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Statement on Report Preparation:

This report was originally initiated in response to the commission’s progress requirement for submission in March 2009. In May 2008 two faculty members recommended by the Academic Senate were allocated .2 FTE reassigned time to secure college-wide involvement in developing the March 2009 report on a basis approved by the Academic Senate [1.1]. In June 2008 the Commission required another earlier report to be submitted October 15, 2008. The resulting report is organized accordingly to provide the background for each recommendation being addressed in this report and citing the progress that has been made and the relevant documentary evidence. All members of the College’s cluster committees and the College Planning Council were consulted and assisted in the preparation of this report, which was approved by the Academic Senate on September 18, 2008 and by the College Planning Council on September 22. [1.2].

Evidence

1.1 Memorandum of Agreement between Administration and the Academic Senate on the preparation of the 2009 Accreditation Midterm Report.
1.2 Memoranda, etc., for the preparation of the October 15, 2008, Progress Report.
Introduction:

This report addresses four recommendations (#2, 3, 4, 6) made by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges Accrediting Commission to Los Angeles Harbor College. These recommendations primarily relate to the College’s evaluation, planning, and review process and define the relationship between Harbor College and the larger Los Angeles Community College District. Harbor College’s evidenced response to each of these recommendations demonstrates that since the Commission’s 2006 accreditation visit, Harbor College has conducted and continues to refine a cycle of campus-wide planning and evaluation that is data driven and rooted in student learning outcomes and their assessment. The ongoing utilization of this cycle further clarifies the College’s mission and promotes overall institutional effectiveness.
Recommendation 2: The College needs to develop an on-going, systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation and re-evaluation. This should be based in deep analysis of District and institutional research provided data and assure a broad involvement and participation in the institutional planning cycle.

Background:

Since Harbor College’s 2006 Self Study, the varied elements of the College’s planning process have been integrated into an ongoing, systematic cycle of evaluation, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. The integrated process includes first prioritizing the needs and goals within unit plans that reflect both program reviews and student learning outcomes. Secondly, planning “clusters” (Academic, Student Services, Administrative Services, and President’s Cluster) merge unit priorities into cluster priorities for presentation to the College Planning Council (CPC). Thirdly, the CPC integrates cluster priorities into college-wide priorities reflecting the College Strategic Plan. Lastly, the Budget Committee funds these priorities from available funding sources.

Harbor College’s 2006 Self Study delineated the college planning process at that time. Unit plans previously were evident, as were cluster decisions periodically derived from those unit plans in distinct areas such as future staffing and facilities priorities; and college decisions were in turn derived from the cluster decisions in those areas. But it was not clear from unit plans how current college budget decisions resulted from them, nor were cluster plans comprehensive across the whole range of cluster activities. The same was true of the College Plan. The College regularly updated its strategic plan, specifying the college goals that fulfill its mission, but cluster plans did not clarify the extent to which these goals were served by the priorities linked to them. No college master plan generated from the cluster plans was evident incorporating those college goals into comprehensive priorities for all activities.

Report of Progress:

Since the last report, these concerns have been systematically addressed, reflecting the college’s position at the self-sustaining level of institutional effectiveness and planning. Specifically, unit plans are updated regularly on improved templates that align all activities with approved college goals and employ District/College data (e.g. from the Los Angeles Harbor College Fact Book and Planning Resource Guide 2008). The process requires unit plans to be integrated into comprehensive cluster plans and cluster plans in turn to be integrated into a College Master Plan also informed by Fact Book data and similarly updated.

The central item in each CPC agenda is focused on the College plan with reference to the cluster plans that it incorporates, and CPC decisions, wherever feasible, are made in the context of implementing or altering planning priorities. Cluster and unit agendas are similarly structured, with decisions at the cluster and unit level, wherever feasible, made in the context of their
respective plans. This fulfills the 2006 Self Study “planning agenda” commitment by the College to “give College Planning Council meetings the planning focus they need by completing cluster plans sufficiently functional to enable CPC to reach its decisions within the framework of the College plan and through the ongoing review of that plan.” Implementing the 2006 Self Study “planning agenda” commitment to “enable the College Budget Committee to perform more fiscal analysis and evaluation functions,” the reports of the College Budget Committee and Research Office made to CPC provide perspective on long-term trends. As provided in the College Planning Manual, plans indicate both current and intended priorities sufficiently to enable funding reductions when strategically necessary and funding increases when strategically possible, so as to address the 2006 Self Study “planning agenda” commitment for plans “from which all educational, personnel, and facilities priorities can be directly derived” [2.1].

