

PEER REVIEW TEAM REPORT

Los Angeles Harbor College
1111 Figueroa Place
Wilmington CA 90744

This report represents the findings of the Peer Review Team that conducted a focused site visit to Los Angeles Harbor College from March 7 - 8, 2023. The Commission acted on the accredited status of the institution during its June 2023 meeting and this team report must be reviewed in conjunction with the Commission's Action letter.

William Duncan IV
Team Chair

Table of Contents

Team Roster.....	3
Summary of Focused Site Visit	6
Team Commendations	7
Team Recommendations.....	7
Introduction.....	8
Eligibility Requirements	10
Checklist for Evaluating Compliance with Federal Regulations and Related Commission Policies.....	12
Public Notification of a Peer Review Team Visit and Third Party Comment.....	12
Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement	13
Evaluation Items:	13
Credits, Program Length, and Tuition	14
Transfer Policies	15
Distance Education and Correspondence Education	16
Student Complaints.....	17
Institutional Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials.....	19
Title IV Compliance	19
Standard I.....	21
I.A. Mission	21
I.B. Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness	22
I.C. Institutional Integrity	24
Standard II.....	26
II.A. Instructional Programs	26
II.B. Library and Learning Support Services.....	31
II.C. Student Support Services.....	32
Standard III	36
III.A. Human Resources	36
III.B. Physical Resources	39
III.C. Technology Resources	40
III.D. Financial Resources	41
Standard IV	44
IV.A. Decision-Making Roles & Processes.....	45
IV.B. Chief Executive Officer	46
Quality Focus Essay.....	53
Appendix A: Core Inquiries.....	55

**Los Angeles Harbor College
Peer Review Team Roster
TEAM ISER REVIEW**

Mr. William Duncan IV, Chair
Superintendent/President
Sierra College
5100 Sierra College Boulevard
Rocklin CA 95677

Dr. Santanu Bandyopadhyay, Vice Chair
Interim President
Woodland Community College
2300 E Gibson Road.
Woodland, CA 95776

ACADEMIC MEMBERS

Dr. Sharyn Eveland
Professor of Psychology
Taft College
29 Cougar Court
Taft CA 93268

Ms. Joanna Kimmitt
Director, Library Programs & Services
Cabrillo College
6500 Soquel Drive
Aptos, CA 95003

Ms. Joey Merritt
Reference and Instruction Librarian
Merced College
3600 M Street
Merced, CA 95340

Mr. Mike Taylor
Professor of Biology
Santiago Canyon College
8045 East Chapman Ave
Orange, CA 92869

ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBERS

Ms. Sahar Abushaban
Vice Chancellor-Business Services
Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District

8800 Grossmont College Drive
El Cajon CA 92020

Dr. Alex Adams
Senior Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness
Fresno City College
1101 East University Ave
Fresno, CA 93741

Dr. Frankie Harriss
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Kaua'i Community College
3-1901 Kaumualii Highway
Lihue HI 96766

Dr. Wendy Stewart
Dean of Counseling and Student Development
MiraCosta College
1 Barnard Drive
Oceanside CA 92056

ACCJC STAFF LIAISON

Dr. Kevin Bontenbal
Vice President
ACCJC
331 J Street, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95814

**Los Angeles Harbor College
Peer Review Team Roster
FOCUSED SITE VISIT**

Mr. William Duncan IV, Chair
Superintendent/President
Sierra College
5100 Sierra College Boulevard
Rocklin CA 95677

Dr. Santanu Bandyopadhyay, Vice Chair
Interim President
Woodland Community College
2300 E Gibson Road.
Woodland, CA 95776

Mr. Mike Taylor
Professor of Biology
Santiago Canyon College
8045 East Chapman Ave
Orange, CA 92869

Dr. Frankie Harriss
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Kaua'i Community College
3-1901 Kaumualii Highway
Lihue HI 96766

Dr. Wendy Stewart
Dean of Counseling and Student Development
MiraCosta College
1 Barnard Drive
Oceanside CA 92056

ACCJC STAFF LIAISON

Dr. Kevin Bontenbal
Vice President
ACCJC
331 J Street, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95814

Summary of Focused Site Visit

INSTITUTION: Los Angeles Harbor College

DATES OF VISIT: March 7 & 8, 2023

TEAM CHAIR: Mr. William Duncan IV

This Peer Review Team Report is based on the formative and summative components of the comprehensive peer review process. In October, 2022, the team conducted Team ISER Review (formative component) to identify where the college meets Standards and to identify areas of attention for the Focused Site Visit (summative component) by providing Core Inquiries that the team will pursue to validate compliance, improvement, or areas of excellence. The Core Inquiries are appended to this report.

A five-member peer review team conducted a Focused Site Visit to Los Angeles Harbor College on March 7 & 8, 2023 for the purpose of completing its Peer Review Team Report and determination of whether the College continues to meet Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and U.S. Department of Education regulations.

The Team Chair and Vice Chair held a pre-Focused Site Visit meeting with the college CEO on October 7, 2022, to discuss updates since the Team ISER Review and to plan for the Focused Site Visit. During the Focused Site Visit, team members met with approximately 25 faculty, administrators, classified staff, and students in formal meetings, group interviews and individual interviews. The team held one open forum, which was well attended, and provided the College community and others to share their thoughts with members of the Focused Site Visit team. The team evaluated how well the College is achieving its stated purposes, providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement. The team thanks the College staff for coordinating and hosting the Focused Site Visit meetings and interviews and ensuring a smooth and collegial process.

Major Findings and Recommendations of the Peer Review Team Report

Team Commendations

Commendation 1: The Team commends the College for its CHAMPS program for advancing student success for athletes and taking a holistic approach to providing services that enrich the social and cultural experiences of student athletes and aligning with the institution's mission (II.C.4)

Team Recommendations

Recommendations to Meet Standards:

None

Recommendations to Improve Quality:

Recommendation 1: In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends the College continues to improve the process for assessing Service Area Outcomes that includes regularly using assessment data to continuously improve student support programs and services (II.C.2)

District Commendations:

District Commendation 1: The team commends the Board and the District on the development and implementation of a Districtwide Framework for Racial Equity and Social Justice: Taking Action to Root Out Racism and Internalize Anti-Racist Policies and Practices at LACCD. The District has successfully built upon the strong legacy of social justice and equity work amongst the campuses, by embedding this framework into existing planning process, developing systems of accountability, and investing in local, regional, and statewide legislative advocacy to support statewide systemic reform to improve racial and social justice initiatives. (IV.D.5)

District Recommendations to Meet Standards:

None

District Recommendations to Improve Quality:

None

Introduction

Established in 1949, Harbor College is one of the nine colleges in the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD), the largest district in the State spanning over 882 square miles. The College was first known as “Harbor Tech” and then as “Harbor Junior College” before adopting its present name in 1965. The initial enrollment totaled 650 students, mostly male and mostly from nearby San Pedro High School. By 1965, the College had grown to approximately 5,000 students. Over the next 30 years, the campus grew to house more than 10 instructional, student services, and administration buildings.

Located at 1111 Figueroa Way in the city of Wilmington, Harbor College currently enrolls approximately 12,000 students per year serving ten area high schools. The College serves nearly 400,000 residents of Carson, Harbor City, Gardena, Lomita, San Pedro, Wilmington, and the cities located in the Palos Verdes Peninsula. The campus is located approximately 20 miles south of downtown Los Angeles and a few miles from the Port of Los Angeles.

The campus has conducted major renovations funded by the community-supported facilities bond passed in 2000. With this support, the College renovated the Fine Arts, Theatre, Nursing, and Music buildings and constructed the Northeast Academic Hall, Student Services and Administration building, central plant buildings, the PE/Wellness Center, the Child Development Center, the Science Complex, the Technology building, and the Library and Learning Resources building. The new Student Union, opened in 2019, is the most recent building added to the campus footprint. The campus is also the home of the Dr. Richard A. Vladovic Harbor Teacher Prep Academy Middle College High School (aka HTPA), which opened new facilities in 2018. A new Southeast Hall, set to open in 2026, will house the nursing program, health center, the Equity Village, and several student support service offices.

Harbor College is a designated Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) with 60% of its students identifying as Hispanic. Nearly 65 percent of the students are 24 years or younger, and approximately 55 percent of incoming students indicate their educational goal is to transfer to a four-year university. The college now employs 86 faculty, 135 staff, and 11 administrators. Educational offerings have increased to meet the ever-changing needs of the community. The College offers 24 associate degrees for Transfer, 71 Certificates, and 39 AA/AS degrees. In 2019-2020, the number of transfer degrees awarded totaled 356 and students earned nearly 1,500 AA/AS degrees. In the same academic year, students earned 691 skills certificates.

Demography, poverty level, median household income, educational attainment, and other characteristics vary greatly across the communities in the service area. Approximately two-thirds of the service area is located in the 15th City Council District of Los Angeles (Harbor City, Harbor Gateway, San Pedro, and Wilmington). According to the American Community Survey by the US Census Bureau, the total estimated population in Los Angeles City Council District 15 is almost 270,000. Approximately 24.7% of District 15 residents live below the poverty level, 32.4% are not high school graduates, and 12.9% speak limited English. The median household

income for the 15th District of Los Angeles is \$46,423 compared to an average of \$56,196 in Los Angeles County. It is estimated that 83 percent of eligible public-school students qualify for free or reduced priced meals. The large range of diversity in socio-economic status within the service area is also evident in the data revealing the median household income in the Palos Verdes area at \$150,135 is almost three times that of the Wilmington area at \$55, 847. In the cities located in the Palos Verdes Peninsula, 3.3% live below the poverty level and 99.3% are college graduates. However, the bulk of the Harbor College students come from District 15, with residents of Palos Verdes making up only approximately 3% of the total student enrollment.

Diversity of the community is also evident in the ethnic/racial demographics of the Los Angeles City Council District 15. In terms of highest level of educational attainment among adults 25 years and older in District 15, 17% have a bachelor's degree or higher, 27% have attended some college, 25% are high school graduates, and 31% report educational attainment of less than high school.

The College was experiencing enrollment declines from 2016-17. The trend was reversed in 2019-20 with significant enrollment gains. However, the global pandemic affected enrollments at Harbor College and the enrollment has declined from 2020-21 onwards. The experience of Harbor College in terms of enrollment loss was similar to the other institutions in the state. The College has taken a variety of measures to increase the enrollment and is witnessing some gains in the last few months. During the pandemic, most of the courses and services transitioned to an online format. The College has successfully transitioned student support services, including counseling, special programs and services, financial aid, and equity programs to a fully virtual format at the onset of the pandemic. Some classes are gradually transitioning into the face-to-face format as the world continues its recovery from the pandemic.

During the visit, the team noted the appreciation for the work done by the College Administration from different campus constituencies. The faculty, classified staff, and students were highly appreciative of the efforts made by the Executive Leadership to encourage teamwork and esprit de corps to bring the campus together.

Eligibility Requirements

1. Authority

The team confirmed that Los Angeles Harbor College (LAHC) is authorized to operate as a public post-secondary degree-granting educational institution. The College has been in continual operation since 1949 under the authority of the State of California and is a part of the Los Angeles Community College District. LAHC has been accredited continuously since its inception by Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

The College meets the eligibility requirement.

2. Operational Status

The team confirmed that LAHC regularly serves more than 11,000 students each year. The college is operational and has students actively pursuing degrees and certificates.

The College meets the Eligibility Requirement.

3. Degrees

The team confirmed a substantial portion of the College's educational offerings are programs leading to degrees. A significant proportion of its students are enrolled in programs that lead to degrees. The College offers more than one degree program that is two academic years in length.

The College meets the Eligibility Requirement.

4. Chief Executive Officer

The evaluation team confirmed that the Governing Board appointed Dr. Luis Dorado as the interim President of Los Angeles Harbor College on December 16, 2020. Dr. Dorado was appointed as the permanent President of LAHC by the Governing Board at their meeting on May 04, 2022. A passionate and committed educational leader, Dr. Dorado has complete authority to administer Board Policies and Administrative Regulations and is also authorized to take appropriate action to ensure the effective functioning of the institution. He is a full-time administrator working for LAHC.

