Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

The institution recognizes and uses the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for promoting student success, sustaining academic quality, integrity, fiscal stability, and continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are defined in policy and are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief executive officer. Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. In multi-college districts or systems, the roles within the district/system are clearly delineated. The multi-college district or system has policies for allocation of resources to adequately support and sustain the colleges.

IV.A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

IV.A.1. Institutional leaders create and encourage innovation leading to institutional excellence. They support administrators, faculty, staff, and students, no matter what their official titles, in taking initiative for improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective planning and implementation.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Administrators, Faculty, Staff and Students Improve Practices

The College shared governance process includes students, faculty, staff, and administration that perform an essential role in ensuring the institution meets goals and continuously improves quality.

- Los Angeles Southwest College completely supports the participation and involvement of all stakeholders of the institution in the decision-making process. The Institution’s commitment to shared governance is evident in the spring 2015 approval of revisions to the Participatory Decision-Making and Integrated Planning Handbook (IV.A.1-1: Participatory Decision-Making and Integrated Planning Handbook).
- Los Angeles Southwest College has developed systematic participative processes to provide the opportunity for all individuals on campus to have their ideas represented in the decision-making process. There are three primary pathways that invite staff, faculty, administrators, and students to participate in institutional decision-making to improving college practices, programs and services.
• Administrative Structure and Processes: The operations of the college are implemented within established policies and procedures facilitated by management staff.

• Constituent Groups: Collective bargaining units assure representation and participation of their members.

• Committee System: Governance roles are allotted for various constituent groups to review and recommend policies, practices, and programs. Refer to Standard I.B.1 for additional details on the college’s committee system.

• Los Angeles Southwest College also provides several opportunities to seek input from stakeholders through town hall meetings, student forums, and meetings with community members. During these public opportunities to participate in decision-making, participants receive pertinent information regarding the institution and are then able to and encouraged to share their ideas and make recommendations that are compiled and taken back to the appropriate committee.

• Los Angeles Southwest College stakeholders are administered surveys to gather data that informs campus decision-making. These surveys provide another method for various campus constituencies to provide ideas for improvement. Biannually (most recently in fall 2014), the Campus Climate Survey and Student Survey are administered to provide all personnel and students, respectively, with an opportunity to answer questions about the college and institutional improvement (IV.A.1-2: Campus Climate Survey and Student Survey). In addition, student service programs administer Point-of-Service-Surveys every semester to gather student feedback on how to improve services (IV.A.1-3: Point of Service Surveys).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College’s shared governance process encourages students, staff, faculty and administrators to participate in campus leadership. Each stakeholder group is represented on college councils, committees and taskforces as delineated by the direction of that committee or council (IV.A.1-4: College Committee Membership requirements).

Through involvement in the Administrative Structure and Processes, constituencies affect college operations and ensure implementation is within established policies and procedures, facilitated by management staff. Additionally, involvement of the aforementioned constituent groups assures representation and participation of their members in institutional decision-making. Lastly, the committee system provides various constituencies the opportunity to review and recommend policies, regulations, and processes that affect all aspects of the college community.
College Council, which has representation from all campus constituencies and collective bargaining units, is the central governing body at the College. It receives regular reports from the College president and each college committee. In addition to the standing reports, any constituent may place items on the agenda for discussion. It is only after open dialogue has taken place between institutional leaders, faculty, staff, and students that College Council makes recommendations to the president.

Los Angeles Southwest College also provides several opportunities to seek input from stakeholders through town hall meetings, student forums, and meetings with community members. During these public opportunities to participate in decision-making, participants receive pertinent information regarding the institution and are then able to and encouraged to share their ideas and make recommendations that are compiled and taken back to the appropriate committee.

In addition to the aforementioned opportunities to participate in campus decision-making, Los Angeles Southwest College stakeholders are administered surveys to gather data that informs campus decision-making. These surveys provide another method for various campus constituencies to provide ideas for improvement. Biannually (most recently in fall 2014), the Campus Climate Survey and Student Survey are administered to provide all personnel and students, respectively, with an opportunity to answer questions about the college and institutional improvement. In addition, student service programs administer Point-of-Service Surveys every semester to gather student feedback on how to improve services. Collectively, this data is analyzed and contributes to the direction of campus decision-making. Though systems are in place to solicit feedback from various campus constituencies, participation among students, classified staff, and faculty in the college committee system is low.

In an effort to keep constituencies abreast of institutional performance, reports are updated annually and shared during the annual strategic planning retreat. This information is also available for review through the user-friendly college website from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE). The College president and the various college committees regularly
request data on institutional performance from the OIE. Requests for data are also available for faculty, staff, administrators, and students. Furthermore, data on institutional performance is available online providing a level of transparency, as this information is available to all campus constituencies for review.

Conclusion

The College meets the Standard. Los Angeles Southwest College completely supports the participation and involvement of all stakeholders of the institution in the decision-making process.

Evidence

IV.A.1-1: Participatory Decision-Making and Integrated Planning Handbook
IV.A.1-2: Campus Climate Survey and Student Survey
IV.A.1-3: Point of Service Surveys
IV.A.1-4: College Committee Membership requirements

IV.A.2. The institution establishes and implements policy and procedures authorizing administrator, faculty, and staff participation in decision-making processes. The policy makes provisions for student participation and consideration of student views in those matters in which students have a direct and reasonable interest. Policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose committees.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Establishes and Implements Policy and Procedures

LASC has established policies and procedures for governance, per California’s Education Code, that specify the roles and responsibilities for governance of California’s Community Colleges.

- The shared governance work of the College is accomplished through membership in all college committees, and each committee consists of at least one member from each constituency group and represents administrators, faculty, and staff who are in unions as well as unrepresented classified managers (IV.A.2-1: College Committee Membership Rosters).
- The ASO appoints a student to each committee who reports back to the ASO, giving the students a voice in governance on campus (IV.A.2-2: ASO College Committee Membership).
- LASC, through the Strategic Planning process outlined in the former Strategic Planning Handbooks and in the current “Participatory Decision Making and Integrated Planning Handbook,” describes the participatory roles of administrators, faculty, staff,
and students as it relates to the decision-making process via the description of the various “constituency groups” on campus.

- As most faculty and staff in the District and college are unionized, the AB 1725 requirements have been stipulated in union contracts, which require committee participation and voting rights in those committees, giving each group a voice (IV.A.2-3: Faculty Union Contract and IV.A.2-4: Classified Union Contract).

**Analysis and Evaluation**

LASC has established policies and procedures for governance per California’s Education Code that specify the roles and responsibilities for governance of California’s Community Colleges. To this end, LASC, through the Strategic Planning process outlined in the former Strategic Planning Handbooks and in the current “Participatory Decision Making and Integrated Planning Handbook,” describes the participatory roles of administrators, faculty, staff, and students as it relates to the decision-making process via the description of the various “constituency groups” on campus. The shared governance work of the College is accomplished through membership on all College committees which consists of at least one member from each constituency group and represents administrators; faculty and staff who are in unions as well as unrepresented classified managers. Each committee meets monthly with a published agenda and minutes that include attendance (IV.A.2-5: LASC Committee Meeting Master Calendar). Also, each committee updates the “Committee Operational Agreement” and the “Shared Governance Committee Annual Self Evaluation Form” and sends the reports to the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) (IV.A.2-6: Committee Operational Agreement and Shared Governance Committee Annual Self Evaluation Form). These reports track meeting members and attendance, as well as document objectives which were to be addressed that academic year with a report on the progress of those objectives and recommendations for improvement of the committee’s processes.

As most faculty and staff in the District and college are unionized, the AB 1725 requirements have been stipulated in union contracts, which require committee participation and voting rights in those committees giving each group a voice. The ASO appoints a student to each committee who reports back to the ASO giving the students a voice in governance on campus. The following collective bargaining units participate in institutional decision making at LASC.

**AFT:** Every full-time monthly rate faculty member shall serve on at least one departmental, college, or District wide committee or equivalent. Adjunct faculty are eligible to serve on department and college wide committees.

**Deans:** The Union Representative or his/her designee at each college shall be granted a voting seat and shall represent the Unit on the shared governance council.

**Classified AFT:** Shared Governance: The set of practices under which District/College employees participate in decisions about the operation of their institutions. The District/Colleges are committed to, and encourage, full participation from Clerical Technical Unit employees. Worksite and District-Wide Committees and Shared
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Governance When a College President, Division Head, the Chancellor, or the Board of Trustees appoint a campus/worksite and/or District-wide advisory committee, for accreditation, budget, planning/development, sexual harassment, AIDS education, staff development, and/or equal employment opportunity and diversity, the AFT College Staff Guild shall be entitled to have at least one (1) of its members appointed to the committee by the AFT Staff Guild. At least one (1) AFT Staff Guild Unit member, appointed by the AFT, shall be appointed to each campus, District Office and District-wide Planning and Advisory Committee (PAC) and any other Shared Governance Committee, not identified above, that will have an effect on Unit 1.

The Trades Council: shall be allowed one (1) representative on each campus shared governance committee that deals with issues directly and specifically relevant to the Crafts Unit, one (1) representative on the District Budget Committee (DBC) and one (1) representative on the Joint Labor Management Benefits Committee. Crafts Unit committee members shall be appointed by the Crafts Unit.

The District and the SEIU 721 recognizes that decision-making in an academic environment is generally made via a committee. If a College President, Division Head, the Chancellor, or the Board of Trustees appoints a campus/worksite advisory committee for accreditation, budget, planning/development, facilities planning, staff development, work environment, and/or equal employment opportunity and diversity, at least one SEIU Local 721 member, selected by SEIU Local 721, shall be appointed to each campus, District Office and District wide Planning and Advisory Committee (PAC) and any other Shared Governance Committee, not identified that will have an effect on Local 721.

Conclusion

The College meets the Standard. The structure needed to develop policies to ensure participation from stakeholders and transparency is in place.

Evidence

IV.A.2-1: College Committee Membership Rosters
IV.A.2-2: ASO College Committee Membership
IV.A.2-3: Faculty Union Contract
IV.A.2-4: Classified Union Contract
IV.A.2-5: LASC Committee Meeting Master Calendar
IV.A.2-6: Committee Operational Agreement and Shared Governance Committee Annual Self Evaluation Form
IV.A.3. Administrators and faculty, through policy and procedures, have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Administrators and Faculty Have a Substantive and Clearly Defined Role

The College’s policies on shared governance through the Strategic Planning process outlined in the former Strategic Planning Handbooks and in the current “Participatory Decision Making and Integrated Planning Handbook” describe the participatory roles of administrators, faculty, staff, and students as relates to the decision-making at LASC.

- The committee charge delineates the purpose of the committee and committee make-up. Each committee has a designated administrator that serves as a member or the chair. Faculty and staff members may also serve a committee chairs (See Participatory Decision Making & Integrated Planning Handbook) (IV.A.3-1: Participatory Decision Making & Integrated Planning Handbook).
- The College committee structure is designed so that each committee reports to either the Academic Senate or the College Council (IV.A.3-2: College Committee Structure).
- The college’s key planning documents, such as the Education Master Plan and Technology Plan are faculty initiated (IV.A.3-3: Education Master Plan and Technology Plan).

Analysis and Evaluation

Faculty and staff take an active role on campus committees and provide feedback to campus leadership. Campus leadership allows the committee structure to operate effectively and input is solicited from all campus constituencies. The campus maintains a calendar with all committee meeting dates and times (IV.A.3-4: LASC Committee Meeting Master Schedule), allowing any interested member of the campus community the opportunity to participate in the shared governance process.

LASC is committed to public disclosure in all areas of operation. Documents and data that inform institutional operations and activities are accessible online through the College website. Additional information is also available through the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE). This includes but is not limited to the following: Senate approval and then College Council approval of policies (IV.A.3-5: Academic Senate and College Council Meeting Minutes), Strategic and College Master Plan (IV.A.3-6: Strategic and College Master Plan), Board Agendas (IV.A.3-7: Board Agendas), meeting schedules and meeting minutes (IV.A.3-8: Committee Meeting Minutes), announcements, class schedules (IV.A.3-9: Class Schedules), catalog information (IV.A.3-10: LASC College Catalog), registration (IV.A.3-11: LASC Registration Process), and SSSP process (IV.A.3-12: LASC Matriculation Process).
Process [8 Steps]), Administrative information and access to employment opportunities (IV.A.3-13: LACCD Employment Announcements), salary information (IV.A.3-14: Union Contracts [Salary Information]), budget information (IV.A.3-15: LASC Budget), institutional planning (IV.A.3-16: Institutional Planning Meeting Minutes), and employee organizations (IV.A.3-17: LASC Employee Organizations), bond construction information (IV.A.3-18: LACCD Bond Information), including construction updates. Information is disseminated through the campus Public Information Officer, and departmental websites. Accreditation reports, self-study, mid-term report and other institutional reports are also made available.

The evidence listed below demonstrates that these policies and procedures are functioning effectively:

- Functional Map: Description of committee membership (older document) (IV.A.3-19: Functional Map)
- Committee Operating Agreements (IV.A.3-21: Committee Operating Agreements)
- Committee Meeting Minutes (IV.A.3-22: Committee Meeting Minutes)
- Committee Self-Evaluations (IV.A.3-23: Committee Self-Evaluations)
- Union Contracts: Faculty; Clerical/ Technical; Crafts; Operations; Academic Supervisors, and Classified Supervisors (IV.A.3-24: Union Contracts: Faculty; Clerical/ Technical; Crafts; Operations; Academic Supervisors, and Classified Supervisors)

The College’s policies on shared governance through the Strategic Planning process outlined in the former Strategic Planning Handbooks and in the current “Participatory Decision Making and Integrated Planning Handbook” describe the participatory roles of administrators, faculty, staff, and students as relates to the decision-making at LASC. The implementation of the current handbook has assisted committees as they work through the governance structure to restructure committee membership to ensure maximum participation.

Additionally, the College Council, as the central governing body at LASC, has representation from all campus constituencies and collective bargaining units thus promoting substantive participation and involvement from college stakeholders in institutional policies, planning, and budget related actions. LASC strives to achieve transparency by making regular reports from the college president and each college committee available on the college website. The OIE has developed a tool to place agendas and minutes on the SharePoint site and has trained chairs to upload those minutes.

**Conclusion**

The College meets the Standard. The College has seen improvement after the implementation of systemic measures and policies and procedures to encourage and support stakeholder participation.
Evidence

IV.A.3-1: Participatory Decision Making & Integrated Planning Handbook
IV.A.3-2: College Committee Structure
IV.A.3-3: Education Master Plan and Technology Plan
IV.A.3-4: LASC Committee Meeting Master Schedule
IV.A.3-5: Academic Senate and College Council Meeting Minutes
IV.A.3-6: Strategic and College Master Plan
IV.A.3-7: Board Agendas
IV.A.3-8: Committee Meeting Minutes
IV.A.3-9: Class Schedules
IV.A.3-10: LASC College Catalog
IV.A.3-11: LASC Registration Process
IV.A.3-12: LASC Matriculation Process (8 Steps)
IV.A.3-13: LACCD Employment Announcements
IV.A.3-14: Union Contracts (Salary Information)
IV.A.3-15: LASC Budget
IV.A.3-16: Institutional Planning Meeting Minutes
IV.A.3-17: LASC Employee Organizations
IV.A.3-18: LACCD Bond Information
IV.A.3-19: Functional Map
IV.A.3-20: Participatory Decision Making & Integrated Planning Handbook
IV.A.3-21: Committee Operating Agreements
IV.A.3-22: Committee Meeting Minutes
IV.A.3-23: Committee Self-Evaluations
IV.A.3-24: Union Contracts: Faculty; Clerical/ Technical; Crafts; Operations; Academic Supervisors, and Classified Supervisors

IV.A.4. Faculty and academic administrators, through policy and procedures, and through well-defined structures, have responsibility for recommendations about curriculum and student learning programs and services.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Faculty and Administrators Have Responsibility for Recommendations

The College, through its shared governance structure, including the Participatory Decision Making & Integrated Planning Handbook and the College Council as the central governing body at LASC, delegates the responsibility for recommendations about curriculum and student learning programs and services to faculty and academic administrators.

- LASC utilizes the Curriculum Committee to monitor the development and maintenance of the college curriculum (IV.A.4-1: Curriculum Committee Meeting
The Curriculum Committee ensures that the course creation process is reflective of academic programs’ and students’ needs.

- The College’s courses are also reviewed by the Program Review Committee to ensure academic programs support student demand as well as campus plans (IV.A.4-2: Program Review Committee Meeting Minutes). Annually, all LASC academic programs must complete the Program Review process, stating their goals and noting their progress in reaching said goals (IV.A.4-3: LASC Program Review Process).
- Academic Departments also have a key role in the development of curriculum. Each department monitors the fill-rate of courses and revises offerings each semester based on findings (IV.A.4-4: Academic Department Meeting Minutes).
- The Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator oversees the process of analyzing how well the college meets its goals regarding what students are learning in the classroom.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The campus administration seeks input from faculty regarding LASC courses. Programs and courses are created and maintained based on the work of the Curriculum and Program Review committees. These committees include students, classified staff, faculty, and College administrators.

The College appoints a Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) coordinator to oversee the process of setting goals for core competencies students should acquire as a result of completing LASC courses or participating in a campus program. The SLO coordinator, in conjunction with the curriculum committee, continues to collect data showing the status of LASC courses and their position in the SLO assessment cycle (IV.A.4-5: LASC SLO Assessment Cycle).

**Conclusion**

The College meets the Standard. LASC has a well-structured procedure for the development of curriculum.

**Evidence**

- IV.A.4-1: Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes
- IV.A.4-2: Program Review Committee Meeting Minutes
- IV.A.4-3: LASC Program Review Process
- IV.A.4-4: Academic Department Meeting Minutes
- IV.A.4-5: LASC SLO Assessment Cycle
IV.A.5. Through its system of board and institutional governance, the institution ensures the appropriate consideration of relevant perspectives; decision-making aligned with expertise and responsibility; and timely action on institutional plans, policies, curricular change, and other key considerations.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Ensures Appropriate Consideration of Relevant Perspectives

The College utilizes its shared-governance structure to solicit various expertise and perspectives and to communicate policies and action plans among administrators, faculty, staff, and students (IV.A.5-1: LASC Committee Structure).

