



Los Angeles Valley College
5800 Fulton Avenue
Valley Glen, CA 91401

Follow-Up Report

March 15, 2014

Submitted to the Accrediting Commission for
Community and Junior Colleges

Western Association of
Schools and Colleges

Table of Contents

Certification signature page.....

Statement on Report Preparation.....

Response to College Recommendation #1.....

Response to College Recommendation #2.....

Response to College Recommendation #3.....

Response to College Recommendation #4.....

Response to College Recommendation #5.....

Response to College Recommendation #6.....

Response to College Recommendation #7.....

Response to College Recommendation #8.....

Response to District Recommendation #1.....

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

Western Association of Schools and Colleges

From: Alma Johnson-Hawkins, Interim College President

Los Angeles Valley College

5800 Fulton Avenue, Valley Glen, CA 91401

I certify that there was broad participation by the campus community and believe that this report accurately reflects the nature and substance of this institution.

Signatures:

Miguel Santiago, President, Board of Trustees date

Alma Johnson-Hawkins, Interim College President date

Karen Daar, Accreditation Liaison Officer date

Michelle Fowles, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness date

Deborah Kaye, Faculty Accreditation Chair date

Josh Miller, President, Academic Senate
Chair, Institutional Effectiveness Council date

Statement on Report Preparation

In preparation for submitting this follow-up report, the College's Accreditation Liaison Officer, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, and Faculty Accreditation Chair formed an Accreditation Response Team (ART), comprised of 10 key campus leaders (faculty, staff, and administrators) knowledgeable about the issues noted in the recommendations. The team worked with College committees (Campus Distance Education Committee, Curriculum Committee, Outcomes Assessment Committee, Educational Programs Committee, and Institutional Effectiveness Council) as well as many individuals to ensure that the proper steps were taken to address the recommendations in order to meet the standards. The team solicited information and evidence from administrators, faculty, and staff at Los Angeles Valley College and the Los Angeles Community College District to write their sections of the follow-up report and collect evidence. The final report was compiled and edited by the Faculty Accreditation Chair.

An Executive Steering Committee (comprised of the College President, the three Division Vice Presidents, the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, and the Faculty Accreditation Chair) held several meetings to discuss the draft in progress and offer suggestions. A meeting was held in October to solicit feedback from campus leaders. The report was reviewed and approved by the College's Institutional Effectiveness Council (its primary shared governance body) and by the Academic Senate in February.

On February 26, 2014, the Board of Trustees' Committee on Institutional Effectiveness heard a presentation from the College and recommended approval to the full Board, which approved the report on March 12, 2014. All of the Board members received copies of the report prior to the meeting.

Response to College Recommendation 1

In order to achieve sustainable continuous quality improvement, the team recommends that the college use ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning. The team recommends that the processes:

- *Provide learning and achievement data on students enrolled in all delivery formats*
- *Fully evaluate indicators of effectiveness and make improvement based on findings*
- *Assure systematic analysis of data to inform decisions*

(Standards I.B, I.B.1, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.6.b, IV.B.2.b)

Recognizing the need for continual and systematic evaluation to improve its planning processes, the College has made a number of improvements.

Providing Achievement and Outcomes Data on Students Enrolled in Distance Education (DE) vs. Face-to-Face Classes

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness publishes key achievement data for students, disaggregated by delivery format and demographic characteristics at the course and institutional levels (**6-Year Success and Retention Report**). The College also publishes reports from accountability agencies such as the IPEDS Feedback Report, the Scorecard and links to the State Chancellor's website, which hosts a variety of public data tools allowing for disaggregation and comparison. These are accessible on the [College website](#).

The College is vetting a modified course learning outcome assessment submission form to disaggregate assessment results by delivery format (distance education vs. face-to-face). Distance education courses have always been included in the sampling for course assessments, but the form is now explicit about the reporting of results (**Draft of Form**).

The Campus Distance Education Committee (CDEC) set up a Strategic Plan workgroup to conduct a comprehensive analysis of student performance and evaluate achievement and effectiveness data to make a recommendation to the Educational Programs Committee (EPC) regarding the DE program. The data is serving as the basis for a campus Distance Education Strategic Plan that will assist LAVC to make constructive changes to that mode of delivery and set goals for the next five years for the Distance Education Program (**DE Strategic Plan Draft**).

During workgroup meetings dedicated to writing the DE Strategic Plan, committee members reviewed data related to learning and achievement on students enrolled in all delivery formats. The discussion included the need to close the performance gap between face-to-face classes and those delivered via distance education. Realizing the importance of this task, the committee established as the first goal of the strategic plan to increase student success and retention in DE courses over the five-year period of the strategic plan. In order to achieve this goal, the committee developed a multi-pronged action plan. This plan includes:

- Increasing student preparedness and readiness for the online learning environment through website tutorial and online learning orientations
- Increasing online student support by linking to current systems (e.g., online counseling and Writing Center assistance)

- Systemizing the collection of data for online learning practices and services from both faculty and students

In order to develop specific methods that address these issues, CDEC has included retention and success as a topic of discussion in meetings. During the February 2014 meeting, members identified more than a dozen operational activities faculty could implement that would assist the College in reaching this goal (**CDEC minutes February 2014**). The general consensus was that increased student success and retention would come about through the development of tactics that would increase student engagement, improve the quality of courses, and establish a stronger sense of ‘a virtual community.’ CDEC members discussed their own experiences with these methods and their willingness to adapt ones they were not familiar with. The committee is going to continue to analyze issues by drilling down on the data to look at differences between specific groups.

In addition, the new Distance Education Coordinator has met with a dean in Academic Affairs to develop a series of workshops on how to integrate these activities in a distance education class. The DE Coordinator and Director of Professional Development will be conducting individual and group training sessions for faculty on implementing these practices. In addition, these activities will be included in a best practices checklist posted to the Virtual Valley website that chairs and instructors can use to identify specific tactics to improve student success and retention. Future CDEC meetings will be devoted to continuing the discussion as well as further analysis of data to determine the effectiveness of these steps.

Using Indicators of Effectiveness and Institutional Standards

In March 2013 the College completed its vetting process and established institutional standards for student achievement (i.e. success, retention, degrees and certificates, and transfer) ([Standards Report 3/2013](#)). The College completed analysis of 10 years of student achievement data ([Data Report](#)) and discussed the implications of the standards in key campus committees (EPC, PEPC, Student Success, Team Transfer, Academic Senate, and IEC). The institutional standards were immediately incorporated into the College’s annual planning/program review and viability processes. The institutional standards for student achievement have also been integrated into the draft 2014-2020 Educational Master Plan (EMP).

As part of the annual plan process, the College requires programs and departments to compare program performance to the College average on several data points (**Annual Plan Data Module 2012-13**). Institutional standards of student achievement are now also applied at the program level through the validation of the modules and review process. With the 2012-13 cycle of annual plans, the Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee (PEPC) applied the institutional standards to its review of the modules to identify programs that were below the institutional standard in multiple areas of achievement and effectiveness. In addition to the standards, data considered include average class size, WSCH/FTEF, and status of SLO assessments and program review completion. Programs with multiple triggers were recommended for viability or self-study. Four program viability processes were initiated and are currently in progress (Low Demand/Low Completers in CTE programs, Computer Science, Photography, and Geology/Oceanography) ([Viability Report Spring 2013](#)). As part of the

process, each workgroup is looking at more detailed data on student achievement, learning outcomes, and program effectiveness. PEPC also identified additional programs as needing more in-depth review and response for institutional or programmatic improvement. PEPC will receive the completed viability reports in spring 2014. Several programs (Business, Chemistry, Education, HHLPs, and Jewish Studies) are undergoing a self-study process for specifically-identified issues related to student achievement and program effectiveness (**Department self-study memos**). PEPC will continue to monitor the status of these programs.