As is shown in the following excerpts from the attached unit and cluster plans [2.2, 2.3], each activity in each plan cites the college goal that it addresses and these activities are prioritized. Priorities are determined according to the extent to which they serve college goals according to the measure/s authorized in the College Strategic Plan [2.4].
The 2007-08 planning process has been reviewed this year and the College Planning Policy and Procedure Manual has been updated, with all planning-related timelines integrated into a comprehensive planning calendar [2.5]. Planning processes will continue to be evaluated annually by all entities concerned. Entries from the minutes of the planning bodies demonstrate the extent to which these reviews are inclusive, in-depth, and data-based [2.6].

Most importantly effectiveness of this process has been tested in the timely filing with the District this past May of the College’s Educational Master Plan Update [2.7] and in the college response to a District mandate to cut costs by over $1 million for 2008-09. The accompanying attachments show the extent to which necessary budget reductions resulted from a college dialogue that was rooted in data, reflected the priorities of unit, cluster, and college, and were determined on the basis of the college planning process [2.8].
Recommendation 2: Evidence
2.1 College Planning Council Statement on Adherence to the College Planning Cycle.
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/collegeplans/unitplans.html
2.2 Instructional and non-instructional unit plans.
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/collegeplans/index.html
2.3 Instructional and non-instructional cluster plans.
2.4 College Strategic Plan 2008-2012.
http://www.lahc.edu/research/strategicplan-for-factbook.pdf
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/planning/plprocmanual.pdf
2.6 Minutes of planning cluster and CPC meetings.
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/governance/cpc/index.html
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/governance/acadaffairs/index.html
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/governance/adminservices/index.html
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/governance/studentservices/index.html
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/governance/prescluster/index.html
2.7 2008 College Educational Master Plan Update.
2.8 2008 unit and cluster budget reduction prioritizations as adopted by the CPC.
**Recommendation 3:** Using the planning process and the governance process the College should construct a meaningful dialogue about student learning which assures understanding and infusion of Student Learning Outcomes. This dialogue should rely on robust information focused on the accomplishment of students as defined in program, inter-departmental, and institutional student learning outcomes. (IB1, IB2, IB4, IIA1c).

**Background:**

Since the 2006 *Self Study* Los Angeles Harbor College has engaged in a campus-wide dialogue that has directed the planning and governance processes toward the measurement of student learning. The dialogue has focused the attention of the entire school at the programmatic, inter-departmental, and institutional level to determine how these outcomes can best be articulated and assessed. The college dialogue may be understood by focusing on three areas that have prioritized student learning and assessment: 1) The leadership and organizational impetus provided by the college’s governing (Academic Senate, Academic Affairs Cluster, and College Planning Council) and administrative (Division Council) bodies. 2) The college’s professional training and development activities, and 3) Writing and assessment of student learning outcomes (SLOs) across the entire college curriculum.

**Report of Progress:**

**College Leadership:** The planning and governance bodies of Harbor College have promoted an ongoing dialogue within the college regarding student learning outcomes. Individual unit plans are determined by the specific goals of a given division and are deeply rooted in its learning outcomes and their assessment. When presented to the Academic Affairs Cluster the unit plans are prioritized on a matrix that integrates cluster priorities with student learning that are once again integrated with learning outcomes on an institutional basis.

