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SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION REPORT
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Team Chair: Pam Eddinger, President
Moorpark College

An eleven-member accreditation team visited Los Angeles Southwest College (LASC) for the purpose of evaluating the College’s request to reaffirm its accreditation. In preparation for the visit, the team chair attended a team chair workshop on December 6, 2011. Ten members of the site visit team, including the chair and the team assistant, attended training on February 3, 2012 in Los Angeles, CA. One member of the team received training in Northern California. The team chair conducted a 45-minute pre-visit phone conference with the LASC College President and accreditation liaison officer on February 9, 2012. The team chair and the assistant also conducted a preliminary campus visit, hosted by the accreditation liaison officer, on March 1, 2012. During the campus visit, the chair and assistant met with college leadership and key personnel involved in the Self Study preparation process, including the student senate president.

The team received the College’s Self Study document several weeks prior to the March 12 visit. The team prepared for its visit by reviewing the College’s Self Study report, responses to the previous accreditation team report, the progress report, and the mid-term report. The College also provided for review its college publications, including the catalog, schedule of classes, and online information. The team was given access to specific online classes in the College’s course management system, and a listing of courses being conducted offsite. None of the sites offer more than 50% of a program, certificate or degree.

On Monday morning, March 12, 2012, the team chair and five team members met with the chancellor of the Los Angeles Community College District, district staff, and members of the Board of Trustees at the district office. Team members met with these individuals to assess areas such as finance, physical facilities, human resources, technology resources, governance, and board relations. Upon arrival to the campus on Monday afternoon on March 12, 2012, the full team was introduced to key college leaders in an open reception, and participated in a tour of campus facilities. On Tuesday and Wednesday of that week, the team held open forums on campus to receive comments from the college community. On the afternoon of Thursday, March 15, 2012, the team concluded its evaluation work. The team chair conducted an exit interview with the College President, and an exit briefing with the campus at an open meeting. The team exited the campus immediately after the conclusion of the meeting.

The team assessed the College’s responses to the 2006 recommendations and found that the College has met College Recommendations 1, 2, 5, 6 and 7; and partially met College Recommendations 3 and 4. The District met District Recommendations 1 and 2. The
Commission Concern was not resolved; and the District is directed to **2012 District Recommendation 5** in Standard V for continuing guidance.

The College was a gracious and attentive host for the evaluation team. College executives, management, faculty and staff were forthcoming and genuine in their engagement with the team. Material and data requested were delivered promptly. The team found a collegial and cohesive college that is dedicated to student learning. The team also found community connections and collaborations that speak well of the surrounding community served by the College.

**College Commendations**

After carefully reading the Self Study report, examining evidence, interviewing college personnel and students and discussing the findings in light of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges Accreditation Standards, the Team offers the following commendations to Los Angeles Southwest College:

**College Commendation 1: Esprit de Corp and Dedication to Student Learning**
The college leadership and community are commended for their resilience and commitment to student learning in the face of myriad challenges. The college community's passion to maximize the human capacity in the lives of its students and its dedication to the college mission is evident and exemplary. ([Iia])

**College Commendation 2: Commitment to the Institutional Goal of Student Success**
The College is commended for utilizing a culture of evidence to make significant progress towards its Institutional Goal of Student Success. Through initiatives like the Student Success Center, the College has created an exemplary practice, resulting in higher levels of success for its students in basic skills. Through the use of dialogue, data inquiry, resource commitments, and cross-discipline collaboration, the College has created a systemic improvement that can be utilized across the campus. ([Ib, Iia])

**College Commendation 3: Student Learning Outcomes**
The College is commended for its aggressive and vigorous progress towards SLO completion. The College faculty have embraced the SLO process linking their work to program improvement. The College provided resources for facilitation of the creation and assessment of SLO's and is well poised to achieve proficiency. ([Iia])

**District Commendations (Shared in team evaluation reports for Los Angeles Southwest College, West Los Angeles, Los Angeles Harbor College)**

After carefully reading the Self Study reports, examining evidence, interviewing personnel at the district office, as well as college personnel and students and discussing the findings in light of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges accreditation standards, the three teams offer the following commendations to the Los Angeles Community College District and its colleges:
District Commendation 1
The district office is commended for revising district service outcomes, district wide committee descriptions, and the district wide functional map to create a user-friendly and clear delineation of College and district functions. The process of survey, dialog, and district-wide review demonstrates a commitment to providing an informed understanding of the district’s role in governance and service.

District Commendation 2
The district is commended for its commitment to planning driven by data and service to the colleges.

College Recommendations

After carefully reading the Self Study report, examining evidence, interviewing college personnel and students and discussing the findings in light of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges accreditation standards, the Team offers the following recommendations to Los Angeles Southwest College:

College Recommendation 1
In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the college validate the current planning model by formally assessing the effectiveness of the process with qualitative and quantitative data. Further, the team recommends the College be attentive to the regular and consecutive implementation of the annual process and document the results for dissemination to the college constituency for the purpose of program improvement. (IB.3, IB.4, IB.6)

College Recommendation 2
In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College maintains a functional website to encourage communication, particularly in the following areas: 1) information on programs and services for students, and 2) information and documentation on governance and other committee activities. (IIA.2.b, II A.2.h, II A.2.i, II A.6.c)

College Recommendation 3
In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends the College review the availability of appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable services to all students. In particularly, the team urges the College to review the parity of services provided to students in distance education as compared to students on campus. (IIB.3.a)

College Recommendation 4
In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends the library regularly update its print and online collections in consultation with discipline faculty. (IIC.1.a) The team further recommends that, to meet the stated Institutional Student Learning Outcome in Information Competency, the College implement a cycle of instruction, assessment, and program
improvement through the appropriate learning resource and instructional areas of the College. (IIIC.1.b) Finally, the team recommends that a sustainable funding source be identified for the acquisition and maintenance of learning resource materials. (IIIC.1, IIIC.2, IIIID.1.a)

College Recommendation 5
In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends the College reviews all aspects of professional development, including key elements of peer review, self-reflection, and continuous review of appropriate pedagogy for the student population. In particular, the completion of faculty evaluations systematically and at stated intervals; engagement in dialogue addressing staff and faculty professional development on various teaching pedagogies and strategies to meet the diverse learning styles of its diverse student population. (IIIA.1.a)

College Recommendation 6
In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends the College fully utilize the established consultative committee structure by documenting actions and recommendations in agendas, minutes, and other official tools to ensure that dialogues and decisions affecting the College are communicated widely and clearly across the campus constituencies. (IV.A.3)

District Recommendations (Shared in team evaluation reports for Los Angeles Southwest College, West Los Angeles, Los Angeles Harbor College)

After carefully reading the Self Study reports, examining evidence, interviewing personnel at the district office, as well as college personnel and students and discussing the findings in light of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges accreditation standards, the three teams offer the following recommendations to the Los Angeles Community College District and its colleges:

District Recommendation 1
In order to meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the teams recommend that the district actively and regularly review the effectiveness of the construction bond oversight structure and the progress in the planned lifting of the moratorium to ensure the financial integrity of the bond programs, and the educational quality of its institutions as affected by the delays of the planned facilities projects. (IIIB.1.a, IIIIC, IIIID.2.a, IVB.1.c, Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18)

District Recommendation 2
In order to ensure the financial integrity of the district and the colleges, and to meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the teams recommend the resolution of the material weakness and significant deficiencies cited in the 2010 financial audit be fully effected by the completion of next year’s audit, and appropriate systems be implemented and maintained to prevent future audit exceptions. (IIID.2.a, IVB.1.c, Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18)
District Recommendation 3
In order to meet Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the teams recommend the district adhere to the ARC guidelines and closely monitor the planned process. (*III.D.1.c; IVB.1.c, Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18*)

District Recommendation 4
To fully respond to the recommendation first tendered by the Comprehensive Evaluation Team in 2006, and to reflect a realistic assessment of financial resources, financial stability, and the effectiveness of short- and long-term financial planning for the district and the colleges, and in order to meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the teams recommend that the district adopt and fully implement as soon as is practicable an allocation model for its constituent colleges that addresses the size, economies of scale, and the stated mission of the individual colleges. (*III.D.1.b, III.D.1.c, III.D.2.c, IVB.3.c, Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18*)

District Recommendation 5
To meet the Standard, the teams recommend that the Board of Trustees make visible, in behavior and in decision-making, their policy role and their responsibility to act as a whole in the public’s interest. Further, the teams recommend continuing professional development for the Board of Trustees to ensure a fuller understanding of its role in policy governance and the importance of using official channels of communication through the chancellor or his designee. (*IVB.1.a*)
ACCREDITATION EVALUATION REPORT FOR LOS ANGELES SOUTHWEST COLLEGE

INTRODUCTION

Los Angeles Southwest College (LASC) is a comprehensive college located on a 78-acre site on West Imperial Highway in an unincorporated section of Los Angeles County, California. The college service area encompasses 35.5 square miles, and includes parts of the city of Los Angeles, unincorporated sections of Los Angeles County, the second Supervisorial District, and portions of the cities of Gardena, Hawthorne, and Inglewood. The College’s service area spans approximately 35.5 miles, which is approximately 1% of the 4,752 square miles that make up Los Angeles County.

The median income for the LASC service area as of the 2000 census was $27,273, compared to $42,189 for Los Angeles county, $47,288 for the state of California, and $41,994 for the United States. The 2000 census also indicates that the college service area population is approximately 48% Hispanic and 39% African American. The south Los Angeles area is "job poor," with unemployment up to 24% as of September 2011. Historical job-to-worker ratio has been twice as low as it is for Los Angeles County. Educational attainment levels are low; 46% of adults are without a high school diploma. A majority of the LASC student population is not yet prepared for college level studies as evidenced by the significant percentage that assessed into basic skills English and mathematics courses at 90% and 99% respectively.

LASC was founded in February, 1967, as the smallest of the nine colleges in the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCCD). The College began offering classes on September 11, 1967 with 600 students and 22 full-time faculty members. Classes were held in 13 temporary bungalows. Four permanent buildings were erected in the 1970s, of which two were demolished in 1994 due to the discovery of earthquake faults at these sites. A facilities master plan was developed in 2003, which identified a large portion of the 78-acre site as being unsuitable for building due to the fault line. A building plan was put in place for the unaffected portion of the campus. It was funded through three bonds measures passed for the LACCD: Prop A in 2001 at $1.23 billion, Prop AA in 2003 at $980 million, and Measure J in 2008 at $3.5 billion. LASC’s portion of each of these bonds was $111 million, $65 million, and $216.7 million respectively.

A number of construction management problems surfaced in 2010, causing the LACCCD to temporarily suspend building construction in summer 2011. The moratorium is scheduled to be lifted incrementally, with complete restoration of construction activities planned for November 2012. Completed buildings under the all bond initiatives include: the student services center, central plant, new stadium and field house, new security building, and the Child Development Center. Buildings in moratorium include: the academic lecture/lab building, the Cox building that housed the old library and the administration offices, the new library, the career technical education building, and the annex. A new middle college,
funded by the Los Angeles Unified School District and sited on the campus, is near completion.

The College offers 35 degree programs and 45 certificate programs. In fall 2010, LASC enrolled 7,372 credit and 1,053 non-credit students. The ethnic breakdown of the College’s credit student body was 64% African American, 26% Hispanic, 2% White, and 0.45% Asian/Pacific Islander. The non-credit student population is 97% Hispanic, 1.1% African American, and 0.6% Asian/Pacific Islander. Seventy percent of students were female, and 30% were male. Enrollment of Hispanic students increased steadily since fall 2006, and the College received the status of a Hispanic Serving Institute (HIS) in 2010 when the percentage of Hispanic students exceeded 25%. The College has recognized the changing demographics of its service area in its recent outreach efforts. The self-study cites that College employs 11 managers, 75 full-time faculty, approximately 200 adjunct faculty, and 358 classified support and other employees. The college research website cited March 2011 statistics of “369 classified support and other employees.” Information gathered onsite identified 94 of the 358 as classified staff. It is unclear what classification the remaining 264 represented.

In addition to the instruction and services offered on the main campus, LASC maintains a number of small instructional sites in the local community. These include:

Animo South Los Angeles High School
11130 S. Western Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90047

Aspire Pacific Academy
2565 58th Street
Huntington Park, CA 90255

Centro Latino
1709 W. 8th Street
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Felton Avenue School
10417 Felton Avenue
Lennox, CA 90304

Fremont High School
7676 S. San Pedro Street
Los Angeles, CA 90003

Heritage Academy
10101 S. Broadway Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90003

Huntington Park High School

6020 Miles Avenue
Huntington Park, CA 90257

International Studies Learning Center
2701 Sequoia Dr
South Gate, CA 90280

Jefferson School
10322 Condon Avenue
Lennox, CA 90304

Lennox Park
10828 S. Condon Avenue
Lennox, CA 90304

Leuzinger High School
4118 W Rosecrans Avenue
Lawndale, CA 90260

Moffett School
11050 Larch Avenue
Lennox, CA 90304

Riley High School
1524 E. 103rd Street
The College also offers courses via distance learning. No sites identified above offer 50% or more of a program, certificate or degree. The team visited the International Studies Learning Center site.

The eleven-member team conducted a comprehensive evaluation to review evidence that LASC meets the Accreditation Standards of ACCJC. The team visited the College from Monday, March 12 to Thursday, March 15, 2012. The team prepared for its visit by reviewing the College’s Self Study report, responses to the previous accreditation team report, the special report, and the mid-term report. The team also reviewed college publications, including the catalog, schedule of classes, and online information. The team was also given access to specific online classes in the College’s course management system, and a listing of a small number of courses currently conducted offsite.

The previous comprehensive visit in 2006 and a subsequent focus visit in 2009 generated seven college recommendations, two district recommendations, and one commission concern. The Accrediting Commission imposed a sanction and placed the College on probation in June 2008. The Commission reviewed and accepted the College’s special and mid-term reports, and took action to remove the College from sanction in June 2009.

This evaluation team found the college community in the midst of change during its visit, both in its physical campus and in the planning and assessment work in student learning. The challenges of the physical campus seem to echo the challenges in the College’s planning work. Some buildings are brand new and orderly, with students and staff learning and working. Many buildings are stopped in some stage of construction: some are dirt lots, others are demolished inside, and one very visible building at the center of campus – the lecture/lab building – is stripped to its steel frame. The anxiety of the college leadership and community is palpable, both in its anticipation of a renewed campus as the building moratorium lifts, and in its concern that too much time has elapsed and student learning is being affected. The temporary nature of the Academic Village and the Library, the mostly gutted administration building, and the visible signs of exposure and incompleteness of the academic lecture/lab building were unsettling for visitors and the college community. As students have said to the team during the visit, this is a less than desirable learning environment.

Like the physical building of the campus, the planning and assessment work at the institution has also slowed since 2009. In the initial phase, much was envisioned and built in both the participatory governance structure and in planning processes. A lull was evident thereafter. Interviews with a number of employees suggest that this might be an effect of an absence in academic leadership. The College was without a chief academic and student services officer, and a chief business officer for a long period. The overall economic crisis was also noted as a barrier to progress. Beginning fall 2011, evidence suggests that there were increased dialogue and increased work product (various completed plans) generated from the planning
and assessment process. Despite this recent burst of activity, however, the stop-and-start nature of the work has contributed to the uneveness of the planning-assessment cycle(s).

The team found the physical document of the Self Study to be aesthetically attentive and expertly printed. The electronic version of the Self Study with linked evidence was functional and convenient. The content of the Self Study is complete in the main; it addresses the eligibility requirements, the prior recommendations, the four main Standards, and the planning agendas from 2006. Less desirable were the uneveness in voice from Standard to Standard, and the need for surface editing throughout. There were inconsistencies in the number and distribution of employees as well as in the description of the administrative structure between what is cited in the self study, and information gathered onsite. The team also noted a lack of planning agendas, particularly when they are clearly needed and were articulated in the self-evaluation portion of the Standard narrative.

