

Program Review Approval Form

Program Name: _____ **Program Review Cycle:** 2025-2026
Department Name: Student Accessibility Services **Review Period:** 2022-2025
Division Name: Student Accessibility and Wellness Services **Review Date:** July 10, 2026

Department/Program Manager: Elizabeth Page
Division Dean: Christopher Elquizabel

Program Review Committee:

Name:	<u>Antonio Lavermon</u>	Title/Role:	<u>Program Facilitator</u>
Name:	<u>Hillary Mennella</u>	Title/Role:	<u>Assoc Dean, Student Health</u>
Name:	<u>Susan McDonald</u>	Title/Role:	<u>Faculty</u>

Final Decision:



Approved



Revisions Required



Not Approved

Recommendations/Explanation if not approved:

Approved by:

Name: Robyn Brammer Title/Role: VP Student Services

Signature:  Date: 10/1/2026



2025-2026 Student Services Program Review – Student Accessibility Services Latest Version

Self-study template for Student Services Program Review process. Visitation Year: 2025-2026. Review period: 2022-2023, 2023-2024, and 2024-2025.

Student Service Program Review Overview & Timeline

Section 1: Service Area Overview

A. Service Area Mission and Alignment : Version by Elquizabal, Christopher on 12/10/2025 19:00

1. Briefly describe how your mission and purpose aligns with the Cerritos College mission and Students First Framework (<https://www.cerritos.edu/students-first-framework/default.htm>).

Student Accessibility Services' (SAS) mission aligns with the Equitable Access, Completion, and Career and Transfer levers outlined in the Students First Framework: Our mission is to support students with disabilities to access their curricula, programs, and college activities in order to facilitate learning, development, and promote success. Since accessibility is the shared responsibility of the campus community, SAS collaborates with faculty and staff to identify and minimize barriers through the design of universal and inclusive learning environments. SAS is committed to providing students with equitable opportunities to pursue their individual, educational, and career goals.

B. Service Area Description : Version by Elquizabal, Christopher on 12/10/2025 19:00

Service	Description
Priority Enrollment	Allowed to enroll on the first two days of enrollment each semester (Tier 1)
Class accommodations and academic adjustments	Includes notetaking and test-taking accommodations.
Specialized Classes	SAS offers several classes to support our students, including ACLR 101, ACLR 102, and AED 42.07
Academic and career counseling appointments	Eligible students can meet with one of our counselors to explore majors and careers, plan classes, create Education Plans, learn about transfer and prepare for employment
Specialist appointments	Students are assigned a SAS specialist to discuss accommodations, practice self-advocacy skills, and learn strategies to support learning styles.
Assistive Technology Training	Training provided on various software programs and features which enable students to better access and understand textbooks and other class materials, complete homework, and enhance study skills.
Materials in Alternate Formats	Includes textbooks and other class materials in formats such as Braille, audio, electronic text, and/or enlarged for students to access the information in a way that works for students.
SAS/SHS Verification	Partnership to provide students with documentation for SAS eligibility.
Testing Center	Provides exam proctoring by appointment for students who have been approved for various exam accommodations in the current semester.
Deaf/Hard of Hearing Accommodations	Provides students with ASL or signed language, spoken English, and/or captioning
Instructor Liaison	Communication with campus faculty to discuss, negotiate, and determine appropriate accommodations, particularly for students who receive adjusted assignments and/or attendance as accommodations.
Off-campus Liaison	Communicate with outside agencies, such as Department of Rehabilitation, Regional Center, and California Rehabilitation Services (independent living services) to coordinate services and advocate on behalf of students with disabilities.
Peer Mentoring Program	Mentoring program which provides disability-related support and tutoring to students who are Deaf or Hard of Hearing in their native language (ASL)

B. Service Area Description Continued : Version by Elquizabal, Christopher on 12/10/2025 19:00

2. Describe efforts to promote the availability of your services to current and prospective users.

a. Describe the key methods used to assist users in getting information about your service areas programs and service offerings (e.g., publicity, outreach, recruitment, etc.).

Student Accessibility Services (SAS) uses a multi-layered outreach and communication approach to ensure current and prospective students—and their support networks—can easily access information about programs, services, and eligibility. These efforts focus on visibility, ease of access, and timely connection to services.

Key Methods for Informing Users About SAS Programs and Services

Web-Based Information and Self-Service Access

The SAS website serves as a primary access point for students, families, faculty, and campus partners. The site is structured to provide clear, role-specific information through dedicated tabs for:

- New and continuing students
- Deaf and Hard of Hearing students
- Veterans with disabilities

- Parents and families

The website also includes quick-access links (“yellow tabs”) for high-demand actions such as:

- Applying to SAS
- Accessing the Faculty Portal
- Navigating Deaf and Hard of Hearing services

Students can complete the SAS new student application, view a 5-step application process video, upload supporting documentation, and submit exams through the SAS Student Portal.

Additional web resources include:

- Assistive Technology information
- Alternate Media services
- Verification of Disability forms
- Instructional offerings and academic support information

Faculty access accommodations and submit exams through the Faculty Portal, supporting consistent delivery of approved accommodations.

Strategic Partnerships and Cross-Departmental Outreach

SAS increases awareness by embedding services within existing campus structures and partnerships, including:

- Student Health Services (SHS)
- Academic Counseling
- Counseling, Aid, Information & Referral (CAIR)
- Veterans Resource Center (VRC)
- Student Affairs
- Financial Aid and EOPS (including reduced course load eligibility)
- Cerritos Complete and Guided Pathways initiatives
- Dual Enrollment and EPSS
- Umoja Advisory Committee
- Health Occupations department leadership
- SLPA Program partnerships (e.g., ACLR 93)
- Title IX Office

These partnerships ensure students encounter SAS information at multiple points in their academic journey, not solely through self-referral.

Events, Presentations, and Targeted Outreach

SAS maintains a strong presence at campus and community events to proactively connect with students and families, including:

- New SAS Student Orientation
- Welcome Day and Campus Connection events
- Senior Preview Day and campus tours for high school students
- High school presentations and college information nights
- Meet & Greet events with SPED counselors, principals, and teachers
- ASCC Leadership Retreat and student leadership events
- Meet Your Counselor Day
- Veterans' welcome information sessions

SAS also collaborates on themed programming such as ADHD Empowerment Week, stress management presentations with Five Acres and Student Health Services, and Umoja-related events. Additional outreach includes campuswide SAS memos, distribution of SAS materials and SWAG, and participation in graduation planning and SAS Graduation Celebration events.

3. Does your service area overlap or duplicate any programs or service function with other Student Services or college units?

a. How and why do these services/programs duplicate one another?

b. How do they complement each other?

Student Accessibility Services (SAS) does not duplicate other Student Services or college unit functions. Under Title 5 regulations, SAS is specifically mandated to assess disability-related needs and determine appropriate academic accommodations—functions that cannot be performed by other departments. While some services may appear similar in form, they are distinct in purpose, scope, and regulatory authority.

Some SAS functions resemble services offered elsewhere on campus because they exist within the same student success ecosystem. However, any apparent overlap reflects parallel but non-duplicative work. For example:

- Educational planning is conducted across multiple counseling areas campus-wide, but SAS Educational Plans are disability-informed and incorporate documentation review, accommodation planning, and reduced course load considerations that fall outside the scope of general counseling.
- Academic support referrals occur throughout Student Services, but SAS referrals are tied to accommodation eligibility, case management, and compliance requirements under ADA and Section 504.

As a result, while the structure of a service (e.g., counseling, planning, referrals) may look similar, the basis, authority, and outcomes differ.

Rather than duplicating services, SAS functions as a specialized partner that enhances the effectiveness of other Student Services units. SAS works in collaboration with counseling, academic support programs, Student Health Services, Equity initiatives, and academic departments to:

- Inform disability-related considerations in academic planning,
- Coordinate accommodations that allow students to fully participate in existing programs,
- Support faculty in implementing approved accommodations within academic and clinical settings.

This complementary model ensures that students with disabilities can equitably access services and programs already offered by the college, rather than creating parallel or redundant systems.

4. Discuss key, collaborative relationships with academic programs and other student service areas. How do these partnerships:

a. Advance achievement, learning, or completion.

b. Support the service area's mission, goals, and Service Area Outcomes (SAOs).

c. Enhance the quality of services and programs provided.

d. Create greater operational efficiencies for the service area.

e. Identify how your partnerships can or have mitigated equity gaps.

SAS relies on intentional, ongoing partnerships with academic programs and student service areas to ensure that students with disabilities can access coursework, clinical experiences, and co-curricular opportunities without unnecessary barriers. These relationships are operational, not symbolic, and are embedded into daily service delivery.

- a. Advancing Achievement, Learning, and Completion

Accessibility is a shared responsibility across the campus (as outlined in the Chancellor Memo and Title 5 updates on universal design for learning) and SAS collaborates closely with instructional faculty and service areas to remove barriers that directly impact student progress and completion. Key examples include:

- Health Occupations partnerships to coordinate specialized test proctoring and determine reasonable accommodations in clinical and hands-on instructional settings, allowing students to remain on track in high-stakes programs.
- Title IX coordination, through which SAS supports pregnant and/or lactating students and students impacted by sexual assault, domestic violence, or harassment by ensuring access to appropriate testing and academic accommodations during periods of disruption.

These collaborations reduce course interruptions and prevent avoidable withdrawal or delay in program completion.

b. Supporting the SAS Mission, Goals, and SAOs

SAS partnerships are intentionally aligned with institutional priorities, including Campus KPIs, accreditation standards, equity gap data, Aspen metrics, and leading and lagging student success indicators. Services are designed to support SAOs focused on:

- Early access to accommodations,
- Alignment between educational planning and course enrollment,
- Persistence and completion in transfer-level English and Math.

c. Enhancing the Quality of Services and Programs

Collaborations with academic departments strengthen both instructional quality and student retention. Examples include:

- A partnership with the English Department to provide targeted classroom support that improves engagement and course persistence for SAS students.
- Co-teaching and co-leading a learning community (English 101B) with SAS and English faculty, creating a structured environment where accommodations, instructional strategies, and academic support are aligned by design.

These efforts move beyond individual accommodations toward coordinated instructional support.

d. Creating Greater Operational Efficiencies

Several partnerships have reduced duplicative processes and improved turnaround time for students:

- A coordinated process with EOPS allows verification of SAS status and approval of reduced course loads without requiring separate SAS faculty appointments.
- Collaboration with Financial Aid enables identification of SAS students approved for a nine-unit reduced load for purposes of SSCG grant eligibility, reducing delays and confusion for students.
- A shared SAS–Student Health Services verification form expedites access to SAS for students with documented medical or mental health conditions, reducing administrative burden and time to service.

These efficiencies allow SAS faculty to focus more time on complex case management and compliance-driven responsibilities.

e. Mitigating Equity Gaps

SAS partnerships play a critical role in mitigating equity gaps by ensuring disability access considerations are embedded into broader institutional initiatives rather than added after the fact. Particularly impactful collaborations include:

- Work with Dual Enrollment and Cerritos Complete to integrate disability access into recruitment, onboarding, and participation phases for students with disabilities.
- Ongoing collaboration across campus to implement universal design strategies alongside individualized accommodations, reducing reliance on retroactive fixes.

By addressing access proactively, these partnerships help ensure students with disabilities—especially those from underrepresented backgrounds—can participate fully in academic and campus life.

Through strategic collaboration, SAS strengthens student achievement, improves service quality, increases operational efficiency, and reduces equity gaps. These partnerships allow disability access to be addressed as an institutional responsibility, while maintaining SAS's specialized role in assessment, accommodation determination, and compliance.

C. Service Area Organizational Resources : Version by **Elquizabal, Christopher** on 12/10/2025 19:00

1. Please describe your service area's organizational and personnel structure. Discuss:

a. Reporting relationships.

b. Distribution of responsibilities/authority.

c. Use of management or work teams.

d. Lines of communication (e.g., area meetings structure/frequency, staff-to-staff and staff-to-manager communication, etc.).

SAS is structured to ensure clear reporting lines, appropriate allocation of authority, compliance with Title 5 and ADA requirements, and effective communication across a large, multidisciplinary team.

a. Reporting Relationships

- The Dean of Student Accessibility Services reports directly to the Vice President of Student Services.
- The Dean has 25 direct reports, reflecting the scope and operational complexity of the service area:
 - **6 Full-Time Faculty**
 - **3 Adjunct Faculty**
 - **7 Full-Time Classified Staff**
 - **8 Student/Short-Term Hourly (STH) staff**
 - **1 Associate Dean, Student Health Services (SHS)** (programmatic oversight relationship)

The Associate Dean of Student Health Services oversees all medical and mental health programs within SHS, including patient care, licensure requirements, and state and federal compliance. While SHS is a distinct service area, the close reporting and coordination structure supports integrated care for students with disabilities.

b. Distribution of Responsibilities and Authority

SAS Specialists (Faculty):

- Carry active student caseloads
- Conduct initial intake appointments
- Determine eligibility for disability services
- Assign and authorize academic accommodations
- Coordinate services with faculty, academic programs, interpreters, and external agencies (e.g., Department of Rehabilitation)
- Teach educational support courses
- Provide all ongoing accommodation-related follow-up

SAS Counselors (Faculty):

- Provide academic, personal, and transfer counseling
- Offer academic coaching

- Deliver career and technical skill counseling
- Do not assess disability eligibility or assign accommodations
- Do not carry accommodation caseloads
- Refer all accommodation-related matters back to SAS Specialists

Department Chair (SAS Faculty):

- One SAS faculty member serves as Department Chair, designated through a faculty vote or dean assignment
- Provided 20% full-time release time to perform leadership and coordination duties

Faculty Release Assignments:

- One SAS faculty member serves as Curriculum Committee Chair with 80% release time, supporting curricular oversight and institutional governance

Associate Dean, Student Health Services:

- Oversees SHS clinical operations, licensure, compliance, and service delivery
- Collaborates closely with SAS leadership on referrals, documentation, and coordinated student support

Use of Management and Work Teams

SAS utilizes purpose-driven work teams to manage both ongoing services and time-bound initiatives.

Standing Work Teams (Service Delivery):

- High Tech Center
- Testing Center
- Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DHH) Programming
- **Project-Based and Operational Teams:**
- New Student Intake Queue
- New Student Orientation
- Priority Registration coordination
- Collaboration with SHS on disability documentation and referrals
- MIS reporting and data collection
- Meet and Greet events with local high school personnel
- Commencement and SAS Graduation Celebration
- DHH Symposium planning

d. Lines of Communication

Meeting Structure:

- All-staff SAS meetings: Once per month
- Faculty-only meetings: Once per month
- Individual 1:1 meetings (faculty and classified staff): Monthly
- Dean–Department Chair meetings: Weekly
- Dean–Associate Dean (SHS) meetings: Bi-weekly
- Communication Methods:
- Email
- Microsoft TEAMS
- Scheduled meetings
- Periodic newsletters
- This layered communication structure supports transparency, timely decision-making, and consistent alignment across SAS and related service areas.

The SAS organizational structure is designed to support compliance-driven service delivery, manage a large interdisciplinary team, and respond to a growing and increasingly complex student population.

2. How does your current staff profile facilitate or impede the service area's ability to fulfill its primary mission and functions?

a. If applicable, what strategies has the area adopted to address staffing-related impediments?

- SAS is a rapidly growing program, which has more than doubled over 3 years, combined with staffing limitations, including 1 Specialist retirement in 2022 and 1 Specialist retirement in Summer 2025; this growth impacts caseload and timely services to meet and improve persistence, retention, and graduation rates for students with disabilities.
- In 24-25 SAS reported a total of 1674 students, more than double served compared to just over 700 in 2022. Fall 25 has 1372 enrolled compared to 1318 at the end of Fall 2024, a 4% increase.
 - Caseloads have increased. For example, in 2022 the average caseload was ~240-280 students. A Specialist who primarily worked with students on the Autism Spectrum, Mental Health, and ADHD retired Summer 2025. Caseloads have shifted tremendously to remaining faculty with redistribution of the retiree's caseload as follows:
 - Specialist 1: 526 students to 795
 - Specialist 2: 250 students to 519
 - Specialist 3: 58 DHH students (+ 42 non-DHH students for 100 students)
 - Adjunct support with 249 students that will need to be redistributed when our adjunct leave
- Appointment demand in Fall 2025 has been as follows:
 - New student intakes: 27%
 - Specialist appointments: 19%
 - Counselor appointments: 54%
- Current specialist to student ratio is 1:339, with adjunct counselor/specialists carrying 32 percent of the load;
- 2 FT specialists retired and have not been replaced;
- Counseling appointments are in greatest demand, yet:
 - 1 FT counselor on reassignment to be Curriculum Committee Chair;
 - Of remaining faculty, only 3 FT meet minimum qualifications for DSPS counselors;
 - Result is that a large burden is placed on adjunct counselors, who require a large investment of time to train them yet they often leave for FT positions elsewhere. Challenging cases must often be moved to a FT faculty member, further increasing their load. Then the cycle repeats.