Comprehensive data analysis provided a foundation for the College’s current revision of its Educational Master Plan. During this review, the College discovered that it had exceeded the 2008-2013 EMP objectives for success, persistence, retention, certificate completion and transfer but fell short in degree completion (**EPC Minutes/summary**). Areas for improvement are reflected in the targets included in the draft of the 2014-2020 EMP. The EMP draft includes a longitudinal overview and analysis of institutional data such as community and demographic data, disaggregated success, retention, and persistence rates, completion data, survey data, and community economic data ([EMP Draft](#)).

The College is currently reviewing its institutional standards identified last year and evaluating how to increase performance on each toward the targets that will be identified in the 2014-2020 EMP ([Target methodology documentation](#)). Current performance is compared to institutional standards to establish the baseline data for the new plan. The vetting process will identify areas of improvement and strategies for meeting the targets and establishing priorities. The EPC will monitor the 2014-2020 EMP annually for performance on stated goals and for possible revisions. PEPC will continue to apply the new plan’s priorities and standards to evaluate program effectiveness.

Proposed Targets

	Institutional Standards	2012-13	Year 3 Goal	3 Year Change	Year 6 Goal	6 Year Change
Success	64%	68.35%	69.85%	1.50%	71.35%	3.00%
Retention	84%	86.10%	87.10%	1.00%	88.10%	2.00%
Persistence	32%	38.04%	39.04%	1.00%	40.04%	2.00%
Degree Comp	722	722	729	7 (1%)	736	14(2%)
Cert Comp	260	887	895	8(1%)	903	16(2%)
Transfers	618	742	749	7(1%)	756	14(2%)

Assuring Analysis of Data to Inform Decisions

To achieve sustainable continuous quality improvement, analysis of data to inform decision making is an integral part of how LAVC operates. Achievement data is readily accessible to the college community on the LAVC website. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness serves as a resource on campus committees and is key to the operations of several campus initiatives. Most recently, the staff has been especially active in providing analysis for the implementation and evaluation of the STEM grant, Basic Skills Initiative, and Achieving the Dream (PASS)

initiatives ([PASS Data and Reports](#)). The Office of Institutional Effectiveness is exploring technologies to assist in sustainable data collection, distribution, and analysis.

Motions submitted to the Institutional Effectiveness Council (IEC), the College's Tier 1 primary governance body, include a justification linking to the EMP and supporting data. The IEC ensures that no "naked motions" (i.e., those without appropriate data and budget implications) are considered before being sent to the College President for approval. The College is tightening up its procedures by also ensuring that submitted motions have required data attachments with analysis summaries before being posted on the web (**Examples of data analysis**).

Established institutional processes also use data. For example, data is used extensively in determining annual FTEF allocations and prioritizing objectives in enrollment management. Data sources referred to in determining annual FTEF allocation by subject include, but are not limited to:

1. Student demand patterns (includes course demand surveys) ([Survey Results May 2013](#))
2. Previous FTEF allocations by subject (six-year trend)
3. FTEF needed to support the Achieving the Dream Global Cohort initiative
4. Retention, course completion, and persistence rates
5. Number of degrees and certificates awarded during the past ten years
6. Analysis of transfer needs (specifically CSU GE)
7. Fill rates according to scheduling blocks and outside scheduling blocks
8. Fill rates in building usage
9. Average class size by department and subject (three-year trend)

In addition to the above, the college FTEF Workgroup reviewed requests for additional allocation through an enrollment management module in which departments requesting additional allocation had to align and support with data the need for any additional classes ([Annual Plan FTEF Requests](#)).

The 2012-13 annual plan modules were also used when funding sources such as Proposition 20 and block grants became available. All fiscal requests required alignment to annual goals and support (as appropriate) from outcomes assessment in order to be considered for funding. An explanation regarding how the request aligned with the goals and objectives of the EMP was also required. This information was reviewed by validators who confirmed the information presented was correct before final allocation decisions were made.

In 2012-13 the Technology Committee reviewed all requests from the technology annual plan modules and prioritized them based on a ranking system of student needs. This information was referred to when formulating the final decision on how to distribute Proposition 20 and block grant funds. Similarly, the 2013-14 year's annual modules were again reviewed by validators to ensure all resource requests aligned with the department's goals and outcomes data to inform decisions on building the next year's budget. Each divisional Vice President then formulated top priorities of currently unfunded items (including staffing hires) and presented their recommendations for prioritization to the IEC.

Annual plan modules continue to be reviewed whenever additional funding becomes available. For example, at the end of spring 2013, when the Office of Academic Affairs was able to reduce costs in one specific line item, excess funding for office supplies was then available to distribute to academic departments. Supplies were purchased and distributed only if the department's request was validated through its fiscal module.

Evaluation of the College's Achieving the Dream initiatives, being led by the [Preparing All Students for Success \(PASS\) Committee](#), is informing campus decision-making about whether or not to institutionalize these activities, consistent with its intention of continuing to 'scale up' these programs. For example, data demonstrating the success of the [Global Cohort/START](#) program led to an allocation of resources to allow it to accommodate 1,000 students in fall 2014 ([U-PASS Report November 2013](#)). Data was also used to support the decision to re-allocate funding from an eliminated program (VCAP) in order to offer more sections of Personal Development 1, Math and English courses in 2013-14.

Response to College Recommendation 2:

The team recommends that the College evaluate its institutional planning process, including hiring decisions, and ensure planning practices are integrated and aligned with resources (Standards I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, III.A.6, III.B.2.b, III.C.2, III.D.4).

The building blocks of the College's institutional planning process are its annual plan modules and their alignment to the College's Educational Master Plan (EMP). Campus committees receive completed annual plan modules for review and are responsible for self-evaluations and assessments as applied to their goal statements. Tier 2 committees review annual plan modules, considering the EMP and other related plans (e.g. Technology Plan). These committees present summary reports ([Summary Report](#)), including priorities where appropriate, for actions to be considered by the Institutional Effectiveness Council (IEC) – the College's Tier 1 primary shared governance body.

Based on annual plan submissions, Tier 2 committees compile information to create an overview of campus needs and identify trends, themes, and priorities for institutional planning and resource allocation (**Examples: EPC goals; Tech Committee priorities**). This information is then submitted to the IEC as resources for additional institutional decision making. Recommendations with fiscal impacts that are submitted from Tier 2 committees to the IEC come with budgetary analyses before being forwarded as recommendations to the College President, who then reviews each recommendation in light of the College's current fiscal responsibilities (**budget analyses**).

College planning and governance processes have been regularly evaluated since the total restructuring that took place in 2009, starting with the [Big Picture Committee](#). The IEC conducts evaluations at its annual retreat in June. At the time of the ACCJC visit in March 2013, the College had not yet conducted an evaluation for that year.

In spring 2013, the College's Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee (PEPC) conducted a thorough evaluation of the 2012-13 annual planning process. The report was reviewed and discussed at the June 2013 IEC retreat. The IEC moved to accept and act on the

recommendations in the evaluation ([Approved Motion and Evaluation of Program Planning Process](#)).

The evaluation showed that there was insufficient time for review committees to complete the work of reviewing their set of modules, and additional lead time was needed in order to be able to use the modules to inform Operational Plan development. In addition, modules with deadlines scheduled after the fiscal module deadline could not be used to inform the Operational Plan even though they may have actually had a fiscal impact on the College.