The College was a gracious and attentive host for the evaluation team. College executives, faculty and staff were forthcoming and genuine in their engagement with the team. Material and data requested were delivered promptly. The team found a collegial and cohesive college dedicated to student learning. The team also found connections and collaborations with local schools and agencies that speak to the College's central place in the community.
RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 2006 EVALUATION TEAM

College Recommendation 1
Although the College has made significant progress in the program review process of instructional programs, the team recommends, as did the team in 2000, that the College implement a program review process, different from unit planning, for non-instructional programs including student services to evaluate their effectiveness and assist in planning. (Standards IB.1, IB.2, IB.3, IIIB.3, IIIB.3.c, IIIB.4, IIIC2, IVa.1, IVa.2a IVa.2b, IVa.3)

The team finds that a consistent NIPR (non-instructional program review) process has been in place since 2008. The College has evaluated this older Program Review model, found it deficient, and made modifications and improvements. Student learning outcomes, point of service surveys, and resource requests are integrated into the new program review model. The College conducted a "mini-review" in spring 2010, focusing on the development of student learning outcomes, the evaluation of 2009-2010 objectives, and the development of objectives and resource requests for 2010-2011. A full review of student services and academic affairs was conducted in fall 2010; administrative services was conducted in fall 2011. The evaluative dialogue and subsequent improvements to the model indicates that the College meets the Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement level. (IIA.2.c, IIa.2.f) and met this recommendation.

College Recommendation 2
The team recommends that the College develop and implement a plan to address the problems of low retention, persistence, and success rates of students who enter the College without sufficient academic preparation. (Standards IA.1, IB.7, IIa.2d, IIIB.1, IIIB.2, IIID.1, IVa.5)

In a recommendation from 2000, and again in 2006, the evaluating teams urged the College to develop and implement a plan that addresses the problems of low retention, persistence, and success rates for underprepared students. As a response, the College developed a basic skills plan for 2006-2009, and a student success plan for 2008-2011. As noted in this Self Study, 95% of the student population assesses into developmental English, and 99% into developmental mathematics.

Subsequent to those plans and reporting progress since 2009, the College has initiated a number of efforts to engage in dialogue about academically underprepared students based on research data, and to make structural changes regarding the way in which basic skills instruction is offered at the College. Among the major projects undertaken are the Bridging Research Information Cultures (BRIC) project of the California RP Group in 2009 and Achieving the Dream Initiative (ATD) in 2010. In summer 2011, the College completed the restructuring of a basic skills academy by moving all courses more than two levels below collegiate into the non-credit category. A Student Success Center that provides tutoring in reading and writing, and a mathematics lab are also operational. The California Accountability Report for Community College (ARCC) of 2012 shows improvement in persistence rate from 50% to 56.6%, and in the successful basic skills course completion rate increased an impressive 9.8%. These are commendable efforts and represent a continued focus. While the team is concerned that these efforts be institutionalized and sustained once grant funding for the various initiatives expire, the College has demonstrated a deep commitment to grapple with the issue of academic under-preparation. The College has developed and implemented a plan as
called for by the 2000 and 2006 evaluating team, and thus met this recommendation.

**College Recommendation 3**

*The team has found that there is a divergence between plans and subsequent action. Therefore, the team recommends that the College focus greater attention on assessing the currency and effectiveness of all programs and services with particular emphasis on the following areas:*

* a) staff development,  
* b) distance learning,  
* c) technology,  
* d) enrollment management, and  
* e) occupational education.*

*The team further recommends that the College incorporate the identified needs and adopted action plans into the Integrated College Operational Plan. (Standards IIA.1, IIA.3, IIB.7, IIA.1a, IIA.1b, IIA.2b, IIA.2c, IIA.2f, IIA.3, IIA.5, IIC.1a, IIC.2, IIB.3, IIC.1, IIC.2).*

Between the first focused visit received by the College in 2008 and the subsequent focus visit in spring 2009, the College responded to Recommendation 3 by conducting a complete cycle of program reviews, an assessment and revision of its planning and budget processes, evaluated the programs associated with the five focus areas listed in the recommendation, and developed an integrated 2008-2011 Strategic Plan addressing ten critical areas of the College, including the five focus areas listed above. The 2009 Special Report to the Commission was accepted, and after the spring 2009 focused visit, the College was removed from probation in summer 2009, and this recommendation was deemed met at the time.

Subsequent to 2009, the College established five committees to respond specifically to each of the focus areas listed and coordinators were assigned. The committees operated in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, though it is difficult to ascertain the level of participation and the vibrancy of discussion in these committees through the meeting rosters and skeletal agenda in this period. The products of these meetings are noted as follows:

- Three-year Comprehensive Distance Education Plan (fall 2011)
- Information Technology Plan (April 2011)
- Enrollment Management Plan (fall 2011)
- Career-Technical Education Plan (2010)
- Three-year Staff Development Plan (spring 2011)
- Strategic Plan 2011-2014 (October 2011)

While these plans are supposed to be used annually for the Integrated College Operational Plan (ICOP), their recent dates of completion preclude the integration of these plans in the annual strategic planning cycles of the last two academic years.

While the team notes the initial progress of the College in 2009, and the impetus to establishing key committees in these critical areas of the College, the continuing progress in the intervening years is uneven. The burst of activities in 2011, while evident of the College’s concern in these areas, does not demonstrate steady and sustained progress. The lack of depth in the Enrollment Management Plan and the Distance Education Plan signals the need for a renewed effort to examine and plan for these areas. Further, the College must document the activities and
outcomes that results from the planning efforts, and engage in a sustained cycle of planning, activities, assessment, and improvement. The College partially met this recommendation. Further, the College should note the recommending language in 2012 College Recommendation 1 in this report in order to meet the Standards.

**College Recommendation 4**

*There is no clear evidence that the College has developed specific strategies to meet the educational needs of the changing demographics of its community. The team recommends that the College intensify its efforts to identify service area needs. The team further recommends that the College develop and implement plans for programs, courses, and services to address identified needs (Standards IA.1, IIA.1a, IB.3a, IIB.4, IIBB.1, IIIB.2, III.D.1).*

The College has noted a shift in the community demographic in which the Latino population is increasing. The unduplicated headcount of Latino student rose by nearly 40% from fall 2006 to fall 2008. In fall 2011, the College met its eligibility as a Hispanic Serving Institution (HIS), which requires 25% full-time Latino enrollment. The College has worked largely through the Latino Employee Association (LEA) to implement the activities of the Associated Student Office (ASO) and the Office of Outreach and Recruitment to increase enrollment from the Latino community and to support Latino student development. The LEA organized events with the Diversity Committee, ASO, Puente, and the Latino Student Organization. An accounting of activities was noted in evidence. Absent from the evidence is documentation of a focused dialogue on identifying the needs of enrolled Latino students in academics and educational planning. While the College developed strategies to increase Latino enrollment, the team’s interviews on site surfaced the need for focused dialog on the impact of the shifting demographics beyond the areas of ESL and basic skills. This recommendation is partially met.

**College Recommendation 5**

*In response to the recommendation of the 2000 team, the College has made some progress in developing a participatory governance structure; however, there continues to be gaps in communication. The team recommends that the College develop and implement a strategy whereby information is communicated to all constituent groups in an accurate, timely, and systematic manner. (Standards IB.1, IIC.1, IIC.1a, IID.1).*

The team finds that the College has documented a participatory governance structure and the associated processes. Ten planning committees exist within the governance structure, and they make recommendations regarding planning and resources. A feedback loop has been established for the president to communicate decisions regarding funding or deferment. The College and the president also established a college hour in which the campus community can freely engage in dialogue through committees or individually. While the vibrancy of a number of committees is not apparent in evidence, the College has established a full governance and decision-making structure, and developed communication strategies. Further development to ensure the vigor and consistency of discussions in, and communications from, the planning committees would enhance the participatory nature of college dialogue. The College met this recommendation.

**College Recommendation 6**

*Because the lack of progress in meeting the previous team’s recommendation, the team strongly recommends that the College creates a secure and fireproof location for the archival of academic records and for the College seal. (Standards IIB.3f, IIIB.1, III.D.1).*
The team finds the records and the College seal secured in the new Student Services Center. This recommendation is met.

**College Recommendation 7**
The College has taken the initial steps at identifying student learning outcomes. The team recommends that the College establish a timeline for developing student learning outcomes at each level (course, program, and institution); develop and implement a process to incorporate the use of student learning outcomes into the curriculum; identify measurable assessments that can be used to determine progress toward achieving student learning outcomes at all levels and incorporate guidelines for developing assessment measures into the SLO Guidelines handbook. (Standards IIB, IIA, IIA.1.c, IIA.2a, IIA.2b, IIA.2f, IIB.4, IIC.1b).

To address the lack of progress in completing the student learning outcome timeline established in 2008, the Academic Senate in early fall 2010 compressed and revised the timeline from a 5-semester plan to a 3-semester plan. Further, that plan stipulates that at least one item in each set of course, program, and institutional student learning outcomes be assessed by the end of fall 2011. A SLO Coordinating Team was formed in 2010-2011, led by the SLO Coordinator and the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, and populated by various mentors and student services representatives. The team found evidence supporting the work associated with the 3-semester plan. Course, program and institutional student learning outcomes have been established and at least one item within each set of course, program and institutional outcomes has been assessed. The College has met the recommendation. The team believes that the College is at least at the Development Level on the Rubric, and will be able to achieve the Proficiency Level by the deadline of Spring 2013.

**District Recommendation 1**
The team recommends that the district evaluate the impact of the revenue allocation model and consider the special conditions of individual colleges. (Standards IIID, IVB).

The team finds that the district has conducted a review of its allocation model and crafted a recommendation for a revision to address the concerns of its constituent colleges. This recommendation has been met.

**District Recommendation 2**
The functional relationship between the College and District needs to be fully defined through a dialog focused on efficient use of resources and service to students. The implementation of a decentralized relationship needs mutual definition. (IVB.3.a, c)

The team finds that the district has clearly defined and documented the functional relationship between the College and District. A 2008 version of the District's participatory governance handbook and functional map was extensively revised and reissued on August 23, 2011. The revision of the document was conducted through the District Strategic Planning Committee. The August 2011 document included an expanded functional map and the delineation of function between the District and the College, District Office Service Outcomes (DOSOs), an update of District-wide committee descriptions. The District
Strategic Planning Committee is responsible for the review and evaluation of the current document for effectiveness. This recommendation has been met.

Commission Concern
The Commission is seeking evidence that the District has developed, implemented, and adhered to a plan which will address the unfunded retiree health benefit liability to assure out-year obligations are met without significant negative impact on the financial health of the institution. (Standard IID.1.c).

The team determined that this Commission Concern is not resolved. Further, the team recommends the following in the current report (2012):

District Recommendation 3 (2012)
In order to meet Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the teams recommend the district adhere to the ARC guidelines and closely monitor the planned process. (IID.1.c; IVB.1.c, Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18)
ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

The team found Los Angeles Southwest College is in compliance with most of the Eligibility Requirements established by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges with the exception of numbers 17 and 18.

1. Authority
Los Angeles Southwest College (LASC) is a public two-year community college in the state of California, and awards degrees and certificates. It is authorized to operate by the State of California, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, and the Board of Trustees of the Los Angeles Community College District. The authority has existed continuously since 1967. The College’s accreditation has been regularly renewed.

2. Mission
The team confirmed that LASC completed a review of its mission in spring 2011, and the reviewed mission statement was approved by the Board of Trustees on July 27, 2011. This statement is communicated to the public both in print and online.

3. Governing Board
LASC is one of nine constituent colleges of the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD). The District Board of Trustees is a seven-member policy-making body. Board members are elected for four-year terms district-wide by voters in the city of Los Angeles and in neighboring cities without their own community college districts. Elections are staggered, with three or four seats filled every two years. An advisory student member is elected annually district-wide. The Board governs through policies that ensure and secure the academic and fiscal integrity of the constituent institutions. A policy on conflict of interest assures that conflicting interests are disclosed, and do not interfere with the impartiality of board members in decision-making.

4. Chief Executive Officer
The president of LASC is the chief executive officer appointed by the Board of Trustees. The president has full time responsibility to the institution, and possesses the requisite authority to administer board policies. The chancellor of LACCD is the chief executive officer of the district appointed by the Board of Trustees. The chancellor has full-time responsibility to the district and its constituent colleges, and possesses the requisite authority to administer board policies. Neither the LASC president nor the LACCD chancellor serves on the Board of Trustees.

5. Administrative Capacity
LASC completed the hiring of it executive ranks over the past two years. The management level is likewise complete with appropriate deanships over academic and student services areas. The College has sufficient staff, with appropriate preparation and experience to provide the services necessary to support the mission and purpose of the institution.

6. Operating Status
The team certifies that LASC is operational with students actively pursuing degree and certificate programs.

7. Degrees
A substantial portion of LASC’s offerings are programs that lead to degrees, and a significant portion of its students are enrolled in them. In fall 2011, over 85% of the courses were degree-applicable and over 80% of LASC students were enrolled in these degree-applicable courses.

8. Educational Programs
The team certifies that LASC offers 35 associate degrees and 45 certificates that are consistent with the college mission. The College also offers non-credit courses as a means to prepare students for entry into credit college level studies. Degree programs are based on recognized fields of study in higher education, are of sufficient content and length, and are conducted at appropriate levels of rigor. At least one degree program is two academic years in length as consistent with the Eligibility Requirements.

9. Academic Credit
The team finds that LASC awards academic credit based on the Carnegie unit, which is a generally accepted practice in degree-granting institutions of higher education. Information about the awarding of academic credit is documented in the college catalog.

10. Student Learning and Achievement
LASC documents in its college catalog the educational purpose, objectives, and student learning outcomes for each academic program offered. Official course outlines of record are established with learning outcomes, and followed in all sections and delivery methods for each course. Institutional, programmatic and course level outcomes have been developed for instructional programs, and assessments are in progress.

11. General Education
The team finds that LASC includes at least 18 units of general education requirements in its degree programs, and competency in mathematics, reading and written expression are reflected in those requirements. The college also specifies course requirements in five areas; they are: American institutions, health education, physical education, critical thinking, and multicultural studies. Course SLOs exist and assessment has begun.

12. Academic Freedom
The team verified that the LASC Academic Senate adopted a statement on academic rights and responsibilities in spring 2011 that supports and defines academic freedom.

13. Faculty
LASC has a substantial core of qualified faculty with full-time responsibility to the institution. The College employs 75 full-time contract faculty and over 200 part-time adjunct faculty. The specific responsibilities are delineated in the faculty collective bargaining agreement. These duties include curriculum review and assessment.
14. **Student Services**
The size and scope of LASC student services are consistent with the needs of the student body, the college mission, and support student learning.

15. **Admissions**
The team finds that LASC has adopted and adheres to admission policy consistent with the college mission and California regulations. LASC maintains and open admission policy and process.

16. **Information and Learning Resources**
The team finds that LASC provides, through the campus library and learning centers, as well as specific contractual agreements, long-term access to sufficient information and learning resources and services to supports its mission and instructional programs. The team finds that information and learning resources are available in all modes of delivery.

17. **Financial Resources**
LASC, as a constituent institution of the LACCD, documents a funding base, financial resources, and plans for financial development adequate to support student learning programs and services. The recent review and recommendation of a revised district allocation model in March 2012, if approved by the board of trustees, would provision the College with adequate funds for base operations, and is meant to alleviate the structural imbalance that contributed to four previous years of negative campus year-end fund balances. The proposed allocation model, in its full implementation of the multiple phases, would speak to the long-term financial stability for operations, and resources to improve institutional effectiveness.

18. **Financial Accountability**
LASC, as part of the LACCD, undergoes externally contracted annual audits by certified public accountants. Audit results and management responses are reviewed and discussed in public sessions of the district's board of trustees. The College currently shows an annual and cumulative operating deficit. The team examined recent external audits of the College and district, and found that the 2011 audit is late. A number of material weakness and significant deficiencies cited in the 2010 audit also await resolution.

19. **Institutional Planning and Evaluation**
The team finds that the College engages in systematic institutional planning and evaluation for all departments and divisions of the College, including instruction, student services, and administrative services. Annual planning is linked to resource allocation. The instructional area has made marked progress since the last evaluation visit, particularly in the areas of student learning outcomes and assessment. The College recognizes the need to bring all areas to the same level in order to enhance student learning, and is committed to these efforts.