3. Describe any challenges the service area has encountered with respect to the recruitment and retention of qualified staff. What are the implications of these challenges?

- There are critical differences between Specialists and Counselor roles that directly impact how SAS assesses eligibility, assigns accommodations, manages student caseloads, and meets compliance requirements.
- SAS Specialists and SAS Counselors are rooted in separate state-mandated minimum qualifications (MQs):
 - Specialists (DSPS, LD, DHH) fall under DSPS instructional MQs

- o Counselors fall under DSPS Counseling MQs with specific training requirements within certain populations (DSPS in this case)
- Unless someone meets both sets of MQs, these roles are not interchangeable. On our campus, our Specialists do not meet minimum qualifications for Counseling.
- Challenges arise from the heavy burden placed on adjunct counselors, who don't have the capacity to follow up on complex student accommodation needs.

4. How does the service area facilitate appropriate career development and progression for staff?

a. Describe the service area's professional development resources, activities, and/or opportunities.

b. How does this engagement directly reflect on the direction of your service area.

1. Describe the service area's professional development resources, activities, and/or opportunities.

- o Since the COVID pandemic, more opportunities to attend professional development seminars and workshops remotely have allowed greater access, especially since many of the remote offerings are free.
- o While increased access is wonderful for learning about new trends, initiatives, strategies, and legalities of working in disability services, the downside of remote learning is problematic in many of the same ways it can be for students. Many folks who work in student services benefit from the sense of community and shared interest that in-person professional development often provides.

2. How does this engagement directly reflect on the direction of your service area.

- o With limited resources and time, very few individuals in SAS can participate in professional development, especially the sort which offers some respite from the day-to-day and helps reinvigorate us for the often-challenging work ahead of us.
- o This can result in burnout and stagnation, both of which can be highly detrimental to the quality of the work we do with some of our most barrier-impacted student populations.

5. Please describe the succession planning for your service area.

a. What steps are in place?

b. How does the service area plan to make changes to services (realignment, reorganization, or other strategies) to ensure continuous improvement in the face of staff turnover, retirement, and attrition?

- In December 2022, the program review committee recommended hiring a Specialist/Counselor to fill a vacant position resulting from a retirement in June of 2022 to reduce the caseload of existing Disability Specialist, which at the time carried a caseload from 240-280 students. The position is still vacant.
- In addition, another Disability Specialist retired in June 2025 and replacement of this position is not expected to be approved.
- Three of the remaining 6 SAS faculty will be retiring in the next 2-3 years.
- Departmental response has been constrained by campus procedures determining which departments will be prioritized for the hiring of new and replacement faculty, despite the fact that SAS has a separate (categorical) source of funding.
- Adjunct counselor/specialists have been hired to help mitigate the effects of reassigned caseloads, but this strategy has limitations such as:
 - o Departure of adjuncts for positions elsewhere: four of the seven adjunct faculty hired over the course of the past three years have left for other opportunities.
 - o Students on their caseloads must be reassigned to other faculty members when they leave, some for the 2nd or 3rd time.
 - o Lack of continuity of services to students and challenges addressing emergent student needs due to limitations of adjuncts' assigned hours.
 - o Limited returns on investment of time spent training adjuncts and the need to continuously provide training when new adjuncts are hired.
 - o This model is not effective, practical, or sustainable, especially with the loss of many years of experience and institutional history anticipated due to the additional pending retirements.
- Replacing the two vacant FT faculty positions should be prioritized as soon as possible to ensure those faculty are fully trained before the next wave of retirements hits. Failure to do so puts the institution at significant risk due to the legal ramifications of unmet SAS student accommodation needs.

6. What assessment methods and measures (either formal or informal) does the service area use to determine staff well-being, satisfaction, and motivation?

a. How does the department use the findings from these assessment efforts to improve the work environment?

- Informal measures are the primary source of information regarding staff's well-being, satisfaction, and motivation, primarily in the form of regular one-to-one meetings with the SAWS Dean. His open-door policy has been vital to assessing various situations and identifying potential solutions to improve staff engagement and well-being.
- However, this can be very costly in terms of time, especially when the Dean is dividing his time between SAS and SHS. Department chair provides support when able, but has limited time to do so. Ideally, SAS should be resourced with a department chair that focuses on the SAS academic offerings and another position (faculty or management) which focuses on the supporting day to day activities and the collection, reporting, and analysis of SAS student data.

7. What significant projects, tasks, workgroups, and committee work are the staff of your service area engaged in?

a. How does this participation reflect on your service area's plans and integration with the college.

- SAS work teams formed to coordinate specific departmental activities:
 - o New Student Intake Queue
 - o New Student Orientation
 - o Meet and Greet with local high school personnel
 - o Commencement celebration
 - o Priority Registration activities
 - o Collaboration with SHS regarding referrals and disability documentation
 - o DHH Symposium
 - o MIS reporting/data collection
- Shared governance participation:
 - o Curriculum Committee
 - o Faculty Senate
 - o Hiring Standards
 - o Faculty Professional Development Committee
 - o Student Life Committee
 - o ACE Committee
- Other activities:
 - o Africana Studies Advisory Committee
 - o Umoja Advisory Council

How does this participation reflect on your service area's plans and integration with the college.

- Work groups and campus collaboration are vital to the success of the SAS mission. SAS faculty and staff often interact with other faculty and staff on campus to facilitate the equitable participation of students with disabilities in all facets of academic life.

Section 2: Service Area Trends

A. Service Area User Demographics : Version by Elquizabal, Christopher on 12/10/2025 19:00

1. Whom do you serve?

a. Describe your primary and secondary user groups that the service area attracts and serves.

b. Describe the demographics and representativeness of the populations served (e.g., race/ethnicity, gender, age range, foster youth, formally incarcerated, and first-generation status).

1. Describe your primary and secondary user groups that the service area attracts and serves.

- o SAS serves students with limitations due to disabilities. Students with physical, visual, hearing, speech, mental health, learning and intellectual disabilities as well as other health conditions, acquired brain injuries, autism, and ADHD are served.
- o Many SAS students are also receiving services via Cerritos Complete, Dual Enrollment, EOPS, VRC, Financial Aid, CalWORKs, LINC, Undocu Scholars, Re-Entry, SHS, and the LGBTQ+ Program.

2. Describe the demographics and representativeness of the populations served (e.g., race/ethnicity, gender, age range, foster youth, formally incarcerated, and first-generation status)

Race/ethnicity:

- Hispanic students are the majority: ~66–71%
- White Non-Hispanic: ~7–9%
- African-American: ~9%
- Other groups (Asian, Filipino, Multi-Ethnicity) show small but steady representation.

Gender

- DSPS gender distribution remained fairly consistent:
- Female: ~52%
- Male: ~45%
- Unknown: ~3%

Age

- DSPS students are increasingly younger:
- Ages 18–19 and 20–24 make up the majority.
- Growth in 1–17 age group: 39 → 143
- Older age groups (30+) remain stable or slightly declining.

2. How do the demographics of your users compare with the college as a whole?

a. Are the trends within your program in alignment with the broader, collegewide trends?

SAS program demographics largely align with those of the campus population. Some areas of discrepancy include:

1. African-American and Hispanic consistently higher than general Cerritos population;
2. Fewer and fewer students who identify as Asian or Filipino;
3. White non-Hispanic student percentages are increasingly lower than the general Cerritos population, particularly in 24–25, with a difference of nearly 8 percentage points.

Gender:

1. Male and female percentages and ratios consistent with campus.
2. Greater percentage of unknown gender – possibly due to higher percentage of students with disabilities who identify as gender non-conforming/trans.

Age:

1. Consistently higher percentage of SAS students in 19 and under age range, possibly due to students participating in Dual Enrollment;
2. 20–24 age range has been consistently higher than the general Cerritos population;
3. Counterintuitively, students in the 50+ age range are less represented in SAS than general Cerritos population. Possibly due to fewer students in this age range familiar with services available in SAS.

First-gen:

1. SAS has a greater percentage of students who are not First-Gen than the general Cerritos population.
2. This is possibly due to fewer First-Gen students being identified as having a disability due to their or their parents' lack of familiarity with the systems in place for this purpose and/or
3. Cultural factors which are more likely to view disability as a stigma and avoid identification.

B. Service Area Service Trends : Version by Elquizabal, Christopher on 12/10/2025 19:00

1. Describe the usage trend for your service area in the last three years.

a. Has it remained steady, increased, or decreased?

b. Are there different patterns of usage for different demographic groups (e.g., race/ethnicity, gender, age range, foster youth formally incarcerated, and first-generation status)?

c. Draw clear connections between your data trends and attempts to identify and mitigate equity gaps.

d. Describe any factors that contributed to any change.

Total DSPS student count increased from 1,158 (2020–21) to 1,912 (2024–25), a 65% increase.

Largest disability growth areas from 20–21 to 24–25:

ADHD: 99 → 236 (138%)

Autism Spectrum: 154 → 291 (89%)

Mental Health Disability: 196 → 407 (108%)

Learning Disability: 352 → 549 (56%)

2. Describe your pattern of service. Include:

a. Standard hours of operations.

b. Alternative modes (e.g., online, hybrid, etc.).

c. Schedules of delivery (e.g., early morning, evening services, etc.).

d. How your services meet the needs of the users.

1. Describe your pattern of service. Include:

1. Standard hours of operations.

- Monday-Thursday: 8am-5pm, Friday: 8am-4:30pm

2. Alternative modes (e.g., online, hybrid, etc.).

- Remote via Zoom or telephone per student requests and needs

3. Schedules of delivery (e.g., early morning, evening services, etc.).

- Busiest time of day tends to be morning, with fewer appointments and drop-in traffic in the latter part of the day.
- An exception to this is during March through May, when many incoming high school students need to schedule their New Student Intake appointments in the latter part of the day, after they get out of school.

4. How your services meet the needs of the users.

- Offering services in a variety of modalities creates greater accessibility for students with a variety of disability-related needs.

3. What are the differences in service usage based on modality? If you do not offer varying modalities, explain why not.

a. How does this help inform future practices?

In person appointments are in highest demand (63%), but there is still a significant number of students who schedule remote appointments (29%). This validates the need to continue providing students the opportunity to receive services from SAS in a variety of formats.

AppointmentType	Total Minutes	Total Hours	Percentage
TOTAL IN PERSON APPT TIME	44234.00	737.23	62.56%
TOTAL PHONE APPT TIME	6029.00	100.49	8.53%
TOTAL REMOTE APPT TIME	20409.00	340.15	28.87%
TOTAL VP APPT TIME	30.00	0.50	0.04%
GRAND TOTAL: ALL APPT TYPES	70702.11	1189.31	100.00%

Section 3: Service Area Performance and Effectiveness

A. Service Area Outcomes Assessment Process : Version by Elquizabal, Christopher on 12/10/2025 19:00

1. What methods are used to assess your service area outcomes (SAOs)? If these are not in place, what do you plan to do in the future to collect this evidence?

Evidence is collected via Clockwork, the campus data dashboard, and the Chancellor's Office Data Mart then compiled, manipulated, and evaluated.

When it is not possible to assess outcomes utilizing available data, student data is checked manually via a smaller, randomly selected population of students, which is very time consuming and cumbersome.

2. How are user needs assessed and considered in the development and delivery of programs and services?

a. What methods does the service area use to remain current with respect to understanding user needs, interests, and experiences?

b. What are the sources of information your service area uses to understand current needs?

c. How have the needs changed over time?

Student needs are largely communicated and measured informally in our regular interactions which occur on a daily basis. Students generally make their needs known, or they become apparent due to the nature of the student's disability and/or course curriculum. Individual needs may vary from semester to semester but trends are typically observed over time and confirmed via ad hoc Clockwork reports and formal annual MIS reporting, as needs are generally tied to disability populations which are increasing.

3. How does the service area track program/service usage patterns and determine users' satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the service area's performance? If these are not in place, what do you plan to do in the future to collect this data?

- SAS regularly reviews appointment and service utilization to identify usage patterns and determine areas of need. Information regarding satisfaction is received formally and informally:
 - Student evaluations of SAS faculty;
 - Student surveys;
 - Anecdotal data based on student self-report; students are generally not shy about letting us know when they are unhappy with any of our services.
 - Potential source of data in the future could include increasing the opportunities for students to provide feedback that can be collected and quantified, perhaps after each visit or via a field within our Clockwork Portal.

4. To what extent does the service area obtain and use comparative/benchmark data to stay current with peers and/or competitors that deliver similar programs and services (both those that are on and off campus)?

- This is generally done on an as-needed basis, to identify whether or not the trends we are seeing are reflective of the statewide population as they relate to:
 - Overall SAS/DSPS population size relative to campus population size;
 - Specific disability population increases and decreases;
- This information is used to:
 - Identify possible untapped areas of need;
 - Identify possible trends to anticipate specific service needs and possible funding shortcomings, such as adequate funding to cover sign language interpreting needs;
 - Support resource requests.

5. How does the service area monitor compliance with the laws/other regulatory requirements that apply to the service areas program and service responsibilities?

- SAS complies with and/or supports the campus obligation to comply with federal American with Disabilities Act, Sections 504 and 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, Title 5, Title IX, and Office of Civil Rights case law.
- SAS must stay abreast of changes to current laws and legal precedents set via court cases regarding disability discrimination in higher education, and to a lesser extent other settings such as K-12, employment, transportation, and housing.

- SAS continues to advocate for additional funding from general funds to fulfill students' disability-related academic needs in response to the campus need to comply with AB1705 requiring students enroll in college level Math and English courses when they enter college rather than remedial coursework. The loss of SAS students' ability to enroll in remedial coursework to further skill development prior to enrolling in college-level English and Math has been detrimental to the success of many students with disabilities and has greatly impacted classroom pedagogical considerations due to larger number of students with a variety of disabilities in entry level English and Math classes.

B. Service Area Outcomes Assessment : Version by **Elquizabal, Christopher** on **12/10/2025 19:00**

1. What does the data say about the success of your service area with respect to the achievement of your service area outcomes? Identify and describe the data sources.
INCOMPLETE

23-24

SAO 1: 30 percent of students enrolled in courses fully matching their Ed Plan. However, 75 percent of all sampled students enrolled in at least one course outlined in their Ed Plan.	45 percent of students successfully completed the semester.	30 percent of students enrolled in courses for Fall 2023.
20 percent of students enrolled in courses fully matching their Ed Plan. However, 40 percent of all sampled students enrolled in at least one course outlined in their Ed Plan.	NA	NA

SAO 2:
Success Indicators: Describe student success indicators used to measure the degree of impact on the SAO.
65% of students who require academic accommodations for their enrolled course will request their letter of accommodation via the Student Portal.
Baseline data for 2023-2024:

TOTAL ENROLLED (#)	ACCOMMODATION LETTERS REQUESTED (#stu)	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL	TARGET PERCENTAGE	DIFFERENCE	GOAL MET?
904	507	56%	65%	-16%	NO
1,493 (F23S24)	494	33%	65%	-32%	NO
1319 (F24)	748	56.71%	65.00%	8.29%	NO
1287 (Sp25)	679	52.76%	65.00%	12.24%	NO

2. What areas for improvement are suggested by the data?
The data from recent SAO assessments point to several interrelated areas for improvement that are structural, procedural, and instructional rather than reflective of a lack of effort or engagement by students or staff.

Improved Accuracy and Integration of Data Systems (SAO 1 & SAO 2)
A consistent theme across SAO assessments is that data limitations significantly constrain SAS's ability to interpret outcomes accurately. Discrepancies between ClockWork and PeopleSoft make it difficult to reliably identify:

- First-time SAS students,
- Students with completed or amended Comprehensive Student Educational Plans (CSEPs),
- Students who independently generated Letters of Accommodation through the student portal but are not captured in standard reports.