The evaluation also identified a lack of infrastructure for pulling reports in different ways, which compounded the workload of the review committees. The PEPC report recommended that to move forward, the College needed to invest in a sustainable system that enables it to more efficiently and effectively plan, evaluate, and prioritize those plans in order to better link budget to planning. As a result, the College requested and was granted additional funding from the District to develop a new online program review system to address identified gaps in the current process (**LACCD Approval of Funding**). This new system will be used during the College's 2014-15 Comprehensive Program Review cycle.

As an interim measure, the 2013-14 annual plan process was adjusted in response to some of the weaknesses identified in the evaluation report. It was decided that a consequence for departments and units with late submissions (or no submissions) would be not to consider them for prioritized over-base funding requests. In addition, the modules were streamlined to ensure that only necessary information was asked for in the annual plan format. Specifically, fiscal requests were integrated into the goals module, and for the 2013-14 planning cycle only, the total number of modules to be submitted was reduced from ten to three. (Fiscal, staffing, and goal modules were determined through evaluation to be the three constant modules to be submitted each year. Others will be included in alternating years according to the schedule recommended in the PEPC report. All three modules to be submitted for 2013-14 had the same deadline instead of each submission being staggered over several months. As a result of these improvements, participation in the process in terms of initial submissions was better than it had been previously (**Module submissions**).

The IEC, in consultation with the College President, has approved a new process linking validation of annual plan modules to budgetary augmentation requests. The new Budget Prioritization Process, which was reviewed and approved by the IEC in fall 2013, changes the way the College allocates over-base resources, including new staff hiring. The process integrates those requests into the next year's budget and more clearly aligns them with goals and outcomes assessments ([Process flow chart, calendar/timeline](#)). The IEC reviewed best practices from other colleges (**Sample rubrics**) to develop a draft rubric to be used to prioritize over-base expenditures for the resource allocation cycle (**Rubric**). The draft prioritization rubric is currently being piloted by the budget task force set up by the College President. In addition, the Academic Affairs deans, who act as validators of annual modules from academic department and service units, volunteered to apply the rubric to their recommendations for prioritization to their division vice presidents to further assess the usefulness of the draft rubric.

Approval of any fiscal request through a module is now aligned with the College's multi-year plan to balance its budget. The multi-year plan was developed in response to a District directive to become fiscally solvent during the next three years. Although the College maintains some flexibility in the proposed plan to be responsive to budgetary and enrollment trends that regularly occur in any given fiscal year, assumptions and strategies are derived from analyzed data related to institutional trends and capacity, prevailing exemplary practices, and District and State mandates ([Enrollment Management Balanced Budget and Debt Reduction Plan](#)). Planning practices assume an increase in average class size, replacement of faculty at 50% of separations, and the ability to capitalize on FTES growth.

The College also conducted a thorough review of its 2008-2013 Educational Master Plan (EMP), which acts as the college's Strategic Master Plan. The EMP guides the development of all other College planning documents, including the Facilities Master Plan, Technology Master Plan, Enrollment Management Plan, Emergency Operations Plan, Foundational Skills Action Plan, Matriculation Plan, Student Equity Plan, department/unit annual plans, and all fiscal decisions. The EMP establishes measurable indicators to monitor and evaluate each objective of the plan. Over a 12-month period, the Educational Planning Committee (EPC) surveyed 19 committees and constituency groups and seven administrative offices to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the plan. In addition, the EPC reviewed data from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness which included success outcomes (i.e., persistence, completion, retention) (**Evaluation of the EMP**). The committee found that the current document had failed to ignite the decision-making process or drive the campus to prioritize, a necessary activity when completing the difficult task of allocating resources during times of fiscal shortfalls. After face-to-face discussions with stakeholders about the preliminary EMP evaluation survey, the EPC found the following issues:

1. The four EMP goals had too many objectives and strategies.
2. Many constituents had not used this document to drive decision-making but had instead used the document as an *expo-facto* rationale.
3. The plan did not effectively integrate all college plans and initiatives.
4. College priorities could not be determined.
5. The College did not have the required infrastructure to support all of the integration and analysis necessary to meet the stated goals.

These findings helped inform the planning process for the EPC's work to revise the EMP. LAVC is now embarking on its approval of the 2014-2020 EMP, which is currently in draft form ([EMP Draft](#)) and is on track to be approved by June 2014. After a campus-wide vetting, which includes several Town Halls ([Email to campus community](#)), the IEC will examine the fiscal impact of each goal, review prioritized objectives, and confirm that the timeline for implementation is aligned with the College's budgetary cycle

The College continues to refine its faculty prioritization process to ensure that rationales for those decisions are based on data and summary reports (**HPC Prioritization Report**). Faculty requests must:

1. Be supported by data (average class size, FT/PT ratio, FTEF/FTES numbers, etc., which are provided by various areas).

2. Show the need for that specific position (that it is supported by the EMP and the department's program review, etc.).

The prioritization of divisional classified and administrative positions is performed by the respective vice presidents and the College President and is presented along with a divisional staffing plan to the Hiring Planning Committee (HPC), which forwards the plans to the IEC ([Divisional Staffing Plans](#)). Each divisional five-year staffing plan identifies the year of the proposed hire and provides a prioritized list for hiring during the next budgetary year.

The determination of whether or not to fill the prioritized position is made by the College President when building the next year's budget, taking into account retirements/separations and the need to continue cost savings. When determining faculty hires, the College President analyzes data which includes, PT/FT faculty ratios, projected retirements, faculty obligation number, recommendations from the faculty hiring prioritization list, department FTE allocations, and projected cost for replacing faculty. A newly created Position Control Report allows the College to accurately analyze hiring trends, which will further a better understanding of how to address human resource needs (**Position Control Report January 2014**). The decision to replace staff is made through careful review of divisional staffing plan documents, programmatic and institutional need, and the availability of funding to sustain the assignment. Additional staff and administrator hires are determined through the new over-base budget process described above.

A priority of the IEC, identified during multiple discussions on the College's governance structure and planning processes ([IEC Retreat Minutes](#)) is to address gaps in the College's budget process. During fall 2013, the IEC devoted a separate meeting each month to deal with budget issues. In consultation with the College President, the IEC has since determined that a separate participatory governance committee reporting regularly to the IEC on budget matters would be a better practice to address ongoing budgetary issues. The IEC created a charter to establish this reporting committee ([Budget Committee Charter](#)). The main objective of this group will be to develop processes for systematic prioritization of college-wide budget requests and evaluation of expenditures to achieve and sustain fiscal stability for the institution. As an intermediary measure before a formal shared governance committee can be convened, the College President has called on College constituencies to create a budget task force to complete one task – the prioritization of over-base requests for next year's budget ([Email on Budget Task Force](#)). The task force will bring the results of its work to the IEC as information for review and comment and will make its recommendations directly to the College President.

As part of its overarching review of the institution's planning processes, the IEC also reviews how well the Tier 2 committees that report to it are making progress toward meeting their annual goals and the status of the implementation of college plans. Each plan owner (often delegated to a Tier 2 committee) is required to submit a Report on Alignment and Progress (RAP) for that plan annually (**RAPs**). This report includes measurable outcomes, performance measures for the year, and challenges for implementation. It shows how each plan is aligned with the goals and objectives of the current EMP. In addition, all reports outline the evaluation strategy for each objective. This process facilitates communication among stakeholders. The IEC also annually reviews Tier 1 and 2 committee self-evaluations to monitor the major issues and tasks that were addressed at each meeting, monthly participation, major committee actions and achievements,

obstacles/problems with committee functions, and recommendations for improving efficiency (**Tier 2 Self-Evaluations**).

The IEC, its standing committees, and workgroups collaborate to gather feedback about the planning and decision-making processes on an ongoing basis. Modifications can be considered by the Council at any point throughout the year via formal motions by council members or IEC workgroups.