LAHC is one of the nine colleges of Los Angeles Community College District. Dr. Francisco Rodriguez was appointed to the position of the Chancellor by the Governing Board in 2014.

The College meets the eligibility requirement.

5. Financial Accountability

The team confirmed that the financial reports of the College are audited by a qualified audit firm and the reports are presented regularly to the Governing Board. The College ensures compliance with Title IV regulations.

The College meets the eligibility requirement.

Checklist for Evaluating Compliance with Federal Regulations and Related Commission Policies

The evaluation items detailed in this Checklist are those which fall specifically under federal regulations and related Commission policies, beyond what is articulated in the Accreditation Standards; other evaluation items under ACCJC standards may address the same or similar subject matter. The peer review team evaluated the institution's compliance with Standards as well as the specific Checklist elements from federal regulations and related Commission policies noted here.

Public Notification of a Peer Review Team Visit and Third Party Comment

Evaluation Items:

x	The institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comment in advance of a comprehensive review visit.
x	The institution cooperates with the review team in any necessary follow-up related to the third party comment.
x	The institution demonstrates compliance with the <i>Commission Policy on Rights, Responsibilities, and Good Practice in Relations with Member Institutions</i> as to third party comment.

[Regulation citation: 602.23(b).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

√	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The College meets the regulation.

Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement

Evaluation Items:

x	The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance across the institution, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. Course completion is included as one of these elements of student achievement. Other elements of student achievement performance for measurement have been determined as appropriate to the institution's mission. (Standard I.B.3 and Section B. Presentation of Student Achievement Data and Institution-set Standards)
x	The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance within each instructional program, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. The defined elements include, but are not limited to, job placement rates for program completers, and for programs in fields where licensure is required, the licensure examination passage rates for program completers. (Standard I.B.3 and Section B. Presentation of Student Achievement Data and Institution-set Standards)
x	The institution-set standards for programs and across the institution are relevant to guide self-evaluation and institutional improvement; the defined elements and expected performance levels are appropriate within higher education; the results are reported regularly across the campus; and the definition of elements and results are used in program-level and institution-wide planning to evaluate how well the institution fulfills its mission, to determine needed changes, to allocating resources, and to make improvements. (Standard I.B.3, Standard I.B.9)
x	The institution analyzes its performance as to the institution-set standards and as to student achievement, and takes appropriate measures in areas where its performance is not at the expected level. (Standard I.B.4)

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(i); 602.17(f); 602.19 (a-e).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

√	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the Institution to meet the Commission's requirements.

Credits, Program Length, and Tuition

Evaluation Items:

x	Credit hour assignments and degree program lengths are within the range of good practice in higher education (in policy and procedure). (Standard II.A.9)
x	The assignment of credit hours and degree program lengths is verified by the institution, and is reliable and accurate across classroom based courses, laboratory classes, distance education classes, and for courses that involve clinical practice (if applicable to the institution). (Standard II.A.9)
x	Tuition is consistent across degree programs (or there is a rational basis for any program-specific tuition). (Standard I.C.2)
x	Any clock hour conversions to credit hours adhere to the Department of Education's conversion formula, both in policy and procedure, and in practice. (Standard II.A.9)
x	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission <i>Policy on Credit Hour, Clock Hour, and Academic Year</i> .

[Regulation citations: 600.2 (definition of credit hour); 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.24(e), (f); 668.2; 668.9.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

√	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The team confirmed that the College meets the credit hours and program lengths meet the minimum of 48 semester hours of total student work. These are documented in a college policy.

Transfer Policies

Evaluation Items:

x	Transfer policies are appropriately disclosed to students and to the public. (Standard II.A.10)
x	Policies contain information about the criteria the institution uses to accept credits for transfer, and any types of institutions or sources from which the institution will not accept credits. (Standard II.A.10)
x	Transfer of credit policies identify a list of institutions with which it has established an articulation agreement.
x	Transfer of credit policies include written criteria used to evaluate and award credit for prior learning experience including, but not limited to, service in the armed forces, paid or unpaid employment, or other demonstrated competency or learning.
x	The institution complies with the Commission <i>Policy on Transfer of Credit</i> .

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.17(a)(3); 602.24(e); 668.43(a)(11).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

√	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The policies are provided in the College Catalog. The College meets the regulation.

Distance Education and Correspondence Education

Evaluation Items:

For Distance Education:	
x	The institution demonstrates regular and substantive interaction between students and the instructor in at least two of the methods outlined in the <i>Commission Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education</i> .
x	The institution ensures, through the methods outlined in the <i>Commission Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education</i> , regular interaction between a student and an instructor or instructors prior to the student's completion of a course or competency.
x	The institution demonstrates comparable learning support services and student support services for distance education students. (Standards II.B.1, II.C.1)
x	The institution verifies that the student who registers in a distance education program is the same person who participates every time and completes the course or program and receives the academic credit.
For Correspondence Education:	
	The institution demonstrates comparable learning support services and student support services for correspondence education students. (Standards II.B.1, II.C.1)
	The institution verifies that the student who registers in a correspondence education program is the same person who participates every time and completes the course or program and receives the academic credit.
Overall:	
x	The technology infrastructure is sufficient to maintain and sustain the distance education and correspondence education offerings. (Standard III.C.1)
x	The institution demonstrates compliance with the <i>Commission Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education</i> .

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(iv), (vi); 602.17(g); 668.38.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

√	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the

	Institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.
	The college does not offer Distance Education or Correspondence Education.

Narrative:

The College has administrative procedures in place and the team observed a subset of online courses to verify the College meets the regulation. The College does not offer correspondence courses.

Student Complaints

Evaluation Items:

x	The institution has clear policies and procedures for handling student complaints, and the current policies and procedures are accessible to students in the college catalog and online.
x	The student complaint files for the previous seven years (since the last comprehensive review) are available; the files demonstrate accurate implementation of the complaint policies and procedures.
x	The team analysis of the student complaint files identifies any issues that may be indicative of the institution's noncompliance with any Accreditation Standards.
x	The institution posts on its website the names of associations, agencies and governmental bodies that accredit, approve, or license the institution and any of its programs, and provides contact information for filing complaints with such entities. (Standard I.C.1)
x	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission <i>Policy on Representation of Accredited Status</i> and the <i>Policy on Student and Public Complaints Against Institutions</i> .

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(ix); 668.43.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

√	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The College has established procedures and policies regarding student complaints and students can access complaint forms on the College's website. Student complaint information is also available in the College Catalog under Student Grievance Procedures. The website also includes links to the California Community Colleges Complaint Process Notices Website where students can find detailed information. The College meets the regulation.

Institutional Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials

Evaluation Items:

x	The institution provides accurate, timely (current), and appropriately detailed information to students and the public about its programs, locations, and policies. (Standard I.C.2)
x	The institution complies with the Commission <i>Policy on Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Policy on Representation of Accredited Status</i> .
x	The institution provides required information concerning its accredited status.(Standard I.C.12)

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(vii); 668.6.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

√	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The College meets the regulation.

Title IV Compliance

Evaluation Items:

x	The institution has presented evidence on the required components of the Title IV Program, including findings from any audits and program or other review activities by the U.S. Department of Education (ED). (Standard III.D.15)
x	If applicable, the institution has addressed any issues raised by ED as to financial responsibility requirements, program record-keeping, etc. If issues were not timely addressed, the institution demonstrates it has the fiscal and administrative capacity to timely address issues in the future and to retain compliance with Title IV program requirements. (Standard III.D.15)
x	If applicable, the institution's student loan default rates are within the acceptable range defined by ED. Remedial efforts have been undertaken when default rates

	near or meet a level outside the acceptable range. (Standard III.D.15)
x	If applicable, contractual relationships of the institution to offer or receive educational, library, and support services meet the Accreditation Standards and have been approved by the Commission through substantive change if required. (Standard III.D.16)
x	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission <i>Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Accredited Organizations</i> and the <i>Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV</i> .

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(v); 602.16(a)(1)(x); 602.19(b); 668.5; 668.15; 668.16; 668.71 et seq.]

Conclusion Check-Off:

√	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The College had six findings from the 2021 Audit of the Title IV Program. The team found that those findings had been addressed by the College as well as the District. The College meets the regulation.

Standard I

Mission, Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness

I.A. Mission

General Observations:

Los Angeles Harbor College demonstrates a strong commitment to a mission that promotes student learning and achievement. Evidence shows systematic review of data for purposes of determining the degree to which mission fulfillment is achieved and to inform action plans and resource allocations for improving the quality of educational programs and services.

Findings and Evidence:

Los Angeles Harbor College's mission statement describes the institution's broad educational purposes and its commitment to student learning and achievement by promoting "equity, diversity, and student success through academic programs and support services." The College serves its "diverse community" as its intended student population and identifies the types of degrees and other credentials it offers as, "associate and transfer degrees, certificates, economic and workforce development, and noncredit instruction." (I.A.1, ER 6)

Los Angeles Harbor College has placed the mission central to all planning processes through both their Collegewide Planning Model and Harbor Assessment-based Planning System model. The College uses progress towards Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs) and the Strategic Educational Master Plan goals and targets to determine efficacy of mission accomplishment. These data are published in the Annual College Profile, College Facebook page, District data dashboard, and in college surveys and reports for use to determine whether the mission directs institutional priorities to meet the educational needs of students. (I.A.2)

Program reviews provide evidence of program and service alignment with the College mission. The template for program reviews requires each program to explicitly address Standard I.A.3 within the overview. College planning models, the Strategic Educational Master Plan, and program evaluations evidence a central connection to the College mission and are used to inform and prioritize resource allocations. (I.A.3)

Through a participatory process, the mission statement is reviewed every five years. The mission was last revised spring 2018, reviewed and approved by the College Planning Council in December 2018, and by the Los Angeles Community College District Board of Trustees. The mission statement is published on the College website and within the College Catalog, Schedule of Classes, Strategic Educational Master Plan, Faculty Handbook, and other publications and planning documents. (I.A.4, ER 6)

Conclusions:

The College meets the Standard.

I.B. Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations:

LA Harbor College demonstrates its commitment to assure academic quality and institutional effectiveness through systematic, periodic evaluation of data and using it for planning processes. The College engages in dialogue about student success that is grounded in data and such dialogues are robust and pervasive. The assessment of student outcomes is comprehensive, and the information is used to improve institutional effectiveness.

