

# EVALUATION REPORT

LOS ANGELES CITY COLLEGE  
855 North Vermont Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA 90029

A Confidential Report Prepared for  
The Accrediting Commission of Community and Junior Colleges  
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited Los Angeles City College from  
March 24, 2009 to March 26, 2009

Judy C. Miner, Ed.D., Chair

**Comprehensive Evaluation Visiting Team Roster  
Los Angeles City College  
March 24 – 26, 2009**

Los Angeles City College  
Comprehensive Evaluation Visit Team Roster  
Monday, March 23-Thursday, March 26, 2009

Dr. Judy C. Miner (Chair) President, Foothill College	Dr. Sandra Stefani Comerford Dean, Language Arts Division College of San Mateo
Ms. Berta Cuaron Assistant Superintendent/Vice President, Instruction Palomar College	Jane Enright (Assistant) Vice Chancellor Emerita, Human Resources Foothill-De Anza Community College District
Mohamed Eisa Dean, Planning, Research and Student Outcomes Diablo Valley College	Mr. Bruce Koller Instructor, Economics Diablo Valley College
Ms. Virginia May Professor of Mathematics Sacramento City College	Ms. Vangie Meneses Vice President, Student Services Coastline Community College
Dr. DeRionne Pollard President, Las Positas College	

**ACCREDITATION TEAM VISIT  
LOS ANGELES CITY COLLEGE  
March 24 – 26, 2009**

**SUMMARY**

A nine-member accreditation team visited Los Angeles City College (LACC) on March 24-26, 2009 for the purpose of validating the college's application for reaffirmation of accreditation. In preparation for the visit, team members studied the Commission Team Evaluator Manual and Guide to Evaluating Institutions and attended a team training workshop conducted by the Commission Staff. Team members also read and studied the self study report, a written response to questions posed during the pre-visit, related documents provided by the college, material posted on the website, the previous team's accreditation report and recommendations, and the college's midterm report. Prior to the visit, the team members analyzed the self study and developed questions related to it and to the standards for which they had been assigned primary and secondary responsibility. They also identified people with whom they wanted to meet during the team visit and additional resources and documents they wished to review while on campus.

The Team Chair and the Standard Chairs met with Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) staff on March 23. During the three-day visit to the college, the team visited twenty classes and labs in a wide range of disciplines. Some classes and labs observed were Dental Technology, Math Pi Shoppe, Speech Therapy, Photography, Business Management, Computer Science, Child Development, Music, Microbiology, as well as the Career Center, Transfer Center and Academic Computer Lab. Team members interviewed over 25 faculty, staff, administrators and students; attended a number of group meetings, including a student panel on labs in the Learning Skills Center, a counseling panel with the dean, chair and five counselors, an English/ESL meeting on SLOs with six faculty, a joint meeting with members of both the Educational Planning Committee (EPC) and Shared Governance Committee (SGC), and a forum with the Associated Student Organization (ASO). Two open forums were held, one in the early afternoon and another in the late afternoon/early evening to allow as many members of the campus community as possible to address issues with team members. Approximately 60 people attended the open forums. Team members toured the campus, three team members visited City College at Wilshire (CCW), and two team members attended the Board of Trustees meeting on March 25 at West Los Angeles College

**District Commendations**

1. The district has dedicated considerable resources to planning and applying sustainability practices throughout the district (IV.B.3.b).

2. The district has focused attention on enhancing the skills and abilities of its employees by developing formal staff development programs and activities, e.g. Faculty Teaching and Learning Academy, Administrative Leadership Program, and Project MATCH (IV.B.3.b).

3. Since 2001, the district has initiated three successful capital facilities bond measures totaling \$5.7 billion enhancing the learning environment throughout the district service area (IV.B.3).

### **LACC Commendations**

1. The team commends the college for its commitment to sustainability and its plans to develop a state of the art energy management program. The long-term plan for photovoltaics on the new parking structure aims not only to get the college off the grid but also aims to sell energy, thereby generating income to help support maintenance of added square footage.

2. The team commends the college for its sincere and substantive response to the 2003 recommendation that “administration, faculty, and staff renew their commitment to effective and timely communication.” Documents and enthusiastic testimonials afforded evidence that great progress has been made not just in the transmission of information but also engagement in dialogue around important campus wide issues.

### **District Recommendations**

1. In order to improve, the post-retirement health liability should be carefully monitored for the potential fiscal ramifications that could arise over the next few years (III.D.1.c).

2. In order to improve, both the district and the college need to evaluate the consistent adherence in practice to the recently developed delineation of operational responsibilities and functions (IV.B.3.a).

3. Develop and implement methods for the evaluation of role delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes for the college and the district. Widely communicate the results of the evaluation and use those results as the basis for improvement (IV.B.3.g).

### **LACC Recommendations**

1. In order to increase institutional effectiveness and meet standards, the team recommends that the college more systematically use the results of program/unit reviews to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement, learning, support services, and institutional processes. (I.B.1-7; II.A.2; II.B.4; II.C.2; III.B.2; III.C.2; III.D.3; IV.A.5).

2. In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the college develop a robust and comprehensive professional development program to both enhance institutional effectiveness practices and promote institutional engagement by all employee groups. (I.B; III.A.2; III.A.5, IV.A.5).

3. In order to increase institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that the college engage in succession planning to increase leadership capacity, institutional consistency, and employee involvement and engagement. (I.B; III.A.2; III.A.5; IV.A.5).

4. To meet the standards, the team recommends that the college strengthen the research function in order to provide continuous and meaningful analysis of data and apply the finding to program improvement. (I.B.2-3; I.B.5-6; II.A.1.a; II.B.3.e; II.B.4; II.C.2; III.B.2; III.C.2; III.D.3).

5. In order to meet Commission standards by 2012, the team recommends that the college fully implement the development and assessment of student learning outcomes at the course and program level and to use the assessment results for program improvement. (Eligibility Requirement 10, Standards II.A.1.a; II.A.1.c; II.A.2; II.A.3; II.A.5; II.B.4; II.C.2; III.A.1.c).

## INTRODUCTION

Los Angeles City College (LACC) is a comprehensive California community college serving the residents of Los Angeles, specifically the area northwest of the downtown area, near the southeast edge of Hollywood. The community it serves is extremely diverse in income, cultures, and language as it is part of an institutional and cultural belt running north-south that includes the medical Center complex at Sunset, Barnsdall Park, the Griffith Observatory and the historic Hollywood Hills. LACC is one of the most diverse colleges in the 109-campus California Community College System. Many of its students come from the adjacent Central Los Angeles, Koreatown, Filipinotown and Little Armenia areas of the city. LACC was established in 1929 as the first Junior College in Los Angeles on the former site of UCLA. In that first year, approximately 1300 students were taught by some 54 faculty. In academic year 2007-2008 nearly 17,000 students were enrolled at the college as it continues as the major educational institution in the region.

The college's vision is to be an "urban oasis of learning that educates minds, opens hearts, and celebrates community." Its mission is to offer programs, coursework, support, and guidance to develop a community of learners, both near and far, with the knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary for optimal growth and action in their personal and professional lives. To that end the college offers certificate and associate degree programs, transfer preparation, basic skills instruction, English as a second language courses, student supports services, economic development activities, and cultural activities for the benefit of students and the community at large.

The last comprehensive visit to LACC occurred in 2003. Since that time the college has had four different presidents. The Board hired the current President in June 2008. The 2003 team made six recommendations and accreditation was reaffirmed with a requirement that the college submit a Focused Midterm Report by March 15, 2006. The report was to focus on the following recommendations:

- That the college emphasize high standards for facilities maintenance and cleanliness,
- That the college administration, faculty, and staff renew their commitment to effective and timely communication and accept personal and organizational responsibility to continue existing efforts to improve trust and shared responsibility, and
- That district and college leadership delineate operational responsibilities and functions of the college and district and establish a method and timeframe for regular evaluation of this delineation.

The Accrediting Commission accepted the Focused Midterm Report in June, 2006 and reminded the college to address the six recommendations made by the 2003 comprehensive evaluation team and document completion of each at the time of the next comprehensive visit.

## **Evaluation of Institutional Responses to 2003 Recommendations**

### Recommendation 1

*The team recommends that the college enhance its efforts to determine institutional effectiveness by identifying additional appropriate assessment measures beyond the vital signs that are part of the strategic plan, by clearly documenting the achievement of its intended institutional outcomes, and by using the results of this assessment for institutional improvement (Standard 3.A.3, 3.A.4, 3.B.2, 3.B.3, C.1).*

The College engaged in a number of activities as described in the 2006 Midterm report, the 2008 self study, and in the March 2009 update to the self study. These activities included monthly meetings of a subcommittee of the Shared Governance Planning Committee (SGP) to develop a new Strategic Master Plan (SMP); a series of all-campus forums and focus groups conducted to engage all segments of the college in the strategic planning process; and a series of focus groups to analyze the college's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT). As a result, the LACC strategic goals for 2008-2013 were approved in January 2009. The 2008-13 SMP links all institution-wide priorities to the college mission and outlines strategies, intended outcomes, and vital signs significant to realizing the mission and vision of the college. The college has developed a series of implementation grids to measure the progress made toward reaching goals and objectives.

However, none of these activities respond to the recommendation to document "the achievement of its intended institutional outcomes" and to use "the results of this assessment for institutional improvement. That is, there was clearly a great deal of activity but insufficient evidence that assessment and consequent improvements to student learning occurred. This recommendation has not been fully met (see 2009 LACC Recommendations 1 and 4).

### Recommendation 2

*The team recommends that the college enhance research and assessment practices of the program level to move the college toward the measurement of student learning outcomes (Standard 4.B.3.)*

LACC has made some progress toward meeting this recommendation, but at this time learning outcomes are not linked to program reviews. Research practices have focused on providing an extensive amount of data through tables and charts without analysis or interpretations. See 2009 LACC Recommendations 1, 4, and 5.

