

Luna Community College

HLC ID 1952

PROBATION

Visit Date: 3/25/2019

Rolando Rael
President

Stephanie Brzuzy
HLC Liaison

Julie Furst-Bowe
Review Team Chair

Haseeb Ahmed
Federal Compliance Reviewer

Jacalyn Askin
Team Member

Kristina Binard
Team Member

Daniel Corr
Team Member

Martha Davey
Team Member

Context and Nature of Review

Visit Date

3/25/2019

Mid-Cycle Reviews include:

- The Year 4 Review in the Open and Standard Pathways
- The Biennial Review for Applying institutions

Reaffirmation Reviews include:

- The Year 10 Review in the Open and Standard Pathways
- The Review for Initial Candidacy for Applying institutions
- The Review for Initial Accreditation for Applying institutions
- The Year 4 Review for Standard Pathway institutions that are in their first accreditation cycle after attaining initial accreditation

Scope of Review

- Reaffirmation Review
- Federal Compliance
- On-site Visit
- Multi-Campus Visit (if applicable)

- Federal Compliance 2018

Institutional Context

Established in 1969, Luna Community College is a public community college in Las Vegas, New Mexico. The college also has campuses in Mora, Springer and Santa Rosa. The school was originally named Luna Area Vocational Technical School; the name was changed in 2000 to Luna Community College. The college was first accredited by the Higher Learning Commission in April 1982. The college currently offers 21 associate degree program and 21 certificate programs and currently maintains specialized accreditations for several health and technical programs. Enrollment at the college has declined significantly in recent years, and in the fall of 2019 there were approximately 1,100 students enrolled at the college.

In November 2017, the Higher Learning Commission issued a Show Cause Order and the college faced losing its accreditation after a series of concerns, including integrity, planning, resource management and institutional effectiveness, were identified by the state of New Mexico and the Higher Learning Commission. In July 2018, the Higher Learning Commission removed the Show Cause Order and placed the college on Probation. While the college demonstrated sufficient levels of improvement to allow the Show Cause Order to be removed, the college remained out of compliance with three of the HLC's Criteria for Accreditation. Six core components of the criteria were determined to be "unmet" while an additional six core components were determined to be "met with concerns."

The college was required to provide evidence that it has addressed the issues that led to Probation, no later than

March 1, 2019, in preparation for this comprehensive on-site evaluation, including a compliance review, that was held from March 25 to March 27, 2019. During this visit the team reviewed the assurance argument, compliance report and several additional documents; met with a number of internal and external constituency groups; and, based on this evidence, completed its report. In November 2019, the HLC Board of Trustees will determine whether the institution has demonstrated that it is in compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation and whether probation can be removed.

Interactions with Constituencies

Opening Meeting

President

Vice Chair, Board of Trustees

President's Cabinet

Shared Governance Representatives (faculty, staff and student)

Criteria 1 Meeting

President

Two Members of Board of Trustees

Shared Governance Representatives (faculty, staff and student)

Five faculty members

Four staff members

Meeting to Discuss College Foundation

Chief Financial Officer

Foundation Board Member

Criteria 2 Meeting

President

Two Members of Board of Trustees

Shared Governance Representatives (faculty, staff and student)

Chief Financial Officer

Two faculty members

Seven staff members

Three students

Criteria 3 Meeting

Vice President of Instruction

Shared Governance Representatives (faculty, staff and student)

Fourteen faculty members

Thirteen staff members

Three administrators

Seven students

Criteria 4 Meeting

Vice President of Instruction

Director of Institutional Research

Twelve faculty members

Seven staff members

Three administrators

Criteria 5 Meeting

President

Chief Financial Officer

Shared Governance Representatives (faculty, staff and student)

Two administrators

Three students

Two staff members

Dinner with Board of Trustees

Three trustees

Board Chairman (interviewed separately by telephone)

Breakfast with Community Members

Twenty-four alumni and community members

Several college administrators, faculty and staff members

Lunch with Students

88 students from a variety of programs

Open Meeting with Faculty and Staff Members

Approximately 18 faculty and staff members

Other Interactions

Team interviewed Past Interim President (Ricky Serna) by telephone

Team chair met with human resources staff to review faculty transcripts

Team chair met with Vice President of Instruction, Director of Institutional Research, Registrar and Financial Aid director to review compliance issues

Additional Documents

Luna Community College website - www.luna.edu, including Fact Book

Articles from Albuquerque Journal on presidential search and foundation issues

Articles from Las Vegas Optic on presidential search and LCC enrollment trends

Resignation letters from two members of the Board of Trustees, Abelino Montoya, David Gutierrez

Recordings of Board of Trustee meetings from 2018 and 2019

New Mexico Department of Higher Education website

Office of Institutional Research & Reporting Student Retention Survey Results and Student Retention Survey Results.

2018 financial statements and audit and a spreadsheet of the FY2019 operating budget

2019 Institutional Update Report and CFI reports for 2015-2017

WEAVE assessment software platform demonstration

WEAVE software platform for assessment. There were no documents to refer to, but we were shown all the of the information that is present in the system.

Puente Juntos: A Reflection & Collection, student publication

1 - Mission

The institution's mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution's operations.

1.A - Core Component 1.A

The institution's mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operations.

1. The mission statement is developed through a process suited to the nature and culture of the institution and is adopted by the governing board.
2. The institution's academic programs, student support services, and enrollment profile are consistent with its stated mission.
3. The institution's planning and budgeting priorities align with and support the mission. (This sub-component may be addressed by reference to the response to Criterion 5.C.1.)

