article 2).

### **Findings and Evidence**

LATTC provides a wealth of information to its students and public at large via its catalog and web site. Accuracy of the information is maintained by appropriate college administrators. The mission statement is clearly available in multiple platforms and accurately portrays the College mission. Information pertaining to student learning outcomes are available on the college website. The catalog serves as the main vehicle for communication about college policies, enrollment guidelines, costs, fees, rules of conduct, and information on programs and services. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness publishes a wide range of data on student enrollment and success patterns. Accurate information about the college’s accreditation status is easily identifiable on its main web site and in the college catalog. (I.C.1; ER 20)

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) collects, and posts to the assessment website different assessment results and reports. In addition OIE utilizes reports from the State



Chancellor's office to generate different reports. Student achievement data is collected and reported in a variety of reports. Reports are posted to the Research and Planning website, which is available to the college constituencies and to the community. Degrees and certificates are clearly described and include student learning outcomes and program learning outcomes. (I.C.1)

The College catalog is available in print form every other year, and updated online every six months between the print editions. The team was able to verify that all of the components required of a college catalog are intact and accurately portray college policies, requirements, fees and programs of study. Included in the catalog is accurate, relevant information pertaining to the college's accredited status, programs of study, course descriptions, student learning outcomes for courses and programs, the academic calendar, and major policies and procedures impacting students. Nearly 90 percent of students surveyed by the college in 2014 agreed that the college catalog "provides accurate information." (I.C.2; ER 20)

The college collects assessment data by course, program, general education, and institutional levels. The assessment cycle indicated in their LATTC guidelines, approved by the Academic Senate, that all PLO's are assessed every three years. In reviewing the PLO assessments, 67 of 98 programs have out of date PLO assessment reports at the time of the team visit, while 13 of 32 student support program PLO assessment reports were up to date in the current cycle. The college has identified fall 2016 as the kick-off date for the next PLO assessment cycle for programs. The Quality Focus Essay identifies the need to review and update learning and service outcomes to ensure alignment with internal and external competencies. The lack of automation coupled with the volume of documents received led to challenges in evaluating the quality of outcome statements, managing data collection, and disaggregation and difficulty connecting outcome assessment results and programmatic improvements through dialogue. (I.C.3)

The college ensures that the information about its programs is accurate by reviewing it on a yearly basis. The catalog is updated every other year, with a major updating done every two years and an addendum done in the years in between. Student learning outcomes are included on the Program Factsheets and program brochures. (I.C.4)

LACCD board rule 6703.10 indicates that during the first week of classes, the faculty members teaching classes shall provide students and the Department Chairperson a syllabus that describes the student work product which will be the basis for determining each student's grade in the class as well as the grading criteria for the class. Also included in the course syllabi are the student learning outcomes. The college provides a checklist for syllabi on their website. Faculty are required to send their syllabi to their department chair for review. Department chairs review the syllabi for student learning outcomes, disabled student information, and academic honesty. Department chairs keep a list of those syllabi, along with those that need to be fixed. The Chair calls those faculty who have not turned in their syllabi on time. A random sampling of course syllabi indicated that a statement about academic honesty and disability accommodation statement was not always present. (I.C.4) It is suggested that LATTC review all syllabi for consistency of information.

Students in DE/CE programs receive information about the institution's degrees and certificates through the website and fact sheets. (I.C.4)

The District's Administrative Regulations and Board Rules bind the College policies and procedures and are reviewed annually in June or whenever parent regulations/rules change. There is a process in place (I.C.1) to ensure accuracy and currency of policies and procedures as they pertain to the mission, educational programs and student support services. Policies are also updated by the Dean of Curriculum in the Catalog publication every other year or when needed. (I.C.5)

The college publishes information about the total cost of education to its students and to the public in various places, including the catalog and its web site. The cost of education, including tuition, fees, textbooks, and living expenses is available on the college's financial aid web site (under the "determining financial need" tab). While the college does make available to the public information on the cost, program length, and success of graduates of gainful employment programs, the college's approach is not intuitive or easy for members of the public to follow. (I.C.6)

The Board maintains two policies on academic freedom: Policy 15002 and 1204.12. The first policy recognizes that an "essential function of learning is a probing of received opinions and an exploration of ideas which may cause some student discomfort" (Board Rule 15002). The Faculty Code of Ethics states that faculty "demonstrate respect for the student as an individual and adhere to their proper role as intellectual guides and counselors." These policies ensure that the College maintains an atmosphere where intellectual freedom flourishes for all constituencies at the college. In addition, Article 4 of an agreement between LACCD and the Los Angeles College Faculty Guild states that, "The faculty shall have the academic freedom to seek the truth and guarantee freedom of learning to the students." The College catalog also includes a section on District and College policies which includes academic freedom and intellectual freedom. The Board's policy on academic freedom specifies the faculty's right to teach and the student's right to learn. The colleges widely publish their commitment to a learning environment that promotes free expression of thought and ideas in the college catalogs and some include it in the class schedule. The District's faculty contract (AFT) specifies that faculty shall have the *freedom to seek the truth and guarantee freedom of learning for students*. The faculty contract also outlines the policies and procedures for protection of academic freedom. (I.C.7; ER 13)

In order to ensure academic honesty for students, LATTC publishes numerous guidelines for student behavior, academic honesty, dishonesty and student conduct in the College Catalog. The standards of student conduct related to academic integrity are contained in Board Policy 9803.28. According to the syllabus evaluation checklist, faculty are required to include an academic honesty policy statement in their syllabi and review it with students at their first meeting. Policies on academic dishonesty are made public on the District website, the college catalog, and the college website. (I.C.8)

LATTC's policy on academic freedom is made widely available to students and the public via section 3 of the College Catalog. Associated with this freedom is a Faculty Code of

Ethics that indicates the faculty “practice intellectual honesty” in their teaching and participation in governance processes and that they protect the academic freedom of students. The College presented satisfactory evidence that students believe faculty present information and data to them in a fair and objective manner. In a recent survey of students, 90 percent of them agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that faculty “present information fairly and objectively, distinguishing between personal convictions and professionally accepted views”. (I.C.9-7; I.C.9)

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

The College adheres to specific standards of conduct for staff and faculty that are outlined in the LACCD Personnel Commission Rules 735 (outlining unacceptable acts by employees), Rule 10101, and Human Resource Guide E-001 (prohibiting unsolicited derogatory communications). Rule 735 requires each employee to take personal responsibility for their actions, and to “conduct themselves in a positive and ethical manner.” In addition the District adopted standards of student conduct describe the punishments that may flow from violations of conduct guidelines. These rules are available to students via the college web site, and from the College’s Vice President of Student Services (I.C.10). Standard I.C.11 pertaining to institutions operating in foreign locations does not apply to LATTC.

Consistent with Eligibility Requirement 21 and ACCJC standards, the college describes its accredited status in an honest manner. Past accrediting commission action letters are publicly available on the college website, and the current institutional self-study makes a clear and concerted effort to document compliance with ACCJC requirements, state and federal mandates. Past recommendations to the College were addressed in 2010 and 2011 progress reports, resulting in the college moving from probation to warning to reaccredited status. The 2016 team visit was organized in such a way as to foster the examination of evidence and to allow for timely interviews of key staff, faculty, and managers. (I.C.12; I.C.13)

A careful review of the historical documents related to accreditation reveals that the District adheres to the Commission’s Eligibility Requirements and Standards. The District website maintains a Planning and Accreditation webpage whereby the District publicly discloses information regarding accreditation. All college self evaluation reports are posted to the website as well as District responses and evidence for the reports. Recent follow-up reports

and correspondence from the Commission are posted. The Educational Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE) division in the Educational Services Center (ESC) provides support and coordination for college accreditation efforts. In particular, EPIE assists college personnel in coordinating accreditation efforts for comprehensive site visits and midterm and progress reports; provides college accreditation leaders information in support of District wide accreditation issues; monitors college progress in responding to Commission recommendations; serves as liaison to the Board of Trustees and the chancellor on all issues related to college accreditation; coordinates the production, review, and revision of the “Functional Map” of District/college responsibilities and duties; monitors and interprets ACCJC Standards and policies; and coordinates responses to accreditation standards that reference multi-college District or District-level functions. Much of this coordinating effort occurs in the District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC), which is comprised of the colleges’ ALOs, faculty leaders with accreditation and planning, deans of institutional research and planning, District Academic Senate appointees, representatives from District Committees, and ESC administrators.

The District and the colleges have numerous relationships with external agencies. The District works in tandem with the colleges to submit all required data and reports to the California Community College Chancellor’s Office, the U.S. Department of Education, external agencies, and accrediting agencies. The District coordinates the submission of MIS data requirements to the state, along with accurate and timely submission of reports and budgets such as those required for the Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) and Student Equity funding. All required data for IPEDS reporting is also coordinated at the District. Working collaboratively with the colleges, the District’s Central Financial Aid Unit complies with Federal Title IV regulations affecting the administration of financial aid programs. This includes regular submission of required data and reports, adherence to federal program reviews and audits, and quickly addressing any noted areas of noncompliance in any findings. The Contract and Purchasing Office in the Business Services Division of the District publicly advertises requests for bids and proposals for qualified suppliers and consultants through the District’s website. All open requests, vendor forms and directions, and contact information for District contract and procurement personnel is provided. The District communicates information regarding accredited status through the Planning and Accreditation webpage. All correspondence from the Commission is posted on the webpage, including the college self evaluation and follow-up reports and the associated evidence.

The Board is responsible for policy and exercises oversight over student success, persistence, retention, and quality (BR 2100). The Board exercises oversight of the District's educational programs and has established an Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success (IESS) Committee to monitor the integrity, quality, and improvement of student learning programs and services (I.C.14). The Board of Trustees is kept regularly informed on key indicators of student learning and achievement through the IESS. Additionally, Board agendas and minutes provide evidence of regular review of the colleges’ academic quality and institutional plans. The annual review and analysis of the state’s Student Success Scorecard completion data and the resultant Board discussion has focused on strategies for improving student success and academic quality.

## **Conclusions**

The College meets the standards and relevant eligibility requirements pertaining to institutional integrity. The visiting team did identify deficiencies in the presentation of information that are easy to rectify and would result in easier access to accurate information about the college's programs and courses. For example, clear tables of information relating to financial cost and gainful employment would be beneficial to include directly in the college's print and online catalog.

The District meets the Standard and ER 13. The Los Angeles Community College District is committed to principles of academic freedom and ethical behavior. The District assures institutional and academic integrity through adherence to Board of Trustee policies on academic freedom that commit to a learning environment in which intellectual freedom exists for faculty and students to explore and critically examine knowledge. This commitment is reflected throughout the organization in a variety of ways including Board policies, mission statements, institutional core values, faculty contracts and governance handbooks that are readily available. This commitment is communicated to students and the public via college catalogs and websites, along with student evaluations at some or all of the colleges.

The District has a number of policies and administrative regulations in place to promote honesty, responsibility, ethical conduct, and academic integrity that apply to all forms of delivery and constituencies, including visitors to the campuses. There are several commendable practices pertaining to academic integrity at the various colleges of the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD). For example, Los Angeles Valley College prints a statement on academic dishonesty on the cover of examination books and includes a line for the student's signature. The online course management system used by some colleges, Etudes, is developing a student authentication for online classes that will require the student to answer a random question that pertains to individually identifiable information about the student contained in the Student Information system before taking an exam or submitting assignments. East Los Angeles College (ELAC) instructors will be piloting the new functionality. Students at ELAC take an honor pledge before taking online assessments and LACCD has a Board rule that requires faculty to include a statement in the syllabi about the student code of conduct including academic honesty on the syllabi.

The Board of Trustees' IESS committee keeps them informed on issues involving academic quality, student achievement, and student learning. The District meets this Standard.

### **Recommendation 4**

In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the College should engage in regular oversight of course syllabi and information contained in distance education courses. The visiting team was not able to document the inclusion of academic dishonesty statements across all course syllabi in the online platform. (I.C.4)

### **Recommendation 5**

In order to improve effectiveness, the College should revamp its method of presenting program fact sheets for gainful employment programs to include in one prominently accessible location with accurate information on program costs, program length, and employment prospects for students who complete each applicable program. (I.C.6)

## **Standard II.A Instructional Programs**

### **General Observations**

All instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education, are offered in fields of study consistent with the institution's mission, are appropriate to higher education, and culminate in student attainment of identified student learning outcomes, and achievement of degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education programs. (ER 9; ER 11). LATTC offers 98 programs of study, 2517 credit course sections of which 95% are degree-applicable course sections. And, there are 135 non-degree sections, 1,436 career-technical education course sections, and 290 non-credit sections.

With 53 associate degree programs (AS and AA) and five programs for transfer, as well as 67 approved certificate programs, the college works to track student job placement and employment through the Perkins Core Indicator Report. LATTC will be participating in the CTE outcome survey, a State-level survey to collect job placement/employment outcomes from alumni who are working. The college has also partnered with the Coalition for Responsible Community Development to co-locate an American Job Center or WorkSource center on campus, which will help students find jobs more quickly.

On campus facilities appear to be adequate, and courses are also offered throughout the community at off-campus sites, through Distance Education (DE), as well as hybrid courses that are part in-class and part online. Those courses use the same "Outline of Record" as campus courses. Unfortunately, no degrees or certificates can be earned via distance education at LATTC. It is a small program with only 40 online courses offered in Spring 2016.

The transfer of credit policies are established by the District in Board Rules and Administrative Regulations. There is no District oversight in ensuring consistency in the application of these policies. The nine colleges maintain articulation agreements with public and private accredited institutions both in-state and out- of-state. The District does not have any role in the development or maintenance of articulation agreements.