### Recommendation 3

*The team recommends that the college emphasize high standards for facility maintenance and cleanliness (Standard 8.1, 8.2, 8.3).*

The college has taken a number of steps and devised a number of strategies to meet this goal. Given the number of challenges that accompany this recommendation (budget,

staff, open campus access) the college has responded in a conscientious and responsible manner to establish high standards for facility maintenance and cleanliness. The response includes: hiring a custodian assigned solely to clean restrooms across the campus; initiating a team cleaning approach to clean classrooms and restrooms; renovation and upgrades to restroom facilities; new equipment to clean building corridors while classes are in session; a signage campaign across campus encourages everyone on campus to help to keep the campus clean. This recommendation has been met.

#### Recommendation 4

*The team recommends that the college administration, faculty, and staff renew their commitment to effective and timely communication and accept personal and organizational responsibility to continue existing efforts to improve trust and shared responsibility (Standard 10.B.5, 10.B.6, 10.B.9).*

Despite the high turnover in key administrative staff, the college has made significant improvement in addressing the issues of communication, inclusion and trust. The current leadership has supported and modeled key communication strategies to improve trust. The team commends the college for its sincere and substantive response to the 2003 recommendation that “administration, faculty, and staff renew their commitment to effective and timely communication.” Documents and enthusiastic testimonials afforded evidence that great progress has been made not just in the transmission of information but also engagement in dialogue around important campus wide issues. This recommendation has been met.

#### Recommendation 5

*The team recommends that the Board of Trustees develop and publish a process for orientation of new Board members, a board code of ethics, and processes for assessing its own performance (Standard 10.A.3, 10.A.5, 10.A.6).*

The Board updated its Statement of Ethics and Conduct in 2005 and instituted an orientation process as well as self-evaluation processes. This recommendation has been met.

#### Recommendation 6

*The team recommends that the district and the college leadership delineate operational responsibilities and functions of the college and district and establish a method and timeframe for regular evaluation of this delineation (Standard 10.C.3).*

The operational responsibilities and functions of the college and district have been included in the functional map developed in 2008 to clarify district and college roles. This appears to be a work in progress with college and district personnel participating in multiple reviews of roles, functions and responsibilities. The team was not presented with evidence that the document has been vetted at the college. This recommendation has not been fully addressed (See 2009 District Recommendation 2).

## 2009 Self Study

The team reviewed the process the college used to develop its self study. Preparation began in Fall 2006 with the appointment of the faculty chair. In Spring 2007 the Self Study Steering Committee and subcommittee co-chairs and the Self Study Standards teams were established. A self study campus wide kick off meeting was held to review supporting documents, establish tentative timelines and determine a self study theme. A student survey was conducted and a Moodle site was established and opened to all committee members. In Fall 2007 the self study chair and the ALO presented an opening day, all-campus flex program to update faculty and staff on self study activities and expectations. The first accreditation newsletter *Got Cred?* was distributed. By Winter 2008 the first drafts of standards were reviewed by the Steering Committee and in Spring 2008 revisions and editing were underway as the second edition of *Got Cred?* was published.

In Fall 2008 the self study report was circulated online for campus wide review, discussion and approval. The Academic Senate and the Shared Governance Council approved the report and the final draft was delivered to the district office for board review in December.

The self-study report describes a college community by a selected group of college employees who offer a review of the institution by using their best efforts to construct an analysis of the organization. Unfortunately, the evidence—qualitative inquiry made by the team and quantitative supplements offered to the team—indicates that many of those who should have been involved were not. The institutional self study process and subsequent report appear not to have been effectively managed, and as a result, was not well crafted to represent the Los Angeles City College story and its strategies for evaluation, planning, and improvement. The self study did not adequately portray the vibrant, caring and dedicated community of faculty, staff and students that the team experienced during its visit. Much of the detail in the study was in error or misstated. There were entire paragraphs repeated just pages apart. Different, albeit not conflicting, sets of data were presented in different sections of the report. The poor quality of the self study did a disservice to the college.

The team noted a number of deficiencies in the self study such as a lack of planning agendas and a lack of evidence to support claims. The Accreditation Team Chair and the Accreditation Team Assistant discussed these concerns with the President and the Accreditation Liaison Officers during a pre-visit meeting in February. The College responded by providing a Self Study update (attached) prior to the Team visit. The update includes the addition of a number of planning agendas and a more detailed and complete response to issues surrounding SLOs and Distance Education. However, the addition of some planning agendas in the update did not relieve the team's concern regarding the full integration of all planning efforts.

## **ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS**

### **1. Authority**

Los Angeles City College is one of the nine colleges in the Los Angeles Community College District that are part of the California Community College system. It is reviewed and accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The college was last accredited by the ACCJC in 2003.

### **2. Mission**

The Los Angeles City College mission was revised and approved by the board of trustees in September 2008. It is clearly defined and is scheduled to be published in the 2009-10 catalog, schedule of classes and on the college website.

### **3. Governing Board**

The Los Angeles Community College District is governed by an eight-member Board of Trustees, an independent policy-making body responsible for the quality, integrity, and financial stability of the District's nine colleges and for ensuring that the Los Angeles City College mission is carried out. Seven members of the board are elected from the communities served by the district, and one student trustee is elected annually by the students in the district. Several team members met with members of the board informally, and two team members attended a board meeting. The team confirms that the Board makes policy for the district and exercises oversight of its operations.

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

The LACCD Board of Trustees appoints LACC's chief executive officer, the president. She has full responsibility for the institution and possesses the authority to administer board policies. The current president served as interim president from September 2007 to July 2008 when she was appointed the permanent president.

### **5. Administrative Capacity**

The team determined that the college has sufficient staff, with appropriate preparation and experience to provide the administrative services necessary to support the college's mission and goals. The college has experienced a great deal of turnover in recent years, and there are a number of unfilled administration positions that should be filled as expeditiously as possible.

### **6. Operating Status**

Los Angeles City College is fully operational, with approximately 17,000 students enrolled in the spring 2009 semester when the team visited. The college offers programs of study for 66 Associate's Degrees and for 80 vocational and skills certificates. 1200 – 1500 students graduate each year and between 500 and 700 transfer.

## 7. Degrees

LACC offers programs leading to 59 AA and AS degrees and 116 occupational or skill certificates.

## 8. Educational Programs

The team confirms that LACC's degree programs are congruent with its mission, are based on recognized higher education fields of study, are of sufficient content and length, and are conducted at levels of quality and rigor appropriate to the degrees offered. The college offers 66 degree programs that are two academic years in length.

## 9. Academic Credit

LACC awards academic credit in semester units based on the Carnegie Unit value system and Title 5 minimum standards. LACC conforms to the appropriate California Educational Code sections in awarding college credit.

## 10. Student Learning and Achievement

LACC has established core competencies, which serve as the basis for institutional student learning outcomes for all students completing programs and courses. However, the college offered little evidence of having developed course and program-level student learning outcomes and achievement expectations. Therefore, this eligibility requirement is met to a limited degree.

## 11. General Education

The team confirms that LACC defines and incorporates into all of its degree programs a substantial component of general education designed to ensure breadth of knowledge and promote intellectual inquiry. The general education component expects students to achieve specific reading, writing and computational competencies. Degree credit for general education programs is consistent with levels of quality and rigor appropriate to higher educations.

## 12. Academic Freedom

LACC believes that faculty and students have the right to pursue teaching and learning with full freedom of inquiry. The college abides by the policy on academic freedom stated in LACCD Board rules (BR 1204.12) and article 4 of the LACCD/Los Angeles Faculty guild agreement, which states, "The faculty shall have the academic freedom to seek the truth and guarantee freedom of learning to the students."

## 13. Faculty

LACC employs 193 full-time faculty including 25 chairs, 460 part-time faculty members, and 43 regular and hourly non-teaching faculty. All faculty meet state-mandated minimum qualifications and thus are qualified to conduct the institution's programs. The faculty collective bargaining agreement details faculty responsibility for development and review of curriculum and assessment of student learning.

#### 14. Student Services

LACC provides a wide range of student services that are designed to support academic success.

#### 15. Admissions

LACC guarantees admission to all high school graduates as well as to persons eighteen years of age or older who can benefit from instruction. Every attempt is made to facilitate student enrollment through admission policies consistent with its mission that specify the qualifications of students appropriate for its programs.

#### 16. Information and Learning Resources

In addition to its collection of books, periodicals, journals and other resources, the new Martin Luther King Library which opened in the summer of 2008, has 12 academic databases that are available to users 24 hours a day from any computer on or off campus. The college supports a variety of student computer labs including the All College Computer Lab, the Writing Center, the Byte Shop, the Pi Shoppe and other open computer labs as well as tutoring and department labs some of which may require enrollment in specific courses for access.

#### 17. Financial Resources

LACC documents its financial resources and allocation of resources to support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. College governance structures and the planning and budget process ensure that the college mission is considered in all financial decisions.

#### 18. Financial Accountability

The team reviewed the LACCD 2007-08 independent auditor's report, prepared by KPMG. The Board of Trustees reviews annual financial audits conducted by externally contracted certified public accountants. Management responses to exceptions and recommendations are reviewed and discussed at Board of Trustees public meeting sessions.

#### 19. Institutional Planning and Evaluation

LACC evaluates its academic programs through the program review process that occurs every 6 years with biennial updates and annual unit plans. Data are supplied by the Office of Research and Planning, analyzed by departments, and evaluated by the Educational Planning Committee.

#### 20. Public Information

LACC produces a catalog for its constituencies that includes precise, accurate, and current information required by ACCJC. The team reviewed the 2007-08 catalog that contains general information, student requirements for attending, graduating and transferring, and major policies affecting students.