Rating

Met

Evidence

Luna Community College spent most of 2018 updating its institution-wide strategic plan as the current plan officially ended in December 2018. In early 2018, the college adopted a new shared governance model that included the integration of faculty, staff and student governance groups into college planning and decision making processes. This expansion of shared governance also included the establishment of a committee dedicated to oversee the process used to revise the strategic plan, the Strategic Planning and Institutional Analysis Committee (SPIA). The strategic planning process included a comprehensive review of the mission, vision, guiding principles and goals of the college by internal and external constituents. However, the process appeared to lack a comprehensive environmental scan that considered all relevant factors for the college, including changing demographics, technology and globalization (see Criteria 5).

The inclusive process used to develop the new strategic plan included obtaining internal and external input through a summer leadership retreat, a summer board retreat, faculty and staff workshops and an external stakeholder survey. The mission documents were updated by SPIA and shared with the Board of Trustees after each group provided its feedback. On November 27, 2018, a draft of the strategic planning documents, including the mission statement, vision statement, guiding principles and goals, was distributed campus-wide for final input. On December 3, 2018, the Board of Trustees adopted the Strategic Plan, 2019-2021. During the team's visit, college administrators, as well as members of the Faculty Senate, Staff Advisory Senate, Student Senate and Board of Trustees, discussed their engagement in this year-long process and made frequent references to the new strategic plan.

The institution's academic programs, student support services and outreach activities are consistent

with its stated mission. The mission statement, Creating Opportunities for You, and the accompanying guiding principles, including providing accessible, affordable and high quality education, shape all programs and services provided by the college to students, employers and to the community. These offerings include career education, general education, adult basic education, transfer education, customized training, academic services, student services, student life, cultural activities and economic development.

As a two-year college located in northeastern New Mexico, the institution is aware of its mission and need to serve its surrounding rural and economically challenged communities. The enrollment profile of the college, including traditional college students, adult students, and high school students from the surrounding geographic area, is consistent with the college mission. The diversity of the student body mirrors that of the local population.

The newly updated college mission, vision, guiding principles and goal statements are clearly understood by the Board of Trustees, senior leaders, faculty and staff. These mission documents are starting to be used to guide academic planning, budgeting and related actions. In particular, the strategic plan is now used as the basis for institutional planning and budgeting. In January 2019, senior leaders developed the process that departments would follow to align department objectives and budget requests with the Strategic Plan 2019-2021. On January 11, 2019, department managers attended a workshop where this process was explained, and this new budget process has been implemented beginning in the spring semester of 2019.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.B - Core Component 1.B

The mission is articulated publicly.

1. The institution clearly articulates its mission through one or more public documents, such as statements of purpose, vision, values, goals, plans, or institutional priorities.
2. The mission document or documents are current and explain the extent of the institution's emphasis on the various aspects of its mission, such as instruction, scholarship, research, application of research, creative works, clinical service, public service, economic development, and religious or cultural purpose.
3. The mission document or documents identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the higher education programs and services the institution provides.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Luna Community College clearly articulates its mission through public documents, including statements of mission, vision, guiding principles and college goals. These documents are current, last updated by the Board of Trustees in December 2018, and articulate the college's commitment to the service region, including numerous opportunities for degree attainment, continuing education and workforce development.

These mission documents are found in the college's publications and advertisements, on the college's internal and public websites, in the president's office, and on internal electronic monitors in the main campus and satellite campuses. Senior leaders also present the mission statement at internal and external events and activities, including new student orientation. During the past year, the college has hired dedicated staff members in communications and marketing and also initiated numerous targeted marketing campaigns that focus on helping students, faculty, staff and external stakeholders better understand the mission, vision and guiding principles of the college.

Although the mission statement, *Creating Opportunities for You*, is rather general in nature, students interviewed by the team were familiar with the mission, and the mission appeared to resonate with external constituencies as well. During a breakfast meeting with community members, alumni talked about opportunities the college had provided for them and how the college had helped them to achieve personal and professional goals.

The college's guiding principles describe the core values of the institution, emphasizing the college's commitment to the service region. These principles describe the college's role in individual academic success and opportunities for degree attainment; strengthening local communities through collaboration; and regional economic and workforce development. The college recognizes that its success is tied to that of the local communities it serves.

In addition, the newly revised college goals further identify the nature, scope, and intended

constituents of the higher education programs and services the institution provides. The college goals include service to the following constituent groups: students, faculty and staff, regional industries, regional government and local K-12 districts. Interviews with administrators, faculty and staff indicated that they appreciated the clarity and specificity of the new college goals and their alignment to the populations served by the college.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.C - Core Component 1.C

The institution understands the relationship between its mission and the diversity of society.

1. The institution addresses its role in a multicultural society.
2. The institution's processes and activities reflect attention to human diversity as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves.

Rating

Met

Evidence

The institution has been engaged in recent initiatives to more completely address its role in a multicultural society. The updated mission documents emphasize an understanding of the diversity of society and the diverse constituencies served by the college. Two of the five new guiding principles address multiculturalism: "Promote a learning community that values and celebrates differences" and "Play a leadership role in economic and community development that honors and recognizes the culture and history of the region."