These limitations result in undercounting service usage and make year-to-year trend analysis difficult. The data suggest that improving system integration and reporting accuracy—particularly through collaboration with IERPG—is necessary before stronger conclusions can be drawn about progress or areas of concern.

Earlier and More Consistent Educational Planning Alignment (SAO 1)
Data for SAO 1 show that while most sampled students enrolled in at least one course aligned with their education plan, full alignment between course enrollment and the CSEP remains inconsistent across semesters. This issue is compounded when:

- Education Plans are initially completed with non-SAS counselors and must be amended after SAS intake to account for accommodations such as reduced course load;
- Students register with SAS mid-year, meaning their plan-aligned coursework may occur in their second year rather than their first.

The data suggest that stronger early coordination between SAS and counseling, as well as clearer processes for updating and tracking amended education plans, are necessary to improve alignment and ensure that planning data reflect students' actual accommodation needs rather than initial recommendations.

Targeted Support for Transfer-Level Math (SAO 3 / Equity Goal)
While completion rates for transfer-level English are high (85.37%), completion in transfer-level Math remains substantially lower (63.65%), indicating a clear area for improvement. This gap suggests the need for:

- Earlier identification of students enrolled in Math who may require additional support,
- Continued coordination with tutoring, counseling, and academic support services,
- More intentional monitoring of Math outcomes throughout the semester.

The data indicate that Math remains a key risk area for persistence and completion for students with disabilities and should remain a focus of targeted intervention and assessment in future cycles.

Earlier and Clearer Access to Letters of Accommodation (SAO 2)
Although the overall percentage of students requesting Letters of Accommodation is improving, the data show that early-term access remains inconsistent. Several factors suggest areas for improvement:

- Reports do not fully capture student-generated LOAs from the portal.
- Some students may not request LOAs because accommodations are not needed in certain courses, which affects utilization percentages.
- Faculty confirmation of receipt is inconsistently recorded, further obscuring true usage.

These findings indicate a need to focus SAO 2 more narrowly on students enrolled in college-level Math and English, emphasize early access (within the first two weeks), and improve how LOA data are captured so that usage metrics can meaningfully inform early course-success interventions.

Finally, the data must be interpreted within the context of rapid enrollment growth and reduced staffing capacity. SAS student enrollment more than doubled between 2022 and 2024–2025, while full-time faculty capacity declined. This mismatch affects:

- Depth of case management,
- Timeliness of follow-up,

- Ability to conduct robust qualitative and longitudinal assessment.

The data suggest that continued progress toward SAOs will require not only refined practices, but sustained capacity to implement and assess them consistently over time.

Overall, the data suggest that improvement efforts should prioritize:

- Stronger data systems and reporting accuracy,
- Earlier and clearer educational planning alignment,
- Focused intervention in transfer-level Math,
- Earlier access and more precise tracking of Letters of Accommodation,
- Sustained implementation of established strategies to determine long-term impact.

3. How is assessment data used to inform organizational decisions, management practices, and program/service delivery strategies?

While SAS is continuously implementing strategies to improve program efficiency and performance, having assessment data helps confirm that we are making progress on our goals and helps the dean to prioritize the activities which support those goals, such as calling students to make an appointment to create/update their Education Plan.

4. How has the assessment of the service area outcomes contributed to your service area's improvements?

While we are able to assess how much progress we have made on our goals, we have thus far been unable to measure their impact on persistence, retention, and completion due to limitations in available data.

5. How does the service area make needed data and information available to area stakeholders?

Primarily via email communications and the SAS website.

Section 4: Previous Three-Year Service Area Program Plan Reflection

A. Service Area Three-Year Reflection : Version by Elquizabal, Christopher on 12/10/2025 19:00

1. What are the primary strengths of the service area?

a. How have these changed over time?

b. What innovative programs/services/practices has the department instituted that puts it out in front with respect to “best practices” in the field?

Student Accessibility Services' (SAS) primary strengths lie in its expertise-driven service delivery, strong cross-disciplinary partnerships, and ability to design programs that directly respond to student needs in high-impact academic contexts. While staffing levels have shifted over time, SAS has continued to leverage innovation and collaboration to maintain service quality and advance best practices.

a. How These Strengths Have Changed Over Time

Historically, a key strength of SAS was its robust staffing levels, which allowed the department to provide intensive, individualized support and proactive case management for students with disabilities. This capacity enabled timely intake appointments, sustained follow-up, and deeper faculty consultation. Over time, staffing levels have declined, with two faculty and two classified vacancies, while student enrollment in SAS has increased rapidly (over 1,000 students). This change has limited the department's ability to provide the same level of individualized support across a growing caseload. Despite these constraints, SAS has shifted its strengths toward strategic partnership-building and targeted program development, allowing the department to continue meeting complex student needs even as overall capacity has been reduced.

b. Innovative Programs, Services, and Best Practices

SAS has instituted several innovative practices that position it at the forefront of disability services in higher education:

1. Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DHH) Peer Mentoring Program:

This program supports DHH students through peer connection, navigation of academic expectations, and social integration, helping reduce isolation and promote persistence. The model centers lived experience and peer-based support rather than relying exclusively on staff intervention.

2. Targeted Partnerships with Allied Health Programs:

SAS has established meaningful collaborations with the Nursing and Speech-Language Pathology Assistant (SLPA) programs to address the unique access needs of students in clinically intensive fields. These partnerships go beyond accommodation implementation and focus on program-specific problem-solving.

3. Development of ACLR 93 (Speech and Language Support):

Working with SLPA faculty, SAS helped develop ACLR 93, a course that creates structured opportunities for SLPA students to provide speech and language services to SAS students. This model simultaneously supports student access needs and offers applied learning experiences for SLPA students, representing a sustainable, academically integrated service approach.

Although staffing reductions have shifted how strengths show up in practice, SAS continues to distinguish itself through intentional program design, deep expertise in complex access issues, and innovative collaborations that align academic programs with disability support. These strengths position SAS to lead best practices even under constrained resource conditions.

2. Please comment on the progress toward achieving your previous service area goals and SAOs. Discuss what has/is/will happen and the status of each goal and SAO.

SAS has made measurable progress toward its Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) and related goals over the past two years. However, due to increasing student enrollment, staffing changes, and data system limitations, continued implementation of recently established strategies is necessary to better assess the trajectory and long-term impact of these efforts.

SAO 1: Course Enrollment Aligned With Education Plans

Status: *In Progress – Ongoing*

SAS has taken consistent action to improve alignment between students' course enrollment and their Comprehensive Student Educational Plans (CSEPs). Document analysis of a random sample of first-time SAS students (N=20) showed that while full alignment between course schedules and education plans remains variable, a large majority of students consistently enrolled in at least one course outlined in their CSEP across semesters. For example, although only 40% of sampled students in Fall 2022 enrolled in courses fully matching their education plan, 90% enrolled in at least one plan-aligned course, and persistence into the following semester remained high (90%).

To support this SAO, SAS implemented multiple professional actions, including proactive outreach to students without CSEPs, targeted follow-up during priority registration, and recurring reminders through semester welcome communications. While these actions have reinforced academic momentum, data collection remains constrained by system limitations between ClockWork and PeopleSoft, as well as timing challenges for students who enter SAS mid-year. As a result, SAS will continue these efforts to build a clearer longitudinal picture of alignment and persistence outcomes.

SAO 2: Requesting Letters of Accommodation

Status: *Partially Met – Under Revision*

Progress toward SAO 2 was more limited, with baseline data indicating that 56% of enrolled SAS students requested Letters of Accommodation, short of the 65% target. Importantly, this figure is likely an undercount, as current reporting does not fully capture student-generated accommodation letters or instances in which faculty did not confirm receipt in ClockWork. Additionally, some students did not require accommodations in specific courses due to instructional formats (e.g., no timed exams).

In response, SAS has already begun refining its approach by shifting the focus of SAO 2 toward early access for students enrolled in college-level Math and English, with an emphasis on

generating accommodation letters at the start of the term or during the first intake appointment. This adjustment reflects lessons learned from the prior assessment cycle and represents a data-informed recalibration rather than abandonment of the goal.

SAO 3 / Equity Goal: Completion of Transfer-Level Math and English

Status: *Progress Demonstrated – Continued Monitoring Needed*

SAS made meaningful progress toward improving outcomes in transfer-level Math and English. For the 2023–2024 academic year, 85.37% of SAS students completed transfer-level English, while 63.65% completed transfer-level Math, outcomes that provide a strong baseline for measuring future improvement toward the 10% increase target.

Key professional actions supporting this outcome included expanded access to tutoring, writing support, accommodations, counseling services, and improved communication between SAS counselors and instructional faculty. Persistent barriers—such as incomplete identification of students with disabilities and discrepancies across data systems—required SAS to manually generate reports to accurately assess outcomes. As with other SAOs, continued implementation of these strategies over multiple years is necessary to determine whether recent improvements result in sustained gains.

Overall, SAS is on a positive trajectory toward meeting its goals and SAOs. The last two-three years have focused on establishing infrastructure, cross-departmental collaboration, and clearer assessment practices. Given the scale of enrollment growth and operational changes, SAS must continue the same strategic efforts before drawing conclusions about long-term impact.

Moving forward, SAS will:

- Maintain current SAOs with targeted refinements (particularly SAO 2),
- Improve data accuracy through collaboration with IERPG,
- Continue interventions that support early momentum, persistence, and course completion.

These actions will allow SAS to more accurately assess trends over time and strengthen alignment between goals, outcomes, and institutional KPIs SAS 2024-2025 Plan.

3. Please provide a financial overview of the service area.

a. How are resources allocated to support the mission, goals, and outcomes of the service area?

b. How are budget allocation/reallocation decisions made in your service area?

c. What factors influence the use of service area resources?

Student Accessibility Services (SAS) is a categorically funded program supported primarily through the statewide DSPS funding model. While these funds are essential to meeting mandated access requirements, they are not designed to cover the full scope of services required to support a growing and increasingly complex student population. As a result, SAS relies on a combination of categorical funding and supplemental funding sources to sustain operations and achieve program goals. The current SAS/DSPS budget is \$2,549,125.00, with the majority allocated to salaries and accommodation-related costs, both of which fluctuate based on unanticipated student need and often requires the DSPS budget to be back-filled.

a. Allocation of Resources to Support Mission, Goals, and Outcomes

SAS resources are primarily allocated to ensure compliance with state and federal disability access requirements and to support student persistence, course access, and completion. Major areas of allocation include:

- Personnel costs, which comprise the largest portion of the budget and support direct service delivery, including intake appointments, accommodation determinations, case management, faculty consultation, and compliance oversight.
- Accommodation-related expenses, which include interpreting and captioning services, assistive technology, testing accommodations, and specialized supports that vary based on student enrollment and course participation.
- Targeted program supports, such as notetaking services and assistive technology platforms, that directly support academic access and success.

Because accommodation needs are often non-anticipatory, budget flexibility is essential to maintain timely access to services.

b. Budget Allocation and Reallocation Decision-Making

Budget allocation and reallocation decisions within SAS are driven by mandated service priorities, student demand, and compliance obligations. Funding is first applied to salaries and legally required accommodations. When shifts occur—such as increases in enrollment, interpreting demand, or emergent accommodation needs—resources are reallocated within the budget to ensure that access requirements are met. Strategic decisions are made in coordination with division leadership and fiscal services, with an emphasis on balancing sustainability, compliance, and responsiveness. When limited flexibility exists within categorical funding, SAS pursues supplemental funding opportunities to support program needs without reducing core services.

c. Factors Influencing Resource Use

Several factors influence how SAS resources are utilized:

- Fluctuating student enrollment and disability-related needs, including unanticipated increases in high-cost accommodations.
- Rising market rates for essential services, such as interpreting and real-time captioning.
- Student participation beyond the classroom, including athletics, student organizations, and field-based coursework.
- Availability of supplemental funding, including:
 - Student Equity and Achievement Program (SEAP) funds
 - Perkins funding
 - Medi-Cal Administrative Activities (MAA) billing for eligible services
 - Partnerships with Regional Center vendors to support students requiring behavior aides or caregiving assistance

Together, these factors necessitate ongoing monitoring and careful fiscal decision-making to ensure that SAS can continue to provide timely, equitable access while responding to changing student and institutional needs.

4. Describe resource changes the service area has encountered over the past three years and future anticipated changes.

a. Explain what circumstances prompted these changes.

b. How these changes have/will affect the service area operations and services.

c. How the service area plans to address these changes.

Over the past three years, SAS has experienced significant changes in staffing capacity while simultaneously serving a rapidly growing and increasingly complex student population. These shifts have required short-term operational adaptations and highlight the need for more sustainable solutions to ensure mandated services can continue without disruption.

a. Circumstances Prompting Resource Changes

Staffing changes within SAS have been driven by a combination of faculty retirements and campus-wide prioritization decisions that limited the ability to immediately replace departing personnel. At the same time, SAS student enrollment increased dramatically—from fewer than 800 students in 2022 to more than 1,700 students by 2024–2025.

These changes occurred alongside a net loss of two full-time SAS faculty positions with expertise in mental health disabilities, while students with mental health and neurodivergent disabilities now represent more than half of the SAS caseload, with continued growth anticipated. The mismatch between staffing reductions and student demand has significantly altered the department's service landscape.

b. Impact on Operations and Services

The reduction in full-time faculty capacity has directly affected SAS's ability to provide the intensive case management, assessment, and consultation required by students with complex and non-anticipatory accommodation needs. Full-time faculty responsibilities—including first-time intakes, accommodation determination, faculty consultation, crisis-responsive adjustments, and compliance oversight—have increased substantially without a corresponding increase in staffing.

For most of the academic year, current SAS facilities and testing spaces sufficiently support daily operations. However, space constraints become significant during midterm and final examination periods, when testing demand increases substantially. This strain is especially evident when accommodating students in high-stakes programs such as Nursing, where exam scheduling, time extensions, reduced-distraction environments, and specialized accommodations must often occur simultaneously.

- Adjunct faculty are not positioned to absorb the full scope of compliance-driven responsibilities.
- Increased onboarding and training demands are placed on remaining full-time staff.
- Continuity of care and institutional knowledge are more difficult to maintain.

As demand continues to grow, this model is increasingly strained and limits SAS's capacity to respond proactively or expand services aligned with student success initiatives.

c. Strategies to Address Current and Future Resource Changes

To address these challenges, SAS is pursuing a multi-pronged approach focused on sustainability:

- Stabilizing staffing capacity by advocating for replacement of retired faculty positions and developing a transition plan that minimizes service disruption.
- Strengthening and formalizing the adjunct pipeline to ensure readiness and reduce onboarding time when full-time vacancies occur.
- Reevaluating service delivery models to better differentiate between routine accommodations and high-acuity, case-managed needs.
- Prioritizing workload alignment so that full-time faculty time is reserved for credentialed, compliance-driven functions that cannot be delegated.
- Engaging in strategic planning now to prepare for additional anticipated retirements and continued enrollment growth.

These strategies are intended to ensure that SAS can continue to meet its legal and institutional obligations while maintaining service quality for students with increasingly complex access needs.

5. How effectively do the service area's current facilities, space, and equipment support area operations?**a. To what extent must these organizational resources change to keep pace with the future needs and expectations of the service area users?****b. What strategies have been adopted or will be adopted to institute these changes?**

For most of the academic year, current SAS facilities and testing spaces sufficiently support daily operations. However, space constraints become significant during midterm and final examination periods, when testing demand increases substantially. This strain is especially evident when accommodating students in high-stakes programs such as Nursing, where exam scheduling, time extensions, reduced-distraction environments, and specialized accommodations must often occur simultaneously.