The evaluation process culminates at the annual shared governance retreat in June and may include recommended revisions to one or more components of the College's model of integrated planning and decision-making process. All approved revisions are documented with revisions to the [Planning and Decision-Making Handbook](#).

Since the IEC did not hold a winter retreat this year, an Evaluation Workgroup was convened in February 2014. The workgroup, which includes representatives from the Academic Senate and all collective bargaining units, began the process of evaluation by gathering information on the RAPs and the Tier 2 committees, such as self-evaluation forms, review of websites, interviews, etc., in order to identify gaps and issues in the process of integrating and implementing plans (**Evaluation Workgroup notes**). Once the Evaluation Workgroup completes its review, it will send a report to the IEC for final input and action, if necessary.

Response to College Recommendation 3

In order to fully meet the Standards, the college must assess and align SLOs at the course, program, and institutional levels and use the results to improve student learning and institutional effectiveness (Standards I.B, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.3.b, II.A.6.b, IV.B.2.b).

The College has implemented several policies to meet the goal of 100% course assessment and to ensure a sustainable process moving forward. The College has completed assessments for 98.4% of its courses. The College has implemented a policy not to schedule courses for spring 2013 that were unassessed as of October 1, 2013. Courses that were not assessed by the end of the fall semester were administratively archived ([IEC Motion Dec 2013](#)). The implications of specific cases were examined and two exceptions were made. The College has also implemented a policy that new courses must be assessed within the first semester of being offered.

Improvement of student learning is the focus of each academic department's outcome assessment ([LAVC Outcomes Assessment Site](#)). Many departments report changes in curriculum and assignments to improve student success. For example:

- Through review of their assessments, science departments are now considering validating English prerequisites on specific courses while giving more writing assignments and promoting the Writing Center.
- Economics instructors have determined the need to integrate basic mathematical and geometric lessons into their curriculum.
- The Communications Department examined the use of its lab and has made appropriate adjustments into associated course content.
- Business instructors have integrated in-class assignment activities that include business-related/real-life exercises along with peer review techniques.

To improve use of assessment results in department planning, the annual plan outcomes and goals modules have been modified for the 2013-14 cycle to make links to outcomes results more explicit (**Revised outcomes and goals module**). In the goals module, for current year (2013-14) and future year (2014-15) goals, departments are asked to specify the planning item that each goal supports. The options include “outcomes assessment improvement plan.” Furthermore, under the requests for additional fiscal resources, plan owners are asked to “explain how the item meets the goals or supports an outcome assessment improvement plan.” The Outcomes module asks for a date for the next planned assessment and “How are results being used for improvement?” Areas are also asked whether or not they have “set goals or targets as part of the improvement plan” and if they are “requesting resources to implement the improvement plan.” Modules will be reviewed by the Outcomes Assessment Committee (OAC) in order to generate a campus synopsis of how results are being used for improvement. In order to improve campus infrastructure to support efficient use of SLO assessment results, the College is in the early stages of development of an electronic system for SLO submission, review, and tracking that will allow simple and systematic access to assessment results for planning and decision-making.

All Program Pathways have been assessed and summary reports have been vetted through the College’s shared governance committee structure (**Program Pathways**). The Outcomes Assessment Committee is working on ways to modify the current course outcomes assessment form to make more explicit links to the program outcome. Course-program alignment grids exist for each course (**Program Alignment Grids**). Disciplines are scheduled to review and update each of their course program alignment grids as part of the comprehensive program review process. Now that departments can review their course assessments along with their program assessments, they can more accurately determine the alignment.

Dialogue on these program SLO results and improvement plans/implementation has taken place in department and division meetings throughout the campus (**Division Meeting Notes**). Departments are able to share best practices, share common findings, and discuss other possible plans for improvement.

All College divisions’ service outcomes have gone through one complete assessment cycle. The College is conducting ongoing dialogue at the division level as well as campus wide to share the results of service outcome assessments and to address common issues raised in the first cycle of assessment (**Service Area Outcomes Dialogue October 2013**). The divisions have implemented a number of improvement plans for institutional effectiveness (**Service Outcomes Assessment Reports**).

For example:

- In response to assessing its outcome in publishing timely and accurate publications, Academic Affairs made improvements to the schedule and production process by shifting resources and responsibilities between office personnel who work on the schedule and catalog (**Academic Affairs Outcomes Report**).
- In Administrative Services, Maintenance & Operations used assessment results to improve the rate of completion of service requests (**M & O Service Outcomes Report Spring 2013**). Receiving and the Mailroom are coordinating efforts to align resources to serve faculty and staff more efficiently.

- In Student Services, based on the assessment of student application attempts, Financial Aid - introduced additional support mechanisms (e.g., Financial Aid TV and Facebook) to add a 24/7 customer service component, which resulted in more students being served outside of office hours. Based on data collected by Services for Students with Disabilities, the Student Handbook was revised and a section on self-advocacy was included. A new workshop for faculty about accommodating students with disabilities was presented on Opening Day 2013 (**SSD Outcomes Assessment Report**).

Based on the criteria provided to the ACCJC in March 2013 for the College's annual SLO report, the Commission issued a Feedback Report to judge our progress compared to other colleges (**Feedback Report**). The College has improved its performance in multiple areas since then. Most noticeably, both the number of courses and the number of programs with ongoing assessments have increased. LAVC continues to ensure authentic assessment through technical review and feedback. The College has created more opportunities for widespread dialogue. Assessment results have been incorporated into mechanisms for planning and decision-making

Response to College Recommendation 4

The team recommends that the college develop a formal definition of correspondence education that aligns with the U.S. Department of Education regulations and Commission policy and a process for determining the differences in practice between correspondence education and distance education (Standards II.A.1, II.A.2, II.A.2.c, II.A.2.d, II.A.2.e, II.A.7, II.B.1, II.B.2.c).

After receiving Recommendation #4, the Distance Education Coordinator investigated best practices regarding the delineation between distance education and correspondence courses. Taking language from U.S. Department of Education Guidelines section 602.3, the DE Coordinator identified the differences between the two types of courses. In addition, he identified the types and frequency of student contact expected in DE sections and standards regarding weekly instructor-initiated contact.

This information was shared with the Campus Distance Education Committee (CDEC) in spring 2013 (**CDEC minutes April 17, 2013**) and was circulated to various committees for feedback and suggestions. The Valley College Curriculum Committee (VCCC) also provided input and recommendations for revisions (**VCCC minutes April 24, 2013**). The committee drafted a formal policy that identified definitions of distance education and correspondence education as well standards for our online instructors to follow to ensure that their classes have the elements required in a DE class (**CDEC policy**).

The CDEC policy went through shared governance and was approved by the Institutional Effectiveness Council and the College President (**Approved Motion June 2013**).

The CDEC policy has been widely distributed and shared. It was presented to Department Chairs and Program Directors (**Chairs and Directors minutes**) and is posted on the **Distance Education page** of the LAVC website.

To ensure that instructors of DE courses are following these policy standards and adhering to the definitions in the preparation of their courses, the VCCC updated the curriculum form used for all distance education courses ([Distance Learning Course Approval Guidelines with updated Course Outline Addendum](#)).