Findings and Evidence:

The team found that the Los Angeles Harbor College planning model ensures that the college engages in regular and substantive dialogue about student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement. Outcomes are assessed annually at the course and service area level with dialogue about best practices and areas of improvement. Annual unit planning/program review processes at the program level include dialogue about student outcomes, student equity, and academic quality. At the institutional level, the college's participatory governance committee structure uses committees to ensure sustained, substantive, and collegial dialogue. (I.B.1)

The College defines and assesses student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services. LAHC instructional program outcomes are approved through the curriculum process and use eLumen to record their outcomes and assessments. Student and learning support services use measures from the Educational Master Plan to define and assess their Student Area Outcomes. (I.B.2, ER 11)

The LAHC Office of Institutional Effectiveness calculates the College's institution-set standards (ISS) each year using three-year averages of student performance metrics, including degree and certificate completion, transfer, and Career Technical Education (CTE) performance (licensure pass rates and job placement). Instructional programs are required to compare their outcomes to the ISS in the College's program review process. The ISS is aligned with both the college Strategic Educational Master Plan (SEMP) and the state's Vision for Success, which ensures that the metrics are appropriate to its mission. The ISS is published in the SEMP, which is published to the College's website. (I.B.3, ER 11)

The College planning model is based on using assessment data to support student learning and student achievement. Assessment across all levels is used for improvement plans and resource prioritization and allocation. (I.B.4)

The College's Harbor Assessment-based Planning System (HAPS) uses a roll-up model to measure progress in the accomplishment of its mission and meeting strategic goals and targets. Assessment and program review are the core of this system, where programs analyze disaggregated quantitative and qualitative data to identify strengths and weaknesses. In the process of continuous improvement, the College has identified the need to improve this process for student/service area assessment and has included this as a part of their Quality Focus Essay. (I.B.5)

As a part of the program review process, the College utilizes a college dashboard to disaggregate student achievement for subpopulations of students and a Los Angeles Community College District (LACCCD) dashboard to disaggregate specific support program data. Assessment of student learning outcomes in courses disaggregated by student subpopulations is in process via the recent transition to a new data management system, eLumen. These disaggregated data are analyzed as a part of the college planning model (specifically, the program review and assessment processes). Plans are created and strategies are developed with resources allocated (human, fiscal, or other) when performance gaps are identified. (I.B.6)

The college regularly evaluates its policies and practices across all areas of the institution, including instructional programs, student and learning support services, resource management, and governance processes. Instructional programs and student and learning support services are regularly evaluated as a part of the college planning model. Resource management, governance processes, and other aspects of the institution are assessed via college and district surveys. Shared governance committees evaluate their effectiveness with workgroups and annual Committee Self-Evaluation Forms. (I.B.7)

The institution communicates the results of its assessment and evaluation activities in a variety of ways. The College website and SharePoint sites provide reports, assessment data, and information about program review. Additionally, this information is presented in college committees and at College Summits. (I.B.8)

The institution engages in continuous, broad based, systematic evaluation and planning through its college planning model and the HAPS. Short-term planning and resource allocation decisions are part of the annual unit planning and program review processes. Longer-term planning is directed by the SEMP. The College is in the process of revising the resource allocation and budget development model to strengthen the connection between program review/unit planning, resource allocation, and budget development to ensure that the budget reflects the College's priorities for student success. (I.B.9, ER 19)

Conclusions:

The College meets the Standard.

I.C. Institutional Integrity

General Observations:

Los Angeles Harbor College assures clarity, accuracy, and integrity of information that it communicates to students and the public through its website and catalog. Through established policies and procedures, the College promotes honesty, responsibility, and academic integrity. The College ensures compliance with Accreditation Eligibility Requirements, Standards, and Commission Policies.

Findings and Evidence:

The team found Los Angeles Harbor College utilizing its catalog as the primary means through which they communicate information to the public and students. The College catalog is published on the College website and includes the mission statement, accurate accreditation information, and updated information regarding all of its educational programs and student support services. (I.C.1, ER 20)

The catalog is published electronically every two years with regular updates occurring via addenda and responsibility for accuracy assigned to the Catalog Committee. The team found that all catalog requirements are met. (I.C.2, ER 20)

The College communicates about the quality of its academic programs by publishing student learning and achievement metrics on the College website, College Data Dashboard, District Dashboards, and through regular presentations to the Board and its subcommittees. (I.C.3, ER 19)

The team located information about certificates and degrees including their purpose, content, course requirements, and learning outcomes within the College catalog and on the College's website. (I.C.4)

Board Policy 2410 requires periodic district review of Board Policies and Administrative Procedures. The Office of the General Council follows a triennial cycle for reviewing all Board policies. Administrative Procedure 2410 defines Administrative Procedures as those approved by the district Chancellor and these procedures also require a triennial review cycle. The *College Planning Model Handbook*, Section II was updated March 22, 2022, to further clarify district roles and responsibilities for this process. The team verified that all policies have been reviewed and revised within the last three years. The College's Committees follow a year-end evaluation process whereby they review College policies, procedures, and publications for accuracy and mission alignment. The College Planning Council and Academic Governance Committees play key roles in the development of campus-level policies. The College's committee and

participatory governance materials are published on the institution's intranet and campus policies can be found in published documents such as the *Curriculum Committee Policy Manual*. Additionally, the Academic Senate has a Senate Academic Planning and Policies Committee (SAPPC) that is responsible for the annual review of all campus academic policies. (I.C.5)

The College provides public information for both current and prospective students regarding the total cost of education in the catalog and on the college website. (I.C.6)

Board Policy 4030 for Academic Freedom and BP 5500 for Standards of Student Conduct are published in the catalog. Through these policies, the College promotes honesty, responsibility, and academic integrity assuring a commitment to academic freedom and integrity (I.C.7, I.C.8, and ER 13). An agreement with the Los Angeles College Faculty Guild further provides a framework for Academic Freedom which fosters the pursuit of knowledge and standards for faculty to remain current, fair, and objective while sharing data and information within their disciplines. (I.C.9)

Standard I.C.10 does not apply to the College, as a public, non-profit institution (I.C.10)

Standard I.C.11 does not apply to the College, as it has no foreign sites (I.C.11)

Los Angeles Harbor College agrees to comply with Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, Commission policies, guidelines, and requirements for public disclosure as evidenced by supporting documentation posted to the College's website under *Accreditation*. There is a quick access, direct link to *Accreditation* at the bottom of the institution's landing page which is replicated on all of the institution's webpages. (I.C.12, ER 21)

While complying with and conducting its external reporting and publication responsibilities, the College demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationship with external agencies. Examples include the College Catalog and the *Accreditation* website for programmatic accreditation. (I.C.13, ER 21)

Standard I.C.14 does not apply to the College, as a public, non-profit institution they have no investors or external interested parties. (I.C.14)

Conclusions:

The College meets the Standard.

Standard II

Student Learning Programs and Support Services

II.A. Instructional Programs

General Observations:

LA Harbor College provides a variety of instructional programs that are aligned with and support its mission and purpose as a higher education institution. These programs include pre-collegiate, noncredit, credit, and transfer programs. The College's instructional programs are developed through faculty led curricular processes, are of the quality and rigor expected from an institution of higher education, and are continuously improved through the regular assessment of student learning and by program review and program vitality processes. The College incorporates equity indicators in program review and decision-making processes and impressively contextualizes multicultural examples via training materials and prompts, and draws connections to cultural awareness and equity outcomes. Some program courses are offered in a variety of modalities and of differing duration in an intentional, thoughtful response to the increasing flexibility sought by their student population and while helping to ensure velocity to student certificate and degree completion. Online courses meet the criteria for substantive, frequent engagement. Praiseworthy are the pre-collegiate and noncredit instructional programs offered by the college, designed as guided pathways, and that serve as gateways to certificate and degree programs. SLOs are articulated for courses and those roll up into program and finally into institutional SLOs. The college has improved its processes for ensuring current, approved SLOs are on official course outlines and syllabi that are provided to students each semester, while the migration to eLumen has facilitated more effective, inclusive SLO assessment processes for both full-time and part-time faculty members. All of the College's degree programs contain a substantial component of general education whose philosophy and purpose is articulated in board policy, administrative procedure, and through the campus curricular processes, and are represented within six general education SLOs. Policy is in place to facilitate mobility of students while graduates completing career-technical certificates and degrees demonstrate competencies to meet industry standards and are prepared for licensure and certification examinations.

Findings and Evidence:

The team confirmed that all instructional programs are offered in fields of study consistent with the College's mission and are appropriate to higher education. The College provides instructional programs using distance education for some courses and programs and the team

confirmed the College does not provide correspondence education. All instructional programs offered by the College culminate in student attainment of identified learning outcomes and the achievement of degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education programs.

Additionally, the College provides noncredit instructional programs that are also appropriate to and consistent with the mission of the College. These noncredit instructional programs include preparation for the High School Equivalency Test. In reviewing these programs, the team verified that adult education is part of the mission, and these programs prepare learners for college level programs. The programs incorporate exposure to higher education programs and skills throughout the sequences, beginning with an orientation course, thereby providing a clear connection to higher education instructional programs. The team applauds the College for framing pre-collegiate and noncredit instructional programs as *gateways* to certificate and degree programs. (II.A.1, ER 9, and ER 11)

Both full time and part time faculty regularly engage in the process of ensuring the content and methods of instruction meet generally accepted academic and professional standards and expectations through the curriculum development and review process, through peer evaluation processes, and through submission of courses for outside review (C-ID evaluation). Through review of committee membership, participatory governance structures, and documentation of decision-making processes along with minutes of various meetings, the faculty exercise collective ownership over the design and improvement of the learning experience. Both full-time and part-time faculty also conduct systematic and inclusive program review. This process includes use of student achievement data and learning outcomes data in aggregated and disaggregated forms. The review of instructional programs includes an evaluation of the currency of content and materials. Faculty members collectively exercise ownership through recommendations for improvement in courses and programs along with recommendations for professional development opportunities through which faculty may improve skills and techniques to promote student success. (IIA.2)

The team confirmed that the College identifies and regularly assesses learning outcomes for courses (course student learning outcomes), programs (program learning outcomes), certificates, degrees, and the institution (institutional learning outcomes) using established institutional procedures. The College has officially approved, current course outlines that include student learning outcomes. The College has identified and documented student learning outcomes for courses and these are published on the College's MySIS password protected website. For each class section, students are provided a course syllabus that includes learning outcomes as reflected on the institution's officially approved course outline. Syllabi are reviewed by division chairs ensuring the required content is present and to give important feedback to the faculty. (II.A.3)

The College offers pre-collegiate level curriculum. The team verified that pre-collegiate curriculum is distinguished from college level curriculum by offering the courses in the Adult & Basic Skills Education Programs area. Pre-collegiate courses are designated as noncredit. A

separate application and orientation process is used for students seeking pre-collegiate coursework. The team further verified that the precollegiate curriculum directly supports students in learning the knowledge and skills necessary to advance to and succeed in college level curriculum. (II.A.4)

The College's degrees and programs follow practices common to American higher education and are of appropriate length. The breadth and depth of degrees and programs are appropriate to the discipline and align with practices common to American higher education. Course sequencing and time to completion follow common practices and through aggregation of course outcomes and the sequencing of course offerings, the College follows common higher education practices leading to synthesis of learning. The team verified that minimum degree requirements are 60 semester credits at the associate level while the College does not offer degrees at the baccalaureate level. (II.A.5, ER 12)

The College schedules courses in a manner that allows students to complete certificate and degree programs within a period of time consistent with established expectations in higher education. The College provides instructional programs in two traditional semesters of 18 weeks, a winter session of five weeks, and summer sessions at either five or seven weeks. Students can complete instructional programs in two calendar years if taking the recommended course work during each of the four segments. (II.A.6, ER 9)

The team confirmed the College uses delivery modes, teaching methodologies and learning support services effectively. Post-pandemic, the college is experimenting with flexible scheduling for course modality and duration to meet evolving and diverse student needs. The team confirmed that the College examines equity indicators associated with delivery modes, teaching methodology, and learning support services. Further, the College incorporates the discussion of equity indicators into the decision-making process and when to support equity in success for all students. The team was especially impressed with the ways the College both contextualized multicultural examples through training materials and prompts and provided clear connections among cultural awareness and equity outcomes. (II.A.7)

The team verified that the College validates the effectiveness of department-wide course and program examinations through documented procedures and protocols. The College documents and uses criterion for direct assessment of prior learning and has and follows processes that reduce test bias and enhance reliability. (II.A.8)

The team confirmed the College awards course credit, degrees, and certificates based on student attainment of learning outcomes. The team recognizes "learning outcomes" as opposed to "student learning outcomes" in the language of this standard. The team verified that units of credit awarded are consistent with the College's policies and reflect generally accepted norms in higher education. The team reviewed policies, procedures, the College's catalog, and course outlines of records. The team confirmed the College reflects generally accepted equivalencies in higher education and that the College follows that policy in awarding

units of credit. The policy includes conversion of clock-to-credit hours that follow Federal standards. (II.A.9, ER 10)

To facilitate mobility of students without penalty, the College has clearly stated transfer-of-credit policies and procedures articulated in Board Policy 4050 and Administrative Procedure 4050, and this information is published through both the district's website and within the College catalog. The College has, and uses, documented procedures for certifying that the expected learning outcomes for transferred courses are comparable to the learning outcomes of its own courses. This transfer-of-credit process is detailed in the Curriculum Committee's *Policy and Procedures Manual*. The team confirmed the College develops articulation agreements and those agreements are appropriate to the College's mission. (II.A.10, ER 10)