20. **Public Information**
The team finds that the College provides a catalog for its constituencies with accurate and current general information regarding mission and values, educational offerings and supporting resources, financial aid, accreditation information, district governing board, College administration, and instructional faculty. It also states admissions requirements, fees
and other financial obligations, and major policies affecting students. The semester class schedule contains an abridged version of this information. The catalog is printed and available on the college website.

21. Relations with the Accrediting Commission
The Self Study, containing signatures from the College, the district, and the board of trustees, assures that the College and the district adhere to the eligibility requirements and accreditation standards and policies of the Commission.
EVALUATION OF LOS ANGELES SOUTHWEST COLLEGE USING ACCJC STANDARDS

STANDARD I: INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND EFFECTIVENESS

Standard IA: Mission

General Observations

"The mission of Los Angeles Southwest College is to facilitate student success, encourage life-long learning and enrich the life of its diverse community." LASC's mission statement is appropriately broad-based to include meeting the needs of a diverse student population with a variety of educational goals. In 2008, the College expanded the original mission statement to include The Vision of Los Angeles Southwest College. The combined mission/vision statement focuses on creating an environment conducive to learning and working, and guides the planning and operations of the college. The mission/vision statement was validated in 2011.

Findings and Evidence

The College has identified its student populations accurately and has created programs and services prioritized to meet their needs. The College has developed a robust system of grant funding to leverage the general fund commitment to serve high needs students. Examples of these are the Passages program, TRIO, and Achieving the Dream. (IA.1)

The current mission statement was crafted by the Mission Review Committee (MRC) in 2010 over several months utilizing data and dialogue. Led by the co-chairs of the Strategic Planning committee, the MRC recommended a revised mission statement to the College Council in 2010, and it was approved by the President in February 2011, and by the Board of Trustees July 27, 2011. The mission can be found online, in the catalog, and the schedule of classes. (IA.2)

According to LASC's Strategic Planning Handbook, the mission is reviewed every three years. The MRC conducts the review, in which the campus community is invited to read and make recommendations. A survey is also disseminated to the campus community to solicit broader dialogue. The final draft of the revised mission is sent to the President for approval. In addition, the mission is reviewed by the broader community on an alternating three-year cycle. (IA.3)

The College deploys a planning process that is linked to the mission and supported by evidence. The planning process flows from the Mission to Strategic Plan goals. Each Strategic Plan goals is further defined by measurable objectives. This clear alignment ensures that all program objectives roll up and aligned with institutional Strategic Plan goals. (IA.4)
Conclusions

The College established its current Strategic Planning Process in 2008-09, with revisions each year. The mission statement has been reviewed and revised per the Mission Review Process. The College uses its mission statement as the centerpiece of its planning and decision-making. As shown in evidence, the Strategic and Institutional College Operational Plan is vibrant for 2008-2009, which included action steps and timelines. The latest plan in 2011-2012 is also documented. However, the team found less substantive evidence for the intervening years of 2009 and 2010; while the ICOPs are available, they are outlines of anticipated activities, and markedly different in presentation than the fuller plans in 2008-2009. The team’s interview onsite verified this lull in the planning, as well as the return to a fuller level of activities in the 2011-2012 cycle.

Additional, this Standard calls for evidence in the alignment of the mission statement to distance education offerings. The team found limited evidence on dialogue about distance education at the time of mission revision; the team also found no direct evidence on dialogue about distance education instruction in the Strategic Plan goals. While the team was provided with a set of distance education guidelines on the implementation of distance learning, it did not find evidence of the dialogue that informed the production of these guidelines, or the process this document traveled from dialogue to publication. The team encourages the College to consider furthering the distance education dialogue and document such activities in its next cycle of planning and mission review.

The College meets the Standard.

Standard IB: Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations

The College’s institutional goal-setting is accomplished by the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC), which drafts the Integrated Strategic Plan (ISP) on a three-year cycle. The SPC also guides the College in annual planning using the three-year ISP. Each year, the SPC receives the departmental program reviews and action plans, and aligns and integrates them with the institutional goals to produce the Institutional College Operation Plan (ICOP).

Student learning outcomes are defined at the course (SLO) or area unit (AUO), program, and institutional levels. In aggregate, these sets of outcomes delineate a college-wide commitment to student learning. Although SLOs and AUOs have not been assessed at all levels, the outcomes are operationally defined and embedded in annual program review.

The College has completed one cycle of the annual planning process and anticipates a continuous and sustained implementation of the planning cycle as the annual planning process matures. There is also a need to evaluate the overall process itself, from rubric
creation to budget allocation. In addition, campus-wide dialogue is not always evident due to the inconsistent documentation of minutes across several planning committees.

Findings and Evidence

There is a vibrant dialogue on student learning and institutional processes occurring throughout and at all levels of the institution. The College’s SPC conducts long-term planning in a three-year cycle to produce the ISP; it also conducts short-term planning annually to produce the ICOP. The ISP provides long term guidance while the ICOP is at the center of the College’s annual planning effort. The ICOP is an overarching college planning document, created based on the assessment of department program reviews and action plans. The ICOP is drafted by the SPC, the membership of which is representative of all college constituents. Once in draft form, the ICOP is presented to College Council. The College Council then reviews and makes recommendations to the president for the plan’s approval.

Other venues for broad dialogue about planning are Academic Senate Committees, Staff Development activities, president forums, Flex Day, the Student Success Newsletter, and Accreditation Self Study Standard committees. Using the Campus Climate Survey as a measure for the effectiveness of planning efforts, 72% of respondents believed that program reviews are integrated into the college planning process and 76% believed that the assessment of SLOs is considered in college planning. Various efforts (e.g. PowerPoint and video explaining strategic planning) have been initiated to better communicate the importance of planning and encourage broader participation. (IB.1, IB.4)

LASC has completed long-term planning cycles in 2005-2008, 2008-2011, and began the cycle for 2011-2014. Short-term cycles are conducted annually within each long-term cycle. Commitment to achieve the ISP goals is evident: the ISP sets the parameters and provides guidance for the crafting of the annual ICOP; the ICOP in turn guides the resource allocation process used by the Budget Committee. Until recently, the College’s administrative restructuring and the vacancies at the vice president level have been barriers to assessing the objectives identified in the ICOP. However, the most recent ICOP matrix, titled the LASC 2011-2014 Strategic Plan First Year Implementation 2011-2012, does depict the assessment of measureable objectives, and illustrates an institutional commitment to sustainable processes. It is important that campus leaders continue to encourage an evidence-based culture of assessment to ensure an ongoing cycle of evaluation. (IB.2)

Ongoing planning efforts are evident in the annual instructional and non-instructional program review processes. The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) delivers course and student related data, provides guidance as where to find data, and provides survey instruments specific to each program’s needs.

During this accreditation cycle, the instructional program review model has evolved from a comprehensive program review conducted once every six years (2010) to ‘mini review’ (2011) to annual program review (2012). The annual review focuses primarily on retention, success and completion at the course level and includes faculty reflections on student and program learning outcomes, and continuous improvement strategies. Learning outcomes
have been mapped from course, program, to the institutional level. It is unclear the extent to
which institutional learning outcomes in the instructional area have been fully assessed.

Similarly, program review in the non-instructional areas of the College moved to an annual
model in 2008. Student services reviews completed annual reviews in 2008, 2009, 2010, and
program reviews are vetted by the Program Review Committee while non-instructional
department/unit program reviews are vetted by area managers. (IB.3)

According to the Strategic Planning Handbook, all constituency groups are represented at
College Council. This is also true for committees such as strategic planning, technology, and
educational master planning. Evidence exists to support that improvements have been made
which are directly related to the program review process. Examples include the opening of a
writing center, revision of the assessment and placement process by the Math department,
and the institutionalizing of common final exams for Math 115 and Math 112. (IB.4)

The College shares information with the public about its effectiveness by posting its planning
documents online. However, campus wide dialogue is not always evident due to the
inconsistent documentation of minutes across several planning committees.

The OIR provides data ranging from enrollments, demographics, retention and success rates,
full-time equivalent students (FTES), and average class size. This information is presented on
the IR website under the title of Strategic Planning Data. In addition, there is evidence of an
environmental scan and various surveys being performed; the College validates that the
information gathered is being used at the unit or program planning level in connection to
resource allocation. The use of the results of the scans are less visible in upper-levels
planning documents. In other instances, particularly in areas connected to the Achieving the
Dream initiative, data use is extensive, and has made an impact in planning for remediation
work. Through the BRIC project, a research team has been established to aid the IR Office
in managing their efforts and the creation of an annual agenda which should lead to better
evidence-based decision making. (IB.5)

The Annual Planning Retreat is a venue for LASC to review and evaluate their planning
efforts. In addition, LASC was selected to participate in the Bridging Research, Information,
and Cultures Initiative Technical Assistance Program (BRIC-TAP) in the 2010-11 year.
Aspects of this initiative include data facilitation, needs assessment, and staff development.
The prospective rewards include training for college leaders, ways to improve SLOs, and
creation of the Strategic Research Team (SRT). The College has evaluated current practices
and improved the program review process. For instance, student services areas are now
reviewing student demographic data. Evidence supports that processes are in place to
increase dialogue regarding the evaluation of planning efforts. (IB.6)

The Strategic Planning Handbook outlines the four phases of the annual planning process.
These phases are: evaluation of previous objectives, development of new objectives,
implementation of objectives, and evaluation of strategic goals. These phases are reviewed
by the SPC on an annual basis, and at the time of the Annual Planning Retreat. LASC is
aware that further improvements in the evaluation process are needed. The areas of focus include: the sustainability of practices, the evaluation of outcomes at the institutional level, the improvement of the use of data for measuring short and long-term goals, and communication to the campus community about the status of student learning outcomes. *(IB.7)*

**Conclusions**

In its intensive work on student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels, the College expresses a clear commitment to student learning. Although SLOs have not been assessed at all levels, the outcomes are operationally defined and the institution appears to be on pace to be at the proficient level by fall 2012.

Long-term goal setting and short-term planning are guided by the SPC, which drafts the three-year ISP, and the annual ICOP. There is evidence to support that the College has completed one cycle of both long-term and short-term planning. An increased focus on sustainable practice and process evaluation is important for improvement.

The College partially meets the Standard.

**Recommendations**

**College Recommendation 1**

In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College validate the current planning model by formally assessing the effectiveness of the process with qualitative and quantitative data. Further, the team recommends the College be attentive to the regular and consecutive implementation of the annual process and document the results for dissemination to the college constituency for the purpose of program improvement. *(IB.3, IB.4, IB.6)*
STANDARD II: STUDENT LEARNING PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

Standard IIA: Instructional Programs

General Observations

The College’s mission statement, revised in 2010-11, provides broad latitude for the instructional programs offered: “The mission of Los Angeles Southwest College is to facilitate student success, encourage life-long learning and enrich the lives of its diverse community.” That statement is echoed in the College’s GE description and was posted around the campus. The College offers a comprehensive curriculum, both credit and non-credit and from ESL to nursing and transfer programs; classes are offered both on and off campus, and evenings and weekends. The College also has on its campus a Middle College High School.

To offer programs consistent with students’ educational preparation and the economy of the community, the College employs data from the OIR regarding the current labor market, industry standards, and identified CTE needs. Most recently, the College created new courses or programs in homeland security, cyber security and computer forensics, and revamped a teacher certificate program in response to local needs. (IIA)

Previous visiting teams have noted the College’s efforts to identify and meet the varied educational needs of its demographic region. The College is situated in an area identified by its low household income, its high unemployment rates, its lack of college-educated graduates, and the under-preparation of its high school graduates. In response, the College, through collaboration and college wide dialogue, has moved in new directions to address the basic skills needs of its students, 95% of whom require developmental English and 99% developmental math. (IIA.1.a)

The team observed three significant instructional contexts shaped by the students’ educational preparation, diversity, and demographics: (1) the movement of many basic skills courses in math and English to a non-credit mode and the subsequent creation of an academy for under-prepared students; (2) a similar shift from credit ESL courses to non-credit ESL; and (3) the modest increase of Latino students. (IIA.1,a)

Many efforts directed toward college-readiness and basic skills necessary for student success are grant-inspired. The decisions to seek particularly grants is based on their mission relevance, and reviewed and approved by the College President. Equity for All, USC Center for Urban Education (CUE), Bridging Research Information Cultures (BRIC) and Achieving the Dream (ATD) make contributes to research and analysis of data. Positive interventions coming as an outgrowth of grant-funded initiatives include adding a mandatory in-person orientation session as part of matriculation in fall 2011 that will eventually be offered to all new students, and coordinated tutorial support with tutors in the classroom and instructors in the tutoring labs. The College also hopes to launch a teaching/learning academy for faculty to improve pedagogy. (IIA.1,a)
The College’s effort to complete build-out of its campus under several bond measures has been halted by a district-imposed moratorium. Once the moratorium is lifted, and the brick-and-mortar building is completed, an arts and humanities center, a new CTE building, and the renovated library can address the future needs of students. (IIA.1.b)

The campus has seen growth in its distance education offerings and supports both the Moodle and the Etudes delivery and support system for distance education. These expansions enable the College to offer instructional modes and methodologies that respond to diverse learning styles some of the College’s students. Short-term sessions, evening classes, on-line and off-site offerings respond to the needs of working or single parents as well. (IIA.1.b, IIA.2.d)

SLO assessments have evolved from a 6-semester timeline to a 3-semester process of development and implementation over more than one semester, measurement/assessment, and revision. In the identification and assessment of student learning outcomes at the course, program, certificate and degree level, the College has ratcheted up its efforts to reach proficiency by October 2012, and has set spring 2012 as its date for doing so. It has also identified 2014 as its target date for achieving sustainability. The team affirmed that as a result of assessment and analysis of data, a number of courses or programs have undertaken improvements in instruction or changes in curricular requirements as a result of their findings. (IIA.1.c)

The institution uses established procedures to design courses and programs. As evidenced by the Curriculum Committee bylaws, faculty have a central role in establishing the quality of the courses through Curriculum Committee and Academic Senate approval, prior to district approvals. As part of that curriculum review, revision, or renewal, discipline faculty identify learning outcomes for each course and program. (IIA.2.a, IIA.2.b)

CTE efforts and resource development are assisted by the CTE General Advisory Committee, a mega committee from across industries, agencies, and the community. Industry-specific advisory boards, required by Accreditation Standard, are expected to offer direction, assistance, and help establish competency levels for CTE graduates. (IIA.2.b)

Aided by the Program Review Committee, faculty routinely review the quality of courses and programs. Program Review, learning outcomes assessments, and annual departmental planning (IDPs) combine to ensure that instruction has an appropriate breadth, depth, rigor and sequencing. The College uses data to prompt changes to their offerings, to ensure rigor, sequencing, and responsiveness to labor market demands. Program-level SLOs measure students’ ability to synthesize the discrete learning occurring at the course level. (IIA.2.c)

Institutional Program Review, in both instructional and non-instructional units, includes analysis of those programs’ relation to the college mission, their function and relationship to other units, and their achievements in student learning outcomes conveyed in both formative and summative evaluations. During this accreditation cycle, the College has modified its program review model from once every six years to a ‘mini review’ to annual program review. This annual review focused primarily on course retention, success and completion but not on program completion. Comparable reporting templates used by instructional and
non-instructional program review require an SLO discussion as well as future plans. OIR provides information about trends, labor needs and regional and state data to assist programs to units in planning for the future. Instructional program reviews are validated by faculty on the Program Review Committee. The comprehensive program review process, launched 2010-11, was revamped, effective fall 2011, and now requires an annual review. This newer version more clearly integrates strategic planning, budget, and resource allocation—all based on program review and achievement of learning outcomes. Difficulties in meeting stated student learning objectives can be analyzed and resources requested as appropriate to address those deficiencies. The College has a program viability mechanism, most recently used to examine the future of the credit ESL program in light of its declining enrollments. (IIA.2.e, IIA.2.f)

English and mathematics are the two programs administering end-of-course departmental examinations (Math 112, 115) or final essays. Faculty in each department collaborate on the formation of a scoring rubric and a normed reading or a shared scoring session; full- and part-time faculty then discuss the findings. Validation of student learning and the appropriateness of rubric form part of the faculty discussion as instruments are evaluated each cycle. Exit examinations are not currently validated for non-bias. (IIA.2.g)

The College’s stated learning outcomes for each course and those outcomes that circumscribe the program more generally are the basis for determining student competency and thereby awarding course credit, certificates, and degrees. The College awards unit credit based upon the well-established Carnegie unit of measurement, used by most American colleges and universities. Content norms and equivalencies are monitored by the college articulation officer and are topics for discussion when courses are systematically reviewed and revised or when new courses are proposed. Degrees intended for transfer are also weighed by external institutions against the stated learning outcomes. This information—from program-level learning outcomes to course units—is clearly contained in the catalog and on the website. (IIA.2.h, IIA.2.i)

The institution requires of all academic and vocational degree programs a component of general education (GE) based on a carefully considered philosophy that echoes the College’s mission statement as well as district policy that stipulates degree requirements. The College’s philosophy statement is contained in its catalog. Faculty propose courses for inclusion in the GE category that includes experiences in the humanities and fine arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences and permeating throughout many courses, a respect for human differences, being effective citizens, showing civility and civic responsibility, and a respect for cultural diversity. The curriculum committee’s GE subcommittee reviews all GE-proposed courses to ensure their course content and methodology are consistent with the tenets of GE. (IIA.3 IIA.3.a, IIA.3.c)

Life-long learning is an explicit feature of the College’s GE philosophy statement, and the College provides GE courses that address oral and written communication, computer literacy, quantitative reasoning and critical thinking, and introductions to modes of inquiry in multiple disciplines. These elements parallel the College’s ISLOS. (IIA.3.b)
The College’s 35 degree-granting programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core and have been reviewed at the campus and district levels, as well as by the California Chancellor’s Office and by ACCJC at the time of their proposal. (II.A.4)

Vocational and occupational certificates and degrees at LASC prepare students for entry level career in the field, or appropriate regional, state or national licensure. Among the programs cited are Nursing and Child Development.