Changes to the curriculum form include:

- Adding language defining distance education, hybrid, and correspondence courses and distinguishing among these three types of courses
- Stating that LAVC does not offer correspondence courses and providing a definition
- Distinguishing among information delivery, hybrid/in person contact, and regular/substantive contact
- Adding a statement that online courses must have regular and substantive contact as well as contact initiated by the instructor
- Providing a checklist of options for effective information delivery and regular, substantive contact
- Adding language about the criteria for submitting substantive change reports

The revised template was posted in the electronic curriculum system (ECD). The VCCC and Academic Senate both approved a motion stating that all courses currently approved for either online or hybrid delivery must be revised on the new DE form and submitted through ECD for curriculum approval in fall 2013. Courses not updated on the new DE addendum cannot be scheduled as DE or hybrid beginning fall semester 2014 ([Notification of Curricular Policy Changes](#)). Working with department chairs, the VCCC Chair made sure that all courses remaining on the DE approved list have had DE updates submitted via ECD. The majority of these DE updates were approved by the VCCC in November 2013, with 28 additional DE updates pending approval in December, with a handful to be discussed at the February meeting. No classes were scheduled for fall 2014 without a DE update submitted.

The VP of Academic Affairs holds training sessions for new department chairs on evaluation to ensure that chairs and evaluation committees are aware of the standards that have been set as they review online instructors' classes as part of their performance evaluation ([Department Chair training](#)). The College is using the new policy to make more explicit the expectations of effective contact in the faculty evaluation process.

Professional Development offered training for online instructors at workshops during Tech Fest ([Tech Fest Winter 2014](#)) and Opening Day ([Opening Day 2013 workshops](#)). The focus of these trainings is online pedagogy that includes teaching tools and innovative technologies for enhanced student-faculty interaction.

The [Virtual Valley website](#) offers information and assistance for faculty teaching DE courses. To assist department chairs in helping their faculty create robust DE courses, the [webpage for department chairs](#) posts resources such as a Best Practices Checklist, a sample ETUDES course, the CDEC policy on the difference between online and correspondence education, presentations on best practices, and a comprehensive [ETUDES Basics tutorial](#). The site also has a [webpage on evaluating online instructors](#).

LAVC has a new Distance Education coordinator, who plans to work with the Professional Development Director to design and implement a series of training sessions targeted to online faculty to ensure they are meeting the Distance Education standards. The DE coordinator will also be available to meet one on one with new and continuing online faculty before the start of the semester to review their course websites to ensure they are in compliance and to make sure the instructor is aware of expectations regarding frequency of contact. The DE Coordinator will work with department chairs to ensure that evaluation committees are aware of the standards that have been set as they review an online instructor's website for evaluative purposes. The goal is to integrate expectations of effective contact into the faculty evaluation process.

Because the evaluation process is mandated by the collective bargaining agreement, at this point in time, the DE Coordinator can only ensure that faculty and department chairs are aware of best practices and encourage them to be used. However, the DE Coordinator will forward the standards to the District Distance Education Committee (DDEC) for discussion and possible adoption at the District level. DDEC will make these standards available to the AFT and District negotiating teams to be considered for inclusion in current contract negotiations.

The DE Coordinator will be working with the Professional Development Director to provide group and one-on-one training for current and potential online instructors. The focus of these trainings will be online pedagogy that includes teaching tools and innovative technologies that can be integrated into online classes. Furthermore, there will be a session on Opening Day in fall 2014 that is specifically for current online instructors and will promote best practices for DE instruction and emphasize the elements required in a DE course.

Response to College Recommendation 5

To fully meet the Standards, the College should ensure that records of complaints are routinely maintained as required by the Policy on Student and Public Complaints Against Institutions (Standards II.B.2, II.B.2.c, II.B.3.a, II.B.4).

Student Grievances and Complaints

A grievance procedure may be initiated by students who believe they have been treated unfairly or-denied rights involving their status as students. These are generally grade grievances filed against instructors. As directed by the Los Angeles Community College District's Office of the Chancellor, the procedure for all nine colleges to follow is spelled out in Administrative Regulation E-55 ([Administrative Regulation E-55](#)). At Los Angeles Valley College, the administration of all E-55 matters is assigned to the [College Ombudsperson](#), who reports directly to the College President.

The College Ombudsperson routinely maintains all E-55-related informal and formal written complaints for all stages of the complaint process (student initiation through President's final decision). Notice to students of the informal and formal protocols for Student Grievances under Administrative Regulation E-55 is updated regularly and clearly publicized in each [Schedule of Classes](#), the [College Catalog](#), and on the [College website](#). Students and the public are also able to go directly to college divisions/departments, ensuring broad-based access.

Public Complaints

Members of the public have ample opportunity to express any concern, complaint, or compliment through each division of the College through a long-standing practice of providing the public with “walk-in” customer service. The [Office of Academic Affairs](#), [Office of Administrative Services](#), [Office of Student Services](#), and [Office of the President](#) provide the public with the opportunity to have their concerns or complaints heard in person or by completing a written complaint form. Staff members are trained on how to take complaints over the phone and when individuals appear in person. Written complaints are reviewed by staff, and if they cannot be resolved at department levels, they are then forwarded to the Office of Ombudsperson for review/resolution. Oral complaints are accepted, logged, and handled in the same manner.

Complaints of Alleged Prohibited Discrimination and Harassment

In fall 2012, the Los Angeles Community College District directed its colleges that all complaints of this nature be referred to the LACCD District Office, Office of Diversity Programs as a centralized approach and consolidation of resources. After the closure of the College’s Compliance Office in fall 2012, all complaints of alleged prohibited discrimination and harassment from students and/or employees have been referred to the [Office of Diversity Programs](#). Its website lists information about filing complaints, including complaint forms.

All files collected prior to fall 2012 were shipped to and received by the Office of Diversity Programs in January 2013. Notice of the change in filing procedures was, and continues to be, widely publicized to students, employees, and the public in multiple locations on the College website, in every published Schedule of Classes and College Catalog, and on hard copy flyers, which were prominently posted on campus (**Office of Diversity Policy and Procedures**).

As of March 2013, there were 15 formal complaints lodged against the College since 2008. The District Office informed the College that in 2013, there were five complaints filed, four unsubstantiated (**LAVC Complaints 2013**). Those files are properly maintained by the Office of Diversity Programs.

Other Student Complaints

The Offices of Academic Affairs, Administrative Services, and Student Services maintain and regularly assess formal (written) student and public complaints regarding instruction, other academic issues, and facilities. Each department has developed its own complaint form for students (**Academic Affairs Student Complaint Form**, **Admin Services Student Complaint Form**, **Student Services Complaint Form**, **Presidents Office Complaint Form**). Upon intake review, staff members assist students by referring the complaint to the appropriate supervisor for resolution.

Occasionally, students will also contact the College President directly with their concerns and/or complaints. The Office of the President refers individuals to the College Ombudsperson for review and resolution.

Due to a miscommunication about the nature of the visiting team’s request while on campus, the team members were provided with a summarized list of complaints on file at the District Office

instead of the actual hard copy files. These files will be made available for review by the next visiting team.

Since receiving Recommendation 5, the College has taken this opportunity to implement a number of improvements:

- Strengthened Communications: Since complaints of unlawful discrimination and/or sexual harassment are no longer managed at the campus level, a formal process has been established between the District's Office of Diversity Programs and the LAVC Office of Ombudsperson to strengthen communication channels. The District Office will send regular reports to the Ombudsperson with a list of individuals who have submitted written complaints against the College.
- Expansion of the Office of Ombudsperson: The Office of Ombudsperson will become the clearinghouse for all student and public complaints. It will be responsible for ensuring that all Division complaint processes, both hard copy and electronic, are routinely and regularly maintained for quality control, tracking, and service outcomes assessment. New online resources for faculty are updated and posted on the Ombudsperson webpage to train faculty on classroom management techniques, such as how to recognize when students are in distress. The College Ombudsperson will now act as the primary contact for the Commission and accreditation teams requesting a physical or electronic review of complaints in the College's possession or in the possession of the Office of Diversity Programs.
- Enhanced Departmental and Division Processes: [The Office of Academic Affairs](#) launched a new online classroom complaint process using Survey Monkey (**Online Complaint Form**) and updated its webpage by adding an additional element to the Current Students page. These changes allow students, at a glance, to access six live links on how to resolve complaints and/or issues of concern as well as access important consumer information. [The Office of Administrative Services](#) and [The Office of Student Services](#) have updated their webpages to allow students to express issues of concern and/or complaints. Complete online access is also provided to the public on the College website, located on the front page within one click under [Policies & Disclosures](#).
- Institutional Oversight: Through regular reports from the College Ombudsperson, the College President is made aware of any trends or repetitive complaint patterns that may be occurring in the divisions so that steps may be taken to resolve any recurring problems ([President's Office Flow Chart for Complaints](#)).