**Professional Activities:** Writing and measuring student outcomes has been the focus of numerous professional activities on campus. In August 2006 (Harbor’s mandatory Flex day) Dr. Fred Trapp of Long Beach City College led a college-wide workshop “Assessing Our Student Needs,” followed by a smaller workshop, “Student Retention and Assessment” led by Gary Colombo of the Los Angeles Community College District. Both speakers reinforced a pragmatic approach to crafting discipline-specific SLOs and their assessment. Fall 2007 Opening Day included another opportunity for college dialogue with Mr. Brad Kemp presenting a keynote address on “Serving Our Students.” Mr. Kemp offered an economic/labor analysis of the Los Angeles region and its influence on the education of Harbor students. The address was followed by smaller focus groups that discussed the educational implications of his presentation. [3.1] Division meetings throughout 2006-2008 also provided extensive opportunity for dialogue. In 2008 the campus sponsored two highly interactive “World Cafés” (April 7 and August 29, 2008)
which included lively discussion among administration, faculty, staff, and students and focused on Harbor’s pedagogy and how we evaluate and measure college outcomes. [3.2]

**Student Learning Outcomes:**

**SLO Coordinator:** In February, 2007 Professor Lora Lane was hired at a .2 FTE reassigned time as the Student Learning Outcome Coordinator. As the SLO coordinator Professor Lane works to infuse SLOs throughout the college and to provide ongoing training on writing measurable SLOs that can be assessed using qualitative and quantitative data. [3.3]

**SLO Activities:** Professor Lane, along with Academic Dean David Humphreys, organized a series of SLO workshops in spring 2008 (March 14-Physical Education, March 21-Music, Humanities, and Fine Arts, April 17-Social and Behavioral Sciences, April 17-Business Division, April 25-Math, May 2- Natural Sciences, May 7-various divisions, May 23-Math) in which over sixty faculty members participated in extensive practice about writing and assessing student learning outcomes. Professor Lane continues to work in one-on-one consultations with various instructors across campus. [3.4]

**The College SLO Dialogue:** This dialogue has produced a robust exchange at all levels of the College. In spring 2008 the Academic Senate approved Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLO) which focused on effective communication skills, problem solving and critical thinking, a global awareness and appreciation of cultural diversity, and personal, professional, and civic responsibility. From these Institutional Outcomes, the Academic Senate and CPC identified reading as a component of the communication ISLO for college-wide assessment. To facilitate a campus-wide integration of this ISLO in spring 2008, reading specialist Thomas Sadowski led a workshop that brought the faculty into discussion around this ISLO and ways to integrate reading into the programmatic and institutional outcomes. [3.5] Harbor College is also initiating a pilot project with ePortfolio that will enable the College to pursue the software’s potential for collecting appropriate data for analysis of program and institutional level student learning outcomes.

Fall 2008 Flex activities continued the assessment dialogue emphasizing the use of Bloom’s Taxonomy to state student learning outcomes and to use these measurable terms to assess and evaluate whether or not the SLOs are achieved. These fall activities included workshops on writing SLOs and formulating assessment rubrics. More workshops on interpreting the collected data are scheduled for October and November, 2008. Course outlines and an accompanying assessment template are continually being updated/ revised. SLO assessment and the analysis of data is ongoing in fall 2008. These are posted at [http://www.lahc.edu/facultystaff/slo/index.html](http://www.lahc.edu/facultystaff/slo/index.html) [3.6]
The following summarizes the over 100 classes that are currently being assessed: Humanities 17 (5 sections), Humanities 60 (1 section), Administration of Justice 001 (3), Sociology 001 (9), Political Science 001 (13), Psychology 001 (15), Economics 001 (2), History 002 (2), History 011 (6), History 012 (9), History 19 (1), History 44 (1), History 52 (1), History 86 (2), History 87 (1), English 021 (9), English 028 (20), English 101 (20), Spanish 001 (6), Speech 121 (7 sections), Journalism 101 (1), Accounting 001 (4), Accounting 22 (1), Business 038 (2).

Analysis of the collected data is scheduled to take place after completion of the fall semester and to be entered into the assessment template. Division Chairs and/or discipline faculty continue to write SLOs at both the program and institutional level. [3.7]

Recommendation 3: Evidence:

3.1 Documentation of Flex activities (2006-2008).
3.2 College-wide participation in World Café I (April 7) & II (Aug. 29).
3.3 Appointment of SLO coordinator.
3.4 Assessment workshops- FLEX- Aug. 27 & 28, 2008.
   http://www.lahc.edu/facultystaff/slo/AssessingCourseSLOs.ppt
   http://www.lahc.edu/facultystaff/slo/training/RubricpresentAug27.ppt
3.5 Sadowski workshop, June 3 & 4, 2008.
3.6 Revised Course Outlines and Assessment Forms
   http://www.lahc.edu/facultystaff/slo/index.html
3.7 Division Chair communications regarding course update and assessment.
Recommendation 4: In making public the process of program review as well as the results, the College will regularly and in a timely manner review and update policy, planning and procedure manuals.