## 21. Relations with the Accrediting Commission

The self study report includes the Certification of Continued Compliance with the Eligibility Requirements signed by the President of the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor of the Los Angeles Community College District and the President of Los Angeles City College.

# EVALUATION OF THE COLLEGE USING ACCJC STANDARDS

## STANDARD I INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND EFFECTIVENESS

### General Observations

A strong and consistent theme throughout the college's response to the Standard—and the entire self-study—is the college's commitment to meeting the diverse needs of the community it serves. The College Profile makes the case that the current demography of the college service area is one that is highly layered, complex, and demanding. The college demonstrates a strong commitment to its mission through its activities, programs, and services—and works to communicate that message extensively internally. LACC's articulated vision statement is a complement to its institutional mission statement and reflects the community college mission in general and its commitment to the students of their service area.

Nevertheless, institutional effectiveness, as defined by the Standard, asks colleges to demonstrate a focused effort to produce and support student learning, to measure that learning, to assess how well learning is occurring, and to make changes to improve student learning—across the institution. In general, the College describes efforts towards coordination of evaluation and planning, and demonstrates evidence in accomplishing the first two items, but provides limited perspective on using that data to guide broad institutional improvement. Although the 2008-2013 Educational Master Plan offers a "Six Years in Review 2002-2008," including a summary of activities the college accomplished in achieving the goals set forth in the previous Educational Master Plan, evidence does not exist in assessing how these activities improved the institution's effectiveness in meeting its mission or how those activities improved the institution. As such, baseline data, benchmarks, targets, timelines, or measurable outcomes were not evident.

While progress has been made in identifying student learning outcomes at the course level, assessment of those outcomes is limited, and program-level student learning assessment is extremely limited, with program-level outcomes only being reported for career/technical programs with external accreditation processes. The structure of the program review processes are tightly coupled with budget development, yet no evidence can be identified that demonstrates how these evaluation processes guide institutional dialogue about institutional improvement. There is limited evidence that program reviews are informed by results of SLO assessment, or that the results of program reviews lead to institutional improvements.

Evidence of summative analysis of evaluation measures that leads to an analysis of institutional effectiveness and organizational improvement is formative at best. The college has seemingly developed processes, but it is unclear as to whether the processes are measurable, it is unclear who owns the various evaluation processes, and it is unclear

as to how accountability is measured within the processes. To that end, the alignment of institutional evaluation and improvement processes does not fully exist at Los Angeles City College.

## **Findings and Evidence**

### Mission

The Los Angeles City College mission statement, institutional goals, and objectives are linked to the needs of the student population as exemplified by the demographics of the community served as reported by students and described in the College Profile. The mission statement has been vetted through the college governance system and was Board approved in July, 2008 as evidenced by the college catalogue (I.A.1 and 2). Additionally, Institutional Core Competencies are reflective of college discussion of the College Profile. (I.A.1 and 2).

Evidence does not exist as to the process by which the College will systematically and periodically review the institutional mission statement (I.A.3). However, the mission statement was recently revised. The team suggests that LACC develop a timeline using the institution's governance and decision-making processes to guide it in the regular reviews of the mission to fully meet this standard. (I.A.3).

### Improving Institutional Effectiveness

LACC engages in continuous dialogue about the improvement of student learning and updates to course outlines. Evidence of this is seen in the Curriculum Committee course review guidelines and in the template for program review (I.B.1). Representation on these shared governance committees is appointed from across the institution, therefore structurally providing for broad-based participation in the dialogue. A review of the agendas and minutes indicates participation; however, it is noted that employee participation in governance structures needs to be more broad-based as the team noted that several members of the college community hold multiple roles within the shared governance system.

As noted in I.A, LACC's goals are responsive to the highly diverse community it serves. The college community is committed to students and engages in dialogue to support students, as typified in its institutional goals (access, success, accountability, and partnerships), its mission statement, and its vision statement. However, while the goals have not yet been defined in measurable terms as asked in I.B.2, it is clear that the organization is working towards the achievement of goals—and works to allocate resources through the program review process and the annual unit plan development.

The Strategic Implementation Grid describes the means by which the college community will execute its strategic priorities as asked in I.B.3. However, evidence does not exist that the organization re-evaluates its planning and improvement processes or has a systematic or routine structure or consciousness in doing so.

The Program Review Process as typified by the reports reviewed and the Annual Unit Plan Process as evidenced by the plans reviewed suggested that the current cycle of

evaluation and planning is tightly coupled with resource allocation and implementation. Continued work in re-evaluation is needed. Standard I.B.4 and I.B.5, which require that these processes be broad-based and inclusive, are met as both processes are managed through the shared governance process, and both processes require both quantitative and qualitative data.

Evidence of systematic and periodical assessment of the effectiveness of all institutional services and processes to be used for institutional improvement as required by I.B.6 and I.B.7 is uneven and minimal. Continued effort is needed by the institution in systematically evaluating its own processes—and documenting improvements of the processes and institution.

## **Conclusions**

As LACC continues to evolve into an organization that makes decisions based on evidence—of student learning, of program review and accountability, of institutional mission effectiveness, of institutional improvement, reflection should accompany the dialogue—dialogue that is robust, ongoing, pervasive, and consistent. While considerable research went into developing the College Profile and the accompanying information about the students and community served, the next step must be an analysis of what the data mean. Beyond knowing that these needs exist based on the demographic data, how is the college community grappling with the data—and acting accordingly? Additionally, how is the college community engaging the external community in articulating its needs and expectations rather than prescribing what the college believes the community needs?

In evaluating institutional effectiveness using the ACCJC Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness, the college has not adequately evidenced a level of implementation beyond the level of development, with some elements of proficiency, and as such, the college falls below the standard. To that end, the evidence suggests that the institution has defined a planning process and assigned responsibility for implementing it, has identified and uses quantitative and qualitative data, has linked institutional planning with the mission statement, and has engaged broad internal constituent input in planning processes.

However, Los Angeles City College did not provide evidence that it has a well-documented, ongoing process for evaluating itself and using data analysis in planning and implementing improvements. While the college has developed component parts of a strategic planning process, additional evidence is needed to demonstrate longitudinal, ongoing, and systematic reflection and analysis.

## **Recommendations**

1. In order to increase institutional effectiveness and meet standards, the team recommends that the college more systematically use the results of program/unit reviews to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement, learning, support services, and institutional processes. (I.B.1-7; II.A.2; II.B.4; II.C.2; III.B.2; III.C.2; III.D.3; IV.A.5).

2. To meet standards, the team recommends that the college develop a robust and comprehensive professional development program to both enhance institutional effectiveness practices and promote institutional engagement by all employee groups. (I.B; III.A.2; III.A.5, IV.A.5).

3. In order to improve, the team recommends that the college engage in succession planning to increase leadership capacity, institutional consistency, and employee involvement and engagement. (I.B; III.A.2; III.A.5; IV.A.5).

4. To meet standards, the team recommends that the college strengthen the research function in order to provide continuous and meaningful analysis of data and apply the finding to program improvement. (I.B.2-3; I.B.5-6; II.A.1.a; II.B.3.e; II.B.4; II.C.2; III.B.2; III.C.2; III.D.3).

## **STANDARD II STUDENT LEARNING PROGRAMS AND SERVICES**

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

#### **General Observations**

Standard II.A. presents the quality of the instructional programs at LACC in addition to the dialogue and procedures followed for updating courses, creating new courses and programs, and completing the online comprehensive program review. Within the Institutional Self Study, the Self Study Update 2009, and the site visit itself, there seems to be a conscious effort to include faculty and staff on committees and decision making, to dialogue collegewide, and to communicate with students so that they are aware of course offerings, program requirements, and policies.

Since the last team accreditation visit in 2003, LACC has made progress in recognizing the importance of assessment related to student learning. With few exceptions, faculty seem more understanding of the importance of articulating learning outcomes as an eventual means of evaluating pedagogy, thereby leading to improved teaching and learning. A large number of faculty are engaged in articulating student learning outcomes for their discipline courses. In fact, the Self Study Update 2009 states that as of fall 2008, approximately 70% of all courses listed in the LACC catalog had identified learning outcomes. Of concern campuswide are the lack of assessment of student learning outcomes and the review of assessment results to improve student learning.

LACC's descriptive summary and self evaluation of all the major points and sub points of Standard II.A address the quality of its courses and programs and the shortcomings it plans to address.

#### **Findings and Evidence**

##### Program Integrity

In the LACC Institutional Self Study, the beginning of Standard II, Section A does not address the question: How does the institution ensure that all institutional offerings fit the stated mission of the institution? The Self Study Update 2009 states: "The college's mission and vision statements provide the overarching principles that guide the development of all the college's plans." A diagram of the Los Angeles City College Master Planning Process links the mission and vision statements to the master planning process. This standard is partially met (II.A.1.a).

Campus leadership recognizes the need to encourage all faculty to take advantage of new educational technologies by offering workshops and training. This standard is met (II.A.1.b.).

The development of the college's Core Competencies involved campuswide dialogue of all constituents of the college. Numerous workshops have also provided opportunities for dialogue. In addition, professors and instructors of each discipline seem to work collegially to create student learning outcomes, and it is their responsibility to develop measurable SLOs for each course. The Core Competencies are used as the focus of the outcomes. It seems that faculty and staff are aware of and discuss the identification of outcomes; development of SLOs at the course level within departments has been steady since LACC's last accreditation visit. The creation of new courses or programs includes dialogue and a defined procedure. Assessment of stated learning outcomes has fallen behind, and LACC will need to use assessment results to plan and implement course, program, certificate, and degree improvements in order to meet the Commission's 2012 deadline and to reach the Proficiency level on the Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness Part III (Student Learning Outcomes). This standard is partially met (II.A.1.a.; II.A.2.b.; II.A.1.c).

The self study does indicate that there is a need to evaluate projects. The Basic Skills Initiative Self Assessment planning matrix and the Annual Unit Plan prioritization process need to be reviewed for effectiveness, but no planning agenda accompanies this noted shortcoming. This standard is partially met (II.A.1.a).