The team validated that the College has identified student learning outcomes that address communication competency, information competency, quantitative competency, analytic inquiry skills, ethical reasoning, and the ability to engage different perspectives for all College programs, along with program specific student learning outcomes. The student learning outcomes are appropriate to the program level. The team noted that student learning outcomes for certificates and degrees with the same focus appeared to be 'stackable' in a manner parallel to the College's framing pre-colligate and noncredit instructional programs as gateways to certificate and degree programs. (II.A.11)

The team reviewed requirements of degree programs and confirmed the College requires a general education component for all degree programs. The philosophy of the College regarding general education and the purpose of general education are published in Board Policy 4025, Administrative Procedure 4025, and the College's catalog. A review of minutes from Curriculum Committee meetings showed the philosophy is used when determining the appropriateness of a course for inclusion in the general education pattern. Faculty expertise, through the curricular approval process, is relied upon for determining the appropriateness of each course for inclusion in the general education curriculum. In addition, the inclusion of courses in the general education curriculum is based on competencies, in the form of course content and course objectives, for determining the appropriateness of each course in the general education curriculum. The College has four institutional learning outcomes and six general education learning outcomes. The institutional learning outcomes include a student's preparation for and acceptance of responsible participation in civil society, skills for lifelong learning, and application of learning. The College has six general education student learning outcomes that include a broad comprehension of the development of knowledge, practice, and interpretive approaches in the arts and humanities, sciences, mathematics, and social sciences. (II.A.12)

Degree programs include focused study in one or more areas of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core. The team validated that the identification of specialized courses in an area of inquiry or interdisciplinary core is based on competencies. Specialized courses in an area of inquiry or interdisciplinary core include mastery, at the appropriate degree level of theories and practices within the field of study. (II.A.13)

Graduates completing career technical certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment standards, other applicable standards, and preparation for external licensure and certification as appropriate to the program. The College reported employment outcomes for graduates of career technical certificates and degrees. Courses in certificate programs include preparation for external licensure and certification. Licensure and certification rates for graduates are reviewed during program review processes. The team confirmed the College curriculum and program development processes for career technical certificates and degrees include communication with experts who are knowledgeable on technical and professional competencies to ensure graduates meet employment and other applicable standards. Programs requiring external agency accreditation are identified and individual program accreditation status is posted on the College website. (II.A.14)

The team found the College has a documented Board Policy 4021 and Administrative Procedure 4021 for identifying programs for viability and potential discontinuation. The campus process is articulated in the *Program Review Handbook*. The College ensures appropriate arrangements so that enrolled students can complete their education in a timely manner and with a minimum of disruption. The team noticed several certificate programs had been eliminated or significantly changed recently and subsequently reviewed the College websites associated with those programs. Information about the changes to programs was available on the sites. These websites include communication of changes to the program and the actions being taken to mitigate the impact on enrolled students. (II.A.15)

The College regularly evaluates and improves the quality and currency of all instructional programs offered in the name of the institution, including collegiate, pre-collegiate, career-technical, and continuing and community education courses. The College provided evidence of the evaluation process and of improvements made because of the evaluation processes. The team reviewed evidence showing the College included modes of delivery and location as elements of the evaluation process. Efforts to improve programs and courses in order to enhance learning outcomes and achievement are systematic. (II.A.16)

Conclusions:

The College meets the Standard.

II.B. Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations:

Los Angeles Harbor College provides a robust Library and Learning Resources program. The college demonstrates its support for students by providing many services in the LLRC (Library and Learning Resource Center). The needs of students are taken into consideration through the curriculum process, inclusion of discipline faculty in the collection development process, student workshops, and the numerous tutoring opportunities in the program. Student input is encouraged via direct and college surveys.

Findings and Evidence:

Los Angeles Harbor College demonstrates its support for students by providing a cohesive and extensive student support system that includes the Library, Open Computer Laboratory, Tutoring Center, Literacy Center, Writing Center, and High Tech Center. It is obvious that they value student learning and that they support lifelong learning.

The library is open 48 hours per week including alternate Saturdays. The library provides chat service from the website through a 24/7 Coop agreement with SpringShare. This allows students 24/7 library support even when the library is not open. There are numerous other ways that the college meets student needs in this area. The college states that distance education students may also meet with librarians via Zoom and Cranium Café but since there is no verbiage that restricts these tools to distance education students, it is assumed that they are also available to any student with a computer off campus. Workshops are offered to students via zoom and faculty provide outreach to faculty about workshops to support the curriculum. The evidence provides a good cross-section of workshops for students. Library faculty work to meet the needs of the curriculum and have created information literacy sessions directed to classroom needs. The team verified during the site visit that information literacy sessions are available and publicized. (II.B.1)

The College follows the District Board Policies which ensure that the expertise of faculty and learning support services coordinators is relied upon to create a comprehensive collection of educational materials and equipment. The Division Chair of the Library is a member of the College Curriculum Committee to ensure that as curricular changes are made, the library has sufficient resources to support the curriculum and to purchase resources to meet the curricular needs. Through the curriculum process faculty inform the library of the needs of students in both online and on-campus courses. Additionally, faculty can request additional resources through the program review process. the library follows its Library Collection Development Policy that guides collection development, which is the process of selecting books, periodicals and electronic resources. (II.B.2)

Learning support services are varied and are planned to meet students at their point of need. There are a number of centers available in the LLRC, each with a computer lab attached. The Tutoring Center provides longer service hours than the library due to 24 hours of online availability. The webpages for the various support services show open hours that coordinate with library hours, and there are numerous and well-supported online services including NetTutor and Penji. Faculty and dedicated tutors provide support across the discipline. (II.B.3)

The college supports student engagement in the library and other learning support services by actively seeking student input both in its own surveys and those provided by the college. These are used to support ongoing assessment and improvement in their services through the program review process. The evidence shows that the LLRC does this well. (II.B.4)

Conclusions:

The College meets the Standard.

II.C. Student Support Services

General Observations:

The College offers comprehensive student support services that support student success, are accessible, regularly evaluated to assess student learning, and align with the mission of the institution. Services are offered both on-ground as well as online and include student-oriented co-curricular and athletic programs conducted with sound educational policy and standards of integrity. A variety of counseling services are offered, geared towards supporting student development and success, and aligned with board policy. The College has adopted and adheres to admission policies consistent with its mission to specify the qualifications of students appropriate for its program. The College regularly evaluates admission and placement instruments and practices and maintains student records permanently, securely, and confidentially in accordance with board policy.

Findings and Evidence:

The College offers comprehensive student support services that support student success and align with the College's mission and the Strategic Educational Master Plan (SEMP). Services are accessible in multiple modalities including both on-ground and online to all students and are provided in an equitable manner. The College has established a process through the Harbor-Assessment-based Planning System for aligning student area outcomes with action plans and resource requests and the SEMP (II.C.1).

The College evaluates the quality of support services through regularly assessing Service Area Outcomes (SAOs). There are specific service area assessments that show evaluation of student support services, and the provided Unit Plans show how each department identifies measurable goals and objectives that are aligned with the SEMP, identified expected outcomes, how data will be collected, and tied to resource allocation requests. Assessments utilize a variety of data sources including survey and focus group data and SAOs are incorporated in the student support program and services unit planning and program review processes. Unit planning and program review serves as a means to utilize outcomes data to evaluate program progress and towards program improvement. While Service Area Outcomes are being regularly assessed, the team noted that the outcomes of that data are not always used towards program improvement. Unit plans highlight how outcomes are aligned to the Strategic Enrollment Management Plan and also identify the types of data that programs will collect. However, the team did not find evidence of robust dialogue regarding the results of outcomes assessments and how those results are being used to continuously improve programs and services. The College has identified this as an issue and in response, the Student Services division is undergoing changes to further align Service Area Outcome assessment to Academic Affairs, provide a more robust program review process that includes assessment of strengths and areas of improvement, connecting SAOs to student learning, and an evaluation of data and service tied to continuous program improvement. (II.C.2).

Support services are reported to be available to students in a variety of modalities including both on-ground and online, however, additional evidence is needed to determine that online services are available and support student learning. There are districtwide surveys that assess the effectiveness of online support services that are also utilized in the evaluation of student support services (II.C.3).

The College's co-curricular and athletic programs are aligned to the college's mission and contribute to the social and cultural dimensions of the educational experience of its students. The College offers co-curricular and athletic programs that are conducted with sound educational policy and standards of integrity. The Athletics program provides dedicated support services for athletes through the CHAMPS program which serves as a model in the Student Services division for both holistic service to students and for utilizing assessment data towards continuous program improvement. The CHAMPS program focuses on serving students in five specific areas: Academics, Athletics, Personal Development, Career Development, and Community Service and provides support for students both outside of the classroom through dedicated support services and inside the classroom ensuring students meet critical class deadlines and maintain positive progress in their classes. The program is piloting dedicated Statistics courses for athletes to close gaps in completion of transfer-level math and integrate sports-specific data in the curriculum to make it relevant and meaningful for athletes. Additionally, the program has completed the planned revision for divisional Unit Planning for 2022-2023 that is inclusive of a program review assessment outlining the program's mission and how it aligns to the institution's mission and SEMP goals. In the plan, the CHAMPS program

identified areas of strength and improvement connected to data collected through student tracking of program components and assessing retention and completion outcomes. The program demonstrates continuous improvement by linking program evaluation directly to program improvement and resource allocation requests. The college offers a variety of on-ground and online co-curricular programs including the Associated Student Organization and retains control over programs and finances as demonstrated through BP 5400, 5420, and 5700 (II.C.4).

The College provides both on-ground and online counseling services that support student development and success aligned with BP 5110. The Counseling department offers self-service videos, in person and telephone appointments, online live chat, and educational planning resources and the opportunity for students to meet with general and/or service area counselors. To ensure timely, useful, and accurate information, new students complete the Virtual Self-Paced New Student Orientation and ConexEd is utilized as a case management, scheduling, and communication system with service data regularly assessed. Counseling faculty assist students with information regarding relevant academic requirements, including graduation and transfer policies by developing Abbreviated and Comprehensive Education Plans. The College prepares Counseling faculty through regular Division Counseling meetings, an Annual Counseling Summit, and ongoing professional development through seminars, trainings, and conferences (II.C.5).

The College has adopted and adheres to admission policies consistent with its mission to specify the qualifications of students appropriate for its program. Admission policies are published in the catalog and College website. Instructional and Counseling faculty work together to create clearly defined degree and certificate pathways. The College has organized pathways using the Transfer, Career and Academic Pathways (TCAPs) structure with pathways published on the college website in the Program Mapper. Pathways are utilized in developing Comprehensive Student Education Plans to ensure students are advised on clear pathways to complete degrees, certificates and transfer goals (II.C.6).

With the implementation of AB 705, the College utilizes a Self-Guided Placement model for new students that is embedded into the application process. The College regularly evaluates admissions and placement instruments and practices through the District Academic Senate with demonstrated discussions around AB705 and English and Math Improvement Plans including validating for effectiveness while minimizing bias (II.C.7).

The College maintains student records permanently, securely, and confidentially in accordance with BP 5040 and follows provision for secure backup of all files. The College follows BP 5040 guidelines pertaining to release of student records. During a team site visit to the college, student records were verified to be stored securely within the Admissions and Records department with limited access by appropriate personnel. During the visit, it was verified that

the college has a process for scanning records, storing physical files in a secure location as backups, and for shredding files according to established policies. The Admissions and Records office ensures that students have access to a Proxy Request Form both within the physical office and online. The college's policies are published on the district website and in the college catalog (II.C.8).

Conclusions:

The college meets this standard.