During the most recent academic year, SAS proctored a substantial volume of exams:

- **Total appointments:** 1,784
- **Total hours proctored:** 2,384 hours

By term:

- **Fall 2024:**
 - 937 appointments | 1,042 hours
 - 181 unduplicated students
- **Spring 2025:**
 - 782 appointments | 1,225.38 hours
 - 191 unduplicated students
- **Summer 2025:**
 - 65 appointments | 117.4 hours
 - 91 unduplicated students

Current testing capacity is limited to 27 seats, distributed as follows:

- One large testing room: 15 seats (including one CCTV station)
- Six small rooms: 12 seats total (two seats per room, each with a computer; one CCTV station total)

Students requiring aides, scribes, or specialized equipment reduce usable seating capacity, further exacerbating limitations during peak testing periods.

a. Extent to Which Resources Must Change

While physical space is generally adequate outside of peak testing times, testing capacity and scheduling flexibility must evolve to keep pace with increased accommodation needs, particularly for exam-intensive programs. More critically, the data and reporting infrastructure supporting SAS operations requires improvement. SAS student data currently exists across multiple platforms, making it difficult and time-intensive to aggregate, analyze, and report. Significant staff time is devoted to manual data management rather than direct student support. As demand increases, this fragmented infrastructure will increasingly limit SAS's ability to respond effectively, meet reporting expectations, and engage in proactive planning.

b. Strategies to Address Facility and Infrastructure Needs

To address these challenges within future planning cycles, SAS will pursue the following strategies:

- Improve testing space utilization during peak demand, including exploring alternative scheduling models, expanded testing windows, or temporary additional space during finals.
- Strengthen coordination with academic programs—particularly Nursing and other high-stakes disciplines—to anticipate testing needs earlier and reduce last-minute capacity constraints.
- Explore options to streamline data management and reporting, including consolidation of platforms or enhanced institutional support for data integration.
- Seek dedicated technical or institutional support to reduce the manual burden of data collection and reporting, allowing staff time to be reallocated toward direct service delivery.

While SAS facilities and equipment adequately support most operational needs, peak testing demand and data infrastructure limitations present growing challenges. Addressing these issues will require targeted improvements in testing capacity planning and institutional investment in streamlined data systems to ensure SAS can continue to meet student needs efficiently and sustainably.

6. How has technology been integrated into the programs, services, and operating functions of the service area?**a. In what ways have technological applications been used to promote innovation, responsiveness, and continuous improvement in the service area?****b. How has the service area kept pace with the development of hardware, software, maintenance, and training support?****c. What are the service area's projected technology needs for the future?****d. What strategies have been adopted or will be adopted to address these needs?**

Technology is embedded in nearly every function of Student Accessibility Services, from accommodation delivery and case management to communication with students and faculty. SAS's ability to respond efficiently to student needs is directly tied to the reliability, accessibility, and scalability of its technological systems..

a. Use of Technology to Promote Innovation, Responsiveness, and Improvement

SAS uses technology to streamline access to accommodations, reduce manual processes, and respond more quickly to student needs. A key recent improvement has been the purchase of Genio, a notetaking support platform that replaces reliance on volunteer peer notetakers. This shift is anticipated to reduce delays, increase access to course notes, and minimize

administrative coordination previously required to recruit and manage volunteers.

Technology is also used to:

- Track accommodation requests and student engagement across the term
- Improve communication with students and faculty regarding accommodation status
- Monitor patterns in accommodation usage to inform service improvements

These functions allow SAS to move from reactive problem-solving toward more timely, data-informed responses.

b. Keeping Pace with Hardware, Software, Maintenance, and Training

SAS maintains technology systems through close coordination with campus IT and by prioritizing tools that are sustainable within existing staffing and budget constraints. The timing of the Genio implementation, for example, was made possible by temporary funding availability following a faculty retirement, highlighting both the importance of fiscal flexibility and the limits of ongoing capacity.

Training occurs through:

- Internal knowledge sharing among SAS faculty and staff
- Vendor-provided training and onboarding resources
- Just-in-time learning as new technologies are introduced into classrooms

However, the pace of emerging instructional and assistive technologies increasingly outstrips the time available for SAS faculty to independently research, test, and evaluate new tools.

c. Projected Technology Needs

Over the next three years, SAS anticipates increased demand for:

- Assistive technology platforms that support notetaking, reading, writing, and organization
- Tools that integrate AI-supported features in a way that is accessible and compliant
- Improved systems for tracking complex accommodation workflows and case management
- Increased capacity to assess accessibility of instructional technologies used across disciplines

As AI-driven learning tools become more common in classrooms, students with disabilities will increasingly require guidance and accommodations related to accessibility, appropriate use, and policy alignment.

7. What major challenges face the service area?

a. What needs to occur, primarily within existing resources, to successfully make improvements in these areas?

Student Accessibility Services (SAS) is operating in a shifting environment marked by increased student demand, greater complexity in accommodation needs, and expanding expectations for accessibility across academic and co-curricular settings. While access to services remains critical for student persistence and success, the current service delivery model and resource structure were not designed for the volume, acuity, and technological complexity now present. The challenges outlined below reflect areas where systems and workflows must adapt in order to maintain timely, effective support within existing resources.

1. Escalating Crisis-Driven Case Management Demands

Challenge:

SAS is experiencing a significant increase in students requiring intensive, non-anticipatory case management due to hospitalizations, acute symptom exacerbations (e.g., mania, psychosis, and severe depression), and sudden changes in functional capacity. These situations frequently require immediate adjustments to attendance and assignment flexibility accommodations, ongoing faculty consultation, and repeated student follow-up—often within compressed timeframes.

The current service delivery model does not sufficiently account for the time required to manage these cases while also sustaining:

- First-time intake appointments
- Ongoing student check-ins
- Faculty consultations
- Compliance-driven accommodation determinations

As a result, SAS faculty are often required to respond reactively, leaving limited capacity for proactive planning and creating situations in which faculty must make short-term instructional adjustments while accommodation decisions are still being finalized.

What must occur within existing resources:

- Shift toward a tiered case management model, allowing SAS to prioritize intensive support for students experiencing acute crises while maintaining access for routine accommodation needs.
- Implement clearer internal workflows that distinguish between anticipatory accommodations and crisis-responsive adjustments, allowing time and staffing to be allocated appropriately.

2. Rising and Unpredictable Costs of Interpreting and Communication Services

Challenge:

The cost of providing ASL interpreting and real-time captioning services has become increasingly difficult to absorb within a fixed budget. Rising market rates, limited availability of qualified providers, and increased student participation in classes, athletics, student organizations, governance, field trips, and off-campus course activities have resulted in expanded service demand beyond traditional classroom settings. These activities are essential for student engagement and completion but require advance coordination, extended service hours, and frequently last-minute coverage, all of which significantly increase costs and complicate scheduling.

What must occur within existing resources:

- Improve early identification and scheduling processes for interpreting needs related to non-classroom activities.
- Strengthen coordination with Athletics, Student Life, and Academic Departments to anticipate access needs earlier in the planning cycle.
- Expand training and utilization of internal support strategies where appropriate, to reduce reliance on high-cost external vendors when feasible without compromising access.

3. Rapid Pace of Instructional Technology Adoption

Challenge:

The growing use of instructional technology—such as multimedia platforms, interactive polling tools, simulation software, and online testing systems—frequently introduces new access barriers, particularly for students with hearing or vision loss. Each tool may require separate analysis to determine:

- Whether it is accessible
- Where barriers exist
- What reasonable accommodations or alternatives are viable

This evaluation process often requires research, vendor engagement, testing, and consultation, all of which demand time and specialized expertise. Current staffing levels do not provide sufficient capacity for SAS faculty to complete this work consistently while managing increased student demand.

What must occur within existing resources:

- Develop shared internal guidance and decision tools to reduce repeated research on commonly used instructional technologies.
- Strengthen partnerships with faculty early in course planning to identify potential access issues before implementation.
- Prioritize professional development that equips SAS faculty to more quickly assess and respond to technology-related barriers without duplicative effort.

8. Where would you like your service area to be three years from now? Dream big while considering any upcoming changes (e.g., new buildings, growth, changes in the services, etc.). Consider the following in your response:

- a. Describe the colleagues and partners inside and outside the institution with whom you would like to work in the ideal future.
- b. What specific innovations, best practices, or other accomplishments would you share with a visiting out-of-state colleague?
- c. What long-term impact would you like your service area to have on the College and the community?
- d. What strengths, opportunities, or new directions now exist on which you can capitalize in three years' time?

In three years, Student Accessibility Services (SAS) envisions itself as a fully integrated, campus-wide leader in disability access, academic inclusion, and workforce preparation—offering comprehensive, responsive services that meet the evolving needs of students with disabilities while remaining sustainable during anticipated faculty transitions.

a. Ideal Colleagues and Partners (Internal and External)

Internally, SAS would work in close, structured collaboration with Student Health Services, General Counseling, Equity and Guided Pathways teams, Academic Affairs, and allied health program faculty to provide seamless, coordinated support for students with disabilities—particularly those with neurodivergent identities and those participating in clinical or practicum-based programs.

b. Innovations and Accomplishments to Share with Visiting Colleagues

SAS would highlight its development into a **full-service accessibility model**, including:

- On-campus **Learning Disability assessment services** to reduce delays and external cost barriers.
- A dedicated **Assistive Technology Specialist** role to provide specialized support, training, and innovation in instructional access.
- Integrated **SAS–Student Health Services partnerships** that address neurodivergence through proactive, whole-student support models.
- Best-practice frameworks for supporting students with disabilities in **allied health and clinical programs**, balancing access, compliance, and program rigor.

c. Long-Term Impact on the College and Community

The long-term impact of SAS would be a measurable increase in persistence, completion, and workforce participation** for students with disabilities—particularly in high-demand fields such as allied health. For the college, SAS would strengthen institutional compliance, reduce reactive accommodation issues, and contribute to student success outcomes aligned with the Students First Framework. For the community, SAS would help produce a more diverse, prepared, and disability-inclusive workforce.

d. Strengths, Opportunities, and New Directions to Leverage

SAS can capitalize on several emerging strengths and opportunities:

- Established cross-departmental collaboration models that can be scaled.
- Opportunity to intentionally address anticipated faculty retirements through early replacement, phased training, and the cultivation of a strong, prepared adjunct pool to minimize service disruption.
- Increased demand for assistive technology and AI expertise, disability-inclusive clinical education, and workforce pathways.

Section 5: Service Area Three-Year Action Plan

A. Service Area Goals, SAOs, Objectives, Action Plans, and Resource Requests

Section 6: Service Area Program Review Process Reflection

A. Service Area Program Review Process Reflection

1. In what capacity were your service area staff, and/or users involved in the program review process?

No Value

2. How did you ensure all members of your service area were involved in the outcome assessment discussions, evaluation of area data, and contributed to the area goals, SAO, objectives, and action plan discussions and development?

No Value

Program Review Cycle:

Division:

Goals	SAOs	Objectives	
			Goal Target Year of Achievement
#1 Outline plan to incorporate more intentional student educational planning activities into academic counseling appointments while maintaining an overall holistic approach to academic counseling.	#1 Students with disabilities will register for courses in alignment with their education plan.		
	# 2 Students enrolled in college-level Math and English courses will request their Letter of Accommodation within the first week of the semester. New students registered with Student Accessibility Services (SAS) will have their letter available at the time of their intake appointment.		
#2 Work in collaboration with the Dean of Equity to implement proven strategies to close the equity gaps as identified by the number of students with disabilities who are disproportionately impacted.	#1 Successful completion of Transfer-Level Math and English within the First Year will increase by 10 percent for Students with Disabilities.		
	#2		

	#3		
#3	#1		
	#2		
	#3		
#4	#1		
	#2		
	#3		
#5	#1		
	#2		
	#3		
#6	#1		
	#2		
	#3		

Action Plan				
Responsible Party	SAO Assessment Year	Method of Assessment	Action Steps	Student First Framework Lever
				Equitable Access
				Completion

Service Area:

College Alignment	Resource Requests			
Student First Framework Lever Strategy	Resource Request	Estimated Cost	Occurrence	Resource Type
A.2. Strengthen our pipeline with the K-12 system and develop similar pipelines with additional groups of prospective students., A.5. Refine our onboarding process so that our incoming students enroll in program applicable classes – including math and English in the first year – to enable them to complete in a timely manner., A.3. Increase dual enrollment courses and programs to provide opportunities for higher education to more high school students in our community.	Maintain current Deaf/Hard of Hearing (DHH) funding at \$67,000 to address the retention gap for students in the DHH community, particularly those with multiple identities such as deaf-blind, deaf who are oral, deaf people of color, deaf disabled, and deaf LGBTQ+ individuals.	\$67,000.00	Ongoing expense	
B.5. Improve the processes that help our students succeed in their current courses and ensure they enroll in the subsequent term. , B.4. Expand support for our students in the gateway general education courses. , A.5. Refine our onboarding process so that our incoming students enroll in program applicable classes – including math and English in the first year – to enable them to complete in a timely manner., D.6. Develop the facilities and technology infrastructure to better support our students’ journey from access, through completion, and to career attainment.	Secure and deploy Otter.ai licenses for at least 500 students ensuring a more efficient and reliable notetaking accommodation process for students with disabilities.	\$30,000.00	Ongoing expense	

		Approval	
Justification	Priority Rank	Dean Approval	Area Approval (P/VP)
Deaf/Hard of Hearing (DHH) mentors and tutors (who are also DHH) provide direct language support to students that are Deaf/Hard of Hearing. Each mentor and tutor have ASL skills, both expressive and receptive, with an understanding for DHH culture, norms, forms of communication, and support needs. Our DHH mentors and tutors offer valuable experiences that contribute to personal, academic, and career development for deaf youth. Yet, the number of opportunities or experiences for mentoring are limited to those who are part of the hearing community. This is especially true for deaf youth with multiple identities, like deaf-blind, deaf who are oral, deaf people of color, deaf disabled, and deaf LGBTQ+ people, which leads to lower retention of students who are part of the DHH community.	1		
Otter.ai ensures students with disabilities receive timely, accurate, and meaningful access to course lectures, replacing inconsistent peer notetaking that often fails to meet accommodation standards. Current alternatives, like Zoom, require faculty setup and do not provide students direct access to notes unless shared by faculty after each class session. Otter.ai is successfully used at other campuses and will streamline the notetaking process for 500 students at an annual cost of \$30,000, supporting equitable and efficient access.			

[illegible]

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS, RESEARCH, PLANNING, AND GRANTS

Student Service Program Review

Program Review: Student Accessibility Services

Reviewer Name: Antonio "Nío" Lavermon

Section 1: Service Area Overview

A. Service Area Mission and Alignment

1. Briefly describe how your mission and purpose aligns with the Cerritos College mission and Students First Framework.				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Provides a concise, well-articulated explanation of how the mission aligns with the College mission and Students First Framework. Clearly identifies connections to four levers. Demonstrates strong understanding of institutional purpose and goal.	Provides a clear explanation of alignment with the College mission and Students First Framework. Mentions specific levers or strategies but may lack full integration or depth.	Provides a generally accurate description but alignment is broad or superficial. Mentions the College mission or Students First Framework but not both.	Provides minimal mission alignment. Response is vague, unclear, or missing explicit connections to Students First Framework.	Mission alignment is missing, inaccurate, off-topic, or unrelated to institutional goals.
Comments: SAS provides/offers an array of services which center holistic accessibility, education, and opportunity.				Score: 5

B. Service Area Description

1. Provide a list and a brief description of the services you provide.				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Provides a comprehensive, clear, and well-organized list of services with specific descriptions and functions. Demonstrates strong understanding of service scope.	Provides clear services and descriptions with minor omissions or room for elaboration.	Lists services but descriptions lack depth or clarity.	Provides incomplete list or unclear descriptions.	Fails to identify services or provides irrelevant/inaccurate information.
Comments: Excellent.				Score: 5

2. Describe efforts to promote the availability of your services to current and prospective users.				
a. Describe the key methods used to assist users in getting information about your service areas' programs and service offerings (e.g., publicity, outreach, recruitment, etc.).				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly describes a strategic, coordinated outreach and communication approach using multiple methods (publicity, outreach, recruitment, digital tools, partnerships). Demonstrates effectiveness using data and explains how efforts advance Student First Framework, particularly for targeted populations.	Describes multiple outreach methods clearly and connects them to user awareness and access; limited data or equity analysis.	Lists outreach and communication methods with minimal explanation of effectiveness or alignment to Student First Framework.	Outreach description is vague, incomplete, or lacks clarity.	Minimal or no description of outreach or information-sharing efforts.
Comments: Absolutely outstanding.				Score: 5