Information about programs, courses, transfer requirements, and degrees is clear and accurate as it appears in the catalog and on the college website. Discussions of programs include a description, the learning outcomes anticipated upon completion of the program, and the requirements and options associated with the degree or certificate. The College catalog makes clear its transfer policies, both in to and out of the College, including credit for military service training and credit for law enforcement academy training, as well as a mechanism for potentially transferring credit from non-accredited universities. The College articulation officer maintains currency of course listings on ASSIST, the official repository of articulation for California’s colleges and universities. This full-time officer also works with other articulation officers in the district to make collective and individual determinations. (II.A.6. II.A.6.a)

The College has not eliminated any program in six years; should it need to do so, the program viability process permits the College to investigate possible changes or discontinuance with minimal disruption to students completing their education. (II.A.6.b)

The College has a Catalog Committee to review the catalog for accuracy and currency. The review process has been effective, and no issues were observed by the team. Other publications convey the mission and services clearly. The public portions of the website provides information regarding the college mission, programs, and services. It also duplicates the catalog information for the public. (II.A.6.c)

The LACCD Board of Trustees has adopted a number of policies and has a signed contract with the faculty bargaining unit that assures academic freedom and notes concomitant faculty responsibilities. The faculty has a code of ethics adopted in 2006 to help faculty differentiate personal conviction from professional viewpoints. (II.A.7.a)

The institution relies solely on Board-adopted policies to articulate its expectations concerning academic honesty. The statement about “Academic Dishonesty” appears in the catalog with other District policies. (II.A.7.b)

Standard II.A.7.c regarding codes of conduct or worldviews and Standard II.A.8 regarding offerings in foreign locations to students other than US nationals are not applicable to this college. (II.A.7.c, II.A.8)
Findings and Evidence

The Self Study thoroughly addresses credit and non-credit instruction on ground and provided analysis of each. While the College evidently takes pride in other units such as the study abroad program, the Middle College High School, fee-based community education, and contract education, a more extensive critical analysis of these areas in this self study in terms of the college mission would provide a fuller picture of the education environment offered at the college. The team strongly encourage the inclusion of these areas for self-evaluation in it subsequent reports.

The team also reviewed brochures, postings, and web information on the range of programs conducted by the college, including courses offered offsite. Examined in the context of the mission/values of the College, these programs are appropriate in content and in the venue. Courses are offered at 13 offsite locations. The team visited the International Learning Center, for which the College has had a long-standing arrangement; team members found that the instructional and support services were in every way comparable to those offered on campus. (IIA.1, IIA.1.b, IIA.2)

The Middle College for high school students is presently housed in temporary facilities on the campus. Their new building, funded by the Los Angeles Unified School District, will open in 2012; as a result of a joint-use agreement, classrooms space in the Middle College will be available for LASC use in evenings and off hours. Middle College students are often concurrently enrolled at the College, although the institution was unable to identify the numbers of students, the completion rates, or the transfer rates of its concurrently enrolled students. The College reported that more than 90% of those Middle College students went on to four-year universities. (IIA.1, IIA.1.b, IIA.2)

Changes to basic skills offerings and the expansion of the Student Success Center have been paralleled by and partially made possible by receipt of numerous grants that focus resources and research analysis on their target populations. For example, Passages seeks to increase the retention of black male students. The College’s participation in Achieving the Dream and its use of BRIC-TAP expertise resulted in the College’s more effective gathering and use of research data to make significant changes and to enable students to achieve learning outcomes. (IIA.1.a)

A continued lack of success in credit basic skills courses and the contrasting success of non-credit students prompted college wide discussions about radical new approaches to stimulate student success. The data-driven decision was a proposal first presented to and subsequently considered and approved by the College Council after constituent discussion. Math and English courses more than two courses below transfer-level were shifted from credit-based offerings to non-credit. The pilot program, launched in fall 2011, offers an orderly sequence of prescribed credit and non-credit courses in a Success Academy, now called the College for Readiness. The student cohort of “about 400-500” entered into this “college within a college” by virtue of their matriculation placement scores. Research will continue to follow these students. In early focus groups, students expressed their dissatisfaction at financial aid difficulties and their simultaneous satisfaction with their classroom success. An unintended
positive consequence has been students enrolled in credit math classes who are concurrently enrolled in non-credit math classes for purposes of review and supplemental instruction that aids their credit work. Similar cross-fertilization is reported in non-credit ESL, although at present ESL is not part of the College for Readiness.

In an effort to ensure students’ smooth articulation from non-credit to credit math, the math faculty have worked with non-credit instructors, sharing exit exams, scoring opportunities, and teaching strategies; English faculty from credit and non-credit classrooms have collaborated on norming sessions to ensure clear articulation between exit and entrance expectations, and some instructors have taught in both settings. Non-credit instructors reported the lack of commitment some non-credit students have shown initially. In partial response to this very early data, the Basic Skills Task force is proposing 8-week classes so that students having difficulties have opportunities to repeat the module without falling out of the prescribed sequence. (IIA.1.b)

In 2003, the ESL program shifted to a predominately non-credit basis. The enrollment in ESL credit courses dropped 66% from fall 2003 to spring 2008, as the non-credit ESL offerings increased four-fold over that same period. While credit ESL emphasizes academic skills to prepare students for success in college, the non-credit ESL program focused on life-skills for an often non-academic population. In on-site interviews with instructors, the team finds that non-credit ESL is not generally seen as a pathway to credit instruction. An in population is evident, but a large number of non-credit classes are offered throughout the service area in community locations, and not on campus. Those who take classes on campus have sometimes made the shift to credit enrollment, but the non-credit program could not provided documented evidence of numbers or trends when asked. While there is no structural arrangement to encourage non-credit ESL students to become credit ESL students, the Bridges to Success program, which houses non-credit instruction, is located next to the Matriculation office in the Student Services Building. Staff often accompany students between the offices to ensure they find the appropriate placement mechanism to advance. The coordinator for the Bridges to Success program serves on numerous college committees, including the Task Force for the College for Readiness; she also collaborates with other student success efforts. Non-credit students have access to the library, counseling and health services. The pathway to credit, while anecdotal as observed by the team, speaks to the college’s intentions and calls out for research and a formal structure to ensure sustainability.

The viability of the credit ESL program remains an issue. A 2010 ESL program viability report was sent to the College President and returned for further study. Currently, there is only one full-time credit ESL instructor and one part-time instructor; budget constraints make it difficult to offer full sequences of the ESL credit courses. While English and Foreign Language faculty are assisting ESL faculty to resolve some of these issues, no action plans have were apparent and the Self Study offers no clear resolution. (IIA.1.b)

Under-preparation in English remains an issue for some of the Latino students pursuing collegiate studies on campus who are 29% of the student population. Given the demography of the surrounding community, the College’s 2008-11 Student Success Plan established explicit goals to increase the number of Latino students by 30%;
college efforts resulted in a more modest increase of only 17%. Interviews with students, faculty and staff yielded some hypotheses and possible learning strategies. For example, counselors reported that most of these students have a degree of English fluency that makes the open-entry, open exit non-credit program more attractive to them. The team urges the college to elevate the discussion of academic preparedness and the emergent needs of the Latino students to a campus wide dialogue, and allowing this discourse to guide further development of strategies for student success. The team further impresses upon the College that integrated discussions involving academics, instructional support, as well as student development regarding this emergent student population is critical and foundational to the effectiveness of the institution. (IIA.1.b)

Finally, many grant efforts are directed toward entering students’ college-readiness and their basic skills necessary for student success. However, only 140 students transferred to CSU and UC in 2009-10 (a decrease of 30%); and the number of degrees and certificates awarded declined 58% over four years, suggesting that preparation efforts for student success are not matched by efforts to ensure ultimate transfer or entry onto career paths appropriate for these students. The College’s mission to “facilitate student success” would appear to be truncated as students advance beyond the beginning of their studies. (IIA.1.b)

Distance education is a newer addition to the modes of delivery and demand for it is growing. The faculty report anecdotally that many students enroll simultaneously in courses both distant and on campus. Over the past three years, retention and success rates in distance education courses vary widely, ranging from 84% success to a low of 6%. Comparable face-to-face course success rates range from 63% to 42%.

Faculty and administrators noted a need for greater discussion among all about which courses best serve students in distance learning modality and what strategies promote success. Such research or analysis has not been conducted. The team strongly suggests that the College conduct robust discussion on ways to stabilize and increase student success in poor achieving distance education classes. (IIA.1.b)

A newly adopted Distance Education Guidelines/Strategic Handbook, approved February 2012, provides practical guidelines consistent with the objectives of the curriculum. The Self Study does not address initial and ongoing training for faculty or equipment needs. An adjunct faculty member serves as the Distance Education coordinator, and there is a Distance Education Committee. The last documented meeting on the college website of this body is October 2008. The team did not find evidence of further institutional support for this modality. Student satisfaction with this instructional mode is not being assessed at this time. A pilot group of 14 instructors is piloting the Etudes delivery system, chosen despite its cost because of the training it provides. (IIA.1.b)

Services to distance education students partially meet the needs of current students by offering email and phone counseling; through TutorTrac, the College will soon offer on-line tutoring. Librarians recognized the need to serve these students equitably, and surveying online students was listed as a planning agenda item later in the document. Without a full discussion of district-wide televised classes—their efficacy or their limitations or even their
enrollment by college students—the team could not determine how “appropriate” that overall distance education delivery modality is to this population and to the College’s curriculum. (IIA.1.b)

Given the number of courses approved for distance education in online, the College may be rapidly approaching the 50% point, which, once reached, must comply with the Commission’s requirement to submit a substantive change as per the Policy on Distance Education and on Correspondence Education, adopted in June, 2011. (IIA.1.b) The team suggests LASW evaluate the number of distance education course offerings and submit a Substantive Change Proposal if appropriate.

The team affirmed that 100% of all credit courses offered since 2010 and certificate and degree programs had identified SLOs although some courses not offered or scheduled to be offered are without SLOs. Approximately 97% of those courses with defined SLOs had identified an assessment mechanism, as noted on the College’s SLO website. Faculty have established competency levels, incorporating baseline or benchmark notations on the submitted SLO forms. For CTE courses, Advisory groups may assist in establishing relevant competency levels; however, the absence of detailed minutes of discipline-specific advisory committee meetings could not substantiate that fact to the team’s satisfaction. Once at least one SLO has been assessed in a classroom environment, faculty submit addenda to validate analysis, discussion, and action plans in response to the results. Sufficient sample addenda were reviewed by the team. Assessment of all SLOs for each course has not been conducted, nor have addenda with analysis and action plans been completed. The College anticipates the completion of this latter work during spring 2012. (IIA.1.c, IIA.2.b)

GE program outcomes are assessed as its component courses are assessed. Institutional Learning Outcomes have been established, and course and program learning outcomes are aligned to them. Currently, the College is considering modifying at least one ISLO, on the recommendation of the Strategic Planning Task Force. ISLOs have been assessed across several courses, and the Achieving the Dream program is assisting the College in analyzing the data. Comprehensive assessment of four of the five ISLOs has been conducted in pilots or in isolated classes selected as representative. The Academic Senate is presently considering a plan to assess the ISLOs across all disciplines using a common rubric. (IIA.1.c, IIA.2.b)

College-wide, faculty discuss results, share rubrics and assessment techniques through highly visible exchanges in Flex Week, Brown Bag exchanges, College Hour presentations, and the standing Academic Senate agenda item, “SLO Spotlight.” The SLO Coordinator and the Committee serve as mentors to other faculty, and a very robust SLO website offers resources and examples. Students are made aware of SLOs as course outcomes appear on all syllabi. Any syllabi faculty submit to the academic deans without SLOs noted on the senate-adopted syllabus checklist are returned to the faculty and must be rewritten to include them. Program level learning outcomes appear in the catalog for each program; additionally, faculty are encouraged to share their rubrics with their students to clarify expectations and to promote student self-assessment. (IIA.1.c, IIA.2.b)
The Self Study did not provide adequate information to judge how the College "assures quality ... of all instructional courses offered in the name of the institution," particularly, "continuing and community education, study abroad, short-term training courses and programs, programs for international students, and contract or other special programs, regardless of type of credit awarded, delivery mode, or location." For example, the study abroad program to Spain in 2011 was a response to the program-review efforts of the International Students Office (ISO); the evidence suggests that the program was designed and first offered by the ISO, rather than through the usual faculty-driven curriculum committee efforts. The curriculum committee activities online for the academic year 2010-2011 was unavailable at the time of the site visit, and the team was unable to determine if the study abroad proposal was discussed, and to what extent, in its venues. As noted earlier, continuing and community education, contract education, (including short-term training programs) received only cursory attention; it remains unclear how the College assures their quality, especially if credit is awarded, or what central role the faculty play in assuring the integrity of offerings in those areas. The curricular review status of non-credit ESL courses is an example of such confusion. While the Curriculum Committee summary for 2009-2010 documents the revision of three non-credit courses, interview with faculty on site determined that there are 11 courses in the non-credit area. The status of the remaining courses are unclear in terms of curricular review. (IIA.1, IIA.1.b, IIA.2, IIA.2.a)

While the Curriculum Committee is now assuming a role less focused on housekeeping responsibilities such as "cleaning up" the curriculum inventory, minutes and interviews suggested that for some time the Curriculum Committee did not address larger conceptual issues. In the view of many faculty, the administration did not rely primarily "on faculty expertise" in the 2011 shift of basic skills curriculum from credit to non-credit status; no evidence of such curriculum review was found on the Curriculum Committee website or on the academic website, whose latest agenda and minutes posting was from 2010. The team also questioned the role of faculty in initially evaluating the study abroad proposal. This year, the Curriculum Chair has been given access to the College website for posting minutes and agendas and relevant materials, as well as links to the status of approval at the College and District levels. (IIA.2.b)

The College's CTE General Advisory Committee provides linkages among school districts, and industry. However, beyond the minutes and agendas for a single advisory committee in Environmental Sciences, no evidence was found to support the role of advisory committees in promoting new programs, offering assistance in shaping curriculum or establishing the expected competencies for course or program completers at this CTE-rich college. (IIA.2.b)