### **Findings and Evidence**

The College ensures the quality and appropriateness of all program and services, and that they are consistent with the College mission. The visiting team found evidence that program review and curriculum review processes do exist. However, as previously noted in Standard

I, the consistency and depth of these evaluation methods vary across instructional programs. (II.A.1)

The college's faculty have been responsible for ensuring quality courses, and have a formal curriculum development process as well as an evaluation process, with a good set of teams that review, make recommendations, and improvements based on needs of the faculty and staff. The faculty also ensure that all credit and noncredit courses meet academic and professional standards both in content and methods of instruction. Curriculum and program review processes occur at least every six years. Unfortunately, program review processes and methods have resulted in significantly mixed methods and unwieldy data. It appears that the Office of Institutional Effectiveness is overwhelmed with program review data, and the linkage of the new eLumen system has delayed production of information that is critical and important for both faculty and the administration in order to make changes, and provide critical information to all consumers of the campus. It is recommended that data be transparently available to all campus audiences. The viability of program review overall is threatened by lack of clear data output. (II.A.2)

All instructional programs have established and recorded learning outcomes at the course and program level. As a methods for ensuring this is the case, the curriculum approve process requires the establishment of student learning outcomes at the time of course approve or modification. (II.A.3)

LATTC offers 22 pre-collegiate level courses in Basic Skills or Learning Skills. The courses are supported by Academic Connections through tutoring, skills assessment, and English and math refresher courses and workshops. The college provides paths from pre-collegiate to college-level courses through PACTS programs and processes. Additionally, a new State-funded Student Success and Support program (SSSP) allows college applicants to undergo assessment testing for appropriate placement in Math and English. Faculty have been working on writing curriculum that is responsive to basic skills students, with, for example an accelerated English class. As a result, a new process now allows students to meet with a counselor based on test results, and start their education plan with extra support and correct course placement and selection. Coordination of students taking basic skills, some for credit and some not-for-credit is evident in the student areas where computers are available for working on student loans, course selection and other needs. (II.A.4)

The curriculum process aligns nicely with meeting the requirements of common practices in American higher education for time to completion of all courses and programs. The visiting team verified the LACCD Board Rule 6201 dictates the minimum number of credits for each associate degree program, the minimum grade point average to be eligible to receive a degree, the English and math competency requirements, and number of required general education units. The College catalog indicates these areas to make up the general education requirements: Natural Science, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Humanities, Language and Rationality, and Health and Physical Education. (II.A.5)

Through the College's work with the Pathways to Academic, Career, and Transfer, two-year plans for each associates degree in the areas of Advanced Transportation and Manufacturing,

Design and Media Arts, and Liberal Arts have been established. As the College works to create pathway plans for all other courses with the full PACTS implementation. The visiting team reviewed the course schedules and degree requirements and confirmed that courses are offered in a manner that allows full-time student to complete each associate degree in a timely manner. (II.A.6)

The team verified that assessment of student learning is occurring in pockets. However, as previously noted in Standard I and in the Quality Focused Essay, the College appears to have difficulty in providing evidence of institutional changes that were implemented due to program review and assessment of student learning, in a clear and consistent manner. As an example, the evidence provided for Standard II.A.7 is the math common final examination. This evidence provides no discussion around ensuring processes are in place to reduce test bias and enhance reliability, but more simply that that math department uses a common final exam. (II.A.7)

Faculty base all course credit, degrees and certificates on student success benchmarks. Learning assessment occurs in classes, and grades are based on whether or not students have met criteria, usually within the learning outcomes. Degrees and certificates are awarded based on the successful completion of required courses (including general education requirements) and number of units. All degrees and certificates have a program of study with defined program learning outcomes (PLOs). These were created to integrate the abilities, skills, and knowledge identified in the course-level student learning outcome. The number of units of credit given for courses is based upon District and state standards for minimum clock (Carnegie) hours needed per unite of credit. (II.A.8)

The college did not provide adequate evidence of SLO and PLO assessments occurring that impact changes to create a continuous improvement culture. The program review could be an excellent document to identify and recognized changes that have occurred do to this regular assessment. In the campus QFE, issue 3 in the action project 2, clearly demonstrates that lack of SLO assessment and programmatic or institutional changes. This should be addressed through the work on the QFE in the upcoming year as well as with the Recommendation for Compliance 1 of this report. (II.A.9)

Students are able to review their opportunities for transferring credits based on campus definitions. When students want transfer credits to help with fulfilling degree requirements, they must provide evidence that the learning outcomes of the courses they wish to transfer are comparable to the learning outcomes of courses. Also new and updated courses are uploaded annually to four-year institutions for review in order to initiate and grow new articulation agreements. The Articulation officer makes special efforts to oversee that the process of uploading new courses demonstrates to the transfer institution that the courses are of sufficient quality to allow transfer. Articulation agreements are refreshed regularly and published to the College website and to the LATTC College Center website. (II.A.10)

LATTC provides, in all programs, student learning outcomes that are appropriate to the program levels in: Communication competency, Information competency, Quantitative



competency, Analytic inquiry skills, Ethical Reasoning, Engaging in diverse perspectives, and other outcomes specific to the program of study. (II.A.11)

The District has well-established policies and regulations in place for acceptance of a wide range of transfer credits including: standardized tests, external exams, International Baccalaureate, military credits, Advanced Placement, courses completed at international institutions, and acceptance of upper division courses to meet lower division requirements. These policies align with state regulations, the policies of California State University and University of California, and other transfer institutions, as well as with generally accepted practices in higher education. This information is published in the college catalogs and websites. The awarding of transfer credits is the responsibility of each college and is reflected on the student's permanent record, maintained in the Student Information System (DAC). Each college currently issues its own student transcripts, however, this will change with the new PeopleSoft system where there will be one District transcript reflecting credits taken throughout the District. There is currently no District monitoring of the consistency of the awarding of transfer credits. However, there is a policy, LACCD Board Rule 6201, which does provide guidance and definitions. (II.A.10)

The information presented to students in college publications is thorough and comprehensive. While some colleges specified that they do not specifically examine student learning outcomes in the process of evaluating transfer credits, the acceptance of transfer credits by the institutions implies that the expected learning outcomes are comparable. LATTC follows the BACCD Board Rule 6201. In order to establish an articulated course, the Articulation Officer oversees the process and ensures that the learning objectives for the course accepted for transfer are consistent with the course objectives and transfer guidelines by working with the discipline faculty experts.

Each of the nine colleges maintains articulation agreements with public and private accredited institutions both in-state and out-of-state. These agreements are contained in ASSIST, the state's recognized articulation database for use by students and employees that advise students. The establishment and maintenance of articulation agreements is the responsibility of the college faculty. The District does not have a role in developing articulation agreements.

The College has established POLs for each program and SLOs for each course. In addition, in an effort to ensure student appreciation of diverse perspectives, the College developed general education learning outcomes (GELOs), which encompass curricular areas meeting the College's general education requirements for an associate degree. These areas are Ethical and Effective Citizen, Humanities, Natural Sciences, Language and Rationality, Behavioral and Social Sciences, and Health and Physical Education. (II.A.11)

LACCD Board rules dictate the required general education areas of emphasis required for graduation. As such, the general education discipline faculty identify courses during the curricular adoption process to support the areas of emphasis in the graduation plan. Syllabi are updated and reviewed each semester to ensure student learning outcomes and course objectives are correct and aligned. General education courses are reviewed every five years.

The campus aligns the course student learning outcomes, program learning outcomes, general education learning outcomes, and institutional learning outcomes, which are placed on an assessment cycle. (II.A.12)

The Program and Course Approval Handbook published by the California Community College Chancellor's Office outlines the requirements regarding the construction of degree programs. To measure the levels of mastery in the area of inquiry and/or emphasis upon completion of the program, faculty construct a curricular map identifying the courses, competencies, and identification of key competencies mastered. The local, District and state approval process ensures that program of study courses incorporate student learning outcomes and the most critical topics and theories to ensure students achieve an appropriate level of mastery to move on to employment or to upper-division courses for transfer programs of study. (II.A.13)

The visiting team verified that CTE program have advisory committees comprising of industry representatives. These professional give relevant recommendations to keep programs current with evolving professional standard, expected competencies, new trends, and offer advice on equipment and software purchases. The College's Nursing, Cosmetology, and Barbering programs are overseen by regulatory agencies that require periodic review. In addition, the Culinary and Transportation programs have external accreditation standards that must be met to ensure industry-recognized accreditation. (II.A.13)

The College's efforts to maintain program currency have enabled it to update programs without requiring a program discontinuance. District Board rule 6202 states that students may graduate under the catalog in effect at the time of graduation or the catalog in which they entered, if the student maintained catalog rights. (II.A.15)

Board Rules 6801 and 6802 define the required process for Program Review and Biennial Vocational Program Review. However, as previously mentioned in standard I.B. and in recommendation one, the team had difficulty identifying noted assessment of deficiencies that led to change, and ultimately improved student learning. The College also recognizes the needed improvement in these areas and plan to address them through the Quality Focused Essay Action Plan 2(II.A.16)

### **Distance Education**

A meeting with Distance Education stakeholders, including faculty and administration, revealed that the College is in the process of moving from the Moodle LMS platform to the OEI supported Canvas LMS. The LMS transition is targeted to sunset Moodle by summer 2016 and fully implement Canvas by fall 2016.

The College has provided extensive training in Moodle which is led by a very dynamic team that is enthusiastic and passionate about online pedagogy. This same team is currently providing Canvas training to all interested College faculty and, additionally, welcomes faculty from other District colleges to participate in LATTC trainings.

During the meeting, the visiting team was informed about the process that is required for an instructor to be approved for online instruction. First, via discussion in a department meeting, an instructor must express interest or is approached to teach online. Then, through the training provided, which includes developing at least four weeks of online content, the instructor completes a review process that includes submitting the course to the curriculum committee. Finally, when the instructor and the course have been vetted by the established process, the instructor is permitted to teach a course via distance education.

The College initiated a review of Distance Ed Success rates when compared to similar courses offered in the face to face modality. During this review, the college discovered that some courses achieved more than a 20 percent differences in student success in courses taught in both modalities. As a result, the College has initiated a process on how to provide support and close the gap between both types of courses. The College is in the process of developing an OEI-based rubric to help alleviate the gap, along with communication and tools around best practices in teaching Distance Education. The visiting team verified that when there are courses with success rates that vary greatly between face to face and DE, the course is removed from being offered by distance until a complete evaluation and assessment is completed and the course is changed to address the areas causing the success gap(s).

The LMS system is also being used in approximately 50% of traditional classrooms to support instruction. All students enrolled in classes that use the LMS are able to access online student support services, including the Net Tutor, a comprehensive online tutoring service supported by the OEI. In addition to the services found in the LMS, students can access the following services via phone or email: Bridges to Success, Business Office, Counseling, Disabled Students Program and Services, Financial Aid, Online Student Support, Transfer Center, traditional tutoring.

The College is in the process of enhancing its online support services. Online students are directed to an Online Student Support website where they have access to student support services that reflect those services available to students on campus. Students are provided links and directions on the College website and Moodle learning management system (LMS) website. (II.C.2)

These online services include:

- Online Student Help Desk
- Online Orientation
- Academic support services, which serve as a one-stop center for the entire onboarding experience to help students enroll, assess, get counseling, and register for courses
- Academic technology support for help with the campus LMS, campus email, and general computer-related questions
- Financial Aid support
- Business Office support – specifically issues with holds on student account and reimbursement due to cancelled or dropped classes
- Online Counseling support is available in email format.
- EOPS Support – available to those students who are registered in 12 units or more of online-only courses at LATTC

The College Equity Plan requires that the campus review data relevant to student access, course completion, ESL and Basic Skills completion and transfer in several ways. Disaggregated data by gender, ethnicity, and special program status are monitored by the Student Success Committee. Dealing with the variety and diversity of students has resulted in very flexible schedules and the addition of many instructional materials that are available online.

Students enrolled in online courses complete the same college application through CCCapply. The assessment test is not available online; therefore, students are encouraged to take an assessment test at a community college or testing site closest to them. (II.C.7)

Findings for this Standard are that the college clearly designs Pathways suited to students for either transfer or for certification. While the Institutional Effectiveness Office provides and posts data about student demographics, preparation, and outcomes, it is felt that there is no process for using the data and for identifying strategies to improve the differences and difficulties among students who may be merely attempting to pass Basic Skills courses versus attaining a degree. SLOs may be a route to identify ways to work on student completion, and distance education, designed to attract students only looking to complete Basic Skills. Fortunately, results of these conversations include new professional development on campus to promote student equity so that such areas as Basic Skills success in course completion in math and English will, ultimately, be improved.

The College is in the process of further strengthening the assessment process as identified in the Quality Focus Essay Action Project 2. With the change in management of the Institutional Effectiveness office, new processes for accessible evaluation will be developed. It is critical to improve the timeliness of PLOs in the future as 79 of 92 programs were late providing their assessments last year.

## **Conclusion**

The College does not meet the Standard. The team found the college to have met the regulations for compliance in the area of distance education. This is an area for growth and development for LATTC and team found evidence that the college is being proactive in alignment with the statewide Online Education Initiative (OEI), which will allow them to provide additional support to students through multiple modalities. The College regularly assesses the success rates of DE courses and when differences are identified, the course is removed from the DE schedule until a close analysis and changes are put into place. The course is then closely monitored for student success gaps to ensure the improvement made an impact.

The District meets the Standard and ER 10. Transfer of credit policies are clearly communicated to students in various college publications, including the college catalog and websites, to facilitate the mobility of students from one institution to another without penalty. While the District does not specifically assess student learning outcomes of transferred courses since they are not readily available, the college reviews required prerequisites, course content and knowledge gained in transferred courses to determine equivalency. Moreover,

by accepting transfer credits in accordance with Board policies, the college has determined that the learning outcomes for the transferred courses are comparable to the courses at the college.

The colleges all have numerous articulation agreements in place and rely on ASSIST as the primary repository of those agreements. The development and maintenance of articulation agreements is the responsibility of the individual college faculty. The District does not have a role.

### **Recommendations 6**

In order to meet Standard, the College should ensure programs are following the approved program review process in a timely manner, as identified by the College. Program reviews should utilize appropriate data to support assessment of student learning outcomes and identify continuous improvement actions. (II.A.3)

## **Standard II.B: Library and Learning Support Services**

### **General Observations**

The LATTC library generally provides sufficient library and learning support services to complement its mission, as shown by most of the evidence. The library's collection consists of over 70,000 print books, nearly 150 print periodical subscriptions, over 5,000 e-books, and nearly 50 online databases. With the library's move into a new facility in 2013, student use of the library increased to 2000-3000 students daily, and library hours were extended from under 40 hours/week to 48 hours/week during Fall & Spring semesters. (ER17)

LATTC supports the learning and teaching needs of all students through the hiring of librarians and support professionals, educational equipment and materials. The library staffing has fluctuated in recent years, but is currently staffed by 3 full-time librarians and recruiting for a 4th full-time librarian, 3 library classified staff, and 3-5 student workers.

Tutoring services within the Academic Connections department contains various learning centers merged when they moved into the new facility in 2013, including the Tutoring Center, the Reading Center, and the Writing Center. Open 52 hours weekly, Tutoring Services provides students with tutoring in a variety of subject areas, both transfer and occupational. In response to feedback from students completing tutoring, Tutoring Services migrated to an open-access no appointment system, making services easier for students to use and resulting in more efficient use of tutoring resources, and an increase in the use of the service and of student satisfaction with tutoring, with a recent peak of 2200 students tutored in a single semester. In both the 2014 and 2015 Academic Connections surveys, students who used the service were extremely positive about the value of the tutoring services they received.

All the colleges adhere to Board policy pertaining to intra-library loans and have strong collaboration pertaining to providing learning support for students. When the institution relies on or collaborates with other institutions or other sources for library and other learning

support services for its instructional programs, it documents that formal agreements exist and that such resources and services are adequate for the institution's intended purposes, are easily accessible, and utilized. The institution takes responsibility for and assures the security, maintenance, and reliability of services provided either directly or through contractual arrangement. The institution regularly evaluates these services to ensure their effectiveness.