- There is efficient and effective alignment among institutional policies, educational purposes, and student-learning goals.
- The institution assures the appropriateness of its educational objectives, degree offerings, and learning goals to the College’s mission; the ongoing challenge for the College is the alignment of the internal needs of the College (adequate fiscal and operational funding, staffing, new programs, and program needs) with the external decision-making of the Board of Trustees (Board) (IV.A.5-2: LASC Program Review Committee Charge).
- Specifically, the College and the Board have in place a clearly articulated shared governance structure that recognizes college leadership and constituency input and decision-making.

Analysis and Evaluation

Neither internal nor external governance bodies make decisions unilaterally. Campus leadership is consulted before internal administrative and external Board decisions are made that impact faculty, staff, and students. Recommendations from governance and contractually mandated committees are solicited before decisions are made. Administration is responsible for communicating Board decisions to the campus community.

There are many objectives and goals that the College is meeting. There is efficient and effective alignment among institutional policies, educational purposes, and student-learning goals. Faculty are teaching and students are learning, although the College is still in the process of articulating a system for the collection, feedback, and placement of evidence of student learning objectives and class, discipline, program, department, division, and college assessment data of these outcomes. While the institution effectively assures the appropriateness of its educational objectives, degree offerings, and learning goals to the College’s mission, the ongoing challenge for the College is the alignment of the internal needs of the College (adequate fiscal and operational funding, staffing, new programs, and program needs) with the external decision-making of the Board.
Conclusion

The College meets the Standard. The campus’ internal leadership and governance structures, policies, and processes allow all perspectives and expert knowledge to be considered in the decision-making process.

Evidence

IV.A.5-1: LASC Committee Structure
IV.A.5-2: LASC Program Review Committee Charge

IV.A.6. The processes for decision-making and the resulting decisions are documented and widely communicated across the institution.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Decision-Making Processes and Resulting Decisions Documented and Widely Communicated

The College documents and communicates the decision-making processes through the recording and public posting of meeting minutes (for example, Academic Senate, College Council, Budget Committee, Program Review, etc.).

- All LASC committee meeting agendas and minutes are posted in Sharepoint on the College website (IV.A.6-1: Sharepoint College Committee Webpage).
- All LASC committee meetings are open to all faculty, staff, and students.
- The campus hosts public forums to discuss important issues and announcements affecting the College (IV.A.6-2: Campus Forum Announcements).
- The public information officer (PIO) utilizes email blasts to inform the campus community of important events where College decision-making will be discussed (IV.A.6-3: PIO Email Blasts).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College has worked to improve communications about its decision-making process. The College recognizes the importance of considering the perspectives of the various campus constituencies in this process and has provided opportunities for participation. As stated previously, both faculty and classified union contracts highlight the importance of participating in shared governance. In developing this communication structure, LASC has developed the mechanisms to publicize the shared governance process. Any member of the campus community can access the agenda and meeting minutes for all campus committees on the campus website. Additionally, all campus committees are open to all student, staff, faculty, and administrative membership.
**Conclusion**

The College meets the Standard.

**Evidence**

IV.A.6-1: Sharepoint College Committee Webpage  
IV.A.6-2: Campus Forum Announcements  
IV.A.6-3: PIO Email Blasts

**IV.A.7. Leadership roles and the institution’s governance and decision-making policies, procedures, and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

**Leadership Roles, Governance, and Decision-Making Regularly Evaluated and Communicated**

The College regularly evaluates leadership roles and the institution’s governance and decision-making policies, procedures, and processes; communicates the results; and uses them to make improvements.

- An ad hoc committee established by the Academic Senate evaluated committee roles and effectiveness in governance in 2013 (IV.A.7-1: Academic Senate Ad Hoc Effectiveness Committee Meeting Minutes). The College did this in an effort to reduce the number of committees to ensure more effective participation. The consolidated committees were then evaluated during academic year 2013-2014 to evaluate the effectiveness of the consolidation process (IV.A.7-2: 2014 Evaluation of Committee Effectiveness).
- The Participatory Decision Making and Integrated Planning handbook (Planning Handbook) outlines the processes by which the various constituencies on campus have a role in the decision making and planning processes at LASC (IV.A.7-3: Participatory Decision-Making and Integrated Planning Handbook). The Institutional Effectiveness division at LASC evaluates the effectiveness of these processes. The results of these evaluations are posted on the College website (IV.A.7-4: Institutional Effectiveness Website).
- LASC prepares a planning handbook in which the roles of the participatory governance process are presented, and the roles of the various constituencies and committees are described. There are three primary pathways for decision-making at LASC. These are:
• Administrative Structure and Processes, which are used to manage the
  operations of the College
• Constituent groups, which allow all impacted parties on campus to make their
  interests known
• The various constituencies use the committee system to review and
  recommend policies, regulations and processes of LASC and LACCD that
  affect the college as a whole.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College is satisfactory with respect to governance on academic issues and needs
improvement with respect to budget issues and support services. The College has improved
issues with respect to support services such as the bookstore and Information Technology,
and there is good communication with the campus community on what is being done to
address the issues.

An ad hoc committee established by the Academic Senate evaluated committee roles and
effectiveness in governance in 2013. The College did this in an effort to reduce the number
of committees to ensure more effective participation by LASC employees. The consolidated
committees were then evaluated during academic year 2013-2014 to assess the effectiveness
of the consolidation process. As a result of this evaluation, the decision to combine the
Technology Committee and Facility Planning committee was reversed because the
consolidation was not effective. The other consolidation was combining the Professional
Growth and Professional Development committees. This consolidation has proven effective.

There have been issues regarding what is being done to address the concerns about
breakdowns in communication of assessment of the campus decision-making process. The
College has worked to improve communication and create transparency about the decision-
making process. Budgets have been shared publicly, allowing the campus community access
to data used to justify administrative decisions.

LASC has a clearly defined participatory governance system, in which all constituencies
have input into District and College governance. In addition, the Academic Senate has
primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic
standards.

**Conclusion**

The College does not meet all elements of the Standard. The Academic Senate has formed an
ad hoc committee to evaluate the effectiveness of the College’s shared governance structure.
The College is also working to improve communication regarding the shared governance
process. Committee meeting agendas and minutes are made publicly accessible and all LASC
students, faculty, and staff can view them on the campus website.
Evidence

IV.A.7-1: Academic Senate Ad Hoc Effectiveness Committee Meeting Minutes
IV.A.7-2: 2014 Evaluation of Committee Effectiveness
IV.A.7-3: Participatory Decision-Making and Integrated Planning Handbook
IV.A.7-4: Institutional Effectiveness Website
IV.B. Chief Executive Officer

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

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

President Meets Regularly with Faculty, Staff, Administrators, Students, Community Members, and District Personnel

The president meets regularly with faculty, staff, administrators, students, community members, and district personnel in order to ensure that the College meets its institutional goals and objectives as outlined in the LASC Strategic Plan and three master plans (Educational Master Plan, Technology Master Plan, and Facilities Master Plan).

- Dr. Linda Rose began her presidency at Los Angeles Southwest College in August 2014. The president meets regularly with campus leaders to provide leadership across all areas of the College. Regular meetings include weekly meeting with the President’s Cabinet (comprised of the vice president of academic affairs, vice president of administrative services, and vice president of student services), monthly meetings with the Academic Senate president/Executive Team, monthly meetings with union representatives, and monthly meetings with the Los Angeles Southwest College Foundation. In addition, the president holds student forums four times per year, twice in the fall and twice in the spring (IV.B.1-1: Campus Forum Information).
- The president works closely with the campus public information officer to ensure pertinent information is posted on the campus website and presented to local media outlets.
- The president collaborates with the dean of institutional effectiveness to review data regarding institutional performance. The president uses the data to influence campus decision-making.
- The president communicates the importance of a culture of evidence by requiring that all proposals for funding or campus support are accompanied by supporting evidence that proposed activities will positively impact student learning (IV.B.1-2: President’s Email Requiring Evidence with Funding Requests).
- The research office and, specifically, the dean of institutional effectiveness report directly to the president. The research office is located in the same suite as the president’s office, allowing direct access when needed (IV.B.1-3: Campus Organization Chart).
- The president has linked resource allocation and institutional planning to institutional research through the Program Review process. All programs, including non-
instructional programs, must submit an annual program review analysis to qualify for budget allocations.

Analysis and Evaluation

The president has ensured that all Los Angeles Southwest College plans and goals are rooted in student success. At every meeting, core questions are: “What is the evidence?” and “How does it benefit students?” Student-centered decisions have been focused on student learning, student success, and student access. In order to achieve these goals, the president has emphasized the importance of planning, budgeting and assessment.

Conclusion

The College meets the Standard. The President prioritizes planning and assessment. The College is in the process of updating its plans, and the President uses these plans to guide LASC towards its goals.

Evidence

IV.B.1-1: Campus Forum Information
IV.B.1-2: Presidents Email Requiring Evidence with Funding Requests
IV.B.1-3: Campus Organization Chart

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

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

CEO Oversees Administrative Structure and Delegates Authority

The president seeks to build an executive team that is competent and effective while supporting the goals of the College.

- The president regularly assesses the administrative structure, most recently in 2015 (IV.B.2-1: Presidents Assessment of Administrative Structure). Currently, the administration is comprised of a president, a vice president of academic affairs, a vice president of administrative services, a vice president of student services, three academic deans, one dean of students, one dean of institutional effectiveness, a dean of resource development, and a dean of TRIO (funded through grant funds). Each of the administrative job descriptions is reviewed periodically and changes in duties may be made in response to the changing needs of the institution (IV.B.2-2: LASC Administrative Job Descriptions). Administrators have authority to perform the duties...
their assignments require, including weekly senior staff meetings with the president and vice presidents and monthly administrators meetings.

Analysis and Evaluation

The president assesses staffing levels for current and future needs. One of the most significant changes to the organizational structure occurred in response to the College’s need to have a balanced budget. In 2010-2011, the president, in line with the duties outlined in the accreditation standards, reorganized the administrative structure. As a result, the College modified its structure from a three-vice-president model to a two-vice-president model. In 2013, the president assessed the executive vice president model and it was determined that the model was not adequate to coordinate the functions of both academic affairs and student support services.

Conclusion

The College meets the Standard. The President regularly assesses the campus’ administrative structure and makes adjustments when necessary.

Evidence

IV.B.2-1: Presidents Assessment of Administrative Structure
IV.B.2-2: LASC Administrative Job Descriptions

IV.B.3. Through established policies and procedures, the CEO guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by:

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

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

CEO Guides Institutional Improvement

The College president, with input from the college stakeholders, guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by soliciting, obtaining, and
reviewing college wide committee recommendations for decision making in all areas inclusive of curriculum, facilities, planning, budget, and technology.

- These leadership responsibilities include the president’s support of processes, such as program review, program viability, divisional planning, and reviewing and assessing the health of the College’s instructional and student services.
- The president has scheduled monthly meetings with both the Academic Senate president and the Academic Senate Executive Board to discuss academic issues (IV.B.3-1: President’s Meeting with Academic Senate Executive Board Meeting Minutes).
- The president receives recommendations from the College Council, the primary participatory governance body, to act upon and provide explanations for decisions.
- The president uses internal and external research and analysis as primary tools in the decision-making process (IV.B.3-2: Campus Research Reports).
- The president emphasizes student-centered, data-driven decision making in institutional planning. In order to ensure that decisions are centered on student access, learning, and success, the president asks two core questions to guide institutional improvement: (1) “How does a particular recommendation benefit students?” and (2) “What data support the recommendation?”
- The dean of institutional effectiveness is the co-chair of the Strategic Planning Committee and a standing resource available to all College committees (IV.B.3-3: Strategic Planning Committee Roster). The Office of Institutional Effectiveness provides data to the president and college committees on a regular basis for program planning and improvement. Data include student performance indicators, efficiency, campus and student surveys, and labor market information.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College has taken several steps to ensure that its practices reflect the goals identified in planning models. Recently, the College has taken on the task of updating the strategic plan, the education master plan, and the technology plan (IV.B.3-4: Strategic Plan, Education Master Plan, and Technology Plan). There is a committee for each plan, consisting of members representing all campus constituencies. Each of these plans is being revised with the intent of improving outcomes for LASC students.

The College sets goals for student success and makes them the primary focus of planning. Resources are clearly identified, as is the process of accessing resources. The College president works in conjunction with campus committees to identify programs on campus in need of support. The College also utilizes budget data to allocate resources for students. The president receives recommendations from the budget committee to assist in the distribution of funds on campus (IV.B.3-5: LASC Budget Committee Meeting Minutes).
Conclusion

The College meets the Standard. Goals for students learning guide the planning and resource allocations on campus. The program review process allows the president to allocate resources to programs that demonstrate effectiveness in improving student learning and achievement outcomes.

Evidence

IV.B.3-1: President’s Meeting with Academic Senate Executive Board Meeting Minutes
IV.B.3-2: Campus Research Reports
IV.B.3-3: Strategic Planning Committee Roster
IV.B.3-4: Strategic Plan, Education Master Plan, and Technology Plan
IV.B.3-5: LASC Budget Committee Meeting Minutes

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

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

CEO Has Primary Leadership Role for Accreditation and Faculty, Staff, and Administrative Leaders Share Responsibility

The president has effectively balanced the role of primary leader with delegating tasks to the appropriate faculty, staff, and administrative leaders in an effort to ensure compliance with accreditation requirements.

- In fall 2014, the College president began planning for the comprehensive visit scheduled for spring 2016. Under the direction of the president, the vice president of Academic Affairs, who serves as the College Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), convened an Accreditation Steering Committee, comprised of the ALO, the president, dean of institutional effectiveness, a faculty co-chair, the chairs of each Standard, and faculty editor (IV.B.4-1: Accreditation Committee Roster). Subsequently, the committee invited faculty, staff, students, and administrators to serve on one of the four Accreditation Standard committees. One faculty and one administrator chair each Standard committee.
- The College president organized campus-wide meetings to educate faculty, staff, administrators, and students about accreditation. At the writing of this report, campus-wide accreditation meetings and workshops had been held during fall 2014 through the completion of the 2016 Self Evaluation Report (IV.B.4-2: Accreditation Workshop Announcements and Agendas). The president hosted an off-campus
accreditation retreat, during which the College’s progress in the accreditation process was explained in detail (IV.B.4-3: Accreditation Retreat Announcement and Agenda).

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College president has the primary leadership role in the accreditation process at LASC. The president organizes accreditation workshops, trainings, and writing sessions (IV.B.4-4: Accreditation Writing Workshop Announcement). The president provides current communications and forms from the ACCJC (IV.B.4-5: ACCJC Manuals). The president is also available to share knowledge and information from her vast accreditation experience.

**Conclusion**

The College meets the Standard. The president has provided knowledge and resources to guide LASC through the accreditation process, beginning with the self evaluation report. The president provides accreditation trainings, writing workshops, and an accreditation retreat. While guiding LASC through the accreditation process, the president solicits faculty, staff and student participation, ensuring all the opportunity to be a part of the accreditation team.

**Evidence**

IV.B.4-1: Accreditation Committee Roster  
IV.B.4-2: Accreditation Workshop Announcements and Agendas  
IV.B.4-3: Accreditation Retreat Announcement and Agenda  
IV.B.4-4: Accreditation Writing Workshop Announcement  
IV.B.4-5: ACCJC Manuals

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

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

**CEO Assures Implementation and Guides Institutional Practices**

The president assures compliance with all board policies while guiding institutional practices that are in support of the College mission and in adherence with the College budget.

- In an effort to ensure that new program and funding opportunities are well thought-out and planned, the president has established a process that requires the president’s approval at the onset (IV.B.5-1: President’s Email Regarding Funding Requests).
- The president works closely with District Fiscal Operations to review revenue and expenditures and authors plans to reduce deficits.
Compliance with external agencies has improved through the administrative reorganization as measured by program visits and reporting (IV.B.5-2: Department of Education Visit Reports).

**Analysis and Evaluation**

Reporting to the chancellor, the president is responsible for implementing statutes, regulations, and governing board policies. One of the president’s tasks is to review compliance reports submitted to the funding agencies (IV.B.5-3: LASC Categorically Funded Programs Compliance Reports). One of the intents of this process is to ensure that new programs or activities are aligned with the College’s mission and strategic objectives. Additionally, this process informs senior administrators of programs and funding opportunities directly related to their areas of responsibility.

In preparation for presidential reports, the president reviews all budget reports from the vice president of administrative services and the district office to monitor program balances (IV.B.5-4: LASC Campus Department Budgets). In light of this review, the president requires all Specially Funded Programs and categorical programs to appropriately offset costs that would otherwise be absorbed by the College general budget. In addition, the president also monitors expenditures and reviews high cost areas. The Executive Committee of the District Budget Committee is in the process of reviewing the District allocation process. Small colleges of the district struggle to meet their costs with the current revenue allocation. This has been a concern for a number of years and is being addressed definitively.

The College works closely with funding agencies to ensure that actions are in compliance with their regulations. The College works closely with the District Chief Financial Officer (CFO) and the District accounting director to monitor revenue and expenditures monthly and quarterly. The College uses the District’s compliance unit to investigate allegations of discrimination, sexual impropriety, and other inappropriate behaviors. The College provides trained facilitators for hiring processes. The District has implemented a whistleblower program through the Internal Audit Division of the District to review whistleblower complaints and actions. The president works closely with the Internal Audit Division to perform periodic reports on areas of high concern.

**Conclusion**

The College meets the Standard. The president assures compliance with all board policies while guiding institutional practices that are in support of the College mission and in adherence with the College budget.
Evidence

IV.B.5-1: President’s Email Regarding Funding Requests
IV.B.5-2: Department of Education Visit Reports
IV.B.5-3: LASC Categorically Funded Programs Compliance Reports
IV.B.5-4: LASC Campus Department Budgets

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

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

CEO Works and Communicates with Communities Served by LASC

The president works tirelessly to increase the awareness of the value of Los Angeles Southwest College to the South Los Angeles community.