#### Degree Programs

All degree programs at LACC include a focused study in at least one area of inquiry as evidenced in the college catalog. In addition, career and technical degree holders, such as those in radiologic technology, dental technology, and dietetics technicians, pass various state or national board exams at an impressive rate. This standard is met (II.A.4 and 5).

#### Program Quality

All Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs have advisory committees. Program review documents give evidence that through these committees' input, the CTE departments remain current of industry trends and develop new courses and programs. With input from discipline representatives, advisory committees, and outside accrediting agencies, where appropriate, discipline faculty initiate new courses or programs; the college then has a systematic review process that involves the Curriculum Committee, the Academic Senate, and ultimately the Curriculum Committee chairs of each district campus. Instructors are required to follow the approved course outline, as documented in the current Basic and Comprehensive Evaluation for All Faculty in the Agreement between the Los Angeles Community College District and the Los Angeles College Faculty Guild (AFT). There is little evidence that programs outside of CTE follow the same systematic review process. This standard is partially met (II.A.2.a, b, and c).

In addressing student achievement, the college asserts: "Students completing LACC's published certificates and transfer programs have demonstrated knowledge and skills in their elected career and technical areas, and/or their abilities to think and communicate clearly and effectively both orally and in writing; they can use mathematics; they can understand the modes of inquiry of the major disciplines; they are aware of other cultures and times; they achieve insights gained through experience in thinking about ethical

problems; they have developed the capacity for self-understanding” (pp. 96-97). Yet, these assertions are not supported by evidence (II.A.2.h.). Recommendation 1 from the 2003 Team Report recommended that the college document “the achievement of its intended institutional outcomes, and ... [use] the results of this assessment for institutional improvement.” Although the research office has collected and disseminated statistics for vital signs and behavioral measures (in part through the Campus Climate Survey and Student Survey) and these data were part of the discussion focused around each strategic plan priority, the response to this recommendation indicates that LACC has yet to assess outcomes collegewide.

Assessment of educational needs is determined through placement exams and student surveys. The Student Satisfaction Survey, conducted every other year, seems to be a primary source of data used to assess students’ perception of program and service quality.

Through the program review process, the college evaluates the effectiveness of its courses and programs. Comprehensive program reviews, analyzing relevancy, appropriateness, currency, and planning goals, are conducted every six years for all programs; biennial reviews, showing progress toward goals set in the six-year program review, are conducted every two years; and annual unit plans, outlining budget needs, are conducted every fall semester. Program review includes data relevant to the program. Funding is requested based on needs in the program review and annual unit plan processes. While these standards are met (I.A.2.c.; II.A.2.e), in order to meet the 2012 deadline, LACC needs to accelerate its analysis of student achievement and student learning outcome assessment data to inform planning and implementation of improvements.

The comprehensive program review includes the Department Mission, the Department Overview (including response to demand, student achievements, and FTEF), Vocational Programs (including labor market demand, advisory board, comparable programs, and program accreditation), Curriculum (including program delivery and effectiveness of current courses, Title 5 updates and SLO assessment, archived and deleted courses, student learning outcomes and assessment, proposed new course and changes, course scheduling, and course consistency), Departmental Engagement, Professional Development, Support and Activities, Resources, Facilities, Planning and Budgeting, and Final Summary by Discipline. (II.A.2.e).

In January 2004, LACC appointed an SLO coordinator; in March 2004, a Student Learning Outcomes Task Force was established, later recreated as an Assessment Team. In February 2005, the Office of Academic Affairs sponsored a collegewide SLO workshop and hired consultants to provide training for academic departments and student services programs. For the 2005-2006 academic year, SLOs became a line item in the college budget. By October 2008, 70 percent of the courses at LACC had identified SLOs. As courses go through Title 5 updates, the course outlines of record include student learning outcomes. The majority of faculty members include SLOs on their course syllabi. Beginning summer 2005, SLOs were identified for new and updated courses. A member of the assessment team reviews all SLOs, and they must have the

signature of the department chair, three members of the discipline, the SLO coordinator, and the curriculum chair. The Curriculum Committee reviews learning outcomes for all new courses before approval for inclusion in the curriculum.

However, program SLOs have yet to be developed; the focus has been on the articulation of course SLOs. eLumen has been adopted as the instrument for documenting SLO assessment. The college believes that this new web-based reporting and assessment software will greatly increase the college's ability to enhance SLO assessment practices and procedures and, in turn, will inform faculty in their effort of reform to improve pedagogy and student learning and success. With this software, course-level outcomes will assess program and institutional outcomes through the use of eLumen. This standard is partially met (II.A.1.c.; II.A.2.a.; II.A.2.f.).

The college's response to Recommendation 2 from the previous accreditation visit states, "With strong faculty leadership, administrative support, and broad-based institutional involvement, the college has made excellent progress in addressing this recommendation" (p. 42). Faculty leadership—the SLO coordinator and SLO Assessment Team—and administrative support as well as institutional dialogue have supported SLO articulation, evident in many of LACC's courses. SLOs have been institutionalized by inclusion in the 2008 comprehensive program review and 2006 biennial review. Course SLOs are required in the course approval process. In its response to Recommendation 2, the college acknowledges that assessment of SLOs has been a slow process. Indeed, a review of the 2008 comprehensive program reviews reveals that most of the instructional programs have not begun to assess SLOs.

As of the site visit, only four courses, one each in the English Department, Child and Family Studies Department, Foreign Languages and Humanities Department, and Media Arts Department, have completed the SLO assessment cycle. Twelve other departments are in the process of assessing 20 courses, but all departments need to be engaged in the SLO assessment cycle if the college is to meet the college leadership expectations that the learning outcomes assessment cycle will be completed in 2012 and the Commission's expectations as defined in the Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness Part III will be met. This standard is partially met (II.A.2.h.).

Assessment is lacking in a number of areas at LACC. Information from assessments is incorporated into the online six-year program review, biennial reports, and annual unit plans; however, the greater majority of instructional departments have not begun assessment of SLOs as evidenced in the 2008 Comprehensive Program Review. The Self Study Update 2009 acknowledges that the college has been slow in moving through the assessment cycle. This standard is partially met (II.A.2.h.).

Currently, there are no SLOs or assessments of student achievement for degrees and certificates. The college plans that the eventual assessment practices across college departments recorded in eLumen will show evidence that degrees and certificates are awarded based on achievement of student learning outcomes. eLumen maps achievement through the college Core Competences. This standard is not met (II.A.2.i.).

The English/ESL Department uses departmental exams on a voluntary basis. However, validation of student learning outcomes is only beginning to be part of the process. This standard is partially met (II.A.2.g.).

Currently, eleven programs in student services have established student learning outcomes, and during summer 2009, two student services areas plan to assess outcomes. Student services plans to complete assessment by 2011. This standard is partially met (II.A.2.f.).

The Curriculum Committee has designed an addendum form for online courses to guide faculty in their development, and the Distance Education Committee, created in 2007 and chaired by the president of the Academic Senate, developed a list of faculty who were trained and are qualified to teach online courses. The Distance Education Committee has developed a number of policies and procedures; however, a distance education program is not fully developed and is still in the developmental phase. There is no evidence of the effectiveness of the delivery modes and instructional methodologies. This standard is partially met (II.A.2.d.).

#### General Education

A good deal of discussion and involvement of the LACC community existed in the development of the college's core competencies. In 2004, the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Team, in conjunction with the Academic Senate and Staff and Organizational Development, conducted an open forum. More than 100 participants—comprising faculty, staff, administrators, and students—responded to the question, “What skills and abilities do we expect all LACC graduates to possess?” The result was the development of the LACC Institutional Core Competencies as the essence of student learning outcomes. These core competencies outlined in three areas the abilities and skills expected of all graduates. The three areas include (1) the essential academic skills, encompassing critical thinking, written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning, and technological literacy; (2) personal growth and development, including self growth, intellectual engagement and physical wellness, ethical reasoning, and aesthetic appreciation; and (3) interpersonal/intercultural/global awareness, incorporating personal interaction, community participation, and intercultural exploration. The LACC Core Competencies emphasize the content and methodology of all the major areas of knowledge for general education. Currently, the Core Competencies are not assessed to determine how well students are able to apply their understanding to subsequent coursework, employment, or other endeavors. These standards are partially met (II.A.1.a.; II.A.3.a.; II.A.3.b.; II.A.3.c.).

#### Information

The college has not eliminated any programs since the last accreditation visit; however, a satellite campus, the Wilshire Center, has undergone viability studies because of declining enrollments. The Wilshire Center is now called City College at Wilshire in a different, more conveniently located building. The viability study is a collaborative governance process, including meetings by the Educational Planning Committee, the

Shared Governance Committee, and the Academic Senate. Recommendations are made to the college president, who makes a final decision. In the LACC Institutional Self Study, it was unclear if there is a process for the elimination of a program or program requirements and the arrangement for those students in such programs to complete their educational requirements. However, the Self Study Update 2009 added a new planning agenda that stated the Education Planning Committee would expand the Program Viability Process by defining the process to include specific information regarding the method by which enrolled students may complete their education. This standard is met (II.A.6.b.).

The college has the schedule of classes, student services, and student policies and responsibilities online. The information is readily accessible. Although students at LACC are given a free school email account, few students use this service, prompting the college to consider a policy requiring students to have an active email address for the dissemination of important student information about the college. LACC would also like to institute new methods for ensuring the accuracy and timeliness of information in its schedule of classes. This standard is met (II.A.6.c.).

LACC clearly communicates to students in print and online the regular schedule of classes. Also available in print and online are LACC policies related to student behavior and responsibility and the transfer process. The college has self identified the need to develop policies and procedures for aligning learning outcomes for transfer credits comparable to LACC courses. This standard is met (II.A.6.a.).