The college recruits students at a wide variety of venues across the state. The college's student demographics, including 79.2 percent Hispanic/Latino students, 16.3 percent Caucasian students and 1 percent Native American and African American students, are reflective of the college's service area and of the state of New Mexico. Similarly, approximately 70 percent of the college's full-time faculty are Hispanic/Latino, 27 percent are Caucasian and the race and ethnicity of the remaining 4 percent are unknown. The college recruits locally and regionally with minimal national recruitment for leadership positions and some specialized faculty positions; however, for some positions, faculty and administrator salaries appear to be below national norms.

Specialized support services are provided for students with disabilities, veterans, students who are parents, distance learners and international students. One program, Barbering, serves incarcerated students. Overall, the students interviewed by the team were complimentary of student services and knew where to obtain assistance.

The college hosts diverse speakers, cultural events and workshops for faculty, staff and students, and sponsors a number of clubs and organizations that promote multiculturalism and diversity. Several examples of these activities were evident during the site visit. Students also discussed their outreach to diverse communities including local children, low income community members and homeless families through their classes and co-curricular activities,

The college offers an Associate of Arts Degree in Early Childhood Multicultural Education. Multicultural content is also included in courses throughout the curriculum including courses in culinary arts, business, nursing and pharmacology. And, according to the college's general education philosophy statement, Luna Community College "graduates participate in the cultural and political life of the community and society." The institution offers numerous general education courses that

include multicultural content including Introduction to Anthropology, Cultures of the World and World Religions.

Although each student in an associate's degree program is required to take general education courses in social sciences and humanities, the amount of diversity education each student receives varies by program. Programs such as Criminal Justice and Teacher Education include required courses in diversity and multiculturalism, while other associate degree programs allow students to choose courses from long lists of general education courses that include varying amounts of diversity-related content. For example, in the Social and Behavioral Science Category, students may choose Cultures of the World or Principles of Macroeconomics; the Humanities and Fine Arts Category includes courses in art, history, music, philosophy, religion and theater.

The vast majority of students interviewed by the team indicated that they had taken a course that included multicultural content. However, due to the large number of elective and selective courses included in many academic programs, it would be difficult to guarantee that each student graduates with cultural competency. The college is encouraged to continue its efforts in program mapping to ensure that each program requires courses with multicultural content. Offering fewer selective and elective courses would also improve the visibility of diversity-related courses and decrease the number of canceled courses each semester.

Finally, the college has been successful in obtaining Title V funding to improve its courses, programs and instructional equipment in areas ranging from automotive technology to nursing. Title V funding is competitively awarded to institutions of higher education serving Hispanic, low-income and under-represented student populations. The college is eligible for this funding based on enrollment documentation of a "fixed" percentage of full-time Hispanic undergraduate students in the year preceding the grant award. Other factors included in awarding Title V funding include the educational needs of the community and the institution's vision for educational development through offering academically enhanced courses and rigorous programs.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.D - Core Component 1.D

The institution's mission demonstrates commitment to the public good.

1. Actions and decisions reflect an understanding that in its educational role the institution serves the public, not solely the institution, and thus entails a public obligation.
2. The institution's educational responsibilities take primacy over other purposes, such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests.
3. The institution engages with its identified external constituencies and communities of interest and responds to their needs as its mission and capacity allow.

Rating

Met

Evidence

The college, as part of the New Mexico Community College system, has no external investors or interests other than to serve the students and the communities within its service area. As a public institution, the college is governed by its Board of Trustees, a Board that is elected by residents of multiple districts. The college solicits input from the community through its planning processes, advisory boards and other community engagement activities. The college is currently in the process of forming advisory boards for every academic program. The president stated that all programs should have advisory boards within the next year. The college responds to external input by providing academic courses and programs; providing training and continuing education programs; and allowing use of physical resources such as facilities use.

The college reaches out to regional high schools in its service area to deliver dual enrollment courses and programs to high school students. The college's Adult Education program offers classes to adult learners who are interested in obtaining a GED, improving literacy skills and improving English-language skills. The college offers Noches de Familia, a prevention program designed to raise awareness of substance abuse, and the college's Barbering program is offered to incarcerated individuals. The college's Small Business Development Center provides consulting, training and government procurement assistance to clients, and the college provides Nursing Assistant training and a variety of continuing education courses in collaboration with Montana del Norte Area Health Education Center. The college is also involved in a number of annual parades, auto shows and other community activities.

The team met with a large group of students and asked them how they were engaged in the local communities. The majority of students indicated they had been engaged in local communities through internships, clinical experiences, service learning and a range of volunteer activities facilitated by athletics, student government and other student organizations. Examples included nursing students practicing their skills in a local homeless shelter, students collecting winter coats for distribution within the community and students serving holidays meals to community members. Faculty and staff members are involved in providing leadership to these activities in their roles as

instructors and student organization advisors.

The team also held a breakfast with a group of community members that included college alumni, local government officials, university partners, social service agencies and employers. During this meeting, several alumni spoke about how the college had enriched their lives and the lives of their families. Senior leaders from Highlands University discussed their partnership with the college that includes sharing courses, accepting transfer students and providing housing for college students who live a considerable distance from Las Vegas, including student athletes. Community members from a local pre-school and the local Head Start program spoke about their relationship with the college's Early Childhood Education program. A representative from Los Alamos National Labs discussed how that organization hires a number of interns and graduates from the college.

