LOS ANGELES MISSION COLLEGE

Accreditation Follow-Up Report

October 2017

Submitted To The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

LOS ANGELES MISSION COLLEGE

ACCJC Follow-Up Report

Submitted by:
Los Angeles Mission College
13356 Eldridge Avenue
Sylmar, California 91342
www.lamission.edu

To:
Accrediting Commission for
Community and Junior Colleges,
Western Association of Schools
and Colleges

October 1, 2017

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Sydney K. Kamlager, *President*

Mike Fong, *Vice President*

Gabriel Buelna, Ph.D.

Andra Hoffman

Ernest H. Moreno

Scott J. Svonkin

Steven F. Veres

Christopher Martinez, *Student Trustee*

DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION

Dr. Francisco C. Rodriguez, *Chancellor*

Dr. Ryan Cornner, *Vice Chancellor for Educational Programs & Institutional Effectiveness*

Dr. Kevin D. Jeter, *Interim General Counsel*

Dr. Robert B. Miller, *Vice Chancellor of Finance & Resource Development*

David Salazar, *Chief Facilities Executive*

Dr. Albert J. Roman, *Vice Chancellor of Human Resources*

LOS ANGELES MISSION COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION

Monte E. Perez, Ph.D., *President*

Isabelle Saber, *Acting Vice President, Academic Affairs*

Dr. Christopher Villa, *Vice President, Student Services*

Daniel G. Villanueva, *Vice President, Administrative Services*

Carlos Gonzalez, *Dean, Student Services*

Larry Resendez, *Dean, DSP&S*

Madelline Hernandez, *Dean, Academic Affairs*

Mark Hobbs, *Interim Dean, Academic Affairs*

Darlene Montes, *Dean, Academic Affairs*

Sarah Master, Ph.D., *Dean, Institutional Effectiveness*

Marla Uliana, *Dean, CTE & Workforce Development*

Ludi Villegas-Vidal, *Dean, Student Services*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 5

CERTIFICATION OF FOLLOW-UP REPORT 7

ORGANIZATION OF REPORT 9

COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION 2 12

COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION 3 18

COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION 6 22

DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 1.....24

DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 2.....26

DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 3.....27

DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 4.....28

DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 6.....30

DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 8.....32

DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 10.....33

DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 11.....34

APPENDIX-LIST OF EVIDENCE.....36

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Los Angeles Mission College expresses sincere gratitude and appreciation to the following individuals for their invaluable contributions to this Follow-Up Report:

Accreditation Steering Committee:

Isabelle Saber, *Acting Vice President of Academic Affairs, Accreditation Steering Committee Co-Chair, Accreditation Liaison Officer*

Kelly William Enos, *AFT Faculty Designee, Accreditation Steering Committee Faculty Co-Chair*

Dr. Monte E. Perez, *College President*

Dr. Christopher Villa, *Vice President of Student Services*

Daniel Villanueva, *Vice President of Administrative Services*

Emily Bill, *Distance Education Coordinator*

Leslie Fernandez, *AFT Staff Designee*

David Garza, *Non-Classroom Faculty Representative*

Michael Griggs, *ASO Designee*

Christine Kourinian, *SLO Coordinator*

Myriam Levy, *Social Sciences Faculty*

Dr. Sarah Master, *Dean of Institutional Effectiveness*

Deborah Paulsen, *Academic Senate President*

Zoila Rodriguez-Doucette, *Staff Bargaining Unit: Supervisor & Manager*

Oliva Sanchez-Ayala, *Classified (Unrepresented) Member appointed by College President*

Steering Committee Support Staff:

Susan Ghirardelli, *Senior Secretary*

Graphic Designer:

Tyler Staines

Writing Teams for the Follow-Up Report:

Recommendation	Writing Team
Rec#2	C. Villa
Rec#3	I. Saber, K. Enos
Rec#4	I. Saber, K. Enos
Rec#6	I. Saber, K. Enos

Certification of Follow-Report

TO: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges,
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

FROM: Monte E. Perez, Ph.D.
President, Los Angeles Mission College
13356 Eldridge Avenue
Sylmar, Ca 91342

We certify that there was broad participation in the production of the 2017 Accreditation Follow-Up Report by the College community and that it accurately reflects the nature and substance of this institution.

Monte E. Perez, Ph.D., President, L.A. Mission College — Date 9/6/2017

Sydney K. Kamlager, President, Board of Trustees, Los Angeles Community College District — Date 9/6/2017

Francisco C. Rodriguez, Ph.D., Chancellor, Los Angeles Community College District — Date 9/6/17

Isabelle Saber, Acting Vice President of Academic Affairs
Accreditation Liaison Officer — Date 9/6/17

Kelly William Enos, Accreditation Steering Committee Faculty Co-Chair — Date: 9/8/17

Daniel Villanueva, Vice President of Administrative Services — Date: 9/12/17

Christopher Villa, Vice President of Student Services — Date: 9/8/17

Sarah Master, Ph.D., Dean of Institutional Effectiveness — Date: 9/7/17

Ludi Villegas, Teamster Representative — Date: 9/7/17

Deborah Paulsen, Academic Senate President — Date: 9/8/17

Louise Barbato, Ph.D., Chapter President AFT Faculty Guild — Date: 9-8-17

Suzanne Mignosi, Chapter President AFT Staff Guild — Date: 9-8-17

Zoila Rodriguez-Doucette, Supervisory Employee Representative — Date: 9/7/17

Jose Custodio, President, Associated Student Organization — Date: 9/7/17

ORGANIZATION OF THE FOLLOW-UP REPORT

District

The Los Angeles Community College District takes an integrated approach to accreditation. While each college has its own governance processes for addressing accreditation, all colleges participate in addressing District accreditation recommendations and in ensuring that the District meets all accreditation standards. The main venue for discussing accreditation issues is the District Accreditation Committee. The District Accreditation Committee is comprised of the college Accreditation Liaison Officers, the college faculty accreditation leads, a college president, and representatives from the Educational Services Center (D0.1_Accreditation Committee Charge). Following the comprehensive site visits, the committee met to review the possible college and District recommendations and to develop a plan for addressing each recommendation.

The committee met over the past year and reviewed progress made on the recommendations. The progress was further communicated to the Board of Trustees through the Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success Committee (D0.2 Accreditation Response Plan; D0.3 LACCD Accreditation summary; D0.4 IESS District Accreditation Update). The report addressing the District recommendations were drafted by the leads in each area at the Educational Services Center: Human Resources, Information Technology, Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness, the Office of General Counsel, and Finance and Resource Development. The area lead responses were compiled and written in one voice by the Division of Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness and provided to the District Accreditation Committee for approval (D0.5 DAC Agenda 5-9-2017).