Background:

Both the process for and the results of all college program reviews are fully accessible to the college community and to the general public on a redesigned website at http://www.lahc.cc.ca.us/accreditation2005/html/program_reviews_.html

College academic affairs and student services programs completed reviews prior to the current review cycle; all college programs are on schedule for the current cycle [4.1]. In 2007 past program reviews were comprehensively evaluated. Samples of the results are attached and as a result of these findings, workshops at the unit level have been held to evaluate and improve program review formats and processes [4.2]. All policies and procedures manuals related to the planning process have been updated and a unified timeline integrating all planning processes including program review schedules is now in force [4.3].

Report on Progress:

The three essential questions in assessing the implementation of the program review process all have been addressed:

1. Is meaningful data on student learning central to what our program reviews are actually evaluating? A sampling of entries from program reviews completed since 2006 is attached, in which the entries showing SLO objectives and/or related data is highlighted to show the extent to which student learning data is central to the content of these reviews [4.4].

2. Are program review results demonstrably reflected in resulting updates to unit plans? A sampling of unit plans updated since 2006 is attached, in which the entries in those unit plans tied to findings in the program reviews cited are highlighted with SLO links shown also. Highlighted entries in the attached academic affairs cluster plan in turn show how the corresponding unit plan entries are incorporated into the college’s over-all plans [4.5].

3. Do measurable improvements in student achievement follow those updates in the plans concerned? College progress in specifying student learning measures and assessing achievement results is detailed in the preceding response to Recommendation 3 and on the college website at http://www.lahc.edu/facultystaff/slo/index.html

The following chart illustrates the interconnection of program reviews, SLOs, and college plans at Harbor College:
### SLO Assessment Report

**Department:** Communications  
**Course/Discipline/Program:** Speech 101  
**Reviewed by:**  
**Academic Dean:**  
**Date:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective Communication Skills</th>
<th>Communicate effectively and clearly, both orally and in writing.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disciplines/Programs intended</td>
<td>Engage in more effective communication strategies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Measures of Assessment and Criteria for Success | | |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Oral presentations                           | Students scored 85%
| Written assignments                          | No changes were necessary at this time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Data Collected</th>
<th>Use of Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students scored 85% when giving oral presentations.</td>
<td>Reviewing to emphasize concept of audience analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unit Plan Activity Summary Sheet

**LA Harbor College**  
**Unit Plan Activity Summary Sheet**  
**Academic Year:** 2010-2011  
**Division:** Liberal Arts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Number</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Activity Objective</th>
<th>Classifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Improve reading and writing skills</td>
<td>Ticket Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed Activity:**  
**Brief Summary of SLO Assessment Results:**

- **Students were able to identify and select appropriate communication models.**
- **50% of students could analyze and evaluate written information.**

**Resources Required:**
- **Instructional materials:** $50,000 Program Expenses
- **Laboratory equipment:**$50,000 Program Expenses
- **Instructional software:** $50,000 Program Expenses

### Cluster Plan Activity Sheet

**LA Harbor College**  
**Cluster Plan Activity Summary Sheet**  
**Academic Year:** 2010-2011  
**Division:** Liberal Arts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Number</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Activity Objective</th>
<th>Classifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Improve listening and speaking skills</td>
<td>Ticket Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed Activity:**  
**Brief Summary of SLO Assessment Results:**

- **Students were able to identify and select appropriate communication models.**
- **50% of students could evaluate oral presentations.**

**Resources Required:**
- **Instructional materials:** $50,000 Program Expenses
- **Laboratory equipment:** $50,000 Program Expenses
- **Instructional software:** $50,000 Program Expenses

### Los Angeles Harbor College Educational Master Plan

1. **Estimate of Future College Capacity Needs Based on Area Demographics and Participation Rates**
2. **Occupational and General Education Areas Identified for Possible New Program Development**
Recommendation 4: Evidence:

4.1 2008 College Program Review Policy and Procedure Manual including Review Schedule for all programs.
http://www.lahc.cc.ca.us/accreditation2005/program%20review%20policy.DOC


4.3 2008 College Planning Policy and Procedure Manual previously cited [2.5].