Overall, the team found evidence of a substantial amount of faculty, staff and student engagement with external constituent groups and local communities. The college is encouraged to continue sponsoring events, such as "Linking Up with Luna" to facilitate the establishment of advisory boards for each academic program. It would also be useful to document the ways in which each academic program and each co-curricular program interact with external constituencies and local communities as many of the examples above were not described in the assurance argument.

Currently, the college's Foundation is inactive due to unresolved legal and financial issues (see Criterion 5). Once those issues are completely addressed, the college has an opportunity to increase community engagement through the re-establishment of a Foundation Board and related fund raising activities. Finally, although academic program directors and coaches were maintaining lists of graduates, there did not appear to be a formal alumni association or systematic methods for communicating with graduates.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.S - Criterion 1 - Summary

The institution's mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution's operations.

Evidence

Luna Community College has recently updated its mission, vision, guiding principles and goal statements through an inclusive process, and these documents are made available to both internal and external audiences through a variety of channels. The college's enrollment profile, programs and services are consistent with its mission and location. Two of the college's updated guiding principles reflect attention to human diversity, and the College is making efforts to increase the diversity in its courses and its co-curricular activities. Finally, the college is engaged with several external constituency groups, including area schools, government and human services agencies and employers, as it deploys its mission of creating opportunities for the individuals and communities it serves.

2 - Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

2.A - Core Component 2.A

The institution operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions; it establishes and follows policies and processes for fair and ethical behavior on the part of its governing board, administration, faculty, and staff.

Rating

Not Met

Evidence

The review team investigated whether Luna Community College (LCC) operated with integrity related to the institution's financial, academic, personnel and auxiliary functions. Previous Higher Learning Commission (HLC) visits had raised a number of concerns centering on LCC's processes for fair and ethical behavior on the part of its Board of Trustees and members of its administration. As a result of previous HLC findings, LCC embarked on a process to develop a system of shared governance at the college. These efforts resulted in the development of a shared governance policy. The Board of Trustees officially approved this policy at their December 12, 2017, meeting. Over the past 15 months, LCC has worked to establish a shared governance system that includes a Faculty Senate, a Staff Advisory Senate and a newly reconstituted Student Governance Council (Student Senate). Two members from each of these constituent groups comprise the Shared Governance Council reporting directly to the president. The leaders of these groups also attend Board of Trustee meetings.

In addition to the creation of the Shared Governance Council, the college's Board of Trustees (BOT) engaged in a number of training sessions with the goal of helping them govern more ethically and with integrity. BOT training sessions covered topics such as the appropriate role of governing boards, Open Meeting Act requirements, team building, professionalism and building trust. Some of these training sessions involved external facilitators. Previous HLC reports highlighted that all Trustees had not signed their annual acknowledgement of Ethics and Conflict of Interest policies. At the time of the review team visit, all Trustees had signed their annual acknowledgments.

There is no question that the development of a shared governance structure and BOT member trainings are positive steps. However, there remain significant concerns centered around the governance of Luna Community College.

The review team found that the BOT's commitment to transparent, collaborative and shared governance to be questionable. Team members heard from a number of LCC administrators, faculty members and staff members who believe that the BOT is engaging in shared governance simply to

placate the Higher Learning Commission while other administrators denied that shared governance exists only to appease accreditors. Interviews with members of the BOT indicate that many recent improvements in shared governance were intended to address HLC concerns.

Perhaps most troubling was the fact that the review team heard from members of the Shared Governance Council who felt bullied and harassed by members of the BOT and administration. One staff member reported that her budget had been cut in response to the position she had taken in the Shared Governance Council. Another staff member reported that she had been verbally attacked by a Trustee in public as a result of her participation in the Shared Governance Council. In summary, more than a dozen faculty and staff stepped forward to convey that they feared losing their jobs based on their support for a transparent, collaborative, shared governance system at LCC. Two members of the review team interviewed the BOT chair relative to these concerns and he expressed his ongoing support for shared governance. He stated that, in his opinion, the BOT was developing positive relationships with shared governance leaders and that the BOT did not dictate or interfere in personnel issues.

LCC employees also reported a pervasive culture of sexist behavior by members of the BOT. Female employees reported that they are routinely ignored by BOT members when asking questions and others reported being belittled verbally by Trustees. The review team experienced that behavior as BOT members focused all of their attention and questions on the sole male member of the team during the team's meeting with three Trustees; faculty and staff members who attended that meeting, or who viewed the meeting on social media, commented on these behaviors. It is important to note that only one female has served on the LCC BOT and that was more than 30 years ago (1983 to 1985). And, although members are elected, the Board can appoint members to finish terms of members who leave the board.

A previous HLC report indicated that "Trustee interactions indicated an absence of cohesion on topics such as the presidential search." The review team found ample evidence that an absence of cohesion still exists. LCC engaged a search firm to assist them in a nationwide search for a new president in the summer of 2018. The initial search yielded a preferred candidate, Dr. Bruce Moses, who had widespread support on campus, and Dr. Moses was announced as the new college president in October 2018. However, the BOT was unable to come to a contractual agreement with Dr. Moses. The review team found evidence that the BOT acted with integrity during the contract negotiations. However, they were unable to come to agreement over various terms, and the search was reopened with the remaining existing candidate pool. Additional interviews were conducted, and, in March 2018, two weeks prior to the review team's visit, LCC hired a new President, an internal candidate, by a 3 to 2 vote.