In the Self Study and interviews, the College raised concerns regarding sequencing and time-to-degree, given budgetary restrictions on class offerings. The Curriculum Committee and administrative circles have undertaken discussions to ensure systematic offerings of courses so that students can complete certificates, degrees, and transfer within a five semester cycle. (IIA.2.c)

The College instructional programs have undergone Program Review. Those results are posted on the Program Review website. However, the too recent implementation of a new
Program Review model, as a result of recommendations from the Program Review Committee and the SPC, has not permitted the College to complete a cycle, or to share findings with other constituencies by the time of this visit. Previously, sharing of results has sometimes occurred through Flex Activities, through the Academic Senate Newsletter, or through dialogues prompted by external expertise (BRIC-TAP, Achieving the Dream). Beginning fall 2012, the College is a pilot campus for a new Institutional Effectiveness System being developed by the District to facilitate exchange of information and data between program review and planning efforts. (IIA.2.c, IIA.2.f)

The new, internally-constructed tests used in English and mathematics have not been validated, primarily because the tests are recent and the sample of test-takers is too small. Bias was not adequately addressed in the self-evaluation of this Standard, nor was there reference to data-gathering that might identify the presence of bias inherent in the test or in the scoring. The team discovered through interviews with English and math faculty that that they were just initially gathering data, but there is no evidence beyond this to confirm that bias was being examined. The English department has determined already that a portfolio assessment for English 102 is more appropriate. (IIA.2.g)

Since 2011, the curriculum process has required alignment of courses to GE and ISLOs, examining the learning outcomes for the course and measuring each course’s stated learning outcomes against the expectations for the GE package. Faculty members participate in the selection process through their participation in the Curriculum Committee. Ultimately, the assessment of the ISLOs will enable faculty to determine how GE courses contribute to these more universal outcomes. (IIA, IIA.3.a)

The College’s Associated Student Organization has taken seriously its fulfillment of the College’s Institutional Student Learning Outcome 4 on responsible citizenship and understanding of diversity, including activities of engagement and civic decision-making and diversity awareness. Their involvement clearly meets the spirit of this College ISLO. Students interviewed reported widespread student participation beyond ASO members. The College offered no evidence that these events were evaluated by the participants. This same need for evaluation and the breadth of participation is raised again in Standard IIB.3.d. While the Self-Evaluation for that standard offered CSSE data about the level of student engagement, the analysis did not fully explore the outcomes of that involvement. (IIA.3.c, IIB.3.d)

The high success rate of nursing licensure was repeatedly cited; comparable data for the other CTE programs was not in evidence. Students’ professional competencies and readiness for employment should be informed by the advice offered through advisory committees associated with each program or group of related programs. The self-evaluation for this Standard candidly acknowledges the need to track student employment to address Perkins and other legislative mandates. The team strongly suggests that the College adopts as a planning agenda the increased, appropriate, consistent, and documented use of advisory committees to provide feedback to the CTE programs. (IIA.5)
The catalog contains information about the “purpose” of general education (page 27), certificates, and cooperative education (page 86). For specific academic and vocational programs, the catalog contains the student learning outcomes for each, but not a description of the purpose or function the program serves in the overall pursuit. The website offered information about one academic program, Business; that website suggested the possible transfer or employment opportunities. The team examined all course syllabi for the spring 2012 semester and confirmed that the learning outcomes posted on them were consistent with the officially approved course outline. (IIA.6, IIA.2.h, IIA.2.i, IIB.2.a-d)

The College candidly acknowledges the difficulty it and all Colleges face evaluating the comparability of learning outcomes. The transfer officer and academic counselors review transcripts and analyze course descriptions for “around 50%” similarity with LASC courses; department chairs then make a final determination. The College has cultivated 12 articulation agreements with Historically Black Colleges and Universities that should complement the transfer efforts now being pursued as a result of such programs as Passages, STEM, Puente, and CUE. (IIA.6.a)

The College website remains a barrier to communication. The type, level, and currency of information are not consistent among departments and units. The website is cumbersome to negotiate, and the search engine undependable. Student Services have many robust web pages, largely as a result of a temporary employee. The College relies upon the President’s assistant to enter changes or updates; few others have access. The Self Study notes that the absence of a college web designer has made it difficult to create an “easy to navigate and completely up-to-date website.” Interviewees reported that those limitations resulted in students often not using the college website, and information not being timely or current. (IIA.6.c)

The “Standards for Student Conduct” and “Student Discipline Procedures,” and the “Student Grievance Procedures” appear under these respective titles in the catalog. The College offers some workshops to address student dishonesty and plagiarism. (IIA.7.b)

Conclusions:

The team lauds the receipt of grants that enable the College to build local research expertise for on-going contributions and hopes the College can continue to support the resources and supplemental learning assistance once the grants expire. (IIA.1.a)

Both faculty and administrators are committed to conducting research to determine the efficacy of the College for Readiness and to engage in continuous improvement. (IIA.1.a, IIA.1.b) Furthermore, the team noted a nascent culture of evidence that is beginning to permeate all planning and decision-making, particularly for those changes initiated for student success. Such research and college wide analytical discussions are less apparent or absent in other areas:

- concurrent enrollment graduation and transfer of Middle College students (IIA.1, IIA.1.b, IIA.2)
- concurrent enrollment of students taking courses at colleges throughout the District,
including by distance education, iTV and on-line (IIA.1.b, IIA.2.d)
- distance education retention and success, and services provided them (IIA.1.b)
- longitudinal success of students enrolled in non-credit English and mathematics courses
- validation of exit exams for bias (IIA.2.g)
- evaluation of student participation in events to draw conclusions on ISLO #4. (IIA.3.c, IIB.3.d)

The present conditions of many temporary classrooms and buildings can be viewed as compromising educational quality and jeopardizing the College’s mission. (IIA.1.b, IIA.2.d)

The team encourages the College to determine if a Substantive Change proposal needs to be filed with the Commission. (IIA.1.b)

As the non-credit basic skills courses are increasingly linked to credit-instruction, the team urges the English, ESL, and mathematics to examine closely non-credit courses’ SLOs and curriculum content through the College’s appropriate, established curriculum review process in order to meet the Standard’s emphasis on assuring “the quality and improvement of all instructional courses … regardless of type of credit awarded.” (IIA.2.b)

While there is lingering faculty concern about the processes the College used to make changes to Basic Skills offerings and the ESL shifts to non-credit as the process seemed to by-pass faculty expertise and their curricular considerations, the team admires the college community’s continued focus on student success and the faculty willingness to collaborate enthusiastically on the College of Readiness. (IIA.2.b)

The team was troubled by the absence of full, posted, or retained records of agendas, items discussed, and actions taken by committees, for example those of CTE advisory committees. Similarly, the lack of timely public posting of agendas on the academic senate website makes it difficult to affirm claims of the Self Study, and hampers full communication and public disclosure to the rest of the College. (IIA.2.b) As the College now relies more heavily on electronic communication, and intends to publish fewer documents, the team urges the College to improve the completeness, currency, consistency, and integrity of its electronic representations. (IIA.2.h, IIA.2.i, IIA.6.c)

Given the College’s aggressive pursuit of the Standards governing SLOs, the team is confident that the College’s ongoing progress is likely to result in full proficiency by October 2012. (IIA.1.c, IIA.2.b)

The College has evaluated an older Program Review model, found it deficient, and made modifications and improvements. While the current model has not been used long enough to determine whether or not the improvements have been effective, the evaluative dialogue and subsequent improvements to the model indicates that the College meets the Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement level. (IIA.2.c, IIA.2.f)

The College partially meets this Standard.
Recommendations

College Recommendation 2
In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College maintains a functional website to encourage communication, particularly in the following areas: 1) information on programs and services for students, and 2) information and documentation on governance and other committee activities. (IIA.2.b, IIA.2.h, IIA.2.i, IIA.6.c)
Standard IIB: Student Support Services

General Observations

The College has a myriad of student support services that address identified student needs. The depth and breadth of student services at the College demonstrates a high level of concern for student access, progress, learning, and success, as stipulated by the Standard. The College offers exemplary student programs and activities that encourage an appreciation for diversity.

All student support services have identified student learning outcomes. The College is establishing the cycles of assessment and continuous improvement using an annual program review process.

Support for distance learning is available; however, counseling is only available to distance learning students through email or telephone, and assessment services are available only on campus. The College has been aggressive in seeking grants to enhance, and in some cases, provide student support services.

Findings and Evidence

Counseling services are available in multiple areas: in general counseling; through various publicly funded categorical and specially funded programs, such as DSPS, and Puente; and through various grant-funded programs such as the TRIO, Passages, and Nursing. Services are robust for students in specially funded programs targeted to a diverse population of new and returning students. The team found that substantial coordination and collaboration exists among the various programs, regardless of funding or reporting structure. In interviews with counseling and student support staff, however, these individual expressed the need to be included at the front end of grant-making processes in order to better design services for large federal grants. (IIB, IIB.1)

The College provides a catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information as required by the Standards. However, the team finds the website difficult to negotiate, and crucial webpages, such as the “Consumer Information Requirements,” were hard to find. (IIB.2 a-d)

In the main, the College provides appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable services to students regardless of service location or delivery method. All student support services are available on campus. In addition, enrollment services, including application orientation, and registration; library access; international student support; and financial aid services are available online to students. Counseling services are limited to email or telephone support. However, students must come to campus to access most other services, including assessment and health services. Bridges to Success non-credit students at off-site locations have a college representative who assists with registration. Non-credit, off-campus students who are second language English learners must come to campus to attend the only bilingual college
orientation sessions. The College offers occasional transportation that shortens the distance between the off-site and the campus environments. (II.B.3.a)

The team finds evidence that the College is committed to student development of personal and civil responsibility as demonstrated in its strategic goals of diversity and social responsibility. Through club activities, cultural celebrations, and other events, students participate in a wide range of extra-curricular programs that encourage personal and civic responsibilities, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development. Of particular note are the exemplary programs that encourage an appreciation for diversity, including "Reaching Out and Giving Back," Hispanic Heritage Month, the 4th Annual African-American Male Summit, "Courageous Conversations," the "Single Parent Connection," "Say the Word" event, International Culture Club, and many others.

Students who met with the team expressed their appreciation and affection for the College. Some students wanted more frequent communication from the administration and faculty on a variety of issues, including how to participate in college governance, who to consult about their college planning, and general angst over the "dismantled" college facilities, which they see as diminishing their school in the larger community. (II.B.3.b)

The counseling department takes the lead in training counselors and in planning and evaluating all counseling services. The department chair holds monthly counseling meetings, which each counselor is required to attend, including those in all the programs and departments that house counselors. At these meetings, counselors and staff discuss various topics relating to counseling and engage in dialogue with other invited campus officials.

Counseling services are evaluated in a variety of ways. The counseling department tracks student satisfaction and engagement through point-of-contact surveys that students are asked to complete after meeting with a counselor in any office. Individual counselor faculty evaluations, which follow the provisions of the collective bargaining agreement, are regularly scheduled in accordance with the collective bargaining agreement. Not all evaluations are current. Counselor participation in student learning outcome development and assessment is a required component of individual counseling faculty evaluations, as required by Standard III. (II.B.3.c)

Dozens of activities and programs that foster intercultural understanding and cultural pride are listed in the Self Study. Some are embedded in courses, other are provided in cultural celebrations. Interviews with students confirm that many are "life-changing experiences." While the number of participants or their evaluation of their experiences was not offered into evidence, the sheer number of activities reflects the College's genuine commitment to such efforts. The institutional student learning outcome (ISLO) related to responsible citizenship and valuing diversity was assessed in fall 2011; activities related to the assessment are planned for spring 2012. (II.B.3.d)

The College routinely evaluates its assessment/placement instruments, relying solely upon the vendor to identify any potential inherent bias. (II.B.3.e)
The College has ensured the safety of its archival student records. The team verified these claims. Electronic imagining of the records is scheduled to be completed by March 2012. The institution maintains student records permanently, securely, and confidentially, with provision for secure backup of all files, regardless of the form in which those files are maintained. The institution publishes and follows established policies for release of student records. (IIB.3.f)

Student services, through comprehensive program review, have engaged in evaluation of their offerings since 2008; beginning in 2011, that review became an annual event. Each unit has developed learning outcomes, a significant element in the review process, as are point-of-service surveys and campus climate surveys. Program Review entails the participation of all members of the non-instructional unit. Flex activities, conferences, and external trainers broaden the discussions about the assessment mechanism, the program offerings, and changes to be made.

The Self Study reported a number of improvements resulting from program reviews across the student services spectrum. Some student service programs are consistently measuring their learning outcomes, while other programs and services have only recently begun to do so. The need to broadly disseminate the results of assessment and improvements to instructional faculty and mutually within student services units was validated by the team during interviews. (IIB.4)

Conclusions

The student support programs and services are well designed to support student success. The College has much to celebrate about the commitment of its student services team to student success. The team encourages the College to complete its work on assessing learning outcomes and integrating those assessments into planning for program improvement; designing and expanding counseling and other student services to distance students, especially to those online; and improving communication among all student service organizations and groups, as well as with the students, and other college faculty and staff. Finally, to assure the effectiveness of its counseling and other faculty, the College should complete individual evaluations that are overdue and utilize tools already in place to ensure that evaluations remain current. (IIB.1, IIB.2.d, IIB.3.a, IIB.4, IIIA.1)

The College partially meets this Standard.

Recommendations

College Recommendation 3
In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends the College review the availability of appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable services to all students. In particularly, the team urges the College to review the parity of services provided to students in distance education as compared to students on campus. (IIB.3.a)
Standard IIC: Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations

The library is temporarily relocated to a large portable unit, awaiting the completion of the renovations in the Administration Building, where it is permanently housed. The building project is on moratorium, pending a full evaluation of the bond projects by the District. The College anticipates a lifting of the moratorium sometime between May and November of 2012.

The library collection consists of 50,000 print books, 206 print periodical titles, 24,195 periodical issues, 116 microfilm titles, 1830 microfilm reels, and a number of electronic databases. The College collaborates with other libraries in the district and with neighboring California State Universities. (IIC.1.e)

The library offers limited equipment to support student learning in its temporarily reduced space. These include computers for online research, and stations with Microsoft Office software for student use. The College will have available three times its current number of computers when the library returns to the Administration Building site. The library also has printers, reading machines, microfiche readers, and assistive equipment. Two new classrooms will be added for instruction in the new library plan. (IIC.1.c)

The institution provides adequate maintenance and security for its temporary library and other learning support services. Deficiencies are addressed as they are identified, and security is tightened when events occur. (IIC.1.d)

The Library offers two types of instruction: The first is a course titled “Library Research Methods,” the student learning outcomes of which are mapped to Institutional Student Learning Outcomes. The second is library orientations, which is delivered upon class instructor request.

In interviews with Librarians, the team gathered that due to the lack of space in the temporary building and a reduced number of full-time librarians, the “Library Research Methods” class is no longer offered. The student learning outcomes of the “Library Research Methods” class are mapped to Institutional Student Learning Outcomes. Information competency instruction is delivered to students via a library orientation, at the request of subject area faculty, or one-on-one by librarians to individuals in the library. (IIC.1.b)

The College provides four learning support services to students: The Writing Center, the new Reading Center, the Mathematical Laboratory (Math Lab), and the Student Success Center. (IIC.1.a)

The Writing Center provides lab support for basic skills in English, and writing across the curriculum. Open Monday through Saturday, the Center is staffed by instructors and student tutors. The Center also received a Passages Grant, enabling them to provide supplemental instructors for all sections of English Fundamentals and Intermediate Reading and
Composition. Online exercises are available. Earlier research linked participation in this lab with higher student achievement in the two affiliated English classes.

The Reading Center opened in February 2012. A new full-time faculty coordinator for the Center is collaborating with the areas of CTE, counseling, and the other learning support services to fully serve students. Plans are being made to support reading, phonics, and fluency needs for non-credit courses, along with transfer-level course reading strategies for various disciplines.