- The College president attends regular community meetings, including homeowner associations, civic groups, workforce investment boards, economic development boards, and other external groups to promote a positive image for the College.
- The president has directed the administrative staff to create and strengthen community partnerships to provide outreach and collaborative opportunities for the institution.
- The president attends all College foundation meetings and activities and serves as the liaison between the College and the foundation.
- In addition, the president holds periodic College forums and two student forums per semester to discuss critical issues and obtain feedback from campus and community stakeholders (IV.B.6-1: College Forum Announcements).

Analysis and Evaluation

The president’s efforts to increase the name recognition and awareness of Los Angeles Southwest College have been effective. The campus has been featured in radio advertisements as well as a campaign of the local bus system (IV.B.6-2: LASC Bus advertisement). These increases in publicity have been cited as factors in the campus exceeding its growth targets for the 2014-15 academic year.

The president has also improved campus communication, which in turn increases community knowledge of campus issues. The outcomes of campus meetings are shared with the campus and community via email and the College website. This allows anyone access to meeting agendas and minutes for all campus committees.
Conclusion

The College meets the Standard. The President is committed to increasing the surrounding community’s awareness of LASC and the College’s programs. The President meets regularly with community groups and promotes the reciprocal relationship between the campus and community.

Evidence

IV.B.6-1: College Forum Announcements
IV.B.6-2: LASC Bus advertisement
IV.C. Governing Board

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

The Los Angeles Community College District’s Governing Board (Board) was authorized by the California Legislature in 1967, in accordance with Education Code sections 70902 and 72000. The Board consists of seven members elected by voters of the school districts composing the District. The Board of Trustees approves all courses, both for credit and noncredit, as well as degree and certificate programs. The Board, through policy and action, exercises oversight of student success, persistence, retention, and the quality of instruction (IV.C.1-1: BR 2100).

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

a. The Board sets policies and monitors the colleges’ programs, services, plans for growth and development, and ensures the institution’s mission is achieved through Board Rules, Chancellor Directives, and Administrative Regulations (IV.C.1-2: BR 2300-2303); (IV.C.1-3: Chancellor Directives, 8/3/15); (IV.C.1-4: Administrative Regulations, 8/3/15).

b. In addition, the Board establishes rules and regulations related to academic quality and integrity, fiscal integrity and stability, student equity and conduct, and accountability and accreditation (IV.C.1-5: BR 2305-2315); (IV.C.1-6: Add Revisions to 6300).

c. The Board, through its standing and ad hoc committees, receives and reviews information and sets policy to ensure the effectiveness of student learning programs and services, as well as the institutions’ financial stability (IV.C.1-7: BR 2604-2607.15).

d. The Board exercises responsibility for monitoring academic quality, integrity, and effectiveness through (1) the approval of all new courses and programs, (2) regular institutional effectiveness reports, (3) yearly review of offerings to underprepared students, and (4) in-depth policy discussions related to student achievement (IV.C.1-8: BOT agenda & minutes for 2/9/11); (IV.C.1-9: BOT agenda & minutes for 3/7/12); (IV.C.1-10: BOT agenda & minutes for 4/3/13); (IV.C.1-11: BOT agenda & minutes for 4/23/14); (IV.C.1-12: BOT agenda & minutes for 1/14/15).

e. The Board receives quarterly financial reports, allowing it to closely monitor the fiscal stability of the District. Board agendas are structured under specific areas: Budget and Finance (BF items), Business Services (BSD items), Human Resources (HRD items), Educational Services (ISD items), Facilities (FPD items), Chancellors Office (CH items) and Personnel Commission (PC items). This structure allows for full information on individual topics to be provided in advance of Board meetings (IV.C.1-13: BOT agenda...
& minutes for 11/2/11); (IV.C.1-14: BOT agenda & minutes for 11/7/12); (IV.C.1-15: BOT agenda & minutes for 11/6/13); (IV.C.1-16: BOT agenda & minutes for 5/14/14); (IV.C.1-17: BOT agenda & minutes for 4/15/15).

Analysis and Evaluation

The LACCD Board of Trustees has authority over, and responsibility for, all aspects of the institution as established in policy and documented in practice. The Board exercises its legal authority and fulfills the responsibilities specified in policy and law. Board agendas are highly detailed and Board members closely monitor all areas of their responsibility, as evidenced in Board meeting calendars, meeting agendas, Board information packets, reports, and minutes.

Board policies governing academic quality are routinely reviewed by designated ESC divisions for compliance and effectiveness and, where needed, updated. The Board routinely reviews student outcomes and, with input from the faculty, student and administrative leadership, sets policy to strengthen institutional effectiveness. The Board receives monthly, quarterly and semi-annual financial information, including enrollment projects and bond construction updates, and acts in accordance with established fiscal policies.

Conclusion

The District meets this Standard.

Evidence

IV.C.1-1: Board Rule 2100
IV.C.1-2: Board Rule 2300-2303
IV.C.1-3; Chancellor Directives, 8/3/15
IV.C.1-4: Administrative Regulations, 8/3/15
IV.C.1-5: Board Rule 2305-2315
IV.C.1-6: revised Board Rule 6300
IV.C.1-7: Board Rule 2604-2607.15
IV.C.1-8: BOT agenda and minutes for 2/9/11
IV.C.1-9: BOT agenda and minutes for 3/7/12
IV.C.1-10: BOT agenda and minutes for 4/3/13
IV.C.1-11: BOT agenda and minutes for 4/23/14
IV.C.1-12: BOT agenda and minutes for 1/14/15
IV.C.1-13: BOT agenda and minutes for 11/2/11
IV.C.1-14: BOT agenda and minutes for 11/7/12
IV.C.1-15: BOT agenda and minutes for 11/6/13
IV.C.1-16: BOT agenda and minutes for 5/14/14
IV.C.1-17: BOT agenda and minutes for 4/15/15
IV.C.2. The governing board acts as a collective entity. Once the board reaches a decision, all board members act in support of the decision.

The Board of Trustees is a highly engaged entity. Board members bring differing backgrounds and perspectives to their positions. At meetings, they engage in full and vigorous discussion of agenda items and share individual viewpoints. However, once a decision is reached and members have voted, they move forward in a united fashion.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

a. The Board’s commitment to act as a unified body is reflected in their Code of Ethical Conduct where Trustees “recognize that governing authority rests with the entire Board, not with me as an individual. I will give appropriate support to all policies and actions taken by the Board at official meetings” (IV.C.2-1: Board Rule 2300.10).

b. Consent agenda items are frequently singled out for separate discussion or vote at the request of individual Board members. Once all members have had a chance to make their views known and a vote is taken, the agenda moves forward without further discussion. Examples of decisions where Trustees have held divergent views, yet acted as a collective entity, include approval of Van de Kamp Innovation Center, the approval of the lease for the Harbor College Teacher Preparatory Academy, student expulsions, ratification of lobbying service contracts, and revision to graduation requirements (IV.C.2-2: BOT Minutes Consent Items Discussions, 2012-2015).

**Analysis and Evaluation**

Board policies and procedures provide a framework for members’ collective action and guide Board discussion, voting, and behavior during and outside of Board meetings. Board members are able to engage in debate and present multiple perspectives during open discussion but still come to collective decisions and support those decisions once reached. Minutes from Board actions from recent years substantiate this behavior.

**Conclusion**

The District meets this Standard.

**Evidence**

IV.C.2-1: Board Rule 2300.10
IV.C.3. The governing board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the CEO of the college and/or the district/system.

The Board follows California Education Code, Board policies, and the District’s Human Resource Guide R-110 in the selection and evaluation of the Chancellor and college presidents.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

**Selection of Chancellor**

a. The hiring of a Chancellor starts with Board action authorizing the Human Resources Division to launch a search. The Board then hires an executive search firm and oversees the Chancellor selection process (IV.C.3-1: HR R-110); (IV.C.3-2: BOT Agenda, BT6, Chancellor search, 5/1/13).

b. The most recent Chancellor search (2013) illustrates the process. The Board hired an executive search firm, which then convened focus group/town hall meetings at all colleges and the Educational Services Center. During these meetings, employee and student input was solicited to develop a “Chancellor’s Profile” describing the desired qualities and characteristics for a new leader. The Chancellor’s Profile was used to develop a job description and timeline for selection and hiring of the new Chancellor (IV.C.3-3: Chancellor Profile Development Announcement, 5/9/13); (IV.C.3-4: Chancellor Job Description, May 2013); (IV.C.3-5: Chancellor Selection Timeline, May 2013).

c. The Board’s search committee began meeting in August 2013 and began interviewing candidates in October 2013. The Board held closed sessions related to the selection of the Chancellor from October 2013-March 2014. On March 13, 2014, the Board announced its selection of Dr. Francisco Rodriguez. Dr. Rodriguez began his tenure as LACCD Chancellor on June 1, 2014 (IV.C.3-6: Chancellor Search Announcement, 5/1/13); (IV.C.3-7: closed Board session agendas 2013-2014); (IV.C.3-8: LA Times article, 3/13/14).

**Evaluation of Chancellor**

d. The Chancellor’s contract includes a provision for an annual evaluation to be conducted by the Board of Trustees. General Counsel is the designated District entity who works with the Board during this process (IV.C.3-9: Chancellor’s Directive 122).

e. **Chancellor’s Directive 122 Evaluation of the Chancellor** indicates that the Board may solicit input from various constituents, typically including the college presidents, District senior staff, the Academic Senate presidents and union representatives. It also states the Chancellor will prepare and submit a written self-evaluation, based upon his or her stated
goals (IV.C.3-10: Chancellor evaluation data collection form); (IV.C.3-11: Blank Chancellor evaluation form).

f. Once submitted, the Board discusses drafts of the evaluation in closed session. When their assessment is complete, the Board meets with the Chancellor and s/he is provided the final, written document. A signed copy of the Chancellor’s evaluation is maintained in the Office of General Counsel (IV.C.3-12: BOT Chancellor evaluation closed session agendas 11/2014-6/2015).

Selection of College Presidents

g. The Board shares responsibility with the Chancellor for hiring and evaluating the performance of college presidents. Board Rule 10308 specifies the selection procedures, which typically involve national searches (IV.C.3-13: BR 10308).

h. Board action is required to initiate the presidential search process, directing the Chancellor to begin the process pursuant to Board Rule 10308. Recent Board actions authorizing president searches include Harbor, Southwest and Valley Colleges in June 2014, and West Los Angeles College in June 2015 (IV.C.3-14: HRD1 Board resolution, 6/25/14); (IV.C.3-15: HRD1 Board resolution, 6/25/15).

i. Per the timeline set by Board action, the Chancellor convenes a Presidential Search Committee comprised of representatives of all stakeholder groups per Board Rule 10308. After consultation with the Board and Presidential Search Committee of the applicable college, the Chancellor oversees the recruitment and advertising plan, which may include the retention of a search firm upon Board approval. The Presidential Search Committee forwards at least three unranked semifinalists to the Chancellor.

j. After conducting interviews, the Chancellor compiles information from background and reference checks and forwards the names of the finalist(s) to the Board of Trustees for consideration. The Board holds closed Board sessions on presidential selection when interviewing candidates (IV.C.3-16: BOT closed agendas 5/2010-6/2015).

Evaluation of College Presidents

k. As detailed in Chancellor’s Directive 122, contracts for college presidents include a provision for an annual evaluation conducted by the Chancellor. College presidents complete an annual Presidential Self-Assessment, update their goals for the following year, and meet with the Chancellor to review both documents. In addition, presidents undergo a comprehensive evaluation at least every three years. In this process, the president’s self-evaluation is supplemented by an evaluation committee, which collects input from peers and completes the Presidential Evaluation Data Collection form. The Chancellor then prepares a summary evaluation memo, which is shared with the college
The presidential evaluation process is used to determine salary increases, as well as recommendations to the Board on the renewal of contracts. Corrective action, if needed, can include suspension, reassignment, or resignation (IV.C.3-18: Closed Board meeting agendas on presidential evaluations 8/2010-6/2014).

Analysis and Evaluation

The Board takes its responsibility for selecting and evaluating the Chancellor very seriously, following a set selection and evaluation process. In turn, the Chancellor is responsible for selecting and evaluating those who directly report to him/her (including college presidents, general counsel, the deputy chancellor and vice chancellors). With the assistance of the Human Resources division, the Chancellor and Board have followed selection and evaluation requirements for its senior administrators.

Conclusion

The District meets this Standard.

Evidence

IV.C.3-1: HR R-110
IV.C.3-2: BOT Agenda, BT6, Chancellor search, 5/1/13
IV.C.3-3: Chancellor Profile Development Announcement, 5/9/13
IV.C.3-4: Chancellor Job Description, May 2013
IV.C.3-5: Chancellor Selection Timeline, May 2013
IV.C.3-6: Chancellor Search Announcement, 5/1/13
IV.C.3-7: Chancellor selection closed Board session agendas 2013-2014
IV.C.3-8: LA Times article, 3/13/14
IV.C.3-9: Chancellor’s Directive 122
IV.C.3-10: Chancellor evaluation data collection form, 12/5/07
IV.C.3-11: Blank Chancellor evaluation form
IV.C.3-12: BOT Agendas, Chancellor evaluation closed sessions, 11/19/14-6/13/15
IV.C.3-13: Board Rule 10308
IV.C.3-14: HRD1 Board resolution, 6/25/14
IV.C.3-15: HRD1 Board resolution, 6/24/15
IV.C.3-16: BOT closed agendas president selection 5/2010-6/2015
IV.C.3-17: Performance Evaluation Process for college presidents
IV.C.3-18: BOT closed agendas president evaluations 8/2010-6/2014
IV.C.4. The governing board is an independent, policy-making body that reflects the public interest in the institution’s educational quality. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or political pressure.

The Board of Trustees consists of seven members elected for four-year terms by qualified voters of the school districts composing the Los Angeles Community College District. The Board also has a Student Trustee, elected by students for a one-year term. The Student Trustee has an advisory vote on actions other than personnel-related and collective bargaining items (IV.C.4-1: Board Rule 2101-2102); (IV.C.4-2: Board Rule 21001.13).

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

a. Board rules mandate that the Board act as an independent policy-making body reflecting the public interest. Board policy states that the Board, acting through the Chancellor, or designee, monitors, supports, and opposes local, state and national legislation to “…protect and to promote the interests of the Los Angeles Community College District” (IV.C.4-3: Board Rule 2300); (IV.C.4-4: Board Rule 1200-1201).

b. The Board independently carries out its policy-making role through four standing committees: Budget and Finance, Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success, Legislative and Public Affairs, and Facilities Master Planning and Oversight (IV.C.4-5 Board Rule 2605.11).

c. The Board forms additional ad hoc committees and subcommittees to investigate and address specific policy issues. They formed the following ad hoc committees during the 2014-15 year: (1) Campus Safety and Emergency Preparedness; (2) Outreach and Recruitment; (3) Environmental Stewardship; and (4) Summer Youth Employment. Two subcommittees were formed during this same period: Campus Safety and Emergency Preparedness. Previous years’ ad hoc committees have included Adult Education and Workforce Development (January 2014), Contractor Debarment (November 2011) and the Personnel Commission (January 2014) (IV.C.4-6: BOT Ad Hoc Committees, 8/4/15).

d. The Board maintains its independence as a policy-making body by studying all materials in advance of meetings, being well informed before engaging in District business, and asking questions and requesting additional information as needed. Before each Board or committee meeting, members receive a Board Letter, detailing all pending actions, follow-up on previous requests, and information related to personnel, litigation, and other confidential matters (IV.C.4-7: Board letters, 2013-2015).

e. Board members engage with local communities across the District. They receive a wide range of input from community and constituent groups by holding meetings at the nine colleges in addition to the District office. This practice helps broaden Board members’ perspectives on colleges’ diversity and the educational quality issues affecting individual colleges. Members of the public have the opportunity to express their perspectives during
the public comments section of each Board meeting, when individual agenda items are under consideration, and through direct correspondence with the Board. Such input contributes to the Board’s understanding of the public interest in institutional quality and is taken into consideration during deliberations (IV.C.4-8: BOT minutes, public agenda speakers, 2015); (IV.C.4-9: BOT minutes, educational quality speakers, 2015).

f. Additionally, members of the public can submit direct inquiries to the Board via the District website and will receive a response coordinated by the Chancellor’s Office (IV.C.4-10: Screenshot of Public Inquiry Email to Board President).

g. The Board’s role in protecting and promoting the interests of the LACCD is clearly articulated in Board Rules. The Board has historically defended and protected the institution from undue influence or political pressure. For example, the Board heard from numerous constituents who spoke against the Van de Kamp Innovation Center and the discontinuance of LA Pierce College’s Farm contractor during public agenda requests at Board meetings. The Board follows Board Rules in considering these issues, then makes independent decisions based on the best interest of the institution, educational quality, and its students (IV.C.4-11: Board Rule 3002-3003.30); (IV.C.4-12: BOT minutes, VKC and Farm, 10/15/11 and 4/29/15).

h. The Board engages in advocacy efforts on behalf of the District in particular, and community colleges in general, through its legislative advocates in Sacramento and in Washington, DC. Annually, the Board sets its policy and legislative priorities in consultation with the Chancellor, their State legislative consultant, McCallum Group Inc., and federal lobbyist firm, Holland and Knight. The Board regularly discusses and takes action, either in support of or against, state and federal legislation with the potential to affect the District and its students (IV.C.4-13: Legislative and Public Affairs Committee agenda, Board Legislative Priorities for 2015, 11/19/14); (IV.C.4-14: BOT agendas, Legislative advocacy, 2015); (IV.C.4-15: BOT minutes, 2015-16 Federal Legislative Priorities, 8/19/15).

Analysis and Evaluation

Board members work together collaboratively to advocate for and defend the interests of the District. Public input on the quality of education and college operations is facilitated through open session comments at Board meetings, and through the Board’s consistent adherence to open meeting laws and principles. The LACCD service area is extremely dense and politically diverse, and members of the public advocate strongly for their respective interests. Regardless, through the years, the Board of Trustees has remained focused on its role as an independent policy-making body and diligently supports the interests of the colleges and District in the face of external pressure.
**Conclusion**

The District meets this Standard.