The presidential search, particularly the re-opening of the search and interviewing of the remaining candidates, was shrouded in controversy leaving many members of the LCC faculty and staff discouraged. According to many college employees, once the search was reopened, the transparency of the process ended. Three different LCC employees, as well as a former BOT member, reported that a Trustee was openly sharing that an internal candidate was going to be chosen as the next president. This assertion prompted a letter dated February 25, 2019, from the co-chairs of the Shared Governance Council urging the BOT not to hire the internal candidate. The letter raised concerns that this candidate, as one of the college's administrators, had been involved in earlier search deliberations. The letter also questioned whether he had an appropriate background to assume the role of president at such a critical juncture in LCC's history. Despite these concerns, the BOT voted 3 to 2 to hire this internal candidate as the new president of LCC. Before the vote was

taken, two members of the BOT had resigned, citing ethical lapses and self serving behavior by other members of the Board. This left only five members of the BOT to vote on the new president. During the review team's visit, a current BOT member referred to the presidential search as “failed” as this trustee wished to hire a female candidate.

In summary, the review team found significant evidence that LCC’s Board of Trustees fails to follow policies and processes for fair and ethical behavior. Although some improvements, as noted above, have been made since the last HLC visit, the review team did not find evidence that a true commitment to shared governance exists at this time. The team also found significant concerns relative to the BOT's oversight of financial matters that are outlined in Criteria 5.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.B - Core Component 2.B

The institution presents itself clearly and completely to its students and to the public with regard to its programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships.

Rating

Met

Evidence

The review team found significant evidence that LCC presents itself to its students and to the public in a manner that is clear and complete. It is of note that the college hired a new coordinator of communications and marketing to boost the college's profile in the communities they serve. The college has started producing a community newsletter that is distributed electronically to both internal and external audiences. The review team found the newsletter to be of high quality and believes that it effectively highlights LCC's contributions to the region.

A comprehensive review of the college's website found it to be appropriate in both scope and depth. LCC's new website went live on October 26, 2018. The new website contains a great deal of information, is easy to navigate and is well organized. Students indicated that they were able to locate information they needed on the college website. The website does indicate the college's current "on probation" status with the HLC. Program-specific accreditations and state certifications are also noted as appropriate for academic programs, including Automotive Technology, Nursing and Teacher Education.

The review team also conducted a thorough review of LCC's publications such as the Student Handbook, the College Catalog and several college brochures for various academic programs. The team found evidence that these documents and others were appropriate relative to the description of the college's program requirements, policies and financial aid information. Information regarding cost of attendance and graduation rates was clear and accurate.

A complete directory of college employees is located on the college website. Directory information includes names, titles and contact information for all faculty members, staff members, administrators and BOT members. This information is organized by department.

Finally, the review team was able to easily find information about the BOT, minutes from BOT meetings and notices of future meetings on the college website. The college also live streams BOT meetings via the web, and several faculty and staff members indicated that they view these meetings.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.C - Core Component 2.C

The governing board of the institution is sufficiently autonomous to make decisions in the best interest of the institution and to assure its integrity.

1. The governing board's deliberations reflect priorities to preserve and enhance the institution.
2. The governing board reviews and considers the reasonable and relevant interests of the institution's internal and external constituencies during its decision-making deliberations.
3. The governing board preserves its independence from undue influence on the part of donors, elected officials, ownership interests or other external parties when such influence would not be in the best interest of the institution.
4. The governing board delegates day-to-day management of the institution to the administration and expects the faculty to oversee academic matters.

Rating

Met With Concerns

Evidence

The review team spent a substantial amount of time with various members of the Board of Trustees. In addition, the Chairman of the Board was interviewed by phone as he was out of the country during the review team's visit. A 2018 HLC site visit report stated "At the time of the visit, there remained open questions by the community about the ability of the Board to ethically govern given the current Trustee membership; and while verbally embracing the notion that change must occur, the Board of Trustees has yet to incorporate such modifications to their modus operandi."

The review team found evidence that the BOT has continued to make progress in establishing the framework to assure that their deliberations reflect the priorities of the institution. As previously noted, the BOT has participated in a series of training sessions with external facilitators with the goal of understanding their role as a governing board. As a result, the BOT has established a new set of norms designed to guide their work and build trust among BOT members. The previous LCC interim president also facilitated discussions with the BOT to measure the college's progress toward meeting the objectives of the strategic plan that ended in December 2018. Additionally, BOT members engaged with faculty, staff, administrators and external stakeholders in developing the new strategic plan as described in 1A. In an effort to increase transparency, LCC's BOT extended their Board agenda to include time for Public Comment, a Faculty Senate Report and a Staff Senate Report. The review team found evidence that recent Board meetings had, in fact, included these reports.

At their January 9, 2019, meeting, BOT members approved a resolution stating, among other things, that "a Trustee shall not: 1. Influence or attempt to influence personnel decisions. 2. Interact with staff in a manner that suggests tasks and duties must be carried out on behalf of a Board member. 3. Act or behave in a manner that encourages staff to deviate from appropriate chain of command and grievance protocols."

The review team found these statements to be appropriate and a positive first step toward sound

governance. However, the review team spoke to numerous LCC employees who reported that they are still regularly approached by Trustees on campus and receive feedback and direction from them. The employees uniformly indicated that they viewed the Trustee comments as being direction for specific action on their part. At least two employees reported receiving direct orders from a Trustee visiting campus. During the review team's meeting with BOT members, some Trustees indicated that they regularly visit campus and interact with employees on the job. At least one Trustee is enrolled as a student and is on campus on a weekly basis. At least two Trustees were former faculty members at the college and voiced strong opinions relative to vocational programs, laboratory equipment, etc. All Trustees denied ever trying to influence the actions of an employee; however, many employees interpreted their interactions quite differently.