## **Findings and Evidence**

Faculty leadership share a perception that the library is under-resourced, having insufficient book funds to refresh their aging collections, although student leaders felt that the library's collections were sufficient. Faculty also felt that the library had insufficient staff and insufficient open hours (the latter perception shared by student leaders, especially for Friday hours). Staffing levels have been in flux, with full-time librarians dropping to 2 in recent years, before climbing to 4 positions presently. Classified positions have been reduced from 6 to 3. For their direct instruction of students, the library provides numerous research, like a Pro drop-in research session, library orientations requested by classroom faculty (53 in 2015), and Library 101, a credit course. Although a library classroom was planned in the new facility, the space was assigned to Academic Connections, leaving the library having to use open space within the building or other campus classrooms for their instruction, and leaving this critical library service insufficiently accommodated. LATTC is the only campus within the district that does not include a library classroom in its facilities plans. The library is working with IT on resolving this deficiency, and they expect to have a functional library classroom space soon. (II.B.1)

Distance Education students are able to use the library's online databases and electronic books for their research. Assistance is available through very visible links on the library's web page. The campus provides DE students with an Online Student Guide that includes contact information for key campus services – unfortunately, not including the library. The campus Moodle Student Help Desk contains a number of tutorials on various topics, and includes a link to a library instruction video. A number of mostly minor broken links were encountered on the library website itself, as a result of recent changes to the library website, but they have been corrected. (II.B.1)

Tutoring Services provides extensive tutoring in math and English, and limited tutoring in biology, chemistry, and other subjects. When requests for tutoring in a subject are received, the department begins recruiting for tutors in the subject, with preference given to recommended tutors who could tutor in multiple subject areas. Distance Education students, EOPS students, and any students using the online course management systems have tutoring services available to them through a recent contract with NetTutor. Students who log into the course management systems are provided with a link to the service on their welcome page. However, websites for in-person tutoring operations do not currently reference the availability of NetTutor, although the Academic Connections website does have a link to the Online Writing Lab from Excelsior College. (II.B.1)

Liaison librarians work with discipline faculty to ensure the library's collections provide sufficient materials to support student success on the campus. Additionally, the library chair reviews all of the campus curricular changes, to identify additional books, periodicals, and other materials that should be considered by the library. Looking at the LATTC Campus Climate Surveys and the district-wide student surveys, staff and student satisfaction with the library has risen considerably. Staff confirm that their services were very incomplete during their years in temporary trailers, and the rise in satisfaction coincided with their move into the remodeled Mariposa Hall. (II.B.2)

The library's 2014-2015 Program Review includes several Service Area Outcomes and Student Learning Outcomes connected to their instruction efforts. This document provided evidence of the library engaging in a robust internal dialog and review of their services and their needs, particularly as they impact student success. No evidence was discovered indicating that the library is evaluating its service SAOs. Evidence was provided to confirm the evaluation of the library's instruction efforts such as their Research Like a Pro workshops and their credit LIBR 101 course, as well as a summary of a very successful CAP model program which involved embedding librarians in several English courses. (II.B.3)

The tutoring services' 2014-2015 Program Review includes several Service Area Outcomes. The regular surveys completed by students using the tutoring services provide a basic assessment of the operation's effectiveness in providing their learning outcomes. Again, feedback from tutored students was extremely positive, and indicated a strong degree of perceived benefit from the services. Faculty leaders reported that frequent mention of the need for tutoring funding via the program review process led to a recent increase in funding for tutoring activities. (II.B.3)

For tutoring services, the district-wide LACCD student surveys appears to show evidence of a perception problem among students. However, for surveyed students actually using the tutoring services showed positive feedback. In the district surveys, student satisfaction levels with tutoring services have been improving considerably, with the percent of students saying they were "very satisfied" going from 13.6% in 2007 (lowest in LACCD), to 15.9% in 2012, and most recently in 2014 to 29.7%, slightly below the 2014 LACCD mean of 31.1%. (II.B.3)

The library's 2014-2015 Program Review mentioned a significant book loss discovered, since moving into the new building. Faculty leaders mentioned student reports of missing textbooks as well. The staff reported getting an open stairwell exit converted to an alarmed emergency exit, and expanding the security gates on the single entryway to cover the entire entryway, and so it is expected that the issue has been resolved. (II.B.4)

The District has a long-standing practice of collaboration for library and learning support for its instructional programs. The District has a policy that facilitates intra-library loans for its students. This reciprocal agreement allows students to request material to be sent to another library within the District, generally within one week. Students also have the option to drive to another college to pick up materials on loan.

The District does not have a role in documenting formal collaborative agreements pertaining to library and other learning support services for instructional programs. The development and maintenance of these agreements is the responsibility of the individual colleges. The colleges also have subscriptions for online databases, tutoring programs, and career planning tools. The District libraries use the California Community College Library Consortium to purchase electronic resources which is the most cost-effective approach. The colleges also have reciprocal agreements with the libraries at the local California State University campuses and refer students to the local public libraries for various materials that may not be available.

The institutions are responsible for assuring the security, maintenance and reliability of the services provided. District Information Technology is responsible for maintaining the software and websites. It should be noted that not all the colleges address security and maintenance measures in their reports. The District does not have a role other than the District wide contract with the Sherriff's Department for campus security services.

### **Conclusion**

The college provides library and learning support services that support instructional programs. The college has not provided evidence that the library is assessing all of its services. Given that the Quality Focused Essay has outcomes around all SLO's and assessment, it is assumed this will be resolved at the required report back on the stated action steps. The visiting team did get feedback from student leadership and faculty regarding the hours of operations as limiting to support student learning.

The District meets the Standard. The nine colleges of the District have strong collaboration with regards to library and other learning support that aligns with District policy. The colleges also collaborate with local universities and the public library system to provide library support for students. The colleges have agreements in place for online resources and services. The nine librarians meet monthly to share resources and identify needs and services for students. The colleges are responsible for the overall security and maintenance of resources, and District IT is responsible for the maintenance of the websites and software. Facilities are secured through a District wide contract with the Sherriff's Department.

### **Recommendation 7**

In order to improve effectiveness, the College should perform an analysis of library usage, unmet student demand, appropriateness and size of the collection needed to support student learning, and staffing levels. This analysis should also include an assessment of the Library's service area outcomes. Actionable items resulting from this analysis should be addressed. (II.B.1)

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

### **General Observation**

Los Angeles Trade and Technical College provides appropriate student support programs and services; Admissions and Records, Assessment, Athletics, Bridges to Success Center, Child



Development Center, Counseling Services, Disabled Student Programs and Services (DSPS), Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS), Cooperative Agencies Resources for Education (CARE), Financial Aid, Foster and Kinship Care Education Program, GAIN/CalWORKs, Guardian Scholars, International Student Services, Outreach, Puente, Student Health Services, Office of Student Life (also known as Student Activities/ASO Office), Umoja, University Transfer, Veterans Student Center, and Worksource Center.

It is clearly evident that student success is the primary emphasis at the institution. When new students enter the campus, they are guided to the Bridges to Success Center by a pathway lined with a purple directional arrows.

The Bridges to Success Center is structured around an Apple Store concept in which students are greeted by college staff who provide assistance with the onboarding process.

Through the onboarding process, staff assists new and continuing students with application assistance, orientation, assessment, counseling, course registration, paying for parking and fees, and obtaining a student identification card. Other support services are organized and marketed through Ready/Go Week activities.

The District has adopted, and the colleges adhere to, admission policies that are consistent with the mission and specify the qualifications of students appropriate for its programs. These policies are published in catalogs and class schedules as well as available on websites. In addition, academic programs that have special admission/selection processes such as nursing and radiologic technology include this information in program applications/websites.

The District and colleges have high standards for the confidentiality, maintenance, release, and destruction of student records. District policies and practices have been developed in accordance with state and federal law and are strictly followed. There are a number of safeguards in place to protect the confidentiality of student records, including: requiring photo identification to access records information in person; nightly back up of the databases; adherence to a records classification and destruction system; and restricting access through the use of controlled passwords that are automatically changed every 90 days.

## **Findings and Evidence**

Los Angeles Trade-Technical College evaluates the quality of its student support services and programs through the annual Program Review process. Evidence states that all student support services and programs complete an annual Program Review every year and a comprehensive Program Review evaluation at the end of the five-year cycle. (II.C.1)

Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) demonstrate that the services provided support student learning. The evidence of these outcomes is contained in the assessments of SAOs. All student services programs have developed SAOs and are in the process of reviewing the data

and updating outcomes to meet the needs of the changing student population and the Pathways to Academic, Career, and Transfer Success (PACTS) Initiative. (II.C.1)

One of the Student Success Committee's goals for 2014-2015 is to "complete and monitor the progress of SSSP and Student Equity Plans." The College also undergoes an annual external peer evaluation of these plans. Lastly, the LATTC Student Success Scorecard will include metrics for student support services as another tool for evaluating the quality of student support services and programs and for demonstrating the support of student learning. At the end of the 2014-15 fiscal year, LATTC had 70 percent of new non-exempt students complete all three components of SSSP requirements – assessment, orientation, and counseling. (II.C.1)

The College evaluates the quality of student support services and programs and ensures, regardless of location, that services support student learning and enhance the institutional mission. The Program Review process allows for reflection and assessment of service area outcomes and student learning outcomes. Through this evaluation process, changes are implemented in student support services that support student learning and success. Examples that outline the Program Review process as a productive means to implement new programs include the development of the Bridges to Success Center and changes to the Financial Student Aid disbursement process. (II.C.1)

Through the Program Review process, the need for additional capacity to provide online services and access to technology (i.e., dedicated lab space) to students is being addressed at the institutional level and through various plans, including the Student Success and Support Program plans (credit and non-credit). The College is also in the process of implementing PeopleSoft to upgrade the online Counseling system. (II.C.1)

In the spirit of continuous improvement, the College recognizes the need to address the focus on student satisfaction surveys as a primary means of collecting assessment data. Student support services and programs are anticipating a formalized assessment process that will provide additional needed guidance. The College also recognizes the need to identify benchmark data points in alignment with the Strategic Educational Master Plan, Institution-Set Standards, equity, and Student Success Scorecard. The OIE will play a critical role in assisting the Division with these conversations and providing training.

All student support services defined service learning outcomes and service area outcomes, which are posted on the assessment website. SLOs and SAOs are mapped to the College's institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) and Strategic Educational Master Plan. The data collected through this process is used for continuous improvement in student support services and programs. During the Program Review process, programs, and services reflect on the data collected, identify areas for improvement, and identify targeted strategies to incorporate into improvement plans. Program Review is also used to identify department resources necessary to implement plans and outcomes. (II.C.2)

Through data review, the College is able to determine the sequence of onboarding services that would best meet the needs of students. For example, with the implementation of pathway

counselors there has been an increase in the number of Student Education Plans completed. In Spring 2014, the College implemented Ready/Go Week as a way to centralize, coordinate, and increase access to student support services and programs at the beginning of the semester. This addressed the issue the College faced in prior years where during the first few weeks of the semester there were a high number of students waiting for services. (II.C.2)

An example of using assessment data to continuously improve student support services and programs can be seen in the area of counseling. In looking at low completion rates and the student usage rate of general counseling services, the College determined that embedding counselors into the academic pathways would provide more direct services to students where they study. In July 2014, **five counselors** physically moved into the instructional areas of five launched pathways. These counselors provide all counseling related services needed in the pathway to support students in these areas. Two pathways are currently being developed utilizing the same model. (II.C.2)

Financial Aid staff have also been placed in the various pathways locations for 4 hours a week. This has reduced the amount of time that students wait in line at the Financial Aid Office as well as strengthens their commitment to their specific career pathway. (II.C.2)

LATTC provides appropriate and reliable student support services. The services are comprehensive in covering the diverse needs of its student population. Students have access to all services on campus during prescribed hours. While comprehensive services are offered on campus, the College is in the process of increasing the ability for students to access and complete forms and other transactions online. (II.C.3)

Los Angeles Trade-Technical College (LATTC) promotes success for all students and is committed to ensuring that student needs are met regardless of service location by providing student services both on campus and online. Information is available via telephone, email, the College website, and through the Student Information System for all student support programs (e.g., applying to the College, registration, programs of study, College Catalog). Many areas provide access to forms and/or processes students need to complete via the College website, email, or the Student Information System (II.C.3)

To accommodate students during peak registration times, all primary onboarding services are offered through the Bridges to Success Center. This one-stop center assists new and continuing students with application assistance, orientation, assessment, counseling, course registration, paying for parking and fees, and obtaining a student identification card. Other support services are organized and marketed through Ready/Go Week activities. The Financial Aid Office supports students located in the pathways and specialized programs by providing a dedicated staff member on a set schedule one day per week. (II.C.3)

The Bridges to Success Center serves as the hub for all outreach, recruitment, and concurrent enrollment with K-12 partners and students in the College's service areas. This includes dual/concurrent enrollment opportunities for high school students and other core onboarding services. (II.C.3)

Categorical and special programs are comprehensive models that include counseling support, financial support, and workshops tailored to meet the needs of students. Students participating in Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS), have a higher success and retention rate compared to the College overall retention and success rate (EOPS retention: 88.8 percent; College retention: 86.1 percent. EOPS success rate: 73.5 percent; College success rate 68.1percent). In 2013-2014, LATTC had the largest EOPS program in the state with 2,338 students enrolled. (II.C.3)

The College has committed to providing additional staffing support to ensure reliable services in areas such as Student Life, Foster and Kinship Care Education Program, general counseling, Student Success and Support Program. In 2014, office hours for the Associated Student Organization (ASO) were expanded into the evening hours with the addition of a faculty advisor. Five additional counselors were hired in 2014-15 to support EOPS and General Counseling. Equity funds have been used to provide additional staffing and services to address outcome gaps in Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS), Foster Youth Guardian Scholars, and for African American students through Umoja. (II.C.3)

LATTC currently offers 4 athletic sports: Men's and Women's basketball, Men's and Women's swimming, Men's and Women's volleyball, and Men's and Women's water polo. Student athletes on these teams must follow specific rules and regulations as set forth by the California Community College Athletic Association (CCCAA) and National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), including academic policies and integrity.

In Fall 2015, audit findings further identified the need for the College to strengthen its existing processes and structures in athletics. The Athletics Program has been sanctioned due to issues with eligibility, recruitment, and missing FORM 1 documentation. Student-Athlete eligibility is currently handled by the Athletics Department. A full-time classified position was added to the Athletics Program to assist with the compliance and the eligibility process. Three levels of checks and balances have been implemented to ensure student-athlete eligibility is monitored on a weekly basis. Student-Athletes Educational Plans, FORM 1's, and FORM 3's are now housed in Athletics, Admissions and Records and with the Dean of Student Services. In addition, ongoing training related to compliance is provided for all staff associated with the Athletics Program. New leadership has also been appointed to address the sanctions from the California Community College Athletics Association (CCCAA). (II.C.4)

Los Angeles Trade-Technical College offers opportunities for students to participate in a variety of co-curricular activities and athletics. The Office of Student Life, commonly referred to as the Associated Student Organization (ASO) office, is dedicated to developing student activities and co-curricular programming, including supporting the ASO and the Inter-Club Council (ICC). The ASO and ICC provide programming on campus that contributes to the social and cultural educational experience for students. The Office of Student life is in the process of being **rebranded** and will be developed by the Associate Dean of Student Life. (II.C.4)

The ASO strives to meet the diverse needs of LATTC's student population. There are 30 chartered clubs in 2015-16 covering student interests, ranging from academic disciplines, student service areas, social interests, ethnic and/or racial groups, and other varying interests.

ASO and its clubs meet the College mission by "...preparing our students to participate effectively in our society." Office of Student Life, in concert with the ASO, is responsible for administering the annual ASO student elections and Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) Student Trustee Election. The ASO Advisor is working with student leaders to expand student leadership opportunities to PACTS. (II.C.4)

During interviews with the current ASO Leaders to gain their perspective, the following points were made clear to the visiting team.

- The first financial aid disbursement is not issued until after the census date. The ASO provides book loans for students who may not receive their aid until after census. EOP&S offers book loans and financial loans to their students to help stopgap until the aid arrives.
- The Library does not have sufficient staffing. The Library closes at noon on Fridays. Students would like to utilize the Library if it had extended hours.
- Tutoring is available on Saturdays from 8am-12pm, which makes getting assistance easier.
- Students loved the pathway structure since it provides personalized counseling and more personalized attention that is geared towards specific careers.

The Office of Student Life and athletics program are reviewed through the Program Review process in the same manner as all other academic, administrative, and student services and programs to ensure they meet College standards. (II.C.4)

Los Angeles Trade-Technical College has 24 full-time faculty counselors.

- Six in general counseling
- Six in Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS)
- Four pathway counselors – Advanced Transportation and Manufacturing (ATM); Construction, Maintenance and Utilities (CMU), Health Sciences (HS); and Liberal Arts
- Three in Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS)
- Two in Gain/CalWORKS
- One University Transfer Center Director and
- One counselor supporting Puente and International Students

Additional counseling capacity to support Athletics, Umoja, Veterans, and the new student onboarding is provided through adjunct counselors. In addition to general Counseling Department services, the College also provides counseling and academic advising in specialized programs, such as EOPS, GAIN/CALWORKS, University Transfer Center, DSPS, Veterans, Foster and Kinship Care Education services, International Students, Puente, and Umoja. The College also provides in-person support for students on academic and progress probation.