Recommendation 1

In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends the College continues to improve the process for assessing Service Area Outcomes that includes regularly using assessment data to continuously improve student support programs and services (II.C.2)

Commendation 1

The Team commends the College for its CHAMPS program for advancing student success for athletes and taking a holistic approach to providing services that enrich the social and cultural experiences of student athletes and aligning with the institution's mission (II.C.4)

Standard III

Resources

III.A. Human Resources

General Observations:

Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) and Los Angeles Harbor College (LAHC) have established appropriate policies, procedures, and rules to recruit and retain qualified faculty, staff, and administrators to carry out their educational mission. They effectively verify qualifications through their recruitment process, provide training in equal employment opportunity practices at regular intervals for search committee members, evaluate staffing levels at both the district and college levels before opening positions for application, and use multiple channels to advertise openings to attract diverse candidate pools. Professional development is offered at the district and college level, and there are multiple pathways for sharing information that represent the diverse community of employees within the college and the district. The college and district employ shared governance to assess staffing needs for academic and other support programs using a faculty prioritization process and assorted metrics for minimum staffing levels in other components. Personnel records are maintained with appropriate security and privacy. The college and district follow ACCJC Policy statements and guidelines, Educational Code, collective bargaining agreements, and Board policies and rules for recruitment, retention, and discipline of employees.

Findings and Evidence:

LAHC employs qualified administrators, faculty, and staff through policies and procedures implemented at both the college and district level. The campus-level Human Resources Department (HRD) works in conjunction with the LACCD Human Resources Department and LACCD Personnel Commission to determine job descriptions, the length of posting of open positions, determining candidate qualifications, and systems for hiring permanent, adjunct, and staff positions. Faculty and academic administrator positions are outlined according to LAHC's programmatic needs through a Notice of Intent to Hire for an open recruitment. Classified staff position eligibility pools are maintained through the LACCD Personnel Commission for hiring committees to review and make selections for open positions. LAHC submits a staffing request for vacant positions and reviews existing pools for eligibility. (III.A.1).

Candidates for open faculty positions are first screened at the district level for eligibility against the Chancellor's Office handbook for minimum qualifications before review and selection at the campus level by hiring committees. Job descriptions and job postings outline specific knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to teach the subject matter and perform other duties

appropriate to faculty roles, such as curriculum development and assessment of student learning outcomes. The HRD certifies minimum qualifications before hiring. (III.A.2).

Administrators and employees responsible for educational programs and services are first screened at the district level for eligibility against the Chancellor's Office handbook for minimum qualifications before review and selection at either the campus or district level, depending upon their role. Sufficient evidence of credentials is obtained during the recruitment process, and the HRD conducts a final certification before hiring. (III.A.3)

Based on District policy and procedure, LACCD and LAHC certify that required degrees held by faculty, staff, and other employees are from accredited institutions, and review degrees from institutions outside the U.S. for equivalency. Candidates submit official transcripts to LACCD HR for verification. (III.A.4)

Personnel are evaluated systematically and at regular intervals according to district-level policy and procedures, with appropriate documentation for any necessary follow-up after the evaluation. During the period of spring 2020 through spring 2021, the District enacted MOUs to delay personnel evaluations due to the COVID-19 pandemic, largely to account for the abrupt shift to remote work and changes in job duties and assignments. The MOUs were submitted as part of the evidence for this standard to demonstrate the need to postpone the usual timeline for evaluations. These shifts in expectations for evaluation created a significant backlog. Only 49.7% of postponed evaluations were completed for the 2021-2022 evaluation period in the usual timeframe. The college has a plan in place to complete all evaluations by December 2022, and has outlined a timeline for improvement and accountability with campus administrators and supervisors and supplied evidence for tracking submitted evaluations. The team verified the human resources evaluation tracking system, EASY, during the visit. The team also verified that the College maintains a shadow system to record if all evaluations are conducted accurately. There has been significant progress made in terms of completed evaluations. Although not 100% evaluations were completed as planned by December 2022, nearly 80% of evaluations had been completed at the time of the visit and the college is continuing to make progress on completing its plan. (III.A.5)

The Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee (FHPC) operates as a standing committee of the Academic Senate, with authority established through the collective bargaining agreement with AFT1521. It is composed of faculty from across the college that assess hiring requests for tenure-track faculty based upon the needs of the quality educational programs and mission of LAHC using data and input from departments' annual program reviews. The committee develops a ranked list of requested positions that are then evaluated by the president. The president makes final approvals, and individual departments file a Notice to Hire based upon that list. (III.A.7)

LAHC provides appropriate orientation, oversight, evaluation, and professional development opportunities for part-time and adjunct faculty through FLEX Week and Opening Day events, as well as periodic events throughout the year through the Academic Senate's Professional

Development Committee. At the district level, LACCD offers opportunities to participate in shared governance committees, Academic Senate, department meetings, and program review, along with student success activities. (III.A.8)

LAHC follows industry standards for hiring staff. For this report, the college provided evidence specific to maintenance and operations staffing levels. The team verified during the site visit that the staffing request for the entire campus is reviewed regularly in the Planning and Budget Committee. The overall staffing needs are summarized through the program review and planning process. After consolidating all the staffing needs as identified by the program review process, the committee evaluates availability of resources to fund the positions that are critical to campus operations. (III.A.9)

LACCD determines the number of administrators for each college in its district budget model for minimum staffing levels. LAHC maintains this number, hiring additional administrators where necessary for grant management. (III.A.10)

LACCD provides district-level policies and procedures for personnel through its publicly available website portal, including collective bargaining agreements and employee reporting forms. (III.A.11)

LAHC and LACCD hold the core values of "the Power of Diversity" and "Equity" among its guiding principles for policies and procedures. At the district level, there is an EEO Advisory Committee which develops and assesses the Board-approved EEO Plan. When searching for candidates for open academic positions, each college recruits using advertising that is national in scope and diverse in depth. In particular, LAHC and LACCD ensure they are following ACCJC policies on Institutional Advertising and the Policy Statement on Diversity, including EEO training at regular intervals for search committee members as well as an EEO Representative on each committee. In its evidence, the college also provides a list of district-wide advisory committees that are representative of the diverse membership of their community. The campus supports professional development events and curricula that bring all constituent groups together to learn about equity and diversity, and how the college supports these areas through its policies and procedures. (III.A.12)

LAHC maintains a code of professional ethics for all personnel that are outlined at the district level by LACCD through Board Policies and Rules, the LACCD Personnel Commission Laws and Rules, Education Code 87732, and collective bargaining agreements. These documents also outline the consequences specific to each employee classification for violating the code of professional ethics, using principles of progressive intervention and discipline as appropriate. (III.A.13)

Both LAHC and LACCD provide significant opportunities for professional development for all employees. These offerings are available to support growth in specific job responsibilities and campus priorities, as well as for professional advancement toward overarching career goals. LAHC regularly assesses these programs, having recently completed a survey to inform future

programs as the needs of students, faculty, staff, and administrators have changed during the COVID-19 pandemic. Survey data was reviewed during the site visit and was found to be extensive. (III.A.14)

Personnel records are maintained and secured at the district level with LACCD HRD. Requests to review personnel files are tracked centrally and through policies and procedures that support the confidentiality and security of the records. (III.A.15)

Conclusions:

The College meets the Standard.

III.B. Physical Resources

General Observations:

The College assures its facilities are safe and sufficient and they are constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, and security. The District annually assesses space utilization to ensure campus buildings are in safe working order. Long-range capital planning, supporting the Strategic Educational Master Plan is integrated into the Facility Master Plan. The College analyzes its operational staffing levels to ensure that it can maintain a clean working and learning environment. Based on the APPA standards, the College planned to increase its staffing levels suggested by APPA.

Findings and Evidence:

LHCC and the District Facilities Planning and Development Department (FP&D) share the responsibility for creating safe and accessible facilities, as well as annually assessing buildings, systems, and workspaces to ensure workspaces are in safe working order. An ADA Title II Transition Plan is in place to identify barriers and describes plans on how those barriers will be removed. Operational staffing levels are regularly analyzed to maintain a healthy learning environment. These analyses are reviewed along with metrics from the District to determine staffing and hiring priorities to maintain the cleanliness and aesthetics of the campus. A new Cleanliness Initiative was instituted to comply with new cleaning system standard during the COVID pandemic. Work orders are monitored for their completion and inspections are done on a district and campus level prior to the start of each semester. Evacuation maps and building emergency captains are assigned to each building to assist in emergencies. (III.B.1)

The College and the District work collaboratively to regularly evaluate facilities and equipment, and assess facilities plans for the near and long term. The College provides input on all facilities master planning through shared governance body including prioritizing the college needs which are included in the master plans. (III.B.2)

LAHC has a shared governance committee called CORE, who gives input on all facilities master plans and prioritizes the needs of the college in terms of providing safe and current learning and working environments. Processes at the college support short-term and long-term strategic plans for the construction of large-scale projects including facilities improvements and repairs. Data are collected from the college to drive resource development plans, and funding can be secured through the State scheduled maintenance program, college resources, or bonds. (III.B.3)

A policy exists to set aside a fixed amount each year from the District's unrestricted general fund operating budget to be used to address deferred maintenance and repair of existing facilities. The amount will be increased each year. The District has a shared governance body that assesses and prioritizes funding for projects and routinely monitors progress. Resource requests include the total cost of ownership as part of the full cost of the request and is considered when prioritizing resource requests. (III.B.4)

Conclusions:

The College meets the Standard.

III.C. Technology Resources

General Observations:

LA Harbor College demonstrates its support to technology through the campus' technology plan, as well as being supported by the District's Technology plan. Information and planning are communicated from the District to the college starting with the District's Office of Information Technology to the District Technology Policy, and Planning Committee and then to the college's own technology committee. The District Innovation and Technology Plan ensures that LA Harbor College's technology needs are met and supported. The college is able to maintain, secure, and utilize safe technologies. Professional development opportunities are available to all constituent groups to provide training for the college's current technologies.

Findings and Evidence:

LA Harbor College's technology is supported by a team to meet the need of all constituent groups. This team provides computing support, maintenance, technology solutions, and manages audio/visual and computer technology for the campus. The college is supported by the District's Office of Information Technology and the Technology Policy, and Planning committee, which is represented by faculty, staff, and administration. There are clear lines of communication between the District and nine campuses. In 2018 a third-party consulting firm

performed an assessment on the District's IT environment and provided a number of strengths and challenges faced by the current District IT structure. The LACCD's improvement plan addresses the third party's assessment. (III.C.1)

LA Harbor College is supported through the District's Innovation and Technology Plan, which was vetted by the Chancellor and the Technology Policy, and Planning committee, and then integrated into the planning process. Prioritizations are aligned with the college technology and District Strategic Plan. There are regular project review processes in place, with the ability to alter plans due to unforeseen circumstances. A Building User Group meets with construction teams and district managers to assure new buildings have appropriate technologies and identifies technology gaps. The District Technology Plan and the LHCC Program Review and Budget/Resource Development process aligns all planning into one resource allocation process. The existing allocation process allows for adequate technology updating and refreshing, but the Program Review and Budget/Resource Development resource allocation model improves on that. (III.C.2)

The District Academic Senate and the Office of Education Programs and Institutional Effectiveness developed an annual list of needed programs and created criteria for purchasing and prioritization to ensure that programs and services are supported. LHCC has an inventory of assets that is used in the maintenance and refresh process as well as the capability for back-up and disaster recovery. The technology resources are protected by the District's Information Security Program. Routine security operational activities are performed to ensure adequate security is consistently in place. (III.C.3)

Professional development opportunities for technology training are in place for faculty, staff, and students. Faculty are required to complete 80 hours of instruction to be certified to teach online, as well as additional courses in place to enhance this certification. Technology support, both in-person and remote, is in place and regularly reviewed and improved upon based on metrics and input from the users. IT has online support that is consistently reviewed to remain current. Departments can indicate additional training needs through their program review process. (III.C.4)

The District and LHCC work together to develop standards to make sure there is reliable access to the District infrastructure. These standards are in place, regularly reviewed and updated in order to meet institutional needs. Board Policy 3720 regulates the appropriate and acceptable use of technology resources. (III.C.5)

Conclusions:

The College meets the Standard.

III.D. Financial Resources

General Observations:

The College's mission and goals are the guiding force behind the financial planning processes that are well documented in both Board policies and administrative procedures and planning documents. The annual budget planning process is transparent and widely communicated to stakeholders. The College and the District undergo an annual audit to ensure compliance with rules and regulations. Internal controls are in place and are tested annually through the audit process. The District has established appropriate reserves to maintain fiscal stability. Multi-year budget projections are compiled and used to guide long-term financial planning and decision making. Based on a five-year financial projection, the College is projecting to have significant savings and carryover budget into the following years.