3. Does your service area overlap or duplicate any programs or service function with other Student Services or college units?				
a. How and why do these services/programs duplicate one another?				
b. How do they complement each other?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Provides a thoughtful analysis of overlapping services, explains why duplication exists, how coordination is intentional, and how complementarity improves student experience, efficiency, and Institutional Health.	Identifies overlap and complementarity clearly but lacks depth or evaluation of impact.	Acknowledges overlap with general explanations.	Discussion of overlap is unclear or incomplete.	Does not meaningfully address duplication or coordination.
Comments: While aligned in philosophy or methodology, there are clear delineations between SAS-specific service provision and other resources/ services/programs on campus. There is much care and detail in discerning student need, which also aims to prevent the duplication of services.				Score: 5

4. Discuss key, collaborative relationships with academic programs and other student service areas. How do these partnerships:

- a. Advance achievement, learning, or completion.**
- b. Support the service area's mission, goals, and Service Area Outcomes (SAOs).**
- c. Enhance the quality of services and programs provided.**
- d. Create greater operational efficiencies for the service area.**
- e. Identify how your partnerships can or have mitigated equity gaps.**

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly describes key partnerships and demonstrates how they advance completion, learning, and achievement, support SAOs, enhance service quality, improve efficiency, and mitigate equity gaps using evidence, aligned with Student First Framework.	Describes collaborations and benefits clearly with limited outcome or equity analysis.	Identifies partnerships but provides minimal explanation of impact.	Partnerships are vague or loosely connected to outcomes.	No meaningful discussion of partnerships.
Comments: SAS has partnered with many areas including but not limited to the LGBTQ+ Program and Equity Center, cultivating various pathways to an accessible environment for all students, with intention.				Score: 5

C. Service Area Organizational Resources

1. Please describe your service area's organizational and personnel structure. Discuss: a. Reporting relationships. b. Distribution of responsibilities/authority. c. Use of management or work teams. d. Lines of communication (e.g., area meetings structure/frequency, staff-to-staff and staff-to-manager communication, etc.).				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Thorough description of staffing structure, roles, communication practices, collaboration, and workflow. Includes clarity on full-time/part-time positions, internal coordination, and optional organizational chart.	Clear description with moderate detail; collaboration or staffing information may be less complete.	Basic description provided but lacks detail or structure.	Limited information, unclear staffing roles, or missing key structural elements.	No meaningful description of personnel or structure.
Comments: Excellent.				Score: 5

2. How does your current staff profile facilitate or impede the service area's ability to fulfill its primary mission and functions? a. If applicable, what strategies has the area adopted to address staffing-related impediments?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Provides a clear analysis of staffing strengths and gaps and how they affect mission fulfillment, and includes strategies used to address impediments.	Describes staffing impacts clearly; limited analysis or strategy evaluation.	General staffing description with minimal analysis.	Staffing discussion is unclear or incomplete.	Staffing impact not meaningfully addressed.
Comments: Excellent.				Score: 5

3. Describe any challenges the service area has encountered with respect to the recruitment and retention of qualified staff. What are the implications of these challenges?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Analyzes staff recruitment and retention challenges, explains implications for service delivery and aligns discussion to program effectiveness and sustainability.	Describes challenges clearly with limited impact analysis.	General description of challenges.	Challenges are unclear or minimally explained.	Question not adequately addressed.
Comments: Excellent, clear, and concise.				Score: 5

4. How does the service area facilitate appropriate career development and progression for staff?				
a. Describe the service area's professional development resources, activities, and/or opportunities. b. How does this engagement directly reflect on the direction of your service area.				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly describes professional development resources and opportunities and explains how staff growth supports innovation and service quality.	Describes professional development clearly; limited connection to service direction.	Mentions professional development generally.	Limited or unclear discussion of staff development.	Professional development not addressed.
Comments: Excellent.				Score: 5

5. Please describe the succession planning for your service area.

a. What steps are in place?

b. How does the service area plan to make changes to services (realignment, reorganization, or other strategies) to ensure continuous improvement in the face of staff turnover, retirement, and attrition?

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Demonstrates proactive succession planning and service realignment strategies that ensure continuous improvement and service area stability.	Succession planning is described but lacks depth or future focus.	General discussion of succession planning.	Minimal planning evident.	Succession planning not addressed.
Comments: Clearly outlines proactive measures pertinent to the area/department, while also detailing specific challenges that have hindered (desired) progression.				Score: 5

6. What assessment methods and measures (either formal or informal) does the service area use to determine staff well-being, satisfaction, and motivation?

a. How does the department use the findings from these assessment efforts to improve the work environment?

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Uses formal and/or informal assessment methods and clearly explains how findings inform improvements to the work environment.	Describes assessment methods and some use of findings.	Mentions assessment efforts with limited follow-through.	Assessment practices are unclear or minimal.	No meaningful discussion of staff well-being assessment.
Comments: Excellent.				Score: 5

7. What significant projects, tasks, workgroups, and committee work are the staff of your service area engaged in? a. How does this participation reflect on your service area's plans and integration with the college.				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly documents staff involvement in key projects, committees, and workgroups and explains how participation aligns with college planning and Student First Framework priorities.	Describes engagement clearly with limited strategic analysis.	Lists involvement with minimal explanation.	Engagement is unclear or limited.	No meaningful discussion of participation.
Comments: Outstanding; SAS is involved with several collaborations, work groups, and initiatives.				Score: 5

Section 2: Service Area Trends

A. Service Area User Demographics

1. Whom do you serve? a. Describe your primary and secondary user groups that the service area attracts and serves b. Describe the demographics and representativeness of the populations served (e.g., race/ethnicity, gender, age range, foster youth, and first-generation status)				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Identifies primary and secondary users, provides disaggregated demographic data, and explains representativeness.	Describes users and demographics clearly.	General description of users.	User populations are unclear.	Users not adequately described.
Comments: Excellent, clear, and concise.				Score: 5

2. <i>How do the demographics of your users compare with the college as a whole?</i>				
a. <i>Are the trends within your program in alignment with the broader, collegewide trends?</i>				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Uses data to compare service users to collegewide demographics and identifies trends.	Provides comparison with limited analysis.	Basic comparison provided.	Comparison is unclear or incomplete.	No comparison provided.
Comments: Data captured illustrates an overview/juxtaposition of applicable trends and discrepancies.				Score: 5

B. Service Area Service Trends

1. <i>Describe the usage trend for your service area in the last three years.</i>				
a. <i>Has it remained steady, increased, or decreased?</i>				
b. <i>Are there different patterns of usage for different demographic groups (e.g., race/ethnicity, gender, age range, foster youth, formally incarcerated, and first-generation status)?</i>				
c. <i>Draw clear connections between your data trends and attempts to identify and mitigate equity gaps.</i>				
d. <i>Describe any factors that contributed to any change.</i>				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Analyzes multi-year trends, disaggregates by demographics, explains contributing factors, and clearly links findings to equity gap mitigation.	Describes trends clearly with limited equity analysis.	General trend description.	Limited or unclear trend data.	Usage trends not addressed.
Comments: Clear and concise.				Score: 5

2. Describe your pattern of service. Include:

- a. Standard hours of operations.**
- b. Alternative modes (e.g., online, hybrid, etc.).**
- c. Schedules of delivery (e.g., early morning, evening services, etc.).**
- d. How your services meet the needs of the users.**

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly describes service patterns and explains how hours, modalities, and scheduling support student needs.	Describes service patterns clearly.	Basic description provided.	Service pattern discussion is unclear.	Not addressed.
Comments: Excellent.				Score: 5

3. What are the differences in service usage based on modality? If you do not offer varying modalities, explain why not.

a. How does this help inform future practices?

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Analyzes modality-based usage differences and explains how findings inform future access and innovation.	Describes differences with limited future planning.	General modality discussion.	Limited or unclear explanation.	Not addressed.
Comments: Excellent.				Score: 5

Section 3: Service Area Performance and Effectiveness

A. Service Area Outcomes Assessment Process

1. <i>What methods are used to assess your service area outcomes (SAOs)? If these are not in place, what do you plan to do in the future to collect this evidence?</i>				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Identifies multiple, appropriate assessment tools (surveys, usage data, service logs, focus groups, KPIs). Provides clear rationale and future plans.	Describes assessment methods with some detail; future plans mentioned.	Basic methods identified but limited explanation.	Minimal mention of assessment methods.	No assessment process described.
Comments: Excellent, concise description of evidence collection, assessments, and unique barriers associated.				Score: 5

2. <i>How are user needs assessed and considered in the development and delivery of programs and services?</i>				
<i>a. What methods does the service area use to remain current with respect to understanding user needs, interests, and experiences?</i> <i>b. What are the sources of information your service area uses to understand current needs?</i> <i>c. How have the needs changed over time?</i>				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly identifies data sources (surveys, IR data, feedback, campus partners). Tracks changes over time and shows deep understanding of evolving needs.	Good description of needs and data sources with moderate depth.	Some sources listed but limited reflection.	Minimal detail on methods or data sources.	Missing or off-topic.
Comments: While SAS has internal procedures to determine and deliver appropriate service provision, students often self-disclose personal needs and identifications. This is also common for those who access other supportive services tied to other facets of their identity, and the service areas work to meet each student where they are at uniquely.				Score: 5

3. How does the service area track program/service usage patterns and determine users' satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the service area's performance? If these are not in place, what do you plan to do in the future to collect this data?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Strong description of data collection tools (EAB/PS queries/reports, surveys, analytics, service counts). Clear future plans if gaps exist.	Good description but lacking depth.	Some tools identified but incomplete.	Limited or unclear.	Missing.
Comments: Provides mode(s) of assessment, including the impact of anecdotal, qualitative data.				Score: 5

4. To what extent does the service area obtain and use comparative/benchmark data to stay current with peers and/or competitors that deliver similar programs and services (both those that are on and off campus)?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Uses comparative data intentionally to support continuous improvement, competitiveness, and innovation.	Mentions benchmarking with limited application.	General reference to comparative data.	Minimal benchmarking evident.	Not addressed.
Comments: Excellent; benchmarking efforts highlight the evolving nature of its application pertinent to the SAS service area.				Score: 5

5. <i>How does the service area monitor compliance with the laws/other regulatory requirements that apply to the service areas program and service responsibilities?</i>				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Demonstrates systematic compliance monitoring aligned with institutional and CCC systemwide requirements and regulations.	Clear compliance practices described.	General compliance mention.	Compliance processes unclear.	Not addressed.
Comments: Excellent; **American with Disabilities Act, Sections 504 and 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, Title 5, Title IX, and Office of Civil Rights case law**				Score: 5

B. Service Area Outcomes Assessment

1. <i>What does the data say about the success of service area with respect to the achievement of your service area's outcomes? Identify and describe the data sources.</i>				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Uses multiple data sources and provides specific, meaningful interpretation of SAO success results.	Interprets data with reasonable clarity but less depth.	General interpretations without detail.	Minimal interpretation.	No meaningful data discussion.
Comments: Adv. incomplection *Provides data points emphasizing ed plan and trajectory.				Score: 4

2. What areas for improvement are suggested by the data?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Identifies strategic, data-informed opportunities for improvement tied to SAOs.	Lists areas for improvement with some analysis.	Basic identification but limited justification.	Minimal detail.	Missing or superficial.
Comments: Outstanding; lists multiple areas of growth/opportunity, and applicable metrics which address student success and completion.				Score: 5

3. How is assessment data used to inform organizational decisions, management practices, and program/service delivery strategies?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Provides detailed examples connecting assessment data to operational changes, resource allocation, workflows, and service improvements.	Clear examples but fewer connections.	General statements without clear examples.	Minimal connection between data and decisions.	No evidence of data-informed decisions.
Comments: Excellent.				Score: 5

4. How has the assessment of the service area outcomes contributed to your service area's improvements?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly demonstrates how SAO assessment results directly informed service improvements.	Assessment use described with limited examples.	Assessment acknowledged.	Limited use of assessment evident.	Not addressed.
Comments: *Adv. data limitations.; provided overview on ability to assess goal progression.				Score: 4

5. How does the service area make needed data and information available to area stakeholders?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly describes how data is shared (reports, dashboards, meetings) and how stakeholders use it.	Describes data sharing practices.	Basic description of communication.	Vague or incomplete.	No description.
Comments: Clear and concise; does not adv. how stakeholders use the data.				Score: 4.5

Section 4: Previous Three-Year Service Area Program Plan Reflection

A. Service Area Three-Year Reflection

1. What are the primary strengths of the non-instructional area?

a. How have these changed over time?

b. What innovative programs/services/practices has the department instituted that puts it out in front with respect to "best practices" in the field?

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clear, evidence-based strengths tied to outcomes, innovations, staffing, and service excellence. Shows evolution over time.	Describes strengths with some reflection.	General strengths with minimal depth.	Limited or generic strengths.	Missing.
Comments: Excellent!				Score: 5

2. Please comment on the progress toward achieving your previous service area goals and SAOs. Discuss what has/is/will happen and the status of each goal and SAO.

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Detailed status updates for each goal/SAO with evidence of progress, partial completion, or obstacles.	Good progress updates but limited detail.	General updates without evidence.	Limited or incomplete updates.	Missing.
Comments: Outstanding!				Score: 5

3. Please provide a financial overview of the service area.

a. How are resources allocated to support the mission, goals, and outcomes of the service area?

b. How are budget allocation/reallocation decisions made in your service area?

c. What factors influence the use of service area resources?

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly aligns financial resources with mission, outcomes, and describes financial decision making process.	Provides clear overview with limited analysis.	Basic financial description.	Financial discussion unclear.	Not addressed.
Comments: Clear and concise; provided SAS/DSPS budget/ funding source, allocation, execution, and overall operation.				Score: 5

4. Describe resource changes the service area has encountered over the past three years and future anticipated changes.

a. Explain what circumstances prompted these changes.

b. How these changes have/will affect the service area operations and services.

c. How the service area plans to address these changes.

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Analyzes past and anticipated changes and explains strategies to sustain services and continuous improvement.	Describes changes clearly.	General description provided.	Limited explanation.	Not addressed.
Comments: Excellent description(s) and strategic organization.				Score: 5

5. How effectively do the service area's current facilities, space, and equipment support area operations? a. To what extent must these organizational resources change to keep pace with the future needs and expectations of the service area users? b. What strategies have been adopted or will be adopted to institute these changes?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Evaluates current resources and identifies future needs aligned with student expectations and needs.	Describes adequacy and some future planning.	General description of facilities.	Facilities discussion unclear.	Not addressed.
Comments: Outstanding; provided historical context and other cross-departmental considerations related to infrastructural challenges, scheduling/academic demand and more.				Score: 5

6. How has technology been integrated into the programs, services, and operating functions of the service area? a. In what ways have technological applications been used to promote innovation, responsiveness, and continuous improvement in the service area? b. How has the service area kept pace with the development of hardware, software, maintenance, and training support? c. What are the service area's projected technology needs for the future? d. What strategies have been adopted or will be adopted to address these needs?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Demonstrates intentional technology use to support innovation, responsiveness, and continuous improvement, with clear future planning.	Describes technology use clearly.	General technology discussion.	Limited or unclear integration.	Not addressed.
Comments: Excellent, all information provided.				Score: 5

7. What major challenges face the service area?				
a. What needs to occur, primarily within existing resources, to successfully make improvements in these areas?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Thorough, realistic challenges aligned with resources, staffing, facilities, or technology. Provides actionable strategies within existing resources.	Lists challenges with some solutions.	Basic challenges listed but limited solutions.	Minimal challenges listed.	None provided.
Comments: Exemplary; absolutely captures an ever-evolving and -shifting environment impacted by "... demand, greater complexity in accommodation needs, and expanding expectations for accessibility across academic and co-curricular settings."				Score: 5

8. Where would you like your service area to be three years from now? Dream big while considering any upcoming changes (e.g., new buildings, growth, changes in the services, etc.). Consider the following in your response:				
a. Describe the colleagues and partners inside and outside the institution with whom you would like to work in the ideal future.				
b. What long-term impact would you like your service area to have on the College and the community?				
c. What strengths, opportunities, or new directions now exist on which you can capitalize in three years' time?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clear, ambitious, and strategic vision with alignment to future institutional priorities, partnerships, and community impact.	Strong vision with some alignment.	General aspirations but lacks detail.	Minimal or vague.	Missing.
Comments: Outstanding!				Score: 5

Section 5: Service Area Three-Year Action Plan

A. Service Area Goals, SAOs, Objectives, Action Plans, and Resource Requests

Please review the goals and resources request worksheet. Comment on area goals, SAOs, objectives, action plans, and resource requests.				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Goals are strategic, overarching, aligned with the Students First Framework, includes measurable SAOs, objectives, steps, responsible parties, timelines, and assessments. Resource requests tied to goals and SFF.	Clear goals and SAOs with moderate specificity and alignment.	Goals and SAOs listed but lack measurable objectives or alignment.	Minimal goals or unclear action plans.	Missing or incomplete.
Comments: SAS has already been a driving pillar of holistic, well-rounded student access/accessibility at Cerritos College at large. Its goals not only align with the campus's mission, but aim to expand upon what is offered currently with the intention of providing additional opportunities that transcend even historical charges, initiatives, and barriers. SAS's work with other service areas such as Student Health Services, General Counseling, and Student Equity also prioritize a seamless integration and sustainment of intersectionally-driven education, resources, and service-provision, seeking to discern and attend to nuanced variables that impact a multitude of (potentially and oftentimes compounded) student experiences. With its detailed plan, anticipated trajectories, historical data and data challenges, SAS reserves the onus to enhance its framework including its assessment practices and services, technological specialty, actualized training models/ professional development opportunities across the campus, expansion of internal and external partnerships, and more.				Score: 5

Section 6: Service Area Program Review Process Reflection

A. Service Area Program Review Process Reflection

1. What capacity were your service area staff, and/or users involved in the program review process?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly documents broad and collaborative participation by staff and/or users.	Participation described clearly.	General participation noted.	Limited involvement evident.	Not addressed.
Comments:				Score: N/A

2. How did you ensure all members of your service area were involved in the outcome assessment discussions, evaluation of area data, and contributed to the area goals, SAO, objectives, and action plan discussions and development?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Demonstrates inclusive, data-informed engagement in SAOs, goals, and action planning aligned with continuous improvement.	Inclusive process described with limited detail.	General involvement described.	Limited inclusion evident.	Not addressed.
Comments:				Score: N/A

Provide your overall program review comments and total score.