The student to counselor ratio in Fall 2013 for all Counselors was 904:1. However, data from the 2013-14 academic year indicates that the general counseling faculty served 18,845 students. This student to counselor ratio (includes full-time and adjunct counselors) was 2692:1 This data more accurately reflects the true student to counselor ratio in the general population because counselors in categorical/special programs are limited to serving students who are eligible for those programs. (II.C.5)

To ensure that the College serves its students, the Counseling Department provides counseling services in a variety of programs and through multiple modalities. Additional adjunct counselors have also been hired to increase student access to counseling services in all programs and services with a counseling component. During peak registration times, counseling services are increased so that all counselors are available to provide drop-in counseling services. For example, this occurs at the beginning of the semester when students need counseling assistance with financial aid appeals and petitions. (II.C.5)

The College's counseling services that support student development and success include academic, career, personal, and transfer counseling. These services are provided in individual and group settings. Counseling sessions include educational planning; evaluation of transcripts; review of transferability of courses, degrees, and certificates; major preparation; prerequisite checks; academic progress; transfer planning; scholarship advising; and Pathways to Academic, Career, and Transfer Success (PACTS) Plan sessions for students in pathways.

Students enrolled in distance education courses can access counseling services through the learning management system. Students can link to the Counseling Department webpage as well as communicate with a counselor through the generic email address: [counseling@lattc.edu](mailto:counseling@lattc.edu). Students can send an email and receive a response within two business days. The Counseling Department is expanding these services to include an eChat system that will provide synchronous communication with a counselor. (II.C.5)

Based on college data, 35% of the student population has identified Transfer as their educational goal. To strengthen the Tier 4 level (Transfer Program) on the PACTS framework pyramid, the college should expand the number of MOU's and articulation agreements with Baccalaureate granting institutions to provide options and meet the demand of students in the career pathway.

Each term, the enrollment process is reviewed. Each registration cycle is evaluated and changes are implemented in subsequent registration cycles. Initially, the College had a three-day orientation, assessment, and counseling process; however, after reviewing data and feedback from faculty and students, the process was shortened to one day (five hours), and the sequence of services was changed to meet students' needs. (E16)

Students also learn about pathways to complete degrees in the following ways:

- The College Catalog, which provides students with information about available programs of study and requirements. This information is also posted on the College website via program fact sheets, which are posted for every program for which a certificate or degree is offered.
- Orientation and counseling information sessions through the Bridges to Success Center as part of the onboarding process. Students receive program fact sheets and additional information on credit pathways in academic and career technical programs. Additionally, credit and non-credit offerings through the Academic Connections Department are reviewed with students needing remediation and/or skill enhancement.
- Specialized counseling provided in Extended Opportunity Programs and Service (EOPS), Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS), Foster and Kinship Care Education Program, GAIN/CALWORKs, International Students, and Veterans.
- Pathways to transfer information available through the Transfer Center and pathway counselor for the Liberal Arts and Sciences Pathway. The Transfer Center website has information on articulation agreements and transfer requirements
- Additionally, the Center has resources including university catalogs, workshops, campus tours, and university representatives.

In an effort to advise students on pathways, the College launched pathway overview sessions (Open Houses) in Fall 2014. These sessions provide students with an orientation to the programs of study, the faculty in each pathway, including the pathway counselor, and career options within a pathway. In addition to the pathway overview sessions, once a student is enrolled in a first semester course, a counselor and instructional faculty member conduct a PACTS Plan session, which provides students with a comprehensive Student Educational Plan. In addition to the necessary coursework a student needs to complete, the student also receives information regarding their level of competency in the four areas of Tier 1. (II.C.6)

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

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

The information on degree, certificate, and transfer programs is published in the college catalogs and various websites. There is no District involvement in developing, publishing, or advising students on degree, certificate, or transfer pathways. (II.C.6)

The institution regularly evaluates its admission and placement instrument for effectiveness and to minimize biases. The CCCCO validates placement instruments. Assessment tools and practices are examined through the equity lens to minimize biases and is a focus in the current LATTC Student Equity Plan. (II.C.7)

The College has adopted and strictly follows admission policies consistent with its mission as a public community college. The policies comply with California Code of Regulations, Title 5. The admissions policies are published in the College Catalog and in the Registration Guide on the Schedule of Classes webpage. The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) uses CCCApply as the district wide electronic admissions application. This admissions application system is utilized throughout the State of California and provides the LACCD with the opportunity to use one application for admission to any of the District's colleges. Bridges to Success and the Admissions and Records Office work collaboratively to ensure the seamless transfer of paper applications to CCCApply. (II.C.7)

The Admissions and Records Office participates in annual program planning, comprehensive Program Review, and outcomes assessment processes to ensure program evaluation informs the implementation of new practices and ensures the effectiveness of the application instrument. The effectiveness of admissions practices and tools are evaluated at the college level through the annual Program Review process, as well as by the districtwide Admission & Records Committee and district wide Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) Committee. The Program Review process allows for continuous improvement of these processes. (II.C.7)

Assessment is a critical component of the onboarding process and a core function of the Student Success and Support Program Plan. At Los Angeles Trade-Technical College (LATTC), the Assessment Center offers placement testing year-round on a first come, first served basis to all matriculating students. Non-matriculating students are also offered the opportunity to complete assessment testing for placement in the English, English as a Second Language (ESL), and/or the mathematics course sequence. Students reported a 76.7 percent satisfaction with Assessment and Placement Services at the College. (II.C.7)

The institution regularly evaluates admissions and placement instruments and practices to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases. The District has no role.

The College uses instruments from the California Community College Chancellor's Office's (CCCCO) list of approved assessment instruments, which are validated using the *Standards, Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Assessment Instruments Used in the California Community Colleges*. This list offers a listing of instruments that have been validated for use in California community colleges as a part of the placement process for English, ESL, and mathematics. The CCCCO assessment workgroup advises the Chancellor's Office on statewide assessment issues, and conducts the biannual review of assessment instruments submitted by colleges and test publishers for CCCCO approval. (II.C.7)



The College ensures a high standard for confidentiality, security, and maintenance of student records. Student academic and registration records for all LACCD campuses are maintained within the LACCD Student Information System by District staff. Data are backed up daily and are recoverable through appropriate District protocols. Students access their own information by entering their student identification number and personal identification number through the student portal. LACCD employees access student records through the District interface or DEC using their username and password. (II.C.8)

The College maintains student records permanently, securely, and confidentially, with provision for secure backup of all files, regardless of the form in which those files are maintained. As part of the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) Student Information System (SIS), student records are backed up and maintained at the Educational Services Center (ESC). Both the District and Los Angeles Trade-Technical College, comply with federal and state law through established policies and procedures governing student records and the control of personally identifiable information. The College adheres to the confidentiality standards required in the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and California Code of Regulations, Title 5. No student records, including directory information are released without the written consent of the student concerned except as authorized by law. In addition, FERPA Training is mandatory for all students, staff and faculty who access student records. (II.C.8)

Programs and services that utilize District software adhere to the following access guidelines:

- In the **Child Development Center**, children's files are maintained for eight years, which is the California requirement, and are locked in confidential cabinets. Parents may make a written request to obtain a copy of their child's file.
- In **Athletics**, student medical forms are kept in the athletic trainer's office and Form 1 and Form 3 are now kept in the Athletics Office, Admissions and Records, and with the area Dean.
- The **Financial Aid Office** adheres to federal and state law and regulations and follows FERPA and the Buckley amendment with regard to the student record policy.
- Applications for **Associated Student Organization** positions are filed away in a locked office.
- **Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS) and Cooperative Agencies Resources for Education (CARE)** developed an in-house database to maintain information about its students. Access to the database is controlled and only given to those who need it. The program conducts regular training to ensure that all staff are aware of the importance of maintaining student privacy and adhere to all applicable federal and state laws, as well as local Board policies.
- In **GAIN/CalWORKs**, each student is given an individual confidential file in the GAIN/CalWORKs Office. Counselors and staff access student files to obtain student information as needed. Files are locked up in the cabinet at the GAIN/CalWORKs Office when they are not in use. Records are not released to any parties. All student workers are required to sign a confidentiality form before the start of their work assignment.
- The **University Transfer Center** maintains an in-house database to maintain and track students interested in transferring to a four-year college and university.

Counseling staff and career guidance counselor assistants have access and update responsibilities. The program conducts regular training to ensure that all staff are aware of the importance of maintaining student privacy and adhere to all applicable federal and state laws as well as local Board policies.

- The **Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS) Department** maintains an internal database to maintain and track students. DSPS also has a secure locked file room that houses all confidential student files.

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

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

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

### **Conclusion**

The Team has reviewed all support services and the various modalities offered by the college. The team acknowledges all the organizational work around the implementation of PACTS and recognizes there will be a need to address the level of counseling faculty and support provided to reach full implementation. The College will also need to identify mechanisms to streamline and decrease duplication of counseling and advising services. Given the PACTS framework and the prominent role for counseling, additional professional development for counselors related to PACTS strategies and innovation need to be a priority. Lastly, the College will need to expand the availability of online support services, including eChat and other counseling related services to meet students' needs.

The Los Angeles Community College District meets the Standard. The District has adopted, and adheres to, admission policies that are consistent with its mission. These policies include criteria for special categories of students such as concurrent high school enrollment and F-1 students. These policies are published in District and college publications and websites. The District does not have a role in defining and/or advising on clear pathways to degree or certificate completion or transfer.

The District and colleges have high standards for the confidentiality, maintenance, release, and destruction of student records that adhere to state and federal law. Staff receives training on the confidentiality of student records, and passwords are routinely changed every 90 days. The databases are backed up nightly and stored in an off-campus location. The campuses also have local databases that store student records. These databases are backed up, although the storage varies.

### **Recommendations**

None.

## **Standard III.A Human Resources**

### **General Observations**

Los Angeles Trade Technical College has a clearly articulated process for the selection of personnel, including faculty, staff, and administrators as evidenced by information posted on the website and a review of related documents including LACCD Board Rules and LACCD Personnel Commission standards.

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

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

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

The College uses its Program Review process to determine new positions to fill and utilizes the State of California's minimum qualifications for hiring faculty. Additional qualifications for faculty, such as licensing and expertise, are determined locally to meet specific criteria within program areas. The College has a Position Review Workgroup (PRWG) which evaluates replacement positions as well as new hire positions. The PRWG consists of various constituency groups and if a position is recommended for approval, it is sent to Institutional Effectiveness, the College Council and lastly to the President for a decision on the recommendation. (III.A.1)

The College follows the Academic Senate's established minimum qualification requirements to determine initial screening for faculty selection. The Academic Senate developed and approved the faculty hiring procedures that the College uses to ensure the recruitment of qualified and knowledgeable professionals. The College has a Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee (FHPC), consisting of the Academic Senate, a union representative, and individuals from each academic division. FHPC reviews departmental applications for new and replacement faculty positions, ranks applicants in order, and submits to the College President for approval. The hiring process for faculty includes a requirement that the candidate demonstrate subject matter knowledge and competency. All distance education/distance learning faculty must be certified prior to teaching. Certification may be obtained by having been certified at another college within the district. If not certified to teach distance learning, the candidate is screened and certified via a peer review process at the College. (III.A.2; ER 14)

New and replacement positions for certificated administrators and support staff responsible for educational programs are reviewed and evaluated annually during Program Review to ensure academic integrity and institutional effectiveness. The College follows processes established by the LACCD for recruiting and selecting certificated administrators and support staff. This includes developing measurable criteria, which are clearly defined in job announcements, for minimum and desirable qualifications, required degrees and certification, or the equivalent. Qualified candidates are invited to participate in a competitive interview process. The College President also interviews the top candidates for certificated administrators. The recommended candidate is forwarded to LACCD Human Resources for certification before a formal offer of employment is made by the College. (III.A.3)

The College has shown that LACCD Board Rules, human resource guidelines, Academic Senate, state minimum qualifications, and personnel committee rules clearly state that all eligible faculty candidates must hold degrees that are recognized by accreditation standards. Candidates with degrees not from the United States must provide official copies of transcript evaluation forms. Foreign transcript valuation forms are only accepted if they are completed by agencies approved by the State of California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (III.A.4)

Faculty, administrators and classified staff are regularly evaluated to ensure the effectiveness and quality of instruction and services provided. The majority of employees are covered by collective bargaining agreements. The evaluation database is maintained by the LACCD

utilizing a system named “EASY”, an acronym for Evaluation Alert System, with notifications sent to supervisors at regular intervals until the supervisor completes the evaluation and logs it into the system. Newly hired full-time faculty are probationary and are evaluated annually through a four year probation process with tenure resulting over a four year successful evaluation. Evaluations for tenured faculty are conducted at least every three year academic period. Evaluations of classified staff and administrators are conducted annually as prescribed by respective collective bargaining unit agreements. (III.A.5)

During the New Faculty Academy and Faculty Convocation, the beginning of the year event for all faculty, all faculty, academic administrators, and other personnel directly responsible for student learning are made aware of the requirement to participate in Program Review. All faculty and staff have opportunities on an annual basis during Program Review to participate in the outcome assessment process. (III.A.6)

The visiting team verified that the college employees and maintains a sufficient number of qualified faculty, a mix of full-time and adjunct faculty. There was no evidence discovered that indicated the College was unable to staff the needed courses to allow students to progress through their academic pathways. The College does utilize a Faculty Hiring and Prioritization Committee on an annual basis. This committee reviews departmental applications for new faculty positions that are the results of assessments completed during departmental program reviews. (III.A.7; ER14)

The College provides adjunct faculty with an orientation prior to entering the classroom. Adjunct faculty are informed how to access resources, fulfill professional development requirements, and are evaluated consistent with the union contract AFT 1521. A “Welcome New Employee” document along with attendance at the Faculty Convocation are also provided. Additionally, the faculty collective bargaining unit has developed an “Adjunct Survival Guide.” (III.A.8)

The LACCD Personnel Commission establishes minimum qualifications for classified employees. Supervisors, deans, managers, and vice presidents for each division are responsible for determining and recommending appropriate staffing levels. As position vacancies occur, supervisors and managers will recommend to the respective vice-president what action is needed. The intent is to maintain the level of staffing, but as with the full-time faculty replacements, the staff replacement may not be in the exact same classification. If the department believes that there is a need for additional staffing, it will be requested through Program Review. (III.A.9; ER8)

The College Executive Team is comprised of the College President, the Vice President of Academic Affairs and Workplace Development, Vice President of Administrative Services, and Vice President of Student Services. The College Leadership Team includes the Executive Team, certificated deans, and classified managers who have oversight over programs. Processes are in place for recruiting and selecting qualified certificated administrators and classified managers (III.A.10; ER8)

The College primarily adheres to LACCD's personnel policies and procedures which are posted online. The College also has on its website a payroll and personnel section with a comprehensive listing of procedures, forms and general instructions for all employee groups. (III.A.11)

The College achieves diversity objectives primarily relying upon the policies and directives of LACCD. The LACCD Office of Diversity Programs, in conjunction with the District Employer/Employee Relations Department, supports the College's effort by providing information and training to supervisors on fair employment practices. Per District and College hiring procedures, the "Evidence of Effort" forms for administrators and faculty requires data regarding the number of persons by gender and race per department before finalizing an actual hiring process. (III.A.12)

All personnel are subject to written codes of ethics emanating from both LACCD and the College. The College adopted a code of professional ethics that establishes standards and responsibilities to encourage ethical conduct and best ethical practices. (III.A.13)

The College's fourth strategic priority in its Strategic Educational Master Plan is faculty and staff development. The College has formed a College-wide workgroup to address this key priority. The College also created a weeklong training for new and recently hired faculty to learn about the College, effective teaching and learning practices, learning outcomes, and their role as LATTC faculty. The College has entered into a partnership with Antioch University, a baccalaureate granting institution, to offer classes for baccalaureate degrees for continued professional development for faculty and staff. (III.A.14)

Personnel records are deemed confidential and treated as such and stored in secure and locked areas at the District's Human Resources Office. Employees may view personnel files during regular business hours and employees can access electronic personnel records via the Systems Application and Products (SAP) system. (III.A.15)