Both the BOT chairman and individual trustees stated that "the Board has one employee, the president." However, this philosophy doesn't appear to be the reality relative to the operations of the college. When interviewed, the chairman of the Board said he believes that trustees should only come to campus for BOT meetings and formal events; however, he indicated that he cannot control the day to day behavior of each of the individual Trustees. In addition to the faculty and staff who expressed concerns in meetings with team members (see 2A and 2D), three public comments and two student survey comments indicated a lack of confidence in the BOT relative to their oversight of the college.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.D - Core Component 2.D

The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.

Rating

Met With Concerns

Evidence

LCC's Academic Guidelines outline faculty rights and responsibilities as related to their freedom of expression. Review team interviews with faculty indicated that faculty largely felt that they were free to conduct their classes without undue influence from administration or members of the Board of Trustees. Interviews with students found that they also felt that they had an opportunity to express themselves both in class and on campus.

The LCC Board of Trustees has approved a new Freedom of Expression and Dissent policy that the review team determined to be appropriate and an important step forward for the college. The new policy has been widely disseminated and the review team found that most employees were aware of the new policy.

While the new Freedom of Expression and Dissent policy is certainly a step in the right direction, the review team found evidence that many faculty and staff felt they were unable to make their views and opinions known without fear of retaliation. During our visit, more than a dozen individuals approached team members to share that they had been discouraged from challenging the administration or Board of Trustees publicly or privately. This discouragement took a variety of forms ranging from a public belittling to more subtle forms of intimidation such as inferring that budget requests would be denied unless staff towed the line. During the review team's visit, many LCC employees were hesitant to participate in open sessions where administrators or Board of Trustee members were in attendance. Privately, individuals and small groups of employees shared that they feared for their jobs if they were to voice their concerns to the review team. It is important to note that this was not a few individuals, but rather a dozen or more employees working across the institution.

At the request of a group of individuals, a meeting was scheduled toward the end of the visit that included faculty and staff who wished to speak freely about their concerns. Senior administrators and Trustees were specifically excluded from participation. Over a period of almost three hours, LCC faculty and staff painted a picture of an institution where employees were allegedly hired and fired capriciously, as well as a college culture of fear, intimidation, rampant sexism and bullying of employees. Approximately 20 employees participated in the meeting; however, not all of the employees were willing to use the sign-in sheet. As stated previously, the chairman of the Board said that the Board's only employee is the college president and that the BOT is not involved in the hiring or firing of faculty and staff members. Documentation from the college indicated that all hires are based on the recommendations of a three-person committee and that six employees were terminated for cause over the past three years with appropriate documentation.

The review team believes that LCC is establishing the framework needed to support freedom of expression and that faculty and students are free to express themselves in the classroom. However the current college culture does not yet reflect a genuine commitment to freedom of expression. Again, there appears to be a disconnect between the philosophy and policy of the BOT and their actual or perceived behaviors toward college employees.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.E - Core Component 2.E

The institution's policies and procedures call for responsible acquisition, discovery and application of knowledge by its faculty, students and staff.

1. The institution provides effective oversight and support services to ensure the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by its faculty, staff, and students.
2. Students are offered guidance in the ethical use of information resources.
3. The institution has and enforces policies on academic honesty and integrity.

Rating

Met

Evidence

The review team uncovered evidence that LCC has established policies and procedures that govern the responsible acquisition, discovery and application of knowledge by their faculty, students and staff. Interviews with faculty revealed that primary research and related activities are not normally conducted at LCC. This is not unusual for a community college with a considerable emphasis on career and technical education programs, and there are processes in place for the small number of faculty members who conduct research as part of their graduate degree programs.

Both faculty and students were able to provide a wide variety of examples where they were engaged in individual and groups assignments and projects involving research, scholarly and creative activities. This included examples from both general education courses and the career and technical education courses. The college library provides a wealth of resources for students who are engaged in class-based research projects and students were complimentary of the library and its services.

The review team also found that the college provides appropriate guidance to students regarding ethical use of information. The college utilizes a master syllabus that includes descriptions of academic dishonesty and its consequences. The review team also reviewed LCC's Computer Use Policy and found it to be clear and concise.

Discussions with faculty and academic administration found evidence that the college enforces its policies on academic honesty in a consistent manner. Information regarding academic honesty was easily found in the Student Handbook, the College Catalog and on the LCC website. There was ample evidence that academic policies regarding academic honesty and integrity were uniformly enforced by the Academic Affairs Division. Students appeared to be aware of the policies on academic dishonesty as well.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.S - Criterion 2 - Summary

The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

Evidence

The review team found that Luna Community College has made great progress, in a relatively short time frame, in establishing a framework for ethical and responsible governance. The college has established and implemented a shared governance structure, approved and implemented several new policies and procedures, and Board members have engaged in ongoing training.

The college is also ethical in its presentation of information to the students and to the public. Faculty members engage students in research and creative activities, and both faculty members and administrators communicate and enforce policies on the ethical use of information, computer usage and academic honesty.

However, an extended and controversial presidential search, which resulted in a split Board decision and the resignations of two Board members that were directly related to the search process, has done little to increase confidence in the remaining members of the BOT. In addition, college employees continue to express serious concerns relative to a culture of fear and intimidation, inappropriate behavior by individual Trustees and a lack of commitment to freedom of expression.

