

Draft Lead	Standard Section	Sources of Evidence and Review Criteria	GAP? (YES/NO)	Describe Gap	Evidence/Narrative for
Amy	I.A.1. The mission describes the institution's broad educational purposes, its intended student population, the types of degrees and other credentials it offers, and its commitment to student learning and student achievement.	EVIDENCE: Board policy that states the mission;	No		
		EVIDENCE: Web page, catalog page, CEO's message, or white paper that explicates the mission;	no		
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard	no		
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution's mission addresses the institution's educational purpose	no	mentions pathways	
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The mission defines the student population the institution serves.	gap	does not specify student population we serve	
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution's educational purpose is appropriate to an institution of higher learning.	no		
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The mission addresses the types of degrees, credentials, and certificates the institution offers.	gap	does not specify types of degrees	
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The mission demonstrates the institution's commitment to student learning and student achievement.	no		
	I.A.2. The institution uses data to determine how effectively it is accomplishing its mission, and whether the mission directs institutional	EVIDENCE: Data reports to the Board that are considered when institutional priorities are being set;	no		
		EVIDENCE: Scorecard reports or fact sheets on student achievement and student learning, or other data related to the mission;	?	not in mission but elsewhere	
		EVIDENCE: Screen shots of data dashboard;	?	not in mission but elsewhere	
		EVIDENCE: Student achievement data as used or included in institutional plans;	no		
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.	no		

	<p>priorities in meeting the educational needs of students.</p>	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution reports and analyzes data that are directly related to its mission. For example, if the mission states that the institution grants degrees, then the institution reports and analyzes degree achievement data.</p>	?		
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution uses those mission-related data to set institutional priorities and improve practices and processes towards meeting its mission</p>	?		
Luis	<p>I.A.3. The institution's programs and services are aligned with its mission. The mission guides institutional decision-making, planning, and resource allocation and informs institutional goals for student learning and achievement.</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Planning handbook, curriculum handbook, and/or budget development handbook that refer to the mission as a guide for decision-making;</p>	no		
		<p>EVIDENCE: Institutional plans that demonstrate that the mission guides planning;</p>	no		
		<p>EVIDENCE: Budget assumptions that are tied to the mission and that guide resource allocation decisions;</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: Minutes from meetings when budget assumptions or resource allocations are decided;</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>			
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution can demonstrate that its programs and services align with its mission.</p>			
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: Planning and decisions are consistently linked to the institution's mission.</p>			

		REVIEW CRITERIA: Decision-making bodies are able to demonstrate alignment of all key decisions, including resource allocation decisions, with the college's mission, especially to its commitment to student learning and student achievement.			
Luis	I.A.4. The institution articulates its mission in a widely published statement approved by the governing board. The mission statement is periodically reviewed and updated as necessary.	EVIDENCE: A document that outlines a mission review process;			
		EVIDENCE: Minutes or other report(s) with details of the process the last time the mission was reviewed and updated;			
		EVIDENCE: Minutes of the Board when the mission was last reviewed, updated, and approved;			
		EVIDENCE: Pages from the college catalog where the mission is presented;			
		EVIDENCE: A few key webpages where the mission is published;			
		EVIDENCE: Copies of other documents or photographs of locations where the mission is published on a regular basis;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution's mission is approved by the governing board.	no		
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The mission is published in multiple locations, including the college catalog.	no		
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution follows its process for reviewing and updating its mission.	no		

Standard 1.B Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness

Standard 1.B Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness						
	Summer 2021 Writing Team	Keller Magenau, Elissa Caruth, Armine Derdarian, Art Sandford, Luis Gonzalez				
Drafting Lead	Standard Section	Sources of Evidence and Review Criteria	GAP? (YES/NO)	Describe Gap	Location of Evidence/Narrative for Criteria	NOTES on Standard
	I.B.1. The institution demonstrates a sustained, substantive and collegial dialog about student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement.	EVIDENCE: Minutes from groups when and where the dialog has occurred;				
		EVIDENCE: Programs from institutional convocations or other professional development activities when the dialog occurs;				DIALOG: student outcomes: Key indicators (student); SESC; program review; department meetings & program planning meetings; advisory committees; annual planning retreat; CPC-- Armine
		EVIDENCE: Minutes from different groups if the various criteria of this Standard are divided among different groups;				
		EVIDENCE: Planning or governance handbooks if the college has regularly scheduled intervals or procedures for discussing these topics and reviewing related data, or if these topics are specifically assigned to different groups for discussion, data review, and planning;				
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.				

		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has a structured dialog on student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement.</p>				
<p>Art w/Elissa</p>	<p>I.B.2. The institution defines and assesses student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services.</p>	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The dialog occurs on a regular basis and stimulates plans for improvement.</p>				
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The dialog uses the analysis of evidence, data, and research in the evaluation of student learning.</p>				
		<p>EVIDENCE: Program information in the catalog and brochures includes program-level learning outcomes;</p>				<p>ART/Elissa; DEFINE and ASSESS: PRC, Department meetings, advisory committees SSLT, eLUMEN</p>
		<p>EVIDENCE: Support services define learning outcomes and other measures of effectiveness;</p>				
		<p>EVIDENCE: Assessment methods for learning outcomes are documented;</p>				
		<p>EVIDENCE: Assessment results are collected and analyzed at the program level;</p>				
		<p>EVIDENCE: Assessment results are collected and analyzed for support services;</p>				
<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>						
<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: Student learning outcomes and assessments are established for all instructional programs, learning support services, and student support services.</p>						

		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: Learning outcomes assessments are the basis for the regular evaluation of all courses and programs.</p>				
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution provides for systematic and regular review of its instructional and student support services.</p>				
	<p>I.B.3. The institution establishes institution-set standards for student achievement, appropriate</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Description of the process that was used to establish institution-set standards or that was used to review and update institution-set standards;</p>				<p>Annual Report: SESC for metrics, AS</p>
<p>EVIDENCE: A document that spells out what the institution-set standards are for the various data appropriate to its mission;</p>						
<p>EVIDENCE: Reports that include actual student achievement data compared to institution-set standards. These may include institutional evaluation reports, institutional planning documents, or program review reports;</p>						
<p>EVIDENCE: Reports include analysis of the data and improvement plans, especially when the data reveal underperforming areas of the college;</p>						
<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>						

Keller	achievement, appropriate to its mission, assesses how well it is achieving them in pursuit of continuous improvement, and publishes this information.	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has established criteria and processes to determine appropriate, institution-set standards for student achievement appropriate to its mission, including standards for course completion, program completion, transfer, job placement rates, and licensure examination passage rates. The metrics both monitor and challenge institutional performance.</p>				
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: In addition to the above metrics, institutions must demonstrate they are aware of, and use the key metrics used in the USDE College Scorecard.</p>				
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: There is broad-based understanding of the priorities and actions to achieve and exceed institution-set standards.</p>				
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution annually reviews data to assess performance against institution-set standards.</p>				
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: If the institution does not meet its own standards, it establishes and implements plans for improvement which enable it to reach these standards.</p>				
		<p>EVIDENCE: Procedures that document institutional evaluation and planning processes, such as an Institutional Planning Handbook;</p>				<p>Integrated Planning (PG committee handbook?); student surveys, qualitative perception surveys (AB705-IE reports); CPC</p>

Luis	I.B.4. The institution USES assessment data and organizes its institutional processes to support student learning and student achievement.	EVIDENCE: Documents that demonstrate how achievement data are used in planning and how planning is intended to support student learning and student achievement;				
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.				
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Assessment data drives college planning to improve student learning and student achievement.				
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Institutional processes are organized and implemented to support student learning and student achievement.				
	I.B.5. The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of goals and	EVIDENCE: Procedures that document the program review process, such as a Program Review Handbook, including instructions or expectations how student learning data and student achievement data are used to plan program improvements;				Strategic plan & department level planning; annual planning retreat, PR; department meetings. Qual. Perception surveys (AB 705). Focus groups--emerging use of qualitative data.
		EVIDENCE: Program review template, including analysis of past goals and objectives, and analysis of student learning and student achievement data;				
		EVIDENCE: The process includes disaggregation of data by program type and mode of delivery, as appropriate to the college's practices;				
		EVIDENCE: Completed program review reports that include all of the above;				
		EVIDENCE: Reports present both quantitative and qualitative data;				

<p>objectives, student learning outcomes, and student achievement.</p> <p>Quantitative and qualitative data are disaggregated for analysis by program type and mode of delivery.</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>				
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The college has established and uses program review processes that incorporate systematic, ongoing evaluation of programs and services using data on student learning and student achievement. These processes support programmatic improvement, implementation of modifications, and evaluation of the changes for continuous quality improvement.</p>				
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The program review process demonstrates how goals and objectives and the data provide information about how well the college is achieving its mission</p>				
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: Data assessment and analysis drive college planning to improve student learning and student achievement.</p>				
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: Data used for assessment and analysis is disaggregated to reflect factors of difference among students, as identified by the institution.</p>				
		<p>EVIDENCE: Procedures that document the program review process (or other institutional evaluation process), including necessary components of student learning and student achievement data disaggregation;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: Completed program review reports, including analysis of disaggregated data;</p>				

Luis

I.B.6. The **institution disaggregates and analyzes learning outcomes and achievement for subpopulations of students**. When the institution identifies performance gaps, it *implements strategies, which may include allocation or reallocation of human, fiscal and other resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies*.

EVIDENCE: If the disaggregated data show achievement gaps between subpopulations of students, the reports include plans for closing the gaps, including resource allocation requests if needed;				
EVIDENCE: Procedures that document how resource allocation requests are included as a component of program review;				
EVIDENCE: Completed program review reports or other institutional evaluations that analyze disaggregated data of past and present after plans/projects have been implemented and resources allocated—to determine if gaps are closing;				
EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.				
<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: Disaggregation of data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The institution disaggregates learning outcome data for student subpopulations, as identified by the institution. -The institution disaggregates student achievement data for student subpopulations, as identified by the institution. -Student subpopulations, for disaggregation, may be defined differently for student learning and student achievement. 				<p>Revisit LOT? In order to have designated place to accomplish this...department chairs meetings: SLO champions positions (disaggregation training...)</p>
REVIEW CRITERIA: Disaggregated data are analyzed, and learning and/or achievement gaps, if any, are reported.				Disag. Data at the department level: GAP

		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution demonstrates that institutional data and evidence, including student achievement data, is used for program review and improvement.</p>				
	<p>I.B.7. The institution regularly evaluates its policies and practices across all areas of the institution, including instructional programs, student and learning support services, resource management. and</p>	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The college's resource allocation is driven by program review (or other institutional evaluation process).</p>				
Art		<p>EVIDENCE: Procedures that document the policy review process or a regular cycle of review for college policies;</p>				<p>GAP: examples of policies and practices? Do we regularly EVALUATE our campus-wide. President's Cabinet, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, ICS, instructional policies and practices</p>
		<p>EVIDENCE: Policies that reflect the latest update or that include the dates of all reviews and updates;</p>				
		<p>EVIDENCE: Procedures that document the evaluation processes or cycles for program review processes, resource allocation processes, and governance structures;</p>				
		<p>EVIDENCE: Results or reports from evaluations of the institutional planning processes, program review process, resource allocation process, and governance structure;</p>				
		<p>EVIDENCE: Analysis within such reports of those processes' effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of the mission;</p>				

	<p>management, and governance processes to assure their effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of mission.</p>	EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.				
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has a regular review cycle for its policies and procedures to assure their continued effectiveness.				
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution regularly evaluates its institutional planning and evaluation processes to determine their efficacy.				
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution regularly evaluates its program review processes to determine their efficacy.				
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution regularly evaluates its resource allocation processes to determine their efficacy.				
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution regularly evaluates its governance structure and decision-making processes to determine their efficacy.				
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution uses the results from assessment processes to develop and implement plans for improvement.				
		EVIDENCE: Regularly published evaluation reports to the campus community or to constituent groups;				IE website; program review; GAP: SESC & program review loop
		EVIDENCE: Minutes of meetings when evaluation reports are disseminated and discussed, from a variety of constituent groups as appropriate;				
		EVIDENCE: Presentation materials from convocations when evaluation results are shared with the campus community;				

Luis

I.B.8. The institution broadly communicates the results of all of its assessment and evaluation activities so that the institution has a shared understanding of its strengths and weaknesses and sets appropriate priorities.

EVIDENCE: Other presentations or reports to communities or stakeholders served by the college;				
EVIDENCE: Minutes of meetings, or reports, when goals or plans are made as a result of the sharing of evaluation results;				
EVIDENCE: Minutes of meetings when data discussions and planning lead to creation of budget assumptions and prioritizations for resource allocation;				
EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.				
REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution demonstrates that communication of its assessment and evaluation to internal and external stakeholders occurs regularly.				
REVIEW CRITERIA: Institutional evaluation reports and program reviews can be accessed by constituencies.				
REVIEW CRITERIA: The strengths and weaknesses of the institution as identified by the assessment are clearly communicated to the college community.				
REVIEW CRITERIA: The data supported discussion on strengths and weaknesses is used to set institutional priorities.				

Keller	<p>I.B.9. The institution engages in continuous, broad based, systematic evaluation and planning. The institution integrates program review, planning, and resource allocation into a comprehensive process that leads to accomplishment of its mission and improvement of institutional effectiveness and academic quality. Institutional planning addresses short- and long-range needs for educational programs and services and for</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Procedures that document systematic evaluation and planning cycles and who is responsible (by position or group) ;</p>				<p>EMP; CPC; annual retreat; PG manual/integrated planning; program review integrated planning flow chart--where published? (amy/chris)--KELLER</p>
		<p>EVIDENCE: Reports that demonstrate integration of institutional evaluation or program review with planning and resource allocation;</p>				
		<p>EVIDENCE: Completed institutional plans, program reviews, and other institutional or programmatic evaluation reports;</p>				
		<p>EVIDENCE: Reports of accomplishment of improvements;</p>				
		<p>EVIDENCE: Minutes that record who is present or who participates in planning and evaluation committees to show broad-based participation;</p>				
		<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>				
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: Comprehensive institutional planning is designed to accomplish the mission and improve institutional effectiveness and academic quality.</p>				

	<p>human, physical, technology, and financial resources.</p>	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: Institutional planning must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o happen on a regular basis o include wide participation across the college-wide community o use valid data sources o follow consistent processes 				
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: Institutional planning integrates program review, resource allocation, strategic and operational plans, and other elements.</p>				
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: Comprehensive planning addresses short- and long-term needs of the institution.</p>				

Draft Lead	Standard Section	Sources of Evidence and Review Criteria	GAP? (YES/NO)	Describe Gap	Location of Evidence/Narrative for Criteria
Standard 1.C Institutional					
Summer 2021 Writing Team: Keller Magenau, James Schuelke, Shannon Davis, Paris Trujillo, Karla Banks, Joel					
Draft Lead	Standard Section	Sources of Evidence and Review Criteria	GAP? (YES/NO)	Describe Gap	Location of Evidence/Narrative for Criteria
	I.C.1. The institution assures the clarity, accuracy, and integrity of information	EVIDENCE: Procedures that document systematic review cycles for the information that is presented in the catalog, in brochures, and on the website, and who is responsible (by position or group) to assure clarity, accuracy, and integrity of the information related to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The mission o Information on educational programs o Information on student support services o Learning outcomes o Accredited status of the college; 			
		EVIDENCE: Page reference where accredited status can be found in the catalog;	NO		Page 8
		EVIDENCE: Screen shots of web page where accredited status is presented, and screen shot of web page where the link to accredited status is located (one click from the college's home page) ;			https://www.oxnardcollege.edu/college-information/accreditation
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution conducts regular review of the information it publishes to ensure its clarity, accuracy, and integrity.			