The final District responses were provided to each college for review and approval through the college governance processes. Each college completed the report by adding their responses to college-specific recommendations and augmenting the District response to reflect the college implementation of district-wide actions. The complete and appended reports were approved through the college approval processes.

College

Notification of Los Angeles Mission College to be ***reaffirmed accreditation*** for eighteen months and require a Follow-Up Report with the ACCJC was communicated to the campus on July 8, 2016. The commission identified three areas for compliance and three areas for improvement. A fourth recommendation for compliance was identified by the visiting team and corrected during the visit (Recommendation four). As instructed, the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report, the External Evaluation Report, and Commission action letters were made available to all signatories, the LACCD Board of Trustees, the District Chancellor, College staff, and local community members through the College website.

Los Angeles Mission College began its preparation of the Follow-Up Report immediately following the visit by the site team in March 2016. Upon receipt of the Commission Action

Letter dated July 8, 2016, the College developed a focused approach to completing the Follow-Up Report.

The Acting Vice President of Academic Affairs, who serves as Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) and Co-Chair of the Accreditation Steering Committee, along with the Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) Faculty Co-Chair, is designated as the coordinator for this Follow-Up Report. The ASC has broad representation from various constituent groups and strong participation, and serves as the primary committee for the development of this document. The Committee met monthly throughout 2016 and 2017 to review and discuss the timeline and to update progress on each recommendation.

The ASC assigned responsibility for each recommendation to the appropriate division Vice President who monitored and reported progress while ensuring that the writing teams contained broad representation from faculty, staff, and administration. The writing teams met during the fall 2016, winter 2017, spring 2017, and summer 2017 terms to address the recommendations and organize the writing of the draft report. The administrators, ASC Co-Chairs, ALO and writing teams collaborated to ensure that the timelines were monitored, updated and adhered to, that processes were revamped as necessary, and that data and evidence were collected. Progress of the recommendations and draft reports were presented and reviewed by the ASC writing teams regularly. As drafts were reviewed and updated, they were made available on the campus shared drive. In addition, evidence supporting each recommendation was gathered and posted on the College's website. The final report was compiled and edited by the ASC Co-Chairs and the ASC writing teams in May 2017.

To keep the campus community informed about the status of the Follow-Up Report process, the President, in collaboration with ASC leadership, held a Town Hall meeting on May 16, 2017 and the Accreditation Steering Committee made monthly reports to the Educational Planning Committee, the Academic Senate, and College Council. The opportunity to review the final draft of the Follow-Up Report for accuracy and evidence review was made available to the campus community during spring 2017. Minor changes were recommended and incorporated.

The Los Angeles Community College District, Board of Trustees Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success Committee met with the College's ASC leadership on **August 23, 2017** and were apprised of the process and progress of the Follow-Up Report. The final Accreditation Follow-Up Report was approved by the Academic Senate on **June 1, 2017** and College Council on **June 15, 2017.** The Board of Trustees approved the final Accreditation Follow-Up Report on **September 6, 2017.**

Following the completion and approval of the college reports, the final content was edited and submitted to the District Office of Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness. The responses to District and college recommendations were presented to the Board through the Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success Committee on August 23, 2017 (D0.6 IESS Agenda). The Board of Trustees reviewed and approved the nine college reports on September 6th, 2017 (D0.7 September Board Agenda). The final reports were provided to the ACCJC with

all required signatures following Board approval. All report materials and evidence have been posted on the college and District websites.

LIST OF EVIDENCE FOR REPORT PREPARATION

D0.1_Accreditation Committee Charge

D0.2 Accreditation Response Plan

D0.3 LACCD Accreditation summary

D0.4 IESS District Accreditation Update

D0.5 DAC Agenda 5-9-2017

D0.6 IESS Agenda

D0.7 September Board Agenda

College Recommendation 2 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standards, and as noted by the College in its Quality Focus Essay, the Team recommends that the College provide appropriate, reliable, and equitable support services to all students. In addition, the Team recommends training staff to improve the design and assessment of service area outcomes to continuously improve student support programs and services. (I.B.4, II.C.1, II.C.2, II.C3, II.C.5, ER15).

PROGRESS IN ADDRESSING THE RECOMMENDATION

The College has moved forward to effectively address the Quality Focus Essay (QFE) in the areas of (1) "Action Project Two: Transforming Student Services to Achieve Student Success" (2) providing students appropriate, reliable, and equitable support services and (3) training staff to improve the design and assessment of service area outcomes.

The Student Services Unit held three retreats that focused on the improvement objectives of the QFE, ranging from appropriate and necessary staffing for the Student Services Division to integrating Student Services policies, procedures, and practices with campus-wide initiatives (2.1).

During the President's Cabinet Retreat in summer 2016, it was determined that Student Services and Academic Affairs would initiate ongoing meetings between Deans from both units to improve collaboration and resolve cross-sectional issues. The ongoing communication between the deans has resulted, thus far, in the streamlining of dual enrollment and outreach, an improved documentation of certificates and various credentials, the clarification of college policies and practices, and sharing of personnel. The deans' group continues to meet on a bi-weekly basis (2.2).

In October 2016, the Student Services Division held a retreat that focused on the eight improvement objectives of the QFE with a particular emphasis placed on the improvement of leadership skills of Student Services faculty and staff and an assessment of staffing levels, as noted in the QFE timeline under "Desired Goals and Outcomes." Other topics focused on staff development, cross-training, improving collaboration between Student Services and Academic Affairs, and establishing a data-driven decision-making culture within the Student Services Division.

A total of approximately 50 administrators, faculty, and classified staff participated in the retreat led by Dr. Kenneth P. Gonzalez who serves as the Director of the University of California, San Diego/California State University, San Marcos Joint Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership. He also serves as a coach for the national initiative, *Achieving the Dream.* Dr. Gonzalez and the Vice President of Student Services, Dr. Christopher Villa, facilitated input from all participants at the retreat, which will be compiled in a report provided by Dr. Gonzalez and used to guide the Division in addressing the QFE Improvement Objectives (2.3).

The College has demonstrated within the past several months its focus on promoting leadership behavior and staff development. Two key staff members, a Dean of Student Services and a faculty leader and former chair of the Counseling Department, were selected to be one of only 20

fellows in the National Community College Hispanic Council (NCCHC), an affiliate of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) (2.4). In addition, the College recently sponsored a classified staff professional development day that focused on improving customer service (2.5).

The College has addressed the need to provide appropriate, reliable, and equitable support services by developing a staffing plan that has been approved and is being implemented. The plan reflects input from administrators, faculty, and classified staff within the Division and is designed to provide students increased support in the areas of outreach, matriculation, admissions and records, and transfer (2.6).

In July 2016 the College hired a Webmaster who works closely with the Public Information Office and Student Services to improve the delivery and navigation of information. The main page of the College Website has become more user friendly. In addition, Student Services units, such as the Financial Aid and Scholarships Office, have improved their Webpages (2.7).