The Student Success Center provides instruction to help students become independent learners. It is open from 8am-8pm Monday through Thursday, and on Saturday morning. Students have access to 60 computers for academic research including academic software applications. Seminars are offered on resumes and job interviews, financial literacy, time and stress management, and test taking strategies. The Center also offers a online program, including Student Lingo, Tutor Trac, and Smart Thinking.

The Math Lab is similarly staffed with faculty and tutors for group or individual study sessions. Tutoring support is available for both credit and non-credit classes. Computers are available for students to use the software, MyMathLab; this online resource offers students a self-paced modular learning environment. Students may access this program 24 hours, regardless of their location. (II.C.1.a)

The self study notes that the library delivers library orientations and assesses its services through surveys and program review. The SLOs for information competency, however, is contained in the “Library Research Methods” course, and mapped to Institutional SLOs for Information Competency. This course has not been offered in recent years, and the team was unable to find evidence that the course SLOs or the ISLOs are assessed. The library noted briefly its African American and Hispanic holdings, and its observances of state and national recognitions of ethnic and cultural celebrations. (II.C)

Findings and Evidence

The library is open during weekdays, four hours on Saturdays and some evenings. Library staff advocated for extended hours on Saturday, but offered no evidence that an increase in hours had direct bearing on student achievement or learning outcomes.

The online library catalog, electronic databases and electronic materials are continuously available. These resources are also available to distance education students. (II.C.1.a) Wireless access was provided to the library in March 2012. (II.C.1.a)

Librarians are responsible for identifying gaps in the collection and for updating holdings in consultation with discipline faculty. They also consider student input, data from the database tallies, and glean information from their participation on the Curriculum Committee as courses are proposed or revised. No formal acquisition guide is in evidence. (II.C.1.a)
In 2011, a large number of outdated uncirculated books, microfiche pieces, periodical issues, reserve items were removed from the library collection. Information gathered in interviews with Library staff suggests that the library has been unable to purchase new books since 2006. While the team was informed by the College that a budget is allotted for library materials, and evidence of it provided during the visit, the Library staff seemed unaware of this funding. The College also noted that e-reading materials have filled some of the gaps in materials. These e-reading materials were purchased by two other Colleges in the District and shared with LASC. (IIIC.1.a)

The library offers library orientation sessions to students at the request of the subject area faculty as a way of instilling information competency. The basis for the instruction is the “The Checklist of Information Competencies for College Students.” There are no online offerings or for-credit classes. The assessment of this service delivery is through surveys. A 2010 Campus Climate survey led the librarians to conclude that “faculty and students would benefit from a proactive information competency outreach program.” The survey also indicated that only 33% of faculty and staff were aware of the information competency instruction provided by the librarians.

Although the “Library Research Methods” course has not been taught in recent years, the student learning outcomes in the course have been developed and are linked to the Institutional Student Learning Outcome for Information Competency. In addition, a rubric for APA or MLA citation style has been developed. However, the team did not find a planning agenda for this assessment. (IIIC.1.b, IIIC.1.c)

The temporary library facility is currently located next to the campus Sheriff’s station, providing adequate security. Library Technicians monitor the Reserves Collection. Online databases are password-protected, for use only by students and employees. The renovated library will have a new security system with cameras, and bar-coding and scanning tools to secure books, DVDs, and CDs. The library receives regular custodial care and routine maintenance. (IIIC.1.d)

The College, along with the other college libraries in the District, participates in the Community College League Consortium to negotiate vendor pricing, and the SirsiDynix system for cataloging and circulation. The library also contracts for cataloging services and for automated acquisitions PROBLEM. Beginning in June 2012, the library will benefit from the statewide funding of EBSCO Premier, a multidisciplinary database. All LACCD libraries share these services, and evaluation of these contracts and services is done at the district level by the LACCD library chairs. (IIIC.1.e)

The Librarians have been aggressive in establishing partnerships and reciprocal borrowing arrangements; evidence of contracts and formal agreements was offered. (IIIC.1.e)

To evaluate their level of user satisfaction, the library uses point-of-service student surveys and faculty surveys. The Writing Center and the Math Lab use student surveys, both online and onground. Based on these surveys, the Writing Center has begun offering one-on-one
tutoring and supplemental instruction, which will be evaluated again at the end of spring 2012. (IIC.2)

The library completed a survey of its collection in spring 2011 and discovered that the majority of its print collection was ten years or older, yet adequate library funding for print and online books is not integrated into the college strategic plan or the Integrated College Operational plan. While preliminary assessment has begun in this area, the results are not being used to implement improvement. (IIC.2)

The Library and the Student Success Center both conduct non-instructional program reviews. The Writing Center is included in the English and Foreign Language department program review, while the Math Lab is included in the mathematics department program review. (IIC.2)

Conclusions

The team finds the library in transition. The physical state of the library, the state of its collections, and the state of information literacy instruction are in flux.

The library is in temporary quarters during the renovation of its permanent home. The moratorium on building projects imposed by the District has stopped all progress on construction. The inadequate interim space has created barriers to adequate library instruction, affecting student learning and assessment in information literacy. Information competency instruction is currently dependent on requests from individual classroom faculty only. No regularly planned schedule of instructional delivery or assessment is in effect. The College’s identification of information literacy as an Institutional Student Learning Outcomes further points to the importance of library instruction and this obvious void in student learning at this junction. (IIC.1.b)

The library print collection, as assessed in spring 2011, is older and in need of updating. In interview with the library staff, the team has not found evidence of documented acquisition guidelines that provide for consultation with discipline faculty on updating the Collection. (IIC.1.a)

The learning support services, as delivered in the four identified centers for reading, writing, math and student success, are vibrant and growing. Student success data are available, and validate student improvement in basic skills.

The College partially meets the Standard.

Recommendations

College Recommendation 4
In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends the library regularly updates its print and online collections in consultation with discipline faculty. (IIC.1.a) The team further recommends that, to meet the stated Institutional Student Learning Outcome in Information
Competency, the College implements a cycle of instruction, assessment, and program improvement through the appropriate learning resource and instructional areas of the College. (IIC.1.b) Finally, the team recommends that a sustainable funding source be identified for the acquisition and maintenance of learning resource materials. (IIC.1, IIC.2, IIIID.1.a)
STANDARD III: RESOURCES

Standard IIIA: Human Resources

General Observations

The College employs qualified faculty, staff, and administration who demonstrated a strong esprit de corp and commitment to student learning. Personnel are treated equitably and are provided with opportunities for professional development. Planning for staffing arises through college administrative analysis as well as through program review processes. Consistent with its mission, the College demonstrates a strong commitment and value for diversity in its personnel decisions and staff development activities.

Findings and Evidence

While faculty positions are generally replaced, although not necessarily in the same area, there has been limited replacement of administrative and classified positions primarily due to budgetary constraints. The College has lately operated by filling classified and administrative positions only when a regular vacancy occurs or when a temporary grant-funded position is identified. The College President determines whether an administrative position is to be filled on a regular, interim, or acting basis, and is the final authority for the selection and recommendation to the Board. (IIIA.1, IIIA.2, IIIA.6)

The College follows well-defined selection practices set forth in district policy and board rules for all positions. Per board rule, the College takes into account equal employment opportunity, its goal of employing a diverse faculty and staff, and its commitment to affirmatively recruiting from historically underrepresented groups. A College compliance officer ensures uniformity in the selection process and an equal opportunity for all applicants for any position being filled. (IIIA.1.a)

The College follows the evaluation processes established by collective bargaining agreements between the Los Angeles Community College District and the various collective bargaining organizations. All employees are expected to participate in an ongoing evaluation process. Applicable performance evaluation forms are used and the actual process varies by employee group. While evaluations for administrative and classified staff are current, the team found that significant numbers of full- and part-time faculty evaluations are overdue, some significantly so. (IIIA.1.b)

Since 2008, the College has evaluated faculty on their participation in the student learning outcome assessment cycle. This includes a requirement that faculty list course student learning outcomes on syllabi. The team found that substantially all spring 2012 syllabi include student learning outcomes. In addition, instructional faculty evaluations include observation and evaluation of effective teaching by peers, department chairs, and students. (IIIA.1.c)
The Board of Trustees has adopted a code of ethics contained in Board Rules 1204.13 and 1204.14 that pertains to all employees. In addition, the Academic Senate has adopted ethical standards for faculty. Furthermore, the College has adopted core values of accountability, equity, respect, excellence, and integrity. (III.A.1.d)

The College follows well documented and regularly reviewed personnel policies and procedures established by the District. College administrators, department chairs, supervisors, directors and managers administer personnel policies, procedures, and bargaining agreements in an equitable manner which results in the fair treatment of personnel. (III.A.3, III.A.3.a)

Collective bargaining agreements provide employees with the right to examine their official personnel file, which are kept in secure locations at the district and at the College. Employees have the right to bring grievances, if they believe policies and procedures have not been adhered to. The district compliance officer addresses questions about all human resource policies and handles complaints of discrimination or harassment for any employee. Every employee has the obligation to report situations of potential abuse. In addition, the District Office of Diversity and the Personnel Commission ensure that all employees are dealt with respect, integrity, and dignity. Moreover, a variety of college activities and groups promote diversity in all its expressions. (III.A.4.a, III.A.4.b, III.A.4.c)

The most recent staff development plan is dated 2008-2011. The current faculty coordinator of staff development has accumulated a list of accomplishments from that plan and is in the process of writing a draft staff development plan for 2011-2014, which he hopes to share with the staff development committee and eventually present to all constituencies for approval. Thus, while staff development exists in various forms and is funded in a variety of ways, including grants, district and college funding, there is no comprehensive planning process in place and little coordination, although the current staff development coordinator recognizes the value of planning and coordination. (III.A.5)

Staff development activities are supported by the college Staff Development Committee, which is comprised of representatives from all constituency groups, as well as the Professional Development Committee, which is a negotiated resource for faculty that operates as a sub-committee of the Academic Senate. College staff development organizes college wide activities and provides limited financial support for individual classified, administrative, and faculty staff development. The Professional Development Committee provides support for conference attendance and tuition reimbursement for faculty. Classified staff do not have a similar contractually negotiated funding source; thus have significantly fewer resources, and this has caused some classified staff to feel marginalized. (III.A.5.a)

Satisfaction surveys are administered after most staff development workshops to assess how well they met the needs of staff and faculty. Aside from this, systematic assessment of staff and professional development is not done. (III.A.5.b)
Conclusion

While the majority of administrative, staff, and many faculty evaluations are complete, a significant number of full-time and part-time faculty evaluations are overdue. Thus, to assure the continuing effectiveness of its human resources, the College needs to complete the overdue evaluations of full- and part-time counseling, librarian, and discipline faculty and initiate practices to ensure that all evaluations remain current. (IIIA.1.a)

In addition, while staff and professional development is available in a variety of means to College staff and faculty, planning is not well coordinated among the various providers to align with strategic goals and directions of the College. To assure that staff development efforts support the mission, the College would benefit from updating its plan for staff development on a regular basis and integrating that plan into overall college planning and direction toward continuous improvement. (IIIA.1.a, IIIA.5.b)

The College partially meets the Standard.

Recommendations

College Recommendation 5
In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends the College reviews all aspects of professional development, including key elements of peer review, self-reflection, and continuous review of appropriate pedagogy for the student population. In particular, the team recommends the completion of faculty evaluations systematically and at stated intervals, and further engagement in dialogue that addresses staff and faculty professional development in teaching strategies that meet the diverse learning styles of the College’s diverse student population. (IIIA.1.b)

Standard IIIB: Physical Resources

General Observations

The 2008-2012 Educational Master Plan guided the updating of the Facilities Master Plan in 2010. The College has exerted a substantial amount of effort in improving the campus image in order to meet the Facilities Master Plan goal of creating a welcoming environment for its students and its community. However, the building moratorium imposed in the summer 2011 has been a major hindrance on campus build out and a detriment to students accessing state of the art physical resources for learning. In addition, a stronger connection between the annual facilities program review process and evaluation of LASC’s facilities is encouraged.
Findings and Evidence

Since 2005, LASC has used the Educational Master Planning process to guide facilities planning. For instance, the 2008-2012 Educational Master Plan guided the updating of the Facilities Master Plan in 2010. This plan included the vision for three bond measures which were passed between 2001 and 2008. On an annual cycle, space inventory and capacity load ratios are reviewed by the Director of Facilities and submitted to the California Community Colleges State Chancellor's Office in the form of the Five-Year Construction Plan and the District does the same in the form of the Five-year Facilities Construction Plan. An Enrollment Management Committee was formed in 2007 to review enrollment projections and space utilization. Based upon the current enrollment, LASC is able to serve the student population, given the moratorium is lifted on specific projects (i.e. renovation of the Cox and Lecture/Lab building). A survey conducted in 2009 evaluated the condition of existing buildings and provided guidelines to facilitate the implementation of goals outlined in the Educational Master Plan (III.B.1.a).

Access throughout the campus is mediated by a central core concept. This design, as well as a new 608 space parking structure, will improve access for students and staff. ADA concerns are addressed in LASC's ADA Transition Plan which stemmed from the District wide survey distributed in 2007, and the District wide safety standards developed by the District Risk Management Office.

LASC employs 15 individuals (5 of which are full-time Sherriff Deputies) to assure the appropriate amount of security. In addition, LASC's 2004 Security Strategic Plan outlines protective factors such as access control, emergency call boxes, and surveillance. A cyclical process for emergency preparedness is assured via the Emergency Preparedness Plan last updated in fall 2011.

Maintenance and operation requests are handled through a web-based work order system. The system is in place, but campus-wide utilization has been slow to develop. Due to three vacancies in this area, staff is addressing a safe and clean campus to the best of their ability. The quality of campus facilities are evaluated via the LACCD Student Survey. Eighty-two percent agreed or strongly agreed that grounds and public areas were clean and 74% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that campus buildings were clean. LASC’s Facilities, Maintenance and Operations department has identified Administrative Unit Outcomes (AUOs) via the program review process. Because of these efforts, the department has determined that efforts towards better communication with constituency groups and improved custodial services were needed. To address these issues, the Operations Manager position was filled and two new custodians will be hired in 2012. (III.B.1.b)

A cyclical long-range capital planning effort is evidenced in the 2010 Facilities Master Plan. The issue of Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) has not been properly addressed in that plan as evidenced in the lack of a current plan. However, the newly proposed allocation model, which includes a specific allocation for maintenance and operations, will address a substantial portion of the TCO needs. Several cost-saving projects have been completed and several more are slated for the future. Energy efficient lighting retrofits, and all new
buildings designed to varying LEED standards, help LASC provide students a learning environment that is conducive to learning and energy efficient. In addition, adding of all buildings to the new central plant, a campus-wide Energy Management System (EMS), and a recycled water system aid in lowering costs and are aligned with sustainability practices. (III.B.2.a)

Physical resource needs are addressed in planning documents such as the Education, Facilities and Technology Master Plans. In addition, department/program level input is gathered annually and reviewed through facilities planning development. Through a shared governance process, the Work Environment Committee (WEC) dialogues regarding issues such as working space, ADA access, parking, and computer access. (III.B.2.b)

While a new lecture building housing the Student Success Center is now open, the renovation of the math and science building has left a skeletal shell in the campus’ midst and has forced about 30% of the classes into leased portables that are already showing wear. Those portables also house wet labs, and students complained in a public forum that the temporary chemistry classroom has a single Bunsen burner, compelling them to “use Google to determine results” of their experiments.

Conclusions

The Educational Master Plan guides physical resource needs. A substantial effort has been placed on increasing the image of the College, and through efforts such as the central core theme and new energy efficient buildings, improvements are visible.

Making sure the new buildings are cost effective and efforts such as the recycled water system ensure sustainability practices for the College are a major focus. Evaluation of LASC’s campus facilities is addressed in the LACCD Student Survey. However, there needs to be a stronger connection between the annual facilities program review process and evaluation of LASC’s facilities.

In the aftermath of discovering evidence of mismanagement in the implementation of the construction bonds, the district underwent both internal and state audits to identify areas for remediation. In response to the identified problems, the district created positions within its management structure to ensure better oversight. The District also imposed a temporary moratorium on construction projects as a means to evaluate construction plans going forward. The moratorium placed on specific facilities has been a major hindrance on campus build out and a detriment to students accessing state of the art resources.