James	integrity of information provided to students and prospective students, personnel, and all persons or organizations related to its mission statement, learning outcomes, educational programs, and student support services. The institution gives	REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution can document processes for regular review of catalog information and website information.			Catalog is reviewed and updated on an annual basis by all appropriate departments
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution provides current and accurate information on student achievement to the public.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Student learning outcomes for courses and programs are published or can be			Student Learning Outcomes for all programs

	<p>accurate information to students and the public about its accreditation status with all of its accreditors.</p>	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution posts its accredited status on its website and in all relevant documents.</p>			<p>The accreditation status of the college is posted on the website: https://www.oxnardcollege.edu/college-information/accreditation . There are links here to specific program's external accreditation too for Fire Tech, EMT, Addictive Disorders Studies, Dental Hygiene, and Auto Tech. OC's Fire Technology Program also publishes its accreditation information on its webpage: https://www.oxnardcollege.edu/departments/academic/public-safety-fire-technology, and Dental Hygiene publishes its accreditation on its webpage https://www.oxnardcollege.edu/departments/academic/dental-hygiene.</p>
		<p>EVIDENCE: Print catalog;</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: Online catalog;</p>			<p>https://www.oxnardcollege.edu/sites/oxnardcollege/files/media/pdf_document/2021/2021-22-OC-Catalog-WEB-FINAL-6-24.pdf</p>

Joel, Shannon, Paris	I.C.2. The institution provides a print or online catalog for students and prospective students with precise, accurate, and current information on all facts, requirements, policies, and procedures listed in the "Catalog Requirements"2 Joel, Shannon Paris	EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution provides a print or online catalog, which is easily accessible to all interested parties.	YES	Catalogs will no longer be sold in a hard copy format at the bookstore, but can be reviewed by students in the counseling and division offices. The current version of the catalog does not meet ADA accessibility requirements, but will next year when we use the new CAT software.	The catalog is available to all interested parties online or hardcopy by request. Our current version does not meet ADA accessibility requirements. However we are switching to a new online Catalog software for 2022-2023 and that will meet accessibility requirements.
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The catalog presents accurate and current information for all required details listed in "Catalog Requirements."	NO		
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The college describes the frequency for catalog publication and process for dissemination.	NO		The catalog is published once a year. The documents are published
	I.C.3. The institution uses documented assessment of student learning and evaluation of student achievement to	EVIDENCE: Reports to the public or to stakeholders contain any or all of the following: o Course completion data and analysis o Degree and certificate completion data and analysis o Results of assessment of student learning o Job placement data of degree and certificate completers o Licensure pass rates/data o Transfer data o Other achievement data related to the college's mission;	YES	We have limited Transfer data available which mainly includes what we get from the CSU and UC and those reports are hard to read and don't really tell the public what they want to know which is how many are transferring to each CSU/UC and in what majors and how many are graduating? I couldn't find any licensure pass rate information in a common area nor any job placement data for	

James, Luis	<p>commitment to communicate matters of academic quality to appropriate constituencies, including current and prospective students and the public.</p>	EVIDENCE: Marketing materials that contain any of the above;			
		EVIDENCE: Data dashboard pages to which public has access;	YES	Didn't there used to be a simple Data Dashboard for the public?	
		EVIDENCE: Links on the college's website to federal scorecard information;	YES	Did search for "scorecard" and "scorecard" and did not find this	
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution collects assessment data on student achievement and student learning, and makes determinations regarding their meaning.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution makes its data and analysis public to internal and external stakeholders			
Shannon, James	<p>I.C.4. The institution describes its certificates and degrees in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, and expected learning outcomes.</p>	EVIDENCE: Print catalog;			Requirements and Descriptions of Courses and Programs can be found
		EVIDENCE: Online catalog;			https://www.oxnardcollege.edu/sites/oxnardcollege/files/media/pdf_document/2021/2021-22-OC-Catalog-WEB-FINAL-6-24.pdf
		EVIDENCE: Marketing materials for degree and certificate programs;			
		EVIDENCE: Program web pages;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			

		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution clearly describes its certificates and degrees in its catalog, including expected program learning outcomes.</p>	NO		<p>Requirements and Descriptions of Courses and Programs can be found on pages 46-60 and 101-303</p>
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: Program descriptions include course sequence, units or credit hours, prerequisites, admission requirements if different from college admission requirements.</p>	NO		<p>Course sequencing will be shown in Program Mapper</p>
Luis	<p>I.C.5. The institution regularly reviews institutional policies, procedures, and publications to assure integrity in all representations of its mission, programs, and services.</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Procedures that document the policy review process or a regular cycle of review for college policies;</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: Publications and web pages where</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>			
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution reviews and evaluates its college-level policies (Board policies are addressed in Standard IV), procedures, and publications on a regular basis to assure integrity and consistency of information in the several places where the same information is published.</p>			
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has clear structures and processes for conducting these reviews.</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: "Tuition and Fees" pages from the college catalog ;</p>			<p>Page 20 -23</p>
		<p>EVIDENCE: Policy on tuition ;</p>			<p>BP/AP 5030 Fees, BP/AP 5020 Nonresident Tuition, BP/AP 4070 Auditing and Auditing Fees</p>

Joel	I.C.6. The institution accurately informs current and prospective students regarding the total cost of education, including tuition, fees, and other required expenses, including textbooks, and other instructional materials.	EVIDENCE: Other documents that inform students of tuition charges for courses or programs;			
		EVIDENCE: Web pages or other publications that describe residence hall pricing, meal plans, off campus housing costs, parking fees, etc. ;			Catalog pages 20-23 and website https://www.oxnardcollege.edu/apply-and-enroll/paying-for-college/fees
		EVIDENCE: Bookstore webpages where textbook prices are published;			webpage is https://venturacollege.bncollege.com/shop/oxnard-college/home?userId=1002&campusId=79736
		EVIDENCE: Bookstore procedures for collecting textbook information from faculty;			link from webpage on Faculty Textbook adoptions https://www.facultyenlight.com/?storeNbr=8101
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution publishes			BP/AP 5031 Instructional
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Tuition is consistent for all courses regardless of program. If there is program specific tuition, the institution can provide a rationale for the difference.			

Art	I.C.7. In order to assure institutional and academic integrity, the institution uses and publishes governing board policies on academic freedom and responsibility. These policies make clear the institution's commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge, and its support for an atmosphere in which intellectual freedom exists	EVIDENCE: A governing board policy on Academic Freedom that contains the criteria stated in this Standard;	NO		The Governing Board policy on Academic Freedom BP 4030 and its Administrative Procedure AP 4030 are available in BoardDocs at https://go.boarddocs.com/ca/vccd/Board.nsf/vpublic?open= The policy is published in the College catalog Page 332.
		EVIDENCE: Copies of this policy in a faculty handbook and student handbook, or similar documents disseminated to faculty and students. ;	MAYBE	A search for "Academic Freedom" on the website does not yield a page with the definition or policy. I did not find a current student handbook online either.	The Academic Freedom policy is published on pg. 26 of the 2020-2021 Faculty Handbook available online https://www.oxnardcollege.edu/sites/oxnardcollege/files/media/pdf_document/2021/Faculty%20Handbook%202020-21_08%2014.20_FINAL_reduced%20size.pdf
		EVIDENCE: Presentations or agenda from faculty development workshops, student orientations, or meetings where the policy is discussed;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			

for all constituencies, including faculty and students.

<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has governing board policies on academic freedom and responsibility.</p>	<p>NO</p>		<p>The Governing Board policy on Academic Freedom BP 4030 and its Administrative Procedure AP 4030 are available in BoardDocs. The policy is published in the College catalog Page 332.</p>
<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: These policies are regularly reviewed by the governing board.</p>	<p>NO</p>		<p>All BPs/APs are on a regular review schedule where each policy is reviewed at least every 5 years or as changes are necessitated by changes to Title 5, Ed Code, or by other CCCC legal or policy mandates. BP/AP 4030 are reviewed by DTRW-I.</p>
<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: Policies are published in easily accessible locations.</p>			<p>All BPs/APSs are on BoardDocs, accessible to</p>
<p>EVIDENCE: A policy on Academic Honesty and Integrity or a Student Code of Conduct that addresses the criteria in this Standard;</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>No webpage on the topic of Academic Honesty/plagiarism (Moorpark has a webpage on it https://www.moorparkcollege.edu/node/2506)</p>	<p>College catalog Page 30 and 320</p>
<p>EVIDENCE: Copy of this policy in a student handbook or similar document disseminated to students;</p>			
<p>EVIDENCE: Course syllabi that clearly describe expectations for academic honesty and consequences for violations;</p>			

Luis, Art

I.C.8. The institution establishes and publishes clear policies and procedures that promote honesty, responsibility and academic integrity. These policies apply to all constituencies and include specifics relative to each, including student behavior, academic honesty and the consequences for dishonesty.

EVIDENCE: Presentations or agenda from student orientations or meetings where the policy is discussed;			
EVIDENCE: Procedure or process for authenticating student identity in DE/CE courses;			
EVIDENCE: Personnel policy on honesty and integrity, or personnel policy describing grounds for employee discipline including violations of honesty or integrity;			BP and AP 7205 Employee Code of Ethics
EVIDENCE: Copy of this policy in an employee handbook or similar documents disseminated to faculty and staff;			Faculty Handbook pg. 37 "Academic Dishonesty"
EVIDENCE: Presentations or agenda from staff orientations or meetings where the policy is discussed;			
EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this			
REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has board approved policies on student academic honesty and student behavior, which are clearly communicated to current and future students.			BP/AP 5500 Standards of Conduct
REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has board approved policies on the faculty's responsibility regarding academic honesty and integrity.			
REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has board approved policies that promote honesty, responsibility, and integrity of all employees and include consequences for dishonesty.			
REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has procedures for authenticating student identity in DE/CE			

Art	I.C.9. Faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline. They present data and information fairly and objectively.	EVIDENCE: The institution expresses these expectations in one or more of the following: o Personnel policy o Faculty handbook o Faculty job description;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: There is a clear expectation that faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views.	YES	I don't see anywhere where it says this explicitly in policy or handbooks	
n/a	I.C.10. Institutions that require conformity to specific codes of conduct of staff, faculty, administrators, or students, or that seek to instill specific beliefs or world views, give clear prior notice of such policies, including statements in the catalog and/or appropriate faculty and student handbooks.	EVIDENCE: Policies that describe expectations of codes of conduct or beliefs;			
		EVIDENCE: College catalog;			
		EVIDENCE: Marketing materials for the institution;			
		EVIDENCE: Student handbook;			
		EVIDENCE: Employee and faculty handbooks;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution clearly communicates its requirements of conformity to codes of conduct of staff, faculty, administrators, and students.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: If a college seeks to instill specific beliefs or world views, it has policies to give clear prior notice of such adherence to specific beliefs or world views, including statements in the catalog			
		EVIDENCE: Documentation of authorization from ACCJC to operate in a foreign location;			
		EVIDENCE: Documentation from the foreign government or locality of authorization to operate in the foreign location;			

n/a	I.C.11. Institutions operating in foreign locations operate in conformity with the Standards and applicable Commission policies for all students. Institutions must have authorization from the Commission to operate in a foreign location.	EVIDENCE: The institution can provide evidence that it satisfies all relevant elements of the “Policy on Principles of Good Practice in Overseas International Education Programs for Non U.S. Nationals”;			
		EVIDENCE: Inventory of programs for non-U.S. nationals recruited abroad;			
		EVIDENCE: Inventory of programs for internally recruited international students organized through the college or the district/system;			
		EVIDENCE: Inventory of study abroad programs for U.S. students;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has protocols in place to ensure that curricula offered in foreign locations, to non U.S. Nationals, adheres to the Commission’s “Policy on Principles of Good Practice in Overseas International Education Programs for Non U.S. Nationals.”			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: If the institution promotes its distance education in foreign locations, the promotion of these activities aligns with the institution’s mission and the objectives for its DE.			
	EVIDENCE: Correspondences between the institution and the ACCJC demonstrating that the college meets all ACCJC deadlines;				
	EVIDENCE: The institution’s accreditation web page is one click away from the college’s home page;	YES	It's two clicks away. Should be added to main menu.	https://www.oxnardcollege.edu/college-information/accreditation	

Art

I.C.12. The institution agrees to **comply with Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, Commission policies, guidelines, and requirements for public disclosure, institutional reporting, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes**. When directed to act by the Commission, the institution responds to meet requirements within a time period set by the Commission. It discloses information required by the Commission to carry out its accrediting responsibilities.

<p>EVIDENCE: College web page with links to accreditation reports and action letters since the last visit, including the last ISER, action letters, midterm report, and follow-up reports, if any;</p>			<p>Webpage has Midterm Report Feb. 1, 2021, Follow-up Report 2017, Forum Follow-up Visit 3/22/18, Commission Report 2016, ISER 2016, as well as an overview of OC's Accreditation History, who is involved in the process, membership of the standing committee, and links to external accreditation of specific programs.</p>
<p>EVIDENCE: Web page with announcement of upcoming ACCJC peer review visit, with link to ACCJC Third Party Comment form (The link should be available more than five weeks before the scheduled visit and then deactivated 35 days before the first day of the visit.);</p>			
<p>EVIDENCE: Press release or board announcement of upcoming peer review team visit and notification for interested parties to provide third-party comments;</p>			
<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>			
<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has made public all required reports and documents regarding its compliance with ACCJC Standards and policies.</p>			
<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution can demonstrate that it consistently meets all reporting deadlines to the ACCJC.</p>			

		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution complies with the ACCJC Policy on Rights and Responsibilities of the Commission and Member Institutions. The institution has publicly disclosed the dates for the upcoming comprehensive peer review visit and has solicited third-party comment.			
Keller	I.C.13. The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies , including compliance with regulations and statutes. It describes itself in consistent terms to all of its accrediting agencies and communicates any changes in its accredited status to the Commission, students, and the public.	EVIDENCE: Web pages or catalog pages where accredited status from other accrediting agencies is located, and their contact information; AND	No		all discipline specific accreditations (e.g. Dental, Fire,...)
		EVIDENCE: Correspondence or documentation from other agencies or government entities that			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution's communications with external agencies are clear and accurate.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution clearly communicates any changes in its accredited status to the Commission, students, and the public in a timely manner.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution complies with the USDE's regulation on public notifications.			
Keller	I.C.14. The institution ensures that its commitments to high quality education, student achievement and student learning are paramount to other objectives such as generating financial returns	EVIDENCE: Conflict of interest policies;	No		BP 7310 Nepotism, BP/AP 7205 Employee Code of Ethics;
		EVIDENCE: Budget assumptions used in financial planning;			Integrated planning map; CPC, shows resource allocation tied to program review and EMP, etc.
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			

	for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests.	REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution's policies and practices demonstrate that delivering high quality education is paramount to other objectives.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution can demonstrate that decisions regarding finance have not compromised its commitment to high educational quality.			