### **Findings and Evidence**

The LACCD Board of Trustees, in its role as the governing authority, establishes policies pertaining to the faculty, staff, and administrators employed by the District. These policies, procedures, and related supporting documentation are found on the District's website. The District's HR Division and PC are responsible for the oversight in the hiring of qualified personnel to serve its nine colleges and central District support services, including the selection, evaluation, and monitoring processes within the LACCD. District guidelines provide consistency in the development, definition, and establishment of hiring policies and processes for administrators, full-time faculty, and classified staff. Job descriptions for full-time/regular positions reflect the duties, responsibilities, and authority in support of mission and goals for the college and the District. Due to the dynamic staffing needs encountered at the college level, decentralization of the recruitment and selection process for part-time/adjunct faculty was implemented. The District's HR department verifies the qualifications of recommended part-time/adjunct faculty prior to hire. HR R-130, entitled "Adjunct Faculty Selection and Pay," requires the president and Academic Senate at each college to develop written procedures

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

Faculty qualifications are clearly stated on job descriptions, including education, skills, experience, and/or certifications. Job descriptions include professional responsibilities beyond teaching expectations. Student learning outcomes, curriculum development, and college-level committee requirements are included in responsibility expectations when developing full-time faculty job descriptions. HR reviews the draft job descriptions for competencies, compliance and consistency. Faculty candidates are required to meet all published job qualifications. A faculty-led process for determining equivalency for stated qualifications exists, but is generally limited in utilization. Faculty performance evaluations include the assessment of multiple measures of these job-related requirements. (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. (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. (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. The visiting team also verified that LATTC did not have all employee evaluations completed in a timely manner, as described by the College. (III.A.5)

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

LACCD employs a substantial cadre of over 3,300 part-time/adjunct faculty among the

nine colleges and academic organizations. Each college is delegated the responsibility for orientation, oversight, evaluation, and professional development of adjunct faculty at their respective campus. Opportunities for part-time faculty participation in the teaching and learning aspects of college operations and decision-making are provided and encouraged. (III.A.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 Human Resource Council meets monthly to review and recommend proposed changes in Board Rules and Administrative Regulations. The HR Council's membership includes college presidents, the vice chancellor of HR, college vice presidents (academic affairs, student services, and administrative services), and resource personnel, as needed. The PC regularly reviews its policies and procedures regarding the employment of classified staff. These rules and regulations provide fair and equitable employment conditions. The Employment Relations Department is responsible for addressing allegations of inconsistent application of District policies. (III.A.11)

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. (III.A.12)

The District has adopted Board policy, Code of Ethics-Board Rule #1204, and collectively bargained language addressing professional ethics expectations. Appropriate corrective actions and consequences are addressed in the Board Rule. (III.A.13)

The District has long-established professional development programs. Existing programs and new opportunities for District employees are continually identified, evaluated, and developed, i.e., "Dean's Academy," "Professional Development College," and "The President's Academy." The introduction of a partnership with the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) to create the "President's Academy" provides relevant training for aspiring LACCD executive leaders. The District Academic Senate provides faculty representatives the ability to work collaboratively in providing content in support of student learning and success. The District also explores methods to increase opportunities for its classified staff. Campus-level trainings are provided by District personnel as part of the regular communication and educational support. (III.A.14)

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



The College has provided sufficient evidence to support all sub-standards except as noted below. The College has an excellent professional development program and has integrated it with its strategic objectives. New faculty, including adjunct faculty, are provided the resources and professional development opportunities to succeed in the classroom. The College evidence identified systematic employee evaluations as a concern.

## **Conclusions**

The College does not meet the standard. Evaluations of personnel (sub-standard III.A.5) were recognized by the College as a challenging area. The President has charged all Vice-Presidents to ensure all evaluations are prepared according to College and bargaining unit agreement specifications. To date, not all evaluations are up to date and completed in a timely manner.

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

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

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

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

## **Recommendation 8**

To meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College review its evaluation process for all positions and ensure that all staff and faculty, including post-tenure faculty, are evaluated systematically and at stated intervals. Actions taken following evaluations are formal, timely, and documented. (III.A.5)

## **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)

## **Standard III.B Physical Resources**

### **General Observations**

Campus structures are built in accordance with Division of the State Architect (DSA) guidelines who provides design and construction oversight for K–12 schools, community colleges, and various other state-owned and leased facilities. The division also develops accessibility, structural safety, and historical building codes and standards utilized in various public and private buildings throughout the state of California.

College facilities are operated in a safe, healthy, secure, and accessible manner. The College assures access to its facilities in compliance with Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act. New buildings are approved by the Division of the State Architect (DSA) and meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) access requirements. The Director of College Facilities maintains the College’s ADA Transition Plan that addresses physical access requirements and has stewardship of campus data on the physical accessibility of building interiors and paths of travel.

The College has a detailed Emergency Operations Plan, updated in 2015, and posted on the campus Emergency Response web page. Emergency information guides are posted in every classroom, and evacuation drills are conducted every semester. Security is provided 24 hours/day, seven days/week, by the Sheriff’s Department, and the campus has over 100 security cameras installed around campus.

College personnel visit off-site locations being considered for instruction, to confirm adequate classroom space and facilities, and visit sites regularly and report any issues. Off-site locations are expected to meet and support required technology needs of classes held there.

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**

As a process, discipline/unit needs including equipment and supplies related to this standard are identified at the departmental level, which are then developed into formal requests via Program Review, and the associated resource request. As part of the governance process, these requests route via the department for review and ranking to the division level (Vice President), and ultimately get to the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) for scoring against the approved rubric. The PBC then emails the prioritized list of resource requests to the entire college community. A recommended list is then forwarded to administration, where funding decisions are made. (III.B.1)

From a security perspective, much of the campus is fenced and access to parking lots is controlled. The LACCD contracts out law enforcement services to the LA County Sheriff's Department throughout the district, including at the LATTC. Staffing includes three Deputies, eight Sheriff's Security Offices and fifteen to twenty cadets who maintain high visibility through continued patrolling, and this high visibility was very much in evidence during our visit. The campus also hired an Environmental Health & Safety (EH&S) specialist whose role is to provide a healthy and safe environment for the campus community, protecting infrastructure from any hazards, and to prevent and/or reduce accidents in the workplace. (III.B.1)

The college's Sheriff's Office centrally monitors fire alarms for all buildings and performs periodic systems tests. Emergency evacuation drills and lockdown procedures are conducted every semester to familiarize students and staff with procedures for dealing with an actual emergency. An emergency mass communication system is in place for use in an emergency, using various modalities to deliver messages. Additionally, over 100 strategically placed surveillance cameras are placed around campus to augment security and these cameras are monitored by the college's Sheriff's Office. (III.B.1)

The team noted that the Clery Act data indicates that the campus is the most impacted by petty theft (108 through October 2015) and vandalism (33 reports through October 2015) in the District, which also confirmed in discussions with the one of the Sheriff's Deputies. There was no evidence of graffiti on the exterior walls of the facility nor in any of the restrooms. However, given the location of the campus, security issues appear to be an ongoing challenge for the Sheriff's Office and senior management. In the Fall 2014 Student

Survey, while the report indicates that 56% of the respondents expressed satisfaction with the college Sheriff's Office, 82.6% stated that they "Feel safe and secure on this campus." (III.B.1)

The Fall 2014 Student Survey also noted a 79.1% satisfaction level that the grounds are clean and well maintained. From touring the facility it was apparent that tremendous efforts were made to maintain the buildings, walkways, infrastructure and landscaping and that sufficient space was available to effectively administer the instructional program and provide associated services. (III.B.1)

The District plays a significant role in ensuring that all locations under its purview are safe and that sufficient resources are provided to maintain each facility. The LACCD contracts with the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department for college campus security. This agreement provides for a standardized and coordinated approach to campus safety. Further, a report titled Blue Ribbon Panel on Campus Safety and Emergency Preparedness was adopted December 16, 2015. The charge of the panel was to, "review the District's existing policies and procedures on safety and security in order to determine the readiness of the colleges, District satellites and the Educational Service Center in cases of natural catastrophes or criminal events." It will be critical to follow up on the progress of the colleges and District in their response to the recommendations and implementation of plans. The sufficiency of physical resources at the colleges is clearly assured by the District. Three bond issues have been passed since 2001 resulting in nearly \$6.2 billion in capital project funding. To date, about 80 percent of those funds have been expended. All funds are budgeted to projects. Sufficiency is also evident by the current cap load status. District wide, the lecture capacity/load ratio is 162 percent while the laboratory cap/load is at 144 percent. The District has supported the colleges in assuring access. ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) transition plans were created for the nine colleges using District resources. The implementation of the plan is funded by a District wide bond allocation of almost \$69 million. (III.B.1)

The District and the College pursued a massive building program funded by several voter-approved bonds, for new construction and renovation of buildings on all nine campuses. Most of the work will have been completed as of 2016. In 2011, a building moratorium was declared by the District, providing for a reassessment of the processes involved in the building program. After the moratorium, funding and approval for expenditure of bond funds was largely centralized with the District, and rules governing design changes were tightened up considerably. Projects over \$125,000 are managed and prioritized by the district, with negotiation and input from the college. (III.B.2)

The College has made improvements to its facilities, grounds, and equipment and capitalizes on its centrally located facilities and urban setting. Their Landscape Master Plan was completed in 2012 (available on the Facilities Master Plan web page), providing a detailed plan for the intentional evolution of the campus exterior environments. The College reflects its open door policy both in terms of educational opportunities and physical resources. The current architecture and expansive windows connect interior environments with the outdoor landscape, with the goal of creating a campus environment that says, "We are open for you."

Examples of this include the warm and inviting Academic Connections Tutoring Center, the green lawn area in the center of campus, and the purple line that points the way to various locations on campus. (III.B.2)

The College is currently guided by a district-wide LACCD Five-Year Construction Plan, covering the years 2017-2021. In addition, the campus has a Facilities Master Plan, guided by the College Strategic Education Master Plan, delineating campus facilities priorities. The Facilities Master Plan (FMP) is aligned with the College's Strategic Educational Master Plan (SEMP). The FMP assures that facilities are programmed and maintained to support instructional programs and services. The Work Environment Committee (WEC) oversees the implementation of plans for new and upgraded facilities. Building User Groups (BUGs) provide input from architectural designers and departments that will occupy the new building space. The FMP, dated 2009, was revised in 2015 and is scheduled to go to the Board for approval in 2016. The 2015 update is available on the college website, along with most of the original 2009 plan. (III.B.2)

The District provides effective centralized services for planning, acquiring, building, maintaining and upgrading its physical resources. Following the 17 recommendations in the Independent Review Panel Report, the District has developed a new program management approach assuring the continuing quality necessary to support its programs and services to achieve its mission. Noting that shared governance practices had significantly contributed to increased costs, changes, delays, and disruptions to the Building Program, the Board responded with BT4: Resolution-Standardize Centralized Accountability Controls dated September 12, 2012. The resolution centralized accountability measures and established that college project managers report through the program manager to the District. The District uses a "project allocation model" in dispensing bond funds which ensures that the Board of Trustees has primary control over which projects will be built at the colleges and that projects will align with District priorities, i.e., support of the Educational Master Plan ensuring a consistency of intent. To ensure the model is followed, Board Resolution to Adopt a Master Budget Plan and to Implement Policies to Strengthen Oversight and Spending Practices for the District's Construction Program (BT6) was approved by the Board on October 5, 2011. (III.B.2)

Staff and student surveys have been conducted periodically to evaluate satisfaction levels for facilities responsiveness, cleanliness, and maintenance, with positive overall results. Based on a 57.2% satisfaction level on restroom cleanliness (Fall 2014 Student Survey), the Physical Plant Department has prioritized restroom cleanliness, and implemented higher standards of care. Interviews with campus officials affirmed survey results and revealed that the department is working to "close the loop" after work orders have been completed. (III.B.2)

The College uses the FUSION (Facilities Utilization, Space Inventory Options Net) database to evaluate the utilization of physical resources. FUSION provides the College with a report showing the efficiency percentage for each building. The Physical Plant Department uses a Computerized Maintenance Management System (CMMS) to process work requests. The

College uses employee surveys to assess satisfaction with cleanliness, maintenance, and safety of College facilities. (III.B.2)

The College continually evaluates new instructional technology and technology business solutions through the Program Review process. To ensure continuous improvements in computing technology, the College approved the Computer Replacement Plan in October 2015. (III.B.3)

The District materially assists the colleges in updating master facilities plans on a regular basis. This planning is managed through the bond program manager reporting to the District Office. The BuildLACCD website shows evidence that all nine colleges have current facility master plans, the oldest being less than eight years old. Further, the District assists the colleges in facility condition assessment and uses the data to identify needs and allocate District-scheduled maintenance funds. (III.B.3)

The District is working to strengthen long-range capital planning to include the total cost of ownership for new facilities and equipment. In January 2012, an independent review panel concluded that "...overall, the Building Program has achieved a good level of success in that a substantial majority of the projects have been successfully completed – compared to the projects experiencing problems (e.g., cost or time overruns, sunk-costs and re-design, litigation, etc.)...the Building Program has the potential to achieve the Program's goals within the funds provided." The Review Panel recommended that "...with every new or renovated building proposed to the Board of Trustees, a total cost of ownership analysis should be included that projects the District's budgeted operating costs for maintenance and operations (M&O), capital renewal, and staffing." Since 2012, the College appears to have followed most of the recommendations contained in the independent review panel's report. (III.B.4)

A comprehensive plan for total cost of ownership that identified total cost of ownership elements, reviewed the status of existing and proposed facilities, benchmarked existing facilities operations, and developed processes to measure, monitor, and control both facilities costs and utilization was developed in March 2013. In April 2013, the District submitted a Special Report to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) that addressed the Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) issue raised in the Bond Audit issued by the State Controller. The District defined the Total Cost of Ownership elements as 1) acquisition, 2) daily maintenance, 3) periodic maintenance, 4) utility costs, 5) capital renewal costs, and 6) end-of-life costs to inform its decision-making about facilities and equipment. Implementation of the TCO plan (III.B.4)

The Board of Trustees adopted the Master Building Program Budget Plan per resolution BT6 dated October 5, 2011. The plan assigns budgets at the individual project level providing support for long-range capital plans. The Board adopted Resolution 3 of BT6 dated October 5, 2011, stating, "The chancellor ... will include in the regular budget reports the identification of funding measures to address the costs of maintaining and operating expanded facilities." Following that, the District produced the Comprehensive Plan for Total Cost of Ownership detailing seven points defining, "a process for establishing the true cost of additional space." The Board voted to create a Deferred Maintenance Fund by passing Board Resolution BT2 on

May 23, 2012. This resolution sets aside a fixed amount each year from the General Fund to address postponed and emergency repairs and maintenance work not funded by the bond program. In addition, the District provides funding to the colleges for maintenance and operations calculated by a formula that takes into consideration total assignable square footage as a part of the basic allocation (III.B.4)

### **Conclusion**

The College meets the standard.

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**

None.

## **Standard III.C Technology Resources**

### **General Observations**

The College's technology infrastructure overlays the district's network for local area inter- and intra-campus networks, including its institutional access to the public Internet and World Wide Web. This District technology tie in also extends to the Student Information System (SIS), the Electronic Schedule Change System (ESC), the Electronic Curriculum Development (ECD) System, the Student Email System (accessible through Canvas), and the Employee Self Service (ESS). All of these access the district's enterprise system.

The College then is responsible for college instructional and administrative computing, which encompasses both hardware and software application programs, and training. Additionally, the IT Department supports the college website and employee email system and also supports and coordinates a number of outsourced services, including learning management systems, popular social networks, an online Bookstore, as well as online Library databases.

The LATTC IT department maintains over 50 computer labs and over 700 faculty and staff computers. Within IT, a staff of 13 provide maintenance and support for the campus technology environment. While IT is in charge of the technology infrastructure they are also being charged with maintaining the technology training budget, providing opportunities for IT and Audio Visual staff and the Academic Technology Unit (ATU) to pursue ongoing training on new and evolving technologies. A recent IT survey indicates end users are very satisfied with the level of technology and related training.