The College ensures that records of complaints, regardless of a complainant's issue or the physical location of initiation, are routinely maintained. The College has enhanced its efficiency in this area by implementing improvements to its internal complaint processes, initiating a collaborative communication channel between the College Ombudsperson and the District Office of Diversity Programs, and expanding the scope of the Office of Ombudsperson.

College Recommendation 6:

To fully meet the Standards, the College should ensure that all employee performance evaluations are conducted in a timely basis in accordance with the employee contracts (Standard III.A.1.b).

The Los Angeles Community College District recognizes six collective bargaining units and Collective Bargaining Agreements (CBAs). Classified employee evaluations are conducted annually, on the employee's birthday. Academic administrators' evaluations are also done annually, on the date when the position was assigned. The process for faculty evaluations is more complex, based on employment categories (Articles 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, and 42). Notices that evaluations are due are sent from the District's SAP system to the designated supervisors in the Classified and Academic Dean's Units.

Faculty

The Office of Academic Affairs is the repository for all faculty evaluations (adjunct, probationary, limited, and tenured) and adheres to the processes outlined in the faculty CBA. Evaluation notices for limited, probationary, adjunct, and tenured faculty are sent directly to the department chairs and the supervising deans. Deans work with department chairs to facilitate timely submission. Academic Affairs maintains a database by department with the type of evaluation and the due date, which is available in the Academic Affairs Office. Deans meet with department chairs regarding the formation of evaluation committees and monitor the process to ensure follow-through. Evaluation plans go to the VP for approval.

Academic Deans

Depending on the division, the Office of the Vice President and/or President is the repository for all dean evaluations and adheres to their CBA. When the employee's yearly evaluation becomes due, notice is sent from the District Office, through the SAP system, to the designated supervisor to complete. The SAP system is programmed to email reminders until the evaluation is submitted. The Vice Presidents are responsible for tracking completion.

Classified

When the employee's annual evaluation becomes due, notice is sent from the District Office through the SAP system to the designated supervisor to complete. The SAP system is programmed to email reminders until the evaluation is submitted. The Personnel & Payroll Supervisor is responsible for tracking.

The College has made several institutional improvements to ensure consistency in evaluation of personnel:

Under the Office of Administrative Services division, the Personnel & Payroll Supervisor has created and implemented the following improvements:

1. Keeps tracking logs for permanent and probationary classified staff evaluations ([Classified Employee Performance Evaluation Report January 2014](#))
2. Follows up with managers and vice presidents on delinquent evaluations
3. Posted the policies and procedures for staff performance evaluations on the Administrative Services website.

Under the Office of Academic Affairs division, the Vice President of Academic Affairs has created and implemented the following improvements:

1. Holds area deans responsible for tracking faculty and classified staff evaluations under their supervision in coordination with the Personnel & Payroll Supervisor.
2. Assigns area deans to work with department chairs on ensuring CBA requirements for faculty and classified staff evaluations are met.
3. Regularly holds discussions on the importance of timely and contractually required faculty and classified staff evaluations throughout the academic year with the deans in staff meetings.
4. Conducts professional development training to department chairs on effective evaluation practices, referencing CBA requirements ([Department Chair training](#)).

As of January 2014, 97% of the evaluations of classified staff (211 of 218 active employees) are up-to-date ([Classified Employee Report January 2014](#)). (One of the seven whose evaluations are overdue has been on medical leave.) All administrator evaluations are current. As of February 2014, a total of 89% of faculty evaluations are current (81% of FT faculty; 91% of PT faculty) ([Faculty Evaluation Summary February 2014](#)), and the remaining evaluations will be completed by the end of spring 2014.

Response to College Recommendation 7

The team recommends that the college, in collaboration with the district, put measures in place to ensure the effective control and implementation of the bond program and that decisions related to facilities are aligned with institutional planning (Standards I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, III.B.1.a, III.B.2.a, III.B.2.b).

The Los Angeles Community College District has taken numerous actions and implemented measures to ensure efficient control and implementation of its bond program. A detailed special report addressing these actions was submitted to the Commission on April 1, 2013 ([LACCD Special Report](#)). A two-person ACCJC visiting team verified the accuracy of the report on a visit to the District Office in April 2013 and issued a report on May 7, 2013 ([ACCJC Visiting Team Report](#)). The visiting team concluded that “tremendous progress had been made” and the recommendation had been met. The District submitted a follow-up report on October 15, 2013 to document continuing actions the District had taken to ensure oversight of the construction program ([Oct 2013 follow-up report](#)). At the Commission meeting in January 2014, the follow-up report was accepted and the recommendation considered resolved ([February 7, 2014 Commission Letter](#)).

The College uses planning to inform all decisions related to the bond program, as noted in the visiting team’s report (page 32), which stated that the College Facilities Master Plan “is used to guide all processes associated with the bond program and physical resources, contributing to an inviting learning environment that is well maintained” and that “The renovation of the campus has been grounded in the EMP and guided by the Facilities Master Plan following the passage of the most recent bond, Measure J in 2008.”

In January 2012, an Independent Review Panel issued a report with recommendations to improve the District’s building program. The first recommendation was to impose a moratorium on new

projects to ensure colleges were not overbuilding and that infrastructure costs were appropriated. The moratorium did result in a delay in construction and in added costs, which troubled some on campus. However, the College responses to the District – justifications provided that eventually removed all but one of the projects from the moratorium -- were aligned with the College's Facilities Master Plan and its EMP ([Requests for release from the moratorium](#)).

Although the moratorium is officially over, the one project at LAVC that remains on hold is the Media Arts and Performing Arts (MAPA) Building. In November 2013 the District Program Management Office (PMO) and the College started a process to develop consensus and find a solution to present to the District for approval in order to begin construction of the project ([MAPA Charter November 2013](#)). Since that time, the College and PMO representatives have been holding regular meetings, and a final report and recommendation to the District is due in late February.

The Independent Review Panel was also concerned that the District's building program contingency reserves were lower than usual for a program of this size. The panel recommended that the reserve fund be augmented and that \$160 million should be placed in reserves to mitigate risks associated with the projects. A Board Resolution was approved to mandate the action ([Board Resolution](#)). Based on the total amount of Prop J funds, the College's pro-rated share was \$20.7 million.

Each college president was asked to decide how to take his/her college's share out of the planned projects. Since the Panorama City Education project was a growth project and not part of the College's Facilities Master Plan, it was rated by the LAVC Bond Work Group (BWG), comprised of the College's constituency representatives, as being #12 out of 12 projects on the College's priority list ([BWG priority list](#)). To fund the amount required for the contingency reserves, the College President agreed to transfer the funds from that project ([BWG Minutes Approving Cancellation 4/12/2012, Budget Transfer](#)).

Although the decisions to impose the moratorium and increase the reserves were out of the College's hands, the actions were taken to ensure that the construction program for the entire District would remain solvent and that college projects were adequately funded and protected from risk.