STANDARD 2.A INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

Draft Lead	Standard Section	Sources of Evidence and Review Criteria	GAP? (YES/NO)	Describe Gap	Location of Evidence/Narrative for Criteria
Shannon	II.A.1. All instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education, are offered in fields of study consistent with the institution's mission, are appropriate to higher education, and culminate in student attainment of identified student learning outcomes, and achievement of degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education programs.	EVIDENCE: The college catalog—program descriptions show that programs align to the mission, are appropriate to higher education, and culminate in student attainment of learning outcomes and achievement of degrees, certificates, employment, and/or transfer;			
		EVIDENCE: Program brochures and web pages that describe the same;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard			
		EVIDENCE: (Data on student degree/certificate completion, transfer, and job placement are already included in the ISER section on Student Achievement and do not need to be repeated here as evidence that programs culminate in achievement of degrees, etc.)			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: All course and program offerings, whether traditional or distance education and/or correspondence education (DE/CE), align with the stated mission of the institution.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Course and program offerings are appropriate for post-secondary education.	NO	n/a	
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Program descriptions include expected student learning outcomes and list the degrees and certificates that can be earned.	NO	n/a	College catalog lists all PSLOs with each program and degrees and certificates are listed for each program, PSLOs are recorded in CIM and eLumen

		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution can supply data that students actually achieve degrees and certificates.	NO	n/a	
II.A.2. Faculty, including full time, part time, and adjunct faculty, regularly engage in ensuring that the		EVIDENCE: Documentation of the process for curriculum development, review, and approval — the workflow and persons responsible — for courses and for programs;	YES	Curriculum webpages need updated including latest workflow, deadlines, curriculum handbook needs revised/reviewed/published	AP 4022 Course Approval, AP 4102 Career Technical Education Programs, Participatory Governance Manual pg. 17-18 on Curriculum Committee
		EVIDENCE: Approved course outlines of record that contain course descriptions, expected course learning outcomes, and course content at appropriate educational levels (precollegiate, lower division, or upper division);	NO	n/a	CORs are located in CIM, evidence of appropriate levels are ASSIST articulation, C-ID approvals, outside accreditation for CTE courses/programs including FT, DA, DH,
		EVIDENCE: Documentation of a rigorous review process for DE courses to ensure they meet expectations for effective DE teaching methods and regular and substantive interactions;	YES	While the DE is being reviewed by the Curriculum Committee, the process for doing so isn't clearly delineated anywhere. Needs to be added to the Curriculum Committee's Guidelines for Technical Review and to handbook.	
		EVIDENCE: Documentation of a regular program review process, with timelines, workflow, and persons responsible;			

Ishita

content and methods of instruction meet generally accepted academic and professional standards and expectations. In exercising collective ownership over the design and improvement of the learning experience, faculty conduct systematic and inclusive program review, using student achievement data, in order to continuously improve instructional courses and programs, thereby ensuring program currency, improving teaching and learning strategies, and promoting student success.

EVIDENCE: Completed program review reports, with analysis of student learning assessment results and analysis of student achievement data, leading to improvement plans, and requests for resource allocations if needed;			
EVIDENCE: Minutes from departmental, divisional, or other meetings where program reviews, program data, and improvement plans are discussed;			
EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
REVIEW CRITERIA: Faculty are involved in curriculum development for courses and programs.	NO	n/a	Curriculum Committee membership, agendas/minutes,
REVIEW CRITERIA: Faculty ensure that course content and methods of instruction meet generally accepted academic and professional standards of higher education.	NO	n/a	Curriculum Committee training materials
REVIEW CRITERIA: Faculty evaluate and discuss the relationship between teaching methodologies and student performance on a regular basis.			
REVIEW CRITERIA: Criteria used in program review include relevancy, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and planning for the future.			
REVIEW CRITERIA: The program review process is consistently followed for all college programs, regardless of the type of program (collegiate, developmental, etc.) and mode of delivery.			

		REVIEW CRITERIA: Program review includes analysis of student achievement data (course completions and degree/certificate completions) and student learning data (SLO assessment results).			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The results of program review are used in institutional planning.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Successive program reviews document improvements that have resulted from plans or goals developed in prior program reviews.			
	II.A.3. The institution identifies and regularly assesses learning outcomes	EVIDENCE: Approved course outlines of record, which contain student learning outcomes and perhaps suggested assessment methods in broad terms;	NO	n/a	CIM (Curriculum Management System), copies of CORs
		EVIDENCE: Documentation of a regular cycle of learning outcomes assessment for courses and programs—with workflow, timelines, and persons responsible;			
		EVIDENCE: Program review reports that contain assessment results/data and analysis;			
		EVIDENCE: Sample assessment instruments and results from courses or programs;			
		EVIDENCE: Written instructions or a template that guides faculty to include student learning outcomes among the course information on a syllabus;			
		EVIDENCE: Syllabi from courses in a broad range of programs and disciplines, all containing SLOs that match the SLOs in the approved course outlines of record;			

Luis	<p>for courses, programs, certificates and degrees using established institutional procedures. The institution has officially approved and current course outlines that include student learning outcomes. In every class section students receive a course syllabus that includes learning outcomes from the institution's officially approved course outline.</p>	EVIDENCE: Documentation of a regular process for review of syllabi—with timelines and persons responsible—to ensure syllabi contain accurate course information, including course SLOs;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has established a procedure for identifying student learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees.	NO		CSLOs are located in CIM, eLumen, and on CORs, PSLOs are located in CIM, in narratives, and eLumen.
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Student learning outcomes are in place for the institution's courses, programs, certificates and degrees.	NO		CSLOs are located in CIM, eLumen, and on CORs, PSLOs are located in CIM, in narratives, and eLumen.
		REVIEW CRITERIA: All faculty regularly assess learning outcomes in courses and programs.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Current, officially approved course outlines include student learning outcomes.	NO	n/a	All CORs have CSLOs and all are current in COCI
		REVIEW CRITERIA: All syllabi include student learning outcomes as listed on the officially approved course outlines.	NO		
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Learning outcomes for courses and programs offered as DE/CE match the learning outcomes for the same courses and programs when taught in traditional mode.	NO		
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Institutions have structures in place to verify all students receive a course syllabus.	~		
	EVIDENCE: The college catalog;				

Elissa

II.A.4. If the institution offers pre-collegiate level 2 curriculum, it distinguishes that curriculum from college level 3 curriculum and directly supports students in learning the knowledge and skills necessary to advance to and succeed in college level curriculum.

EVIDENCE: Documents that record course sequences from pre-collegiate to college-level;	NO		College catalog pg. 202 has ENGL course sequencing, pg. 210 has ESL course sequencing, pg. 256 has MATH course sequencing
EVIDENCE: Pre-collegiate prerequisite courses noted in catalog descriptions of college-level courses;			
EVIDENCE: College-level course outlines of record that identify necessary prerequisite skills or knowledge, and pre-collegiate course outlines of record that contain the requisite skills as outcomes;	NO		Requisite justifications are located in CIM and on the COR for every course with any type of requisite.
EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
REVIEW CRITERIA: Criteria and processes have been developed and are used for decision-making in regards to offering developmental, pre-collegiate, continuing and community education, short-term training, or contract education.			
REVIEW CRITERIA: The college has a process and criteria for determining the appropriate credit type, delivery mode, and location of its courses and programs.			
REVIEW CRITERIA: There is alignment between pre-collegiate level curriculum and college level curriculum in order to ensure clear and efficient pathways for students.			

		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: Catalog information for courses clearly delineates whether a course is pre-collegiate or college-level. Course sequencing from pre-collegiate to college-level is clearly described. Course numbering protocols indicate the level of courses.</p>	NO		<p>college catalog pg. 103 Course Identification, pg. 104 Courses Not Applicable for Degree Credit, statement included in each catalog course description about degree applicability, transfer & GE applicability.</p>
Shannon	<p>II.A.5. The institution's degrees and programs follow practices common to American higher education, including appropriate length, breadth, depth, rigor, course sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning. The institution ensures that minimum degree requirements are 60 semester credits or equivalent at the associate level, and 120 credits or equivalent at the baccalaureate level.</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Catalog pages that accurately and clearly describe the number of credits required for degrees and certificates;</p>	NO	n/a	<p>college catalog 48 (ADTs), 49-52 (AA/AS), 58 (Certificates), and specific units are listed with each program major.</p>
		<p>EVIDENCE: Course and/or program development, review, and approval procedure that contains criteria used by faculty and others for determining appropriate length, breadth, depth, rigor, course sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning;</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: Policy on the minimum number of credits required for a degree or certificate;</p>	NO		<p>AP 4100 Graduation Requirements for Degrees and Certificates, college catalog 48 (ADTs), 49-52 (AA/AS), 58 (Certificates), and specific units are listed with each program major.</p>
		<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>			
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution demonstrates the quality of its instruction by following practices common to American higher education and has policies and procedures in place to define these practices.</p>			

	baccalaureate level.	REVIEW CRITERIA: The college follows established criteria to decide the breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning of each program it offers.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: All associate degrees at the college require successful completion of a minimum of 60 semester credits.	NO		College catalog (each AA/AS/ADT has units required listed), General Minimum Requirements for degrees are listed: pg. 48 (ADTs), 49-52 (AA/AS)COCI,
Carolyn	II.A.6. The institution 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.4	EVIDENCE: Enrollment management plans that take into consideration time to completion and program pathways;			
		EVIDENCE: Student achievement data reports that evaluate the effectiveness of enrollment management and pathways plans;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution schedules classes in alignment with student needs and program pathways, allowing students to complete programs within a reasonable period of time.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution uses data to evaluate the degree to which scheduling facilitates completion for their diverse students' needs.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution reflects on time-to-completion data in program review and institutional evaluation, and devises plans to improve completion rates.			

Luis/Laura	II.A.7. The institution effectively uses delivery modes, teaching methodologies and learning support services that reflect the diverse and changing needs of its students, in support of equity in success for all students	EVIDENCE: Institutional reports on diverse and changing needs of students and resulting plans for developing or improving delivery modes, teaching methodologies, and learning support services;			
		EVIDENCE: Policy and/or procedure for DE/CE course and/or program approval;			
		EVIDENCE: Minutes from committee meeting when DE/CE approval procedure is followed.			
		EVIDENCE: Course outlines of record and syllabi from courses that are taught both in traditional mode and in DE/CE mode;			
		EVIDENCE: Examples of DE/CE course materials, assignments, activities, and assessments;			
		EVIDENCE: Institutional evaluation or program review of DE/CE and related learning support services;			
		EVIDENCE: Program reviews that disaggregate student learning assessment data and student achievement data by mode of delivery. When achievement gaps are noted between delivery modes, program reviews include plans to improve teaching methodologies and/or learning support services in support of equity in success;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution demonstrates it understands and is meeting the needs and learning styles of its students, by identifying students by subpopulations.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has established protocols to determine the appropriate delivery modes for its diverse student populations.			

for all students.

<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has established and follows a policy and/or procedure for approving courses and programs for DE/CE. The procedure ensures that DE/CE courses and programs comply with federal definitions of distance education (with regular and substantive interaction with the instructor, initiated by the instructor, and online activities are included as part of a student's grade) and correspondence education (online activities are primarily "paperwork related," including reading posted materials, posting homework and completing exams, and interaction with the instructor is initiated by the student as needed).</p>			
<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The college regularly evaluates the effectiveness of its delivery modes and uses results to guide improvements.</p>			
<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The college regularly assesses the changing needs of its students and uses the results of such assessments to plan or improve delivery modes, teaching methodologies, and learning support services.</p>			
<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The college provides equitable learning support services for DE/CE students and traditional on-campus students.</p>			
<p>EVIDENCE: Documented procedures for department-wide course or program assessments and for evaluating students' prior learning;</p>			
<p>EVIDENCE: In-house or external reports with data analysis that verifies that department-wide assessments are free of bias;</p>			

Luis	II.A.8. The institution validates the effectiveness of department-wide course and/or program examinations, where used, including direct assessment of prior learning. The institution ensures that processes are in place to reduce test bias and enhance reliability.	EVIDENCE: Documentation of the existence of an IRB at the institution, one of whose tasks is to verify that department-wide assessments are free of bias;			
		EVIDENCE: If the college uses third-party assessments, it can provide verification from the vendor that the assessments are free of bias;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Programs and departments have clear structures in place to determine pre-requisite criteria and to ensure their consistent application.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: If appropriate, programs and departments have protocols to evaluate students' prior learning.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has established protocols to ensure the use of unbiased, valid measures of student learning.			
	II.A.9. The institution	EVIDENCE: Faculty documents that show which course-level assessments/assignments link to which student learning outcomes. Documentation may be noted on syllabi, in gradebooks, or on other documents;			
		EVIDENCE: When appropriate, course outlines of record that connect course level SLOs to program level SLOs;			
		EVIDENCE: A policy or other document that explains the meanings of grades;			
		EVIDENCE: A policy and/or procedures that assure award of credit for educational experiences is based on achievement of stated student learning outcomes;			

Shannon	awards course credit, degrees and certificates based on student attainment of learning outcomes. Units of credit awarded are consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education. If the institution offers courses based on clock hours, it follows Federal standards for clock-to-credit-hour conversions.	EVIDENCE: Course outlines that state a minimum of hours of work per unit of credit awarded;			
		EVIDENCE: A policy or other document that verifies the institution follows Federal standards for clock-to-credit-hour conversions;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution can demonstrate that at the course level, passing grades on assignments or exams link directly to students' demonstration of achieving learning outcomes.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution can demonstrate that course credit is awarded based on students' demonstration of achieving learning outcomes.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution awards credits consistent with accepted norms in higher education.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The achievement of stated programmatic learning outcomes is the basis for awarding degrees and certificates.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution demonstrates that it follows federal standards for clock-to-credit-hour conversions in the awarding of credit.	NO	n/a	AP 4020, pg 25 in the college catalog
	EVIDENCE: A policy on Transfer of Credit;	NO	n/a	AP 4100, AP 4235,	
	EVIDENCE: Documented procedures for review of transcripts, including persons responsible (by position);				

Shannon

II.A.10. The institution makes available to its students clearly stated transfer-of-credit policies in order to facilitate the mobility of students without penalty. In accepting transfer credits to fulfill degree requirements, the institution certifies that the expected learning outcomes for transferred courses are comparable to the learning outcomes of its own courses. Where patterns of student enrollment between institutions are identified, the institution develops articulation agreements as appropriate to its mission.

EVIDENCE: Catalog pages that describe transfer of credit;	NO	n/a	College catalog: Page 19 transcript requirements, acceptance of transfer coursework, and credit for military service; Pages 55-57 GE reciprocity, course substitution, unit transferability, guidelines for additional degrees; Pages 92-100 for Credit for Prior Learning (AP/IB/CLEP too)
EVIDENCE: Other documents, such as a Student Handbook, that describe transfer of credit;			
EVIDENCE: Catalog pages and other documents that describe transfer services available to students;	NO		College catalog pg. 38 describes Transfer Center, pg 68-69 describe the steps to transfer (including transfer center), AP 5120 Transfer Center
EVIDENCE: Articulation agreements or transfer agreements with other institutions;	NO		ASSIST, C-ID, links on website,
EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			AP 4050 Articulation with Baccalaureate Institutions, AP 4051 Articulation with High Schools
REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has approved policies and procedures to address the transfer of classes from and to other institutions, and these policies and procedures are clearly communicated to students.	NO		AP 4100, AP 4235,

		REVIEW CRITERIA: Transfer of coursework policies and procedures are regularly reviewed.	NO		DTRW-I minutes, AP 4100 Graduation Requirements for Degrees and Certificates, AP 4235 Credit for Prior Learning
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has developed, implemented, and evaluated articulation agreements with institutions where patterns of students enrollment have been identified.	NO		Evidence of participation with CSUCI's Articulation and Transfer initiatives like the Project PROMESAS STEM Articulation Summits, participation in SCIAC Region 6 (includes UCSB, CSUN, CSUCI, CLU) articulation meetings,
		EVIDENCE: A policy or other document that identifies the above as institutional learning outcomes, or that includes the above within general education (GE) outcomes;	NO	n/a	GE SLOs are in GE Handbook and College Catalog; ISLOs are in College Catalog,
		EVIDENCE: Course outlines of record that include related institutional or GE learning outcomes among course level learning outcomes;	YES	CORs do not include GE or Institutional SLOs, but is this required?	
		EVIDENCE: Program or degree information in the college catalog or other documents that include learning outcomes related to the above;			
		EVIDENCE: Program reviews or other assessment reports that document student achievement of the above learning outcomes;			
	II.A.11. The institution includes in all of its programs, student learning outcomes, appropriate to the program level, in	EVIDENCE: Institutional evaluation or planning documents that report and/or broadly analyze student achievement of the above learning outcomes;			