The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) emphasizes the effective use of technology in the support of teaching and learning, student support and success, and

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

### **Findings and Evidence**

The LATTC's technology planning is guided by the District's Technology Planning and Policy Committee (TPPC), consisting of all primary stakeholders from each college, to help achieve district-wide consistency, adequacy, and security. TPPC also approved the LACCD Technology Implementation Plan in 2013. TPPC membership is broad, that spans representation from the District and across the all colleges, including the LATTC IT. Furthermore, TPPC consults with the VP Councils and the District Planning Committee (DPC), which includes LATTC representation. The TPPC addresses and recommends on all district-wide strategic planning and policy issues related to information, instructional, and student support technologies. In addition, the LATTC IT director meets monthly with all the district's IT directors as part of the District Technology Committee. (III.C.1)

In concert with the District TPPC, the College also has a Technology Enhancement Committee (TEC) which is charged to research, promote, and recommend new technology as it relates to both academic and administrative effectiveness and improvements to the college as an instructional institution. Funding through the Build-LACCD bond allowed the campus to undergo significant technology upgrades. (III.C.1)

As part of that the college's Work Environment Committee (WEC), through its former Technology Subcommittee, developed a technology replacement plan in alignment with minimum standards identified by the TPPC. This plan was submitted to and adopted by the WEC in October of 2015. Replacements are discussed with deans and department heads at the beginning of the fiscal year and funded through the Program Review process. (III.C.1) Technology resources are used to support student learning, student services, and institutional effectiveness. As noted in the District/College Functional Map, this is a shared responsibility between the colleges and the District. Each college technology department provides support and infrastructure to meet campus network and computing needs. At the District level, the LACCD Information Technology department provides the wide area network infrastructure, an enterprise resource planning system for finance and human resources (SAP), a student information system (DEC/Peoplesoft), an educational planning system (DegreeWorks), email for students and staff (Office 365/Microsoft Exchange), a helpdesk ticketing system



(CMMS), a scheduling system for faculty class and room assignments (Protocol ESS), an electronic curriculum development system (ECD), and other related systems as presented in the campus Self Evaluation Reports and confirmed in interviews with District and college technology staff. In addition, it was noted in interviews with campus technology managers that LACCD Information Technology assists with contract optimization, District wide technology standards, best practices, data interface to campus specific systems such as distance education systems and staff augmentations when needed to assist the colleges. (III.C.1)

The district IT department maintains technology networks between campuses, and provides internet access to all district campuses. They also maintain the district-wide course management system, being migrated to Curricunet, and other district-wide systems such as the student email system available through Microsoft and an employee self-service system used for various accounting and procurement functions. In discussions with the College IT Director, the College has a good rapport with the district team, participating on the various district-wide technology committees. (III.C.1)

The College IT Department coordinates with District IT services to ensure that the College follows best practices in using resources available to support technology needs. The College contracted with a third party vendor to host the Moodle learning management system and in 2016 plans to transition to Canvas, the California Community College (CCC) Online Education Online Education Initiative's (OEI) learning management system. This move will provide the College with access to additional statewide resources and upgrades. The campus is using both systems during Spring 2016, but will be completely in Canvas as of July 1, 2016. (III.C.1)

The campus also has a number of smart classrooms, with technology based upon the very up-to-date district-established standard for smart classrooms. The college uses district-established standards for smart classrooms as a baseline, and then evolves their local implementations as needed with new technologies or local requirements. (III.C.1)

Propositions A and AA and Measure J, recent successful bond propositions, provided the campus with sufficient funding for a massive college-wide technology upgrade. The College invested almost \$20 million to fully upgrade its infrastructure, hardware, and software infrastructure to support faster and reliable access to online resources. The campus also initiated a Technology Replacement Policy and Plan in 2015 to formalize the updating and replacement of campus technology, ensuring that the college students and staff continue to have access to sufficiently functional and sustainable technology. The new plan, to be implemented in 2016, is guided by the district's Technology Implementation Plan. Additionally, campus technology needs are identified and funded through the Program Review process. In recent years, ongoing software licensing was centralized within the IT department, which eliminated an earlier problem of departments being able to obtain funding for an initial software purchase but not for upgrading and maintaining the software. (III.C.2) 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. (III.C.2)

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. (III.C.2)

The campus ensures the physical security of its computers using lockdown devices, an extensive network of indoor and outdoor security cameras, and tracking software installed in its mobile computers. Campus online resources and records are protected with LDAP single sign-on and Active Directory systems, ensuring only students or staff authorized to use a tool can access it. (III.C.3)

Online systems and information resources are backed up regularly, either by the college IT department or the district IT department, as appropriate. Additionally, LATTC maintains a second data center on the campus, appropriately labeled the Disaster Recovery or DR data center, building in redundancy into every system within the data center to effectively eliminate single points of failure. That redundancy data center is tested quarterly, assessing different portions of redundancy then validating performance metrics against third party products. Thus policies and procedures are in place to ensure that key systems can operate in the event of emergencies or system failures. (III.C.3)

Through the Build-LACCD bond, LATTC was also able to vastly improve and maintain reliable access. Buildings are now connected via fiber and internet access is provided via a Gigabit (Gigaman) connection accessed from the Corporation for Education Network Initiatives in California (CENIC). The College also hired a Data Communications Specialist with responsibilities to monitor and maintain the College firewalls and web connectivity. (III.C.3)

To address training, the Academic Technology Unit (ATU) was established in 2013 to provide training and support services to all end users. This unit provides support for the Open Computer Lab located in the library, supports the campus Distance Education system, and provides user training and support to instruction faculty and staff both face to face and online. Attendees complete evaluations for the training sessions, which informs the evolution of the training offerings. Their robust array of instructional technology workshops offered each year focus on key technologies and newly introduced technologies. The campus also subscribes to Lynda.com, a rich source of application technology training used extensively by campus faculty and classified staff. Faculty are able to use completed Lynda.com training for FLEX credit, and classified staff can use this training to advance on their salary schedule. For students, the campus makes available a collection of training and introductory videos to their learning management system and related technologies. Online students are also able to receive academic support through a new campus contract with NetTutor. (III.C.4)

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

Distance education (DE) students receive the assistance they need by contacting student support service offices on campus, contacting the Academic Technology Unit via phone or

email, or using the web-based resources on the College website or in Moodle. The Online Student Guide provides direct phone numbers for DE students to call to get assistance. Students who attend classes off-site have access to student support services. (III.C.4; II.B.1)

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

The campus has a number of technology use policies and administrative regulations in place, with other policies put in place by the district. Principal policies consist of the District and College Computing Policy, the Email Policy, and the Distance Education Policy. Both the Distance Learning Committee and the Work Environment Committee are charged with developing policies that govern the use of technology in the workplace. The policies in place, in conjunction with the security systems described earlier, provide students with a secure and reliable technology environment for their academic activities. (III.C.5)

## **Conclusion**

The College does not meet the standard.

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)

## **Recommendations**

**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.C Financial Resources**

### **General Observations**

LATTC receives an allocation from the LACCD annually, which supports student learning programs and services. Adjustments are made upward or downward during the year due to enrollment and state funding changes. The budget allocation model also includes fund for administration, maintenance, and operations, and a set aside for scheduled maintenance of College facilities in the unrestricted general fund and the restricted general funds. The College has an established process to allocate resources based upon the program review process. The visiting team confirmed with the campus community that there is a well defined transparent budgeting process.

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, EEIU Local 99, Building and Construction Trades, Supervisors Local 721, Classified Management, and Associated Students Organization. This committee also includes the deputy chancellor,

chief financial officer, and budget director as resource personnel. The DBC reports to both the chancellor and all constituent groups, and is charged with formulating recommendations to the chancellor for budget planning policies consistent with the District's Strategic Plan; reviewing the District's budget; making recommendations to the chancellor for adoption or modifications; and reviewing the District's financial condition on a quarterly basis.

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

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

The Los Angeles Community College District's financial outlook for 2015-16 continues to be favorable, maintaining a minimum 6.5% General Reserve and a 3.5% Contingency Reserve that ultimately also benefits the Los Angeles Trade Technical College, one of nine colleges within the LACCD. Given the prospect of a slow recovery in enrollments, the impending loss of Proposition 30 revenues, and annual expenditures increases related to pension reform, the potential impact of the Affordable Care Act, as well as other increases in its internal operational expenditure structure, the current reserve levels are prudent. That favorable fiscal picture is evidenced in LATTC's three year budget allocation comparison that shows increases year over year with general unrestricted fund budget of \$49.8 million in 2013-2014; \$50.8 million in 2014-2015, and \$59.3 million in 2015-2016. Similarly, the college saw increases in its restricted budget of \$7.6 million, \$15.8 million, and \$19.8 million in 2013-2014, 2014-2015, 2015-2016, respectively. The latter two years increases were principally related to increases in Student Success funding.

The college is three years into transforming their specialized career technical education and academic, transfer track programs into what the institution labels Pathways to Academic, Career, and Transfer Success (PACTS) to improve the quality academic, technical, and professional educational opportunities to the communities it serves. It is around these PACTS, the institution is beginning to shape their operations, roles, finances, and culture. The college is piloting a Pathways approach to budgeting, an innovative approach.

### **Findings and Evidence:**

Financial planning is framed by institutional priorities through the tie in to the college's 2014-17 Strategic Educational Master Plan (SEMP), forming the basis and strategy underlying the college's innovative model called the Pathways to Academic, Career, and Transfer Success (PACTS).

This financial planning process revolves around Program Review and starts with unit plans, as articulated via the annual departmental plan, which move up to the division/school level for review and prioritization of related resource requests, then are forwarded to the respective Vice-President for incorporation into area level prioritization. The division resource requests are then provided to the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) and scored against an approved rubric. Once the PBC sends the prioritized list of resource requests to the entire college community via email for comments and/or additional input. A final list of ranked resource requests in rank order is produced, then sent to College Council for action. College Council in turn forwards their resources request recommendation to the College President for his approval and incorporation into the budget which is then moved for Board approval.

Revenue estimates, per the Governor’s Budget, along with known expenditure increases and FTES goals are discussed and established at the District level (DBC). They help shape budget assumptions (scheduling, revenue and expenditures). Additionally, both technology and facilities improvements, while also passing through the Program Review process, are guided by the Technology Master Plan as well as the Five Year Capital Outlay Plans.

New faculty position requests, filtered through the departmental plans, are reviewed and prioritized by the Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee. A priority list is then built into the budget within the college’s fiscal constraints/assumptions. New classified and management positions are expected to go through the departmental plans, whereas the filling of academic administrative vacancies or new positions are decided via the Program Review process as noted above.

While the PACTS are enhancing programs and services, enrollment declines are impacting the college’s financial situation. The beginning budget does not reflect additional funds, lottery funds, mandated costs, revenues generated through dedicated revenue, additional growth money, contract education, etc., that are allocated to the colleges when the district receives those funds. The college reports out to the Chancellor the use of these additional funds. The additional funds were used to increase instructional offerings. The Board approves the allocation of the additional funds. The Board approved using contingency funds to fund over the state funded growth rate for LATTC at the rate of 125 FTES and \$500,000 at their August 5, 2015 meeting. Additional funds were used for growth and to add courses. These monies are part of the additional allocated funds.

Budgeted expenses, allocation and additional allocation funds are as follows:

AY	Exp	Allocation	Additional Allocation	Ending Balance Redistribution	Total Revenue
14-15	53,821,675	50,557,973	2,976,162	218,797	53,845,988
15-16	59,306,807	56,542,383	2,289,293	538,383	59,306,807

It is the significant one-time monies received this year that will allow LATTC to end 2015-16 with a surplus to help position the college for the next years. The college’s 2015-16

budget allocation is just under \$59.3 million, representing about a 16.5% increase over the prior year allocation. (III.D.1)

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

Budgetary decisions are driven by college goals, beginning with departments through program review and vetted through the shared governance process. The mission drives the allocation of resources each year. Departments link goals and planning directly to the College mission. The College's program review process provides an ongoing assessment of the use of financial resources by all units' (instructional, student services and administrative) self-evaluation to validate that they are addressing the mission of the college and meeting student needs.

In discussions with the two co-chairs of the Planning and Budget Committee, they indicated that the results of the final scores/ranking is publicized to the college community via email and maintained for two weeks to allow for additional input and/or comments before being incorporating them into the budget. In the following Program Review cycle, funded requests must provide assessment on effective use of such financial resources.

Additionally, LATTC considers its long-range financial priorities and obligations in the budget development process to assure financial stability. As part of the new district funding model, each college is responsible for its proportional share of the liabilities in the areas of load bank liability, vacation liability, retiree health benefits and self-insurance. In the college projections, resources are dedicated to the payments of these liabilities as well as ongoing reserves for unforeseen emergencies.

Financial information is communicated through monthly financial reports to the Board of Trustees and periodic financial data reports to various committees of the College. The College communicates information with potential fiscal impact on a timely basis throughout its various committees so that decisions can be made to react to significant changes in funding.

The College's Business Office is responsible for maintaining the various funds of the college in accordance with district business procedures. Proper fiscal management is validated by the annual external audit that is presented to the Board of Trustees each year. The district's internal audit services department conducts periodic reviews to insure compliance with policies, procedures, and accepted practices. (III.D.1; III.D.2; III.D.3)



As noted the financial planning process revolves around Program Review and has been in place since 2011 when this updated process was initiated. A process which calls for all budgetary decisions to be driven by college goals, beginning at the discipline/unit level, to the department, and then division level through program review and vetted through the shared governance process. The mission drives the allocation of resources each year. Departments link goals and planning directly to the College mission. The College's program review process provides an ongoing assessment of the use of financial resources by all units' (instructional, student services, and administrative) self-evaluation to validate that they are addressing the mission of the college and meeting student needs. If additional resources are needed, the resource request is supported by aligning with the strategic priorities, demonstrated need, sustainability, accountability of use of past funds, and collaboration. (III.D.3)

Given the significant apportionment cuts experienced these last few years, LATTC has worked hard through its Planning and Budget Committee to align institutional spending within revenue confines. And PBC under the leadership of the Vice President of Administrative Services and its co-chair were charged with developing the budget and have used the strategy of not having an ending reserve, as the district works function to establish and fund the needed reserve.

Noteworthy is that for 2015-2016, the College was able to secure \$11,848,651 in grant funding and nearly tripled dedicated revenue projections for 2015-2016 to \$646,600.

The institution also partnered with the University of Southern California's Center for Urban Education (CUE) that confirmed that the quality of assessment and fully implementing PACTS as an institutional priority.

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

The Chief Financial Officer of the district and the Colleges work together to ensure that dependable and timely information for sound financial decision-making is consistently available to all parties. The district's internal audit department works on internal controls and has a Central Financial Aid Unit (CFAU) that continually monitors federal loans. The District received an unmodified external audit, with no identified material weaknesses, for 2013 and 2014. Financial information is distributed on a set schedule to the Board of Trustees, the colleges, the District Budget Committee (DBC) and the Board Budget and Finance Committee (BFC).

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

The District appears to do a good job of managing the finances and evidenced by the over 13% ending balance (Reserves) that has been maintained over the last three years. (III.D.5; III.D.9)

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

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

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

The District's audit reports for the bond program are posted on the District's website. There are two separate reports, one for performance audits and the second for financial audits. The performance audit reports (2006-07 through 2013-14) are quite detailed and address such things as analysis of change orders, completeness of operating procedures, and evaluation of the project close-out process. The financial reports (2007-08 through 2014-15) are broken down between Proposition A, Proposition AA and the Measure J bond programs, each with a separate opinion. For the 2014-15 financial report, all three opinions were all unmodified and the results of the auditor tests disclosed no instance of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under Government Auditing Standards. For the performance audits, it was noted that there were several substantial improvements over key capital project delivery processes compared to what was found in previous years. There were several areas where additional improvements could be made which included two medium-priority opportunities and three low-priority opportunities. No high-priority opportunities were identified. (III.D.8)

The district's unrestricted general fund budget essentially is driven by the Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES) it serves through its nine colleges through the State's apportionment funding formula for community colleges. Elements of the state's funding formula are public and include base funding rates, the basic allocation revenues, adjusted for cost of living, growth, and other factors.