Overall comments:

Absolutely exceptional. SAS offers and continues to refine excellent and very needed holistic support for all students, irrespective of dis/ability level.

Total Score:

177.5

Reviewer Signature:

Ant Zeman

Date:

02/09/2026



OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS, RESEARCH, PLANNING, AND GRANTS

Student Service Program Review

Program Review: Student Accessibility Services

Reviewer Name: Hillary Mennella

Section 1: Service Area Overview

A. Service Area Mission and Alignment

1. Briefly describe how your mission and purpose aligns with the Cerritos College mission and Students First Framework.				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Provides a concise, well-articulated explanation of how the mission aligns with the College mission and Students First Framework. Clearly identifies connections to four levers. Demonstrates strong understanding of institutional purpose and goal.	Provides a clear explanation of alignment with the College mission and Students First Framework. Mentions specific levers or strategies but may lack full integration or depth.	Provides a generally accurate description but alignment is broad or superficial. Mentions the College mission or Students First Framework but not both.	Provides minimal mission alignment. Response is vague, unclear, or missing explicit connections to Students First Framework.	Mission alignment is missing, inaccurate, off-topic, or unrelated to institutional goals.
Comments: Speaks to Equitable Access, Completion, and Career and Transfer levers outlined in the Students First Framework specifically pointing out access curricula, programs, and college activities.				Score: 4

B. Service Area Description

1. Provide a list and a brief description of the services you provide.				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Provides a comprehensive, clear, and well-organized list of services with specific descriptions and functions. Demonstrates strong understanding of service scope.	Provides clear services and descriptions with minor omissions or room for elaboration.	Lists services but descriptions lack depth or clarity.	Provides incomplete list or unclear descriptions.	Fails to identify services or provides irrelevant/inaccurate information.
Comments: Numerous, wide-range of services/programs with detailed descriptions and methods/efforts to implement mission in alignment with target populations that SAS is committed to serving.				Score: 5

2. Describe efforts to promote the availability of your services to current and prospective users.

a. Describe the key methods used to assist users in getting information about your service areas' programs and service offerings (e.g., publicity, outreach, recruitment, etc.).

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly describes a strategic, coordinated outreach and communication approach using multiple methods (publicity, outreach, recruitment, digital tools, partnerships). Demonstrates effectiveness using data and explains how efforts advance Student First Framework, particularly for targeted populations.	Describes multiple outreach methods clearly and connects them to user awareness and access; limited data or equity analysis.	Lists outreach and communication methods with minimal explanation of effectiveness or alignment to Student First Framework.	Outreach description is vague, incomplete, or lacks clarity.	Minimal or no description of outreach or information-sharing efforts.
Comments: Embedded services and outreach in sync with numerous campus partnerships to capture target populations who benefit from SAS; data evaluation to determine ongoing needs and/or revisions and resources.				Score: 5

3. Does your service area overlap or duplicate any programs or service function with other Student Services or college units?

a. How and why do these services/programs duplicate one another?

b. How do they complement each other?

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Provides a thoughtful analysis of overlapping services, explains why duplication exists, how coordination is intentional, and how complementarity improves student experience, efficiency, and Institutional Health.	Identifies overlap and complementarity clearly but lacks depth or evaluation of impact.	Acknowledges overlap with general explanations.	Discussion of overlap is unclear or incomplete.	Does not meaningfully address duplication or coordination.
Comments: No duplication, follows Title X and ADA Section 504 regulations.				Score: 5

4. Discuss key, collaborative relationships with academic programs and other student service areas. How do these partnerships:

- a. Advance achievement, learning, or completion.**
- b. Support the service area's mission, goals, and Service Area Outcomes (SAOs).**
- c. Enhance the quality of services and programs provided.**
- d. Create greater operational efficiencies for the service area.**
- e. Identify how your partnerships can or have mitigated equity gaps.**

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly describes key partnerships and demonstrates how they advance completion, learning, and achievement, support SAOs, enhance service quality, improve efficiency, and mitigate equity gaps using evidence, aligned with Student First Framework.	Describes collaborations and benefits clearly with limited outcome or equity analysis.	Identifies partnerships but provides minimal explanation of impact.	Partnerships are vague or loosely connected to outcomes.	No meaningful discussion of partnerships.
Comments: Partnerships listed/described to support SAOs and close gaps within the SFF, including early access to accommodations, Title IX regulation compliance, specialized test proctoring, ed planning and course alignment, persistence & transfer with English & Math courses, and identifying various partner program SAS verifications.				Score: 5

C. Service Area Organizational Resources

1. Please describe your service area's organizational and personnel structure. Discuss: a. Reporting relationships. b. Distribution of responsibilities/authority. c. Use of management or work teams. d. Lines of communication (e.g., area meetings structure/frequency, staff-to-staff and staff-to-manager communication, etc.).				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Thorough description of staffing structure, roles, communication practices, collaboration, and workflow. Includes clarity on full-time/part-time positions, internal coordination, and optional organizational chart.	Clear description with moderate detail; collaboration or staffing information may be less complete.	Basic description provided but lacks detail or structure.	Limited information, unclear staffing roles, or missing key structural elements.	No meaningful description of personnel or structure.
Comments: Good overall explanation of the SAS direct reports, interoffice communication, and operational/programmatic complexity.				Score: 5

2. How does your current staff profile facilitate or impede the service area's ability to fulfill its primary mission and functions? a. If applicable, what strategies has the area adopted to address staffing-related impediments?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Provides a clear analysis of staffing strengths and gaps and how they affect mission fulfillment, and includes strategies used to address impediments.	Describes staffing impacts clearly; limited analysis or strategy evaluation.	General staffing description with minimal analysis.	Staffing discussion is unclear or incomplete.	Staffing impact not meaningfully addressed.
Comments: Staffing gaps are clearly addressed, including the substantial workload created by recently retired FT faculty, as well as retirement gaps from 3 years ago that have not been filled; data analysis addresses increase in SAS enrollment and workload, and creative processes to try to meet needs with fewer specialized faculty.				Score: 5

3. Describe any challenges the service area has encountered with respect to the recruitment and retention of qualified staff. What are the implications of these challenges?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Analyzes staff recruitment and retention challenges, explains implications for service delivery and aligns discussion to program effectiveness and sustainability.	Describes challenges clearly with limited impact analysis.	General description of challenges.	Challenges are unclear or minimally explained.	Question not adequately addressed.
Comments: Addresses different barriers and requirements, including state mandated minimum qualifications. Describes staff burden created by MQs and not operating at full capacity (replacement of retired faculty), and burden/lack of flexibility on adjunct and how this can backload appointments and affect students, particularly when cases are complex.				Score: 5

4. How does the service area facilitate appropriate career development and progression for staff?				
a. Describe the service area's professional development resources, activities, and/or opportunities.				
b. How does this engagement directly reflect on the direction of your service area.				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly describes professional development resources and opportunities and explains how staff growth supports innovation and service quality.	Describes professional development clearly; limited connection to service direction.	Mentions professional development generally.	Limited or unclear discussion of staff development.	Professional development not addressed.
Comments: Given the make-up of staffing to accommodate appointments and office hours, there are challenges; though encouraged and supported, and curated by the Dean, there are limitations with availability. Burnout and stagnation is a recognized concern.				Score: 5

5. Please describe the succession planning for your service area.

a. What steps are in place?

b. How does the service area plan to make changes to services (realignment, reorganization, or other strategies) to ensure continuous improvement in the face of staff turnover, retirement, and attrition?

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Demonstrates proactive succession planning and service realignment strategies that ensure continuous improvement and service area stability.	Succession planning is described but lacks depth or future focus.	General discussion of succession planning.	Minimal planning evident.	Succession planning not addressed.
Comments: Seems difficult to plan succession for an area that is already short-staffed and that consistently demonstrates an increase in overall enrollment workload per data analysis. There is proactive planning discussed, but as part of the program review team 3 years ago, the inability to replace retired faculty role as per the team's recommendation in 2022, it is difficult to foresee improved services to meet increasing needs without adequate staffing.				Score: 4

6. What assessment methods and measures (either formal or informal) does the service area use to determine staff well-being, satisfaction, and motivation?

a. How does the department use the findings from these assessment efforts to improve the work environment?

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Uses formal and/or informal assessment methods and clearly explains how findings inform improvements to the work environment.	Describes assessment methods and some use of findings.	Mentions assessment efforts with limited follow-through.	Assessment practices are unclear or minimal.	No meaningful discussion of staff well-being assessment.
Comments:				Score: 4

7. What significant projects, tasks, workgroups, and committee work are the staff of your service area engaged in? a. How does this participation reflect on your service area's plans and integration with the college.				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly documents staff involvement in key projects, committees, and workgroups and explains how participation aligns with college planning and Student First Framework priorities.	Describes engagement clearly with limited strategic analysis.	Lists involvement with minimal explanation.	Engagement is unclear or limited.	No meaningful discussion of participation.
Comments: Numerous campus-wide activities and shared governance groups to capture and ensure students have knowledge and access to SAS.				Score: 5

Section 2: Service Area Trends

A. Service Area User Demographics

1. Whom do you serve? a. Describe your primary and secondary user groups that the service area attracts and serves b. Describe the demographics and representativeness of the populations served (e.g., race/ethnicity, gender, age range, foster youth, and first-generation status)				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Identifies primary and secondary users, provides disaggregated demographic data, and explains representativeness.	Describes users and demographics clearly.	General description of users.	User populations are unclear.	Users not adequately described.
Comments: Detailed aggregated and disaggregated data available, and analysis provided for possible interdepartment and college-wide trends & gaps.				Score: 5

2. <i>How do the demographics of your users compare with the college as a whole?</i>				
a. <i>Are the trends within your program in alignment with the broader, collegewide trends?</i>				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Uses data to compare service users to collegewide demographics and identifies trends.	Provides comparison with limited analysis.	Basic comparison provided.	Comparison is unclear or incomplete.	No comparison provided.
Comments: See above.				Score: 5

B. Service Area Service Trends

1. <i>Describe the usage trend for your service area in the last three years.</i>				
a. <i>Has it remained steady, increased, or decreased?</i>				
b. <i>Are there different patterns of usage for different demographic groups (e.g., race/ethnicity, gender, age range, foster youth, formally incarcerated, and first-generation status)?</i>				
c. <i>Draw clear connections between your data trends and attempts to identify and mitigate equity gaps.</i>				
d. <i>Describe any factors that contributed to any change.</i>				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Analyzes multi-year trends, disaggregates by demographics, explains contributing factors, and clearly links findings to equity gap mitigation.	Describes trends clearly with limited equity analysis.	General trend description.	Limited or unclear trend data.	Usage trends not addressed.
Comments: See above.				Score: 5

2. Describe your pattern of service. Include:

- a. Standard hours of operations.**
- b. Alternative modes (e.g., online, hybrid, etc.).**
- c. Schedules of delivery (e.g., early morning, evening services, etc.).**
- d. How your services meet the needs of the users.**

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly describes service patterns and explains how hours, modalities, and scheduling support student needs.	Describes service patterns clearly.	Basic description provided.	Service pattern discussion is unclear.	Not addressed.
Comments: Clearly documented.				Score: 5

3. What are the differences in service usage based on modality? If you do not offer varying modalities, explain why not.

a. How does this help inform future practices?

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Analyzes modality-based usage differences and explains how findings inform future access and innovation.	Describes differences with limited future planning.	General modality discussion.	Limited or unclear explanation.	Not addressed.
Comments: Data usage analysis in various formats, with student need and preference taken into consideration for future strategies.				Score: 5

Section 3: Service Area Performance and Effectiveness

A. Service Area Outcomes Assessment Process

1. <i>What methods are used to assess your service area outcomes (SAOs)? If these are not in place, what do you plan to do in the future to collect this evidence?</i>				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Identifies multiple, appropriate assessment tools (surveys, usage data, service logs, focus groups, KPIs). Provides clear rationale and future plans.	Describes assessment methods with some detail; future plans mentioned.	Basic methods identified but limited explanation.	Minimal mention of assessment methods.	No assessment process described.
Comments: Thorough.				Score: 5

2. <i>How are user needs assessed and considered in the development and delivery of programs and services?</i>				
<i>a. What methods does the service area use to remain current with respect to understanding user needs, interests, and experiences?</i> <i>b. What are the sources of information your service area uses to understand current needs?</i> <i>c. How have the needs changed over time?</i>				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly identifies data sources (surveys, IR data, feedback, campus partners). Tracks changes over time and shows deep understanding of evolving needs.	Good description of needs and data sources with moderate depth.	Some sources listed but limited reflection.	Minimal detail on methods or data sources.	Missing or off-topic.
Comments: Thorough.				Score: 5

3. How does the service area track program/service usage patterns and determine users' satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the service area's performance? If these are not in place, what do you plan to do in the future to collect this data?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Strong description of data collection tools (EAB/PS queries/reports, surveys, analytics, service counts). Clear future plans if gaps exist.	Good description but lacking depth.	Some tools identified but incomplete.	Limited or unclear.	Missing.
Comments: Thorough discussion of state & federal regulations and how the data with these regulations drives programmatic needs and potential funding to continue compliance.				Score: 5

4. To what extent does the service area obtain and use comparative/benchmark data to stay current with peers and/or competitors that deliver similar programs and services (both those that are on and off campus)?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Uses comparative data intentionally to support continuous improvement, competitiveness, and innovation.	Mentions benchmarking with limited application.	General reference to comparative data.	Minimal benchmarking evident.	Not addressed.
Comments: See above.				Score: 5

5. How does the service area monitor compliance with the laws/other regulatory requirements that apply to the service areas program and service responsibilities?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Demonstrates systematic compliance monitoring aligned with institutional and CCC systemwide requirements and regulations.	Clear compliance practices described.	General compliance mention.	Compliance processes unclear.	Not addressed.
Comments: See above.				Score: 5

B. Service Area Outcomes Assessment

1. What does the data say about the success of service area with respect to the achievement of your service area's outcomes? Identify and describe the data sources.				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Uses multiple data sources and provides specific, meaningful interpretation of SAO success results.	Interprets data with reasonable clarity but less depth.	General interpretations without detail.	Minimal interpretation.	No meaningful data discussion.
Comments: Thorough collection & analysis of data; clearly defined barriers are multi-faceted.				Score: 5

2. What areas for improvement are suggested by the data?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Identifies strategic, data-informed opportunities for improvement tied to SAOs.	Lists areas for improvement with some analysis.	Basic identification but limited justification.	Minimal detail.	Missing or superficial.
Comments: Intensive evaluation of data, including barrier considerations that limit data analysis, and plans for improvement.				Score: 5

3. How is assessment data used to inform organizational decisions, management practices, and program/service delivery strategies?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Provides detailed examples connecting assessment data to operational changes, resource allocation, workflows, and service improvements.	Clear examples but fewer connections.	General statements without clear examples.	Minimal connection between data and decisions.	No evidence of data-informed decisions.
Comments: See above.				Score: 5

4. How has the assessment of the service area outcomes contributed to your service area's improvements?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly demonstrates how SAO assessment results directly informed service improvements.	Assessment use described with limited examples.	Assessment acknowledged.	Limited use of assessment evident.	Not addressed.
Comments:				Score: 4

5. How does the service area make needed data and information available to area stakeholders?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly describes how data is shared (reports, dashboards, meetings) and how stakeholders use it.	Describes data sharing practices.	Basic description of communication.	Vague or incomplete.	No description.
Comments:				Score: 3

Section 4: Previous Three-Year Service Area Program Plan Reflection

A. Service Area Three-Year Reflection

1. What are the primary strengths of the non-instructional area?

a. How have these changed over time?

b. What innovative programs/services/practices has the department instituted that puts it out in front with respect to "best practices" in the field?