#### Academic Freedom

The Board of Trustees, the Academic Senate, and the American Federation of Teachers have clearly stated policies on academic freedom. The self study states that district policies of academic freedom are made public in the LACC college catalog and schedule of classes, which was confirmed by the team. This standard is met (II.A.7.a.).

The college publishes policies on student conduct online and in print in the college catalog, the schedule of classes, and student handbook under the Standards of Student Conduct. Student services offices provide brochures on student services and due process rights and guidelines for student complaints and grievances. This standard is met (II.A.7.b.).

LACC does not require conformity to specific codes of conduct or seek to instill specific beliefs. It does not offer curricula in foreign locations to students other than U. S. nationals. This standard is met (II.A.7.c.; II.A.8.).

#### **Recommendations**

See Recommendations 1 through 4

5. In order to meet Commission standards by 2012, the team recommends that the college fully implement the development and assessment of student learning outcomes at the course and program level and use the assessment results for program improvement. (Eligibility Requirement 10, Standards II.A.1.a; II.A.1.c; II.A.2; II.A.3; II.A.5; II.B.4; II.C.2; III.A.1.c)

## **II.B. Student Support Services**

### **General Observations:**

Standard II. B. appears to have been written by different authors and thus, there seems to be unevenness to the approach in the descriptive summaries and self-evaluations. The narratives provided in the self study do not do justice to what is actually taking place in the different programs. In addition, evidence to support statements and more in-depth descriptions of evaluation/assessment processes was not readily discernible. The interviews and review of documents provided a much more comprehensive view of the processes and structures and revealed a greater commitment and proactive approach than what was described in the self study.

In general, the lack of documentation to substantiate certain statements that were made throughout this standard seriously impacted the effectiveness of the self-study.

### **Findings and Evidence**

#### Integrity

It is evident that the college is dedicated to serving its highly diverse student population as demonstrated by faculty, staff, and administration's commitment, attitudes, and behavior. This was determined through interviews and forums with staff, faculty, administration, and students. Formal, written processes and structures exist; however, there is no evidence that these actually guide institutional action. . There is clear evidence that student services has actively engaged in the program review process and has readily embraced student learning outcomes. There has been on-going dialogue and a dynamic, evolving process to improve the program review process and the identification of student learning outcomes. There is anecdotal evidence but no written documentation that the program review process is integrated with program planning, budget, and program improvement. This standard is partially met (II.B.1, II.B.4.1).

#### Catalog

The team confirmed that LACC produces a catalog with information about the college, requirements, major policies affecting students and location or publication where other policies may be found. Although the self-study cited a concern regarding the timeliness of the catalog, an online version is available to students. The college is addressing problems that interfere with a timely publication and expects to resolve the issues by the end of this academic year. This standard is met (II.B. 2.a-d).

#### Learning Support Needs

It was not readily apparent in the self study and document review how student services utilizes research to identify the learning support needs of its student population and designs programs to address those needs. As an example, the study cites the planned opening of an educational center in the historic Van de Kamp building in 2009. However, there was no related documentation describing what target population will be served, how services will be delivered, or what the rationale and research was behind this decision.

(II.B.3). Interviews revealed that research and data are collected and analyzed to improve delivery of services but the consistency of this process within all the departments is not clearly evident.

The college is committed to assuring equitable access to all of its students by providing appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable services to students regardless of location or delivery of method. Student services are provided not only on the main campus, but also at the City College at Wilshire, as well as providing on-line accessibility of some student services. During peak periods, demand and access to student services pose a challenge. Also, timeliness of access to services is an on-going challenge. Though Counseling has struggled to keep up with the high demand for services, various efforts have been made to address this demand. The counseling department has utilized different strategies such as collaborative efforts with other student services departments, utilizing a flexible appointment schedule to accommodate more students, and initiating an intern program. In addition, the college has committed to hiring two new counseling faculty and the Counseling department is seeking to develop online counseling capability. The department also engages in dialogue with instructional faculty to provide an understanding of counseling responsibilities and their role in achieving college goals. The college also offers an impressive variety of special programs and projects that serve a very diverse student population. In addition, the college will also be breaking ground in Spring 2010 for a new One Stop Student Services Center. This standard is met (II.B.3.a).

There is change in the focus from student activities/student government to a leadership development model. Students who are interested in leadership development are able to participate in a newly developed course that focuses on the scholarly leader engaging in personal and civic responsibility. Students are afforded opportunities to develop leadership skills in different venues. As a result, there has been an increase in the student participation rate in the leadership class as well as more faculty participation. A number of innovative activities have been implemented to enhance student life at Los Angeles City College. Among those activities includes Explore L.A. where faculty and students experience the multitude of attractions that Los Angeles affords. The goal of the program is to provide students the opportunity to fully engage in a holistic learning experience beyond the classroom. This standard is met (II.B.3.b).

The college engages in a regular and structured program review process that includes the counseling program that supports student development. There is also a concerted effort to provide faculty and other personnel involved in the advising function to continually engage in professional development opportunities. There are twice monthly meetings to share information; counselors and staff regularly attend conferences; and peer-facilitated workshops are provided on a regular basis. This standard is met (II.3.c).

The college provides appropriate programs, practices and services that support and enhance student understanding and appreciation of diversity. This endeavor is exemplified in the college's various and numerous diversity programs and activities and demonstrated in interviews with staff, faculty, administrators, and students. This standard is met (IIB.3.d).

The institution engages in a structured process to regularly evaluate its placement instruments and practices to validate the effectiveness of the instruments and minimize biases. The validation process is conducted in a timely manner. The college permanently, securely, and confidentially maintains student records. There is a secure, fireproof vault that contains hard copies of older records as well as microfiche files. Records have also been scanned and stored in the college's computer system with a secure, second back-up system. This standard is met (II.B.3.e.; II.B.3.f).

## **Conclusions**

Student Services personnel have demonstrated a strong commitment to serving a diverse student population. Frequent discussion and dialogue take place within departments as well as across departments. Collaboration takes place and creative endeavors have been implemented to optimize the delivery of service. However, because of high student demand, timely access to services is a challenge.

Student Services has clearly embraced the program review process and the identification of student learning outcomes. This process has been incorporated into planning and budget. Data analysis for program improvement also has taken place. However, a concerted, systematic effort needs to take place that more accurately describes and documents this structure and process.

## **Recommendations**

See Recommendations 1, 4 and 5.

## **II.C. Library and Learning Support Services**

### **General Observations**

Standard II.C. addresses each area within the standard and is well-written, candid and supported by a number of evidence links. It was anticipated that the new MLK, Jr. Library would provide the much needed space to increase student access to computers and to expanded library services and collections. During the site visit, it was apparent during a tour and in conversation with faculty, staff, and students that the opening of the new library in Summer 2008 has fulfilled these expectations. In addition, the college has continued to commit basic resources to provide learning support services for its very diverse student population in tutoring, learning centers, computer laboratories, and learning technology development and training through such programs as the Learning Skills Center, the Pi Shoppe, the English/ESL Writing Center, the Speech Therapy Clinic, and the High Technology Center in the Office of Special Services. It was apparent, through interviews, observations, and evidence provided, that faculty expertise and that of support staff are instrumental in developing, providing, and assessing the library and learning support services. To ensure student development of information competency, regular one-hour bibliographic instruction sessions are provided to classes at the request of individual faculty members. Also, two courses, Library Science 101-Research Methods, and Library Science 102-Internet Research Methods, provide students with more formal classroom learning opportunities to develop their research skills and to apply them to classroom assignments.

### **Findings and Evidence**

#### Quality

LACC clearly supports and commits to the success of its students by constructing the new library and sustaining a variety of learning support services. The opening of the new MLK, Jr. Library in Summer 2008 has been a major factor in increasing student access to computers and to expanding library services and collections. The depth and quantity of learning support services are evident in the Learning Skills Center, the English/ESL Writing Center, the Pi Shoppe, the High Tech Center in the OSS, and the Speech Therapy Clinic.

The college relies on librarians and faculty expertise in selecting materials for library collections to support the curriculum and programs offered and essential to support students with their learning activities and assignments. Procedures in place include a librarian serving as a member of the curriculum committee and the library department chair signing off on new courses and/or programs. These procedures ensure that the librarians are aware and informed of the scope, content, and possible assignments of new curricula and programs, so that plans for acquiring necessary collections and materials can be made. Although funding for library collections, materials, and subscription to electronic databases is minimal during the current fiscal constraints, efforts are made to provide the essential resources to support student learning by continuously evaluating and

prioritizing resources based on available funding. The new MLK, Jr. Library has increased student access to computers and individual and group study areas. Student surveys conducted in 2002, 2005, and 2007 provide feedback on use of and satisfaction with the library and its services. This standard is met (II.C.1.a).

On-demand, one hour bibliographic instruction (BI) sessions are provided to classes at the request of individual faculty members. Evidence provided included a sample list of BI sessions, the participating faculty, and surveys of faculty who used this service and provided feedback of general satisfaction. No process is currently in place for students to evaluate the bibliographic sessions. A librarian is assigned to the reference desk to teach individual students how to do research while also assisting them in finding the information they need for classroom assignments. Library Science 101-Research Methods, and Library Science 102-Internet Research Methods, provide students with more formal classroom learning opportunities to develop their research skills and to apply them to classroom assignments. This standard is met (II.C.1.b).

Student access to the library and other learning support services for tutoring, various learning centers, and learning technology development and training is adequate. Hours of operation are clearly posted at the facilities, in the class schedule, and on some department websites. Access to online library materials and databases is provided and visibly posted on the library's website. Student surveys in 2002, 2005, and 2007 indicate frequent use of the library and general satisfaction with its services. However, faculty, staff, and students expressed concerns in interviews and forums that recent budget constraints have negatively affected the hours of operation in some areas and the services provided, particularly in tutoring. The learning support service areas do not have a formal process for students to evaluate their services, although faculty and staff indicated an interest in exploring such an evaluation and felt the information would be useful for planning purposes. This standard is met (II.C.1.c).