The College provides equitable support services for all students. In February 2017, with support from the Student Equity Committee, the Disabled Student Programs and Services Office (DSPS) expanded services for the learning disabled by hiring a part-time Learning Disabled Specialist. The College also established a new Veterans Resource Center (VRC) in spring 2015. Additional funding was provided to the VRC through the Student Equity funds for a new Veterans Outreach and Engagement (VOE) Project; the objective of the Project is to increase the number of veterans on campus and to increase their retention, certificate completion, degree attainment, transfer rates and job readiness. The VOE Project, in alignment with the requirements set forth by SB860, aims to reduce gaps in access and success for this special population (2.8).

The college has expanded its efforts to serve undocumented students by establishing a Dream Center that provides matriculation services combined with academic, social, and community support services (2.9). The college has determined that approximately 10 percent of its student population (or close to 1,000 students) are undocumented.

Training

On November 4 and November 18, 2016, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, in Coordination with the College's SLO Coordinators and Student Services Deans, provided hands-on Service Area Outcome assessment training to various divisions within Student Services. The workshops met for a total of six hours and included eighteen participants. Representatives from Admissions & Records, ASO, Career Center, Disabled Students Programs & Services, Extended Opportunity Programs & Services, Financial Aid, Outreach & Recruitment, Veterans Resource Center, Student Health Center, and the Transfer Center attended the workshops during which they updated their assessment data, analyses and plans for improving SAOs within the Program Review Screens (2.10), (2.11).

On February 10, 14 and 15, 2017, thirteen representatives from eight areas of Student Services attended focus group training workshops facilitated by faculty. The training focused on ways to conduct student focus groups and data analysis, and assess the effectiveness of planned improvements. Exit surveys indicated a higher level of confidence among participants to conduct student focus groups and assess service area outcomes (2.12), (2.13), (2.14), (2.15), (2.16), (2.17).

Next, six units in Student Services conducted their own student focus groups to assess their Service Area Outcomes. After analyzing the data, many units implemented changes and shared their assessments during committee and management meetings. Some of the changes included:

- The Counseling Department implemented two of the recommendations: create a suggestion box in the Counseling office for students to provide continuous feedback, and promote counseling events and deadlines in classrooms.
- The Financial Aid Office improved customer service by setting up an information table to assist students during hours of heavy traffic.
- The Transfer Center is implementing student success stories on its website.
- The Veterans Resource Center plans to improve the organization of the office and provide additional training to its employees (2.18), (2.19), (2.20), (2.21), (2.22), (2.23), (2.24), (2.25), (2.26).

Assessments

Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) have become central to the culture and operations of the Student Services Division. All units within the Division submitted 2016-17 SAOs that have undergone review by the Vice President of Student Services, Deans, faculty and classified staff in conjunction with the College Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator. The SAOs have been implemented and additional assessments have been completed in Program Review.

For example, the Counseling Department assessed an SAO measuring the Distance Education (DE) Students' awareness of e-counseling services. A focus group was formed that revealed that 17 percent of all students were aware of e-counseling services. Participants in the focus group recommended that (1) e-counseling and counseling be more visible on the LAMC home page (2) DE instructors include this service on their course syllabi, and (3) information about this service be embedded in welcome emails to new DE students (2.27). In response to the focus group feedback above, the counseling link is now prominently visible on the LAMC homepage (2.28). Additionally, counseling has collaborated with the Public Information Office to update the Website and enhance its aesthetics and user experience. Counseling will work with the DE committee and DE faculty to get information out to DE students about e-counseling services. Counseling is currently pursuing options to create short videos and texting options to better reach students. Additionally, the College is in the process of purchasing a new counseling platform called Cranium Café.

The DSPS unit established an SAO with the goal of completing a minimum of ten learning disability assessments per academic year. Eighteen learning disability assessments were completed in the last year (2.29).

The Health Center created an SAO to increase awareness of depressive symptoms among students. Assessment results indicate that 74 percent of students seen at the Health Center are now aware of symptoms of depression (2.30).

An assessment of the results from the spring 2017 LAMC Student Survey indicate that 70 percent of students are either very satisfied or satisfied with the Counseling Department services. The rate of dissatisfaction with the unit's performance was reported at 9.2 percent while 20.7 percent of respondents selected the option of "not applicable" when asked about their level of satisfaction with counseling services. These results are encouraging as they reflect an 8 percent increase (up from 62 percent) in student satisfaction over a two-year period (2.31).

The 2017 LAMC Student Survey provided additional information on the efficacy of the Financial Aid Office with 74.2 percent of respondents indicating that they were either very satisfied or satisfied with its services, placing the College within 1 percent of its satisfaction goal for that unit (2.32).

Results for the DSPS Office were less encouraging, with only 47 percent of the 2017 Student Survey respondents claiming a high or moderate level of satisfaction with the unit's services, falling short of the 60 percent benchmark (2.33). The unit plans to investigate this gap and address the deficiency perceived by students.

In April 2017, the Vice President of Student Services, in close collaboration with the Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs and Administrative Services, began the process of integrating three existing committees (Student Equity, Student Success and Support Program (SSSP), and the College Readiness Committee) into a combined group focused on improving student outcomes. The new committee, Student Equity, Access, and Success (SEAS) established its charter and began its official work in August 2017.

Conclusions

The College has effectively addressed this recommendation and will move to implement the action steps noted in the QFE by focusing on the need for data collection, the development of tasks and activities to better support students, and improvements through the assessment process.

EVIDENCE LIST FOR COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION 2 (COMPLIANCE)

2.1 Student Services Retreats 7/7/2017 & 7/12/2017

2.2 Student Services-Academic Affairs Meeting 10/26/2016

2.3 Report on College's Student Services Retreat 10/28/16

2.4 Graduation from National Hispanic Leadership Program

2.5 1521A Classified Professional Development Day 1/24/2017

2.6 Student Services Staffing Plan and Proposed Funds

2.7 Improvement of Opening College Web Page

2.8 Student Equity Proposals - Veterans Resource Center and DSPS

2.9 Dream Center

2.10 2016-2017 Service Area Outcomes

2.11 SAO Training Follow Up Email 11/18/2016

2.12 Focus Group Training Sign-In sheet 2/10/2017

2.13 Focus Group Training Sign-In sheet 2/14/2017

2.14 Focus Group Training Sign-In sheet 2/15/2017

2.15 Focus Group Training Exit Survey

2.16 Focus Group Training Lesson Plan

2.17 Focus Group Training PowerPoint Presentation

2.18 ASO Student Focus Group Sign-In sheet

2.19 Counseling Student Focus Group Sign-In sheet

2.20 Financial Aid Student Focus Group Sign-In sheet

2.21 TRiO Student Focus Group Sign-In sheet

2.22 Transfer Center Student Focus Group Sign-In sheet

2.23 Veterans Student Focus Group Sign-In sheet

2.24 Student Support Services Committee Minutes 3/14/2017

2.25 Student Support Services Management Minutes 3/23/2017

2.26 Student Services Report to College Council 4/20/2017

2.27 Student Focus Group results

2.28 Counseling link on LAMC homepage

2.29 DSPS assessment results

2.30 Health Center assessment results

2.31 Counseling Student Satisfaction Survey results

2.32 Financial Aid Office Student Satisfaction Survey results

2.33 DSPS Student Satisfaction Survey results

College Recommendation 3 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College develop a plan to evaluate all learning and tutoring center services and support to students, regardless of location or means of delivery, and use the result of the evaluation as a basis for improvement. (II.B.3)