<p>communication competency, information competency, quantitative competency, analytic inquiry skills, ethical reasoning, the ability to engage diverse perspectives, and other program-specific learning outcomes.</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Educational planning documents or templates (commonly used by academic advisers) that include all required courses for a degree, including courses that satisfy institutional (or GE) learning outcomes;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: A transcript evaluation process for graduation applicants that assures student achievement of the above learning outcomes;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has adopted programmatic learning outcomes in communication competency, information competency, quantitative competency, analytic inquiry skills, ethical reasoning, the ability to engage diverse perspectives, and other program-specific learning outcomes.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: These learning outcomes are regularly assessed and results are used to drive program improvements.</p>			
<p>II.A.12. The institution requires of all of its degree programs a component of general education based on a carefully considered philosophy for both associate and baccalaureate</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: A policy or other document that states the institution's general education (GE) philosophy;</p>	NO		GE philosophy is located in the college catalog and the GE Handbook
	<p>EVIDENCE: Catalog pages that outline GE requirements for graduation, including GE requirements for the baccalaureate if the institution offers a BA, BS, or Bachelor of Applied Science;</p>	NO		
	<p>EVIDENCE: A Curriculum Handbook or other procedural document that outlines an approval process, including persons responsible, for accepting courses as satisfying GE requirements;</p>	NO		The GE Handbook outlines the process

Shannon	degrees that is clearly stated in its catalog. The institution, relying on faculty expertise, determines the appropriateness of each course for inclusion in the general education curriculum, based upon student learning outcomes and competencies appropriate to the degree level. The learning outcomes include 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.	EVIDENCE: Course outlines of record for GE approved courses that include relevant GE learning outcomes;	YES	GE Outcomes are not listed on CORs, but are they required to be?	
		EVIDENCE: Educational planning documents or templates (commonly used by academic advisers) that include all required courses for a degree;	NO		Counselors use GE worksheets for local GE, CSU GE-Breadth, and IGETC. These forms are also included in DegreeWorks so students can track their progress.
		EVIDENCE: A transcript evaluation process for graduation applicants that ensures completion of GE requirements;	NO		DegreeWorks
		EVIDENCE: Program reviews or other assessment reports that analyze and evaluate student achievement of GE learning outcomes;	YES	Evaluation of GESLOs has been impeded by how eLumen functions	
		EVIDENCE: Institutional evaluation or planning documents that report and/or broadly analyze student achievement of GE learning outcomes;	YES	Evaluation of GESLOs has been impeded by how eLumen functions	
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has a faculty developed rationale for general education that serves as the basis for inclusion of courses in general education and is listed in the catalog.	NO		The institution has GESLOs for each GE area
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has a general education philosophy, which reflects its degree requirements.	NO		There is a statement of philosophy for GE as well as GESLOs for each GE area and courses included in each area align with the GESLOs
II.A.13. All degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or	EVIDENCE: Catalog information for each degree and certificate, including required courses within the discipline and/or related disciplines;	NO		College catalog	

Shannon	in an established interdisciplinary core. ⁵ The identification of specialized courses in an area of inquiry or interdisciplinary core is based upon student learning outcomes and competencies, and includes mastery, at the appropriate degree level, of key theories and practices within the	EVIDENCE: Other publications that contain the same information for each degree;			
		EVIDENCE: Appropriate level student learning outcomes recorded in the course outline of record for each course in the degree pathway;	NO		College catalog
		REVIEW CRITERIA: All programs include a focused study on one area of inquiry or discipline and includes key theories and practices appropriate for the certificate of achievement or associate's degree level.			
Josepha	II.A.14. Graduates completing career-technical certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment standards and other applicable standards	EVIDENCE: Catalog information for each degree and certificate, including required courses, preparation for external licensure or certification, and career opportunities;			
		EVIDENCE: CTE program websites;			
		EVIDENCE: Reports of licensure pass rates;			
		EVIDENCE: CTE program reviews or similar reports that include assessment data on student demonstration of technical and professional competencies;			
		EVIDENCE: Minutes of CTE faculty/professional advisory groups;	YES	Not all CTE programs are current with advisory committee meetings/minutes	
		EVIDENCE: Course outlines of record of CTE and technical courses;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution verifies and maintains currency of employment opportunities and other external factors in all of its career-technical disciplines.			

	<p>and preparation for external licensure and certification.</p>	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution determines competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes based upon faculty expertise and input from industry representatives.</p>			
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution assesses student achievement of technical and professional competencies as captured in learning outcomes of career-technical courses and programs.</p>			
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: CTE faculty and professional advisory groups discuss current employment standards and revise curriculum as needed.</p>			
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution’s website maintains current information of external requirements and other factors related to career-technical degree and certificate programs and current information about employment opportunities.</p>			
<p>Shannon</p>	<p>II.A.15. When programs are eliminated or program requirements are significantly changed, the institution makes appropriate arrangements so that enrolled students may complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption.</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Documented procedures for program elimination process;</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Not included in the catalog</p>	<p>AP 4021 Program Discontinuance,</p>
		<p>EVIDENCE: If a program has been eliminated, the college can provide documentation that it has followed its procedures;</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>			
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has established procedures regarding program elimination, including the process for which enrolled students will be able to complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption.</p>			

		REVIEW CRITERIA: Program elimination procedure is clearly communicated to students.	YES	Not included in the catalog, not found on the website (or at least not in a search)	AP 4021 Program Discontinuance,
Luis	II.A.16. The institution 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 and programs, regardless of delivery mode or location. The institution systematically strives to improve programs and courses to enhance learning outcomes and achievement for students.	EVIDENCE: Program review calendar and schedule for report submissions;			
		EVIDENCE: Program review reports that document plans for improvements and improvements that have been accomplished;			
		EVIDENCE: Institutional planning and evaluation documents that include plans for improvements and reports on improvements that have been accomplished, with accompanying data on student learning and student achievement;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The college has a process to regularly evaluate the effectiveness of its courses and programs.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The criteria used in program review include relevancy, appropriateness, and achievement of student learning outcomes, currency, and planning for the future.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The program review process is consistently followed for all college programs, regardless of the type of program (collegiate, developmental, etc.).			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The results of program evaluation are used in institutional planning.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Changes/improvements in programs have occurred as a result of the consideration of program evaluations and are evaluated for their effectiveness.			

STANDARD 2.B LIBRARY & LEARNING RESOURCES

Draft Lead	Standard Section	Sources of Evidence and Review Criteria	GAP? (YES/NO)	Describe Gap	Location of Evidence/Narrative for Criteria
	<p>II.B.1. The institution supports student learning and achievement by providing library, and other learning support services to students and to personnel responsible for student learning and support. These</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: College catalog information on library and other learning support services. These services may be repeated in a Student Handbook, Faculty Handbook, and/or Personnel Handbook;</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: Web-based access to all library and learning support services;</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: Web instructions on how to use online library and learning support services;</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: Schedules of trainings/workshops/podcasts on how to use library and learning support services;</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: New staff and faculty orientations that include library and learning support services on the agenda;</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: Results of student satisfaction surveys or other evaluations of library and learning support services;</p>			

Luis, Kari,
Ron

services are sufficient in quantity, currency, depth, and variety to support educational programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education. Learning support services include, but are not limited to, library collections, tutoring, learning centers, computer laboratories, learning technology, and ongoing instruction for users of library and other learning support services.

EVIDENCE: Results of faculty and staff satisfaction surveys or other evaluations of library and learning support services;			
EVIDENCE: Enrollment reports of library and learning support users;			
EVIDENCE: Other reports of student use of library and learning support services;			
EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution assesses the effectiveness of its own library and learning support services in terms of quantity, quality, depth and variety.			
REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has an established evaluation process to determine it has sufficient depth and variety of library materials, including technology support, to meet the learning needs of its students.			
REVIEW CRITERIA: All campus locations/all types of students/all college instructional programs are equally supported by library services and accessibility.			

		REVIEW CRITERIA: The college provides equitable learning support services for DE/CE students and traditional on-campus students.			
Tom, Ray	II.B.2. Relying on appropriate expertise of faculty, including librarians, and other learning support services professionals, the institution selects and maintains educational equipment and materials to support student learning and enhance the achievement of the mission.	EVIDENCE: Minutes of meetings of library and/or learning support personnel and/or faculty, especially for the purposes of planning or evaluating library and learning support services;			
		EVIDENCE: Inventory of educational equipment and materials for library and/or learning support services;			
		EVIDENCE: Replacement, repair, or maintenance schedule for library and learning support equipment and materials;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Faculty and library personnel work together to develop and maintain appropriate library resources.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Faculty and library personnel work together to inform the selection of educational equipment and materials to support student learning.			

		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: Faculty and learning support personnel work together to develop appropriate learning support services, equipment, technology, and learning spaces.</p>			
<p>Juan, Ricky, Luis</p>	<p>II.B.3. The institution evaluates library and other learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services includes evidence that they contribute to the attainment of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Surveys and other evaluation instruments that are used to determine effectiveness of library and learning support services;</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: Program review reports of library and learning support services;</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: In the program review reports, institutional student achievement data or select program or course data that show library or learning support services' impact on student learning and student achievement;</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: Special reports that evaluate library or learning support services' impact on student learning and student achievement;</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>			
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution uses methods to evaluate its library and other learning support services.</p>			
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The evaluation assesses use, access, and relationship of the services to intended student learning.</p>			
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The evaluation includes input by faculty, staff and students.</p>			

		REVIEW CRITERIA: The college regularly evaluates the impact that learning support services have on student learning.			
Tom, Ray	II.B.4. When the institution relies on or collaborates with other institutions or other sources for library and other learning support services for its instructional programs, it documents that formal agreements exist and that such resources and services are adequate for the institution's intended purposes, are easily accessible and utilized. The institution takes responsibility for and assures the security, maintenance, and reliability of services provided either directly or through contractual arrangement. The institution regularly evaluates these services to ensure their effectiveness.	EVIDENCE: Copies of contracts or MOUs with external sources, organizations, consortiums, or agencies;	NO		Reference MOUs databases, NetTutor, CCLC, PsyOnline, JSTORE, GrammerFlip; BibliU;
		EVIDENCE: Evaluations of these external services, which may be included in program reviews;	No/yes	student feedback - need more	Annual Program Reviews - 2015 or 2016
		EVIDENCE: Reports of numbers of end users;	No		Gate counts, accudemia, ALMA numbers, Nettutor,
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.	No/Yes	Not general funds	Equity Funds, Budget, IELM fund budget
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Collaboration with other institutions or other sources for library and learning support services are evaluated for quality assurance, including services that are formalized through contractual agreements.	No		Inter-library loan;
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution gathers information to assess whether the services are being used and are effective.	No/yes	student feedback - need more	versions of surveys

STANDARD 2.C STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

Draft Lead	Standard Section	Sources of Evidence and Review Criteria	GAP? (YES/NO)	Describe Gap	Location of Evidence/Narrative for Criteria
	<p>II.C.1. The institution regularly evaluates the quality of student support services and demonstrates that these services, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education, support student learning, and enhance accomplishment of the mission of the institution.</p>	EVIDENCE: Program reviews of student support services;			
		EVIDENCE: Student support services planning documents;			
		EVIDENCE: Needs assessment or satisfaction surveys of student support services;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has evaluation processes in place to measure the quality of its student support services.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Evaluation occurs at regular intervals.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Student support services data or outcomes are disaggregated by location or means of delivery as appropriate to the institution's structure.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has established protocols to verify that these services are of comparable quality and support student learning regardless of location or means of delivery.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Student services programs are aligned with the institutional mission.			
	<p>II.C.2. The institution identifies and assesses learning support outcomes for its student population</p>	EVIDENCE: Program reviews of student support services, including analysis of student achievement data or student learning data as they relate to student support services, and including plans for improvements and reports on accomplishments of past plans;			

<p>for its student population and provides appropriate student support services and programs to achieve those outcomes. The institution uses assessment data to continuously improve student support programs and services.</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Program reviews or other reports that show connections between learning support services and student support services;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has developed assessment methods to ascertain the effectiveness of student support services.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution uses evaluation results to improve student services.</p>			
<p>II.C.3. The institution assures equitable access to all of its students by providing appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable services to students regardless of service location or delivery method.</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Inventory of all student support services that are available at on-the-ground sites and those that can be accessed 100% online;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: Results of periodic needs assessments and/or satisfaction surveys for student support services at all sites and online;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: Reports that analyze data on student use of support services, disaggregated as appropriate to the mission and student population;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: Catalog information regarding student support services and how to access them regardless of service location or delivery method;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution demonstrates that it assesses student needs for services regardless of location or mode of delivery, and allocates resources to provide for those services.</p>			

		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has established protocols to verify that these services are equitable regardless of location or means of delivery.			
<p>II.C.4. Co-curricular programs and athletics programs are suited to the institution's mission and contribute to the social and cultural dimensions of the educational experience of its students. If the institution offers co-curricular or athletic programs, they are conducted with sound educational policy and standards of integrity. The institution has responsibility for the control of these programs, including their finances.</p>	EVIDENCE: Policies or procedures regarding the purposes, integrity, and supervision of cocurricular programs;				
	EVIDENCE: Financial reports of co-curricular programs;				
	EVIDENCE: Documentation, such as club charters, that demonstrate that co-curricular programs align with the institution's mission;				
	EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.				
	REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution determines what co-curricular programs are appropriate to its mission and students.				
	REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution evaluates the quality and effectiveness of its co-curricular programs on a regularly basis.				
	REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has policies and/or procedures in place to oversee the effective operation of athletic and co-curricular programs.				
	EVIDENCE: Schedule of trainings for faculty and others on their advising roles and resources available;				
	EVIDENCE: Presentations from trainings for faculty and others on their advising roles and resources available;				
	EVIDENCE: Educational planning documents used by advisors;				

<p>II.C.5. The institution provides counseling and/or academic advising programs to support student development and success and prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function. Counseling and advising programs orient students to ensure they understand the requirements related to their programs of study and receive timely, useful, and accurate information about relevant academic requirements, including graduation and transfer policies.</p>	EVIDENCE: Content and expected learning outcomes of student orientations;			
	EVIDENCE: Annual calendar of student orientations and academic advising activities;			
	EVIDENCE: Copies of advising materials shared with students;			
	EVIDENCE: Catalog information regarding academic advising;			
	EVIDENCE: Policies on academic requirements or academic progress;			
	EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
	REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution develops, implements, and evaluates counseling and/or academic advising services.			
	REVIEW CRITERIA: The evaluation of counseling and/or academic advising includes how these services enhance student development and success.			
	REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has structures in place to verify all pertinent information on academic requirements is accurate and disseminated in a timely manner.			
	REVIEW CRITERIA: Professional development is provided to prepare faculty and others for their advising roles.			
	EVIDENCE: Admission policies;			
	EVIDENCE: College catalog pages where admission policies are presented to prospective students;			
	EVIDENCE: Web pages where admission policies are presented to prospective students;			

<p>II.C.6. The institution has adopted and adheres to admission policies consistent with its mission that specify the qualifications of students appropriate for its programs. The institution defines and advises students on clear pathways¹ to complete degrees, certificate and transfer goals.</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Educational planning software or documents that include pathways to all degrees, certificates, and transfer;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: Presentations from trainings for academic advisors and/or students on how to use educational planning software or documents;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has governing board approved admission policies that are consistent with its mission.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The policies specify the qualifications of students appropriate for its programs.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution advises students on clear pathways to obtain their educational goals.</p>			
<p>II.C.7. The institution regularly evaluates admissions and placement instruments and practices to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases.</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Identification or description of admissions and placement instruments and practices;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: Program review of admissions or advising services, including data that attempt to correlate results of placement instruments with success rates in courses;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: Other evaluation reports that attempt to correlate results of placement instruments with success rates in courses;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: Timeline of periodic evaluations of assessment or placement instruments to ensure continued consistency and effectiveness;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>			

		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has established processes to evaluate the effectiveness of practices and tools of admissions and placement.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Evaluations of placement processes are used to ensure their consistency and effectiveness.			
	II.C.8. The institution maintains student records permanently, securely, and confidentially, with provision for secure backup of all files, regardless of the form in which those files are maintained. The institution publishes and follows established policies for release of student records.	EVIDENCE: Policy or procedure that assures safe, secure, confidential, maintenance of student records, including procedures for backup;			
		EVIDENCE: Protocols for release of records;			
		EVIDENCE: Presentations from staff trainings on maintaining student records and confidentiality;			
		EVIDENCE: Copies of forms used for release of records or transcripts requests;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has an established process to maintain student records permanently, securely, and confidentially, with a provision for secure backup of all files, regardless of the form in which those files are maintained.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution publishes and follows its established policies for release of student records.			