**Evidence**

IV.C.4-1: Board Rule 2101-2102  
IV.C.4-2: Board Rule 21001.13  
IV.C.4-3: Board Rule 2300  
IV.C.4-4: Board Rule 1200-1201  
IV.C.4-5: Board Rule 2605.11  
IV.C.4-6: BOT Ad Hoc Committees, 8/4/15  
IV.C.4-7: Board letters, 2013-2015  
IV.C.4-8: BOT minutes, public agenda speakers, 2015  
IV.C.4-9: BOT minutes, educational quality speakers, 2015  
IV.C.4-10: Screenshot of Public Inquiry Email to Board President  
IV.C.4-11: Board Rule 3002-3003.30  
IV.C.4-12: BOT minutes, VKC and Farm, 10/15/11 and 4/29/15  
IV.C.4-13: Legislative and Public Affairs Committee, Board Legislative Priorities for 2015, 11/19/14  
IV.C.4-14: BOT agendas, Legislative advocacy, 2015  
IV.C.4-15: BOT minutes, 2015-16 Federal Legislative Priorities, 8/19/15

**IV.C.5.** The governing board establishes policies consistent with the district mission to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them. The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity and stability.

The Board sets and updates policies consistent with the District’s mission, and monitors their implementation to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services. Recent Board actions include revising and strengthening rules governing academic probation and disqualification (BR 8200); graduation, General Education and IGETC/CSU requirements (BR 6200); and academic standards, grading and grade symbols (BR 6700). Active faculty participation through the District Academic Senate provides the Board with professional expertise in the area of academic quality.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

*Educational Quality, Integrity and Improvement*

a. The Board’s policies regarding educational programs and academic standards help ensure that the mission of the Los Angeles Community College District is realized in providing “...our students [with] an excellent education that prepares them to transfer to four-year
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institutions, successfully complete workforce development programs designed to meet local and statewide needs, and pursue opportunities for lifelong learning and civic engagement” (IV.C.5-1: Board Rule 2300-2303.16 and 2305); (IV.C.5-2: Board Rule 1200).

b. Chapter VI of LACCD Board Rules (Instruction, Articles I-VIII), establishes academic standards, sets policies for graduation, curriculum development and approval, and sets criteria for program review, viability, and termination. Regulations governing educational programs are implemented as detailed in Section IV of LACCD Administrative Regulations ("E-Regs") (see Standard IV.C.1) (IV.C.5-3: BR Ch. VI, Articles I-VIII Instruction).

c. The Board’s Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success (IESS) Committee “...fulfills an advisory, monitoring and coordinating role regarding accreditation, planning, student success and curriculum matters. The committee’s responsibilities include the coordination of accreditation activities, oversight of District wide planning processes and all issues affecting student success, academic policies and programmatic changes. Its specific charge is to: 1) Review and approve a coordinated timeline for institutional effectiveness and accreditation planning processes throughout the District; 2) Review and provide feedback on indicators of institutional effectiveness so that common elements, themes, and terms can be identified, reviewed and agreed upon; 3) Monitor college compliance with the Standards of Accreditation of the Association of Community Colleges and Junior Colleges; 4) Monitor existing planning and evaluation practices relative to student completion initiatives; and 5) Facilitate the review, update and revision of the long-range strategic plan and goals every five years; and 6) Discuss potential new or revised curricular programs and services within the District, and encourage the development of new programs and services as may be appropriate” (IV.C.5-4: Board Rule 2605.11).

d. The IESS Committee reviews, provides feedback on, and approves reports containing institutional effectiveness and student success indicators. For example, this Committee reviews colleges’ Student Equity Plans, Strategic Plans, and mission statements. Board members are actively engaged in asking for clarification on college reports, presentations, and plans to better their understanding and support of the colleges (see Standard IV.C.8) (IV.C.5-5: BR 2314).

**Ensuring Resources**

e. The Board ensures colleges have the necessary resources to deliver quality student learning programs and services. Board support is evidenced in budget policies, the budget development calendar, and the tentative and final budgets, which are reviewed and approved after substantial discussion. Allocation formulas are implemented to ensure appropriate distribution of funds are made that are consistent with the District’s and colleges’ mission to support the integrity, quality and improvement of student learning.
programs and services (see Standard III.D.11) (IV.C.5-6: Board Rule 2305 and 7600-7606); (IV.C.5-7: LACCD Budget Development Calendar); (IV.C.5-8: 2015-2016 Final Budget); (IV.C.5-9: District Allocation Mechanism amendment, 6/3/12).

f. The Board’s Legislative and Public Affairs Committee monitors legislative initiatives and pending legislation which may affect the District, and advocates for policies which will have a positive impact. The Chancellor and Board members meet regularly with state lawmakers and educational leaders to promote legislation and other initiatives intended to improve student access and secure funding for community colleges and specific programs (IV.C.5-10: LPA minutes 2014-2015).

Financial Integrity and Stability

g. The Board is responsible for the financial integrity and stability of the District. The Budget and Finance Committee (BFC) is a standing committee of the Board whose charge is to review and recommend action on fiscal matters prior to full Board approval. As articulated in Chapter II, Article IV, 2605.11.c, the Committee recommends action on the tentative and full budget; general, internal and financial audits; quarterly financial reports, and bond financing (see Standard III.D.5) (IV.C.5-4: BR 2605.11).

h. The BFC monitors the financial stability of each college and reviews annual District financial reports as required by Board Rule 7608. The Committee critically reviews and approves monthly enrollment and FTES reports which involve members asking college presidents to elaborate on fiscal fluctuations and enrollment trends. The Committee also sets annual goals that are consistent with their role and mission to maintain financial stability for the District (IV.C.5-11: Board Rule 7608); (IV.C.5-12: BFC minutes 11/5/14, 3/11/15 and 5/13/15); (IV.C.5-13: BFC agendas 2014-15).

i. Board policy mandates a 10% District reserve. Use of contingency reserves is only authorized upon recommendation of the Chancellor, the (Chief Financial Officer (CFO) and the District Budget Committee, and requires a super-majority vote by the full Board (IV.C.5-14: 2015-2016 Final Budget, Appendix F, Reserve policy, p. 3); (IV.C.5-15: BOT Agendas approval of contingency reserves, 7/9/14 and 8/5/15).

The Board approved Fiscal Accountability policies in October 2013. These policies hold each college, and college president, responsible for maintaining fiscal stability. Board members evaluate and authorize college’s requests for financial assistance for fiscal sustainability (IV.C.5-16: BOT agenda BF2, 10/9/13); (IV.C.5-17: BFC minutes 6/11/14, 2/11/15 and 9/6/15 and BOT agenda, 8/5/15 regarding college financial requests).

j. The Board’s Facilities Master Planning and Oversight Committee (FMPOC) oversees the Bond Construction Program. Based on recommendations made in 2012 by both an independent review panel and the ACCJC, the Board embarked on a wide range of activities to strengthen fiscal control of the Program. These actions were subsequently
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determined by the Commission to have resolved the issues identified in its February 7, 2014 letter to the District (IV.C.5-18: ACCJC letter, 2/7/14).

**Legal Matters**

k. The Board is apprised of, and assumes responsibility for, all legal matters associated with the operation of the nine campuses and the Educational Services Center. The Board closely monitors legal issues that arise in the District, reviewing them in closed session, and approving decisions during open session as required by law. The District’s Office of General Counsel provides legal counsel to the Board and ensures the District is in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations (IV.C.5-19: BOT closed session agendas on legal issues); (IV.C.5-20: Board Rule 4001).

**Analysis and Evaluation**

As documented above, the standing policies and practice of the Board of Trustees demonstrates that they assume the ultimate responsibility for policies and decisions affecting educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity and stability of the Los Angeles Community College District. The Board holds college presidents and the Chancellor, publicly accountable for meeting quality assurance standards associated with their educational and strategic planning efforts.

**Conclusion**

The District meets this Standard.

**Evidence**

IV.C.5-1: Board Rule 2300-2303.16 and 2305
IV.C.5-2: Board Rule 1200
IV.C.5-3: BR Ch. VI, Articles I-VIII, Instruction
IV.C.5-4: Board Rule 2605.11
IV.C.5-5: Board Rule 2314
IV.C.5-6: Board Rule 2036 and 7600-7606
IV.C.5-7: LACCD Budget Development Calendar
IV.C.5-8: 2015-2016 Final Budget
IV.C.5-9: District Budget Allocation Mechanism amendment, 6/3/12
IV.C.5-10: LPA minutes, July 2014-June 2015
IV.C.5-11: Board Rule 7608
IV.C.5-12: BFC minutes, Quarterly reports, 11/2014-5/2015
IV.C.5-13: BFC agendas, 2014-15
IV.C.5-14: 2015-2016 Final Budget, Appendix F, Reserve policy, p. 3
IV.C.5-15: BOT Agendas approval of contingency reserves, 7/9/14 and 8/5/15
IV.C.5-16: BOT agenda BF2, 10/9/13
IV.C.6. The institution or the governing board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board’s size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures.

Chapter VI of LACCD Board Rules delineates all structural and operational matters pertaining to the Board of Trustees. Board rules are published electronically on the District website. The Office of General Counsel also maintains, and makes available to the public, paper (hard) copies of all Board rules and administrative regulations. Board rules are routinely reviewed and updated.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

a. Board membership, elections, mandatory orientation and annual retreats, and duties and responsibilities of the governing board are defined in Chapter II of the LACCD Board Rules (IV.C.6-1: Screenshot of Board Rules online); (IV.C.6-2: BR 2100-2902); (IV.C.6-3: BR 21000-21010).

 Article I – Membership – includes membership, elections, term of office, procedure to fill vacancies, orientation, compensation and absence of both Board members and the Student Trustee.
 Article II – Officers – delineates the office of president, vice president, president pro tem, and secretary of the Board.
 Article III – Duties of the Board of Trustees - includes powers, values, expectation of ethical conduct and sanctions for failure to adhere thereby; governance, self-evaluation, disposition of District budget, calendar, monuments and donations; acceptance of funds; equity plans, and conferral of degrees.
 Article IV – Meetings – Regular, closed session and annual meetings; order of business, votes, agendas and public inquiries; number of votes required by type of action, and processes to change or suspend Board rules.
 Article V – Communications to the Board – written and oral communications; public agenda speakers; expectations of behavior at Board meetings and sanctions for violation thereof;
 Article VI – Committees of the Board of Trustees – delineates standing, ad hoc, citizens advisory and student affairs committees.
 Article VII – Use of Flags - provisions thereof.
 Article VIII – Naming of College Facilities – provisions to name or re-name new or existing facilities.
 Article IX – General Provisions – including travel on Board business; job candidate travel expenses, and approval of Board rules and administrative regulations.
- **Article X – Student Trustee Election Procedures** – including qualifications, term of office, election, replacement and other authorizations.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The Board publishes bylaws and policies which are publically available, both electronically and on paper. These policies are routinely reviewed and updated by the Office of General Counsel under the supervision of the Chancellor and the Board.

**Conclusion**

The District meets this Standard.

**Evidence**

IV.C.6-1: Screenshot of Board Rules online
IV.C.6-2: Board Rule 2100-2902
IV.C.6-3: Board Rule 21000-21010

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

The Board of Trustees is aware of, and operates in a manner consistent with, its policies and bylaws. The Board is actively engaged in regularly assessing and revising its policies and bylaws for their effectiveness in fulfilling the colleges’ and District’s mission and commitment to educational quality, institutional effectiveness, and student success.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

a. In accordance with Board Rules, the Board meets regularly during the academic year. Closed sessions, special, emergency, and annual meetings are held in accordance with related Education and Governance Codes (IV.C.7-1: BR 2400-2400.13); (IV.C.7-2: BR 2402-2404).

b. As stipulated by Board rule, the Board conducts an annual orientation and training for new members; an annual self-assessment and goal-setting retreat, and an annual review of the Chancellor. Board goals are reviewed and updated annually during the Board’s annual retreat (IV.C.7-3: BOT agendas, 6/13/15 and 6/18/15).

c. The Board of Trustees is responsible for the adoption, amendment or repeal of Board rules in accordance with Board Rule 2418. The process for adoption, or revision, of Board rules and the administrative regulations which support them is outlined in Chancellor’s Directive 70. As the Board’s designee, the Chancellor issues Administrative
Regulations. The District adopts other procedures, such as its Business Procedures Manual and Chancellor’s Directives, to establish consistent and effective standards (IV.C.7-4: Chancellor’s Directive 70); (IV.C.7-5: BR 2418).

d. The Chancellor, as the Board’s designee, assigns rules and regulations by subject area to members of his/her executive team for the triennial review. Administrative regulations stipulate the process for the cyclical review of all policies and regulations. Regulations are coded by a letter prefix which corresponds to the administrative area and “business owner,” e.g. Educational Regulations (“E-Regs”) and Student Regulations (“S-Regs”) are under the purview of the Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness division (IV.C.7-6: Administrative Regulation C-12); (IV.C.7-7: Board Rule Review Schedule 2015); (IV.C.7-8: Admin Regs Review Schedule 2015).

e. Under the guidance of the Chancellor, the Office of General Counsel conducts periodic reviews of Board Rules and Administrative Regulations and maintains master review records. The OGC monitors changes to Title 5 as well as State and federal law, and proposes revisions as needed. Changes to Administrative Regulations are prepared by the “business owner,” then consulted per Chancellor’s Directive 70. Formal documentation of the revision is submitted to OGC and subsequently posted on the District website (IV.C.7-9: Admin Reg Rev Form Template); (IV.C.7-10: E-97 review and comment).

f. During the 2014-15 academic year, the Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE) division reviewed and updated twenty-eight Educational Services regulations (IV.C.7-11: Admin Regs Review Schedule 2015); (IV.C.7-12: E-110 Confirmed Review, 4/22/15).

g. As noted in item ‘d’ above, designated ESC administrative areas bring proposed Board Rule revisions for review and comment to key District-level councils, committees and stakeholders prior to being noticed on the Board agenda. Board members themselves, or individuals who were not part of the consultation process, have the opportunity to comment or request more information before the rule is finalized. Approved changes are posted on the District website (IV.C.7-13: BR 6700 consultation memo and BOT Agenda notice, 5/5/15).

Analysis and Evaluation

Trustees act in accordance with established policies. Board meeting minutes and agendas provide clear evidence of the Board acting in a manner consistent with policies and bylaws. Board rules and administrative regulations are subject to regular review and revision by both District administrative staff and the Office of General Counsel, and are fully vetted through the consultation process. The District recently subscribed to the Community College League of California’s (CCLC) Board Policy and Administrative Procedure Service. The receipt of CCLC notifications on State regulation and policy changes will further strengthen the District’s regular update of Board policies and procedures.
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**Conclusion**

The District meets this Standard.

**Evidence**

IV.C.7-1: Board Rule 2400-2400.13  
IV.C.7-2: Board Rule 2402-2404  
IV.C.7-3: BOT agenda 6/13/15 and 6/18/15  
IV.C.7-4: Chancellor’s Directive 70  
IV.C.7-5: Board Rule 2418  
IV.C.7-6: Administrative Regulation C-12  
IV.C.7-7: Board Rule Review Schedule 2015  
IV.C.7-8: Administrative Regs Review Schedule 2015  
IV.C.7-9: Admin Reg Rev Form Template  
IV.C.7-10: E-97 review and comment  
IV.C.7-11: Admin Regs Review Schedule 2015  
IV.C.7-12: E-110 Confirmed Review, 4/22/15  
IV.C.7-13: Board Rule 6700 consultation memo and BOT Agenda notice, 5/5/15  

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

At set intervals throughout the year, the Board of Trustees reviews, discusses and accepts reports, which address the quality of student learning and achievement. The primary, but by no means only, mechanism for such inquiry is the Board’s Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success Committee (IESS).

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

a. The Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success Committee “fulfills an advisory, monitoring and coordinating role regarding accreditation, planning, student success and curriculum matters” and fulfills its charge to “review and provide feedback on indicators of institutional effectiveness so that common elements, themes, and terms can be identified, reviewed and agreed upon.” Committee reports are received on behalf of the full Board, and the Committee has the authority to request revisions or further information before recommending items to the entire Board for approval (IV.C.8-1: BR 2605.11).

b. The Board reviews and approves colleges’ academic quality and institutional plans annually. The Board also participates in an annual review and analysis of the State’s Student Success Scorecard, which reports major indicators of student achievement. It reviews and approves colleges’ Educational and Strategic Master Plans every five years,
or sooner if requested by the college. At its recent retreat, the Board reviewed national and District student completion data for the past six years. The Board discussed factors that may contribute to low completion rates and possible goals focusing on improving students’ completion rates across the District (IV.C.8-2: IESS minutes and PPT 6/24/15; IV.C.8-3: IESS agenda 12/17/14; (IV.C.8-4: IESS minutes 11/19/14); (IV.C.8-5: IESS minutes 9/17/14); (IV.C.8-6: IESS Min 1/29/14); (IV.C.8-7: IESS minutes 12/4/13); (IV.C.8-8: IESS minutes 11/20/13); (IV.C.8-9: BOT agenda and PPT 9/2/15); (IV.C.8-10: BOT agenda and DAS Board meeting notes 8/19/15); (IV.C.8-11: BOT agenda and PPT 5/13/15); (IV.C.8-12: BOT agenda 4/15/15); (IV.C.8-13: BOT agenda 3/11/15); (IV.C.8-14: BOT agenda 1/28/15); (IV.C.8-15: BOT minutes 8/20/14); (IV.C.8-16: BOT agenda, CH1, 2/26/14).

c. The Board has taken a special interest in the performance of underprepared students. In June 2014, the Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success Committee (IESS) requested a presentation on the success rates and challenges faced by underprepared students district wide. In addition, the Board was updated on the number of basic skills offerings relative to the number of underprepared students by college. In response, the Board urged that more basic skills sections be offered to support the success of these students (IV.C.8-17: IESS Agenda and Underprepared Students PPT, 6/11/14); (IV.C.8-11: BOT agenda and PPT 5/13/15).

d. The Board annually reviews student awards and transfers to four-year colleges and universities (IV.C.8-18: IESS agenda 1/29/14); (IV.C.8-19: IESS agenda and minutes 3/26/14); (IV.C.8-20: District certificate report and degree reports, 3/26/14); (IV.C.8-21: Certificates Attached to Degrees, Summary by College, 4/29/14).

e. The Board reviews students’ perspectives on learning outcomes and key indicators of student learning as a part of the District’s biennial Student Survey. The Survey provides an opportunity for students to share their educational experiences and provide feedback to colleges and the District (IV.C.8-22: 2014 Student Survey Question 25 and results); (IV.C.8-23: IESS minutes & student survey PPT, 5/27/15).

f. In Spring 2015, the Board reviewed and approved college and District-level goals for four State-mandated Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) indicator standards on successful course completion, accreditation status, fund balances, and audit status (IV.C.8-24: BOT agenda and PPT, 6/10/15).

g. During the approval process, accreditation reports are reviewed, especially with regard to college plans for improvement of student learning outcomes (IV.C.8-25: BOT minutes 3/28/13); (IV.C.8-26: IESS 9/25/13); (IV.C.8-13: BOT agenda, 3/11/15).
Analysis and Evaluation

The Board is regularly informed of key indicators of student learning and achievement, both as a whole and through its Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success Committee. Board agendas and minutes provide evidence of regular review, discussion and input regarding student success and plans for improving academic quality.