Findings and Evidence:

The District has a District Allocation Model that allocates funding among the nine colleges. The model aligns with the State's Student-Centered Funding Formula (SCFF). The funding is proportional to the college FTES. The allocation process is transparent. The District has an Administrative Procedure on reserves that provides for the District to maintain a District General Reserve of 6.5% and a Contingency Reserve of 3.5% of total unrestricted general fund revenue. Ending balance for the last 5 years was between 17% to 21%. (III.D.1)

A budget calendar is developed every year. The budget process starts with revenue projections for the following year. Each College sets its own local budget priorities to meet its goals and objectives. The annual budget is presented to the District Budget Committee for feedback during the development process. Financial information is distributed at the Budget Committee meetings, Academic Senate, College Planning Council. A unit planning process is used to determine resource allocation. The College is launching an improved program review in Spring 2022. The plan features a rubric that prioritized spending on student outcomes. The District and the College have policies and procedures in place to guide the budget development process. (III.D.2)

The Budget and Management Analysis Unit at the District level develops internal budget operational plans and provides guidance to colleges during the budget development process. The College rolled out a new Program Review and Budget/Resource development process in Spring 2022. This new process defines guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget development. These processes ensure that representative committees, councils and constituent groups are involved or consulted through the stages of the budget cycle. During the Focused Site Visit the team verified that the College uses the Budget Committee to review and provide input into campus budget plans. The campus community expressed appreciation for the transparency that the administration has provided into the budget development process. Budget training is occurring, and managers are being provided tools and support to effectively manage their budgets. (III.D.3)

The Board approved a District Financial Accountability Measures Policy to ensure sound fiscal management and provide a process to monitor and evaluate the financial health of the colleges. In 2019-20, Harbor College ended the year with a 2% deficit therefore was required to complete a Fiscal Intervention Team Action Plan (FITAP). The FITAP developed an enrollment and budget management plan for the College to follow. As a result, the college has shown a positive fund balance in FY 2021 and 2022. The District provides the Board Budget and Finance Committee with five-year forecasts of revenues, expenditures and fund balances to inform the District's next fiscal year's budget. Monthly expenditures reports are emailed to the District Budget Committee and posted on the website. (III.D.4)

The District has an internal control structure with appropriate control mechanisms through Board policies and administrative procedures. The College receives internal control audits by the Internal Audit Unit. The District regularly evaluates and updates its policies, financial management practices, and internal controls to ensure financial integrity. Financial information and planning are provided throughout the College. (III.D.5)

Financial documents, including the budget, have a high degree of credibility and accuracy as evidenced in the audit reports for the previous years. Audit reports indicated that the financial statements are accurate and credible and there were no material weaknesses or significant deficiencies. Quarterly reports are filed with the California Community College Chancellor's Office that compare the budget to the actual amounts. (III.D.6)

Audit findings are communicated to several Budget Committees and to the Board of Trustees. The results are used to evaluate and improve the District's financial management and internal control systems. For the 2019-2020 audit findings, corrective action plans were created and implemented. For the 2021-2020 audit findings, a corrective action was also created and implemented. The plans in both instances include the responsible party, due dates and status of the audit issue. The 2021-2020 also included Federal Findings, seven of which applied to the College. One finding, 2021-010 was corrected by the College and back-up documentation was reviewed. The College reported that the remaining six findings (2021-001, 2021-002, 2021-003, 2021-006, and 2021-0017) are all being worked on at the district level. (III.D.7)

The district's financial and internal control systems are evaluated and assessed annually by external auditors and internally on an ongoing basis and reported quarterly by the Vice Chancellor Chief Financial Officer. The Internal Audit Unit investigates the areas reported through the whistle blower hotline. (III.D.8)

The district has an administrative procedure on reserves to maintain a general reserve of 6.5% and contingency reserve of 3.5%. In addition, the district maintains a 2% for deferred maintenance funds and a STRS/PERS designated reserve to support increases in employer contributions rates. The district conducts a monthly cash flow analysis. The district has established accountability at the college level to ensure that the colleges are operating within its budget. (III.D.9)

Policies and procedures exist for financial aid regulations. The district has a Central Financial Aid Unit that oversees the financial aid program to ensure compliance with all applicable rules and regulations. (III.D.10)

The district creates income and cost projections on a regular basis that are used for budget planning. The District evaluates the liabilities including load banking and requires the college to submit the information each semester. All liabilities are identified in the external audit report. The District performs actuarial evaluation every two years to access OPEB liability and the District prefunds a portion of the liabilities in a trust fund. (III.D.11)

The District performs an actuarial evaluation every two years to access OPEB liability. In 2008, the LACCD Board of Trustees adopted a resolution to establish an irrevocable trust to pre-fund a portion of the OPEB liabilities. The District has been funding the trust at a 1.92% of total full-time salaries. (III.D.12)

The District does not have any locally incurred debt. (III.D.13)

Consistent with statutory oversight requirements concerning its bond initiatives, the District has formed a Citizen's Bond Oversight Committee to ensure that bond activities are in line with the intent of the bond language. Bond projects are reviewed by the Board Facilities Committee. External financial and performance audits are performed annually. (III.D.14)

The District Central Financial Aid Unit and the College Financial Aid departments monitor and manage student loans default rates, revenue, and items related to financial aid to ensure compliance with Federal regulations. (III.D.15)

Contractual agreements with external entities are consistent with the mission and goals of the College. Contracts are reviewed to ensure terms, conditions and performance standards are in the District's best interest and adhere to all local, state, and federal compliance requirements. (III.D.16)

Conclusions

The College meets the standard.

Standard IV

Leadership and Governance

IV.A. Decision-Making Roles & Processes

General Observations:

Los Angeles Harbor College (LAHC) is committed to a participatory governance structure that encourages participation in decision making processes, leading to institutional excellence. The shared governance committee structure is clearly articulated outlining the roles of each group and establishing a systematic participative process. The process is evaluated periodically to ensure its effectiveness. There are several Board Policies that ensure continued adherence to participatory governance at the College.

Findings and Evidence:

Los Angeles Harbor College's (LAHC) institutional leaders demonstrate their commitment to participatory governance processes through established practices and procedures that encourage participation in decision-making from all constituencies. The Guided Pathways initiative is a demonstration of the effectiveness of shared governance at LAHC. The Guided Pathways Committee engaged in robust descriptions about program pathways and services; the conversations were continued in shared governance committees through standing reports. (IV.A.1)

LAHC is committed to include student voice in the decision-making process. Following BP 2510, the College confers the right of appointment of student representatives in participatory governance process to the Associated Student Organization (ASO) President. Additionally, the College's Participatory Governance Handbook defines the roles and responsibilities of administrators, staff, faculty, and students in the decision-making process. Constituents that are not committee members may either ask their constituency representatives to carry forward their views or they may directly contact the co-chairs of the committees to ensure their voices are heard. (IV.A.2)

LAHC has structures in place that ensure faculty and administrators have a substantive role in institutional governance. The faculty members represent their voice through the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate President or representatives are members of each participatory governance committee. The College adopts a model of co-chairing the committees, ensuring both administrators and faculty can express their views in academic and professional matters. For example, the VP of Administrative Services provides standing reports on budget at Academic Senate meetings. The Academic Senate representative provides reports to the College Planning Council on program review and assessment. (IV.A.3)

The curriculum development process at LAHC is inclusive. Creation, modification, and deactivation of courses and programs are under the purview of the curriculum committee. The Curriculum Committee chair presents the recommendations approved at the committee to Academic Senate. (IV.A.4)

To ensure effective participation from different constituencies, LAHC purposely assigned Committee Co-Chair in areas related to the functional expertise of participants. The Plan for Accelerated College Education (PACE) underwent a viability study. Functional experts from across constituency groups participated in the study and presented their observations to Academic Senate. The Academic Senate voted on the viability of the program based on the observation of functional experts and made a recommendation to the College President. (IV.A.5)

The Participatory Governance Handbook is published on the College's website. Each committee also has its own policies and processes that are documented in committee handbooks. There are appropriate Board Policies in place that ensure vital information is distributed in a timely manner. The Planning Model Handbook of LAHC details the processes through which individual members can bring ideas forward through the shared governance channel. The institutional leaders also encourage informal practices where different constituency groups can bring ideas and such ideas are integrated into the institutional structure if found effective. Higher Education Leadership Empowerment Network (HELEN) was a program that was developed through informal processes and subsequently approved through the shared governance process. (IV.A.6)

All LAHC governance bodies periodically evaluate their policies and procedures. The Committee Evaluation Forms are used to capture the information. Additionally, surveys are conducted at the College and District levels that evaluate the integrity and effectiveness of governance and decision-making policies. (IV.A.7)

Conclusions:

The College meets the Standard.

IV.B. Chief Executive Officer

General Observations:

Los Angeles Harbor College (LAHC) has a passionate and experienced academic administrator as its Chief Executive Officer. Dr. Luis Dorado has been in the role of Chief Executive Officer of LAHC since January 2021. Initially, he was the interim President. On May 4, 2022, he was appointed as the permanent President by the Board of Governors. Dr. Dorado's full-time responsibility is to lead LAHC and he is authorized as well as empowered by the Board of Governors and LACCD Chancellor to perform his job.

Findings and Evidence:

The Chief Executive Officer of Los Angeles Harbor College's (LAHC), Dr. Luis Dorado is responsible for development of strategic master plan for the institution that would drive the budget process, resource allocation process, institutional development and facilities planning. The Chancellor of the District delegates full authority and responsibility to the Chief Executive Officer to implement District Policies and oversee campus operations. Dr. Dorado has requested and participated in a data summit to review the student success outcomes at the institution. It is evident that Dr. Dorado provides effective leadership to LAHC in planning, organizing, budgeting and assessing institutional effectiveness. (IV.B.1)

LAHC organization chart shows that the institution follows the typical organization structure in any academic institution: instruction, student services and administrative services. Each of the three areas is headed by a Vice President. All three vice presidents are qualified and experienced. Although the executive team is relatively new, all the three vice presidents have the authority to provide leadership to their respective areas. The President delegates the responsibility and authority appropriately. The three functional areas have deans, directors and managers. The organization structure is clearly articulated and followed. (IV.B.2)

LAHC has a data-driven planning model in place that is followed by the Chief Executive Officer. Evaluation and planning are driven by research and analysis of internal and external data. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness is responsible for conducting appropriate research to inform the college planning process. Educational planning is integrated with resource planning. The institutional processes ensure that resources are allocated appropriately to enable the institution to achieve its mission. Planning and resource allocation process is transparent and participatory (IV.B.3)

The President is actively engaged in the accreditation process of the institution. The President encouraged campus-wide participation in accreditation. The President also ensured an accreditation update was provided to the academic senate and college planning council regularly, so the campus community is informed of the process. (IV.B.4)

The President ensures the institution adheres to all the statute, regulations and policies set by the Governing Board. Dr. Dorado is a competent leader and has a thorough understanding of policies and procedures. Adherence to policies is discussed in the President's Council monthly. The Chancellor's Cabinet also discusses adherence to policies and procedures. (IV.B.5)

Dr. Dorado is actively involved with the community. The President routinely attends community events and festivals such as Wilmington and San Pedro Parades and Rotary Clubs. The President also meets with the publicly elected officials to ensure the campus is engaged with the community. (IV.B.6)

Conclusions:

The College meets the Standard.

IV.C. Governing Board

General Observations:

The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) has a seven-member Board of Trustees elected at-large by the citizens of the District, and one non-voting student trustee determined through an election by all enrolled students. The Board has established five Standing Committees: Institutional Effectiveness, Student Success, Budget and Finance, Legislative and Public Affairs, and Facilities Master Planning and Oversight; and one over-arching committee entitled Committee of the Whole. The Board meets monthly, and the Standing Committees meet regularly with report out to the Board at their monthly meeting. This structure allows members to be engaged in developing a foundational knowledge to facilitate building consensus for taking action at the Board meeting each month. Through established policies and procedures aligned with the District's mission, the Board has the ultimate authority for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity. The Chancellor reports directly to the Board and the Board has delegated authority to implement and administer board policies to the chancellor.