STANDARD 3.A HUMAN RESOURCES

Draft Lead	Standard Section	Sources of Evidence and Review Criteria	GAP? (YES/NO)	Describe Gap	Location of Evidence/Narrative for Criteria
District HR	III.A.1. The institution assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing administrators, faculty and staff who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support these programs and services. Criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selection of personnel are clearly and publicly stated and address the needs of the institution in serving its student population. Job descriptions are directly related to institutional mission and goals and accurately reflect position	EVIDENCE: Job announcements for staff, faculty, and administrative positions, including minimum qualifications;	No		District HR
		EVIDENCE: Job descriptions, including duties, responsibilities, required skills and knowledge, and minimum qualifications;	No		District HR & on website (governmentjobs.com/careers/vcccd/classspecs)
		EVIDENCE: Policies related to hiring;	No		District HR, Board Policies
		EVIDENCE: Recruitment and hiring procedures, including persons responsible;	No		District HR, HR Tools
		EVIDENCE: Screening tools used during the hiring process;	No		District HR
		EVIDENCE: Equivalency policies and procedures;	No		District HR
		EVIDENCE: Procedures for equivalency review of transcripts from non-U.S. institutions;	No		District HR
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution demonstrates that it has developed appropriate hiring criteria.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution advertises open positions using appropriate venues to attract quality candidates.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution demonstrates it has a process to verify the qualifications of applicants and newly hired personnel.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Checks are conducted on applications regarding the equivalency of degrees from non-U.S. institutions.			

	accurately reflect position duties, responsibilities, and authority.	REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution uses methods to ensure that qualifications for each position are closely matched to specific programmatic needs and that duties, responsibilities, and authority are clearly delineated.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution demonstrates that all job descriptions are directly related to the institutional mission.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution employs safeguards to ensure that hiring procedures are consistently followed.			
District HR	III.A.2. Faculty qualifications include knowledge of the subject matter and requisite skills for the service to be performed. Factors of qualification include appropriate degrees, professional experience, discipline expertise, level of assignment, teaching skills, scholarly activities, and potential to contribute to the mission of the institution. Faculty job descriptions include development and review of curriculum as well as assessment of learning.	EVIDENCE: Job announcements for faculty, both full-time and part-time if different;	No		District HR
		EVIDENCE: Job descriptions for faculty, both full-time and part-time if different;	No		District HR & on website (governmentjobs.com/careers/vcccd/classspecs)
		EVIDENCE: Procedures for screening faculty applications, including verifying transcripts for minimum qualifications;	No		District HR
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The college demonstrates that it has a consistent process to verify that faculty selected for hire have adequate and appropriate knowledge of their subject matter.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The college has a formal process for vetting credentials, and other forms of preparation, to ensure that qualified faculty are selected for hire.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: All faculty job descriptions include the responsibility for curriculum oversight and student learning outcomes assessment.			

District HR	III.A.3. Administrators and other employees responsible for educational programs and services possess qualifications necessary to perform duties required to sustain institutional effectiveness and academic quality.	EVIDENCE: Job announcements for administrators and other employees;	No		District HR
		EVIDENCE: Job descriptions for administrators and other employees;	No		District HR & on website (governmentjobs.com/careers/vcccd/classspecs)
		EVIDENCE: Procedures for screening applications, including verifying transcripts for minimum qualifications;	No		District HR, HR Tools
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution demonstrates that it has a process to determine if administrators and other employees responsible for educational programs and services possess the qualifications necessary to perform duties required to sustain institutional effectiveness and academic quality.			
	III.A.4. Required degrees held by faculty, administrators and other employees are from institutions accredited by	EVIDENCE: Procedures for verifying applicants' transcripts, including procedures for verifying equivalency from non-U.S. institutions;	No		District HR
		EVIDENCE: Documentation when transcript verification has been completed, perhaps as a step in the screening/hiring process;	No		District HR
		EVIDENCE: Transcripts of current employees of the college, by position, with names and other identifying information redacted. (These confidential evidentiary documents, though available to the team1, should not be made available to the public.);	No		District HR

District HR	recognized U.S. accrediting agencies. Degrees from non-U.S. institutions are recognized only if equivalence has been established.	EVIDENCE: Completed equivalency reviews, with names and other identifying information redacted. (These confidential evidentiary documents, though available to the team, should not be made available to the public.)	No		District HR
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution demonstrates that it verifies the qualifications of applicants and newly hired personnel.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Degrees from non-U.S. institutions are validated for equivalency.			
III.A.5. The institution assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The institution establishes written criteria for evaluating all personnel,	EVIDENCE: Policies related to performance evaluations of staff, faculty, and administrators;	No		District HR, Board Policies, HR Tools	
	EVIDENCE: Procedures for conducting employee performance evaluations, including timelines and persons responsible;	No		District HR, HR Tools	
	EVIDENCE: Procedures for conducting faculty and administrator performance evaluations, including timelines and persons responsible;	No		District HR, HR Tools	
	EVIDENCE: Templates or forms used for performance evaluations of staff, faculty, and administrators, including opportunities for encouraging improvement;	No		District HR, HR Tools	
	EVIDENCE: Timeline of scheduled performance evaluations;	No		District HR, HR Tools	
	EVIDENCE: Records of completed performance evaluations;	No		District HR	

District HR	including performance or assigned duties and participation in institutional responsibilities and other activities appropriate to their expertise. Evaluation processes seek to assess effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement. Actions taken following evaluations are formal, timely, and documented.	EVIDENCE: Sample completed performance evaluations, with names and other identifying information redacted. (These confidential evidentiary documents, though available to the team, should not be made available to the public.);	No		District HR
		EVIDENCE: Records of follow-up evaluations when deficiencies or areas of needed correction are identified;	No		District HR
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The college has a process in place to ensure that evaluations lead to improvement of job performance.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The college demonstrates that performance evaluations are completed on a regular basis.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Evaluation criteria accurately measure the effectiveness of personnel in performing their duties.			
	III.A.6.	(Effective January 2018, Standard III.A.6 is no longer applicable. The Commission acted to delete the Standard during its January 2018 Board of Directors meeting.)			
III.A.7. The institution maintains a sufficient		EVIDENCE: Department rosters of faculty, identifying full-time and part-time;	Maybe		Deans Council
		EVIDENCE: Data reports of FTEF or student-to-faculty ratios, student-to-counselor ratios;	No		IE

District HR & (secondary) Amy Edwards	number of qualified faculty, which includes full-time faculty and may include part-time and adjunct faculty, to assure the fulfillment of faculty responsibilities essential to the quality of educational programs and services to achieve institutional mission and purposes.	EVIDENCE: Program reviews that evaluate the need for more or fewer faculty, including replacements due to resignations or retirements, and the resulting resource allocation process;	Maybe	Need to document process for replacements - new faculty process is clear, but replacements not documented in PG process as well.	PRC minutes, Budget committee minutes, Resource Requests
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution demonstrates that it has the appropriate staffing levels for each program and service.			
Both - Amy Edwards	III.A.8. An institution with part-time and adjunct faculty has employment policies and practices which provide for their orientation, oversight, evaluation, and professional development. The institution provides opportunities for integration of part time and adjunct faculty into the life	EVIDENCE: Policies or procedures for orientation, supervision, and evaluation of part-time faculty;	No		District HR, HR Tools
		EVIDENCE: Agenda from orientations for part-time faculty, with copies of materials from the orientation;	No		District HR (onboarding), and Art Sandford and Luis Gonzalez
		EVIDENCE: Schedule of orientations and other professional development workshops or trainings for part-time faculty;	No		PDC? - Amparo
		EVIDENCE: An online, self-directed orientation;	No		District HR, HR Tools
		EVIDENCE: Documentation of part-time faculty participation in trainings, committee work, program review and planning, institutional evaluation and planning, or other activities and events;	No		District HR & PDC
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			

	of the institution.	REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has policies and practices demonstrating that part-time and adjunct faculty have opportunities for professional development, are appropriately oriented to the institution and its student populations, and are engaged in key academic processes.			
Both - Amparo Medina	III.A.9. The institution has a sufficient number of staff with appropriate qualifications to support the effective educational, technological, physical, and administrative operations of the institution.	EVIDENCE: Department or division rosters of staff in support positions;	No		Karla
		EVIDENCE: Program reviews that evaluate the need for more or fewer support staff, including replacements due to resignations or retirements, and the resulting resource allocation process;	Maybe	Need to document process for replacements - new faculty process is clear, but replacements not documented in PG process as well.	PRC minutes, Budget committee minutes, Resource Requests
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has policies and practices to determine the appropriate number and qualifications for support personnel.			
Both - Matt Jewett	III.A.10. The institution maintains a sufficient number of administrators with appropriate preparation and expertise to provide continuity and effective administrative leadership and services that	EVIDENCE: Department or division rosters of managers and administrators in leadership positions;	No		District HR & Karla
		EVIDENCE: Policy or procedure for succession planning when managers or administrators leave the institution;	Maybe		BoardDocs?
		EVIDENCE: Program reviews that evaluate the need for more or fewer managers or administrators, including replacements due to resignations or retirements, and the resulting resource allocation process;	Maybe	Need to document process for replacements - new faculty process is clear, but replacements not documented in PG process as well.	PRC minutes, Budget committee minutes, Resource Requests

	support the institution's mission and purposes.	EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has policies and practices to determine the appropriate number, qualifications, and organization of administrators.			
District	III.A.11. The institution establishes, publishes, and adheres to written personnel policies and procedures that are available for information and review. Such policies and procedures are fair and equitably and consistently administered.	EVIDENCE: Personnel policies and procedures, publicly available in print and/or online;	No		HR Tools, Board Docs, HR webpages
		EVIDENCE: Notices to employees how to access personnel policies and procedures;	??		District HR
		EVIDENCE: Agenda item in employee orientations notifying employees of the location of personnel policies and procedures;	No		Orientation (President), Faculty Orientation/Handbook, etc.
		EVIDENCE: Documentation that all employee complaints against the college for not following personnel policy or procedure have been resolved and improvements made if needed;	No		District HR
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution publishes its personnel policies and makes them available for review.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution ensures that it administers its personnel policies and procedures consistently and equitably.			
		EVIDENCE: Personnel policies that support diversity and equity, or other formal statements of the institution's commitment to diversity and/or equity;	No		District EEO, DEI Workgroup?, ARW webpage and minutes, SESC minutes

District & Amparo	III.A.12. Through its policies and practices, the institution creates and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support its diverse personnel. The institution regularly assesses its record in employment equity and diversity consistent with its mission.	EVIDENCE: Program review of human resources, including evaluation of data on the diversity of staff and faculty;	No		District HR & EEO
		EVIDENCE: Diversity plans or goals for human resources that arise from program review;	No		District HR
		EVIDENCE: Equity plans or goals for human resources that arise from program review;	No		District HR
		EVIDENCE: Personnel reports on equity and diversity;	No		District HR
		EVIDENCE: Agenda or presentations from staff development sessions or other programs that the institution conducts to support its diverse personnel;	No		District HR & (maybe) PDC
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution's policies and practices promote an understanding of equity and diversity.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has methods to determine the kinds of support its personnel need and regularly evaluates the effectiveness of these programs and services.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution tracks and evaluates its record on employment diversity and equity.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution ensures that its personnel are treated fairly.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution plans for the recruitment of diverse personnel in accordance with its mission.			
			EVIDENCE: Ethics policy, including consequences for violations;	No	
	EVIDENCE: Procedure for ethics violations;	No		District HR, HR Tools	

District	III.A.13. The institution upholds a written code of professional ethics for all of its personnel, including consequences for violation.	EVIDENCE: Report of any ethics violations, procedures followed, and resolution, with names and other identifying information redacted. (These confidential evidentiary documents, though available to the team, should not be made available to the public.)	No		District HR
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has an approved ethics policy for all of its personnel, which delineates consequences for violation.			
Amparo	III.A.14. The institution plans for and provides all personnel with appropriate opportunities for continued professional development, consistent with the institutional mission and based on evolving pedagogy, technology, and learning needs. The institution systematically evaluates professional development programs and uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for	EVIDENCE: Schedule of professional development opportunities offered at the college;	No		PDC Agendas/Minutes
		EVIDENCE: Staff/faculty survey of professional development needs, and results;	No		District, Classified Senate, PDC
		EVIDENCE: Staff development program review, or human resource program review including evaluation of and improvement plans for staff development;	No		Program Review Docs, Resource requests
		EVIDENCE: Evaluation instruments for professional development opportunities, plus results, analysis, and plans for improvement;	Maybe	Need possible rubric for evaluating opportunities	District Classified PDC
		EVIDENCE: Professional Development Committee roster and minutes;	No		PDC Agendas/Minutes
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution offers professional development programs consistent with its mission.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has methods to identify professional development needs of its faculty and other personnel.			

	improvement.	REVIEW CRITERIA: The college engages in meaningful evaluation of professional development activities and uses results for improvement.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The college measures the impact of professional development activities on the improvement of teaching and learning.			
District	III.A.15. The institution makes provision for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. Each employee has access to his/her personnel records in accordance with law.	EVIDENCE: Policy and/or procedure for maintaining security and confidentiality of personnel records;	No		District HR
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has provisions for keeping personnel records secure and confidential.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution provides employees access to their records.			

STANDARD 3.B PHYSICAL RESOURCES

Lead: Matt Jewett

Members: Allie Frazier; Chris Renbarger; Bob Sube; Rainer Mack; Amanda Burwick; Marcia Fulkerson

Draft Lead	Standard Section	Sources of Evidence and Review Criteria	GAP? (YES/NO)	Describe Gap	Location of Evidence/Narrative for Criteria
Amanda Burwick, Bob Sube	III.B.1. The institution assures safe and sufficient physical resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs, and learning support services. They are constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment.	EVIDENCE: Facilities inventory;	No		Bob Sube to provide document
		EVIDENCE: Reports from safety and security walk-throughs;	No		CUDS Minutes (Allie Frazier) and Campus Police (Lt. Romero); Lt. Romero is looking into the supporting docs
		EVIDENCE: Facilities program review or facilities plan, including improvement plans based on evaluations of safety and security;	No		Maintenance program review (Bob Sube); FMP (evidence of what we are doing currently now and our last FMP); CUDS Minutes (Allie Frazier)
		EVIDENCE: Reporting procedure or template for facilities safety, security, or maintenance;	Yes	Bob Sube to provide description of reporting process. We do not have a SOP or official process.	CUDS Minutes (Allie Frazier)
		EVIDENCE: Maintenance request protocol;	Yes	Bob Sube to provide description of request process. We do not have a SOP or official process.	Email to OC maintenance
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution ensures that all facilities are safe.	No		Examples of annual building inspections; Fire; Elevators; Plumbing; etc Bob Sube

		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution regularly evaluates whether it has sufficient physical resources at all locations.	No	Need clarity of what ACCJC means 'physical resources'	Program Review example of this analysis (Laurie Nelson-Newsor); Resource Requests; Deans support faculty by ordering general and instructional supplies; FMP (evidence born out of FMP and CUDS committees)
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has a process by which all personnel and students can report unsafe physical facilities.	No		Standing item at CUDS (Allie Frazier; example of an item being brought to CUDS)
Rainer Mack	III.B.2. The institution plans, acquires or builds, maintains, and upgrades or replaces its physical resources, including facilities, equipment, land, and other assets, in a manner that assures effective utilization and the continuing quality necessary to support its programs and services and achieve its mission.	EVIDENCE: Program reviews for areas within physical resources (such as facilities maintenance, housekeeping, grounds, transportation, etc.);	No		Program Review example of this analysis (Laurie Nelson-Newsor)
		EVIDENCE: Facilities plan;	No		Previous FMP and FMP in progress (Allie Frazier)
		EVIDENCE: Institutional plan;	No		EMP &/Or Strategic Master Plan (on website: Marcia Fulkerson)
		EVIDENCE: Minutes from facilities planning meetings;	No		FMP Minutes (Allie Frazier)
		EVIDENCE: Correspondence related to acquiring, building, maintaining, upgrading, or replacing facilities, equipment, or other physical assets, only if the correspondence demonstrates institutional alignment with details within this Standard;	No		Apparatus bay building work/documentation example (Matthew Jewett & Bob Sube); M&O for other documentation on this (Bob Sube)
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution ensures that the needs of programs and services are considered when planning its buildings.	No		Program Review example of this analysis (Laurie Nelson-Newsor) & work we are doing to build the new FMP (Allie Frazier)
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Facilities' planning is aligned with the institutional mission.			