4.4 See attached “Sampling of SLO References in Harbor College Program Reviews”:
   Business: specified SLOs, p. 3; related data, pp. 6-12, 14-17.
   Communications: specified SLOs, pp. 6, 15, 17, 21, 35, 38.
   Humanities: specified SLOs, pp. 5, 8; related data, pp. 3-5.
   Mathematics: specified SLOs, pp. 6-7.
   Nursing: specified SLOs, p. 3.
   Physical Education: specified SLOs, p. 12; related data, pp. 12, 16-17.
   Social and Behavioral Sciences: specified SLOs, p. 3; related data, throughout.

4.5 See attached “Sampling of Updates in College Plans Resulting from Program Review Data”:
   Business: Unit Plan entries pp. 6-7; from Program Review findings p. 4 & resulting Unit Plan SLO references, p. 4.
   Communications: Unit Plan entries pp. 1, 4, 10, 12; from Program Review Findings pp. 39, 19, 8, 23.
   Humanities: Unit Plan entries pp. 5-6; from Program Review findings pp. 6, 13 & resulting Unit Plan SLO references, p. 2.
   LAC: Unit Plan entries, pp. 5-6; from Program Review findings, pp. 4-5.
   Mathematics: Unit Plan entries, p. 3; from Program Review findings, p. 4; resulting Unit Plan SLO references, p. 2.
   Nursing: Unit Plan entries, pp. 4-5; from Program Review findings, p. 5; resulting SLO references, p. 2.
   Physical Education: Unit Plan entries, p. 3; from Program Review findings pp. 9, 12.
   Social and Behavioral Sciences: Unit Plan entries, pp. 4, 9, from Program Review findings, p. 9.
Recommendation 6: The functional relationship between the College and District needs to be fully defined through a dialog focused on efficient use of resources and service to students. The implementation of a decentralized relationship needs mutual definition. (IVB3a, c)

Background:
Discussions concerning the relationship between the College and the District have been ongoing since 1999 when the Board of Trustees adopted a policy of partial administrative decentralization, which shifted additional responsibility and accountability for planning and decision making to the local college level. The 45-page Functional Map, which resulted from the Multi-College Pilot Program (MCPP) organized by the ACCJC to clarify lines of accountability in multi-college districts, has been revised several times over the years [6.1]. To respond to ACCJC concerns that the map did not provide a sufficiently detailed delineation of operational responsibilities and functions, the District initiated an intensive review of all District office functions in 2005. Over an 18-month period, every administrative unit in the District office documented the specific functions it provided to the Colleges, identified the end users of these functions, and enumerated outcome measures to gauge unit effectiveness. Results of these District Office Service Outcomes were periodically shared with the Chancellor’s Cabinet and the three vice presidents’ councils to elicit feedback. The outcomes have been incorporated into the newly revised 2008 Functional Map [6.2].

In the spring of 2006, constituencies engaged in dialogue related to District/College relationships and functions when the District initiated the District Strategic Planning Initiative. Informal SWOT analysis focus groups were held at each College that semester in which participants identified District-wide strengths and weaknesses and suggested future priorities [6.3]. These activities led to the creation of the District Strategic Plan 2006-2011 [6.4]. Among its goals is Strategic Plan Goal #4, which deals with the development of a District-wide “culture of service and accountability” to maximize the ability of each College to act efficiently as an independent entity while enjoying the benefits of being part of a large, multi-college district. The short-term and long-term outcome measures of effectiveness for the plan’s goals and objectives are outlined in the plan’s implementation matrix [6.5]. This comprehensive District-wide strategic planning process has involved Harbor constituents in dialogue on ways to work together to achieve mutual goals and has given the College a chance to assess progress made toward achieving goals and to establish new objectives.