The Board’s level of engagement, along with knowledge about student learning and achievement, has continued to grow over the years. Board members ask insightful questions and expect honest and thorough responses from the colleges. The Board sets clear expectations for improvement of student learning outcomes.

Conclusion

The District meets this standard.

Evidence

IV.C.8-1: Board Rule 2605.11
IV.C.8-2: IESS minutes and PPT 6/24/15
IV.C.8-3: IESS agenda 12/17/14
IV.C.8-4: IESS minutes 11/19/14
IV.C.8-5: IESS minutes 9/17/14
IV.C.8-6: IESS minutes 1/29/14
IV.C.8-7: IESS minutes 12/4/13
IV.C.8-8: IESS minutes 11/20/13
IV.C.8-9: BOT agenda and PPT 9/2/15
IV.C.8-10: BOT agenda and DAS Board meeting notes 8/19/15
IV.C.8-11: BOT agenda and PPT 5/13/15
IV.C.8-12: BOT agenda 4/15/15
IV.C.8-13: BOT agenda 3/11/15
IV.C.8-14: BOT agenda 1/28/15
IV.C.8-15: BOT minutes 8/20/14
IV.C.8-16: BOT agenda, CH1, 2/26/14
IV.C.8-17: IESS Agenda and Underprepared Students PPT, 6/11/14
IV.C.8-18: IESS agenda 1/29/14
IV.C.8-19: IESS minutes 3/26/14
IV.C.8-20: District certificate report and degree reports, 3/26/14
IV.C.8-21: Certificates Attached to Degrees, Summary by College, 4/29/14
IV.C.8-22: 2014 Student Survey Question 25 and results
IV.C.8-23: IESS minutes & Student Survey results PPT, 5/27/15
IV.C.8-24: BOT agenda and PPT, 6/10/15
IV.C.8-25: BOT minutes 3/28/13
IV.C.8-26: IESS minutes 9/25/13
IV.C.9. The governing board has an ongoing training program for board development, including new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.

The District has a clear process for orienting Board members, which includes an overview of District operations, a review of ethical rules and responsibilities, a briefing on compliance with the Ralph M. Brown and Fair Political Practices acts, a review of the roles of auxiliary organizations and employee organizations, and a discussion about preparing for, and conduct during, Board meetings. The Chancellor, in consultation with the president of the Board, facilitates an annual Board retreat, and schedules regular educational presentations to the Board throughout the year.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Board Development

a. The Board has had a formal orientation policy since 2007. There are also long-standing procedures for the orientation of the Student Trustee. All new Board members are oriented before taking office. Most recently, orientation sessions for new members who began their terms on July 1, 2015 were conducted in June 2015 (IV.C.9-1: Board Rule 2105); (IV.C.9-2: Student Trustee Orientation procedures).

b. Board member orientation also includes an overview of the functions and responsibilities of divisions in the District office. Presentations on accreditation, conflict of interest policy, and California public meeting requirements (Brown Act) are also included in the orientation (IV.C.9-3: BOT agenda and orientation packet, 6/4/15); (IV.C.9-4: BOT agenda and orientation packet 6/18/15).

c. A comprehensive and ongoing Board development program was implemented in 2010. Topics include Trustee roles and responsibilities; policy setting; ethical conduct; accreditation, and developing Board goals and objectives (IV.C.9-5: BOT Agenda, minutes & handouts, 1/20/10); (IV.C.9-6: BOT Agenda, minutes & handouts 12/10/10-12/11/10); (IV.C.9-7: BOT Agenda, minutes & handouts, 8/25/11-8/26/11); (IV.C.9-8: BOT Agenda, minutes & handouts, 4/19/12); (IV.C.9-9: BOT Agenda and minutes, 9/24/12); (IV.C.9-10: BOT Agenda and minutes, 11/13/12); (IV.C.9-11: BOT minutes & Action Improvement Plan, 3/19/13); (IV.C.9-12: BOT minutes & handouts, 10/22/13); (IV.C.9-13: BOT Agenda, minutes & handouts, 8/23/14); (IV.C.9-14: BOT Agenda, minutes & handouts, 12/10/14).

d. In affirmation of their commitment to principles developed during their retreats, the Board revised their Rules to include a statement that Board members should work with the Chancellor to obtain information from staff, and avoid involvement in operational
matters. Board rules were further revised to facilitate member training, conference 
attendance, and educational development (IV.C.9-15: Board Rule 2300.10-2300.11).

e. Trustees are encouraged to expand their knowledge of community college issues, 
operations, and interests by participating in Community College League of California 
(CCLC) statewide meetings and other relevant conferences. Trustees also complete the 
online ACCJC Accreditation Basics training, with new Trustees completing this training 
within three months after taking office (see Standard IV.C.11) (IV.C.9-16: BOT agenda 
and minutes, 11/19/14 and 5/13/15); (IV.C.9-17: ACCJC training certificates from 2012).

Continuity of Board Membership

f. Board Rule Chapter II, Article 1, Section 2103 specifies the process the Board will follow 
in filling a vacancy that occurs between elections. The procedure ensures continuity of 
Board membership, as demonstrated. The Board followed the process when it appointed 
Angela Reddock (2007) to complete Trustee Waxman’s term, who resigned to accept a 
position outside of the District. The Board again followed this process when it appointed 
Miguel Santiago (2008) to fill the unexpired term of Trustee Warren Furutani, who was 
elected to another office. More recently, when Trustee Santiago was elected to the State 
Assembly, the Board determined not to fill his unexpired term, as the length of time 
between his departure (December 2014) and the next election (March 2015) was allowed 
by law. The Board subsequently voted to appoint the individual elected to fill the vacant 
seat, Mike Fong, for the period remaining in the unexpired term (March 2015 to June 
2015) (IV.C.9-18: Board Rule 2103); (IV.C.9-19: BOT minutes 4/11/07); (IV.C.9-20: 
BOT Agenda 3/11/15).

g. Trustee elections are held on a staggered basis, with members serving four-year terms. 
An election is held every two years to fill either three or four seats. Three new Board 
members were elected in March 2015 with terms beginning July 1, 2015. A District wide 
student election is held annually to select a student member, who has an advisory vote, in 
accordance with Board Rule Chapter II Article X (IV.C.9-20: BR 2102); (IV.C.9-21: BR 
21000).

Analysis and Evaluation

The Board has a robust and consistent program of orientation as well as ongoing 
development and self-evaluation. Board members have demonstrated a commitment to 
fulfilling their policy and oversight role, and a responsibility for ensuring educational quality. 
The Board had followed policy in ensuring continuity of Board membership when vacancies 
have occurred. The staggering of Board elections has provided consistency in recent years 
and incumbents are frequently re-elected to their positions, providing continuity of 
governance.
Conclusion

The District meets this Standard.

Evidence

IV.C.9-1: Board Rule 2105
IV.C.9-2: Student trustee orientation procedures
IV.C.9-3: BOT orientation agenda and packet, 6/4/15
IV.C.9-4: BOT orientation agenda and packet, 6/18/15
IV.C.9-5: BOT Agenda, minutes & handouts from 1/20/10
IV.C.9-6: BOT Agenda and minutes, 12/10/10-12/11/10
IV.C.9-7: BOT Agenda, minutes & handouts from 8/25/11-8/26/11
IV.C.9-8: BOT Agenda, minutes & handouts from 4/19/12
IV.C.9-9: BOT Agenda and minutes, 9/24/12
IV.C.9-10: BOT Agenda and minutes, 11/13/12
IV.C.9-11: BOT minutes and Action Improvement Plan, 3/19/13
IV.C.9-12: BOT minutes & handouts, 10/22/13
IV.C.9-13: BOT agenda, minutes & handouts, 8/23/14
IV.C.9-14: BOT Agenda, minutes & handouts from 12/10/14
IV.C.9-15: Board Rule 2300.10-2300.11
IV.C.9-16: BOT agenda and minutes, 11/19/14 and 5/13/15
IV.C.9-17: BOT ACCJC training certificates, 2012
IV.C.9-18: Board Rule 2103
IV.C.9-19: BOT Minutes 4/11/07
IV.C.9-20: BOT Agenda 3/11/15
IV.C.9-21: Board Rule 2102
IV.C.9-22: Board Rule 21000

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

The Board of Trustees consistently adheres to its self-evaluation policies. Board members routinely assess their practices, performance, and effectiveness in promoting and sustaining academic quality and institutional effectiveness. The Board’s self-evaluation informs their goals, plans and training for the upcoming year.
Evidence of Meeting the Standard

a. In 2007 the Board adopted Board Rule 2301.10, which requires the Board to assess its performance the preceding year, and establish annual goals, and report the results during a public session. Since then, the Board has regularly conducted an annual self-evaluation of its effectiveness in promoting and sustaining academic quality and institutional effectiveness, as well as setting goals which are in alignment with the District Strategic Plan (IV.C.10-1: BR 2301.10).

b. The Board has regularly sought specialized expertise in conducting their self-evaluation. For the past two years, the Board contracted with Dr. Jose Leyba to assist in ensuring a comprehensive and consistent self-evaluation process, in alignment with ACCJC standards (IV.C.10-2: Jose Leyba bio).


d. Also in May 2015, Board members completed individual interviews with the consultant, where they candidly assessed the Board’s effectiveness. The Board’s interview questions were adapted from the Community College League of California’s publication, “Assessing Board Effectiveness” (IV.C.10-5: 2015 Self-Assessment Tool).

e. The Board conducted a facilitated self-evaluation at their June 2015 meeting. Topics included a summary of the Board’s individual interviews, along with a self-assessment of their internal practices and effectiveness in promoting academic quality and institutional effectiveness. The Board also reviewed their progress in light of their 2014-2015 priorities and attainment of their 2013-2014 goals. Their individual self-assessments, group assessment, and data informed their plans for Board improvement and strategic initiatives and goals for 2015-2016 which included a focus on academic quality and institutional effectiveness (IV.C.10-6: BOT agenda and minutes, handouts & PPT, 6/13/15).

f. The Board conducted a similar self-evaluation process with Dr. Leyba in 2014. Members evaluated their participation in Board training, their role in accreditation, adherence to their policy-making role, and received training on accreditation process and delegation of policy implementation to the CEO/Chancellor. The Board has used qualified consultants in prior years to facilitate their self-evaluation, ensuring that they meet the requirements of the Board Rule and this standard (IV.C.10-7: BOT minutes and handouts, 3/13/14); (IV.C.10-8: BOT minutes, 2/6/13 and 3/19/13); (IV.C.10-9: BOT Evaluation Comparison Summary Report 2012-2013, 2/2013); (IV.C.10-10: BOT Actionable Improvement Plan,
Analysis and Evaluation

The Board’s self-evaluation process has facilitated a focus on appropriate roles and responsibilities in the policy-making and accreditation activities of the District; and in helping promote and sustain educational quality, institutional effectiveness, and student success. All Board members regularly participate in training, orientation, goal-setting, and self-evaluation activities, which increased their knowledge of appropriate engagement in policy-making and oversight of student success and educational quality outcomes.

The Board and Chancellor are committed to continuously improve the Board’s self-evaluation process to ensure the District achieves better outcomes in promoting and sustaining academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and student success.

Conclusion

The District meets this Standard.

Evidence

IV.C.10-1: Board Rule 2301.10
IV.C.10-2: Jose Leyba bio
IV.C.10-3: BOT agenda and minutes, 5/13/15
IV.C.10-5: BOT 2015 Self-Assessment Tool
IV.C.10-6: BOT agenda and minutes, handouts & PPT, 6/13/15
IV.C.10-7: BOT minutes and handouts, 3/13/14
IV.C.10-8: BOT minutes, 2/6/13 and 3/19/13
IV.C.10-10: BOT Actionable Improvement Plan, 3/19/13
IV.C.10-11: BOT agenda and minutes, 2/21/12
IV.C.10-12: BOT agenda, minutes and handouts, 1/20/10

IV.C.11. The governing board upholds a code of ethics and conflict of interest policy, and individual board members adhere to the code. The board has a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code and implements it when necessary. A majority of the board members have no employment, family ownership, or other personal financial interest in the institution. Board member interests are disclosed and do not interfere with the impartiality of governing body members or outweigh the greater duty to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the institution.
The Los Angeles Community College District has clear policies and procedures that govern conflict of interest for Board members as well as employees. Board Rule 14000 spells out the Conflict of Interest Code for the District and the Board. Board members receive an initial orientation before taking office, updates throughout the year, and file a yearly conflict of interest statement (IV.C.11-1 Board Rule 14000).

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

a. Board rules articulate a Statement of Ethical Values and Code of Ethical Conduct, along with procedures for sanctioning board members who violate District rules and regulations and State or federal law (IV.C.11-2: Board Rule 2300.10 – 2300.11).

b. Trustees receive certificates from the California Fair Political Practices Commission for conflict of interest training they complete every two years. Incoming Trustees are also trained on the District’s conflict of interest policy during orientation sessions (see Standard IV.C.9) (IV.C.11-3: Trustee Ethics Certificates, 2013); (IV.C.11-4: Trustee Ethics Certificates, 2015).

c. The LACCD’s electronic conflict of interest form (California Form 700, Statement of Economic Interests), ensures that there are no conflicts of interest on the Board. The District’s General Counsel is the lead entity responsible for ensuring Trustees complete forms as required. Completed conflict of interest forms are available to any member of the public during normal business hours of the Educational Services Center (IV.C.11-5: Trustees Form 700).

d. Board members follow the code of ethics and conflict of interest policy by recusing themselves from Board discussion or abstaining from a Board vote where they have a documented conflict (IV.C.11-6: BOT minutes, 12/13/14).

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The Board has a clearly articulated code of ethics and processes for sanctioning behavior that violates that code. Board members are required to electronically file conflict of interest forms, which remain on file in the Office of General Counsel. Board members are fully aware of their responsibilities and, to date, there have been no reported instances of violation by any Trustee or any sanctions discussed or imposed. A majority of the Board members have no employment, family ownership, or other personal financial interest in the institution.

**Conclusion**

The District meets this Standard.
Evidence

IV.C.11-1: Board Rule 14000
IV.C.11-2: Board Rule 2300.10 – 2300.11
IV.C.11-3: Trustee Ethics Certificates, 2013
IV.C.11-4: Trustee Ethics Certificates, 2015
IV.C.11-5: Trustees Form 700
IV.C.11-6: BOT minutes 12/13/14

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

The Board of Trustees delegates full authority to the Chancellor, who in turn, has responsibility for oversight of District operations and the autonomy to make decisions without interference. Per Board rule, Trustees specifically agree to participate in the development of District policy and strategies, while respecting the delegation of authority to the Chancellor and Presidents to administer the institution. Trustees pledge to avoid involvement in day-to-day operations.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

a. The Board “authorizes the Chancellor to adopt and implement administrative regulations when he/she finds regulations are necessary to implement existing Board Rules and/or a particular policy is needed which does not require specific Board authorization” (IV.C.12-1: Board Rule 2902).

b. The Board delegates full responsibility to the Chancellor and recognizes “that the Chancellor is the Trustees’ sole employee; [pledging] to work with the Chancellor in gathering any information from staff directly that is not contained in the public record” (IV.C.12-2: Board Rule 2300.10).

c. The Board’s delegation of full responsibility and authority to the Chancellor to implement and administer Board policies without Board interference is also evident in the Functional Area maps for the Board and for the Chancellor. The Board and Chancellor review their respective Functional Area maps on a regular basis, and update them as needed (IV.C.12-3: Board Functional Area map 2015); (IV.C.12-4: Chancellor Functional Area map 2015).

d. To avoid any perception of interference, Board member inquiries are referred to the Chancellor and his designees for response. The Board office documents information requests in a memo to the Deputy Chancellor’s Office, which in turn, enters it into a tracking system. Responses are then provided to all Trustees via the Board letter packet.
sent one week prior to each Board meeting (IV.C.12-5: BOT Info Request Tracking Document); (IV.C.12-6: Board letter packet 5/27/15).

e. In accordance with Chancellor’s Directive 122, the Board holds the Chancellor accountable for District operations through his/her job description, performance goals, and annual evaluation (see Standard IV.C.3). The Board works with the Chancellor in setting annual performance goals guided by his/her job description and the District Strategic Plan. Chancellor evaluations have been conducted in accordance with District policies (see Standard IV.C.3) (IV.C.12-7: Chancellor Job Description, May 2013); (IV.C.12-8: Chancellor’s Directive 122); (IV.C.12-9: BOT closed agendas Chancellor evaluations 11/2014-6/2015).