		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution ensures that program and service needs determine equipment replacement and maintenance.	No		Program Review example of this analysis (Laurie Nelson-Newsor); Requests that go to M&O (Bob Sube)
Marcia Fulkerson	III.B.3. To assure the feasibility and effectiveness of physical resources in supporting institutional programs and services, the institution plans and evaluates its facilities and equipment on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account.	EVIDENCE: Reports on the state of facilities, equipment, or other physical assets;	No		Furniture refresh example (Allie Frazier);
		EVIDENCE: Reports on facilities use and occupancy;	No		Gilbert Downs to provide document; Documents recieved: Seat Occupancy Report, Event Schedule Fall 2019, Event Schedule Fall 2021, Fall 2019 Schedule, Fall 2021 Schedule
		EVIDENCE: A schedule of regular inspections of facilities and equipment;	No		Examples of annual building inspections; Fire; Elevators; Plumbing; etc Bob Sube
		EVIDENCE: Program reviews for areas within physical resources (such as facilities maintenance, housekeeping, grounds, transportation, etc.);	No		Maintenance; Grounds; Custodial program review (Bob Sube)
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution regularly assesses the use of its facilities.	No		Program Review (Laurie Nelson-Newsor) & previous and new FMP (Allie Frazier)
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution uses the results of the evaluation to improve facilities or equipment.	No		Program Review (Laurie Nelson-Newsor) & previous and new FMP (Allie Frazier)
		EVIDENCE: Long range capital plans;	No		Districts infrastructure budget (Chris Renbarger)
		EVIDENCE: Multiple years' institutional budgets;	No		Chris to share budget
		EVIDENCE: Multiple years' division or department budgets, especially Maintenance and Operations;	No	Is this an overall buget outlook or do we want to give a couple division example?	Chris to run 10 years of budget reports
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			

Chris Renbarger, Allie Frazier	III.B.4. Long-range capital plans support institutional improvement goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment.	REVIEW CRITERIA: Long-range capital projects are linked to institutional planning and include projections of total cost of ownership.	Partial	They are linked but don't have specific TCO measures included.	Program Review (Laurie Nelson-Newsor) & previous and new FMP (Allie Frazier)
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has identified elements which constitute the definition of "total cost of ownership" that the institution uses when making decisions about facilities and equipment.	Yes	Need college adopted definition for TCO and capital equipment tracker.	Program Review (Laurie Nelson-Newsor) & previous and new FMP (Allie Frazier)
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Planning processes ensure that capital projects support college goals.	No		FMP & Educational Master Plan
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution assesses the effectiveness that long-range capital planning has in advancing the college's improvement goals.	Yes	Does program review assess effectiveness of our long range capital planning? Example would be does the new DH building do what we planned for it to do? Rainer Mack to look into	

Program review examples: Art; Fire Academy;
Dental Hygiene; Marine Biology

[Evidence Folder](#)

- Program Review List**
- [Art Program Review](#)
 - [Coastal Environmental Studies Program Review](#)
 - [Custodial Program Review](#)
 - [Dental Hygiene Program Review](#)
 - [Dental Hygiene Program Reviews 2014–2017](#)
 - [Dental Hygiene Program Five Ps Model](#)
 - [Fire Academy Program Review](#)
 - [Grounds Program Review](#)
 - [Maintenance Program Review](#)
 - [Campus Police Program review](#)

**FT Apparatus Building
Project**

[Baseline Schedule](#)

[Meeting Agenda](#)

[09.02.2021](#)

[Meeting Agenda](#)

[09.09.2021](#)

[Meeting Agenda 09.30.21](#)

[Meeting Minutes](#)

[07.10.2018](#)

[Meeting Minutes](#)

[09.02.2021](#)

[Meeting Minutes](#)

[09.09.2021](#)

[Open RFI Log](#)

[Project Schedule](#)

[Update 08.12.2021](#)

[Update 11.13.2020](#)

[NRA Notification](#)

[Phase II Final Bid Set](#)

OC Planning Documents

[OC Strategic Plan](#)

[Educational Master Plan](#)

[Technology Master Plan](#)

[Facilities Master Plan](#)

Facilities Documents

[Building Analysis](#)

[Worksheet](#)

[CUPA Permit and CERS Docs](#)

[Elevator and Wheel Chair](#)

[Lift Permit](#)

[Fire Extinguisher Inspection
Card](#)

[Fire Sprinkler Inspection
Emergency Lighting Power
System Inspection](#)

[Fume Hood Certification
Failed](#)

[Inspection Report List \(1 of
2\)](#)

[Inspection Report List \(2 of
2\)](#)

[LLRC Fire Alarm System Test
Monthly Fire Pump Testing
Staffing Ratios](#)

[PE Fire Alarm System Test
Seat Occupancy Report
Space Inventory](#)

[Statement of Compliance
Air Pressure Tank Permit
Maintenance and Repair
Reporting Process](#)

**Facilities Use and
Occupancy**

[Event Schedule Fall 2019](#)

[Event Schedule Fall 2021](#)

[Schedule Enrollment Fall
2019](#)

[Schedule Enrollment Fall
2021](#)

STANDARD 3.C TECHNOLOGY RESOURCES

Draft Lead	Standard Section	Sources of Evidence and Review Criteria	GAP? (YES/NO)	Describe Gap	Location of Evidence/Narrative for Criteria
	III.C.1. Technology services, professional support, facilities, hardware, and software are appropriate and adequate to support the institution's management and operational functions, academic programs, teaching and learning, and support services.	EVIDENCE: Technology plans or program reviews that evaluate and plan for reliability, disaster recovery, privacy, and security;			
		EVIDENCE: Technology inventories;			
		EVIDENCE: Technology infrastructure blueprints;			
		EVIDENCE: Disaster recovery procedure or plan;			
		EVIDENCE: DE/CE technology plan;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution ensures that its various types of technology needs are identified.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution regularly evaluates the effectiveness of its technology in meeting its range of needs.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: There are provisions for reliability, disaster recovery, privacy, and security, whether technology is provided directly by the institution or through a contractual arrangement.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution makes decisions about use and distribution of its technology resources.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The technology infrastructure is sufficient to maintain and sustain traditional teaching and learning and DE/CE offerings.			
		EVIDENCE: Technology plans, short term and long range;			
		EVIDENCE: Documentation of technology replacement, repair, or upgrade cycle;			

<p>III.C.2. The institution continuously plans for, updates and replaces technology to ensure its technological infrastructure, quality and capacity are adequate to support its mission, operations, programs, and services.</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Employee and student survey instruments (with technology questions);</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: Analysis of the results of such surveys;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: Examples of program reviews from other divisions, departments, or units that include technology resource requests;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has established provisions to ensure a robust, current, and sustainable technical infrastructure is maintained that provides maximum reliability for students, staff, and faculty.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution bases its technology decisions on the results of evaluation of program and service needs.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: Evaluations of technology and technology services include input from end users.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has developed a process to prioritize needs when making decisions about technology purchases.</p>			
<p>III.C.3. The institution assures that technology resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs, and services are implemented and</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Technology replacement, repair, or upgrade cycle that highlights “all locations”;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: Technology replacement or repair log that highlights “all locations”;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: Technology help request protocols, including access for employees at “all locations”;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard</p>			

	<p>implemented and maintained to assure reliable access, safety, and security.</p>	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution allocates resources for the management, maintenance, and operation of its technological infrastructure and equipment.</p>			
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The college provides an appropriate system for reliability and emergency backup.</p>			
	<p>III.C.4. The institution provides appropriate instruction and support for faculty, staff, students, and administrators, in the effective use of technology and technology systems related to its programs, services, and institutional operations.</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Schedules of technology training for staff and faculty;</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: Presentations or agenda from professional development opportunities on technology;</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: Evaluations of training, and documentation of improvements to subsequent training for staff and faculty;</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: Schedules of technology training for students;</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: Curriculum for training students on technology use;</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: Resources, such as manuals or online instructions, that support students, staff, and faculty in their use of technology;</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>			
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution assesses the need for information technology training for students and personnel.</p>			
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution allocates resources for information technology training for faculty, students, and staff.</p>			

		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution regularly evaluates the training and technical support it provides for faculty and staff to ensure these programs are appropriate and effective.			
III.C.5. The institution has policies and procedures that guide the appropriate use of technology in the teaching and learning processes.	EVIDENCE: Policies or procedures for acceptable use of technology;				
	EVIDENCE: Publications containing acceptable use policies or guidelines, such as employee handbooks, student handbooks, etc.;				
	EVIDENCE: Other forms of acceptable use guidelines, such as posters in computer labs;	No	This is not referenced in our response on p. 138 of current draft ISER.		
	EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.				
	REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has established processes to make decisions about the appropriate use and distribution of its technology resources.				
	REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution publicizes these policies and processes.				

STANDARD 3.D FINANCIAL RESOURCES

Draft Lead	Standard Section	Sources of Evidence and Review Criteria	GAP? (YES/NO)	Describe Gap	Location of Evidence/Narrative for Criteria
	III.D.1. Financial resources are sufficient to support and sustain student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. The distribution of resources supports the development, maintenance, allocation and reallocation, and enhancement of programs and services. The institution plans and manages its financial affairs with integrity and in a manner that ensures financial stability.	EVIDENCE: Annual financial reports (including Audited financial statements);	No		District Office
		EVIDENCE: Budget allocation model or process;	No		District Office, DCAS Minutes
		EVIDENCE: Longitudinal comparison of annual operating budgets or financial plans by program or department, highlighting or explaining significant increases or decreases;	Maybe?	Unclear if these comparisons have been done - may need to do.	Need to put together
		EVIDENCE: Examples of the enhancement of programs or services funded through the budget allocation model or process;	No		Resource request and fulfillment process - Budget Committee meetings
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has sufficient revenues to support educational improvement and innovation.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Funds are allocated in a manner that will realistically achieve the institution's stated goals for student learning.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Line items in the budget for resources support student learning programs and services.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution's resource allocation process provides a means for setting priorities for funding institutional improvements.			

		REVIEW CRITERIA: Institutional resources are carefully managed to sustain student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness.			
<p>III.D.2. The institution's mission and goals are the foundation for financial planning, and financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning. The institution has policies and procedures to ensure sound financial practices and financial stability. Appropriate financial information is disseminated</p>		EVIDENCE: Policies or procedures for budget development that identify the institution's mission and goals as the foundation for financial planning or that integrate financial and institutional planning;	No		District budget development process & Adoption Budget presentation & Budget Committee meetings & AP/BP
		EVIDENCE: Budget process that ties resource allocation to program review and planning;	No		PRC minutes and Budget Committee minutes
		EVIDENCE: Budget assumptions that are tied to the mission, institutional goals, or program reviews;	No		PRC minutes and Budget Committee minutes, Strategic Plan and EMP
		EVIDENCE: Budgeted or planned fiscal expenditures that have supported or that support the achievement of institutional plans or goals;	No		Resource request and fulfillment process - Budget Committee meetings
		EVIDENCE: Minutes from a finance or budget committee's meeting when institutional mission and goals, institutional plans, or program reviews are discussed;	No		Budget Committee minutes
		EVIDENCE: Minutes from any governance group when institutional planning and financial planning are connected or coordinated;	No		Budget Committee minutes
		EVIDENCE: Any document in which budget proposals, resource allocation decisions, and/or financial decisions are reported to the campus;	No		Budget Committee minutes
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution reviews its mission and goals as part of the annual fiscal planning process.			

throughout the institution in a timely manner.	REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution establishes priorities among competing needs so that it can predict future funding. Institutional plans exist, and they are clearly linked to financial plans, both short-term and long-range.			
	REVIEW CRITERIA: The financial planning process relies primarily on institutional plans for content and timelines.			
	REVIEW CRITERIA: The governing board and other institutional leadership receive information about fiscal planning that demonstrates its links to institutional planning.			
	REVIEW CRITERIA: Budget process that ties resource allocation to planning and program review.			
	REVIEW CRITERIA: Budget assumptions that are tied to the mission, institutional goals, or program reviews.			
III.D.3. The institution clearly defines and follows its guidelines and processes	EVIDENCE: Procedures that define guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget development;	No		District Office, DCAS, AP/BP & Budget Committee minutes
	EVIDENCE: Minutes from finance or budget committee meetings verifying that established financial planning and budget development processes are followed;	No		DCAS & Budget Committee minutes
	EVIDENCE: Roster of a finance or budget committee;	No		Budget Committee minutes, PG Manual
	EVIDENCE: Documented budget development process that identifies responsible parties for steps in the planning process and that identifies opportunities for input from constituencies;	No		Budget Committee minutes

for financial planning and budget development, with all constituencies having appropriate opportunities to participate in the development of institutional plans and budgets.	EVIDENCE: A documented timeline of institutional planning coordinated with budget development process, including reporting deadlines for various types of reports to or reviews with different audiences;	No		Resource request and fulfillment process - Budget Committee meetings
	EVIDENCE: Budget proposals presented to the Board, to the public, and to the campus;	No		District Office, Budget Committee
	EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
	REVIEW CRITERIA: Institution has established processes for financial planning and budget development, which are widely known and understood by college constituents.			
	REVIEW CRITERIA: The college's mechanisms or processes are used to ensure constituent participation in financial planning and budget development.			
	EVIDENCE: Agenda or minutes from planning committee meetings or budget committee meetings when financial resource availability is discussed;	No		Budget Committee minutes & CPC minutes
	EVIDENCE: Attachments from such meetings that identify funding sources, partnerships, or expenditure requirements;	No		Resource request and fulfillment process - Budget Committee meetings
	EVIDENCE: Budget documents that balance expected revenues and expenditures;	No		Adoption Budget
	EVIDENCE: Documentation of coordination of institutional planning with grants and other alternative funding sources;	No		Resource request and fulfillment process - Budget Committee meetings, Grant reports

<p>III.D.4. Institutional planning reflects a realistic assessment of financial resource availability, development of financial resources, partnerships, and expenditure requirements.</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Other documents used during institutional planning that identify available or potential financial resources and/or funding sources;</p>	?	Need documentation of available or potential resources and funding sources.	Maybe budget book - look at LY report
	<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: Individuals involved in institutional planning receive accurate information about available funds, including the annual budget showing ongoing and anticipated fiscal commitments.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: Budget information, including the institution's fiscal condition, is sufficient in content and timing to support realistic institutional and financial planning.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: Sound financial planning, including a realistic expectation of financial resource availability, are foundational elements of the institution's plans and goals.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution reviews its past financial results as part of planning for current and future fiscal needs</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: Policies or procedures for internal control mechanisms;</p>	No		District Office
	<p>EVIDENCE: Policies or procedures for purchasing;</p>	No		District Office
	<p>EVIDENCE: Budgets, financial reports, audit reports presented to the campus and to the Board;</p>	No		Budget Committee minutes & Board minutes
	<p>EVIDENCE: Reports of decisions for financing or allocation of resources presented to the campus community or to constituent groups;</p>	No		Budget Committee minutes
	<p>EVIDENCE: Monthly, quarterly, or other reports of revenues and expenditures;</p>	No		District Office

III.D.5. To assure the financial integrity of the institution and responsible use of its financial resources, the internal control structure has appropriate control mechanisms and widely disseminates dependable and timely information for sound financial decision making. The institution regularly evaluates its financial management practices and uses the results to improve internal control systems.