PROGRESS IN ADDRESSING THE RECOMMENDATION

The College has developed a systematic plan to evaluate all learning and tutoring center services that support students, and uses the evaluation results as the basis for improvement and enhancement of the learning experience.

In April 2016, the Vice President of Academic Affairs requested that the Dean of Academic Affairs commence the process of developing an evaluation plan for all learning and tutoring center services. The approved plan included:

- The completion of a program review/unit update for the College's Learning Resource Center;(3.1)
- Discussions pertaining to tutoring services at the Council of Instruction/Chairs & Deans meetings;
- Meetings with key tutoring services staff members; and
- Point-of-service surveys at all locations where learning and tutoring services were provided:
    - STEM Center
    - Learning Resource Center
    - Learning Center Math Lab
    - The Math Center
    - The Science Success Center.

Evaluation

For a number of years, tutoring services at LAMC were funded by a Title V grant. Upon the expiration of the grant and the advent of the 2008 Recession, support services were sharply reduced on campus. Due to budgetary constraints, the tutoring budget for the Learning Resource Center (LRC) was cut sharply for 2012-2014, resulting in a reduction in the Learning Center hours and staff.

One of the most pressing challenges of tutoring services has been to provide continued and adequate support for the high numbers of students underprepared for college-level Math and English. To that effect, the College has leveraged Basic Skills funds to address the needs of

developmental students. Furthermore, students enrolled in college-level courses have been provided services by leveraging Equity funds.

Improved coordination between grant-funded tutoring services across campus (the LRC, the Science Center, and the Math Center) has allowed the College to maximize the efficiency of its tutoring programs.

The three tutoring centers on campus (Learning Resource Center, Science Center, and Math Center) conducted a week-long student survey in April 2016 to assess student needs and to maximize efficiency. Overall, students expressed satisfaction with the quality of services offered in various tutoring labs. However, there is an express need to expand tutoring services to a greater number of subjects.

To strengthen student success across the college, tutor training has been centralized and best practices shared with all the programs that provide tutoring assistance. During fall 2015, all tutors were invited to attend tutor training sessions at LA Pierce College while the College pursues its efforts to backfill positions that have remained vacant in our support services.

The data gathered from the April 2016 student surveys are as follows:

STEM Center (Science Success) Survey

Among students surveyed in April 2016, 95.5 percent visited the STEM Center more than ten times during the semester and 81.8 percent strongly agreed that the services they received helped them in their science courses. Students requested tutoring services be offered on Fridays. However, 100 percent of students surveyed expressed satisfaction with the quality of tutoring and stated that they would recommend the services to a friend (3.2).

LRC Survey

Among students surveyed in April 2016, 66.7 percent visited the LRC more than ten times during the semester and 51.2 percent strongly agreed that the tutoring service helped them in their class (3.3).

LRC Math Lab

Ninety percent of students surveyed who visited the LRC Math Lab specifically sought individual tutoring services. However, there was some dissatisfaction with the number of tutors available on site as well as the hours of operation of the center (3.4).

Math Center (STEM)

Sixty nine and a half percent of students surveyed who routinely visit the Math Center on East Campus strongly agreed that the service helped them in their Math class. Some students requested earlier opening times and longer hours of operations (3.5).

NetTutor

The College contracted with LinkSystems International in 2015 to offer online tutoring in a variety of subjects. The product, NetTutor, is approved by and is ADA-compliant. OEI in the State Chancellor's Office; NetTutor offers online tutoring in Accounting, Biology, Business, Chemistry, Computer Science and Information Technology, Economics, English, ESL, Finance, General Humanities and Social Sciences, Mathematics, Physics, and World Languages, to name a few.

NetTutor integrates well with Canvas, the College's learning management system. Students are able to directly access NetTutor from the course page in Canvas as well as the College's Webpage. NetTutor is customizable per section and allows faculty to share their syllabi and assignments as well as set parameters on the type and amount of help that should be extended to their students. Many faculty include information on NetTutor in their syllabi (3.6), (3.7), (3.8).

In addition to synchronous tutoring in a variety of topics, NetTutor assists students with their papers by providing feedback in accordance with the parameters set forth by faculty. All paper/lab reports can be submitted 24 hours a day, seven days per week. All writing submissions to NetTutor maintain a 48-hour turnaround time.

NetTutor assessment

In fall 2016, an assessment was completed to determine the usage and satisfaction of NetTutor. 322 students used NetTutor for a total of 653 sessions. 92% of students surveyed strongly agreed they had a positive experience with NetTutor and would recommend it to others (3.9), (3.10), (3.11).

Improvement

The LRC completed a Comprehensive Program Review and validation by the Educational Planning Committee in spring 2017 and is currently working on implementing the resulting recommendations from this assessment.

The following improvement goals, as set forth in the most recently-completed Program Review, have been met:

- Increase coordination and collaboration among all tutoring services on campus under the umbrella of the Learning Center;
- Open the LRC on Fridays;
- Promote NetTutor, the online tutoring service, both to the faculty and students;
- Secure ongoing funding for tutors and institutionalize the tutoring/learning support services;

- Fill the LRC Director (1.0 FTE), was filled in fall 2016 (3.12), (3.13).

In addition, the College plans to fill the position of Language Arts Instructional Assistant (0.5 FTE) in Fall 2017.

Conclusion

The College has met this recommendation.