3 - Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support

The institution provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.

3.A - Core Component 3.A

The institution's degree programs are appropriate to higher education.

1. Courses and programs are current and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree or certificate awarded.
2. The institution articulates and differentiates learning goals for undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate, and certificate programs.
3. The institution's program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (on the main campus, at additional locations, by distance delivery, as dual credit, through contractual or consortial arrangements, or any other modality).

Rating

Met

Evidence

The review team met with faculty and staff across the college to address Core Component 3. In the first session, the focus was primarily on instruction. During that meeting, faculty affirmed that the college is offering certificate and degree programs that align with the mission of the college. The programs are current to the needs of the local community both for career and technical programs as well as for transfer programs. Examples included the transferability of several programs, including STEM and Liberal Arts, to New Mexico universities as well as graduate job placement for Dental Assisting, Nursing, and Collision Repair as shared by the program directors.

Recently the college reviewed all of its academic programs to determine student success and completion. Because of this review, the college began the process to sunset four degrees and certificates. These programs were closed due to low enrollment, no enrollment, or low job placement. One major change for the 2019-2021 College Catalog is the removal of the Associate Degree in General Studies. After researching student completion, job placement, and lack of transfer opportunities for this degree, the curriculum committee submitted the request to the Vice President of Instruction to remove this degree and move students into the Associate of Arts Degree in Liberal Arts. Faculty advisors are meeting with these students to determine the best program placement starting in fall 2019.

Programs are determined to be at appropriate levels of performance based on the success of transfer students at state universities, as well as student performance on national exams for the nursing and dental programs. In addition, students are placed in jobs after graduation. The program directors for career and technical education programs track the students by program. In addition, the Registrar's

Office surveys all graduating students regarding their experience at LCC as well as job placement and/or university transfer. Based on past survey results, the Registrar's Office has changed the survey to include more relevant questions.

New Mexico's Department of Higher Education (NMDHE) has been moving toward a common course numbering system, and all courses will be reviewed under this new model. In addition, NMDHE has implemented a new general education common core that includes five general competencies, labeled essential skills, for all graduates to master. College faculty are revising curriculum and submitting the updated curriculum to NMDHE for approval. The 2019-2021 College Catalog includes these changes to the curriculum.

The college has implemented WEAVE, a technology system, to assist with program learning outcomes (PLO), course learning outcomes (CLO), and the general education competencies listed above. The college started using WEAVE in April 2018, and most of the program data has been entered into the system. The PLOs are also listed in the syllabi for students to review. For career and technical education programs, PLOs also align with the specialized accreditation for the programs, including Auto Collision Repair Technology and Cosmetology. All associate of applied science degrees require general education courses and all associate degrees require English Composition I and II.

LCC has an online instructional designer and several faculty members are Quality Matters reviewers. In addition, the college has several dual credit instructors. Faculty who teach in specific disciplines and programs, including dual credit instructors, work together to provide consistent delivery of education across locations and learning modalities.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.B - Core Component 3.B

The institution demonstrates that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational programs.

1. The general education program is appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution.
2. The institution articulates the purposes, content, and intended learning outcomes of its undergraduate general education requirements. The program of general education is grounded in a philosophy or framework developed by the institution or adopted from an established framework. It imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess.
3. Every degree program offered by the institution engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments.
4. The education offered by the institution recognizes the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work.
5. The faculty and students contribute to scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge to the extent appropriate to their programs and the institution's mission.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Two members of the review team met with faculty members about the general education core courses offered at the college. The faculty discussed how the general education courses will align with the New Mexico Department of Higher Education (see 3A). Some courses have been approved and others are in the pipeline for state approval. There are clear expectations of all general education courses.

The institution articulates its intended learning outcomes through the WEAVE program. This software allows the college to outline specific outcomes for all of the programs. These outcomes were developed through the New Mexico Department of Higher Education as well as faculty experience attending and using the information from the American Association of College and Universities conference. Faculty review outcomes through the Curriculum Committee and Faculty Senate as explained to the review team by the faculty.

According to the New Mexico Department of Higher Education website, and also supported in the meeting with faculty, the Associate of Arts and Associate of Science degrees require 31 general education credits and the Associate of Applied Science degrees require 15 general education credits. The state is implementing a new system in fall 2019 that aligns the five learning competencies, called essential skills, across six general education education discipline areas. The faculty are working on the plans to implement these core competencies. Although the Assurance Argument mentions six essential general education skills, these have been redesigned into five essential skills across the state, and LCC has made these changes.

As evidenced in the Assurance Argument and from discussions with faculty and students, the students complete capstone courses, practicums and clinical work experience to demonstrate competency. In addition, all degree programs require an English composition course, which ensures all students meet specific writing competencies.

The faculty provided several examples of how they stay current in their fields of study as well as how they encourage student involvement. Examples includes a poetry book published by the developmental English courses, students working at a local health fair, students providing dental services to the community, and student attending professional conferences. Faculty members expressed that they were supported in their ability to attend professional conferences that inform and improve their teaching.

One of the New Mexico Department of Higher Education essential skills is personal and social responsibility. Every degree seeking student must complete an English composition course. According to the faculty chair of the English Department, this course includes a diversity component for all students. In addition to enrolling in other courses that address cultural diversity in the social sciences, the humanities and in the career and technical education programs, students have opportunities to volunteer in the surrounding communities, helping with health programs, dental care and child care. Student Life also provides opportunities for co-curricular activities related to cultural diversity.