**Analysis and Evaluation**

In 2012, the ACCJC recommended that Trustees improve their understanding of their policy role and the importance of following official channels of communication through the Chancellor. The Board then commenced a series of trainings (see Standard IV.C.9). In Spring 2013, after a follow-up visit to three LACCD colleges, the visiting team found the District to have fully addressed the recommendation, stating “…the Board of Trustees has provided clear evidence to show its commitment to ensuring that Board members understand their role as policy makers [and]...the importance of using official channels of communication through the Chancellor or assigned designee” (IV.C.12-10: Spring 2013 Evaluation Team Report and June 2013 ACCJC letter).

The Chancellor and his executive team continue to support the training and focus of the Board on its policy-making role. The Board adheres to existing policies when evaluating the performance of the Chancellor and appropriately holds him, as their sole employee, accountable for all District operations. These practices have effectively empowered the Chancellor to manage the operations of the District and provide a structure by which the Board holds the Chancellor accountable.

**Conclusion**

The District meets this Standard.

**Evidence**

IV.C.12-1: Board Rule 2902  
IV.C.12-2: Board Rule 2300.10  
IV.C.12-3: Board Functional Area map 2015  
IV.C.12-4: Chancellor Functional Area map 2015  
IV.C.12-5: BOT Info Request Tracking Document  
IV.C.12-6: Board letter 5/27/15  
IV.C.12-7: Chancellor’s Job Description, May 2013
IV.C.12-8: Chancellor’s Directive 122
IV.C.12-10: Spring 2013 Evaluation Team Report and June 2013 ACCJC letter

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

The LACCD Board of Trustees has a strong, and ongoing, focus on accreditation. All Board members are made aware of Eligibility Requirements and accreditation Standards, processes, and requirements. The Board takes an active role in reviewing colleges’ accreditation reports and policy-making to support colleges’ efforts to improve and excel.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

a. To ensure that Board members are knowledgeable about the Eligibility Requirements, Commission policies, and all aspects of accreditation, Trustees receive annual training on accreditation, which includes a review of the ACCJC publication *Guide to Accreditation for Governing Boards*, their role and responsibilities therein, and presentation on the accreditation status for each of the nine colleges. All Board members complete the ACCJC’s online *Accreditation Basics* training within three months of entering office (see Standard IV.C.9) (IV.C.13-1: BOT Accreditation Training Minutes, 11/3/12); (IV.C.13-2: BOT Accreditation Training Minutes, 10/22/13); (IV.C.13-3: BOT Accreditation Training Minutes, 12/10/14).

b. The Board has had a consistent focus on accreditation. The Board supports through policy the colleges’ efforts to improve and excel (IV.C.13-4: BOT minutes, 12/11/13, p. 4).

c. In order to engage and support faculty, staff and students at colleges undergoing accreditation, the Ad Hoc Committee on Accreditation visited Mission, Valley and Southwest colleges to meet with their accreditation teams and campus leadership to review and discuss their accreditation status and reporting activities in early 2014. In Fall 2014, the duties of the Ad Hoc Committee were formally incorporated into the charge of the Board’s Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success (IESS) Committee (IV.C.13-5: Accreditation Ad Hoc Committee agendas 2014).

d. During the 2014-2015 academic year, the IESS Committee held special committee meetings at the four colleges that were preparing Follow-Up or Midterm Reports. The IESS committee met with each college’s accreditation team, received a formal presentation on their accreditation report, and discussed accreditation-related issues. This committee has decided to utilize this same process for their review and approval of all
e. The Board’s focus on accreditation is evident as it is a standing agenda item for the IESS Committee. Formal presentations and updates on colleges’ accreditation status and accreditation activities at the District level have been made regularly. In addition to monthly District-level updates, the Committee reviews and approves all college accreditation reports (IV.C.13-7: IESS committee agendas for 2013-2015); (IV.C.13-8: IESS Accreditation Update PPT, 11/19/14); (IV.C.13-9: IESS Accreditation Recap PPT, 2/25/15); (IV.C.13-10: IESS Accreditation Update PPT, 3/25/15); (IV.C.13-11: IESS Accreditation Update PPT, 4/29/15); (IV.C.13-12: IESS Accreditation Update PPT, 6/24/15); (IV.C.13-13: IESS committee minutes for 2014-2015).

f. In 2013 and 2014, the Board committed funding to support the colleges and the Educational Services Center (ESC) in their accreditation activities. These funds are dedicated to fund faculty accreditation coordinators, provide college wide training, and offer technical support to help each college strengthen its accreditation infrastructure (IV.C.13-14: IESS Minutes 8/21/13); (IV.C.13-15: BOT minutes, 6/11/14).

g. Each year the Board devotes one meeting to an accreditation update under the direction of the Committee of the Whole (COW). In April 2015, the Committee received an update on District wide accreditation activities and benchmarks achieved over the past year. Additionally, the EPIE division gave an accreditation update to the Board in January 2015 (IV.C.13-16: COW PPT, 4/29/15); (IV.C.13-17: BOT Minutes, 8/22/12); (IV.C.13-18: BOT Accreditation Update, 1/28/15).

h. In addition to its IESS committee, the Board reviews and approves all accreditation reports (IV.C.13-19: BOT Agendas, 3/12/14, 2/11/15 and 3/11/15).

i. The Board participates in the evaluation of its roles and functions in the accreditation process during its annual self-evaluation (see Standard IV.C.10). This includes their review and approval of their updated Functional Area map and evaluation of their adherence to the stated roles and responsibilities (IV.C.13-20: BOT Functional Area map, 9/17/15).

Analysis and Evaluation

Through active oversight by the Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success Committee, Board members have become more engaged in and aware of the accreditation process. Board members receive regular trainings and presentations on accreditation. The Board of Trustees reviews and approves all accreditation reports prior to their submission to the ACCJC. Decisions and discussion of policy frequently reference their impact in helping the colleges meet accreditation standards.
Conclusion

The District meets this Standard.

Evidence

IV.C.13-1: BOT Accreditation Training Minutes, 11/3/12
IV.C.13-2: BOT Accreditation Training Minutes, 10/22/13
IV.C.13-3: BOT Accreditation Training Minutes, 12/10/14
IV.C.13-4: BOT minutes, 12/11/13, p. 4
IV.C.13-5: Accreditation Ad Hoc Committee agendas 2014
IV.C.13-6: IESS committee minutes 12/9/14, 12/11/14, and 2/2/15
IV.C.13-7: IESS committee agendas for 2013-2015
IV.C.13-8: IESS Accreditation Update PPT, 11/19/14
IV.C.13-9: IESS Accreditation Recap PPT, 2/25/15
IV.C.13-10: IESS Accreditation Update PPT, 3/25/15
IV.C.13-11: IESS Accreditation Update PPT, 4/29/15
IV.C.13-12: IESS Accreditation Update PPT, 6/24/15
IV.C.13-14: IESS Minutes, 8/21/13
IV.C.13-15: BOT Minutes 6/11/14
IV.C.13-16: COW PPT, 4/29/15
IV.C.13-17: BOT Minutes, 8/22/12
IV.C.13-18: BOT Accreditation Update PPT, 1/28/15
IV.C.13-20: BOT Functional Area map, 9/17/15
IV.D. Multi-College Districts or Systems

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

The Chancellor engages employees from all nine colleges and the Educational Services Center (ESC) to work together towards educational excellence and integrity. Through his leadership and communication, the Chancellor has helped establish clear roles, authority and responsibility between the colleges and the District that support the effective operation of the colleges.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

CEO Leadership

a. The Chancellor demonstrates leadership in setting and communicating expectations for educational excellence and integrity through his participation in various faculty, staff, and student events at the nine colleges and the Educational Services Center. He shares his expectations for educational excellence and integrity through his columns in two District quarterly newsletters: Synergy and Accreditation 2016. Both newsletters are disseminated to District employees through email, posted on the District’s website and distributed at campus and District meetings. The Chancellor’s newsletter columns focus on his vision and expectations for educational excellence and integrity, support for effective college operations, and his expectation for all employees to engage in and support District and college accreditation activities (IV.D.1-1: Synergy newsletters 2014-2015); (IV.D.1-2: District Accreditation newsletters, 2014-2015).

b. The Chancellor exhibits leadership at his regular monthly meetings with both the Chancellor’s Cabinet (senior District administrators and college presidents), as well as the Presidents Council, where he communicates his expectations, reviews and discusses roles, authority, and responsibility between colleges and the District, and assures support for the effective operation of the colleges. In general, Cabinet meetings address operational effectiveness and alignment between the District office and the colleges, while the Presidents Council focuses on overall District policy and direction and specific college needs and support (IV.D.1-3: Chancellor Cabinet agendas); (IV.D.1-4: Presidents Council agendas).

c. The Chancellor conducts regular retreats with the Cabinet to facilitate collaboration, foster leadership, and instill team building and mutual support. These retreats also provide the Chancellor with a forum to clearly communicate his expectations of
 educational excellence and integrity with his executive staff and college presidents (IV.D.1-5: Chancellor retreat agendas, 2014).

d. The Chancellor communicates his expectations of educational excellence and integrity during the selection and evaluation process for college presidents. The Chancellor holds presidents to clearly articulated standards for student success, educational excellence, and financial sustainability. He emphasizes educational excellence and integrity in their annual evaluations, goal-setting for the upcoming year, and review of their self-evaluations (see Standard IV.D.4). The Chancellor assures support for effective operation of the colleges when meeting individually with each college president on a regular basis to discuss progress on their annual goals and any concerns, needs, and opportunities for their individual campus (IV.D.1-6: WLAC College President Job Description, 2015).

e. The Chancellor communicates his expectations for educational excellence and integrity with faculty through regular consultation with the 10-member Executive Committee of the District Academic Senate (DAS). Meetings address academic and professional matters, including policy development, student preparation and success, District and college governance structures, and faculty professional development activities. The Chancellor also addresses educational excellence, integrity and support for college operations with faculty, staff and administrators through consistent attendance at Academic Senate’s annual summits (IV.D.1-7: Agendas from DAS Consultation Meetings with Chancellor, 2014-2015); (IV.D.1-8: Agendas from DAS Summits, 2013-2015); (IV.D.1-9: DAS Academically Speaking newsletter, Fall 2015).

f. The Chancellor assures support for the effective operation of the colleges through his annual Budget Recommendations to the District Budget Committee and the Board of Trustees. His most recent actions ensured the distribution of $57.67M from the State Mandate Reimbursement Fund and alignment of expenditures with the District’s Strategic Plan goals (IV.D.1-10: DBC Minutes, 7/15/15 & 8/13/14); (IV.D.1-11: Chancellor Budget Recs, 8/26/15).

g. In instances of presidential vacancies, the Chancellor meets with college faculty and staff leadership to discuss interim president options. Most recently, he met with West Los Angeles College leadership and accepted their recommendation for interim president, prioritizing college stability and support for effective operations in his decision-making process (IV.D.1-12: WLAC Press Release announcing interim President, 6/25/15).
Clear Roles, Authority and Responsibility

h. The Los Angeles Community College District participated in the ACCJC’s multi-college pilot program in 1999, and has continuously worked since that time to ensure compliance with this standard. In 2009, ACCJC visiting teams agreed that the District made great strides in developing a functional map that delineates college and district roles, and encouraged it to further “…develop and implement methods for the evaluation of role delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes for the college and the district [as well as] widely communicate the results of the evaluation and use those results as the basis for improvement.” In response, the District renewed its dedication to, and focuses on, these activities (IV.D.1-13: ELAC Accreditation Evaluation Report, March 23-26, 2009, p. 6-7).

i. In October 2008, the Board of Trustees approved the first District/college Functional Area maps, which clarified the structure of District administrative offices and their relationship to the colleges, aligned District administrative functions with accreditation standards, and specified outcome measures appropriate to each function identified (IV.D.1-14: LACCD District/College Functional Area map, 2008).

j. In March 2010, the Board of Trustees approved an initial Governance and Functions Handbook, which expanded upon the previous District/College Functional Area maps to more clearly define District and college responsibilities and authority along accreditation standards. This was the culmination of a two-year project led by the District Planning Committee (DPC), which engaged faculty, staff, administrators and student leaders in this update. During this process, all administrative units in the Educational Service Center (ESC) updated their earlier functional descriptions and outcomes. Over 50 Districtwide committee and council descriptions were also updated to a uniform standard. Functional Area maps were expanded to clarify policy formulation processes, roles and responsibilities of stakeholder groups, and the handbook evaluation process was defined (IV.D.1-15: LACCD Governance and Functions Handbook, 2010); (IV.D.1-16: Committee Description template); (IV.D.1-17: College governance handbook template).

k. In 2013, the 2010 Governance Handbook underwent an internal review by the Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE) division to ensure it matched current processes, organizational charts, and personnel. As of August 2015, the Handbook is being updated under the guidance of the District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC) and the EPIE division (IV.D.1-18: LACCD Governance and Functions Handbook, 2013).

l. In Fall 2014, all ESC administrative units began a new program review process. Each of the eight administrative divisions developed unit plans and updated their unit descriptions and functional maps. Individual unit plans, along with measurable Service Area Outcomes (SAOs), replaced the previous District Office Service Outcomes (DOSOs) performance objectives (see Standard IV.D.2). Existing Functional Area maps were also...
reviewed and updated by the ESC administrative units. The content for District and college responsibilities is currently being reviewed by the colleges, the Executive Administrative Councils and other stakeholders (see Standard IV.D.2) (IV.D.1-19: ESC 2014 Program Reviews); (IV.D.1-20: Draft Functional Area maps 2015).

m. In late 2009, the District began planning for a new Student Information System (SIS), currently scheduled to go live in Fall 2017. During the initial phase, faculty, staff, and students mapped over 275 business processes, in which the functions, roles, responsibilities and the division of labor between colleges and the ESC were clarified, and in some instances, redefined. Business processes continue to be updated and refined as the SIS project moves through its various implementation phases (IV.D.1-21: SIS maps).

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The Chancellor communicates his expectations for educational excellence and integrity and support for effective college operations through regular meetings, electronic communications, college activities and faculty events across the District, and civic engagement throughout the region to bolster the goals and mission of the District.

The Chancellor and his executive team led the ESC’s revised program review processes, which resulted in updated Functional Area maps, clarification of District and the colleges’ roles and responsibilities, and identification of service gaps between college and District functions.

Update of the District’s Governance and Functions Handbook as part of the District’s regular review and planning cycle, will further strengthen its usefulness in providing clear roles, responsibilities, and authority for employees and stakeholders across the District.

**Conclusion**

The District meets this Standard.

**Evidence**

IV.D.1-1: District newsletters 2014-2015
IV.D.1-3: Chancellor’s Cabinet agendas
IV.D.1-5: Chancellor cabinet retreat agendas, 2014
IV.D.1-6: WLAC college president Job Description, 2015
IV.D.1-7: Agendas from DAS Consultation Meetings with Chancellor, 2014-2015
IV.D.1-8: Agendas from DAS Summits, 2007-2015
IV.D.1-9: DAS Academically Speaking newsletter, Fall 2015
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IV.D.1-10: DBC Minutes, 7/15/15 and 8/13/14
IV.D.1-11: Chancellor Budget Recommendations, 8/26/15
IV.D.1-12: WLAC Interim President Press Release, 6/25/15
IV.D.1-14: District/College Functional map, 2008
IV.D.1-16: Committee Description template
IV.D.1-17: College Governance and Functions Handbook template
IV.D.1-19: ESC 2014 Program Reviews
IV.D.1-20: Draft Functional Area maps 2015
IV.D.1-21: SIS maps

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

During the District’s early years, operations of the District Office (now known as the Educational Services Center) were highly centralized, and many college decisions related to finance and budget, capital projects, hiring, payroll and contracts were made “downtown.” Operations were subsequently decentralized and functions delineated, and the District continues to evaluate these delineations on an ongoing basis.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

a. In 1998, the Board of Trustees adopted a policy of partial administrative decentralization. Colleges were given autonomy and authority for local decision-making to streamline administrative processes, encourage innovation, and hold college decision-makers more accountable to the local communities they serve. Since that time, the District has continued to review and evaluate the delineation of responsibilities between the colleges and the Educational Services Center (IV.D.2-1: 1998 decentralization policy).

**Delineation of Responsibilities and Functions**

b. Functional Area maps detail the division of responsibilities and functions between the colleges and the Educational Services Center (ESC), as well as Districtwide decision-making and planning (see Standard IV.D.1). The District developed its first functional maps in 2008, and they have been widely communicated and regularly updated since that
In Fall 2014, the Chancellor directed all ESC units to review and update their Functional Area maps to accurately reflect current processes, roles, and responsibilities as part of a comprehensive program review process (see Standard IV.D.1). Revised maps are currently under review by all colleges, the Executive Administrative Councils, and major stakeholders across the District. The Chancellor engages the college presidents and the cabinet in the discussion and review of the Functional Area maps. The Functional Area maps will be finalized in Fall 2015 (IV.D.2-2: District Functional Area maps, 2015); (IV.D.2-3: Functional Area map review request email).

Effective and Adequate District Services

c. The Chancellor directs the Educational Services Center staff to ensure the delivery of effective and adequate District services to support the colleges’ missions. Services are organized into the following units: (1) Office of the Deputy Chancellor; (2) Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness; (3) Economic and Workforce Development; (4) Chief Financial Officer/Treasurer; (5) Facilities Planning and Development; (6) Human Resources; (7) Office of the General Counsel; and (8) the Personnel Commission (IV.D.2-4: 2013 LACCD Governance and Functions Handbook, p. 51-57).

- **The Office of the Deputy Chancellor** includes ADA training and compliance; Business Services, including operations, contracts, procurement and purchasing; Information Technology, including the District data center, system-wide applications, hardware and security, and Diversity Programs, which includes compliance and reporting.

- **Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE)** coordinates District-level strategic planning, accreditation, research, and attendance accounting reporting, as well as Districtwide educational and student services initiatives, maintains course and program databases, and supports the Student Trustee and the Students Affairs Committees.

- **Economic and Workforce Development** facilitates development of career technical education programs, works with regional businesses to identify training opportunities, collaborates with public and private agencies to secure funding, and keeps colleges informed of state and national issues affecting CTE programs.