EVIDENCE LIST FOR COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION 3 (COMPLAINCE)

3.1 LRC Program Review

3.2 STEM Center Survey

3.3 LRC Survey

3.4 LRC Math Lab Survey

3.5 Math Center (STEM) Survey results

3.6 Art syllabus with NetTutor information

3.7 Biology syllabus with NetTutor information

3.8 Math syllabus with NetTutor information

3.9 NetTutor email regarding survey results 12/6/2016

3.10 NetTutor Satisfaction Survey 12/1/2016

3.11 NetTutor Usage Report 12/6/2016

3.12 LRC Job announcement

3.13 LRC hire

College Recommendation 6 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College update academic administrator's and part-time faculty performance evaluations to include the responsibility of these individuals in learning outcomes assessment to improve teaching and learning. (III.A.6)

PROGRESS IN ADDRESSING THE RECOMMENDATION

The Human Resources Division has worked with collective bargaining groups to add Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) and Service Area Outcomes (SAO) language to job descriptions, job duty statements, and evaluation forms. LACCD academic supervisors (Deans) operate under a collective bargaining agreement (6.1). On June 2, 2016, the union and the District entered into a Memorandum of Understanding to include the results of the assessment of learning and/or service outcomes in the evaluation of all Deans (6.2). The evaluation form was immediately put into practice (6.3).

All unrepresented management and executive level administrators have also had SLO and/or SAO assessment integrated into their evaluation process. The revised evaluation forms ensure that learning and/or service outcomes are a component of the evaluation process (6.4, 6.5).

Each college has implemented the new evaluation process for academic administrators and managers. The process begins with common language in administrative job announcements that make clear the role of administrators in using learning and/or service outcomes to improve academic and service programs. All Colleges have used the revised job description for all new academic administrators (6.6, 6.7). All colleges have evaluated current administrators based on the revised job duties and evaluation processes. This includes utilizing the revised evaluation form that mandates a review of the administrator's use of learning and/or service outcomes. All administrative evaluations are up to date and are available in the personnel files for review.

Both fulltime and adjunct faculty are evaluated on their participation in student learning outcomes assessment as outlined in the AFT, Local 1521 Collective Bargaining Agreement and incorporate SLO assessments as part of the faculty contractual responsibility. The AFT's clarification of the meaning of "participates in the SLO assessment cycle" states "all instructors shall conduct SLO assessment in their assigned classes and use the results to make appropriate changes to instruction to improve student learning" (6.8).

All faculty must include the officially approved course SLOs on course syllabi, conduct SLO assessments in their assigned classes, and use the results to make appropriate changes in instruction to improve student learning. Faculty are required to provide evidence of changes in instruction and improvement in student learning through uploading data analysis to the SLO website portal (6.9-6.13).

Faculty share the responsibility of producing and assessing student learning outcomes in their individual disciplines, and department chairs are tasked with monitoring the outcomes assessment process (6.14).

EVIDENCE LIST FOR COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION 6 (COMPLIANCE)

6.1 Local 911 2014-17 Agreement

6.2 Signed Teamster MOU

6.3 Dean Evaluation form with SLO Assessment

6.4 Basic Other Academic Administrator form

6.5 Form HR E-210C LACCD Summary Evaluation of College President

6.6 Associate Dean, Strong Workforce

6.7 Dean of Special Programs and Services

6.8 LACCD Faculty Guild Agreement, Faculty evaluation form p. 189

6.9 SLO Online System Website

6.10 Sample syllabus

6.11 Sample syllabus

6.12 Sample syllabus

6.13 Sample syllabus

6.14 Department memo

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

The District has policies for hiring that are established in Board Rule Chapter X Article III (D1.1 Ch. X - Article III). The previous adjunct hiring process allowed for the development of local processes that were not consistent across all colleges. Following the ACCJC's comprehensive visit, the District Academic Senate (DAS), in collaboration with the Chancellor and the District's Human Resources Division as representatives of the governing board, jointly agreed to a uniform hiring procedure for all adjunct positions. The District Academic Senate approved the hiring process on May 11, 2017. (D1.2 May 2017 DAS Agenda; D1.3 Adjunct Recruitment Process). Other participatory governance groups were consulted as well. The revised adjunct hiring process was included in the HR Guide (D1.4 HR GUIDE) which was approved in September 2017. A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document was developed to assist colleges in the implementation of this new process (D1.5 FAQ Adjunct Hiring Process).

As part of the new process, a centralized web-based adjunct recruitment system that creates applicant lists by discipline was developed and is maintained by the District Human Resources Division for dissemination to the colleges and other district hiring locations (D1.6 Recruitment Portal). The revised process includes a hiring selection committee with an Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) officer, for screening and interviewing applicants. The Human Resources Division also developed templates for posting adjunct positions (D1.7 Example Template PT HEALTH (DR-1)). The templates include duty statements, minimum qualifications, and application processes and are accompanied by a style guide to ensure conformity in the appearance of postings. The new process provides consistency for the recruitment and selection of adjunct faculty with the goal of ensuring a diverse and highly qualified list of applicants. All hiring processes throughout the district are confidential, and all evidence for this section has been de-identified to protect that confidentiality.

The new process was implemented for adjuncts hired for fall 2017. The online application portal includes requests from every college for disciplines in need of adjunct faculty (D1.8 List of Disciplines Posted). The Human Resources Division validated adjunct hiring lists and distributed the lists to department chairs throughout the spring and summer semesters (D1.9 Example Email to Colleges; D1.10 Example De-identified applicant list). Selection committees reviewed the lists through the online portal to determine which candidates to offer interviews (D1.11 Process for Reviewing Applicants). All interviews were conducted as defined in the adjunct hiring process and included faculty and EEO membership. The uniform guidelines were used in the hiring of all new adjuncts for fall (D1.12 New Adjunct Hiring List to date).

Los Angeles Mission College used the adjunct recruitment process for all new adjunct faculty members hired to teach in fall 2017.

EVIDENCE LIST FOR DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 1 (COMPLIANCE)

D1.1 Ch. X - Article III

D1.2 May 2017 DAS Agenda

D1.3 Adjunct Recruitment Process

D1.4 HR GUIDE

D1.5 FAQ Adjunct Hiring Process

D1.6 Recruitment Portal

D1.7 Example Template PT HEALTH (DR-1)

D1.8 List of Disciplines Posted

D1.9 Example Email to Colleges

D1.10 Example De-identified applicant list

D1.11 Process for Reviewing Applicants

D1.12 New Adjunct Hiring List to date

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

Following the site visit, the Human Resources Division began an analysis of the current evaluation tracking processes. It found that the process did not include the ability to upload the evaluation as a digital record, which left a gap in the tracking mechanism. Additionally, the District enterprise system, SAP, did not include academic personnel as part of the evaluation tracking. This led to paper records that were sometimes incongruent with the SAP system and two separate means of tracking evaluations. The impact was District records sometimes reflected fewer completed evaluations than college records.

The District has completed an update of the SAP system to enhance tracking and congruence in the evaluation process. The system is now used for all personnel (classified and academic employees) as the system of record for evaluations. In addition, the system has been updated to include the ability to upload evaluations (D2.1 Evaluation Alert System User 3 0 Manual; D2.2 LACCD_EASY enhancements release - 3.0). The digitizing of evaluation forms ensures that all official records are in agreement and that the SAP system can serve as the official record. The SAP system can now track the percentage of evaluations that have been received and provide reports to managers to assist in completing evaluations (D2.3 Evaluation Report). The system is programmed to track evaluations in accordance with the contractual guidelines in bargaining agreements. The system of submitting digital copies of evaluations for the official record and for tracking purposes went into effect for evaluations due January 1st, 2017 moving forward. This process will capture all evaluations as they are due.