Report on Progress:
College-District Dialogue:
In an effort to further clarify and delineate operational responsibilities, dialogue took place at the annual District Academic Senate Summit in September 2006, a day-long event attended by 125 faculty leaders and senior staff from all nine colleges. A panel comprised of the chancellor, a member of the Board of Trustees, the president of the DAS, a faculty union representative, and a college president explored the current state of decentralization and District/College relations with attendees. Breakouts afforded participants a chance to explore and question the District Office
Service Outcomes in greater depth and to raise questions about specific functional areas, such as instructional support services, payroll, HR, facilities planning, and marketing [6.6]. This dialogue on District/College functional relationships was extended through a series of annual Department Chair Workshops, co-sponsored by the District administration and the Los Angeles College Faculty Guild [6.7]. Attended by more than 100 department chairs and VPs of Academic Affairs each year, these workshops provide faculty leaders with an overview of District and campus roles as related to the vital function of running the college’s academic departments.

To further clarify College/District relationships and the operational meaning of decentralization, all administrative service units in the District Office have begun a pilot project to create detailed process maps of critical District-wide functions. These process maps delineate reporting responsibilities between the colleges and the District Office for each step of the process being described. The goal of this project is to create intuitive flow charts that will help faculty and staff understand all critical District/College processes. The resulting process maps will also be used to re-engineer District/College processes to increase their effectiveness. By fall 2008, more than 20 process maps for critical District/College functions had been completed, including those involved in faculty and staff hiring, employee evaluation, curriculum approval, procurement, specially funded programs budget management, the filing of student grievances, etc. [6.8]. These were reviewed by the Chancellor’s Cabinet, the Vice President Councils, and the DAS in fall 2008.

By spring 2009, these process maps will be displayed prominently on the District website with active links to the forms required for the processes depicted. In addition, they will each be accompanied by a vision statement that provides historical context for the District’s policy of administrative decentralization as well as a general framework for understanding District/College relationships. This section of the District website will be completed by a full listing of all District-wide committees, complete with functions, charges, meeting schedules, and reporting responsibilities.

Finally, in fall 2008 Customer Satisfaction Surveys for every major service unit in the District Office were piloted, to be completed by January 2009 [6.9]. The results of these surveys will be used in spring 2009 to improve unit performance and further refine District Office operations.

In fall 2008, the Chancellor and District senior staff will begin a series of regional roundtable meetings with college stakeholders to continue the dialogue on decentralization and District/College relationships. Open to all faculty and staff, these roundtable discussions will provide additional feedback on the process mapping pilot and satisfaction survey efforts. They will also give college faculty and staff the opportunity to meet directly with District leaders and to raise further questions about District/College relations and responsibilities. Harbor College will participate in the roundtable meetings in the spring of 2009.

In the past several years, these efforts have improved the understanding of campus constituencies about their roles and responsibilities. In fact, during the last round of comprehensive self-study visits involving three of our District Colleges -- Pierce College, Los Angeles Mission College, and Los Angeles Valley College -- ACCJC team evaluation reports indicated that the District and Colleges had complied satisfactorily with this standard. In the October 2007 Pierce report, the evaluator wrote, “The District has developed a decentralized plan for service to the College that
clearly delineates and communicates the operational responsibilities and functions of the District from those of the College.” [6.10] The March 2007 evaluation of Valley College stated, “The District service outcomes document clearly delineates and communicates the operational responsibilities and functions of the District from those of the Colleges.” [6.11] This was the first time District Colleges have met the standard on the issue of District/College function mapping since the ACCJC instituted this requirement for multi-college districts.

**Recommendation 6: Evidence**

6.2 LACCD Functional Map (2008)
6.3 Harbor SWOT.
6.4 District Strategic Plan.
6.5 Implementation Matrix.
6.6 DAS Summit 2006.
6.7 Department Chair Workshops.
6.8 Process Maps.
6.9 Customer Satisfaction Surveys.
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Notes on Printed Evidence Included with Report:

Please note that where a large group of documents are included as a particular item of evidence, we have included links to the college website where that group of documents can be found, rather than printing out each individual document. For example, the reference on p. 5 to the Cluster Committee Minutes. Many years of minutes are available. As such, the link is available when specific dates were not the issue.

The evidence for Recommendation 6, provided by the Los Angeles Community College District, is included on disk only, due to its large size.