The College partially meets this Standard.

Recommendations
See District Recommendation 1, Standard IID

**Standard IIIC: Technology Resources**

**General Observations**

The College utilizes a Technology Planning Committee (TPC) that assesses the institution’s technology infrastructure, and makes recommendations for upgrades and enhancements. The Committee has representation from all campus constituent groups, and meets regularly. *(IIIC.1)*

The College's Technology Plan is an identified component of the College’s Integrated Strategic Plan. The last formally adopted and approved campus Strategic Technology Plan addressed academic years 2008 through 2011. A new Strategic Technology Plan, prepared by PlanNet Consulting, was in “Final Preliminary Revision” status as of March 2012. The date of the Final Preliminary Revision provided to the Accreditation Team is as of April 14, 2011. *(IIIC.1.c, IIIC.2)*

The College employs a full-time information technology (IT) manager who works closely with various construction companies on new building technology infrastructure issues. Three full-time network specialists and a full-time audio-visual specialist staff the department under the supervision of the IT Manager. *(IIIC.1.a, IIIC.1.d)*

The College's IT Department is responsible for all maintenance and repair of technological infrastructure and equipment. Basic policies on technology replacement and technology maintenance and security are defined. The IT Department submitted annual project lists to the College President as part of planning. The College notes that budget shortfalls in the recent years have created challenges to replacing or upgrading technology. *(IIIC.1.a, IIIC.1.c, IIIC.2)*

The District provides IT system services for major College operations, including the hosting and supporting of the Student Information System, and Enterprise Resource Planning System (SAP). Bond funds in Propositions A and AA and in Measure J have provided educational facilities and new technology to the campus. *(IIIC.1.a)*

The College is evaluating a move from Moodle as its primary Distance Education (DE) Learning Management System (LMS) to Etudes. In addition, the College implemented Blackboard Mass Communication System in 2010, which allows for instantaneous communication college wide via text messaging, phone and email. *(IIIC.1.a, IIIC.1.d)*

A limited degree of staff and faculty development is made available typically on an as-needed basis or during flex week activities. *(IIIC.1.d)*

**Findings and Evidence**
In interviews with the TPC, there appears to be multiple understandings of the role of the Committee. The College’s Strategic Planning Handbook states that the TPC “is responsible for developing and maintaining the Technology Master Plan.” It further states that the TPC is responsible for written internal procedures and timelines for information sharing with other planning groups within the planning process. However, the co-chairs of TPC view the Committee as a recommending body that deals primarily with the academic affairs area of the College. The TPC website proposes yet a broader interpretation of its charge, which is to “lead, plan, and coordinate the application of technology to execute the College’s mission and the achievement of its goals and objectives (Committee Charge, July 2001).” There does not appear to be a formal document that explicitly states the full mission, responsibilities, and authority of the TPC. (IIIC.1.c, III.C.2)

As of January 3, 2012 the committee comprises one administrator, one classified staff, one IT staff, and seven faculty. The adjunct faculty, student, and Special Funded Program staff positions were unassigned. The TPC is co-chaired by one faculty and one IT staff member. No minutes were available for all of 2009, 2010 (except the January 14 meeting), 2011, or 2012. Without these minutes, the team was unable to determine what conversations were conducted, what recommendations were made, and who attended the meetings. (IIIC.1.c, III.C.2)

The representation of the College at district level conversations is also unclear. The Vice President of Administrative Services (VPAS) and the IT Manager represent the College at different meetings. While the VPAS represents the TPC and College at the district level technology committee, he is not a member of TPC. The College IT Manager meets with IT District Managers in a separate monthly venue. Regardless of this lack of clarity, however, the TPC co-chairs as well as the VPAA and IT Manager did feel that the TPC is cognizant of college needs and is able to communicate them to the District. (IIIC.1.a, III.C.1.c)

The College’s prior Strategic Technology Plan spanned the years of 2008 through 2011. Five primary objectives with associated activities are identified. However, performance outcomes from the Plan for the years represented are only minimally described. As such it is unclear as to how much progress was made in achieving objective activities.

The College has developed a new Technology Plan. The plan was generated by an outside consulting firm, PlanNet. This plan, as of April 14, 2011, was in “Final Preliminary Revision” status, and not yet official adopted. The draft Technology Plan provides goals, objectives, activities, and projections; there is no timeline established for completion. (IIIC.1.c, III.C.2)

The College consultant PlanNet, which assisted in the development of the draft Technology Plan, noted within its analysis report (preliminary revision, April 2011) that technology is general lacking at LASC. It notes that, “....Initiatives involving technology seem to be funded with little regard to operational support, and post-implementation effectiveness is a function of best effort. The current staff structure is not well suited to support academic or instructional technology. The services that are provided at the District are generally viewed as ineffective and antiquated.”
The District has produced a *LACCD Technology Strategic Plan/Vision 2020* to address systems technology needs. As with the College’s technology plan, the District plan is also in approved “draft” status of November 16, 2010. (*III.C.1.c, III.C.2*)

The College provides technology training both in person and by online seminars. It is unclear from the evidence provided how frequent, successful, or essential was the training provided. Technology training was also provided on Flex days. In discussion with the Vice President of Administrative Services and the IT manager, it was stated that staff technology training was on an as needed basis, and limited. Faculty development in IT was more frequent, but nevertheless, not robust. (*III.C.1.b*)

**Conclusions**

The College has in final draft a strategic technology plan to replace the outdated 2008-2011 plan, but it has not been approved or adopted. The College has also hired a consulting firm to produce an analysis report regarding the campus’ technology infrastructure, and to craft the new strategic technology plan now awaiting approval. The District has drafted a district wide technology plan, pending approval and adoption. (*III.C.1.c*)

The College’s TCP has representation from all campus constituents, although a number of seats remained unfilled. The TCP meets regularly, although agenda and minutes are not generally available. The team is unable to ascertain topics of discussion or recommendations that emerged from these meetings. (*III.C.1.c*)

Within its Self Study, the College reports uncertainty in sustaining its technological infrastructure into the future due to uncertain budgets. The availability of bond funding, and the intention of the College to seek technology grant funding speak to a part of the ongoing technology funding needs. (*III.C.1.a, III.C.1.c*)

The College has a technology support staff, but there appears to be confusion as to the line of supervision. The District hosts large systems and provide limited technology support at the College. (*III.C.1.a*)

While the College and the District appear to be aware of the long term technology needs, and are in the process of finalizing the next of College and District plans, the team is concerned about the clarity of IT goals in the interim. The College has provided no formal planning agenda items in this Standard. However, much of it plans for the future are note in the self-evaluation sections. The team strongly encourages the College to follow its self-prescriptions, and conclude its technology planning as soon as possible. (*III.C.1, III.C.2*)

The College meets the Standard.

**Standard III.D: Financial Resources**
General Observations

LASC receives its revenue allocation from the District based on the SB361 funding model. The District's Budget Allocation model has been in use since 2007. However, changes have been made to provide additional funding to increase the college basic allocations for small colleges. For LASC its base funding has been increased by $500,000. LASC budgets its revenues to meet its program and service needs. (III.D)

Findings and Evidence

The key budgeting tool for LASC is the annual Integrated College Operational Plan (ICOP). The strategic planning committee drafts the annual ICOP based on annual plans proposed by programs and departments through their program reviews and by the 10 committees charged with college wide planning. After review, the LASC president approves the final ICOP for the upcoming year. (III.D.1, III.D.1.a)

The College's financial reserve requirement is met through the district reserve. The District reserve is the net of District and all nine colleges' ending balance. For 2010-11, fund balance amounted to $90,093,870 or 17.1% (ref: CCFS-311Q4). The State Chancellor's Office recommends a reserve level of at least 5%. (III.D.2.c)

The District and the colleges have developed a TCO process. TCO refers to maintenance and operations (M&O) costs for new and remodeled construction under the District's general obligation bond. For two fiscal years, the District has supplemented the College's budget to cover TCO costs. The District has developed a projected M&O staff increase by location for each of the following fiscal years. For example, LASC's baseline for custodians is 14 for 2010-11. It is projected that LASC would have to add two custodians for 2011-12. The average gross square foot per FTE Custodian is 44,188. (Re: 10/24/11 document) (III.D.1.b-d)

The District contracts with an external accounting firm to conduct the annual audits of college financial statements. The June 30, 2010 audit (Re: audit report) was deemed "unqualified" on its basic financial statements. Though there are findings relating to federal and state awards, there are no findings attributed to LASC. The June 30, 2011 audit was not available. (III.D.2.a)

In August 2011, the State Controller released an audit of the LACCD Building Program. The audit was an outcome of a series of articles in the LA Times reporting fiscal mismanagement. Subsequently, an Inspector General was appointed. Also, LACCD Chancellor appointed a nine member independent review panel to review the District's building program and provide recommendations for improvement. A final report was issued on January 4, 2012 and contains a number of recommendations. Among the recommendations are: 1) the placing of all new projects on a moratorium to conduct a thorough review, and 2) the modification of the building program management structure to a centralized model. Although none of the issues identified in the bond program occurred at LASC, the building projects at the College were included in the District wide moratorium, causing a number of key projects to be delayed. (III.D.2.f, III.D.2.g)
LASC has operated at a deficit for the last four fiscal years. The District has covered these shortfalls, but the repayment must be made over a three-year period. Though the District has deferred the debt repayment for the next two fiscal years, it is unlikely that LASC would have the funds necessary for repayment in subsequent years. The deficit is in part an artifact of the current allocation model, which does not adequately address the needs of smaller colleges and the efficiency of scale and the needs of smaller colleges. A new allocation model, which has been proposed and ready for recommendation to the District Chancellor and the Board of Trustees, should begin to address the imbalance. (IIID.1.a-c)

The proposed new allocation model maintains the basic framework of the current SB361 funding allocation mechanism and identifies possible changes to the current model to provide more adequate funding for colleges to sustain operations. The executive committee of the District budget committee has recommended the implementation of phase I and deferred phase II. Phase I increases the college basic allocation model to include minimum administration staffing and maintenance & operations costs. Phase I implementation is pending Board approval. With the implementation of phase I, LASC will receive additional funding, but not sufficient to mitigate its shortfall. Phase II includes all other allocation issues: carryover of college balances, differential growth rates, operating deficits, funding assessment methodology, and college operating costs. Phase II implementation is planned for 2013-14. (IIID.1.d, IIID.2.f, IIID.2.g)

The District is insured for the excess of maximum self-insurance retention of $750,000 for each worker's compensation claims. every dollar in excess of $750,000 is covered by insurance. For all other claims, the District is liable for a self-insurance retention of $500,000. Excess liability insurance covers up to a maximum of $25,000,000 in aggregate for all claims. (IIID.2.c)

The bookstore operations is under the purview of LASC's vice president, administrative services. The bookstore had shortfalls over the last two years, and will probably have another deficit in the current year. Bookstore operations District wide is under review for alternative models. In the interim, LASC is reviewing the bookstore operations to reduce its deficit. (IIID.1.b, IIID.2.g, IIID.2.f)

The District takes responsibility for many long term obligations, including retiree health benefits. Under the District's current plan, the District annually directs 1.92% of the previous year's full time employee payroll into an irrevocable trust managed by CalPERS. The contribution for fiscal year 2010-11 totaled $33,804,289, which is 82.7% of the annual required contribution (ARC). As of December 31, 2011 the balance in the trust is $37,419,294. This is in addition to the annual pay-as-you-go amount, which is $25,789,000. Also, an amount equivalent to the District's annual Medicare D refund is also diverted from the District's operating budget into the CalPERS trust. The District estimates that it will accumulate sufficient funds invested in the irrevocable trust over the next 20 years to fully fund the ARC. (IIID.1.c, IIID.2.c)

LASC has 37 current grants and contracts. It appears the grants align with the college's mission. However, LASC should develop plans for institutionalizing the initiatives of the
grants, where appropriate. LASC president reviews and approves all grant applications. (IIID.2.f)

The College Foundation has current by-laws and an agreement with LASC. (IIID.2.d-e)

Conclusions

Bookstore operations continue to operate with a shortfall. LASC has initiated planning to curb the deficit in the bookstore.

The District has developed plans to fund its unfunded liability for OPEB; however, the District only partially (82.7%) funds the ARC. A Commission Concern regarding this issue was first communicated in 2008 and reiterated in 2009 and 2010. To date, the district has not fully funded the ARC as planned. As a consequence, the concern for long-term financial solvency and the potential for significant out-year impact on the general operating funds of the district and its colleges persist. (IIID.1.c, IIID.2.c)

The District and its constituent colleges have developed a new revenue allocation model to provide more adequate funding for colleges to sustain operations. (IIID.1.b, IIID.2.g, IIID.2.f)

The district’s 2011 financial audit and management letter, due in December 2011, is overdue. The teams recommend the timely completion of audits. The district’s 2010 financial audit and management letter note a number of significant findings related to federal and state awards, among other issues. (IIID.2.a)

The College partially meets the Standard.

Recommendations

District Recommendation 1
In order to meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the teams recommend that the district actively and regularly review the effectiveness of the construction bond oversight structure and the progress in the planned lifting of the moratorium to ensure the financial integrity of the bond programs, and the educational quality of its institutions as affected by the delays of the planned facilities projects. (IIIB.1.a, III, IIID.2.a, IVB.1.c, Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18)

District Recommendation 2
In order to ensure the financial integrity of the district and the colleges, and to meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the teams recommend the resolution of the material weakness and significant deficiencies cited in the 2010 financial audit be fully effected by the completion of next year’s audit, and appropriate systems be implemented and maintained to prevent future audit exceptions. (IIID.2.a, IVB.1.c, Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18)
**District Recommendation 3**
In order to meet Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the teams recommend the district adhere to the ARC guidelines and closely monitor the planned process. (*III.D.1.c, IVB.1.c, Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18*)

**District Recommendation 4**
To fully respond to the recommendation first tendered by the Comprehensive Evaluation Team in 2006, and to reflect a realistic assessment of financial resources, financial stability, and the effectiveness of short- and long-term financial planning for the district and the colleges, and in order to meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the teams recommend that the district adopt and fully implement as soon as is practicable an allocation model for its constituent colleges that addresses the size, economies of scale, and the stated mission of the individual colleges. (*III.D.1.b, III.D.1.c, III.D.2.c, IVB.3.c, Eligibility Requirements 17 and 18*)
STANDARD IV: LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE

Standard IVA: Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations

LASC has demonstrated a strong commitment to building an atmosphere of active participation within the college community. They have developed a formal communication and decision-making process, which includes the ICOP, the SPC, and the College Council. Recommendations are discussed and vetted in these groups before the president makes the final decision. The members of these groups have clearly defined roles; however, the College identified that it is challenged to increase participation in planning. 43% of faculty and 61% of staff said they were neutral or disagreed that they played a significant role in decision-making processes.

Findings and Evidence

The College's policies and procedures are written in the Strategic Planning Handbook and the 2008 Shared Governance Agreement between the Academic Senate and College President. The policies are widely distributed in hard copy and online. The SPH describes ten institutional committees. Reviewing the committee membership in evidence, it appears that committees are missing key constituent representation.