All Colleges have implemented the evaluation process developed in the SAP system. As of September 2017, the District has uploaded to the new system 62.6 % of employees in accordance with the stated intervals.

EVIDENCE LIST FOR DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 2 (COMPLIANCE)

D2.1 Evaluation Alert System User 3 0 Manual

D2.2 LACCD_EASY enhancements release - 3.0

D2.3 Evaluation Report

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

The Human Resources Division has worked with collective bargaining groups to add Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) and Service Area Outcomes (SAO) language to job descriptions, job duty statements, and evaluation forms. LACCD academic supervisors (Deans) operate under a collective bargaining agreement (D3.1 Local911_2014-17 Agreement). On June 10, 2017, the union and the District entered into a Memorandum of Understanding to include the results of the assessment of learning and/or service outcomes in the evaluation of all Deans (D3.2 Signed Teamster MOU). The evaluation form was immediately put into practice (D3.3 Deans Evaluation with SLO Assessment).

All unrepresented management and executive level administrators have also had SLO and/or SAO assessment integrated into the evaluation process. The revised evaluation forms ensure that learning and/or service outcomes are a component of the evaluation process (D3.4 Basic Other Academic Administrator; D3.5 FORM HR E-210C LACCD Summary Evaluation of College President Academic Vice Chancellor).

Each college has implemented the new evaluation process for academic supervisors and managers. The process begins with common language in administrative job announcements that make clear the role of administrators in using learning and/or service outcomes to improve academic and service programs. All Colleges have used the revised job description for all new academic administrators (D3.6 Associate Dean, Strong Workforce; D3.7 Dean of Special Programs and Services). All colleges have evaluated current administrators based on the revised job duties and evaluation processes. This includes utilizing the revised evaluation form that mandates a review of the administrator's use of learning and/or service outcomes. All administrative evaluations are up to date and are available in the personnel files for review.

EVIDENCE LIST FOR DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 3 (COMPLIANCE)

D3.1 Local911_2014-17 Agreement

D3.2 Signed Teamster MOU

D3.3 Deans Evaluation with SLO Assessment

D3.4 Basic Other Academic Administrator

D3.5 FORM HR E-210C LACCD Summary Evaluation of College President Academic Vice Chancellor

D3.6 Associate Dean, Strong Workforce

D3.7 Dean of Special Programs and Services

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

The visiting team indicated that the District and the colleges share responsibility for technology resources and that this led to situations in which technology resources and planning were inconsistent across the colleges. As an example, the team noted that while the District Office has onsite and offsite backups, only some of the colleges had offsite backup systems. In addition, business continuity plans were inconsistent as were the technology resources needed to implement such plans. The District has worked to develop a comprehensive Business Continuity plan that is consistent across all colleges and for the District centralized functions. The plan utilizes the California Community College System Office Information Security Center Template as the framework for a robust disaster recovery process.

The plan was developed through the District Technology Committee constituted by all college IT managers and the District Chief Information Officer. Based on the state template and multiple district-wide technology assessments (D4.1 District Technology Assessment Summary, D4.2 CCCCIO Assessment), the committee refined the recommendations to fit the specific staffing, governance, and technology infrastructure of the District. The committee approved a district-wide business continuity and disaster recovery plan on July 14th, 2017 (D4.3 LACCD College and ESC IT Systems Backup and Disaster Recovery Standards and Procedures). The plan was codified in Administrative regulation B-37, which was approved by the Chancellor on July 24, 2017 (D4.4 Administrative Regulation).

While the plan puts in place a consistent process for ensuring reliable access, safety, and security of district and college technology and data, the District has worked to further identify improvements in technology systems, hardware, and processes that will offer even further protection and continuity. As part of a district-wide technology project, the Board requested an assessment of college and district technology needs (D4.5 FMPOC 40J Technology Update) and the development of a Strategic Execution Plan (D4.6 Strategic Execution Plan Timeline) that would improve technology systems such that all colleges are operating at the same standard. The plan included improvements of storage systems, firewall security, and servers that were used in the development of the business continuity and disaster recovery plan.

The completed technology assessment indicated a need for enhanced data storage processes. The Strategic Execution Plan included enhancement to data storage that would lead to segregated onsite storage, local offsite storage, and offsite emergency backups (D4.7 Backup Plan Update Presentation and Timeline). The District has already begun implementation of these improvements with the District and each college adopting a new segregated backup storage system that ensures that all data and systems have a backup separated from the general system. These storage systems bring all colleges up to the same standard for security, and training has been provided for college IT employees on the use of the systems (D4.8 Backup Strategy).

The second phase of the back-up plan includes the development of offsite backups for all colleges. The District has sought industry experts in the development of these planned upgrades. As part of an overall technology assessment strategy, the District will be contracting with a

consultant to conduct an evaluation of current IT policies and processes at the college and district level (D4.9 LACCD IT Infrastructure and Organization Assessment). This evaluation will include final recommendations for the use of offsite cloud or physical back-ups. The technology solution will be implemented uniformly across all colleges to add another layer of security.

The District also plans to enhance business continuity and minimize downtime through the purchase of additional servers that could be used as a cold site in the event of catastrophic event or as a warm site in the event of minor outages. These servers will allow the district to maintain enterprise functions in the event that the primary datacenter is inoperable. The purchase of these servers is included in the Strategic Execution Plan with funding identified. The technology assessment strategy noted above will assist the District in identifying the most appropriate location for the secondary site. Additionally, the District has already developed performance/product standards for servers (D4.10 Server Standards). The result of these actions will be uniform server functionality across the district and colleges and the ability to mobilize district resources in support of any college in the event of an emergency.

Through initial assessments it has been made clear that there is a need for a greater standardization related to IT systems. The technology assessment strategy will include an evaluation of current IT organizational structure, policies, processes, and staffing at the college and district-level. This evaluation will be used to determine what additional policies, regulations, and processes should be adopted to bring the District to a higher industry standard for IT operations, cyber security, and business continuity.