On a campus level, the BWG exercises oversight of campus construction and ensures that decisions regarding facilities are aligned with LAVC's Facilities Master Plan and institutional planning. BWG members are expected to report back to their constituencies. In addition, BWG minutes are posted on the [Bond Workgroup page](#) of the LAVC website and email notifications are pushed out to the campus on items of significance regarding construction ([LAVC Communications update on construction sequencing, 1/29/2013](#)).

Response to College Recommendation 8

To fully meet the Standards, the college should establish appropriate management and control mechanisms needed for sound financial decision-making. The Institution should ensure that it has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability with realistic plans to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences and to ensure long-term financial stability. The team

recommends that the President effectively control budget and expenditures (Standards III.D, III.D.2.c, IV.B.2, IV.B.2.a, IV.B.2.d).

The College has taken a number of actions to improve its long-term financial stability. The first substantial action was the hiring of outside financial experts, the College Brain Trust (CBT), to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the College's financial situation and develop independent recommendations on steps the College can take to bring its budget into balance. In March 2013 the consultants issued a report on their findings ([College Brain Trust Report](#)).

Using many of the recommendations from the CBT report, the College then prepared a series of reports to the Executive Committee of the District Budget Committee (ECDBC), cited in the response to District Recommendation 1. The most recent report is the Enrollment Management and Balanced Budget and Debt Reduction Plan, submitted in December 2013 ([Enrollment Management Balanced Budget and Debt Reduction Plan](#)). It describes strategies for a five-year plan that is currently being implemented to achieve a balanced budget by the third year of the plan ([Financial Stability Plan](#)). In preparing the plan, the College also considered measurement criteria cited in the District's Financial Accountability Measures ([District Financial Accountability Measures](#)) adopted by the Board of Trustees in October 2013.

Key actions the College has implemented or is in the process of implementing include:

Enrollment Management: Recognizing the financial effects resulting from changes in increased efficiencies through enrollment management, the College developed multiple strategies that focus on increasing average class size and sections offerings. To ensure proper projection of expenditures, a Five-Year Enrollment Management projection tool was developed and is being utilized. This tool improves long-term expenditure planning related to enrollment management by projecting the needed Full-time and Part-time FTEF and their associated expenditures relating to levels of efficiency ([Enrollment Management FTEF Projections](#)). Utilization of this tool allows the College to run scenarios with built-in assumptions to project FTEF and expected levels of efficiency to assist with monitoring budget expenditures related to instruction. To ensure accurate analysis and cost estimates (e.g., cost per FTEF to assess efficiency), the Academic Affairs and Administrative Services divisions collaborate on monthly projections that monitor FTEF and hour changes in credit and noncredit section offerings ([FTEF and Hours](#)).

The five-year projection provides guidance to the College's FTEF Workgroup -- a body that reports to the Educational Planning Committee (EPC) on the amount of FTEF that can be recommended for scheduling in any given fiscal year. The FTEF Workgroup reviews three-year trend data of average class size by department and subject and, considering the needs of students through review of student demand patterns, uses enrollment data ([Fall 2012 Databook](#)) to determine class offerings that meet student demand yet also increase average class size to 40 over the next three years.

The College recently initiated changes to policies on enrollment caps across departments and classroom scheduling to further ensure greater productivity. The reallocation of FTEF for spring 2014 demonstrated that these changes resulted in increased efficiency based on the attendance

monitoring received from the District (**FTEF Report**). To ensure these methods continue to be effective, the College will be monitoring efficiency on a regular basis.

In addition, the College has embarked on a thorough review of programs with low enrollments and/or a limited number of student completions. The College's Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee (PEPC) issued a Viability Report recommending review of multiple instructional programs that yield low performance on data points, including average class size, success rates, retention rates, number of program completers, WSCH/FTEF, and status in the SLO and Program Review processes (**Viability Report and Recommendations**). Four viability committees were formed and have been meeting regularly. The reports they will produce will recommend improvements as well as cost analyses for long-term planning to address any inefficiencies.

Budget Discipline: The College implemented several management and control mechanisms in the form of new policies, procedures, and reports to help exercise further control of the budget and allow for more sound financial decision making:

- To ensure that each cost center maintains a balanced budget, all purchase requisitions must have a budget print-out attached and if any line item within the cost center budget has a negative balance, the requisition will be denied ([Requisitions Budget Docs Policy](#)).
- To ensure compliance and prevent disallowance of expenditures that would affect the unrestricted fund, all purchase requisitions from Specially Funded Programs must have an expenditure certification attached ([SFP Certification Policy](#)).
- To ensure that resources are connected to planning, all budget transfers must include narrative tying the transfer to a College planning document/process or other operational need ([eBTA Budget Transfer Documentation Unrestricted](#)) and ([eBTA Budget Transfer Documentation Restricted](#)).
- To allow the President more control over expenditures, all unrestricted non-Health and Safety related procurement now goes through an extra level of scrutiny and approval by senior staff (**8-13a**). Requestors must explain how the request for procurement is connected to the College's vision, mission, core values, or an approved planning document.
- To better inform the President of budgetary over runs on a quarterly basis, a report will be issued to all Senior Administrators detailing the account lines (not related to full-time employees or adjunct faculty) that are in a negative balance, and a report will be made to the President on how each area will bring their budgets into balance immediately ([Negative Balances 12-31-2013](#)).
- To ensure proper monitoring of changes in personnel in the unrestricted fund, a Position Control Report was created and updates are made monthly to the Chair of the Hiring Prioritization Committee (HPC) and the Vice President of Administrative Services ([Position Control Report](#)).
- To enable sound financial decision making when addressing the hiring of new full-time faculty, a Full-Time Faculty Obligation calculation report was created to fully inform the President of the financial effects of hiring ([FON Scenario](#)).

Training: To increase understanding about budget issues on campus, training on budget-related topics has started to occur and will continue through the entire budgeting process. To date, trainings/discussions have explained the monthly and newly developed quarterly budget reports,

the District Budget Allocation Model and its effect on LAVC, and Prop 30/EPA and its effect on College funding ([SB 361 and EPA Training](#)). Additionally, to further promote transparency, clarity, and use of information, new forms and easy-to-read charts are distributed at committee meetings and prominently displayed on the [Administrative Services](#) web page.

Improvement in Budget Development: To promote participation in the budgeting process, the IEC dedicated a second meeting per month to discuss budget and planning issues ([IEC Motion](#)). The IEC reviewed high-level quarterly performance reports and was given the opportunity to provide input and ask questions. Council members worked on processes and procedures related to budget management and development that resulted in the creation of a budget prioritization process ([Flow Chart/Calendar](#)) and a rubric ([Rubric](#)) to prioritize over-base funding. This new prioritization process creates the link between program review annual plan modules and the allocation of over-base resources.

To further enhance the budgetary process, the IEC approved a charter for a stand-alone budget committee ([Budget Committee Charter](#)). The new committee, which will begin meeting in spring 2014, will establish benchmarks to evaluate college expenditures, review and assess budget policies, assist in the development of planning, develop recommendations for an annual balanced budget, and promote transparency and enhance understanding of fiscal matters.

To complete this year's budgeting process until the shared governance budget committee can be constituted, the College President called for a budget task force to review the top 10 prioritized requests from each of the College's four divisions (based on program review annual plan modules) and develop a recommendation for allocation. The College President will review each recommendation and amend or augment the next year's budget accordingly, while ensuring that the augmentation does not impact the overall Multi-Year Balanced Budget Plan.