Findings and Evidence:

LACCD's Board policies outline the scope of the Board's duties and responsibilities. Board Policies and Board Rules outline Board membership, the duties and responsibilities of the Board, which include the Board's role in monitoring fiscal health, institutional performance, integrity, and educational quality, as well as the Board's committee structure. (IV.C.1, ER 7)

The governing board speaks with one voice, and once they reach a decision all members support that decision. *Board Policy 2715- Code of Ethics*, affirms the notion that the Board acts as a whole and that authority rests only with the Board and not with individual Board members. (IV.C.2)

Board Policy 2531 and related administrative procedures provide guidance in the selection of the chancellor. *Board Rule 10105.13* states that the Board will conduct an evaluation of the Chancellor annually. The evaluation of the Chancellor culminates with a recommendation for contract renewal. (IV.C.3)

Board Policy 2200 defines the Board's role and responsibility in protecting the public interest and affirms that the Board is an independent policy-making entity. Furthermore, *Board Policies 2710 and 2715* define the Board's responsibilities and obligations concerning conflict of interest and establish ethical rules in protecting the District from undue influence. (IV.C.4, ER7)

Board Policy 2200 defines the Board's role and responsibilities for establishing policies that are consistent with the District's mission, ensuring educational quality, integrity, and continuous improvement. The Board has established five subcommittees to assure quality and improvement in core areas including: institutional effectiveness, student success, Budget and Finance, Legislative and Public Affairs, and Facilities Master Planning and Oversight. The Board has also established a Committee as a Whole to review general and special topics of interest. (IV.C.5)

Board policies and administrative procedures are published on the District's website under "Board Rules" and can also be found on the District's Board Docs website. The District has policies and procedures in place specifying the Board's size (*Board Policy 2010 – Board Membership* and *Board Policy 2015 – Student Trustee*), duties and responsibilities (*Board Policy 2200 – Duties and Responsibilities*), structure (*Board Policy 2210 – Officers*) and *Board Policy 2220 – Committees of the Board*). Where appropriate, the District, through the chancellor, has established related administrative procedures to operationalize Board Policies. (IV.C.6)

The Board acts in a manner consistent with its policies as indicated by a review of Board minutes. The District has started the process of converting their Board Rules over to a standard used by most California Community Colleges for Board policies and administrative procedures. The Board has delegated responsibility and authority to the Chancellor for a periodic review of policies and procedures. The Chancellor has created a triennial review schedule beginning in 2023 for all policies and procedures as outlined in Administrative Procedure 2410 – *Board Policies and Administrative Procedures*. (IV.C.7)

The District keeps the Board of Trustees informed of student academic performance through a review of the data with the Board's Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success (IESS) Committee. After review and discussion of the data, the IESS periodically refers the information to the Board's Committee of the Whole. During its annual retreat the Board uses the data to establish annual goals and to update the District's strategic plan, as well as in other related plans. (IV.C.8)

As outlined in BP 2740 – *Board Education* the Board is committed to ongoing development as a Board and to a trustee education program, including a new trustee orientation. Board Members attend conferences, such as the Community College League of California (CCLC) and the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT) for professional development. The Committee of the Whole often holds in-depth sessions to allow for better understanding of major focus areas, for example budget and AB 705. Board member terms of office are outlined in BP 2100 – *Board Elections*, which provides for staggered terms to ensure continuity of leadership. (IV.C.9)

Board Policy 2745 defines the Board's annual self-evaluation process. The Board has complied with their policies as evidenced by the Board's meeting minutes (January, 2022) and the report of their findings. The Board has implemented and participated in a variety of training programs in order to improve Board performance. (IV.C.10)

The Board has adopted both a conflict-of-interest policy (*Board Policy 2710 – Conflict of Interest*) and code of ethics (*Board Policy – Code of Ethics-Standards of Practice*) policy, which assures that individual board members maintain impendence from the District and also defines a process for sanctioning an individual Board member who violates Board Policy. Also, Board members file a Statement of Economic Interest form annually. (IV.C.11)

Board Policy 2430 and *District Governance Handbook* detail how the Board delegates responsibility and authority to the chancellor to administer board policies. The Board has a

policy for evaluating the chancellor, which assures that the Board is holding the chancellor accountable for the operation of the District and the administration of Board Policies. (IV.C.12)

The Board of Trustees Special Meeting was held on June 25, 2022 where the Board discussed Board roles and responsibilities. The Board's Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success (IESS) Committee had an Accreditation 101 training on May 18, 2022. The Board of Trustees approved the ISERs on July 6, 2022. The Board has been appropriately informed and involved with the accreditation process throughout the reaffirmation process and continuing to meet accreditation standards are an on-going focus of the LACCD Board. (IV.C.13)

Conclusions:

The College meets the Standard

IV.D Multi-College Districts or Systems

General Observations:

The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) is a nine-college district. The Board of the LACCD delegates authority for administering board policies and overall operations to the chancellor. The chancellor, in turn, delegates appropriate authority to the college presidents to administer and operate each college. As part of the evidence, the District provided an accreditation matrix, which delineates responsibility for meeting accreditation standards between the colleges and the district. LACCD regularly assesses the effectiveness of its central services, its budget allocation model, and the efficacy of its district-level planning and participatory governance processes and makes changes to these systems to effectuate continuous improvement. Through its data assessment and planning processes, LACCD has maintained its leadership role in social justice and equity by adopting a districtwide framework for social justice and equity.

Findings and Evidence

Board Policy 2430 delegates executive authority to the chancellor to administer Board policies. The chancellor delegates authority to the college presidents to administer relevant board policies and related operational activities. *Board Policy 6100* delegates authority to the chancellor or his designee to oversee the general administration of District business functions. Finally, *Board Policy 7110* provides authority to the chancellor to execute personnel actions. (IV.D.1)

Board Policies 2430, 6110, and 7110 provide a clear delineation of roles and responsibilities between district and the colleges. The district and colleges administer regular surveys at the college and central services level to ensure that the needs of the colleges are being met by the district service offerings. The District works proactively with the colleges to assure that each college has adequate resources, and that there is an equitable distribution of resources among the colleges. (IV.D.2)

The district maintains a clearly defined Budget Allocation Model (BAM), which is implemented and evaluated on a three-year cycle by the District Budget Committee, a committee which includes membership from all colleges and the district office. The BAM acknowledges and accommodates the varying needs of the colleges; ensures that each college receives sufficient resources to operate and sustain the colleges and district; and is perceived as an open, fair, equitable and transparent allocation model by members of the District Budget Committee. Expenditure is adequately controlled and stays within the available budget. On a quarterly basis, projections of expenditures compared to budget are performed and reviewed in detail with the District Budget Committee; if anomalies exist or are identified, they are reconciled and agreed upon before presentation to the Board of Trustees. (IV.D.3)

Board Policy 2430 addresses delegation of authority to the college presidents. According to the policy, college presidents have full responsibility for the implementation of district and local policies. This includes organizational structure, hiring, and other critical functions. The college presidents are held accountable for their performance by the chancellor and the Board. (IV.D.4)

The colleges derive their strategic plans from a district-wide strategic plan that is updated every five years, through a participatory process that includes all colleges and the district CEO. The self-assessment indicates that the district is working to produce better alignment between the college planning processes and district plan and related communications. The district office has issued recommendations to this end including measurement and data standards

The team was impressed with the Districtwide and campus-level response to social justice and equity, which provides an example of how District system planning, and evaluation is integrated with college planning and evaluation. Recent events at the national level prompted the District and the colleges to work together to develop a districtwide framework for racial equity and social justice. The framework is heavily influenced by campus-level work and input. At the same time, the Board and the District were able to provide an operational structure and the resources necessary to support the overall framework. The structure of program review, resource allocation decisions, and the development of programs and services are all influenced by this common districtwide framework. The District has funded a districtwide equity and justice fellow to ensure that the work continues and that the colleges are supported. LACCD enjoys a well-earned reputation as a leader in social justice and equity initiatives. The Board and the District are to be commended for developing a model that could be replicated at other member institutions. (IV.D.5)

The district implemented Board Docs, an enterprise level software package, in 2019 to improve districtwide communications, and to facilitate committee operations. The chancellor communicates regularly with the colleges' academic senates, unions, as well as the college presidents through Chancellor's Cabinet and Presidents Council. The district governance and planning processes include several opportunities for cross-communication between groups.

LACCD is a large entity and the District has increased its reliance on digital communications. As an example, stakeholders now receive regular updates from the chancellor summarizing activities of the District and the colleges, including a quarterly *Governance Update* that provides a summary of all major participatory governance recommendations. (IV.D.6)

The district has regular, intentional cycles to assess and improve planning, governance, and decision-making processes. A survey is administered every two years to assess the efficacy of district-level participatory governance processes. This process culminates in results that are shared and used for future action and planning. The recent action to re-align strategic planning processes between colleges and district, and to improve communications is an example of how this assessment process is used to improve planning, governance, and decision making. (IV.D.7)

Conclusions:

The College meets the Standard

Quality Focus Essay

Harbor College identified four areas to focus on in the future to improve institutional outcomes. The four areas are well intertwined with a goal to streamline the resource allocation process and better align the process with institutional process. The team noted during the visit that there is an overall emphasis to align resource allocation with program review to impact outcomes as well as equity. Integrating four areas identified in the QFE: Guided Pathways, Student Equity, Resource Allocation, and Student Outcomes-Driven Institutional Planning, is a good aspirational goal.

Guided Pathways

Harbor College attracts a diverse body of students with different academic aspirations. The College has invested in guided pathways to clarify the path available to students. In the post-pandemic environment, ensuring students find the right path and continue to stay on the path is a challenge facing most of the institutions. Through several town halls, the campus community at Harbor College identified that a focus on guided pathways is critical to build back better post pandemic. Disaggregating the data, identifying where students face most of the challenges, and developing appropriate interventions to help students overcome the challenges are key success factors. Guided pathways will help re-engage the students in a post-pandemic world.

Student Equity

During the pandemic, students who need the community colleges the most were adversely affected in a disproportionate manner. In order to build back better, an eye on equity is essential. Integrating the guided pathways project with an emphasis to achieve equitable outcomes is a great way to re-engage students from underrepresented minorities. The focus on equity will help the campus identify and provide the resources required to be successful in college.

Resource Allocation

In order to improve the resource allocation process, Harbor College is applying for an IEPI seed grant. The commitment from the campus to learn from the peers by seeking the help of an IEPI team to visit their campus is commendable. To successfully accomplish the aspirational goals of guided pathways and equity, allocating and prioritizing resource allocation process is critical. Although the college has made advances to link resources with program review and planning, integrating this work in the institutional framework via memorializing it in QFE is appreciable.

Student Outcomes Driven Institutional Planning

As the campus emerges from the pandemic, the need and expectation of the student body is anticipated to change. Harbor College has experienced the need to offer a large number of programs and services through remote and hybrid modality – the experience of Harbor College is no different from the other campuses across the state. It is necessary to be intentional about the outcomes achieved in the post pandemic world. Quantifying and integrating student outcomes in

institutional planning will help the campus assess how well it is meeting its institutional goals in the coming years.

Overall, the four areas of focus identified in the Quality Focus Essay are relevant and timely. The ideas are complementary to each other. The emphasis to measure student outcomes via institutional planning process and aligning resource allocation model to fund the priorities should Harbor College build back better in a post pandemic world.

Appendix A: Core Inquiries



ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR
COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES
WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

CORE INQUIRIES

Los Angeles Harbor College
1111 Figueroa Place
Wilmington, CA 90744

The Core Inquiries are based upon the findings of the peer review team that conducted Team ISER Review on 10/4/2022.