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clear, evidence-based strengths tied to outcomes, innovations, staffing, and service excellence. Shows evolution over time.	Describes strengths with some reflection.	General strengths with minimal depth.	Limited or generic strengths.	Missing.
Comments: Clearly defined, use of data to discuss barriers/strengths; staffing history discussed, and is important to show how SAS operates under state and federal regulations and within our SFF. The innovative programming is impressive and also aligns with SFF.				Score: 5

2. Please comment on the progress toward achieving your previous service area goals and SAOs. Discuss what has/is/will happen and the status of each goal and SAO.

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Detailed status updates for each goal/SAO with evidence of progress, partial completion, or obstacles.	Good progress updates but limited detail.	General updates without evidence.	Limited or incomplete updates.	Missing.
Comments:				Score: 5

3. Please provide a financial overview of the service area.

a. How are resources allocated to support the mission, goals, and outcomes of the service area?

b. How are budget allocation/reallocation decisions made in your service area?

c. What factors influence the use of service area resources?

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly aligns financial resources with mission, outcomes, and describes financial decision making process.	Provides clear overview with limited analysis.	Basic financial description.	Financial discussion unclear.	Not addressed.
Comments:				Score: 5

4. Describe resource changes the service area has encountered over the past three years and future anticipated changes.

a. Explain what circumstances prompted these changes.

b. How these changes have/will affect the service area operations and services.

c. How the service area plans to address these changes.

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Analyzes past and anticipated changes and explains strategies to sustain services and continuous improvement.	Describes changes clearly.	General description provided.	Limited explanation.	Not addressed.
Comments:				Score: 4

5. How effectively do the service area's current facilities, space, and equipment support area operations?

a. To what extent must these organizational resources change to keep pace with the future needs and expectations of the service area users?

b. What strategies have been adopted or will be adopted to institute these changes?

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Evaluates current resources and identifies future needs aligned with student expectations and needs.	Describes adequacy and some future planning.	General description of facilities.	Facilities discussion unclear.	Not addressed.
Comments: Anaylsis provided on operational functions and how to implement changes to improve services to meet needs in a growing SAS program of complex cases.				Score: 5

6. How has technology been integrated into the programs, services, and operating functions of the service area?

a. In what ways have technological applications been used to promote innovation, responsiveness, and continuous improvement in the service area?

b. How has the service area kept pace with the development of hardware, software, maintenance, and training support?

c. What are the service area's projected technology needs for the future?

d. What strategies have been adopted or will be adopted to address these needs?

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Demonstrates intentional technology use to support innovation, responsiveness, and continuous improvement, with clear future planning.	Describes technology use clearly.	General technology discussion.	Limited or unclear integration.	Not addressed.
Comments: As technology is a key factor in all SAS related programming, the Dean gave a thorough overview of the needs, innovation/future needs, and efficiency.				Score: 5

7. What major challenges face the service area?				
a. What needs to occur, primarily within existing resources, to successfully make improvements in these areas?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Thorough, realistic challenges aligned with resources, staffing, facilities, or technology. Provides actionable strategies within existing resources.	Lists challenges with some solutions.	Basic challenges listed but limited solutions.	Minimal challenges listed.	None provided.
Comments:				Score: 5

8. Where would you like your service area to be three years from now? Dream big while considering any upcoming changes (e.g., new buildings, growth, changes in the services, etc.). Consider the following in your response:				
a. Describe the colleagues and partners inside and outside the institution with whom you would like to work in the ideal future.				
b. What long-term impact would you like your service area to have on the College and the community?				
c. What strengths, opportunities, or new directions now exist on which you can capitalize in three years' time?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clear, ambitious, and strategic vision with alignment to future institutional priorities, partnerships, and community impact.	Strong vision with some alignment.	General aspirations but lacks detail.	Minimal or vague.	Missing.
Comments:				Score: 5

Section 5: Service Area Three-Year Action Plan

A. Service Area Goals, SAOs, Objectives, Action Plans, and Resource Requests

Please review the goals and resources request worksheet. Comment on area goals, SAOs, objectives, action plans, and resource requests.				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Goals are strategic, overarching, aligned with the Students First Framework, includes measurable SAOs, objectives, steps, responsible parties, timelines, and assessments. Resource requests tied to goals and SFF.	Clear goals and SAOs with moderate specificity and alignment.	Goals and SAOs listed but lack measurable objectives or alignment.	Minimal goals or unclear action plans.	Missing or incomplete.
Comments:				Score: 5

Section 6: Service Area Program Review Process Reflection

A. Service Area Program Review Process Reflection

1. What capacity were your service area staff, and/or users involved in the program review process?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly documents broad and collaborative participation by staff and/or users.	Participation described clearly.	General participation noted.	Limited involvement evident.	Not addressed.
Comments:				Score: 5

2. How did you ensure all members of your service area were involved in the outcome assessment discussions, evaluation of area data, and contributed to the area goals, SAO, objectives, and action plan discussions and development?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Demonstrates inclusive, data-informed engagement in SAOs, goals, and action planning aligned with continuous improvement.	Inclusive process described with limited detail.	General involvement described.	Limited inclusion evident.	Not addressed.
Comments:				Score: 5

Provide your overall program review comments and total score.	
Overall comments: The Dean leads an innovative and expanding program focused on enhancing student access under the Students First Framework, while ensuring adherence to state and federal regulations. These regulations require specific and stringent staffing to meet program needs and financial requirements. The Dean diligently collects and analyzes demographic and program data to identify equity gaps and establish new partnerships and programs, and provides excellent foresight to determine infrastructure. Additionally, they foster collaborative relationships with staff, campus partners, and academics to promote equity, access, and completion for our students. Staffing challenges, budget constraints, growing technology needs, operational constraints, and increasingly complex caseloads present significant obstacles to both programmatic and staff development, and succession planning.	Total Score: 138

138

Reviewer Signature: Hillary Mennella (Jan 20, 2026 13:11:57 PST)

Date: 1/20/2026

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS, RESEARCH, PLANNING, AND GRANTS

Student Service Program Review

Program Review: Student Accessibility Services

Reviewer Name: Susan McDonald

Section 1: Service Area Overview

A. Service Area Mission and Alignment

1. Briefly describe how your mission and purpose aligns with the Cerritos College mission and Students First Framework.				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Provides a concise, well-articulated explanation of how the mission aligns with the College mission and Students First Framework. Clearly identifies connections to four levers. Demonstrates strong understanding of institutional purpose and goal.	Provides a clear explanation of alignment with the College mission and Students First Framework. Mentions specific levers or strategies but may lack full integration or depth.	Provides a generally accurate description but alignment is broad or superficial. Mentions the College mission or Students First Framework but not both.	Provides minimal mission alignment. Response is vague, unclear, or missing explicit connections to Students First Framework.	Mission alignment is missing, inaccurate, off-topic, or unrelated to institutional goals.
Comments: Well-written statement that succinctly addresses how the SAS Program meets the relevant levers in the Students First Framework.				Score: 5

B. Service Area Description

1. Provide a list and a brief description of the services you provide.				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Provides a comprehensive, clear, and well-organized list of services with specific descriptions and functions. Demonstrates strong understanding of service scope.	Provides clear services and descriptions with minor omissions or room for elaboration.	Lists services but descriptions lack depth or clarity.	Provides incomplete list or unclear descriptions.	Fails to identify services or provides irrelevant/inaccurate information.
Comments: The chart clearly identifies the list of services and specific functions of each. Very comprehensive and impressive at how many supports are in place for students.				Score: 5

2. Describe efforts to promote the availability of your services to current and prospective users.				
a. Describe the key methods used to assist users in getting information about your service areas' programs and service offerings (e.g., publicity, outreach, recruitment, etc.).				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly describes a strategic, coordinated outreach and communication approach using multiple methods (publicity, outreach, recruitment, digital tools, partnerships). Demonstrates effectiveness using data and explains how efforts advance Student First Framework, particularly for targeted populations.	Describes multiple outreach methods clearly and connects them to user awareness and access; limited data or equity analysis.	Lists outreach and communication methods with minimal explanation of effectiveness or alignment to Student First Framework.	Outreach description is vague, incomplete, or lacks clarity.	Minimal or no description of outreach or information-sharing efforts.
Comments: Again, very comprehensive summary of all the different methods the SAS Program utilizes to promote their support services as well as efficiently collaborating with existing outreach channels and organizations on campus.				Score: 5

3. Does your service area overlap or duplicate any programs or service function with other Student Services or college units?				
a. How and why do these services/programs duplicate one another?				
b. How do they complement each other?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Provides a thoughtful analysis of overlapping services, explains why duplication exists, how coordination is intentional, and how complementarity improves student experience, efficiency, and Institutional Health.	Identifies overlap and complementarity clearly but lacks depth or evaluation of impact.	Acknowledges overlap with general explanations.	Discussion of overlap is unclear or incomplete.	Does not meaningfully address duplication or coordination.
Comments: Clearly responded to the question in a thoughtful manner. Distinct comparison between SAS and counseling services was a good example of how this could be thought to be a duplicated service but in fact serves a specialized partner.				Score: 5

4. Discuss key, collaborative relationships with academic programs and other student service areas. How do these partnerships:

- a. Advance achievement, learning, or completion.**
- b. Support the service area's mission, goals, and Service Area Outcomes (SAOs).**
- c. Enhance the quality of services and programs provided.**
- d. Create greater operational efficiencies for the service area.**
- e. Identify how your partnerships can or have mitigated equity gaps.**

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly describes key partnerships and demonstrates how they advance completion, learning, and achievement, support SAOs, enhance service quality, improve efficiency, and mitigate equity gaps using evidence, aligned with Student First Framework.	Describes collaborations and benefits clearly with limited outcome or equity analysis.	Identifies partnerships but provides minimal explanation of impact.	Partnerships are vague or loosely connected to outcomes.	No meaningful discussion of partnerships.
Comments: Excellent use of examples to illustrate each of the sections listed above. It appears that there has been a very focused and intentional approach to the collaborations with different departments.				Score: 5

C. Service Area Organizational Resources

1. Please describe your service area's organizational and personnel structure. Discuss: a. Reporting relationships. b. Distribution of responsibilities/authority. c. Use of management or work teams. d. Lines of communication (e.g., area meetings structure/frequency, staff-to-staff and staff-to-manager communication, etc.).				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Thorough description of staffing structure, roles, communication practices, collaboration, and workflow. Includes clarity on full-time/part-time positions, internal coordination, and optional organizational chart.	Clear description with moderate detail; collaboration or staffing information may be less complete.	Basic description provided but lacks detail or structure.	Limited information, unclear staffing roles, or missing key structural elements.	No meaningful description of personnel or structure.
Comments: Clearly laid out all personnel, reporting relationships, and distribution of responsibilities.				Score: 5

2. How does your current staff profile facilitate or impede the service area's ability to fulfill its primary mission and functions? a. If applicable, what strategies has the area adopted to address staffing-related impediments?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Provides a clear analysis of staffing strengths and gaps and how they affect mission fulfillment, and includes strategies used to address impediments.	Describes staffing impacts clearly; limited analysis or strategy evaluation.	General staffing description with minimal analysis.	Staffing discussion is unclear or incomplete.	Staffing impact not meaningfully addressed.
Comments: The response to this question identifies the staffing challenges due to a doubling of the caseload.. Initially I had the following questions but those were answered in #5 below (changed rating from 4 to 5) It was not clear if SAS was on the full-time hiring list for additional faculty? Also, could you provide training and mentorship to existing faculty to increase their qualifications? Are there recruitment efforts happening with related associations or universities?				Score: 5

3. Describe any challenges the service area has encountered with respect to the recruitment and retention of qualified staff. What are the implications of these challenges?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Analyzes staff recruitment and retention challenges, explains implications for service delivery and aligns discussion to program effectiveness and sustainability.	Describes challenges clearly with limited impact analysis.	General description of challenges.	Challenges are unclear or minimally explained.	Question not adequately addressed.
Comments: Similar to comments above--I think you addressed the question well enough, but I'm curious about recruitment efforts.				Score: 5

4. How does the service area facilitate appropriate career development and progression for staff?				
a. Describe the service area's professional development resources, activities, and/or opportunities.				
b. How does this engagement directly reflect on the direction of your service area.				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly describes professional development resources and opportunities and explains how staff growth supports innovation and service quality.	Describes professional development clearly; limited connection to service direction.	Mentions professional development generally.	Limited or unclear discussion of staff development.	Professional development not addressed.
Comments: What systems do you have in place and/or requirements do you have in place (if any) for SAS staff and faculty to engage in professional development? Do you provide financial support for that? It might be worth mentioning that adjunct faculty (at least instructional faculty) are not required to attend faculty meetings which could affect connection to campus; not sure if that is different in a service area such as SAS.				Score: 5

5. Please describe the succession planning for your service area.

a. What steps are in place?

b. How does the service area plan to make changes to services (realignment, reorganization, or other strategies) to ensure continuous improvement in the face of staff turnover, retirement, and attrition?

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Demonstrates proactive succession planning and service realignment strategies that ensure continuous improvement and service area stability.	Succession planning is described but lacks depth or future focus.	General discussion of succession planning.	Minimal planning evident.	Succession planning not addressed.

Comments:

Your answer here responded to my comment in the sections in #2. Those are significant challenges in hiring. It might be worth stating if SAS has reached out to the Faculty Senate and/or other relevant leadership groups on campus regarding this shortage.

Score:

5

6. What assessment methods and measures (either formal or informal) does the service area use to determine staff well-being, satisfaction, and motivation?

a. How does the department use the findings from these assessment efforts to improve the work environment?

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Uses formal and/or informal assessment methods and clearly explains how findings inform improvements to the work environment.	Describes assessment methods and some use of findings.	Mentions assessment efforts with limited follow-through.	Assessment practices are unclear or minimal.	No meaningful discussion of staff well-being assessment.

Comments:

I think you make a good case for a full-time Department Chair here based on the increase in size of the students accessing SAS services.