Expenditure Reductions: As detailed in the Five-Year Budget Plan presented in the December 2013 report to the ECDBC, in order for LAVC to balance its budget, the College will need to reduce expenditures in excess of \$3 million dollars over the next two fiscal years. To help identify reductions, the College President convened a "mega consultation" group of college constituency leaders, conducted a general survey, and met with stakeholders who were impacted by proposed budget reductions. As a result of its efforts, the College identified \$699,991 of specific actions ([Budget Actions](#)), both revenue and expenditure-related, that it would undertake in the 2013-2014 fiscal year. The new Budget Committee will be charged with taking on the fiscal responsibility of proposing the additional reductions needed to balance the budget.

Reassigned Time: In an effort to ensure the College is as efficient as possible in its assignments, LAVC undertook a critical examination of reassigned time and created a chart showing that all but 5.6 FTE of reassigned time is contractual (required), SFP-related (no budget effect), or for department chairs ([Reassigned Time chart](#)). Additionally, the President, in an effort to determine if shared governance reassigned time was appropriate, required that all shared governance chairs who received reassigned time present a description of their duties and deliverables ([Email on reassigned time](#)). The College will continue to examine reassigned time and will include the reduction in time as part of budget discussions with the administrative team and those involved in shared governance.

Position Reduction: As noted in the CBT report, the College needs to address its extremely high percentage of budget that is associated with salary and benefits. The District Office and College administration have been working together closely since April 2013 to develop a plan for financial stability, which is described in the December ECDBC report and includes partially balancing the budget through attrition and a reduction of the College's FON ratio ([College and District Activities](#)).

Culture of Rapid Response to Budget Changes: The College is developing new processes, forms, and budgeting practices to foster a culture of fiscal responsibility. The College's Multi-Year Balanced Budget Plan focuses on attrition, the capturing of growth funding, and increased efficiencies. Given that much of the College's budget is in areas that cannot be significantly reduced, the College must turn to resource development, such as acquisition of grants or other activities that will generate revenue to offset some of its expenditures. In order to follow the recommendation that LAVC craft a budget balanced without anticipating any subsidy or distribution of District reserves, all multi-year projection tools are being prepared without the assumption of subsidy or distribution of reserves from the District ([Financial Stability Plan](#)). Nevertheless, being part of a large multi-college district allows colleges to request funding from District contingency reserves in case of an emergency or unforeseen circumstances. The accessibility of District reserves ensure an ongoing cash flow and provide a mechanism to allow colleges, even those with deficits, to meet their financial commitments.

The activities developed jointly by the College and the District are described in the response to District Recommendation 1.

Response to District Recommendation 1:

In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the Chancellor and Board put accountability measures into place to ensure the long-term fiscal stability and financial integrity of the college (Standards IV.B.1.j, IV.B.3).

The District has been working closely with the College since April 2013 to develop a structured response to LAVC's fiscal issues. The LACCD initiated a series of follow-up activities to help LAVC develop a long-term (multi-year) fiscal plan in order to balance its budget and achieve financial stability.

In February 2013, the District provided funding to secure outside fiscal expertise ([CBT Contract Proposal](#)). Consultants from the College Brain Trust (CBT) reviewed the College's spending practices and issued a comprehensive fiscal analysis report with 11 recommendations for the College to undertake in order to bring its budget into balance ([College Brain Trust Report](#)). The report was provided to LAVC in March 2013, allowing it to be included as part of the College's April 1, 2013 Institutional Special Report to the ACCJC, which laid out the College's improvement plans and course of action ([Institutional Special Report April 2013](#)).

In April 2013, the LACCD Chief Financial Officer requested that the College provide a follow-up to the 2012-13 Second Quarter Review and the Institutional Special Report ([CFO memo](#)

[April 9, 2013](#)). The College responded with the requested information, as well as a formal request for a budget augmentation and debt relief ([LAVC Response May 14, 2013](#)).

In response, on May 31, 2013, the LACCD Chief Financial Officer requested that the College:

- Present its debt relief request to the Executive Committee of the District Budget Committee (ECDBC) in preparation for review by the larger District Budget Committee (DBC)
- Describe how the recommendations from the College Brain Trust Report would be addressed
- Develop and submit a multi-year action plan to balance its budget

Consideration of the College's request for additional funding or debt forgiveness would be contingent on the ECDBC's review of the action plan ([CFO Memo May 31, 2013](#)).

In July 2013, the College responded to the CFO's memo requesting further follow-up information on the 2012-13 Second Quarter Review and the Institutional Special Report. The College response included a status update on progress in implementing the recommendations in the CBT report ([LAVC Response July 6, 2013](#)).

In July 2013, the ECDBC reviewed LAVC's deficit. The College President discussed LAVC's financial status and expenditure analysis of fiscal year 2012-13, its budget allocation for 2013-14, and its five-year plan to ensure a balanced budget within three years, based on suspension of debt repayments and District debt relief funds ([Financial Review Presentation](#)). The ECDBC reviewed the request and, in response, scheduled a special Committee meeting in August for expanded review.

In August 2013, the ECDBC undertook an in-depth review of LAVC's five-year plan and funding request and asked the CFO to respond to follow-up questions before proceeding further.

In September 2013, LAVC's College President had to take an emergency medical leave and subsequently retired. In September 2013, the District CFO responded to the LACCD Interim Chancellor and LAVC's Acting President, providing the ECDBC response to the College's five year plan and proposed funding request ([CFO memo September 12 2013](#)). The ECDBC response required the College to strengthen enrollment management processes and develop a multi-year balanced budget plan. In addition, the committee recommended that the District develop accountability measures to ensure long-term fiscal stability and financial integrity and hold all its colleges accountable for balancing their budgets. The ECDBC requested that the College resubmit the revised multi-year balanced budget plan by October 31, 2013 for consideration. In October 2013, the ECDBC reviewed its recommendations from the September CFO memo with LAVC's Interim President and the Vice President of Administrative Services.

In October 2013, in consultation with the District Budget Committee (DBC) and the District's College Presidents, the Interim Chancellor developed District Financial Accountability Measures ([District Financial Accountability Measures](#)), effective for fiscal year 2013-14 for all colleges projecting negative end-of-year balances. The measures provide a process to monitor and evaluate the financial health of LACCD colleges through specific operating standards, holding each college president responsible for his/her college's budget, including maintaining a balanced budget, reducing expenditures, developing a long-term enrollment plan, controlling personnel

assignments, developing reports and analyses, and setting aside a 1% reserve. Any college ending the year in a deficit greater than 1% of its budget or \$500,000 (whichever is less) is required to conduct an internal self-assessment, submit a financial plan to the ECDBC, and undergo quarterly review. In addition, the measures require a college experiencing three consecutive years of deficit, or a deficit of 3% or \$1 million (whichever is less) to submit a detailed recovery plan. The Board might decide to appoint a special emergency response team to monitor and regulate the fiscal affairs of a college. The Chancellor could consider a college's fiscal condition as part of the college president's annual performance evaluation and could take corrective measures, including possible non-renewal of his/her contract.

In November 2013, the District CFO met with LAVC college leadership to review the College's First Quarterly Budget/Expenditures and FTES projections. The College requested an extension of the revised plan submission. Quarterly financial status reports were then provided to the Chancellor and the Board's Budget and Finance Committee ([Budget and Finance Committee Agenda December 4, 2013](#)).

Also in November 2013, the Board's Budget and Finance Committee approved the DBC recommendation for revisions to the District's College Debt Repayment Policy. The new policy limits college annual debt repayment to 3% of the college budget allocation and suspend one year of debt repayment to colleges with new or interim presidents. The amended policy was approved by the Board of Trustees in December 2013 ([College Debt Repayment Policy December 2013](#)).

The College presented its most recent plan to the ECDBC in January 2014 ([Enrollment Management Balanced Budget and Debt Reduction Plan](#)). Response from the District is pending.