EVIDENCE LIST FOR DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 4 (COMPLIANCE)

D4.1 District Technology Assessment Summary

D4.2 CCCCIO Assessment

D4.3 LACCD College and ESC IT Systems Backup and Disaster Recovery Standards and Procedures

D4.4 Administrative Regulation

D4.5 FMPOC 40J Technology Update

D4.6 Strategic Execution Plan Timeline

D4.7 Backup Plan Update Presentation and Timeline

D4.8 Backup Strategy

D4.9 LACCD IT Infrastructure and Organization Assessment

D4.10 Server Standards

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

As part of the ongoing efforts to correct audit findings, the District developed corrective action plans. The corrective action plan for technology controls was developed following the 2015 Audit indicating that the District would increase segregation of duties and further implement Security Weaver (D6.1 2014-2015 Audit p.82-84). The segregation of duties issue has been addressed with additional hiring of a Software Systems Engineer who developed and improved the processes related to security and change management. Over the past year, the District Information Technology Team refined internal controls to establish a list of users who should have administrative and other elevated (Super User) access within the district enterprise systems (SAP) (D6.2 LACCD SAP Privileged Access Report). The District has redacted names and usernames for security purposes. Full reports are available upon the visit. The team conducted further reviews of roles and implemented processes and procedures to segregate duties. Additionally, the District Information Technology Division established a new process to limit the use of shared user IDs to ensure that access is appropriate to the user's job responsibilities. In August 2016, the District engaged in its regularly scheduled audit. The auditing firm found significant improvements related to technology controls over the areas of security and change management. (D6.3 2015-2016 Audit p.96-98)

Past corrective action plans related to the audit findings for TBA hours have included training with no changes in internal procedures. The District worked to develop a new corrective action plan (D6.4 TBA Validation Process) that involves increased central review and control over the TBA reporting. This plan was shared with Chief Instructional and Student Service Officers in a joint meeting on May 20, 2016, for final revision and approval (D6.5 CIO CSSO Joint Council Agenda 5 20 16). The validation process includes periodic reviews of TBA courses to ensure that required curricular and attendance records are present. While the colleges still retain the autonomy to schedule TBA courses, the District assumes the role of verifying that all state requirements are satisfied prior to submitting final FTES reports. At the end of each semester, the Division of Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness will audit attendance records for compliance. Scheduled sections not meeting requirements will not be submitted for apportionment.

The corrective action plan was presented at a districtwide meeting to ensure all personnel involved were aware of the new processes (D6.6 Corrective Action - Audit - August 2016 Presentation). The plan was put into action for the 2015-2016 FTES reporting. All colleges worked with the District to ensure that sections included the correct documentation prior to submission. The external audit report found no deficiencies with TBA documentation and reporting, indicating that the reoccurring finding regarding TBA hours had been addressed (D6.7 2015-2016 Audit p.126-128). One course was identified as being used to address a student time conflict and was not related to the documentation of TBA hours.

EVIDENCE LIST FOR DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 6 (COMPLIANCE)

D6.1 2014-2015 Audit p.82-84

D6.2 LACCD SAP Privileged Access Report

D6.3 2015-2016 Audit p.96-98

D6.4 TBA Validation Process

D6.5 CIO CSSO Joint Council Agenda 5 20 16

D6.6 Corrective Action - Audit - August 2016 Presentation

D6.7 2015-2016 Audit p.126-128

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

The District completed an assessment of load banking across all colleges and noted the liability in the financial statements (D8.1 Financial Statements). Through collaboration with the college offices of academic affairs, the District has developed a system that, each semester, requires the colleges to submit required detailed information to calculate the district-wide load banking liability resulting from load banking at the colleges (D8.2 Load Banking Memo, D8.3 Load Banking work sheet 2017). The load banking information will be regularly reported to the Accounting Department and recorded as a liability in the District's books for use in the District's financial statements at the end of the fiscal year.

EVIDENCE LIST FOR DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 8 (COMPLIANCE)

D8.1 Financial Statements

D8.2 Load Banking Memo

D8.3 Load Banking work sheet 2017

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

In the evaluation of Board policies, the team determined that there were no policies that clearly identified the process for the selection and the evaluation of the chancellor. Board Rule Chapter X, Article III articulates hiring processes, including those for college presidents. Section 10309 was added to the Board Rule to clearly define the process for the selection of the Chancellor (D10.1 Ch. X - Article III). The revised Board Rule was approved by the Board on March 8th, 2017 and is in effect for the next selection process (D10.2 March 8 2017 Board Agenda; D10.3 March 8 2017 Board Minutes).

The evaluation of the Chancellor was added to Board Rule Chapter X Article I, Human Resources Services (D10.4 Ch. X - Article I). Section 10105.13 defines the process of the evaluation of the Chancellor stating:

> The Board shall conduct an evaluation of the Chancellor of the District at least annually. Such evaluation shall comply with any requirements set forth in the contract of employment with him/her as well as this policy. The Board shall evaluate the Chancellor using an evaluation process developed and jointly agreed to by him/her and the Board.
>
> The criteria for evaluation shall be based on board policy, the Chancellor's job description, and overall priorities developed in accordance with board policy.

The Board Rule was approved on March 8th, 2017 (D10.2 March 8 2017 Board Agenda; D10.3 March 8 2017 Board Minutes). The evaluation process went into effect immediately and will be used in the annual evaluation of the Chancellor.

EVIDENCE LIST FOR DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 10 (COMPLIANCE)

D10.1 Ch. X - Article III

D10.2 March 8 2017 Board Agenda

D10.3 March 8 2017 Board Minutes

D10.4 Ch. X - Article I

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

The District has had a long established process for the regular review of policies and Board Rules defined in C-12 (D11.1 Admin_Reg_C_12 Previous Version). The previous process had called for District executive staff to review all Board rules on a triennial basis and to bring all proposed changes to the Board for approval. The procedure did not require the review of Board rules in instances when no changes were recommended. The recommendation from the visiting team stressed the need to revise the process to include a regular review even when no changes are recommended. In May 2016, administrative regulation C-12 was updated to include the provision that the Board review all policies on a triennial basis regardless of whether changes were recommended (D11.2 Admin Ref C 12). Specifically, the regulation indicates:

> If the specified designee recommends that no changes be made to a particular rule or regulation, the rule will be noticed at the next scheduled Board meeting for subsequent affirmation. The next scheduled review period for that rule or regulation shall be calendared three years from the current year.

To ensure that all current Board Rules have been reviewed by the Board in the past three years, the Office of General Counsel provided all unchanged Board Rules for approval to the Board on December 7th, 2016 (D11.3 Board-Agenda December 7 2016 item C-5; D11.4 Board Minutes December 7 2016). To date, all Board Rules have been reviewed and approved by the Board at least once in the past three years, and the Office of General Counsel will continue its practices of tracking the review of all policies and procedures to ensure that triennial reviews occur. (D11.5 Board Rule Tracking)

The District has also used this recommendation as an opportunity to improve all of its policies through a process of continuous quality improvement. The Office of Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness in consultation with the Office of General Counsel will be working toward the adoption of the Community College League of California model policies. The District has developed a crosswalk of the model policies to current policies beginning with Chapter 2 (D11.6 Example Crosswalk) and assigned the revision of District policies to appropriate consultation groups. The District plans on integrating the model policies over the course of the next 18 months and believes that these efforts will provide additional uniformity to the District policies and a greater ability to respond to legislative changes from the state.