Score:

5

7. <i>What significant projects, tasks, workgroups, and committee work are the staff of your service area engaged in?</i>				
a. <i>How does this participation reflect on your service area's plans and integration with the college.</i>				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly documents staff involvement in key projects, committees, and workgroups and explains how participation aligns with college planning and Student First Framework priorities.	Describes engagement clearly with limited strategic analysis.	Lists involvement with minimal explanation.	Engagement is unclear or limited.	No meaningful discussion of participation.
Comments: Identified several collaborations and workgroups. This was similarly and adequately addressed in the mission statement at the beginning of the document.				Score: 5

Section 2: Service Area Trends

A. Service Area User Demographics

1. <i>Whom do you serve?</i>				
a. <i>Describe your primary and secondary user groups that the service area attracts and serves</i>				
b. <i>Describe the demographics and representativeness of the populations served (e.g., race/ethnicity, gender, age range, foster youth, and first-generation status)</i>				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Identifies primary and secondary users, provides disaggregated demographic data, and explains representativeness.	Describes users and demographics clearly.	General description of users.	User populations are unclear.	Users not adequately described.
Comments: Provided useful data on students who access SAS programs. May want to replace DSPS with SAS in these sections.				Score: 5

2. <i>How do the demographics of your users compare with the college as a whole?</i>				
a. <i>Are the trends within your program in alignment with the broader, collegewide trends?</i>				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Uses data to compare service users to collegewide demographics and identifies trends.	Provides comparison with limited analysis.	Basic comparison provided.	Comparison is unclear or incomplete.	No comparison provided.
Comments: Good concise analysis of similarities and differences between SAS and the larger Cerritos student population.				Score: 5

B. Service Area Service Trends

1. <i>Describe the usage trend for your service area in the last three years.</i>				
a. <i>Has it remained steady, increased, or decreased?</i> b. <i>Are there different patterns of usage for different demographic groups (e.g., race/ethnicity, gender, age range, foster youth, formally incarcerated, and first-generation status)?</i> c. <i>Draw clear connections between your data trends and attempts to identify and mitigate equity gaps.</i> d. <i>Describe any factors that contributed to any change.</i>				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Analyzes multi-year trends, disaggregates by demographics, explains contributing factors, and clearly links findings to equity gap mitigation.	Describes trends clearly with limited equity analysis.	General trend description.	Limited or unclear trend data.	Usage trends not addressed.
Comments: Change DSPS to SAS. These are staggering increases in numbers. It would be good to address any possible contributing factors to these changes and attempts to identify and mitigate equity gaps (even if it is similar to what has been already stated).				Score: 3

2. Describe your pattern of service. Include:

- a. Standard hours of operations.**
- b. Alternative modes (e.g., online, hybrid, etc.).**
- c. Schedules of delivery (e.g., early morning, evening services, etc.).**
- d. How your services meet the needs of the users.**

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly describes service patterns and explains how hours, modalities, and scheduling support student needs.	Describes service patterns clearly.	Basic description provided.	Service pattern discussion is unclear.	Not addressed.
Comments:				Score: 5

3. What are the differences in service usage based on modality? If you do not offer varying modalities, explain why not.

a. How does this help inform future practices?

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Analyzes modality-based usage differences and explains how findings inform future access and innovation.	Describes differences with limited future planning.	General modality discussion.	Limited or unclear explanation.	Not addressed.
Comments: Chart is very clear at illustrating data for usage differences.				Score: 5

Section 3: Service Area Performance and Effectiveness

A. Service Area Outcomes Assessment Process

1. What methods are used to assess your service area outcomes (SAOs)? If these are not in place, what do you plan to do in the future to collect this evidence?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Identifies multiple, appropriate assessment tools (surveys, usage data, service logs, focus groups, KPIs). Provides clear rationale and future plans.	Describes assessment methods with some detail; future plans mentioned.	Basic methods identified but limited explanation.	Minimal mention of assessment methods.	No assessment process described.
Comments: Would the IERPG program be useful in identifying any other methods of collecting data that would be more time efficient?				Score: 5

2. How are user needs assessed and considered in the development and delivery of programs and services?				
a. What methods does the service area use to remain current with respect to understanding user needs, interests, and experiences?				
b. What are the sources of information your service area uses to understand current needs?				
c. How have the needs changed over time?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly identifies data sources (surveys, IR data, feedback, campus partners). Tracks changes over time and shows deep understanding of evolving needs.	Good description of needs and data sources with moderate depth.	Some sources listed but limited reflection.	Minimal detail on methods or data sources.	Missing or off-topic.
Comments:				Score: 5

3. How does the service area track program/service usage patterns and determine users' satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the service area's performance? If these are not in place, what do you plan to do in the future to collect this data?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Strong description of data collection tools (EAB/PS queries/reports, surveys, analytics, service counts). Clear future plans if gaps exist.	Good description but lacking depth.	Some tools identified but incomplete.	Limited or unclear.	Missing.
Comments:				Score: 5

4. To what extent does the service area obtain and use comparative/benchmark data to stay current with peers and/or competitors that deliver similar programs and services (both those that are on and off campus)?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Uses comparative data intentionally to support continuous improvement, competitiveness, and innovation.	Mentions benchmarking with limited application.	General reference to comparative data.	Minimal benchmarking evident.	Not addressed.
Comments:				Score: 5

5. How does the service area monitor compliance with the laws/other regulatory requirements that apply to the service areas program and service responsibilities?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Demonstrates systematic compliance monitoring aligned with institutional and CCC systemwide requirements and regulations.	Clear compliance practices described.	General compliance mention.	Compliance processes unclear.	Not addressed.
Comments: It is an interesting connection between new laws governing curriculum at the college level and how that may create more gaps for individuals with disabilities.				Score: 5

B. Service Area Outcomes Assessment

1. What does the data say about the success of service area with respect to the achievement of your service area's outcomes? Identify and describe the data sources.				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Uses multiple data sources and provides specific, meaningful interpretation of SAO success results.	Interprets data with reasonable clarity but less depth.	General interpretations without detail.	Minimal interpretation.	No meaningful data discussion.
Comments: Not sure what the "INCOMPLETE" refers to--is there a lack of data or is there more that can be added here? SAO 1 needs to be clearly identified (consistent with how SAO 2 is listed).				Score: 4

2. What areas for improvement are suggested by the data?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Identifies strategic, data-informed opportunities for improvement tied to SAOs.	Lists areas for improvement with some analysis.	Basic identification but limited justification.	Minimal detail.	Missing or superficial.
Comments: Very thorough analysis of specific areas for improvement.				Score: 5

3. How is assessment data used to inform organizational decisions, management practices, and program/service delivery strategies?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Provides detailed examples connecting assessment data to operational changes, resource allocation, workflows, and service improvements.	Clear examples but fewer connections.	General statements without clear examples.	Minimal connection between data and decisions.	No evidence of data-informed decisions.
Comments:				Score: 5

4. How has the assessment of the service area outcomes contributed to your service area's improvements?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly demonstrates how SAO assessment results directly informed service improvements.	Assessment use described with limited examples.	Assessment acknowledged.	Limited use of assessment evident.	Not addressed.
Comments:				Score: 5

5. How does the service area make needed data and information available to area stakeholders?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly describes how data is shared (reports, dashboards, meetings) and how stakeholders use it.	Describes data sharing practices.	Basic description of communication.	Vague or incomplete.	No description.
Comments:				Score: 5

Section 4: Previous Three-Year Service Area Program Plan Reflection

A. Service Area Three-Year Reflection

1. What are the primary strengths of the non-instructional area?

a. How have these changed over time?

b. What innovative programs/services/practices has the department instituted that puts it out in front with respect to "best practices" in the field?

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clear, evidence-based strengths tied to outcomes, innovations, staffing, and service excellence. Shows evolution over time.	Describes strengths with some reflection.	General strengths with minimal depth.	Limited or generic strengths.	Missing.
Comments: As a faculty member I still feel that SAS provides outstanding support for our students, but the obstacles are clearly significant in maintaining that level of service based on this report. Despite all this, the program is still embarking on new endeavors and collaborations!				Score: 5

2. Please comment on the progress toward achieving your previous service area goals and SAOs. Discuss what has/is/will happen and the status of each goal and SAO.

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Detailed status updates for each goal/SAO with evidence of progress, partial completion, or obstacles.	Good progress updates but limited detail.	General updates without evidence.	Limited or incomplete updates.	Missing.
Comments: Looks like you are focusing the goal on a more pertinent area, although ongoing data collection seems to be tricky with the current systems. Is there a system or software that could be put in place that would provide you with the information you need? That would make a good rationale for a resource request. I see that you mentioned collaborating with IERPG, I think they could provide lots of resources and support.				Score: 5

3. Please provide a financial overview of the service area.

a. How are resources allocated to support the mission, goals, and outcomes of the service area?

b. How are budget allocation/reallocation decisions made in your service area?

c. What factors influence the use of service area resources?

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly aligns financial resources with mission, outcomes, and describes financial decision making process.	Provides clear overview with limited analysis.	Basic financial description.	Financial discussion unclear.	Not addressed.
Comments: Replace DSPS with SAS. Well explained-section here.				Score: 5

4. Describe resource changes the service area has encountered over the past three years and future anticipated changes.

a. Explain what circumstances prompted these changes.

b. How these changes have/will affect the service area operations and services.

c. How the service area plans to address these changes.

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Analyzes past and anticipated changes and explains strategies to sustain services and continuous improvement.	Describes changes clearly.	General description provided.	Limited explanation.	Not addressed.
Comments: Excellent summary of all three points. It also sounds like, based on the report so far, that examining ways to automatize processes such as on-boarding and training could be useful to save full-time faculty time (as much as is possible). There has been no mention of whether the state Chancellor's office requires a student to faculty ratio for students with disabilities. That would be helpful if such a mandate existed to assist with putting SAS at the top of the full-time hiring list.				Score: 5

5. How effectively do the service area's current facilities, space, and equipment support area operations?

a. To what extent must these organizational resources change to keep pace with the future needs and expectations of the service area users?

b. What strategies have been adopted or will be adopted to institute these changes?

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Evaluates current resources and identifies future needs aligned with student expectations and needs.	Describes adequacy and some future planning.	General description of facilities.	Facilities discussion unclear.	Not addressed.
Comments: Clearly explained the issues and presented general strategies to meet goals.				Score: 5

6. How has technology been integrated into the programs, services, and operating functions of the service area?

a. In what ways have technological applications been used to promote innovation, responsiveness, and continuous improvement in the service area?

b. How has the service area kept pace with the development of hardware, software, maintenance, and training support?

c. What are the service area's projected technology needs for the future?

d. What strategies have been adopted or will be adopted to address these needs?

5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Demonstrates intentional technology use to support innovation, responsiveness, and continuous improvement, with clear future planning.	Describes technology use clearly.	General technology discussion.	Limited or unclear integration.	Not addressed.
Comments: The example of Genio is helpful in illustrating the needs of the program and how technology is useful in making things more efficient. It would be maybe worth mentioning that the SAS offers access to a variety of different types of assistive technology tools and provide more examples here that are used by students. This will also help support any resource requests in this area.				Score: 4

7. What major challenges face the service area?				
a. What needs to occur, primarily within existing resources, to successfully make improvements in these areas?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Thorough, realistic challenges aligned with resources, staffing, facilities, or technology. Provides actionable strategies within existing resources.	Lists challenges with some solutions.	Basic challenges listed but limited solutions.	Minimal challenges listed.	None provided.
Comments: Excellent summary of challenges and needs for SAS.				Score: 5

8. Where would you like your service area to be three years from now? Dream big while considering any upcoming changes (e.g., new buildings, growth, changes in the services, etc.). Consider the following in your response:				
a. Describe the colleagues and partners inside and outside the institution with whom you would like to work in the ideal future.				
b. What long-term impact would you like your service area to have on the College and the community?				
c. What strengths, opportunities, or new directions now exist on which you can capitalize in three years' time?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clear, ambitious, and strategic vision with alignment to future institutional priorities, partnerships, and community impact.	Strong vision with some alignment.	General aspirations but lacks detail.	Minimal or vague.	Missing.
Comments: Section A--yes! I am in favor of this as a faculty member in an allied health program with students who need earlier access to accommodations and for us all to be on the same page prior to the clinical experiences. Section B-I support these endeavors. I also think educating faculty on available AT tools for students will be helpful. Proud to be a partner with SAS through the ACLR 93 course! I also think discussions with faculty on neurodivergence would be helpful; I think both SAS and HO faculty feel the need to work together more to develop a shared understanding of the needs of the clinical practicums.				Score: 5

Section 5: Service Area Three-Year Action Plan

A. Service Area Goals, SAOs, Objectives, Action Plans, and Resource Requests

Please review the goals and resources request worksheet. Comment on area goals, SAOs, objectives, action plans, and resource requests.				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Goals are strategic, overarching, aligned with the Students First Framework, includes measurable SAOs, objectives, steps, responsible parties, timelines, and assessments. Resource requests tied to goals and SFF.	Clear goals and SAOs with moderate specificity and alignment.	Goals and SAOs listed but lack measurable objectives or alignment.	Minimal goals or unclear action plans.	Missing or incomplete.
Comments: Excellent work summarizing the main goals into actionable objectives and steps. I was surprised that hiring full-time faculty members was not specifically requested in the resource request (just to keep this as a high priority for the program), but maybe that comes from a separate 'pot' of funds that would not be applicable for this report.				Score: 5

Section 6: Service Area Program Review Process Reflection

A. Service Area Program Review Process Reflection

1. What capacity were your service area staff, and/or users involved in the program review process?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Clearly documents broad and collaborative participation by staff and/or users.	Participation described clearly.	General participation noted.	Limited involvement evident.	Not addressed.
Comments:				Score: 1

2. How did you ensure all members of your service area were involved in the outcome assessment discussions, evaluation of area data, and contributed to the area goals, SAO, objectives, and action plan discussions and development?				
5	4	3	2	1
Exemplary	Strong	Adequate	Developing	Insufficient
Demonstrates inclusive, data-informed engagement in SAOs, goals, and action planning aligned with continuous improvement.	Inclusive process described with limited detail.	General involvement described.	Limited inclusion evident.	Not addressed.
Comments:				Score: 1

Provide your overall program review comments and total score.	
Overall comments: The report was very well thought out and focused in the responses to each question. The suggestions I provided were just that, simply considerations for any additions. The only section missing was section 6. The SAS program clearly adds so much value to our campus and it was a pleasure to be able to read all that you do. I was impressed at the amount of services that are offered and how the program is operating with many adjuncts and a high need for full-time faculty. As mentioned in the report, the use of technology and AI will be important to automatize processes, data collection, and to support staff and students. I think the resources of IERPG and our IT departments would be good partners for a few of those projects. Again, this report was well-written and fantastically illustrated the journey that the SAS program has been on and the directions it wishes to go.	Total Score: 178

Date: 1/22/2026

Program Review Planning Form

Program/Department Name: Student Accessibility Services

Program Review Cycle: 2025-2026

Division Name: Student Accessibility and Wellness Services

Review Period: 2022-2023, 2023-2024.

This form serves as formal acknowledgment that the above-named program/department/division is undergoing a Program Review in accordance with institutional policies and timelines. Program Review is a collaborative process aimed at continuous improvement, accountability, and strategic development.

Program Review Team Members

Please list the names and titles of all individuals actively participating in the Program Review process (e.g., staff, coordinators, or other contributors):

Division Dean Information

Name: _____

Email: _____

Department/Program Manager Information

Name: _____

Email: _____

Program Review Collaborators:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title/Role</u>	<u>Email Address</u>
Hillary Mennella	Associate Dean; Coordinator	hmennella@cerritos.edu
Elizabeth Page	SAS Counselor & Chair; Contributor	epage@cerritos.edu
Angela Williams	Manager; Contributor	awilliams@cerritos.edu
Eliza Hoyos Vences	Dean of Counseling; Contributor	ehoyosve@cerritos.edu
Tonee Burdick	SAS Specialist; Contributor	tburdick@cerritos.edu
Christopher Elquizabal	Dean SAWS; Contributor	cequizabal@cerritos.edu

Important Due Dates

Planning Form: 09/12/2025

Review Committee Form: 10/01/2025

Program Review Draft: 11/21/2025

Reviewer Feedback: 12/12/2025

Final Plan: 01/09/2026



Acknowledgement

By signing below, I acknowledge the following:

- I am aware that the program/department/division is currently undergoing Program Review as scheduled for the 2025-2026 cycle.
- I understand the expectations and responsibilities of the program/department/division throughout the review process, including submission of the self-study and timely communication with the review committee and IERPG.
- I have received and reviewed the guidelines, timelines, and required documentation for the Program Review process as provided by Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, Planning, and Grants.
- I agree to work collaboratively with faculty, staff, and administrators to ensure a thorough and reflective review process.

Program/Department Manager:

Name: Elizabeth Page Signature:  Date: 9/11/25

Division Dean/VP:

Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

Dean, Institutional Effectiveness, Research, Planning, and Grants:

Name: Amber Hroch Signature:  Date: _____

Signature: 
Christopher Elquizabal (Sep 12, 2025 16:39:04 PDT)

Email: celquizabal@cerritos.edu

Signature: 
Amber Hroch (Sep 12, 2025 18:28:37 PDT)

Email: ahroch@cerritos.edu