Several security measures have been included in the new library and were noted as very positive improvements through interviews with faculty and staff. It was also stated that maintenance efforts are evident and have improved since the opening of the new library but that a planning agenda has still been included in the self-study for II.C.1.d. to address campus-wide issues for addressing the scheduling and regular cleaning of high profile areas. Maintenance and security issues were also noted for the Speech Therapy Clinic in the self study but to a lesser degree than the library. This standard is met (II.C.1.d).

LACC collaborates with other institutions, including Cal State Los Angeles, to provide access to both electronic and print resources and services to students. Participation in local, regional, and national level database consortiums also expand library resources for students. The college has agreements with Westlaw/Lexis-Nexis to support the research needs of its paralegal students. These resources are noted on the library's website and the level of student access of such resources can be determined through monthly reports. This standard is met (II.C.1.e).

### Evaluation

The student surveys conducted in 2002, 2005, and 2007 provide a general evaluation of student use and satisfaction with the library and its services. Feedback in these surveys was used in part to design the library facilities, particularly including increased computer workstations and small study rooms for group work. The library has also tracked the volume of reference desk use to schedule appropriate librarian support. Faculty, staff, and administration in other learning support service areas stated that they informally and anecdotally determine that their services meet the needs of students but currently have no formal process for gathering this information. Students in the Learning Skills Center stated they were very appreciative of the support and help they receive but would like more hours and more tutors available. No program learning outcomes have been developed for the library or for any of the learning support services areas. This standard is partially met (II.C.2).

### **Conclusions**

The team applauds LACC's commitment to providing and sustaining a variety and depth of library and learning support services for its very diverse student population, the opening of the new library, the Learning Skills Center, the English/ESL Writing Center, the Math Pi Shoppe, the High Technology Center in OSS, and the Speech Therapy Clinic. The genuine dedication from the faculty, staff, and administration in these learning support service areas is apparent and contribute to the positive and successful learning experiences of the students. Developing program level student learning outcomes and assessments and including them in the program review process should provide a systematic, continuous evaluation process for gathering student input and analyzing data on how the library and learning support service programs are meeting the identified needs of students and to implement changes to improve services based on such data.

### **Recommendations**

See Recommendations 1, 4 and 5.

## **STANDARD III RESOURCES**

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

#### **General Observations**

The college and district are to be congratulated for taking the first step in spring 2008 to modify their collective bargaining agreement to acknowledge the importance of participation in the assessment of student learning in faculty evaluations. A task force proposed linking faculty professional development goals to assessed institutional and departmental student learning outcomes. This linkage, when fully implemented, should ensure that individual faculty members make a positive contribution to the ongoing improvement in student learning. (III.A.1.c).

#### **Findings and Evidence**

##### Employee Qualifications, Selection and Evaluation

LACC employs a qualified and dedicated faculty and staff who are committed to student learning and success. The hiring policy and procedures are designed to select qualified applicants committed to the institutional mission and goals. Job announcements are clear, and criteria for selection are established by the faculty. An Academic Senate representative and a compliance office representative sit on each hiring committee. The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) has a personnel commission that determines position qualifications and establishes lists for classified service. The commission verifies that all classified staff meet the minimum qualifications. The selection process includes several steps such as identification of vacancies, position announcements, evaluation of the applicants, job interviews, and hiring. This standard is met (III.A.1.a).

Faculty and staff are evaluated in accordance with the terms and conditions of their collective bargaining agreements. Both the district and the college admit that evaluations are often late. The district has implemented an email notification system to alert supervisors and administrators when evaluations are due. The system sends weekly reminders when an evaluation is late and continues the weekly reminders until the evaluation is submitted. Since the implementation of the notification system the timeliness of evaluations has improved. Documented evidence on campus confirms that this standard is met (III.A.1.b). The evaluation of administration and board members is covered under Standard IV of this document.

As noted above the faculty bargaining agreement was modified in spring 2008 to link faculty participation in the assessment of student learning outcomes to professional development and faculty evaluation. Effective with the new AFT Agreement (2008 – 2011) faculty will be evaluated on the following criterion: (For all faculty) “Participates in the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle” (for classroom faculty, includes approved SLOs on class syllabi). The Team acknowledges both the district and the

college on successfully negotiating this new evaluation standard. The plan to then link assessment and improvement of student learning to staff development activities is laudable. These actions are clear manifestation of the leadership and commitment of the faculty to improve learning and enhance institutional effectiveness. This standard is met (III.A.1.b-c).

The self study stated that the college publishes and enforces a code of conduct for all employees. This code is available on the district website, and there is no documented evidence of violations of the ethics code in the past six years. This standard is met (III.A.1.d).

### Sufficiency of Human Resources

LACC employs 193 full-time faculty including 25 chairs, 460 part-time faculty members, and 43 regular and hourly non-teaching faculty. All faculty meet state-mandated minimum qualifications and thus are qualified to conduct the institution's programs. The college has 294 classified staff and 17 administrators. LACC has experienced high turnover in numerous key administrative positions over the past six years and can anticipate future changes resulting from retirement, resignation and transfer. The team recommends that the college engage in succession planning to increase leadership capacity, institutional consistency, and employee involvement and engagement.

Requests to fill vacant positions are initiated at the department level or by unit managers. Positions are prioritized by the EPC based first on emergency and then on the length of the vacancy, enrollment demands, the number and availability of part-time faculty, and the ability to provide the full sequence of courses for a program. Faculty hiring will increase in 2009 and 2010 to meet the full-time faculty obligation. This standard is met (III.A.2).

### Administration of Policies and Security of Records

The self study stated that personnel policies are systematically and fairly applied in good faith by those responsible at the college. Interviews on campus confirmed this assertion. This standard is met (III.A.3.a).

Official personnel files are maintained at the district, and a copy is also kept at the college. Access to personnel files is limited to the human resources director and the vice president of administration. There is ample evidence to indicate that protections and safeguards are in place to ensure security and confidentiality of the college's personnel records. This standard is met (III.A.3.b).

### Equity and Diversity

The district's office of diversity programs promotes diversity and equal opportunity, and investigates, and resolves issues pertaining to discrimination complaints. The Compliance Officer is the campus representative of that office. There is no college plan or program

designed to promote diversity or to enhance awareness and support its diverse personnel. The college may indeed be one of, if not the most, diverse institution in the state by virtue of its location alone, yet there is no active program to celebrate and secure the value of that diversity or to assess its impact on student learning. There is evident heartfelt commitment by faculty and staff to participate in student programs and clubs that enhance the student experience at LACC. That commitment is reflected in the job announcements for faculty positions that highlight the LACC's "long tradition of innovation and responsiveness to the changing needs of the times and its more than 17,000 students." The Title 5 requirement that applicants be sensitive to and aware of the diverse academic, socioeconomic, cultural, differently abled and ethnic backgrounds of community college students is listed under major duties and responsibilities rather than as a minimum qualification. Students repeatedly told the team that LACC is a welcoming supportive environment that makes them feel valued and "at home". This standard is partially met (III.A.4.a-c).

### Professional Development

LACC reorganized the professional development activities so that both the Staff and Organizational Development Office and the Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) report to the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness (vacant) and are housed at the same location. The Director of Staff Development position is currently vacant, and as a result, only basic, required training is offered at this time. The TLC Director coordinates technical training for faculty and staff and assists staff in finding suitable training opportunities. On-campus training and development opportunities are generally posted on "This Week" the College weekly update for students and employees. This standard is met (III.A.5.a-b).

### Integration of Human Resource Planning

LACC assesses the effective use of human resources through the administrative program review process and through the Climate Survey. Since this was the first year that Administrative Services participated in the program review process it is not clear how the results of program review will be used for improvement and for enhancing institutional effectiveness. Human Resource Planning focused on requests for positions and is incorporated into Program Review to anticipate the need for additional staff. The request must be made in an Annual Unit Plan in order to be considered. The Educational Planning Committee determines which positions will receive priority. The first priority goes to emergency hires. The criteria used for other positions include the term of the vacant position, the need based on increased enrollment or providing adequate instruction for sequenced courses and the availability of part-time faculty. This standard is met (III.A.6).

### **Conclusion**

The link between planning and resource allocation should be established and practiced with respect to human resources. The college should implement its comprehensive program review and link the results of such reviews to various planning processes and to

resource allocation. The team reiterates its concern about the absence of planning agendas for Human Resources.

### **Recommendations**

See recommendations 1 through 5

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

### **General Observations**

LACC is in the midst of construction development and renovation as a result of the passage of the district's \$2.2 billion Proposition A/AA and the \$3.7 billion Measure J. LACC's campus renovation and upgrade program includes the recently completed Martin Luther King, Jr. Library and a new 900-space parking structure with an athletic field and track on top. Construction continues and is near completion on the Child and Family Studies Building scheduled to open in spring 2009 and a new \$38 million Science and Technology Building scheduled to open in summer 2009. The Science and Technology Building will present a new campus gateway adjacent to the MTA's Redline Vermont/Santa Monica subway station. The renovation of Franklin Hall is scheduled for completion in winter, 2010. The accreditation survey results and interviews with faculty, staff and administrators indicate that the college's physical resources are sufficient to support its programs and services thereby supporting that the standard is met. (III.B.1) The college has one main off-campus temporary leased facility to alleviate the shortage of space during construction. Northeast Campus, the new off-campus location, will open its doors in fall 2009. A determination of whether the college will continue to operate at the Wilshire Center is pending. The college should be commended for its forward thinking regarding the use of green technology in constructing its new facilities.