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

Apportionment and other revenue assumptions, as well as expenditure assumptions, are widely discussed and disseminated at the district as well as colleges, as the budgets are being developed. The budget documents clearly spell out the Chancellor's recommendations on use of one-time funds, outlines district goals, and also how prior year monies were spent. Looking forward, long-range financial priorities are folded into the annual budget development process utilizing both the Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan and Scheduled Maintenance Plan for facilities related costs and the Technology Master Plan to address technology needs. Thus the LACCD annual budget process and its allocation model are well understood by LATTC PAC members and leadership, which they in turn disseminate throughout the Colleges of the District.

LATTC's approach to the local budget development is open, transparent, and inclusive, framed by its mission, vision, and goals. The team confirmed that through the PBC, the College community enjoys a budget process that has a high degree of credibility, accuracy, and also reflects functional allocations in support of their student learning programs and services. (III.D.6)

Revenue and expense activities are examined annually by an independent audit firm, contracted to perform the district audit as well as two bond audits, a performance and financial audit. While the audit reports culminate in unmodified or “clean” opinions, LATTC did end up with two findings for 2014-15. These included:

- 1 - Equipment Management – Policies and Procedures
- 2 – Residence Determination for Credit Courses (425) – Commission of Athletics

Because the audit was completed and issued after the finalization and printing of its comprehensive evaluation report, the college informed the team during initial interviews and also provided an Institutional Self Evaluation Update, dated February 29, 2016, that included the audit findings. In discussions with the College’s Vice President of Administrative Services, the institutional responses to external audit findings are comprehensive, timely, and communicated appropriately.

As noted above, the audit opinion for this year, as in years past, were unqualified (unmodified), attesting to the institution’s strong internal controls, fiscal oversight and support.

These audits are performed annually and results of the audit reports including the institutional responses to external audit findings are accepted in an open Governing Board session. The annual audits are then posted on the District website, under the Office of the Chief Financial Officer (CFO)/Treasurer, where periodic financial statements; budgets and budget presentations; audits; quarterly and annual budget and financial reports; and actuarial studies for the retiree health liability can be found under the CFO reports. (III.D.7)

The institution relies on the annual independent audit to evaluate its financial management processes, and has implemented timely action to correct findings of deficiencies. In addition, the District also employs an internal auditor who has the ability to continuously monitor and recommend changes to the financial management process. (III.D.8)

The District evaluates its financial and internal control systems on a continuous cycle to ensure validity and effectiveness. Results from internal and external audits are used for improvement. When any deficiencies or material weaknesses are identified, the District promptly implements corrective action plans to resolve the deficiency. Where deficiencies are the result of issues with internal controls, policies, or procedures, remedial steps are taken before the next audit cycle.

The District has an internal audit department that regularly reviews all business and finance systems to ensure compliance with relevant policies, procedures, laws, and statutory regulations. Review of the Internal Audit Plans it appears that the focus is on cash controls, procurements/contracts, Associate Student Organizations, Foundations, Financial Aid, and the Fraud Hotline. (III.D.8)

The College’s financial management processes are evaluated and audited by the District’s Internal Audit Department (IAD). If any discrepancies or deficiencies are

found, personnel from those areas are required to attend mandatory meetings with the Internal Audit Department to discuss the findings and take corrective action steps. 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. (III.D.8)

The District reviews cash flow on a regular schedule and has maintained a sufficient cash flow and reserves ranging from 13 percent to 17 percent. Since 2013-14 the District has had a General Fund Reserve of 6.5 percent of expenditures and other uses and a Contingency Reserve of 3.5 percent.

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

The District practices effective oversight and management of all financial resources. It continually evaluates, and where needed, improves its oversight of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contracts, foundations, auxiliary organizations, and institutional investment and assets. The District has both centralized and decentralized practices to ensure effective oversight. The District has a long history of compliance and sound financial management and oversight practices. Both colleges and the Educational Services Center (ESC) identify and correct deficiencies in internal controls and financial management practices when they are identified. Improved communication and coordination between District staff and the nine colleges will help ensure improved responsibility and compliance with all rules and regulations.

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. (III.D.10; III.D.11)

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. (III.D.10)

Sufficiency of cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, support strategies for appropriate risk management, are within the purview of the District Finance Office and have not been a factor at the college level.

For the 2015-16 fiscal year, LATTC maintained minimal local fund balances. (III.D.9)

The college has multi-level review and approval processes for all disbursements, beginning with the assigned manager, to the respective area vice presidents, then moving to Administrative Services. Managers review items for propriety (meeting District guidelines), that it is not a prohibited expenditure, and that the transaction falls within the intended purpose of the department. Only the College Vice President of Administration and the President can sign for disbursements. College Administrative Services, the District Finance Office, and the District's Internal Auditor provide oversight for all financial reports, generates quarterly reports, which are presented through PBC, to the President and the Board. Additionally, Administrative Services provides oversight of all expenditures and grant reports to ensure that the expenditures meet District guidelines, are allowable and meet grant purposes. The District's external auditors review expenditure for compliance with federal and state guidelines and review internal controls. (III.D.10)

The District has a well-coordinated and integrated budget planning system that takes into consideration both short-term and long-term financial issues. The District creates comprehensive income and cost projections on a regular basis that are used for budget planning, resulting in a long-standing culture of fiscal responsibility and solvency. The District adheres to well-considered reserve and fiscal management policies that are congruent with the District's Strategic Plan, and ensure financial solvency in the short and long-term. The proposed budget reflects a \$65.43 million projected ending balance.

Budget planning includes funding of contingency (3.5 percent), general (6.5 percent) reserves, and a deferred maintenance (1.5 percent) reserve. There is also a special reserve set aside for future obligations, such as the 2015-2016 salary increase as well as STRS and PERS contribution increases, and also for new faculty hires to meet the FON obligation. (III.D.11)

The District takes appropriate and timely action in planning and allocating payment of liabilities and future obligations. It continuously monitors for potential increases in OPEB and other employee-related obligations and takes action accordingly. The District's short-range financial decisions are well integrated with long-term financial plans for facilities and infrastructure development, technology investments, and hiring. Long-term obligations, specifically debt repayment of general obligation bonds arising from the construction program and control of insurance expenses, are effectively managed. Health benefit costs for active employees are fully funded every fiscal year.

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

payment. At the time of the accreditation visit, the District was waiting for the draft of the 2015 Actuarial Valuation. (III.D.12)

The District regularly reviews and analyzes the impact of OPEB, retirement rate increases, and healthcare reforms. In July 2013, the Aon Hewitt Retiree Health Exchange provided the District with an Actuarial Valuation Report for its post-retirement health benefits. The District funds the trust at a rate of approximately 1.92 percent of the total full-time salary expenditures of the District. An amount equivalent to the federal Medicare Part D subsidy returned to the District each year is also directed into the trust fund. As of June 30, 2015, the value of the fund was \$76.8 million (III.D.12)

The District's Long-term Debt schedule shows a liability of \$4.3 billion with most of this debt being General Obligation Bonds where debt payment resources will be coming from taxes on local property. (Need to look at this and the amount of taxes per \$100,000 in assessed valuations). Other long-term debt reported is Workers' Compensation Claims, General Liability Claims, Compensated Absences and Capital Lease Obligations. (III.D.13)

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

The District has numerous rules, regulations, and standing procedures to ensure proper use of funds consistent with their intended purpose. Regulations are updated regularly, and both internal and external audits are conducted on an annual basis, allowing the institution to identify and promptly correct any deficiencies in internal controls and ensure financial resources are well managed and used with integrity and in accordance with their intended purpose. CEO's are responsible for financial management. GO Bonds and their audits are reviewed by the Board and Student Default rates are monitored. The District has not issued COPs since 2009.

Other Post-Employment Benefits is a district-wide obligation to its employees to fund health care upon retirement. As a College, LATTC does participate proportionally in funding that obligation.

The last actuarial valuation on the district's Retiree Health and Liabilities plan was prepared as of 2013. The report was prepared in compliance with Government Accounting Standards Board (GASB) 43 and 45. The Annual Required Contribution (ARC) is the basis of calculating the annual OPEB cost and net OPEB obligation under GASB 43 and 45. The

contribution requirements are established and may be amended by the District and the District's bargaining units. The required contribution is based on projected pay as you go financing requirements. Additionally, the District's board of trustees adopted a resolution dated April 23, 2008 (com No. BF2) to establish an irrevocable trust with CalPERS to prefund a portion of retiree health benefit costs.

The trust is to be funded with annual contributions by the District of approximately 1.92 percent of the total full-time salary expenditures in the District. Additionally, the District will direct an amount equivalent to the federal Medicare Part D subsidy returned to the District each year into the trust fund. (III.D.12)

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

The LATTC student loan default rates have been above the national average at 32.2% for Fiscal year 2012. As of January 23, 2016, the default rate was 26.1 percent. As established by the requirements of section 435(a)(7) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) and the implementing regulations at 34 CFR 668.217, an institution that has a three-year cohort default rate (CDR) of 30 percent or greater for any one federal fiscal year is required to establish a default prevention task force, create a program of default prevention, and submit a written Default Prevention Plan to the Department of Education (Department) for review and technical assistance. The purpose of the task force and Default Prevention Plan is to reduce defaults and to enhance borrowers' understanding of their loan repayment responsibilities. The college has put in place a detailed default prevention plan and contracted with the services of a firm to assist them in fully implementing the plan. To develop an effective plan, data was compiled on the students who defaulted to determine if there were any identifiable patterns. The team developing the plan found that there were three characteristics that were indicators for potential default: 1) students who selected their educational as goal as "transitional"; 2) students who declared automotive and/or construction as their program of study; and 3) students who did not successfully complete basic skills courses. These groups are the focus of the initial default prevention plan. (III.D.15)

The District's Financial Aid Unit (CFAU) coordinates the work of college Financial Aid offices and ensures college and District operations are legally compliant. The unit implements standardized policies and procedures throughout the District, reconciles student loan programs, and provides guidance to college administrators and Financial Aid managers. The CFAU also assures that the colleges clean up any audit issues as soon as discovered and



tracks and makes phone calls to help collect on the Federal Perkins Loan Program. Default rates for the last four years were provided by the Office of the Chief Financial Officer.

**Perkins Default Rates**

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

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

The District has purchasing policies consistent with state guidelines and public contract code and all contracts are reviewed and approved at several levels prior to coming to the District level before they are approved by the Board. Policies and procedures to ensure sound financial practices and financial stability are found in – Board Rules Chapter VII. Article 1 - Business and Fiscal Services, Contracts. (III.D.16)

**Conclusions:**

The college has adequate financial resources sufficient to support student learning and improve institutional effectiveness. The college has established its own reserve to continue to serve students and to remain fiscally stable, which is a priority for the college. The integrated planning model that LATTC has developed has been fully implemented and assessed. The college meets this standard.

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.

**Recommendations:**

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

#### **General Observations**

It appears that institutional leaders have worked to create and encourage innovation at LATTC. Because of the engagement of faculty, staff, students and community members in the dialogue process through the Day of Dialogue and through the Participatory Governance process, it appears that new initiatives have developed to improve in-house practices, program services and pathways, and innovations. Campus members are free to engage in dialogue and critical reflection on previous process patterns as well as opportunities for new ones in multiple settings including open forums, campus-based committees, district-wide committees and initiatives. Administrators, faculty and staff have clearly moved forward with new priorities, objectives, and actions that are based in the Strategic Educational Master Plan that reflects the effort on PACTS. Additionally, it is clear that the various opportunities for dialogue on the different areas of focus have resulted in new levels of ideas and processes, new energy for accomplishing new goals, and the accompanying culture shift that accommodates the changing student and faculty/staff demographics and community need.

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 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 presidents report to the chancellor of the District.

### **Findings and Evidence**

College Executive Team and College President have strategically hired faculty, staff, and administrators to be independent and entrepreneurial leaders who have been encouraged to participate in determining institutional directions and implement innovations. For example, the Executive Team specifically realigned and added dean positions to areas to help remove organizational silos between instruction and student services through implementing the Pathways approach. The College President intentionally changed the historic annual College Council Retreat participation to also include the college deans and managers for the first time, which has allowed for the different efforts to be taken directly to the working areas and pathways. (IV.A.1)

The College underwent combining all their plans and initiatives in the Strategic Educational Master Plan with a great focus on the PACTS. The buildings have been renamed to help provide an identity for the campus to be student focused and mission driven. The mission is pervasive throughout the campus and evidence exists that the mission and goals are available throughout the campus in multiple venues. Although the evaluation of the dialogue has been conducted through initial surveys and through collection of the "comment portal," the college might consider consolidating the feedback process with other data gathering around college campus climate as the college considers options for the long-term evolution of the Day of Dialogue and options for consistent communication mechanisms.

The College provided evidence that they have a Participatory Governance Handbook and Planning document that establishes processes and participation across constituent groups including students. (IV.A.6) Academic Senate bylaws clearly state roles and responsibilities of faculty purview and involvement. (IV.A.2) Evidence within the College Council Retreat, College Council, Reports to College Council, Program Review, and Academic Senate minutes indicate that participation is delineated and provides appropriate delegation to areas involving faculty related to curricular and other educational matters. (IV.A.4) Further, the evidence clarifies the integrated planning process ties all the planning efforts together with final recommendations going to College Council. The Planning and Budget Committee are tied to Program Review and the Student Success Committee is tied to the elements identified in the Education Policy Committee of the Academic Senate. Committee membership across all committees is

constructed to ensure faculty, staff, students, and administrators are involved that allows for involvement and expertise. (IV.A.5) The standing meetings for various the different committees are publicized as open meetings and minutes are available. College Council provides a quarterly newsletter to help communicate status on different efforts throughout the college. Department level minutes as well as weekly email updates from the president provide evidence that information is available to all levels of the institution. (IV.A.6)

Through the college's approach to clearly defining the participatory governance process and its focus on implementation of the Strategic Educational Master Plan with focus on PACTS, a cultural change has been occurring with intentional support of entrepreneurial and innovative efforts to develop structures that allow for curriculum and student learning programs and services to be centered around pathways. Curriculum, support services, and programs are being redefined through the pathway perspective rather than the traditional program perspective. The effort requires intentional dialogue across services and programs with student- and mission-centered discussion. Evidence indicates that Academic Senate along with its sub-committees, Student Services Council, Deans Council, and College Council and its sub-committees all work in their appropriate roles to ensure that efforts are working effectively. (IV.A.5)

At both the college, district, and board level, the role of decision-making is clearly identified and delineated. Board Rules outline the participatory governance and the college Participatory Governance Handbook and committee and council structures ensure appropriate constituent involvement as well as identifying responsibilities of membership for expertise and institutional communication. The matrix of decision-making provides evidence of the involvement of different groups in the decision-making process. Evidence exists from the board rules, represented groups, committee membership, bylaws, and minutes that the institution ensures appropriate consideration of different perspectives while ensuring that decision-making is aligned with expertise and that timely action is taken. (IV.A.3)

Although the College and district has structures in place to ensure participation and action and that efforts are communicated throughout the college. The College utilizes the College Council and the Academic Senate to evaluate the institution's governance and decision making-policies. Although the Day of Dialogue is well known and College Council appears to be active, there are many new processes in place. The College has undergone significant cultural shift both with student demographics and through its approach with PACTS and its Strategic Educational Master Plan. As the College continues to work on implementing the PACTS approach to its organization of programs and services, it will need to continue the good work completed through the governance groups and campus wide communication activities. (IV.A.7)

Faculty and administrators have ample opportunity for providing input on institutional policies, planning, and budget through participation on college-level governance committees, District wide executive administrative councils, and District-level governance committees. At all the colleges, administrators serve on governance committees based on their areas of

expertise. The LACCD and AFT (American Federation of Teachers) Agreement 2014-2017 (Agreement) emphasizes the importance of faculty representation from the union and senate on participatory governance committees. The LACCD and AFT Agreement specifies which committees require faculty representation and those for which it is recommended. The Agreement requires faculty membership for both Budget and Strategic Planning Committees. (IV.A.3.)