William H. Duncan, IV
Team Chair

Contents

Los Angeles Harbor College
Peer Review Team Roster

Team ISER Review
10/4/2022

Mr. William Duncan IV, Team Chair Sierra College Superintendent/President	Dr. Santanu Bandyopadhyay, Vice Chair Modesto Junior College President
ACADEMIC MEMBERS	
Dr. Sharyn Eveland Taft College Professor of Psychology	Ms. Joanna Kimmitt Cabrillo College Director, Library Programs & Services
Ms. Joey Merritt Merced College Reference and Instruction Librarian	Mr. Mike Taylor Santiago Canyon College Professor of Biology
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBERS	
Ms. Sahar Abushaban Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District Vice Chancellor-Business Services	Dr. Alex Adams Fresno City College Senior Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness
Dr. Frankie Harriss Kaua'i Community College Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs	Dr. Wendy Stewart MiraCosta College Dean of Counseling and Student Development

ACCJC STAFF LIAISON	
Dr. Kevin Bontenbal Vice President ACCJC	

Summary of Team ISER Review

INSTITUTION: Los Angeles Harbor College

DATE OF TEAM ISER REVIEW: October 4, 2022

TEAM CHAIR: William H. Duncan, IV

A ten-member accreditation peer review team conducted Team ISER Review of Los Angeles Harbor College on October 4, 2022. The Team ISER Review is a one-day, off-site analysis of an institution's self-evaluation report. The peer review team received the college's institutional self-evaluation report (ISER) and related evidence several weeks prior to the Team ISER Review. Team members found the ISER to be a comprehensive, well written, document detailing the processes used by the College to address Eligibility Requirements, Commission Standards, and Commission Policies. The team confirmed that the ISER was developed through broad participation by the entire College community including faculty, staff, students, and administration. The team found that the College provided a thoughtful ISER containing several self-identified action plans for institutional improvement. The College also prepared a Quality Focus Essay.

In preparation for the Team ISER Review, the team chair attended a team chair training workshop on August 3, 2022 and held a pre-review meeting with the college CEO on August 30, 2022. The entire peer review team received team training provided by staff from ACCJC on August 31, 2022. Prior to the Team ISER Review, team members completed their team assignments, identified areas for further clarification, and provided a list of requests for additional evidence to be considered during Team ISER Review.

During the Team ISER Review, team members spent the morning discussing their initial observations and their preliminary review of the written materials and evidence provided by the College for the purpose of determining whether the College continues to meet Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and US ED regulations. In the afternoon, the team further synthesized their findings to validate the excellent work of the college and identified standards the college meets, as well as developed Core Inquiries to be pursued during the Focused Site Visit, which will occur in early March in the Spring of 2023.

Core Inquiries are a means for communicating potential areas of institutional noncompliance, improvement, or exemplary practice that arise during the Team ISER Review. They describe the areas of emphasis for the Focused Site Visit that the team will explore to further their analysis to determine whether standards are met and accordingly identify potential commendations or recommendations. The college should use the Core Inquiries and time leading up to the focused site visit as an opportunity to gather more evidence, collate information, and to strengthen or develop processes in the continuous improvement cycle. In the course of the Focused Site Visit, the ACCJC staff liaison will review new or emerging issues which might arise out of the discussions on Core Inquiries.

Core Inquiries

Based on the team's analysis during the Team ISER Review, the team identified the following core inquiries that relate to potential areas of clarification, improvement, or commendation.

Core Inquiry 1: The team seeks to better understand the college's process for evaluating institutional policies and procedures.
Standards or Policies: I.C.5
Description: a. The team saw evidence that the institution reviews college-level publications. b. More information and evidence are needed regarding the College Planning Model and the review of policies and procedures. c. Policy for periodic review exists; examples for the process are not included. d. References are made to a committee that evaluates policies annually; unclear what they are responsible for evaluating. e. Unclear about the review cycles for assessing institutional policies. f. Some examples were given, ie the curriculum subcommittee that evaluates the college catalog. This subcommittee has a clear cycle, and district-level review for AP/BP is also clear.
Topics of discussion during interviews: a. Who has responsibilities for reviewing institutional policies? b. Who has responsibilities for reviewing institutional procedures? c. What is the frequency of review for policies and procedures?
Request for Additional Information/Evidence: a. Timelines for evaluation of college's policies and procedures under the review cycle b. Parties/individuals responsible for review of different college policies and procedures

Request for Observations/Interviews:

- a. Committee with responsibility for the HAPS college planning model
- b. College Planning Council
- c. Institutional Effectiveness Committee
- d. Others responsible for review of college policies & procedures, ie executive leadership

Core Inquiry 2: The team seeks to understand how the institution documents and consistently utilizes student learning outcomes across its instructional programs and processes, including learning support services.

Standards or Policies: II.A.3, II.A.10, II.A.11, II.A.12, II.A.13

Description:

- a. Cannot verify that the official student learning outcomes (SLOs) on syllabi are the same as the SLOs in the official CORs and program descriptions. (II.A.3)
- b. The team verified that the college has a policy for transfer credit. It is unclear how the institution certifies that the expected student learning outcomes from transfer courses are comparable to learning outcomes of its own courses. (II.A.10)
- c. The team verified the institutional policy that outcomes are to be mapped and assessed in Elumen, but the team was unable to access Elumen to verify this. (II.A.11)
- d. The team verified that the college has a required general education component appropriate to its degree programs. The team was unable to verify how student learning outcomes are used to determine the appropriateness of a course's inclusion in the GE curriculum. (II.A.12)
- e. No evidence sample was provided to support the presence of GE student learning outcomes appropriate to the standard: "a student's preparation for and acceptance of responsible participation in civil society, skills for lifelong learning and application of learning, and a broad comprehension of the development of knowledge, practice, and interpretive approaches in the arts and humanities, the sciences, mathematics, and social sciences". (II.A.12)
- f. The team observed that there is a model for alignment of student learning outcomes that are mapped, however, there is lack of evidence of the model put into practice (II.A.12)
- g. The team could not find evidence that the identification of specialized courses in an area of inquiry or interdisciplinary core is based upon student learning outcomes.(II.A.13)

* The team understands the college is transitioning to Elumen and adopting a new planning process. Historical evidence for the previous process used within this evaluation cycle is acceptable, if current documentation is not yet available.

Topics of discussion during interviews:

- a. Are the official student learning outcomes as adopted used consistently throughout course syllabi, CORs, and program outcomes?
- b. If student learning outcomes are not fully defined, how are transfer courses evaluated and matched appropriately?
- c. How are general education SLOs mapped across syllabi/CORs/programs for transfer to and from other institutions?
- d.

Request for Additional Information/Evidence:

- a. Information about and documentation of the process for syllabi review within the last six years
- b. Seeking example syllabi that include student learning outcomes that match approved CORs and that CORs map to the program-level outcomes.
- c. Mapping of outcomes and their assessment in Elumen to verify connections of SLOs between syllabi, CORs, and programs *OR* historical documentation for SLOs from within the last six years
- d. Evidence that sample GE course outcomes are connected to GE program outcomes
- e. Evidence that there is a process for including SLOs in syllabi, CORs, and program descriptions (there were no SLOs on syllabi and CORs submitted as requested evidence)

Request for Observations/Interviews:

- a. Curriculum Subcommittee
- b. Academic Senate
- c. Assessment Subcommittee/program planning personnel for Instruction

Core Inquiry 3: The team seeks to better understand the regular evaluation of the quality of student support services and how the institution uses data to continuously improve student support programs and services.

Standards or Policies: II.C.1, II.C.2, I.B.2

Description:

- a. The team has observed HAPS and the alignment of Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) to Program Review/Unit Plans and the Strategic Educational Master Plan
- b. The team would like clarification about the program review cycle specific to student services and to understand how programs and services evaluate the quality of services (II.C.1) and how programs and services use assessment data to improve student support programs and services (II.C.2).
- c. The team was unable to verify the documentation of assessment of student learning outcomes for student support services (I.B.2).

Topics of discussion during interviews:

- a. Where is the evidence of the assessment of SAOs by program and service?
- b. Where is evidence of specific program and/or service assessments used towards continuous improvement?
- c. What, if any, concrete examples of improvement have resulted from the program review process?

Request for Additional Information/Evidence:

- a. Example of program and/or service specific SAOs
- b. Examples of data collected in assessing SAOs
- c. Examples of assessment data used towards continuous improvement for student support programs and services

Request for Observations/Interviews:

- a. Vice President of Student Services
- b. Individuals responsible for overseeing assessment of SAOs and programmatic improvement

Core Inquiry 4: The team seeks to verify that the evaluation schedule as presented is being followed.

Standards or Policies: III.A.5

Description: a. The team verified that there is evidence for the rationale behind the evaluation schedule, but it did not appear that the college was meeting the schedule and the team was unable to verify the improvement plan for the evaluation process (III.A.5).
Topics of discussion during interviews: f. Update on status of evaluations
Request for Additional Information/Evidence: a. Evidence of the implementation of the evaluation schedule
Request for Observations/Interviews: c. Human Resources personnel d. College leadership

Core Inquiry 5: The team seeks to understand how the college determines sufficient staffing for all areas of the college.
Standards or Policies: III.A.9
Description: b. The team verified that there is a process to determine a sufficient number of staff in one area of the college (facilities), but no evidence was presented for the process for all other campus components (educational, technological, and other operations).
Topics of discussion during interviews: d. More evidence is needed to demonstrate that there is a process for other areas to determine sufficient levels of support personnel. e. Further evidence was provided in the form of an outline for hiring for select staff and faculty positions, but without connection to an existing program/service review process and desired outcomes.

f. How does the college determine that it has sufficient staffing in areas other than facilities?
Request for Additional Information/Evidence: b. Assessment plan for determining sufficient staffing levels in areas other than facilities
Request for Observations/Interviews: e. College leadership f. Human resources personnel g. Budget Committee

Core Inquiry 6: The team seeks to understand the assessment process for professional development programs offered at the institution and how it uses the results of those assessments to provide programming that meets the needs of its employees.
Standards or Policies: III.A.14
Description: c. While the institution notes that they regularly assess their programs, the team was not able to verify assessment data and its use in programmatic improvement.
Topics of discussion during interviews: g. What professional development programs are planned to meet current and anticipated needs for growth and development for the college's employees? h. How is data used in continuous improvement of professional development programs?
Request for Additional Information/Evidence: c. Data from the recent survey about professional development offerings. d. Program improvement plans, if available e. Any other available evaluations of professional development at the college or district level

Request for Observations/Interviews:

- h. Human Resources personnel
- i. Professional Development committee(s)?
- j. Coordinator for Professional Development?

Core Inquiry 7: The team seeks to verify the status of the college's Corrective Action Plans for the FY 2020-21 audit.

Standards or Policies: III.D.7**Description:**

- d. The team verified that the college has 6 federal audit findings from the last fiscal year, but was unable to verify that the college has Corrective Action Plans in place to address them.
- e. The college notes that audit Corrective Action Plans are tracked through the Office of the CFO, but no evidence for the plans was supplied.

Topics of discussion during interviews:

- g. Are Corrective Action Plans in place?
- h. Who is responsible for carrying out Corrective Action Plans?

Request for Additional Information/Evidence:

- f. Corrective Action Plans for audit findings for FY 2020-21

Request for Observations/Interviews:

- k. Personnel from the Office of the CFO responsible for Corrective Action Plans

Core Inquiry 8: The team seeks to recognize outstanding performance in the development and implementation of the CHAMPS program in support of student-athlete development and excellence.

Standards or Policies: II.C.4

Description:

- f. The team observed that the CHAMPS program addresses social and cultural dimensions of experience of high-risk students through 5 areas of development and excellence.
- g.

Topics of discussion during interviews:

- i. To what extent has the program advanced student success for students participating in the program?
- j. Learning more about individual components of the program
- k. <List what the team will discuss which will help clarify Core Inquiry 3>

Request for Additional Information/Evidence:

- g. Outcomes for the program
- h. Further examples of how the planning and implementation of the program has supported student success and social cultural development
- i. Student feedback on program participation

Request for Observations/Interviews:

- l. Student Services personnel responsible for CHAMPS
- m.