- **Chief Financial Officer/Treasurer** serves as the financial advisor to the Board and the Chancellor. Budget Management and Analysis develops revenue projections, manages funding and allocations, and ensures college compliance and reporting. The Accounting Office is responsible for District accounting, fiscal reporting, accounts payable, payroll, and student financial aid administration. Internal Audit oversees internal controls and manages the LACCD Whistleblower hotline.
Facilities Planning and Development is responsible for the long-term planning, management, and oversight of capital improvement and bond projects, as well as for working collaboratively with college administrators to identify creative, cost-effective solutions to facility challenges.

Human Resources assists colleges with the recruitment and hiring of academic personnel, the hiring of classified staff, and managing employee performance and discipline. It also conducts collective bargaining, develops HR guides, administers the Wellness Program, and oversees staff development.

The Office of the General Counsel provides legal services to the Board of Trustees and District employees, including: litigation, contracting, Conflict of Interest filings, and Board Rule and administrative regulations review. It also responds to Public Records Act requests.

The Personnel Commission is responsible for establishing and maintaining a job and salary classification plan for the classified service; administering examinations and establishing eligibility lists, and conducting appeal hearings on administrative actions, including demotions, suspensions, and dismissals.

Evaluation of District Services

d. Beginning in 2008, each ESC service area unit evaluated its own District Office Service Outcomes (DOSOs) as part of unit planning. In Fall 2014, the Chancellor directed the Educational Services Center to implement a comprehensive program review to expand DOSOs into a data driven evaluation process in support of the colleges (IV.D.2-5: DOSO evaluations, 2008-2009); (IV.D.2-6: DOSO evaluations 2011-2012).

e. Each unit participated in a series of workshops on conducting a program review, led by an external consultant. Units identified and documented their core services, then created projected outcomes. Resulting Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) were based on District wide needs and priorities, with clear links to district-level goals. The program review process requires each unit to consider its main contributions to the colleges’ missions, goals, effectiveness, and/or student achievement or learning. Simultaneously, the ESC moved towards adopting an online program review system, currently in use at two of the District’s colleges (IV.D.2-7: Fall 2014 Accreditation Newsletter “ESC Begins Revitalized Program Review Cycle”); (IV.D.2-8: Program Review workshop agendas, 2014); (IV.D.2-9: Program Review Template, 2014).

f. An Educational Services Center user survey was created to solicit college user feedback in support of the program review process. Common questions were developed for all units, with individual units having the ability to customize supplemental questions specific to their college users. Over 21 user groups, including services managers, deans,
directors, vice presidents, and presidents participated in the survey over a period of five weeks (IV.D.2-10: 2014 ESC Services Surveys).

g. As of this writing, all ESC divisions have completed one cycle of program review. Analysis of the ESC Services Survey was disaggregated and used to identify areas of strength and weakness. Units received feedback on the effectiveness of their services and suggestions for improvement. Results also included comparison data between different units within the ESC in order to provide a baseline for overall effectiveness. Units with identified areas for improvement set in place plans to remediate their services and strengthen support to the colleges in achieving their missions. The Board received a presentation on the status of the ESC Program Review process in Spring 2015. The Institutional Effectiveness (IE) unit has since developed a program review manual for the ongoing implementation of program review at the ESC (IV.D.2-11: 2014 ESC Services Survey Analyses); (IV.D.2-12: Program Review Update PPT, 2/20/15); (IV.D.2-13: Draft ESC Program Review Manual, 10/1/15).

Allocation of Resources

h. The District revised its Budget Allocation policies in June 2012 and its Financial Accountability policies in October 2013. Together, these policies set standards for support of college educational mission and goals, providing a framework for them to meet the requirements of Standard III.D. Policies hold colleges accountable for meeting fiscal stability standards, while also allowing a framework within which colleges can request additional financial support in instances of situational deficits. There is a clear process whereby colleges can request debt deferment or additional funds, and self-assessments and detailed recovery plans are required before receiving approval of such resources. The District and Board continue to evaluate these policies (see Standard III.D.3) and revise them as needed to support college fiscal stability (IV.D.2-14: Budget Allocation Mechanism, 2012); (IV.D.2-15: Financial Accountability Measures, 2013); (IV.D.2-16: ECDBC recommendation on LAHC deferral request, 6/10/15); (IV.D.2-17: LAHC Debt Referral Request PPT to BFC, 9/16/15).

Analysis and Evaluation

The District is comprised of nine individual colleges of vastly different sizes, needs and student populations. The Educational Services Center strives to continuously delineate its functions and operational responsibilities to support colleges in achieving their missions. Adequacy and effectiveness of District services are evaluated through program review and user satisfaction surveys. Through the implementation of its comprehensive program review process, the EPIE division discovered that its user surveys did not adequately evaluate the District and colleges’ adherence to their specified roles and functions. In response, questions related specifically to this issue will be included in the 2016-2017 cycle of the Districtwide governance and decision-making survey. Revisions to the program review system and assignment of specific staff will ensure ongoing evaluations are systematized and data
driven, and that the results are used for integrated planning and the improvement of ESC services.

The District continues to evaluate its resource allocation and financial accountability policies to ensure colleges receive adequate support and are able to meet accreditation standards related to financial resources and stability.

**Conclusion**

The District meets this Standard.

**Evidence**

IV.D.2-2: District Functional Area maps, 2015
IV.D.2-3: Functional Area map review request email, 7/24/15
IV.D.2-5: DOSO evaluations 2008-2009
IV.D.2-6: DOSO evaluations 2011-2012
IV.D.2-7: Fall 2014 Accreditation Newsletter, “ESC Begins Revitalized Program Review Cycle”
IV.D.2-8: Program Review workshop agendas, 2014
IV.D.2-9: Program Review Template, 10/1/15
IV.D.2-10: 2014 ESC Services Surveys
IV.D.2-11: 2014 ESC Services Survey Analyses
IV.D.2-12: Program Review Update PPT, 2/20/15
IV.D.2-13: Draft ESC Program Review Manual, 10/1/15
IV.D.2-14: Budget Allocation Mechanism amendment, 6/3/12
IV.D.2-15: Financial Accountability Measures, 10/9/13
IV.D.2-16: ECDBC recommendation on LAHC deferral request, 6/10/15
IV.D.2-17: LAHC Debt Referral Request PPT to BFC, 9/16/15

**IV.D.3.** The district/system has a policy for allocation and reallocation of resources that are adequate to support the effective operations and sustainability of the colleges and district/system. The district/system CEO ensures effective control of expenditures.

The District has well-established resource allocation policies that support the effective operations and sustainability of the colleges and District. These policies are regularly evaluated. Under the leadership of the Chancellor, college presidents, administrators and faculty leaders work together to ensure effective control of expenditures and the financial sustainability of the colleges and District.
Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Allocation and Reallocation of Resources

a. The District Budget Committee (DBC) provides leadership on District-level budget policies. Membership includes all nine college presidents, the District Academic Senate, and collective bargaining unit representatives. Its charge is to: (1) formulate recommendations to the Chancellor for budget planning policies consistent with the District Strategic Plan; (2) review the District budget and make recommendations to the Chancellor, and (3) review quarterly District financial conditions (IV.D.3-1: DBC webpage screenshot, 8/2015).

b. In 2007, the District instituted a budget allocation policy which paralleled the SB 361 State budget formula. Funds are distributed to the colleges on a credit and noncredit FTES basis, with an assessment to pay for centralized accounts, District services, and set-aside for contingency reserves. In an attempt at parity, districtwide assessments were changed from a percentage of college revenue, to a cost per FTES basis, and the small colleges (Harbor, Mission, Southwest and West) received a differential to offset their proportionately-higher operational expenses (IV.D.3-2: BOT Agenda, BF2, 2/7/07 SB 361 Budget Allocation Model).

c. In 2008, the Fiscal Policy and Review Committee (FPRC) was created to address ongoing college budget difficulties and to consider new approaches for improving their fiscal stability. The FPRC and the DBC reviewed their roles and, in Spring 2011, the FPRC was renamed the Executive Committee of the DBC (ECDBC). The charges for both committees were revised to ensure that budget planning policies were consistent with the District Strategic Plan (IV.D.3-3: DBC minutes 5/18/11).

d. Also in 2011, the District undertook a full review of its budget allocation formula and policies, including base allocations, use of ending balances, assessments for District operations, growth targets, and college deficit repayment. A review of other multi-college district budget models and policies was also conducted. The resulting recommendations were to adopt a model with a minimum base funding. The model had two phases:
  - Phase I increased colleges’ basic allocation to include minimum administrative staffing and maintenance and operations (M&O) costs
  - Phase II called for further study in the areas of identifying college needs (including M&O), providing funding for colleges to deliver equitable access for students, and ensuring colleges are provided with sufficient funding to maintain quality instruction and student services (IV.D.3-4: ECDBC Budget Allocation Model Recommendation, Jan 2012).

e. The Board of Trustees adopted an updated Budget Allocation policy on June 13, 2012. An evaluation of the policy was completed in late 2014, and additional policy
recommendations were forwarded (IV.D.3-5: BOT Agenda, BF4, Budget Allocation model amendment, 6/13/12); (IV.D.3-6: District Budget Allocation Evaluation).

f. The Board adopted new District Financial Accountability policies on October 9, 2013 to ensure colleges operate efficiently. These policies called for early identification and resolution of operating deficits required each college to set aside a one percent reserve, and tied college presidents’ performance and evaluation to college budgeting and spending. The Board’s Budget and Finance Committee regularly monitors colleges’ costs per FTES and deficits (IV.D.3-7: BOT agenda BF4, Financial Accountability Measures, 10/9/13); (IV.D.3-8: BFC agenda, minutes and handouts on Costs per FTES, 10/8/14).

g. The District’s adherence to the State-recommended minimum 5% reserve has ensured its continued fiscal sustainability. In June 2012, the Board’s Finance and Audit Committee (now known as the Budget and Finance Committee) directed the CFO to set aside a 5% general reserve and an additional 5% contingency reserve to ensure ongoing District and college operational support (IV.D.3-9: FAC meeting minutes 6/13/12).

Effective Control Mechanisms

h. The District has established effective policies and mechanisms to control expenditures. Each month, enrollment updates and college monthly projections are reported (see Standard IV.D.1). The Chancellor and college presidents work together in effectively managing cash flow, income and expenditures responsibly to maintain fiscal stability (IV.D.3-10: 2014-15 Quarterly Projections).

i. College and District financial status is routinely reported to and reviewed by the Board of Trustees, along with college quarterly financial status reports, attendance accounting reports, and internal audit reports (see Standard III.D.5).

j. The District provides comprehensive budget and financial oversight, including an annual finance and budget report (CCFS-311), a final budget, an annual financial audit, a bond financial audit report, a performance audit of bond construction programs, year-end balance and open order reports, full-time Faculty Obligation Number (FON) reports and targets, enrollment projections, and year-to-year comparisons with enrollment targets (see Standard III.D.5).

k. Each college president is responsible for the management of his or her college’s budget and ensures appropriate processes for budget development and effective utilization of financial resources in support of his/her college’s mission (see Standard IV.D.2) (IV.D.3-7: BOT agenda, BF4, Financial Accountability Measures, 10/9/13).
Analysis and Evaluation

The District has a long history of financial solvency. Colleges follow standards of good practice that include the development of an annual financial plan, quarterly status reports, set-aside for reserves, and the obligation to maintain a balanced budget. Through its effective control of expenditures, the District has consistently ended the fiscal year with a positive balance. The higher levels of reserves have allowed the District to minimize the impact of cuts to college operations resulting from the State’s recent financial crisis.

Conclusion

The District meets this Standard.

Evidence

IV.D.3-1: DBC webpage screenshot, August 2015
IV.D.3-2: BOT agenda, BF2, 2/7/07 SB 361 Budget Allocation Model
IV.D.3-3: DBC minutes 5/18/11
IV.D.3-4: ECDBC Budget Allocation Model Recommendation, Jan 2012
IV.D.3-5: BOT agenda, BF4, Budget Allocation model amendment, 6/13/12
IV.D.3-6: District Budget Allocation Evaluation
IV.D.3-7: BOT agenda, BF4, Financial Accountability Measures, 10/9/13
IV.D.3-8: BFC agenda, minutes and handouts on Costs per FTES, 10/8/14
IV.D.3-9: FAC minutes 6/13/12
IV.D.3-10: 2014-15 Quarterly Projections

IV.D.4. The CEO of the district or system delegates full responsibility and authority to the CEOs of the colleges to implement and administer delegated district/system policies without interference and holds college CEO’s accountable for the operation of the colleges.

The Chancellor delegates full responsibility and authority to the college presidents and supports them in implementing District policies at their respective colleges. College presidents are held accountable for their college’s performance by the Chancellor, the Board, and the communities they serve.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

a. College presidents have full responsibility and authority to conduct their work without interference from the Chancellor (see Standard IV.C.3). College presidents have full authority in the selection and evaluation of their staff and management team (IV.D.4-1: HR Guide R-110 Academic Administrator Selection, 7/31/15).
b. The framework for CEO accountability is established through annual goal-setting between the Chancellor and each college president. College presidents then complete a yearly self-evaluation based on their established goals. At least every three years (or sooner if requested), presidents undergo a comprehensive evaluation, which includes an evaluation committee, peer input, and, if needed, recommendations for improvement. Unsatisfactory evaluations may result in suspension, reassignment, or dismissal. Evaluations are reviewed with the Board of Trustees in closed session (IV.D.4-2: College president Self Evaluation packet); (IV.D.4-3: BOT agendas w/President evaluations, 2011-2014).

c. In October 2013, the Board adopted fiscal accountability measures which explicitly hold college presidents responsible to the Chancellor for their budgets, ensuring that they maintain “a balanced budget, as well as the efficient and effective utilization of financial resources.” These measures also require that the Chancellor “...review the college’s fiscal affairs and enrollment management practices as part of the college president’s annual performance evaluation...[and] report to the Board of Trustees any significant deficiencies and take corrective measures to resolve the deficiencies up to and including the possible reassignment or non-renewal of the college president’s contract” (IV.D.4-4: BOT Agenda BF2, 10/9/13).

d. The role of the Chancellor, as well as that of the presidents and the levels of authority within, is clearly delineated in the LACCD Functional Area maps, which explicitly state “...the Chancellor bears responsibility and is fully accountable for all operations, programs, and services provided in the name of the district...The Chancellor delegates appropriate authority to the college presidents and holds them accountable for the operations and programs offered at District colleges.” Functional Area maps are regularly reviewed and updated, and published in the Governance and Functions Handbook and on the District website (IV.D.4-5: Chancellor Functional Area map, 2015).

Analysis and Evaluation

The Chancellor delegates full authority and responsibility to the college presidents to implement District policies without interference. College presidents serve as the chief executives and educational leaders of their respective colleges. They ensure the quality and integrity of programs and services, accreditation status, and fiscal sustainability of their colleges.

Conclusion

The District meets this Standard.
Evidence

IV.D.4-1: HR Guide R-110 Academic Administrator Selection, 7/31/15
IV.D.4-2: College president Self Evaluation packet
IV.D.4-3: BOT agendas w/President evaluations, 2011-2014
IV.D.4-4: BOT agenda BF2, 10/9/13
IV.D.4-5: Chancellor Functional Area map, 2015

IV.D.5. District/system planning and evaluation are integrated with college planning and evaluation to improve student learning and achievement and institutional effectiveness.

College strategic plans are integrated with the District Strategic Plan (DSP), *Vision 2017*, through alignment of goals between the two. Colleges develop goals for their strategic and educational master plans during their internal planning process, and reconcile alignment with the District Strategic Plan on an annual basis. The structure of the DSP allows colleges to maintain autonomy and responsibility for implementing the goals and objectives of the District plan, based on their local conditions and institutional priorities (IV.D.5-1: District Strategic Plan: Vision 2017, 2/6/13).

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

*District Strategic Plan, Planning Integration*

a. LACCD has established district-level integrated processes for strategic, financial, facilities and technology planning. These processes provide a coherent framework for district-college planning integration with the goal of promoting student learning and achievement. The District’s Integrated Planning Manual is currently being updated by the District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC) and the District’s Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE) division and will be reviewed and approved by the colleges and Board of Trustees in Fall 2015 (IV.D.5-2: LACCD Integrated Planning Manual, 2015).

b. DSP measures were developed for each college, and the District as a whole, to create a uniform methodology and data sources. Colleges compare their progress against the District as a whole using the most recent three-year timeframe as the point of reference. Colleges assess progress and establish targets to advance both local and District objectives. Colleges’ annual assessments are reported to the Board of Trustees using a standard format, allowing for an apples-to-apples District wide discussion (IV.D.5-3: college effectiveness report template); (IV.D.5-4: IESS Committee agenda on IE Reports).

c. College institutional effectiveness reports inform the Board of Trustees on the advancement of District goals which, in turn, informs the Board’s annual goal setting.
process and shapes future college and District planning priorities. The District Strategic Plan is reviewed at the mid-point of the planning cycle, and a final review is conducted in the last year of the cycle (IV.D.5-5: BOT agenda, Annual Board Leadership & Planning Session, 8/19/15); (IV.D.5-6: DPAC agenda 6/26/15); (IV.D.5-7: DPAC agenda, 8/28/15).

d. The District Technology Plan created a framework of goals and a set of actions to guide District wide technology planning. The District Technology Implementation Plan established measures and prioritized deployment of technology solutions in consideration of available resources. The District Technology Plan promotes the integration of technology planning across the colleges by establishing a common framework for college technology planning (IV.D.5-8: District Technology Strategic Plan, 3/9/11); (IV.D.5-9: District Technology Implementation Plan, 3/21/13).

e. District-college integration also occurs during operational planning for District wide initiatives. Examples include joint marketing and recruitment activities, implementation of the Student Success and Support Program, Student Equity Plans, and the new student information system. These initiatives involve extensive college-district collaboration, coordination with centralized District service units, and interaction with an array of District-level committees (IV.D.5-10: SSSP New DEC Svc Categories PPT, 2014); (IV.D.5-11: SSSP Counselor DEC Trng PPT, 2014); (IV.D.5-12: SSI Steering Committee Minutes, 8/22/14); (IV.D.5-13: SIS Fit-Gap agendas, 2013).

f. Planning is integrated with resource allocation at the District level through annual enrollment growth planning and the budget review process. The individual colleges, and the District as a whole, develop enrollment growth and budget projections and confer on a quarterly basis to reconcile and update enrollment, revenue, and cost projections. Updated projections are regularly reported to the District Budget Committee and the Board’s Budget and Finance Committee. This high-level linkage of enrollment planning and resource allocation provides a framework for the District budget process (IV.D.5-14: Quarterly College FTES meetings, 2014-2015); (IV.D.5-15: Quarterly enrollment reports to DBC); (IV.D.5-16: Quarterly enrollment reports to BFC); (IV.D.5-17: Budget Allocation Model, 2012 amendment).