### **Findings and Evidence**

#### Sufficiency and Safety

The college has undertaken a number of activities to improve the cleanliness of its classrooms and restrooms. The vice president of Administrative Services has aggressively addressed these issues by refocusing the efforts of the staff, purchasing new equipment, providing training on cleaning techniques, instituting a closely followed routine maintenance schedule and developing an automated system to respond to and track work orders. In addition, the college has embarked on a public relations campaign to improve the cleanliness of the grounds and facilities. Despite the college's efforts to change the face of the campus through the new modern structures, keeping the restrooms clean remains a challenge. The college recognizes some challenges stemming from the location of the campus in the heart of an economically depressed urban area. Nevertheless, visits to a number of restroom facilities in different buildings on campus indicate that cleanliness is evident despite the fact that the buildings themselves are relatively old. The off campus facility at Wilshire was in good condition with respect to cleanliness.

The district contracts with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department to provide onsite security for LACC. The Sheriff's local site commander participates in administrative service management meetings to discuss issues of importance to safeguard the environment. The contract with the Sheriff's Department is evaluated periodically.

Evaluations of the sheriff's performance through focus groups of faculty, staff, and students provide opportunities for improvement. Visits to the off campus facility at Wilshire indicate that security is well maintained. This standard is met (III.B.1.b).

### Planning and Evaluation

There is evidence to indicate that physical resource planning appears to be generally integrated with institutional planning through the Educational Master Plan and the Long-range Facilities Master Plan. Evaluations of facilities and equipment are carried out regularly. As a result, the college is embarking on a public relations campaign in spring 2009 to improve the cleanliness of grounds and facilities. New signs appeared in the classrooms to advise students against eating or drinking inside the room. The campaign for campus cleanliness appears to have paid dividends, particularly during the accreditation team's visit. The self study did not explicitly address the issue of efficient space utilization in terms of time and square footage. However, discussion with college personnel indicates that industry standards are used in determining efficient space utilization. This standard is met (III.B.2.a-b).

### **Conclusion**

The self study states that the college relies on program review, campus climate surveys, and focus groups to evaluate the effectiveness of facilities in meeting the needs of programs and services. With the exception of the climate survey, the self study did not provide any specifics regarding the outcomes of these evaluative processes. During the campus visit, the team examined the program review documents that were completed in February 2009. The report for facilities management highlighted the need for additional personnel, particularly in the maintenance area. Since these reports were done recently, not enough time has elapsed to determine whether or not actual improvements took place as a result of the program review. During the Team's visit to the campus, construction activities were evident throughout the campus. The college is also proud of implementing green technology in its new facilities.

A consultant is working to update all of the campus room designation, square footage and utilization ratios. This is clearly needed given the new construction and renovation of campus buildings as well as the reconfiguration of space in existing buildings (e.g. the old library) to make decisions on the allocation of physical resources and to schedule classes into spaces that are most appropriate to the type of instruction being offered. In order to assure effective utilization the college should establish guidelines for space allocation and a plan to periodically review the best utilization of its available resources

### **Recommendation**

See Recommendations 1 and 4.

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

#### **General Observations**

The self study report and interviews with college personnel demonstrate that planning activities have been carried out with the involvement of all college constituencies. Efforts have been made to publicize the plans that have been developed through open meetings prior to being recommended to the college president.

However, the college does not have a well-understood process for generating evidence documenting that decisions on technology resources are monitored for their effectiveness in reaching the college's goals and that this information is then used to make changes to improve student learning.

#### **Findings and Evidence**

The college has a robust decision-making body in the Technology Steering Committee, which has good representation from different groups across the campus. This committee is working to address the rapidly changing technology needs of the campus, both academic and administrative, while also staying abreast of the rapidly evolving environment in terms of computer hardware and software. The committee is developing a vision for how technology resources are budgeted including support, replacement, and effective utilization, that can serve as a model for how the college evaluates and makes changes to all of its operations. The college IT leadership has developed a vision for the future of computer resources including evaluation of promising new technological developments that could deliver improved computing resources across all areas. Although students voice support for faculty and staff efforts, they also expressed frustration about the limited number of computers, the age and obsolescence of many of the computers, and the limited hours that computer labs were open for students. Students expressed the need for additional computer access to complete their class assignments and saw this as a major bottleneck, especially in programs that need computer technology to meet current standards. This standard is met (III.C.1.a).

The college has a staff development area with resources and training available for college personnel. The position of staff development coordinator has been temporarily filled by a faculty member with reassigned time but is currently vacant. The director of the Teaching Learning Center currently oversees the staff development operation. This standard is met (III.C.1.b).

The various programs and departments ask for needed technology in their annual unit plans. These plans become part of the shared governance decision-making process and are prioritized and checked to verify that they correspond to institutional goals expressed in the Technology Master Plan, Educational Master Plan, and College Strategic Plan. The college has recently installed a back-up generator to keep computer and telephone systems in operation in case of power failure. The college has also installed an improved cooling system for the centralized computer facility to improve reliability. This standard is met (III.C.1.c-d).

The college uses annual unit plans to determine instructional and administrative technology needs. These are prioritized through the college's well-defined shared governance process and then submitted through the budget process for funding. These processes expose all requests to examination by college constituencies for their contribution to the achievement of college goals as expressed in the various planning documents. The college does not have explicit processes or documentation showing how it collects data to make decisions on the effectiveness of current technology and how it makes ongoing changes in response to what is learned from that data. This standard is partially met (III.C.2).

### **Conclusions**

The Technology Steering Committee has good representation from areas across campus and performs an important role in recommending acquisition of new technology that improves support of student learning.

To meet this standard, the college must institute processes that clearly document that data are being gathered, analyzed, and used to make decisions about the effectiveness of current technology in meeting the goals of the institution, and that changes are made based on lessons learned from the data gathered.

### **Recommendations**

See Recommendations 1 and 4.

### **III.D. Financial Resources**

#### **General Observations**

The Self Study Report and interviews with college personnel demonstrate that planning activities have been carried out with the involvement of all college constituencies. Efforts have been made to publicize the plans that have been developed through open meetings and subsequently recommended to the college president.

However, the college does not have a well-understood process for generating evidence documenting that decisions on financial resources are monitored for their effectiveness in reaching the college's goals and that this information is then used to make changes to improve student learning.

#### **Findings and Evidence**

Information on needs for programs comes from annual unit plans developed by those closest to departmental operations and in the best position to recognize their own needs. Through the Educational Planning Committee and Shared Governance Council, participants get a sense of overall college needs as well as their own department needs. College personnel from all constituencies repeatedly demonstrated familiarity with and understanding of the budget process, exactly as described in the self study. However, college personnel did not have a shared understanding of the need for systematic review of evidence that budgeting decisions supported achievement of institutional goals as expressed in planning documents. This standard is met (III.D.1.a).

The college has a strategic plan that establishes goals and is used to guide distribution of funds. This standard is met (III.D.1.b).

The college and district have taken steps to deal with long-term liabilities highlighted by new GASB accounting standards. The college has established a plan to deal with a large deficit and is on track to pay the district back ahead of schedule. This standard is met (III.D.1.c).

Processes for financial planning and budget are well-documented and clearly understood by the college community. Interviews with college personnel from all constituencies revealed a common understanding of the budget process that corresponded exactly with the process as described in the Self Study Report. This standard is met (III.D.1.d).

The college has evidence of recent audits and has addressed the issues raised in these audits in a timely manner. This standard is met (III.D.2.a).

The college has distributed financial information throughout the college by using the budget process and involving all college constituencies. This standard is met (III.D.2.b).

The district and college have sufficient reserves to address unexpected emergencies. The audits have found no reason for concern with the college's handling of cash flow issues. This standard is met (III.D.2.c).

The well-defined and transparent budget process, along with regular audits by an outside organization, demonstrates effective oversight of college finances. This standard is met (III.D.2.d and e).

The college and district have well-defined procedures for dealing with external contracts. This standard is met (III.D.2.f).

The college needs to develop a more explicit process for reviewing effectiveness of past fiscal planning as part of ongoing planning for current and future needs. This standard is partially met (III.D.2.g).

The college needs formal documentation showing that results of evaluation of use of financial resources are used as a basis for improvement. This standard is partially met (III.D.3).

## **Conclusions**

The Budget Subcommittee of the Shared Governance Council has good representation from areas across campus. The college uses this group and the larger Shared Governance Council to recommend financial decisions to the president.

To fully meet this standard, the college must institute processes that clearly document that data is being gathered, analyzed, and used to make decisions about the effectiveness of current use of financial resources in meeting the goals of the institution, and that changes are made based on lessons learned from the data gathered.

## **Recommendations**

See Recommendations 1 and 4.

## **District Recommendations**

1. In order to improve, the post-retirement health liability should be carefully monitored for the potential fiscal ramifications that could arise over the next few years (III.D.1.c).

## **STANDARD IV LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE**

### **General Observations**

The leadership and governance structure at Los Angeles City College brings together the entire college community to participate in planning, decision-making, and conflict resolution. Constituencies contribute their opinions, suggestions, and varied viewpoints through a variety of both structured and open venues such as the Shared Governance Council (SGC) or the monthly dinner meetings consisting of the college leadership and the college president. The college leaders work respectfully with all segments of the campus community and recognize that there is a segment of the college population that feels the shared governance process is an information exchange, and not truly shared governance. The SGC is an advisory body to the college president and she relies heavily on the work of the SGC when making decisions for the college. The shared governance model includes all constituencies: administration, faculty, staff, and students.

All constituencies have a clearly defined and written process for bringing matters through the decision-making process. The Shared Governance Committee is composed of both voting and non-voting members and includes representatives from the Academic Senate, AFT Faculty Guild, AFT Classified Guild, the Teamsters Union, Associated Student Organization, and administration. Other groups that ensure various campus constituencies have a voice are The Educational Planning Committee, the Technology Steering Committee, the Work Environment Committee, and the Academic Senate. There are some members of the college community that have concern that such a shared governance process may cause the college to miss opportunities for action due to the volume of discussion required, yet these discussions are vital.