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

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

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

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

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

In some cases, it appears that classified staff do not have appropriate representation on District-level institutional governance committees regarding institutional planning, policies, and other key considerations. For example, the Student Success Initiative Committee (SSIC) states that the “overarching purpose of the Student Success Initiative is to create an effective

District wide network of faculty, administrators and *staff* dedicated to improving student success.” However, the committee’s membership does not include representatives from the classified staff. Likewise, the committee membership of the District Planning Committee does not include representation from the classified staff. (IV.A.5)

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 (IV.A).

### **Conclusion**

The college meets all the requirements set forth in Standard IVA. The institution recognizes and uses the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for promoting the various aspects of institutional improvement. With a college-wide focus on the Strategic Educational Master Plan and the all-encompassing focus on PACTS and pathways, the college has implemented clear governance roles that facilitate decisions that support student learning and programs. The president is the final authority; however, significant input and consideration occurs prior to recommendations moving forward.

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.

LACCD meets Standards IV.A.3, IV.A.4, and IV.A.5. LATTC meets the Standards.

### **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**

By policy, the Los Angeles Community College District Board delegates full responsibility and authority to the chancellor who in turn delegates the responsibility and authority to the

president to ensure the institution offers quality programs and services to its students. (IV.B.1-1, IV.B.1-2)

The college has structures in place to allow for broad participation and information sharing. The president leads the college through its established processes and is the final decision-maker at the college level for hiring, delegation of operation, budget and expenditures, and curriculum based on appropriate participatory or administrative input.

### **Findings and Evidence**

The LATTC President ensures regular administrative and participatory governance standing meetings with senior leadership, mid-level leadership, and constituent representatives. He hosts a monthly Day of Dialogue to share information and update the status of efforts on strategic priorities aligned with the mission and Strategic Educational Master Plan. The institution is organized by four primary functioning areas: 1) President including Institutional Effectiveness, 2) Academic Affairs & Workforce Development, 3) Student Services, and 4) Administrative Services.

The executive team comprised of the president and vice presidents meet weekly to discuss updates and budget status. The president attends the District Budget Committee and monthly Board of Trustees Budget and Finance Committee meetings. All updates, statuses, and changes to the budget are provided in regular updates to College Council and Academic Senate. (IV.B.)

The president approves all permanent hiring requests. The district has policy and guidelines on the processes for administrative, faculty, and staff positions. (IV.B.1) through Hiring committees are used to pre-screen applicants and forward nominations to the president for consideration and final selection. The status of positions and hiring is a standing agenda for the executive team.

The institution's SEMP specifically prioritizes professional development of all faculty and staff as outlined in its Pathways to Academic, Career, and Transfer Success (PACTS) in the Quality Focus Essay. Resources have been put into supporting new faculty, adjunct faculty, and special institutional efforts such as assessment outcomes training. The president provides for development across the institution including the Deans Academy and faculty and staff through district-wide efforts and external sources such as conferences, workshops, and academic coursework through Antioch University. (IV.B.1)

The institution has a dedicated Office of Institutional Effectiveness which reports directly to the president and provides a variety of information and data to the different working areas and committees. The Day of Dialogue is used as a mechanism to share the information broadly and widely across the institution in addition to the weekly, biweekly, and monthly use of information in Executive Team, Leadership Team, College Council, Academic Senate, and board reports. Campus climate, Convocation Monday, Blasts, and Open Office Hours are other methods used to share and gather information from the larger institution. Notably, a revised LATTC College Participatory Governance & Planning Handbook was adopted after four years. (IV.B.1-28) The effectiveness of the year in planning and progress of the SEMP is conducted annually at the College Council Planning Retreat. (IV.B.2)

The president oversees the administrative structure in the college. The college is divided up in four primary operating areas to allow for effective administrative function: 1) President's Office including the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, 2) Academic Affairs and Workforce Development lead by a vice president, 3) Student Services lead by a vice president, and 4) Administrative Services lead by a vice president. Additionally, each of the vice president areas have deans, directors, and managers with supervisory and leadership responsibilities to manage the day-to-day operations. A weekly meeting with the Executive Team comprised of the president and vice presidents, and the Leadership Team comprised of the Executive Team, deans and specific key directors, and managers ensure open communication and dialogue on the status of functions and operations. Reorganization, reassigned time, and release time are discussed and evaluated. The Executive Team conducts an annual evaluation. (IV.B.2)

The president ensures collegial participation through use of constituent representative College Council and Academic Senate. Additionally, there are other mechanisms in place that allow for broad discussions and information sharing on values, goals, and priorities through the monthly Day of Dialogue, monthly standing constituent group meetings. In 2015, the college embarked on combining multiple plans and objectives into one cohesive Strategic Educational Master Plan. Through the use of a consultant, multiple committees, councils, and Day of Dialogue provided input that resulted in a final document approved through the participatory governance process.

The college has established a minimal set of institutional set standards (ISS) through the Educational Policies Committee of the Academic Senate. The Student Success Committee reviews and evaluates the college performance and makes recommendations for improvement. (IV.B.3)

The college has a dedicated Office of Institutional Effectiveness reporting directly to the president. The office function focuses on three main areas: 1) information resources, 2) process development and monitoring, and 3) research resources. (IV.B.3) The College Council Retreat is used as a mechanism to ensure components of planning are integrated. Additionally, resource allocation is tied to the Program Review process and outcomes of the College Council Retreat. The college engages in evaluation of the planning process through several venues including campus survey, committee evaluations, and annual College Council Retreat where the topic specifically addressed.

The president has promoted a culture focused on teamwork, structure, communication, and trust, which includes an intentional focus on accreditation. The Day of Dialogue was implemented to help promote the culture. Accreditation has been a theme and openly discussed at convocation. (The vice president of academic affairs was appointed as ALO and tasked with gaining wide participation in the self-evaluation process. Workgroups for the standards and sub-areas were implemented and dedicated work time was allocated to ensure adequate time could be given. The Executive Team keeps the item as a standing agenda item and each member of the Leadership Team has a specific role with a standard. (IV.B.4)

As a function of the vice president of administrative services position, the VPAS has been tasked with ensuring the college processes related to budget and expenditures are in



accordance with compliance, laws, and board policy. The Executive Team keeps the budget as a standing item. (IV.B.5)

The college president was the former Deputy Mayor of Los Angeles where he worked with many community leaders, employment groups, universities, K-12s, and elected officials. This has allowed for quick access for the college to form relationships that have led to programs and training opportunities for existing and future students. The college highlights its efforts through its Annual Report produced by the Public Relations Office. (IV.B.6)

## **Conclusion**

The college meets all the requirements set forth in Standard IVB. The board and chancellor delegate authority and responsibility to the college president. The president has ensured an administrative structure to allow for effective leadership, management, and operations. The president engages in a system of structured meetings with administration, constituent groups, and participatory governance groups to allow for open discussion and broad participation in institutional planning and evaluation including emphasis on institutional effectiveness, budget, and accreditation. Further, the president engages the community and communicates the effectiveness and offerings of the college through an Annual Report.

## **Recommendations**

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.

The Board of Trustees (BOT) of the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) was authorized by the California Legislature in 1967 under Education Code sections 70902 and 72000. The Board is responsible for policy and exercises oversight over student success, persistence, retention, and quality (BR 2100).

The members of the BOT are publicly elected at-large by voters in LACCD. As such, they are representative of the public interest in the affairs of the district. As an independent policy-making entity, the board represents the interests of a broad range of constituencies. The BOT also has a Student Trustee who is elected by the students of the district for a one-year term. The Student Trustee has an advisory vote on actions other than personnel-related and collective bargaining items.

The governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students appear to work together for the good of the colleges/district; however, there was no direct evidence of equitable participation from all constituencies.

### **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)

The College President is held accountable by the District Chancellor and the BOT. The President works collaboratively and effectively with the constituents of the Board. He communicates outcomes that can affect the campus community in a broad manner.

## **Conclusions**

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

## **District Recommendations for 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. Multi-College Districts or Systems**

### **General Observations**

The Chancellor of the Los Angeles District engages the nine campus presidents and the Educational Services Center (ESC) to work collaboratively towards educational excellence and integrity. This group serves as the Chancellor’s Cabinet. The colleges are provided

effective and adequate service as support to achieve their individual missions, while being provided the autonomy and authority for local decision-making to streamline administrative processes, encourage innovation, and hold campuses accountable. The District has well-established resource allocation policies that supports the effective operations and sustainability of the colleges and District. The complex set of cross-campus and district committees serve as the evaluation and communication conduits to inform other constituents of actions taken by the District and District related committees.

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

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

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

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

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

The College executive team works effectively with the Chancellor's office and his designated ESC team. The support provided through the district office allows for adoption or updating of policy at the district level and then the campus responses accordingly through changes adopted at the campus level. There is a close alignment between the campus and district

offices. Offices that have much policy and responsibility overlap, such as Human Resources, meet regularly to ensure effective decision making and communication.

## **Findings and Evidence**

The Chancellor effectively communicates his expectations for educational excellence and integrity through a number of channels. Quarterly newsletters address two main topic areas: Synergy and Accreditation. Regularly scheduled Cabinet meetings are used to provide support and feedback to the campus presidents, as well as discuss the Chancellor's expectations, a discussion of roles, authority, and responsibility between colleges and Districts. These meetings predominately address operational effectiveness and alignment between the District office and the Colleges. Regularly scheduled retreats also take place with the Cabinet to build collaboration, foster leadership, and allow for planning across the system. In order to allow for clear roles of authority and responsibility, the Board of Trustees have approved District/college Functional Area Maps, which clarify the structure of District administrative responsibilities. These Functional Maps were later improved and expanded to be included in a Governance and Functions Handbook. The Handbook also includes the roles and responsibility of the District, as applied to meeting accreditation standards. (Standard IV.D.1)

District services and support are provided through eight areas.

- 1) The Office of the Deputy Chancellor
- 2) Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE)
- 3) Economic and Workforce Development
- 4) Chief Financial Officer/Treasurer
- 5) Facilities Planning and Development
- 6) Human Resources
- 7) The Office of the General Counsel
- 8) The Personnel Commission

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)

To effectively gauge the performance of these units, each of the eight units have developed SAOs and have completed one cycle of the program review process. Surveys were deployed among 21 user groups within the system to gather feedback. Action plans were then put in place to address areas of needed improvement. (Standard IV.D.2)

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)

The District Budget Committee (DBC) provides leadership on District-level budget policies. Membership of these groups includes all nine college presidents, the District Academic Senate, and Collective Bargaining unit representatives. This groups is tasked with: 1) formulating recommendations to the Chancellor's budget planning policies consistent with the District Strategic Plan, 2) reviewing the District budget and making recommendations to the Chancellor, and 3) reviewing quarterly district financial conditions. The District utilizes an annual financial plan, quarterly status reports, reports and set aside reserves to manage and maintain a balanced budget for the District and the campus. The District has consistently ended the fiscal year with a positive balance. (Standard IV.D.3)

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)

Each campus CEO/President is delegated full responsibility and authority to conduct their work without interference from the District Chancellor. The visiting team verified



this is the case with LATTC. Annual goals for the President include activities that ensure the president is managing the quality and integrity of programs and services, accreditation status, and fiscal sustainability of their colleges. (Standard IV.D.4)

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 District has established district-level integrated processes for strategic, financial, facilities and technology planning. The District strategic plan (DSP) creates a uniform methodology and data sources to be used to compare the colleges’ performance. LATTC adopts the outcomes identified in the DSP and incorporates those measures and goals into the campus specific strategic plan. (Standard IV.D.5)

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). The visiting team verified this process works effectively for the College. 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)

The District has numerous councils and committees, which meet regularly to share best practices and to ensure an effective flow of information between the colleges and the Educational Services Center. Seven District-wide Executive Administrative Councils meet monthly. These include: 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, 6) Human Resources Council, and 7) the Sheriff's Oversight Committee. Four District-level Governance Committees meet monthly: 1) District Planning and Accreditation Committee, 2) District Budget Committee, 3) Joint Labor Management Benefits Committee, and 4) the Technology Planning and Policy Committee. These committees are made up of diverse ranges of employees, including faculty, researchers, college deans, union representatives, and members of executive administration. Information regarding the activities and discussions of the committees is shared through a webpage containing descriptions of each committee function, charge, authority, and responsibility. The Chancellor keeps the Board of Trustees, college presidents, and senior administrators abreast of Trustee matters, college/District update and activities, legislative/public affairs updates, and community events through weekly reports. Regular newsletters and campus announcements are released to keep the entire employee based updated and informed. (Standard IV.D.6)

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)

The District regularly evaluates the effectiveness of the District/college role delineations, governance and decision-making processes. In 2009, ACCJC recommended changes to this process. As a result of that, the District planning and accreditation committee implemented a cyclical process for system-level evaluation and improvement. The DPAC established an annual Committee Self-Evaluation process for all District governance committees. This common self-assessment document requires each committee to discuss accomplishments, challenges, and area for improvement over a one-year cycle. These results are reviewed by each respective committee and serve as the basis for changes and improvements to Committee function. Role delineations are evaluated during the regular review of Functional Area maps and revisions are made based on input from governance committee members, governance surveys, Education Services Center, the Chancellor’s Cabinet, and college stakeholders. The District Functions Handbook is also regularly reviewed and updated by District Stakeholder under the coordination of the district planning and Accreditation committee. (Standard IV.D.7)

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

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

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

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

## **Conclusion**

The College meets the Standard.

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.

## **Recommendations**

**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.)

## **Feedback on the Quality Focused Essay**

LATTC is committed to completing two action projects through the Quality Focused Essay process.

Action Project 1 – Full Implementation of Pathways to Academic, Career, and Transfer success (PACTS). This action project addresses further changes, developments, and improvements in the areas related to: 1) including PACTS in the mission statement; 2) providing the organizational structure and resources to ensure pathway sustainability; and 3) expanding the scope and scale of professional development for all College employees, in relation to PACTS practices and strategies. The project centers on further supporting the transformative changes occurring at the College to improve student learning and achievement.

### **Action Project 2 – Assessment**

The Institutional Self Evaluation Report highlighted the need to strengthen the quality of the College's current assessment practices in order to increase institutional effectiveness in using learning outcome assessment results, and to better inform decision-making in support of student learning and achievement. The three main focus areas to further improve assessment

practices were identified as 1) purposefully assure learning outcomes are clearly aligned with internal and/or external competencies; 2) fully implement a system to intensify and streamline collection, reporting, and disaggregation of data; and 3) strengthen dialogue and evidence-based action planning to focus on improving student learning and achievement.

The team commends the College for identifying these two action projects. Full implementation of the PACTS is at a critical juncture for the campus. There is large-scale support for PACTS but not unanimous throughout the campus culture. Because full implementation of PACTS will touch every department and every touch point of the student journey, the culture of the campus needs to shift to 100 percent support of the project. Without that, the program will operate in silos. The College has already invested in a great deal of professional development into those departments participating in PACTS. More professional development will be necessary for full-scale implementation. The team recommends the College be diligent in communicating the student success results of the programs participating in PACTS. It is important to review the measureable results of the PACTS programs but communicating these across the institution will allow for the entire campus to understand the need to make such broad based changes. This assessment will also set the appropriate tone for the financial support these programs will need to be sustained.

The second action project touches most areas of assessment and how that assessment is managed across the campus. Several items became apparent while visiting the institution. The overall assessment process at the campus should be evaluated and mechanisms should be put in place to ensure all program reviews and related assessments are done in a timely manner. To meet the requirements to continuously improve, the college may want to consider building in mechanisms within the program review to allow for programs to document how changes have impacted success. Documenting these “closing the loop” actions can be powerful in fostering an environment of change. The assessment action project should also identify which types of data would be most appropriate to enhance the program review process. Providing program disaggregated data sets for instance.