Planning Evaluation

g. Various mechanisms are used to evaluate the effectiveness of college-district integrated planning:
   - The Biennial District Governance and Decision-Making Survey assesses budget development and resource allocation, enrollment management, and FTES and facilities planning (see Standard IV.D.7).
   - District-level planning and policy committees assess their effectiveness through an annual committee self-evaluation process (see Standard IV.D.1).
The ESC Program Review process assesses performance and outcomes through an annual User Survey and information specific to each service unit (see Standard IV.D.2).

Evaluation of District-level plans includes both an analysis of plan outcomes and a review of plan currency, relevancy, and alignment with external accountability initiatives; e.g. the Student Success Scorecard and the Statewide Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IV.D.5-18 DPAC agendas, June-Aug 2015); (IV.D.5-19 BOT Agenda, Student Success Scorecard presentation, 9/2/15); (IV.D.5-20 IEPI 2015-16 Goals Framework, 5/27/15).

Analysis and Evaluation

The District has established mechanisms for integrated District-level strategic and operational plans. This integration involves collaboration and cooperation between colleges, the ESC service units, and District-level shared governance and administrative committees. Assessment mechanisms include direct assessment of governance and decision-making, governance committee self-evaluation, ESC program review, and review of District-level plans.

Even with the institutionalization of these processes, the size and complexity of the LACCD presents challenges to integrated planning and evaluation. Self-examination has revealed gaps in adherence to evaluation timelines and the need for more systematic and consistent evaluation processes and alignment across plans. The District, primarily through its Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE) division, continues to work on strengthening and expanding these mechanisms to improve the effectiveness of District-college integrated planning in promoting student learning and achievements.

To this end, the District Planning and Accreditation Committee has revised and strengthened its charter and has undertaken a review of all governance evaluations, as well as mid-term review of the District Strategic Plan. The Institutional Effectiveness (IE) unit has created an integrated planning manual for District wide plans with timelines and timeframes that set a synchronized reporting cycle. The updated evaluation and reporting framework will be institutionalized in the District Governance and Functions Handbook, codifying commitment to more coordinated planning on a district wide basis.

Conclusion

The District meets this Standard.

Evidence

IV.D.5-1: District Strategic Plan: Vision 2017, 2/6/13
IV.D.5-3: College Effectiveness Report template
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IV.D.6. Communication between colleges and districts/systems ensures effective operations of the colleges and should be timely, accurate, and complete in order for the colleges to make decisions effectively.

The District has numerous councils and committees, which meet regularly to share best practices and to ensure an effective flow of information between the colleges and the Educational Services Center (ESC). Additionally, a number of standing monthly reports and updates are sent electronically to established District employee list serves.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

a. In total, the District has 46 district wide councils, committees, and consultative bodies in which District and college administrative staff, faculty, classified staff, and students regularly participate. All councils and committees maintain agendas and meeting summaries/minutes on either the District website (public) or on the District intranet (IV.D.6-1: Screenshot of District Intranet of Councils and Committees).

b. Seven District wide Executive Administrative Councils meet monthly: (1) Chancellor’s Cabinet, (2) Council of Academic Affairs, (3) Council of Student Services, (4) District Administrative Council, (5) Executive Committee of the District Budget Committee (ECDBC), (6) Human Resources Council; and (7) the Sheriff’s Oversight Committee (IV.D.6-2: District wide Executive Administrative Councils 2015 update).

c. The Councils of Academic Affairs, Student Services, and the District Administrative Council are responsible for the review and study of district wide instructional, student services, and administrative operational and programmatic issues. Executive
Administrative Council members are predominantly senior ESC administrators, college presidents and college vice presidents. All councils report to either the Chancellor directly or to the Chancellor’s Cabinet. Meeting agendas and minutes are distributed to Council members in advance of meetings. Meeting schedules are set each July for the upcoming year, and generally rotate between colleges and the ESC (IV.D.6-3: Chancellor’s Directive 70).

d. **Four District-level Governance Committees** meet monthly: (1) District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC); (2) District Budget Committee (DBC); (3) Joint Labor Management Benefits Committee (JLMBC); and (4) the Technology Planning and Policy Committee (TPPC). Committee members encompass a broad range of college faculty, college researchers, and college deans, with representatives from the unions, college presidents, college vice presidents, and ESC senior administrators. These committees typically consult with one or more Executive Administrative Council and report to either the Chancellor or to the Chancellor’s Cabinet (IV.D.6-4: District-level Governance committee 2015 update).

e. In 2013, the governance committees agreed to a common format for their webpages. Each committee’s webpage contains a brief description of its function, committee charge, who it reports to, who it consults with, chairs, membership, meeting information, and resources. Results of the District wide Governance Committee Self Evaluation as well as meeting agendas, minutes, and resource documents are posted on the webpage, which is accessible to the public (IV.D.6-5: District-level Governance Committee webpage screenshot).

c. **Sixteen Operational Committees** meet monthly, or on a per-semester basis. These Committees are structured by subject/function area and coordinate with one of the Executive Administrative management councils. Committee members are largely faculty, program directors, researchers, and college deans, with representatives from the three Executive Administrative management councils and ESC senior administrative staff. Meeting agendas and minutes are emailed to committee members in advance of each meeting (IV.D.6-6: District Coordinating Committees 2015 update); (IV.D-7: Email report to list serve, 2015).

d. **Five Academic Initiative Committees** coordinate District wide academic programs. These committees are primarily led by faculty, but also include administrators and classified staff. These committees focus on broader goals in various areas, including labor issues, articulation, transfer, and student success (IV.D-8: District Academic Initiative Committees, 2015 update).

e. Information Technology maintains **78 active list serves**. These list serves include the District wide consultative bodies, administrative councils, and operational committees as well as subject-specific groups such as articulation officers, curriculum chairs,
counselors, and IT managers. Each list serve has a coordinator/owner charged with maintaining an accurate list of members (IV.D.6-9: District List serve list).

f. In accordance with the Brown Act, all agendas and informational documents for Board of Trustee meetings are posted in the lobby at the ESC and on the District website. They are also distributed electronically to college presidents, college vice presidents, college and the District Academic Senate presidents, and bargaining unit representatives (IV.D.6-10: sample BOT agenda email).

g. Policy changes are communicated by the Office of General Counsel (OGC), which disseminates memos informing campuses and constituency groups of approved changes to Board Rules and Administrative Regulations. These updates are also posted on the District’s website (IV.D.6-11: OGC Board Rule & Admin Reg Revision Notices, July-August 2015).

h. The Chancellor, Board of Trustees, and select ESC divisions and programs issue regular bulletins and newsletters, disseminating information on programs, accreditation, budget updates, success stories, and employee benefits. Additionally, the District Student Information System (SIS) project team has conducted forums at each college, informing all employees about the development and roll-out of the District’s new student records system (IV.D.6-12: LACCD newsletters); (IV.D.6-13: Chancellor bulletins); (IV.D.6-14: Accreditation newsletters); (IV.D.6-15: Diversity newsletters); (IV.D.6-16: SIS newsletters); (IV.D.6-17: Wellness newsletters); (IV.D.6-18: Bond Program newsletters); (IV.D.6-19: SIS forum PowerPoint).

i. The Chancellor keeps the Board of Trustees, college presidents, and senior administrators abreast of Trustee matters, college/District updates and activities, legislative/public affairs updates, and community events through his weekly reports. Items often include updates on Chancellor and Board actions regarding college operations and stability (IV.D.6-20: Chancellor weekly email updates).

j. The District Academic Senate (DAS) represents the faculty of the District in all academic and professional matters. In this capacity, the President and Executive Committee regularly inform faculty of District policy discussions and decisions related to educational quality, student achievement, and the effective operation of colleges (IV.D.6-21: DAS Communication, 2014-15).

k. In 2011, District Information Technology (IT) undertook a complete redesign of the District website. The updated website, which allows each division/unit in the ESC to manage its own content, launched in Fall 2012. In 2013, the District updated its public interface and in December 2014, the District upgraded its internal software systems to better support the online needs of the District. Creation of web links to Board, committee,
council, and program information has improved the public’s and District employees’ access to information about the District (IV.D.6-22: Web redesign meeting, 10/13/11).

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The District ensures regular communication with the colleges and front-line employees through its committees and councils, websites, list serves, newsletters and bulletins, and email. Meeting agendas and minutes are posted online or distributed electronically. The District’s revamped website has facilitated easier access for employees to maintain, and for the public to access, District and college information.

The District’s sheer size and volume of activity offers challenges to maintaining consistent engagement and communication with employees and stakeholders. While the District has improved its access to information and regular communications, it continues to look for ways to improve efforts in this area. The launch of the District’s new intranet site, currently scheduled for December 2015, is anticipated to improve employee access to ESC divisions, units, and services.

In September 2015, District Educational Program and Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE) staff and District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC) members co-presented a workshop at the annual DAS Summit. The workshop addressed district wide communication and discussed data from recent governance surveys related to communications. A facilitated discussion followed, with participants brainstorming communication strategies, which will be reviewed by DPAC in upcoming meetings.

**Conclusion**

The District meets this Standard (IV.D.5-23: District wide Communication PPT, 9/25/15).

**Evidence**

IV.D.6-1: Screenshot of District Intranet of Councils and Committees
IV.D.6-2: District wide Executive Administrative Councils 2015 draft update
IV.D.6-3: Chancellor’s Directive 70, 8/30/94
IV.D.6-4: District-level Governance committee 2015 update
IV.D.6-5: District-level Governance committee webpage screenshot
IV.D.6.6: District Coordinating Committees 2015 update
IV.D.6-7: Email report to list serve, 2015
IV.D.6-8: District Academic Initiative Committees, 2015 update
IV.D.6-9: District List serve list
IV.D.6-10: Sample BOT agenda email
IV.D.6-11: OGC Board Rule and Admin Regs Revision Notices, July-August 2015
IV.D.6-12: LACCD newsletters
IV.D.6-13: Chancellor Bulletins
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IV.D.6-14: Accreditation newsletters
IV.D.6-15: Diversity newsletters
IV.D.6-16: SIS newsletters
IV.D.6-17: Benefits and wellness newsletters
IV.D.6-18: Bond Program newsletters
IV.D.6-19: SIS forum PowerPoints
IV.D.6-20: Chancellor weekly email updates
IV.D.6-22: Web redesign meeting, 10/13/11
IV.D.6-23: District wide Communication PPT, 9/25/15

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

The District, under the guidance of the Chancellor, regularly evaluates the effectiveness of
District/college role delineations, governance, and decision-making processes. Based on
recommendations made by the ACCJC in 2009, the District Planning committee (DPC)
implemented a cyclical process for system-level evaluation and improvement. The District
institutionalized this cycle and continues to review and revise, processes in support of
institutional effectiveness.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

**Governance and Decision-Making Assessment, Effectiveness and Communication**

a. In Fall 2009, the District Planning Committee (now the District Planning and
   Accreditation Committee) designed and administered a District governance survey. This
   assessment was undertaken in response to recommendations received during the Spring
   2009 accreditation visits at East Los Angeles, Los Angeles City, and Los Angeles Trade-
   Technical Colleges, and resulted in action items for continuous improvement of
   District/college role delineation (IV.D.7-1: 2009 District Governance Survey Tool);

b. The District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment Survey continues to be
   administered on a two-year cycle. Survey participants evaluate the quality of District-
   level governance in the following areas:

   - Appropriateness and effectiveness of the roles played by stakeholder groups,
     including administration, District Academic Senate, collective bargaining groups, and
     Associated Students organizations;
Effectiveness of district-level decision-making processes in relation to five primary governance areas: budget and resource allocation, enrollment management, strategic planning and goals setting, bond program oversight, and employee benefits;

Quality of district-level decision making (e.g., the extent to which decisions are based on data and are effectively communicated, implemented, and assessed), and

Overall assessment of administrative and Board support of participatory governance as well as the effectiveness of district wide decision-making in relation to the District’s stated mission (IV.D.7-3: 2012 District Governance Survey Tool and Results); (IV.D.7-4: 2015 District Governance Survey Tool).

c. The District’s Institutional Effectiveness (IE) unit has conducted surveys, analyzed recurring themes, disseminated and discussed results, and used the results to plan improvements. Challenges in implementing improvement plans occurred, and the IE unit has restarted its survey and evaluation cycle. The unit recently completed current-year survey results and a comparative analysis of 2010, 2012 and 2014 survey results. Results were reviewed by the District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC) and plans to strengthen the survey tools and the development and implementation of improvement plans are now part of DPAC’s 2015-2016 work plan. These assessment reports have been posted online and will be reported to the Board’s Institutional Effectiveness Committee in Fall 2015 and used to inform recommendations for District improvement (IV.D.7-5: District-level Governance and Decision-making Assessment Comparison Report for 2010, 2012, 2014, 8/28/15); (IV.D.7-6: District-level Governance and Decision-making Assessment Analysis, 8/19/15); (IV.D.7-7: 2014-15 District-level Governance and Decision-making Assessment Report by College and Analysis by Role, 8/28/15); (IV.D.7-8: DPAC 2015-16 Work Plan, 8/28/15).

d. In 2009, DPAC, with assistance from the IE unit, established an annual Committee Self-Evaluation process for all District governance committees. This common self-assessment documents each committee’s accomplishments, challenges, and areas for improvement over the past year. Results of the assessment are reviewed by each respective committee and serve as the basis for changes and improvements to Committee function. Through their 2015-2016 work plan, DPAC reaffirmed their responsibility to ensure self-evaluations are conducted by District governance committees, results are posted online, and that they are used to inform committees’ work plans (IV.D.7-9: District wide Committee Self-Evaluation form); (IV.D.7-10: DBC self-evaluation 2012-2013, 6/30/13; 2013-2014, 6/30/14); (IV.D.7-11: DPAC self-evaluation 2012-2013, 10/5/13; 2013-2014, 2/27/15); (IV.D.7-12: JLMBC self-evaluation 2011-12, 11/20/12; 2012-13, 7/9/13; 2013-14, 10/16/14); (IV.D.7-13: TPCC self-evaluation 2011-2015, 8/2015).

e. Role delineations are evaluated during the regular review of Functional Area maps and revisions are made based on input from governance committee members, governance surveys, ESC administrative units, the Chancellor’s Cabinet, and college stakeholders. Functional Area maps were expanded and revised in 2015, and are currently under review prior to finalization (see Standard IV.D.1 and IV.D.2).
f. The District Governance and Functions Handbook is regularly reviewed and updated by District stakeholders under the coordination of the District Planning and Accreditation Committee (DPAC). A section of the Handbook describes all district wide councils, committees, and consultative bodies. These entities were first formalized in 1994 by Chancellor’s Directive (CD) 70: District wide Internal Management Consultation Process. Updates to CD 70, and its related committee/council structure, committee/council charge, membership, meeting schedule, leadership and reporting structure are underway as of Fall 2015 (IV.D.7-14: Updated District Council and Committee list, 9/2/15).

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The District has processes to regularly evaluate district/system and college role delineations, governance, and decision-making processes. It has developed mechanisms for wide communication of the results of these evaluations. However, the District as a whole has faced challenges in the evaluation process.

Thorough self-evaluation led the Institutional Effectiveness (IE) unit to discover that some evaluation cycles were off-track and results had not been systematically disseminated. The unit is currently updating governance survey and committee self-assessment instruments and integrating these evaluations into the District Effectiveness Cycle (see LACCD Integrated Planning Manual) (IV.D.7-15: Governance Evaluation Timeline, 8/27/15); (IV.D.5-2: LACCD Integrated Planning Manual).

The IE unit reported these findings and activities to DPAC, which, through its own self-examination and goal-setting process, undertook development of a comprehensive, and consistent, evaluation framework as part of its 2015-16 work plan. Adherence to the work plan will be ensured through the Committee’s expanded oversight role, as reflected in its revised charter, and by assigning a specific ESC staff member to maintain District governance committee websites.

**Conclusion**

The District meets this Standard (IV.D.7-8: DPAC 2015-16 Work Plan, 8/28/15); (IV.D.7-16: Updated DPAC Charter, 6/22/15).

**Evidence**

IV.D.7-1: 2009 District Governance Survey Tool
IV.D.7-2: 2010 District Governance Assessment Report, 2/26/10
IV.D.7-3: 2012 District Governance Survey Tool and Results
IV.D.7-4: 2015 District Governance Survey Tool
IV.D.7-6: 2014-15 District-level Governance and Decision-making Assessment Analysis, 8/19/15
IV.D.7-7: 2014-15 District-level Governance and Decision-making Assessment Report by College and Analysis by Role, 8/28/15
IV.D.7-8: DPAC 2015-2016 Work Plan, 8/28/15
IV.D.7-9: District wide Committee Self-Evaluation form
IV.D.7-10: DBC self-evaluation 2012-2014
IV.D.7-11: DPAC self-evaluation 2012-2014
IV.D.7-12: JLMBC self-evaluation 2011-2012
IV.D.7-13: TPCC self-evaluation 2011-2012, 7/19/12
IV.D.7-14: Updated District Council and Committee list, 9/2/15
IV.D.7-15: Governance Evaluation Timeline, 8/27/15
IV.D.7-16: Updated DPAC Charter, 6/22/15