To improve participation and communication, the College has developed a list of objectives under its strategic goal "Excellence" as part of its recent Strategic Plan, 2011-2014. Campus leaders have set goals to improve their communication among constituents regarding campus goals and values, SLOs, assessment, evaluation, and other activities to improve student learning. Given the combination of low participation on governance committees and the survey data that emerged regarding the role that faculty and staff have in the decision-making process, the College is urged to create a planning agenda with timelines to assure progress in this area. (IVA.1)

LASC has a system of evaluation of College decision-making structures. The Strategic Planning Handbook outlines the system for annual review and revision of the planning process. It also outlines a committee structure that includes students, classified staff, faculty, and administrators. Several committees have mandatory participatory governance membership, such as the Mission Review Committee, College Council, Strategic Planning Committee, and Budget Committee. (IVA.2)

The SPC evaluates the planning and budgeting processes and revises college wide planning based on college wide input through the integrated planning system. They have revised their planning process annually through the SPC retreat. The 2011-2014 Strategic Plan established five goals over a three-year period. The Strategic Plan First Year Implementation Matrix describes the goals, objectives, responsibilities and timeline for achieving the first set of goals in the 2011-2014 Strategic Plan.
Despite their efforts in planning, the College is concerned regarding feedback in the 2010 Campus Climate Survey, which revealed that faculty and staff have a lower perception of their importance in the planning process. The College has set an appropriate Planning Agenda to develop a strategic communication plan to more fully include faculty and staff in planning revisions. (IVA.2.a)

The College utilizes its formal 2008 Shared Governance Agreement with the Academic Senate and, where appropriate, local bargaining agreements with the AFT Faculty Guild to consult on academic matters. Further, the College implements its Strategic Plan through the Strategic Planning Handbook, which drives the integrated planning agenda at LASC. Additionally, the College provides a glossary that indicates clearly the roles and responsibilities of faculty on committees. Based on the acceptance of updates to the SPC it would appear that the Academic Senate plays a pivotal role in academic matters related to college wide planning and decision-making. Evidence including curriculum committee minutes provides documentation of significant faculty leadership in this area. (IVA.2.b)

In 2010-2011, LASC participated in the RP Group’s Bridging Research Information and Cultures (BRIC) project to learn how to implement a culture of inquiry on their campus. They are also participating in the “Achieving the Dream Initiative” as well as “Equity for All.” The College has done a remarkable job of bringing experts to its constituents who can assess and help implement new ideas and processes, and facilitate discussion and effective communication. What is unclear is how planning drives these efforts, and if it does, how the outcomes are assessed within the integrated planning model. Given the significant impact of these efforts, and their effect on teaching and learning, the team urges the College to crosswalk these efforts into the planning process with clearly articulated outcomes and measurements. (IVA.3)

The College has demonstrated an effort to promote campus wide dialogue through the annual updating of the strategic plan and through reflections regarding SLOs at the department level. In addition, the College has supported a campus-wide collaborative process that included all constituencies, to develop and implement SLOs. The College also recently held a budget summit on January 19, 2012 to engage College constituents in discussions regarding budget cuts. This demonstrates the College’s commitment to many different forms of communication among the institution’s constituencies. While the College has some evidence of these actions, there is a lack of documentation in minutes, agendas and dissemination of information. (IVA.3)

Due to Commission actions regarding compliance in the past several years, LASC has undertaken a strong effort to comply with Accreditation and other external agencies. To fully comply with past recommendations, the College created a matrix of standards cross-referenced to various campus committees and functional areas. Timely compliance is monitored by the ALO, faculty accreditation co-chair, and the College President. Additionally, the College is required to make presentations both to the Board of Trustees and the BOT committee on Institutional Effectiveness. (IVA.4)
The College annually evaluates its decision-making structures through the Strategic planning Committee. The College has been faced with continual budget cuts and as such has had to modify its process each year to mitigate the impact. The College still utilizes its priorities and planning; however, the College constituencies also agreed collectively to utilize task force recommendations due to assessment of college needs. This demonstrates the College’s commitment to flexibility and closing the loop after evaluating resource and planning needs.

In winter 2010, the College reviewed its structure, and considered a re-organization to better focus their resources on the areas with the greatest need: basic skills instruction and student support services. The changes were discussed campus-wide, in a variety of settings, including senate meetings, forums, AFT meetings, the president’s cabinet, Budget committee, and College Council. The President made the final decision.

Conclusions

LASC is offering high quality instructional programs in relevant fields of study aligned with their mission. Assessments are in place for learning outcomes and a cycle of planning, measuring, review and revision are deployed. The College has SLOs for all units and assessments have been made in a majority of the areas. The College is on pace to meet the goal of proficiency by fall 2012.

The Self Study describes a lack of follow-through in assessing the outcomes of new interventions, referencing the Planning Agenda for Standard IVA.2.a., the strategic communication plan. This may not fully meet the College’s needs in terms of assessment of new interventions, and can be traced to an aforementioned issue regarding grant funds driving planning, versus planning driving resources. The team urges the College to develop a planning agenda related to assessment of new interventions to improve upon this Standard. (IVA.5)

Recommendations

College Recommendation 6
In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends the College fully utilize the established consultative committee structure by documenting actions and recommendations in agendas, minutes, and other official tools to ensure that dialogues and decisions affecting the College are communicated widely and clearly across the campus constituencies. (IVA.3)

Standard IVB: Board and Administrative Organization

General Observations

The LACCD is comprised of nine separately accredited colleges and the District Office, which includes the Office of the Chancellor. It is responsible for setting policies and clearly defining the roles of the district and the colleges. The Board of Trustees is responsible for the policies that assure quality, integrity, and effectiveness of student programs. They have
clearly defined policies for selecting and evaluating the chief administrator for the College/District. Trustees are elected for four-year terms district-wide by voters in the city of Los Angeles. Semi-monthly meetings are held year round at the both the District Office and at each of the nine colleges. All major constituent groups are represented at the designated resource table.

Findings and Evidence

The Board of Trustees is an independent policy making body that serves the public's interest; uniting to support local planning decisions made through shared governance processes. In the self-evaluation of Standard IVB.1.a, the board members are reported to work together collaboratively; however, in their recent Board Self-Evaluation (spring 2012) there is evidence that describes the Board's communications to be disrespectful of one another and the administration. In interviews, the Board Members described spirited dialogue rather than arguments, and reported that their outcomes were better vetted through this open communication style. Additionally, the evaluation described some board members as coming to the meetings unprepared and not giving their full attention to speakers during board meetings. (IVB.1.a)

The Board of Trustees has established policies consistent with the mission statement to ensure the quality, integrity and improvement of student learning programs and services. The Board approves curriculum recommended by faculty curriculum committees and the Academic Senate. Further, the District Office of Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness and the District Academic Senate coordinate district wide policy in these areas. (IVB.1.b)

The Board has established a number of subcommittees that give them the opportunity to interact with district and college staff regarding policy matters. They hold responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity; they monitor these areas through four standing committees:

- Institutional Effectiveness Committee
- The Finance and Audit Committee
- The Legislative Committee
- The Capital Construction Committee

Through the District Strategic Plan, the Board sets goals and provides a sense of direction for the colleges. In spring 2010, the District Planning Committee evaluated the current plan through a district-wide process; the result is the new Vision 2017 Plan that spans the years 2012-2017.

During this Accreditation Cycle, (August 2011) the Board released the results of an independent audit of the Capital Bond Program. The audit was an outcome of several Los Angeles Times articles suggesting fiscal mismanagement of the program. Since that time, the district experienced several audits and reviews, from the State Controller, to Independent Review Boards. To address these serious concerns, the District, directed by the Board, established an expanded role in oversight of the Capital Bond Program as so:
1. Created an independent Office of Inspector General;
2. Created a Whistleblower Program for Bond and non-Bond issues;
3. Instituted limits on "mark-up" from builders and construction companies;
4. Responded to concerns from the State Controller's Office;
5. Took action to strengthen operation of the District Citizens Oversight Committee;
6. Appointed an independent review panel to examine the 6 billion dollar building program, consisting of 10 distinguished citizens; and
7. Responded to concerns of how the Inspector General was chosen, by engaging the Office of the City of Los Angeles Controller.

On the District's most recent annual independent audit, the District achieved an unqualified report; however, a number of areas required special attention: Capital Assets and General Obligation Bond Program, employee benefits, risk management, information technology, federal financial aid awards, one annual performance report, and one college's tagging of equipment. Additionally, findings were reported for state apportionment census reporting, actively enrolled students, concurrent enrollment, and a discrepancy between reported enrollment fee revenues and the District's Annual Financial and Budget Report. The District has implemented a mandatory training for any personnel involved in any area of deficiency. (IVB.1.c)

The LACCD Board of Trustees publishes bylaws and policies specifying their size, duties, responsibilities, structure and operating procedures. (IVB.1.d)

The LACCD Board of Trustees acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The BOT adopted Administrative Regulation C-12 in 2007 which mandates cyclical, automatic review of all policies and regulations. The latest revision was done in August of 2011. (IVB.1.e)

The LACCD Board of Trustees adopted a formal policy for orientation of new board members, and also for student trustees. The orientations are comprehensive and include all aspects of board responsibilities including Accreditation, finance, and California Community College legal matters. Interviews with Trustees revealed a high level of confidence in the orientation program. The District also hired external resources to work with the Board towards the orientation and development. (IVB.1.f)

The governing board of LACCD has had a formal self-evaluation process in place since 1995. The Board of Trustees last modified the process in June 2005 to adopt an annual cycle following an ACCJC recommendation. Annually based on this evaluation and data provided, the Board of Trustees revises and adopts new goals. In 2010, the Board adopted a District Effectiveness Review cycle, aligning annual board and CEO goals with the District Strategic Plan. Additionally, the Board reviews ARCC data and each college's institutional Effectiveness Progress as part of this process. A component of the self-evaluation is a survey completed by the Board Members, Senior District Staff, and members of the Board Resource Table. Evidence suggests that while the trustees have an opportunity to participate in the survey component of the self-evaluation, only 4 of 7 trustees completed a survey. (IVB.1.g)
The Board has a clear code of ethics and a process in place for sanctioning behavior that violates code. (IVB.1.h)

The Board of Trustees is informed and actively participates in the accreditation process. Specifically the Board of Trustees' Institutional Effectiveness Committee works with the district and colleges to regularly share progress and milestones for Accreditation. Additionally, the board members attend workshops the Community College League (CCLC) and other relevant conferences. (IVB.1.j)

The Board of Trustees employs the Chancellor of the LACCD. The Chancellor and senior staff oversee the administrative tasks for the district. The Chancellor considers recommendations on financial matters from the District Budget Committee, and employee benefits from the Joint Labor Management Benefits committee. The Chancellor works directly with the College Presidents and Senior District Staff.

The Self Study reports that the Board of Trustees, in keeping with the California Education Code, and Accreditation Standards delegates authority to the Chancellor, giving him/her the autonomy to make decisions without interference and holds him/her accountable for those decisions. Recently in the Board of Trustees Self-Evaluation Survey, participants reported that the Board focuses too much on processes that should be delegated and not enough time on policy matters; that the work of the Board of Trustees Committees is departing from oversight and policy level and becoming directive at the operational level, to include micro-managing the Chancellor and his decisions. The Board has been participating in several retreats this year and has one more planned before the end of the academic year. Evidence from interviews of trustees reveals a willingness to continue to refine their roles and attend to issues of collaboration, delegation and focused responsibilities. (IVB.1.f)

The President is actively leading and managing LASC. All evidence points to effective leadership at the presidential level, including proactive advocacy at the district and in the community. The President regularly meets with College constituents through participatory governance committees. The College reassessed the administrative structure in 2007, 2008 and 2010. The President endorsed a different structure than exists in the other district colleges, creating the position of Executive Vice President over Student Services and Instruction. The College has experienced several periods of administrative turnover during this accreditation cycle, which has caused the College to fall behind in its planning efforts. The team urges the College to consider a long-term administrative staffing plan that meets the needs of the College and its students. (IVB.2.a)

The President is actively involved in guiding the College's institutional improvements in teaching and learning. Evidence of effective leadership are found in the minutes of college wide meetings, utilization of dialogue, data and relevant research that are indicative of the President's leadership of the College. (IVB.2.b)

The President holds responsibility for compliance with statutes, regulations, and board policies. Due to past recommendations regarding accreditation compliance, the President
reorganized the administrative structure to more closely align with oversight of planning and grants. \textit{(IVB.2.c)}

LASC has a complicated set of budget and expenditure challenges. The President monitors all funds closely, including the Bond program at the College. The President has worked closely with the College constituents to understand the budget and to offset expenses with grant funding. He launched an aggressive campaign to raise outside revenues in order to move the student success agenda. The effort garnered over $13 million in federal, state and private funds. The College is also working to reduce its expenses while building resources to carry out its priorities. \textit{(IVB.2.d)}

The District has made significant progress in mapping the responsibilities and functions to delineate roles between the College and the District. They have utilized several projects through the District Strategic Planning Committee to modify the Functional Map to include, Review and Revision of District Office Service Outcomes (DOSO's), Update of District-wide Committee Descriptions, Expansion of the Functional Map, Survey, and the Replacement of the 2008 Functional Map.

The LASC self-evaluation describes the District's efforts in creating opportunities for feedback utilizing Customer Satisfaction Surveys. The team found the survey template in evidence, and sample results were presented to the team on site. Organized results were not in evidence. \textit{(IVB.3.a)}

The Self Study reports that the District has been engaged in ongoing cycles of self-analysis utilizing district-wide user groups and meetings. While a number of improvement efforts are cited, there is no evidence in the form of minutes, survey results or other documents to support these findings. \textit{(IVB.3.b)}

The District provides resources to the colleges via the District Allocation Model which is currently under revision. The District Budget Committee oversees its implementation. \textit{(IVB.3.c)}

The District has demonstrated control over its expenditures through a series of efforts; the Joint Labor Management Benefits Committee works collaboratively to recommend medical insurance plans to control costs in benefits. Additionally, the District carries a reserve of an average of 15%. \textit{(IVB.3.d)}

The College President has the full responsibility and accountability to implement and administer delegated district policies without interference for the operation of the college. \textit{(IVB.3.e)}

The District, led by the Chancellor, has committed to increasing effective methods of communication within the District. In evidence are District Strategic Planning Committee Minutes, Chancellors bulletins, Board of Trustees minutes, and a number of other communication devices. The Office of Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness has deployed web communication tools to include Links to the DSPC minutes, a search
engine for community access to district wide committees, and a system that facilitates the posting of agendas and minutes per the Brown Act. (IVB.3.f)

The District in 2009 launched efforts to evaluate the accuracy of the 2008 Functional Map following an Accreditation recommendation in 2009. The February 2010 report to the District SPC recommended to the Board of Trustees four action items:

- Implement a District-Wide Communication
- Review the District Budget Process
- Streamline District-level Governance and Planning Processes, and
- Enhance Staff Development on District Governance.

All of these efforts are ongoing, and the District recently revised the 2010 survey and recently completed implementation. (IVB.3.g)

Conclusions

The Board of Trustees of the LACCD has established policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of student learning programs. However, evidence suggests that self-reflection and professional development are needed in a number of areas, in particular, board decorum and civility in the conduct of public meetings and in dialog regarding district-wide issues, appropriate delegation of operational responsibilities to the Chancellor, and adherence to its policy-making role as a Board of Trustees. (IVB.1.a)

The Board takes seriously its role to monitor educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity. The team identified three major issues in the finance area that requires attention. While full discussions and District Recommendations regarding these three issues reside in Standard IId, the overall financial integrity of the District and the College falls to the Board of Trustees, and are addressed in sub-sections of Standard IVB. These issues identified are: the efficacy of the increased oversight of the construction bond projects and the resolution of the moratorium; the remedy of the late audit and the material findings in the prior audit; and the ongoing concern of funding the post-retirement employee benefits. (IVB.1.c, IVB.3c)

The Board meets its obligations by publishing bylaws, policies, and regularly evaluates them. (IVB.1.d, IVB.1.e) The Board participates in orientations and development opportunities, conducts self-evaluations, and has an established code of ethics.

The President of the LASC is actively involved in the leadership and management of the College. He assures implementation of statutes, regulations and Board of Trustees policies. LASC has challenges in terms of balancing its General Fund budget; however, the new District allocation process is purported to remedy this structural deficit. The President has actively sought and received external grants to support the college mission of student success. (IVB.2.a-d) The President is active in the community enjoying positive feedback from community constituents.

The District Office has worked diligently to provide an accurate functional map delineating District and College goals, including surveys and cyclical revisions.
Recommendations

See District Recommendation 1.

See District Recommendation 2.

See District Recommendation 3.

See District Recommendation 4.

District Recommendation 5
To meet the Standard, the teams recommend that the Board of Trustees make visible, in behavior and in decision-making, their policy role and their responsibility to act as a whole in the public's interest. Further, the teams recommend continuing professional development for the Board of Trustees to ensure a fuller understanding of its role in policy governance and the importance of using official channels of communication through the chancellor or his designee. (IVB.1.a)