EVIDENCE LIST FOR DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 11 (COMPLIANCE)

D11.1 Admin_Reg_C_12 Previous Version

D11.2 Admin Ref C 12

D11.3 Board-Agenda December 7 2016 item C-5

D11.4 Board Minutes December 7 2016

D11.5 Board Rule Tracking

D11.6 Example Crosswalk

APPENDIX: LIST OF EVIDENCE

ORGANIZATION OF REPORT

D0.1_Accreditation Committee Charge

D0.2 Accreditation Response Plan

D0.3 LACCD Accreditation summary

D0.4 IESS District Accreditation Update

D0.5 DAC Agenda 5-9-2017

D0.6 IESS Agenda

D0.7 September Board Agenda

COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION 2 (COMPLIANCE)

2.1 Student Services Retreats 7/7/2017 & 7/12/2017

2.2 Student Services-Academic Affairs Meeting 10/26/2016

2.3 Report on College's Student Services Retreat 10/28/16

2.4 Graduation from National Hispanic Leadership Program

2.5 1521A Classified Professional Development Day 1/24/2017

2.6 Student Services Staffing Plan and Proposed Funds

2.7 Improvement of Opening College Web Page

2.8 Student Equity Proposals - Veterans Resource Center and DSPS

2.9 Dream Center

2.10 2016-2017 Service Area Outcomes

2.11 SAO Training Follow Up Email 11/18/2016

2.12 Focus Group Training Sign-In sheet 2/10/2017

2.13 Focus Group Training Sign-In sheet 2/14/2017

2.14 Focus Group Training Sign-In sheet 2/15/2017

2.15 Focus Group Training Exit Survey

2.16 Focus Group Training Lesson Plan

2.17 Focus Group Training PowerPoint Presentation

2.18 ASO Student Focus Group Sign-In sheet

2.19 Counseling Student Focus Group Sign-In sheet

2.20 Financial Aid Student Focus Group Sign-In sheet

2.21 TRiO Student Focus Group Sign-In sheet

2.22 Transfer Center Student Focus Group Sign-In sheet

2.23 Veterans Student Focus Group Sign-In sheet

2.24 Student Support Services Committee Minutes 3/14/2017

2.25 Student Support Services Management Minutes 3/23/2017

2.26 Student Services Report to College Council 4/20/2017

2.27 Student Focus Group results

2.28 Counseling link on LAMC homepage

2.29 DSPS assessment results

2.30 Health Center assessment results

2.31 Counseling Student Satisfaction Survey results

2.32 Financial Aid Office Student Satisfaction Survey results

2.33 DSPS Student Satisfaction Survey results

COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION 3 (COMPLIANCE)

3.1 LRC Program Review

3.2 STEM Center Survey

3.3 LRC Survey

3.4 LRC Math Lab Survey

3.5 Math Center (STEM) Survey results

3.6 Art syllabus with NetTutor information

3.7 Biology syllabus with NetTutor information

3.8 Math syllabus with NetTutor information

3.9 NetTutor email regarding survey results 12/6/2016

3.10 NetTutor Satisfaction Survey 12/1/2016

3.11 NetTutor Usage Report 12/6/2016

3.12 LRC Job announcement

3.13 LRC hire

COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION 6 (COMPLIANCE)

6.1 Local 911 2014-17 Agreement

6.2 Signed Teamster MOU

6.3 Dean Evaluation form with SLO Assessment

6.4 Basic Other Academic Administrator form

6.5 Form HR E-210C LACCD Summary Evaluation of College President

6.6 Associate Dean, Strong Workforce

6.7 Dean of Special Programs and Services

6.8 LACCD Faculty Guild Agreement, Faculty evaluation form p. 189

6.9 SLO Online System Website

6.10 Sample syllabus

6.11 Sample syllabus

6.12 Sample syllabus

6.13 Sample syllabus

6.14 Department memo

DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 1 (COMPLIANCE)

D1.1 Ch. X - Article III

D1.2 May 2017 DAS Agenda

D1.3 Adjunct Recruitment Process

D1.4 HR GUIDE

D1.5 FAQ Adjunct Hiring Process

D1.6 Recruitment Portal

D1.7 Example Template PT HEALTH (DR-1)

D1.8 List of Disciplines Posted

D1.9 Example Email to Colleges

D1.10 Example De-identified applicant list

D1.11 Process for Reviewing Applicants

D1.12 New Adjunct Hiring List to date

DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 2 (COMPLIANCE)

D2.1 Evaluation Alert System User 3 0 Manual

D2.2 LACCD_EASY enhancements release - 3.0

D2.3 Evaluation Report

DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 3 (COMPLIANCE)

D3.1 Local911_2014-17 Agreement

D3.2 Signed Teamster MOU

D3.3 Deans Evaluation with SLO Assessment

D3.4 Basic Other Academic Administrator

D3.5 FORM HR E-210C LACCD Summary Evaluation of College President Academic Vice Chancellor

D3.6 Associate Dean, Strong Workforce

D3.7 Dean of Special Programs and Services

DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 4 (COMPLIANCE)

D4.1 District Technology Assessment Summary

D4.2 CCCCIO Assessment

D4.3 LACCD College and ESC IT Systems Backup and Disaster Recovery Standards and Procedures

D4.4 Administrative Regulation

D4.5 FMPOC 40J Technology Update

D4.6 Strategic Execution Plan Timeline

D4.7 Backup Plan Update Presentation and Timeline

D4.8 Backup Strategy

D4.9 LACCD IT Infrastructure and Organization Assessment

D4.10 Server Standards

DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 6 (COMPLIANCE)

D6.1 2014-2015 Audit p.82-84

D6.2 LACCD SAP Privileged Access Report

D6.3 2015-2016 Audit p.96-98

D6.4 TBA Validation Process

D6.5 CIO CSSO Joint Council Agenda 5 20 16

D6.6 Corrective Action - Audit - August 2016 Presentation

D6.7 2015-2016 Audit p.126-128

DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 8 (COMPLIANCE)

D8.1 Financial Statements

D8.2 Load Banking Memo

D8.3 Load Banking work sheet 2017

DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 10 (COMPLIANCE)

D10.1 Ch. X - Article III

D10.2 March 8 2017 Board Agenda

D10.3 March 8 2017 Board Minutes

D10.4 Ch. X - Article I

DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION 11 (COMPLIANCE)

D11.1 Admin_Reg_C_12 Previous Version

D11.2 Admin Ref C 12

D11.3 Board-Agenda December 7 2016 item C-5

D11.4 Board Minutes December 7 2016

D11.5 Board Rule Tracking

D11.6 Example Crosswalk