Meetings of the Shared Governance Council are open to all who wish to attend. Faculty positions in the shared governance model such as the Academic Senate President and the Curriculum Committee Chair at both the college and district levels are given reassigned time from their regular teaching load in order to effectively carry out their charges.

### **Findings and Evidence**

#### Decision-Making Roles and Processes

The college community, which includes all constituencies, overwhelmingly supports and applauds the shared governance policies and decision-making procedures. In addition, they acknowledge the need for and existence of fair and ethical leadership. Codes of Ethics are in place for the Board of Trustees, administrators, and faculty. No Code of Ethics has been found regarding the classified staff. The Student Handbook contains the Student Code of Conduct. The college has well-established systematic participative processes in place. This standard is met (IV.A.1).

The college has well documented information regarding the participatory decision-

making. Documentation is found on the college website, and in published hard copies of the Student Handbook and College Catalog. All constituencies of the college community are well informed of the existence of these procedures. The all encompassing standing committee is the Shared Governance Council (SGC) that consists of representatives from all of the college constituencies. SGC meetings are open to the entire college community. Meeting agendas and minutes are posted on the college website, but are not always current. This standard is met (IV.A.2.a, IV.A.3).

LACC has a strong representation of faculty and academic administration in recommending instructional policy, programs, and student services, but there is concern that more faculty and staff need to participate. Evidence that these structures are in place was clearly found through interviews and discussions with faculty leaders and academic administration and the detailed information provided on the college website regarding the college's Standing Committees: Academic Senate, Educational Planning Committee, the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Team and the Curriculum Committee. There are also district committees such as the District Curriculum Committee and the District Academic Senate to discuss curriculum procedures and policies along with other academic issues. This standard is met (IV.A.2.b).

The self study cites the 2006 Midterm Report as evidence for compliance with the Accrediting Commission standards, policies, and guidelines. Accreditation information, including the self study, mid-term report, accreditation team visit, and open forums, is posted on the LACC website. The college responded in whole or in part to all of the recommendations made by the Commission. This standard is met (IV.A.4).

The team was not presented evidence that the role of leadership and the governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. Consequently, such results have not been made available to the college community nor used as a basis for improvement. Currently, the curriculum committee has no official evaluation tool, but regularly welcomes comments and suggestions for improvements to their processes. There is a planning agenda item to develop a faculty handbook that will include specific language regarding the shared governance process and its regular evaluation.

Numerous interviews confirmed that a relatively small number of faculty and staff carry the burden of collegewide involvement. The lack of a robust staff development program appears to contribute to limited engagement in governance. The team frequently heard that there are too few people doing too many things. Further, regular evaluation or self-assessment of the leadership roles and shared-governance structures and processes does not exist. This standard is partially met (IV.A.5).

## **Conclusions**

The college has a well-established and defined shared governance process. All constituencies of the college community are well represented. However, more members of the college community need to become involved in leadership roles.

## **Recommendations**

See Recommendations 1 through 4

## **IV. B. Board and Administrative Organization**

### **General Observations**

There are nine colleges in the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) governed by an eight-member Board of Trustees. Seven board members are elected for four-year terms in odd-numbered years with three or four seats being filled during one election. The students of the nine colleges elect one student trustee annually. Board meetings are publicized, open to the public, and held at the district office, or at one of the nine campuses. The Board relies primarily on the advice of the District Academic Senate regarding all academic or professional matters.

The board gives the chancellor autonomy to make decisions without interference, and holds him accountable for those decisions. The board and the chancellor share the responsibility of hiring and evaluating the vice-chancellors, college presidents, and legal counsel. Although the team did not view evaluation reports, faculty and administrators reported that board and administrator evaluations occur annually.

The district provides instructional and student services support, institutional research, human resources, business services, financial services, legal services, public relations and marketing, facilities planning, and information technology to the colleges. Centralized services can offer economies of scale with consequent financial and technical advantages.

### **Findings and Evidence**

The organizational roles of the board, the district and the college are well documented in the Draft of the Functional Map. However, a shared understanding of the organizational roles between the district and the college community is needed. The Functional Map was a recommendation in 2003, and the latest copy is still in draft status as of October 2008. Broad distribution to the college has yet to occur. This standard is met (IV.B).

A review of board agendas and minutes as well as an observation of the board meeting on March 25, 2009 provided evidence that the board reflects the public interest in its activities and decisions. This standard is met (IV.B).

Board Policies state that the Board relies primarily on the advice of the District Academic Senate regarding academic and curriculum issues. These policies support the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of student learning programs and services. The board periodically reviews and approves the college's mission and vision statements. The board also approves student learning programs in its process of approving and forwarding curricula to the systemwide office. This standard is met (IV.B.1.b)

The Board demonstrates their ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity through its Committee on Planning and Student Success, its responsibility for legal matters for all nine campuses, and its District Budget Committee. This standard is met (IV.B.1.c).

The LACCD website contains all information regarding the Board of Trustees including

bylaws and policies on the board's membership, terms of service, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures. The bylaws also contain information regarding self-evaluation processes and a Code of Ethics. The board reviewed and amended its evaluation policy in 2008. Board Rule 2105, a formal policy for the orientation of new board members was adopted in February 2007. The code of ethics contained within this rule was the subject of a recommendation from the previous accreditation cycle, and it addresses all areas regarding Board behavior. This standard is met (IV.B.1.d, f-h).

The process for adoption of Board Rules and administrative regulations that support them are outlined in the Chancellor's Directive Number 70 District-wide Internal Management Consultation Process. The board revises its rules when necessary as evidenced by a change in policy to permit adjunct faculty to serve on presidential selection committees. This standard is met (IV.B.1.e.).

The Board's committee on Planning and Student Success monitors the accreditation self study process for all nine colleges. Since not all nine colleges undergo accreditation in the same years, this is a continual process for the Board and the district. The District Liaison for Accreditation reports directly to the Vice-Chancellor of Institutional Effectiveness. During interviews with the team, board members demonstrated their knowledge of and involvement in the accreditation process. This standard is met (IV.B.1.i).

Selection and evaluation procedures pertaining to the chancellor and college presidents are clearly outlined on the LACCD website. The board uses the general counsel as staff to conduct the annual review of the chancellor. The board and the chancellor share the responsibility of hiring and evaluating the vice-chancellors, college presidents, and legal counsel. The district created a formal written policy for the Performance Evaluation Process for College Presidents in 2007. Hiring committees include representatives from all stakeholder groups. This standard is met (IV.B.1.j).

In the last six years, LACC has had four college presidents. The current president served in an interim capacity until June of 2008. She assumed the position on a permanent basis on July 1, 2008. The president demonstrated her commitment to ensure that educational planning is integrated with resource planning and achieving student learning outcomes by continuing to support a full time Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator and the eLumen program. eLumen is a software program to capture course, program, and institutional outcomes and document and capture the assessment of those outcomes.

The president communicates with college staff regularly via email regarding college and district issues such as state and district budgetary matters, her vision, concerns and solutions, plans, goals, and implementation strategies. Moreover, she holds monthly leadership dinners that include the President of the Academic Senate, the President of the AFT Faculty Guild, the President of the AFT Classified Guild, and the President of the Teamsters Union. During these dinners she encourages an open exchange of ideas regarding college programs and issues. When invited, the president will attend the Department Chairs Council, Academic Senate, and other meetings. She also meets weekly with senior administrators. This standard is met (IV.B.2.a-e).

The district has assigned increased responsibility and accountability for planning and decision making to the colleges. The district participated in a Multi-College Pilot Program organized by ACCJC to clarify the lines of accountability in multi-college systems. As a result, a functional map was created to clearly delineate the responsibilities and functions of the district and college. It is well supported by the district personnel, but the college community appears to know very little about this functional map. It has been in draft form since October of 2008, and district representatives indicated that would undergo continual revision. The functional map draft is available on the district website. It displays the college operations it supports such as instruction and student services, institutional research, human resources, business and finance, legal, public relations and marketing, facilities planning, and information technology. This standard is met (IV.B.3.a and b).

In 2006, the district engaged a third-party consultant to review the district's budget allocation model to assure that small colleges were not being negatively impacted. Based on the findings of the DBC Budget Allocation Task Force, a new budget allocation model was developed and adopted in January 2007. Since the district has maintained an overall ending balance of approximately 10% per year, audited financial statements do not portray individual college deficits. This standard is met (IV.B.3.c-d).

As a result of the decentralization of district processes the college presidents have had more freedom to make college decisions and are held more directly accountable for their actions. This standard is met (IV.B.3.e).

Board minutes are posted on the district website and board agendas are posted at the district office and online. District committees communicate with the colleges and the board. This standard is met (IV.B.3.f).

In 2006 the district initiated the District Strategic Planning Initiative. There is now a District Strategic Plan 2006-2011 in which strengths, weaknesses and future priorities are identified. This plan seems to be a major part of the decentralization process to give individual colleges more autonomy. The chancellor has held a series of roundtable discussions with college faculty and staff to discuss the state of the district and the effectiveness of district/college functional relationships. These meetings were well attended by constituency representatives and those in attendance were given the opportunity to provide input. The district is beginning the evaluation process of its decision-making structures and processes. Communication to the college community needs to improve. This standard is partially met (IV.B.3.g).

## **Conclusions**

The district has made progress in responding to the recommendations in 2003. However, the evaluation of the processes to improve effectiveness, and the dissemination of information to the college community is not sufficient.

## **District Recommendations**

2. In order to improve, both the district and the college need to evaluate the consistent adherence in practice to the recently developed delineation of operational responsibilities and functions (IV.B.3.a).

3. Develop and implement methods for the evaluation of role delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes for the college and the district. Widely communicate the results of the evaluation and use those results as the basis for improvement (IV.B.3.g).