EVIDENCE: Finance department program review, including evaluation of effectiveness of internal controls;	No		District Office
EVIDENCE: Evaluation instruments for assessing effectiveness and integrity of financial management practices, and the results of such evaluations;	No		District Office
EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has internal control mechanisms, including persons responsible, that govern the preparation of financial documents and ensure dependable, accurate, and timely financial information is available for sound financial decision-making.			
REVIEW CRITERIA: Information about budget, fiscal conditions, and financial planning are provided throughout the college.			
REVIEW CRITERIA: Individuals involved in institutional planning and management receive dependable and timely information about available funds, including the annual budget showing ongoing and anticipated fiscal commitments.			
REVIEW CRITERIA: Budget information, including the fiscal condition, financial planning, and audit results, is sufficient in content and timing to support sound financial management			
REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution prepares accurate financial documents through the application and maintenance of adequate internal controls			

<p>III.D.6. Financial documents, including the budget, have a high degree of credibility and accuracy, and reflect appropriate allocation and use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services.</p>	EVIDENCE: Budget versus actual variance reports and analyses;	No		District Office
	EVIDENCE: Annual external audit reports and findings;	No		District Office
	EVIDENCE: Audits of any foundations that are not separately incorporated;	No		OC Foundation and Board minutes
	EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
	REVIEW CRITERIA: Funds are allocated, as shown in the budget, in a manner that will realistically achieve the institution's stated goals for student learning.			
	REVIEW CRITERIA: The institutional budget is an accurate reflection of institutional spending and it has credibility with constituents.			
	REVIEW CRITERIA: Audits demonstrate the integrity of financial management practices.			
<p>III.D.7. Institutional responses to external audit findings are comprehensive, timely, and communicated appropriately.</p>	EVIDENCE: Formal responses to external audit reports and findings;	No		District Office
	EVIDENCE: Minutes of meetings when audits and findings are discussed and responses are planned;	No		District Office
	EVIDENCE: Minutes of meetings where the above reports are disseminated;	No		Board minutes
	EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
	REVIEW CRITERIA: Information about budget, fiscal conditions, and audit results are provided throughout the college.			
	REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution remediates audit findings in a timely manner.			

		REVIEW CRITERIA: If the institution has received any audit findings or negative reviews during the last six years, they have been addressed in a timely manner.			
III.D.8. The institution's financial and internal control systems are evaluated and assessed for validity and effectiveness, and the results of this assessment are used for improvement.		EVIDENCE: External auditors' reports and findings that address the college's internal control systems;	No		District Office
		EVIDENCE: The college's responses to such findings;	No		District Office
		EVIDENCE: Financial reports subsequent to audits findings, and subsequent audit reports and findings;	No		District Office
		EVIDENCE: Finance department program reviews, including evaluations of validity and effectiveness of financial and internal control systems;	No		OC Fiscal program review & District docs
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The Finance Department regularly conducts program review, including evaluation of effectiveness of internal controls.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution assesses the effectiveness of its past financial plans and the results of this assessment are used to improve current and future financial plans.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Audits demonstrate the integrity of financial management practices.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution reviews its internal control systems on a regular basis.			
		EVIDENCE: Policy or procedure reflecting commitment to sound financial practices and financial stability;	No		Board policies

III.D.9. The institution has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, support strategies for appropriate risk management, and, when necessary, implement contingency plans to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences.

EVIDENCE: Policy or procedure that defines minimum reserve expectations;	No		Board policies
EVIDENCE: Monthly, quarterly, or other cash-flow or cash balance reports;	No		District Office
EVIDENCE: Reports of reserves, special reserve accounts, etc.;	No		District Office
EVIDENCE: Policies or procedures for risk management;	No		Board policies
EVIDENCE: Reports of insurance policies, funds, payments, etc.;	No		District Office
EVIDENCE: Records of self-insurance for health benefits, workers compensation, and unemployment;	No		District Office
EVIDENCE: Contingency plans for financial emergencies;	No		District Office
EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution's level of unrestricted fiscal reserves is adequate to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences.			
REVIEW CRITERIA: The ending balance of unrestricted funds for the immediate past three years is sufficient to maintain a reserve needed for emergencies.			
REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has sufficient insurance to cover its needs. If the institution is selffunded in any insurance categories, it has sufficient reserves to handle financial emergencies.			

		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution’s process for receiving revenues does not pose cash-flow difficulties. When there is a cash-flow challenge, the college has a process to rectify those difficulties.			
III.D.10. The institution practices effective oversight of finances, including management of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contractual relationships, auxiliary organizations or foundations, and institutional investments and assets.		EVIDENCE: Procedures for the financial management and oversight of grants, externally funded programs, contractual relationships, auxiliary organizations or foundations, and institutional investments and assets;	No		District Office
		EVIDENCE: Financial reports or audits for grants, externally funded programs, contractual relationships, auxiliary organizations, foundations, bonds, institutional investments, endowments, and/or assets;	No		District Office
		EVIDENCE: Financial aid reports and/or audits that demonstrate effective oversight;	No		District Office
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has established processes to assess its use of financial resources.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution demonstrates compliance with Federal Title IV regulations and requirements for managing federal financial aid.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution ensures that it assesses its use of financial resources systematically and effectively.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution uses results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.			
	EVIDENCE: Procedure for both the short-term and long-range management of the institution’s cash and capital structure;	No		District Office	
	EVIDENCE: Cash flow forecasts and analyses;	No		District Office	

<p>III.D.11. The level of financial resources provides a reasonable expectation of both shortterm and long-term financial solvency. When making short-range financial plans, the institution considers its long-range financial priorities to assure financial stability. The institution clearly identifies, plans, and allocates resources for payment of liabilities and future obligations.</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Resulting institutional budgets and plans that account for payments of both shortterm liabilities and long-term and future obligations;</p>	No		District Office
	<p>EVIDENCE: Reports of obligations for future total employee compensation expenditures, including employment agreements, collective bargaining agreements, and management contracts, including any buy-out provisions;</p>	No		District Office
	<p>EVIDENCE: The institution’s credit rating;</p>	No		District Office
	<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution continually assesses and adjusts its capital structure and cash management strategies to ensure both short-term and long-term financial solvency.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has plans for payments of long-term liabilities and obligations, including health benefits, insurance costs, building maintenance costs, etc. This information is used in short-term or annual budget and other fiscal planning.</p>			
<p>III.D.12. The institution plans for and allocates appropriate resources for the payment of liabilities and future obligations, including Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) compensated</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Actuarial valuation report for pension and OPEB;</p>	No		District Office
	<p>EVIDENCE: Records of annual required contributions (ARC) for pension and OPEB obligations;</p>	No		District Office
	<p>EVIDENCE: Collective bargaining agreements;</p>	No		District Office
	<p>EVIDENCE: Leave accrual policies and records;</p>	No		District Office
	<p>EVIDENCE: Notes to financial statements dealing with employee benefit plans, commitments and contingencies;</p>	No		District Office

	<p>(OPEB), compensated absences, and other employee related obligations. The actuarial plan to determine Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) is current and prepared as required by appropriate accounting standards.</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>			
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution incorporates actuarially developed plans for Other Post-Employment Benefit (OPEB) obligations into its financial plans.</p>			
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution's pension and OPEB plans are sufficiently funded. The institution fully funds or has a plan to fully fund its annual pension and OPEB obligation (Annual required contribution [ARC]).</p>			
	<p>III.D.13. On an annual basis, the institution assesses and allocates resources for the repayment of any locally incurred debt instruments that can affect the financial condition of the institution.</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Documentation of debt repayment schedules;</p>	<p>No</p>		<p>District Office</p>
		<p>EVIDENCE: Independent evaluation reports or other documents that demonstrate the institution's record or history of debt repayment;</p>	<p>No</p>		<p>District Office</p>
		<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>			
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has an annual assessment of debt repayment obligations.</p>			
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has appropriate plans to repay locally incurred debt.</p>			
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution ensures that locally incurred debt repayment schedule does not have an adverse impact on meeting all current and future financial obligations.</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: Reports that analyze grant expenditures consistent with intended use of the grant funds;</p>	<p>No</p>		<p>District Office</p>
		<p>EVIDENCE: Similar reports on use of funds from auxiliary activities and fund raising efforts;</p>	<p>No</p>		<p>District Office</p>

<p>III.D.14. All financial resources, including short- and long-term debt instruments (such as bonds and Certificates of Participation), auxiliary activities, fund-raising efforts, and grants, are used with integrity in a manner consistent with the intended purpose of the funding source.</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Records from bond funding, if any, including audit reports;</p>	No		District Office
	<p>EVIDENCE: Minutes and reports of bond oversight committee;</p>	??		District Office
	<p>EVIDENCE: Compliance reports from funding agencies or audits, both internal and external;</p>	No		District Office
	<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution's restricted funds are audited or reviewed by funding agencies on a regular basis.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: Expenditures from restricted funds are made in a manner consistent with the intent and requirements of the funding source.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: Bond expenditures are consistent with regulatory and legal restrictions.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution ensures that the financial operations of all auxiliary activities are appropriately monitored.</p>			
<p>III.D.15. The institution monitors and manages student loan default rates, revenue streams, and assets to ensure compliance with federal requirements,</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Reports on student loan default rates;</p>	No		District Office & Linda Faasua
	<p>EVIDENCE: Institutional plans or service area plans for lowering loan default rates;</p>	No		District Office & OC Fin Aid as appropriate
	<p>EVIDENCE: USDE Federal Student Aid (FSA) audits and compliance reports (Checklist: Title IV Compliance. Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV);</p>	No		District Office
	<p>EVIDENCE: College responses to FSA audits and related reports and correspondences (Checklist: Title IV Compliance. Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV);</p>	No		District Office

	<p>including Title IV of the Higher Education Act, and comes into compliance when the federal government identifies deficiencies.</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard</p>			
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution's three-year default rate is within federal guidelines.</p>			
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has a plan to reduce the default rate if it exceeds federal guidelines.</p>			
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: Student loan default rates, revenues, and related matters are monitored and assessed to ensure compliance with Federal Regulation.</p>			
	<p>III.D.16. Contractual agreements with external entities are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution, governed by institutional policies, and contain appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the institution and the quality of its programs, services, and operations.</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Copies of contractual agreements with external entities, highlighting consistency with institutional mission and goals;</p>	<p>No</p>		<p>District Office</p>
		<p>EVIDENCE: Policies and procedures regarding contractual agreements with external entities, highlighting provisions for maintaining institutional integrity and support for programs and services;</p>	<p>No</p>		<p>District Office</p>
		<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>			
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: If the institution has contractual agreements, they are consistent with institutional mission and goals.</p>			
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has appropriate control over these contracts. It can change or terminate contracts that don't meet its required standards of quality.</p>			
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: External contracts are managed in a manner to ensure that federal guidelines are met.</p>			

STANDARD 4.A DECISION MAKING ROLES & PROCESSES

Draft Lead	Standard Section	Sources of Evidence and Review Criteria	GAP? (YES/NO)	Describe Gap	Location of Evidence/Narrative for Criteria
Art Sandford	IV.A.1. Institutional leaders create and encourage innovation leading to institutional excellence. They support administrators, faculty, staff, and students, no matter what their official titles, in taking initiative for improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective planning and implementation.	EVIDENCE: Diagrams of governance and decision-making lines of communication;			
		EVIDENCE: Examples of innovations or improvement ideas that have been brought forward by an individual or group, advanced through the governance/decision-making process, and implemented;			
		EVIDENCE: Minutes of meetings, or progress reports, that can track the development of innovations or improvements from inception to planning to implementation;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has formal and informal practices and procedures that encourage individuals, no matter their role, to bring forward ideas for institutional improvement.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has established systems and participative processes for effective planning and implementation for program and institutional improvement.			
	IV.A.2. The institution establishes and implements policy and procedures authorizing administrator, faculty, and staff	EVIDENCE: Policy and/or procedure that establishes governance structure and explains constituents' roles in decision making;			
		EVIDENCE: Policy or procedure that delineates constituents' areas of responsibility in bringing ideas forward, planning, and decision-making;			

Luis Gonzalez	participation in decision-making processes. The policy makes provisions for student participation and consideration of student views in those matters in which students have a direct and reasonable interest. Policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose committees.	EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Institutional policies and procedures describing the roles for each group in decision-making processes			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: These policies and procedures encourage student participation in matters which concern them, and take into consideration the student perspective when making decisions.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has policies and procedures that describe the official responsibilities and authority of the faculty and of academic administrators in curricular and other educational matters.			
Art Sandford	IV.A.3. Administrators and faculty, through policy and procedures, have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise.	EVIDENCE: Policy and/or procedure that defines the roles of administrators and faculty in governance;			
		EVIDENCE: Minutes or other reports that demonstrate administrators and faculty carrying out their roles as defined;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Institutional policies and procedures describe the roles for each group in governance, including planning and budget development.			
		EVIDENCE: Policy and/or procedure that describe the roles of administrators and faculty in decision-making related to curriculum and student learning programs and services;			

Amy Edwards	IV.A.4. Faculty and academic administrators, through policy and procedures, and through well-defined structures, have responsibility for recommendations about curriculum and student learning programs and services.	EVIDENCE: Minutes or other reports that demonstrate administrators and faculty carrying out their roles as described;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Institutional policies and procedures describe the official responsibilities and authority of the faculty and of academic administrators in curricular and other educational matters			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution regularly evaluates these policies and procedures to ensure they are being followed and practices are functioning effectively.			
Lilia	IV.A.5. Through its system of board and institutional governance, the institution ensures the appropriate consideration of relevant perspectives; decision-making aligned with	EVIDENCE: Policy and/or procedure that establishes governance structure and explains constituents' roles in institutional decision making;			
		EVIDENCE: Governance committee(s) charters and rosters;			
		EVIDENCE: Governance handbook or other document that describes institutional governance system;			
		EVIDENCE: Sample minutes from decision-making groups and other types of reports that demonstrate when decisions are made and/or when resulting actions are completed;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			

Ruvalcaba	making aligned with expertise and responsibility; and timely action on institutional plans, policies, curricular change, and other key considerations.	REVIEW CRITERIA: Written policies on governance procedures specify appropriate roles for all staff and students. These policies specify the academic roles of faculty in areas of student educational programs and services planning.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Staff and students are well informed of their respective roles. The various groups collaborate on behalf of institutional improvements. The result of this effort results in documented institutional improvement.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The college has developed structures of communication that demonstrate that it values diverse perspectives.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The college demonstrates that consideration of diverse perspectives leads to setting institutional priorities and timely action.			
Keller Magenau	IV.A.6. The processes for decision-making and the resulting decisions are documented and widely communicated across the institution.	EVIDENCE: Procedures that establish processes for decision-making;			
		EVIDENCE: Sample minutes from decision-making groups and other types of reports that demonstrate when decisions are made and/or when resulting actions are completed;			
		EVIDENCE: Sample communications to the institution regarding decisions made and the resulting actions;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The college has processes to document and communicate decisions across the institution.			

Amparo Medina	IV.A.7. Leadership roles and the institution's governance and decision-making policies, procedures, and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.	EVIDENCE: Evaluation instruments and resulting reports that assess effectiveness of governance structures and processes, including plans for improvement;			
		EVIDENCE: Evaluation instruments and resulting reports that assess effectiveness of committees, including plans for improvement;			
		EVIDENCE: Minutes from a governance body when effectiveness of governance structures and processes were discussed;			
		EVIDENCE: Documentation of a regular cycle of evaluation for governance;			
		EVIDENCE: Subsequent governance evaluation reports that document improvements to governance;			
		EVIDENCE: Examples of communications to the college on results of the evaluations or discussions;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution regularly evaluates its governance and decision-making structures. The results of these evaluations are communicated within the campus community.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution uses the results of these evaluations to identify weaknesses and to make needed improvements			

STANDARD S4.B CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Draft Lead	Standard Section	Sources of Evidence and Review Criteria	GAP? (YES/NO)	Describe Gap	Location of Evidence/Narrative for Criteria
	<p>IV.B.1. The institutional chief executive officer (CEO) has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution. The CEO provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness.</p>	EVIDENCE: Policy that outlines CEO responsibilities;			
EVIDENCE: CEO job description;					
EVIDENCE: Job announcements for CEO;					
EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.					
REVIEW CRITERIA: The CEO regularly communicates institutional values, goals, institution-set standards, and other relevant information, to internal and external stakeholders.					
REVIEW CRITERIA: The CEO communicates the importance of a culture of evidence and a focus on student learning.					
REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has mechanisms in place to link institutional research, particularly research on student learning, to institutional planning processes, and resource allocation processes, which has been driven by the CEO.					
	<p>IV.B.2. The CEO plans, oversees, and evaluates an administrative structure organized and staffed to reflect the institution's purposes, size, and complexity. The CEO delegates authority to</p>	EVIDENCE: Policy that outlines CEO responsibilities;			
EVIDENCE: Organizational charts;					
EVIDENCE: Policies and procedures that provide for the delegation of authority from the CEO to administrators and others;					
EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.					

	administrators and others consistent with their responsibilities, as appropriate.	REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has policies and procedures which provide for the delegation of authority from the CEO to administrators, and others, consistent with their roles and responsibilities.			
	IV.B.3. Through established policies and procedures, the CEO guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by: o establishing a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities; o ensuring the college sets institutional performance standards for student	EVIDENCE: Policies and procedures that provide for the delegation of authority from the CEO to administrators and others for the topics listed in this Standard;			
		EVIDENCE: Minutes of meetings with CEO present when any of the above are decided or acted upon;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: (listed within the Standard)			
	IV.B.4. The CEO has the primary leadership role for accreditation, ensuring that the institution meets or exceeds Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies at all times. Faculty, staff, and administrative leaders of the institution also have responsibility for assuring compliance with accreditation requirements.	EVIDENCE: Policy and/or procedure that describes CEO role in accreditation;			
		EVIDENCE: Rosters of accreditation leadership teams;			
		EVIDENCE: Examples of CEO communications or presentations related to accreditation;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The CEO takes a lead role in accreditation processes and in creating a culture of commitment to continuous quality improvement.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The CEO ensures others on campus also understand accreditation.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The CEO collaborates with the institution's accreditation liaison officer to guide all accreditation efforts.			

IV.B.5. The CEO assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies, including effective control of budget and expenditures.	EVIDENCE: Policy and/or procedure that describes CEO role in the matters described in this Standard;			
	EVIDENCE: Copies of communications from the CEO regarding statutes, regulations and policies, and budgets;			
	EVIDENCE: Reports and other documents related to the matters described in this Standard and signed by the CEO;			
	EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
	REVIEW CRITERIA: The CEO regularly communicates statutory and compliance expectations to the governing board to provide for informed decision-making.			
	REVIEW CRITERIA: The CEO ensures that all governance decisions are linked to the institutional mission.			
IV.B.6. The CEO works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution.	EVIDENCE: Copies of communications from the CEO to the communities served by the college;			
	EVIDENCE: Press releases from the CEO			
	EVIDENCE: Itinerary of CEO's in-person contacts with community groups;			
	EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
	REVIEW CRITERIA: The CEO ensures that communities served by the college are regularly informed about the institution.			

STANDARD 4.C GOVERNING BOARD

Draft Lead	Standard Section	Sources of Evidence and Review Criteria	GAP? (YES/NO)	Describe Gap	Location of Evidence/Narrative for Criteria
	IV.C.1. The institution has a governing board that has authority over and responsibility for policies to assure the academic quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution.	EVIDENCE: Policies that describe the authority and responsibilities of the board;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has a policy manual or other compilation of policy documents that delineates the governing board's accountability for academic quality, integrity, the effectiveness of learning programs and services, and institution's financial stability. These policies are reviewed on a regular basis.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution's board policies address quality improvement and adherence to the institution's mission and vision.			
	IV.C.2. The governing board acts as a collective entity. Once the board reaches a decision, all board members act in support of the decision.	EVIDENCE: Policy or bylaws that describe the ways in which the board may make decisions or act;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: Board members, individually, demonstrate their support for board policies and decisions.			
		EVIDENCE: Policy and/or procedures for selecting and evaluating the CEO;			
		EVIDENCE: Timeline of CEO selection process and/or CEO evaluation process;			

IV.C.3. The governing board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the CEO of the college and/or the district/system.	EVIDENCE: Documents from the most recent selection process for a new CEO;			
	EVIDENCE: Completed CEO evaluations;			
	EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
	REVIEW CRITERIA: The board has an established process for conducting a search and the selection of the chief administrator.			
	REVIEW CRITERIA: The board has an established process for its evaluation of the chief administrator's performance.			
	REVIEW CRITERIA: The board sets clear expectations for regular reports on institutional performance from the chief administrator.			
IV.C.4. The governing board is an independent, policy-making body that reflects the public interest in the institution's educational quality. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or political pressure.	EVIDENCE: Board policy or bylaws that address the elements contained in this Standard;			
	EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
	REVIEW CRITERIA: The governing board is appropriately representative of the public interest and lacks conflict of interest.			
	REVIEW CRITERIA: The composition of the governing board reflects public interest in the institution.			
IV.C.5. The governing board establishes policies consistent with the college/district/system mission to ensure the quality, integrity, and	EVIDENCE: Board policy or bylaw that describes the board's responsibility for matters described in this Standard;			
	EVIDENCE: Minutes from board meetings when policies are discussed and approved;			
	EVIDENCE: Minutes from board meetings when educational quality, legal matters, or financial integrity and stability are discussed;			

<p>improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them. The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity and stability.</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The Board has approved policies, institutional goals or other formal statements that describe governing board expectations for quality, i</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The governing board is aware of the institution-set standards and analysis of results that have led to the improvement of student achievement and learning.</p>			
<p>IV.C.6. The institution or the governing board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board's size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures.</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Board policy or bylaws that define the elements contained in this Standard;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: Location where policies and bylaws are made available to the public;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: Board bylaws and policies regarding the governing board's specifications are readily available in print and/or online.</p>			
<p>IV.C.7. The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly assesses its policies and bylaws for their effectiveness in fulfilling the college/district/system mission and revises them as necessary.</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Policy or procedure for review of board policies;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: Timeline for regular review of board policies. This may be a multi-year timeline;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: Governing board records (minutes, resolutions) indicate that its actions are consistent with its policies and bylaws.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The governing board has a system for evaluating and revising its policies on a regular basis.</p>			

	IV.C.8. To ensure the institution is accomplishing its goals for student success, the governing board regularly reviews key indicators of student learning and achievement and institutional plans for improving academic quality.	EVIDENCE: Reports to the board on student performance data or on institutional plans;			
		EVIDENCE: Minutes of board meetings when student performance data or institutional plans are discussed;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The governing board regularly reviews data on student performance.			
	IV.C.9. The governing board has an ongoing training program for board development, including new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.	EVIDENCE: Policy or procedure for staggered terms of office;			
		EVIDENCE: Agenda and/or presentations from new board member orientations;			
		EVIDENCE: Schedule of ongoing training opportunities or topics for board members;			
		EVIDENCE: Documentation of board member participation in offsite board development workshops or conferences;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The governing board has a program for development and orientation.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The governing board has a formal, written method of providing for leadership continuity and staggered terms of office.			
	IV.C.10. Board policies and/or bylaws clearly establish a process for board evaluation. The evaluation assesses the	EVIDENCE: Bylaws, policy, and/or procedures for conducting board evaluations;			
		EVIDENCE: Completed board evaluations;			
		EVIDENCE: Locations where the results of board evaluations are made public;			

<p>board's effectiveness in promoting and sustaining academic quality and institutional effectiveness. The governing board regularly evaluates its practices and performance, including full participation in board training, and makes public the results. The results are used to improve board performance, academic</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Agenda/minutes that note discussions on the board evaluation;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: Subsequent evaluations that record improvements made as a result of prior evaluations;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The governing board has a self-evaluation process, as defined in its policies.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The governing board uses the results from its self-evaluation to make improvements regarding its role, functioning, and</p>			
<p>IV.C.11. The governing board upholds a code of ethics and conflict of interest policy, and individual board members adhere to the code. The board has a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code and implements it when necessary. A majority of the board members have no employment, family, ownership, or other</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Policy or procedure on board code of ethics and conflict of interest, with consequences for violations;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: Affidavits or conflict of interest agreements signed by individual board members;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: When a conflict of interest is reported, the board demonstrates that it follows its conflict of interest policy.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The governing board has a stated process for dealing with board behavior that is unethical</p>			
<p>IV.C.12. The governing</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Policy on board delegation of authority to the CEO;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>			

<p>board delegates full responsibility and authority to the CEO to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds the CEO accountable for the operation of the district/system or college, respectively.</p>	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: Board delegation of administrative authority to the chief administrator is defined in policy or other board approved documents.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: Board delegation of administrative authority is clear to all parties.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The governing board sets clear expectations for regular reports on institutional performance from the chief administrator.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The board sets clear expectations for sufficient information on institutional performance to ensure that it can fulfill its responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.</p>			
<p>IV.C.13. The governing board is informed about the Eligibility Requirements, the Accreditation Standards, Commission policies, accreditation processes, and the college's accredited status, and supports through policy the college's efforts to improve and excel. The board participates in evaluation of</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Reports to the board regarding accreditation;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: Minutes from board meetings when accreditation is discussed;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: Agenda or presentations from board trainings on accreditation;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: Documentation of board participation in institutional self-evaluation for accreditation, if any, such as rosters or minutes from committees;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: Board evaluations that include discussion of the board's role in accreditation;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The governing board receives training about the accreditation process and Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements, and Commission policies.</p>			

governing board roles and functions in the accreditation process.	REVIEW CRITERIA: The governing board participates appropriately in institutional self-evaluation and planning efforts.			
	REVIEW CRITERIA: Governing board actions indicate a commitment to improvements planned as part of institutional self-evaluation and accreditation processes.			
	REVIEW CRITERIA: The governing board is informed of institutional reports due to the Commission, and of Commission recommendations to the institution.			

STANDARD 4.D Multi-College Districts or Systems

Draft Lead	Standard Section	Sources of Evidence and Review Criteria	GAP? (YES/NO)	Describe Gap	Location of Evidence/Narrative for Criteria
	<p>IV.D.1. In multi-college districts or systems, the district/system CEO provides leadership in setting and communicating expectations of educational excellence and integrity throughout the district/system and assures support for the effective operation of the colleges. Working with the colleges, the district/system CEO establishes clearly defined roles, authority and</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Presentations by or communications from the district/system CEO that express expectations for educational excellence and integrity;</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: Policies and/or procedures that delineate roles and responsibilities between district/system and the colleges;</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>			
		<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: There are established policies and/or practices which demonstrate the delineation of roles and responsibilities for the district/system and the colleges.</p>			
	<p>IV.D.2. The district/system CEO clearly delineates, documents, and communicates the operational responsibilities and functions of the district/system from those of the colleges and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice. The district/system CEO ensures that the colleges receive effective and adequate district/system provided</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: The functional map (see Appendix D);</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: Policies and/or procedures that delineate roles and responsibilities between district/system and the colleges;</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: Communications from the district/system CEO regarding operational responsibilities of the district/system and/or colleges;</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: Evaluations of the district/system completed by CEOs of the colleges;</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: Summary of district/system role in institutional evaluation and planning, if described in greater detail in Standard I;</p>			
		<p>EVIDENCE: Summary of district/system role in resources and allocation of resources, if described in greater detail in Standard III;</p>			

<p>district/system provides services to support the colleges in achieving their missions. Where a district/system has responsibility for resources, allocation of resources, and planning, it is evaluated against the Standards, and its performance is reflected in the accredited status of the institution.</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The district/system is knowledgeable regarding the established policies and/or practices which demonstrate the delineation of roles and responsibilities for the district/system and the colleges.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The delineation of responsibilities is regularly evaluated for effectiveness.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: District/system services are regularly evaluated with regard to their support for institutional missions and functions.</p>			
<p>IV.D.3. The district/system has a policy for allocation and reallocation of resources that are adequate to support the effective operations and sustainability of the colleges and district/system. The district/system CEO ensures effective control of expenditures.</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Policies and/or procedures for allocation and reallocation of resources to the colleges;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: Policies and/or procedures for internal controls of district/system finances;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: Resource allocation model or plan;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: District/system budgets and college budgets;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: District/system and college audit reports;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The district/system's has an established policy for distributing resources to its institutions.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The policy is well-understood across the district/system.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The distribution method reflects the needs and priorities of the colleges.</p>			

		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution's most recent annual independent audit reports and audited financial statements demonstrate the district reviews and controls system-wide expenditures.			
IV.D.4. The CEO of the district or system delegates full responsibility and authority to the CEOs of the colleges to implement and administer delegated district/system policies without interference and holds college CEO's accountable for the operation of the colleges.		EVIDENCE: Policies and/or procedures that describe delegation of authority to the CEOs as described in this Standard;			
		EVIDENCE: Procedure or evaluation instrument for district/system CEO evaluation of college CEOs;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The institution has policies and practices that demonstrate delegation of authority to college CEO.			
IV.D.5. District/system planning and evaluation are integrated with college planning and evaluation to improve student learning and achievement and institutional effectiveness.		EVIDENCE: District/system evaluation and planning manual;			
		EVIDENCE: District/system plans;			
		EVIDENCE: District/system reports on student learning and student achievement;			
		EVIDENCE: Minutes of district/system governance or planning committees;			
		EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: The district/system and the colleges engage in an integrated planning and evaluation process.			
		REVIEW CRITERIA: District/system plans include analysis of student learning and student achievement in the district/system.			

IV.D.6. Communication between colleges and districts/systems ensures effective operations of the colleges and should be timely, accurate, and complete in order for the colleges to make decisions effectively.	EVIDENCE: Policy, procedures, and/or protocols for communications between district/system and colleges;			
	EVIDENCE: Reports from district/system to colleges and from colleges to district/system;			
	EVIDENCE: Minutes from district/system committees, with evidence of dissemination to colleges;			
	EVIDENCE: District/system website, used for sharing information with colleges;			
	EVIDENCE: Examples of timely communications between district/system and colleges regarding operational matters;			
	EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.			
	REVIEW CRITERIA: The district/system and the colleges have an established communication protocol to ensure effective operations of the colleges are timely, accurate and complete.			
	REVIEW CRITERIA: The colleges are well informed about district/system issues, governing board actions and interests that have an impact on operations, educational quality, stability or the ability to provide high quality education.			
	EVIDENCE: Policy and/or procedure for district/system evaluations;			
	EVIDENCE: Timeline or cycle for regular evaluations of district/system;			
	EVIDENCE: Evaluation instruments used for evaluating effectiveness of district/system on governance, decision-making, district/system and college relationships, and resource allocation;			

<p>IV.D.7. The district/system CEO regularly evaluates district/system and college role delineations, governance and decision-making processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals for student achievement and learning. The district/system widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.</p>	<p>EVIDENCE: Minutes that document discussion of the effectiveness of district/system governance, decision-making, district/system and college relationships, and resource allocation;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: Documentation of dissemination of evaluation results;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: Program reviews or other system evaluations of district/system services;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: Reports of improvements in subsequent program reviews or system evaluations;</p>			
	<p>EVIDENCE: And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The district/system and the colleges have a robust evaluation process on college role delineations, governance and decision-making processes which ensure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting college in meeting their goals.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: The evaluation process is conducted regularly and results of such evaluations are widely communicated.</p>			
	<p>REVIEW CRITERIA: Improvements are made as a result of these evaluations.</p>			