As outlined in the Assurance Argument and supported in meetings at LCC, students participate in activities outside of the classroom to complement their studies. Examples include auto collision repair students holding a car show for the program, culinary arts students providing catering for state events, cosmetology students providing services to the community, liberal arts students writing poetry for a creative arts publication and STEM students participating in a competition with the Los Alamos National Laboratories. The team heard from faculty, staff and students about numerous opportunities to participate in active learning outside the classroom.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.C - Core Component 3.C

The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services.

1. The institution has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out both the classroom and the non-classroom roles of faculty, including oversight of the curriculum and expectations for student performance; establishment of academic credentials for instructional staff; involvement in assessment of student learning.
2. All instructors are appropriately qualified, including those in dual credit, contractual, and consortial programs.
3. Instructors are evaluated regularly in accordance with established institutional policies and procedures.
4. The institution has processes and resources for assuring that instructors are current in their disciplines and adept in their teaching roles; it supports their professional development.
5. Instructors are accessible for student inquiry.
6. Staff members providing student support services, such as tutoring, financial aid advising, academic advising, and co-curricular activities, are appropriately qualified, trained, and supported in their professional development.

Rating

Met

Evidence

The review team met with numerous faculty and staff members who confirmed that LCC has an adequate number of faculty to oversee the curriculum and an adequate number of staff to provide assistance to students. In the student meeting, the review team also heard that there are adequate numbers of both faculty and staff and students feel supported in and out of the classroom. The college recently hired several professional staff members to assist students, some in specific disciplines. In addition, there are student support advisors to help students navigate the first semester and beyond.

Since the last site visit, the college has reviewed and revised its hiring guidelines and faculty credentialing process to assure alignment with Higher Learning Commission guidelines. The same credentials are required to teach at the main campus, online, dual credit or at the satellite campuses. New faculty hires are vetted at the department level using the college faculty qualification guidelines. A review of personnel files, including transcripts, by the team chair demonstrated that faculty are appropriately credentialed. Currently, all faculty hold appropriate degrees with the exception of three faculty members who are on educational plans to obtain appropriate degrees. The team chair noted these plans are being monitored on a regular basis by administrators. The vice president of instruction explained that because of the college's rural location, it is difficult to recruit qualified faculty in certain disciplines often leaving positions vacant for months.

There are policies and processes in place for the annual evaluation of full-time faculty members, and

faculty members are reviewed on a regular basis by the program director and through student course evaluations. However, because it is so challenging to hire full-time faculty members in many areas, the college utilizes a large number of part-time or adjunct faculty members. Currently, there is not a similar annual evaluation process for adjunct instructors who would greatly benefit by the implementation of college-wide policies and processes for regular evaluation.

In meetings with faculty and staff, it is clear that LCC employees have opportunities to participate in professional development on local, state and national levels. In addition, several career and technical education programs provide services to the community, and transfer faculty collaborate with four-year institutions within the state. In addition, many employees have opportunities to attend conferences in their content area such as the registrar at RMACRAO, financial aid at NASFA and FSA, and advising at NACADA. Faculty members have also attended national conferences such as AAC&U.

According to students, both faculty and staff members are accessible and helpful. Through a special state allocation for student retention, the college recently hired seven academic advisors for the following areas: Allied Health, Education, Humanities, Nursing, School of Business, STEM, and Vocational/Trades. Along with the new advisors, the college also hired a dual credit coordinator, veteran's resource center coordinator, student success advisor, a tutoring coordinator and student tutors. Staff members are available for tutoring, early alert, advising, counseling, student life, registration, financial aid, etc. Staff are prepared to assist students and also have opportunities for professional development, including the examples listed above.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.D - Core Component 3.D

The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.

1. The institution provides student support services suited to the needs of its student populations.
2. The institution provides for learning support and preparatory instruction to address the academic needs of its students. It has a process for directing entering students to courses and programs for which the students are adequately prepared.
3. The institution provides academic advising suited to its programs and the needs of its students.
4. The institution provides to students and instructors the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning (technological infrastructure, scientific laboratories, libraries, performance spaces, clinical practice sites, museum collections, as appropriate to the institution's offerings).
5. The institution provides to students guidance in the effective use of research and information resources.

Rating

Met

Evidence

The review team met with several faculty and staff members to review Criterion 3. In addition, the review team met with students in an open forum. Team members also had an opportunity to talk to students, faculty and staff members individually during the visit. During these discussions, students confirmed that staff are available to meet their needs. Faculty understand the student population and how to support them in their classrooms, and there is collaboration between academic and student affairs to help students stay on their academic paths as well as address students' emotional, social and financial needs. As described in 3C, the college recently hired several professional staff members to address the needs of program students, dual credit students and veterans.

The college has recently changed the developmental education process so that students complete only one developmental course before entering into college-level English or math. The English Department implemented a new bridge program, and team members had an opportunity to review a report on this program. In addition, poetry from the developmental English course was organized in a publication for the college, and there are plans to continue this publication opportunity for students. The STEM program is responsible for math and they also restructured the developmental math sequence to better serve students. Both English and math courses have seen an increase in student retention as a result of these changes.

Based feedback from a student satisfaction survey conducted last year, the college changed their advising structure to include both four student success advisors as well as seven new academic advisors. Student success advisors assist with the first semester for all new students and support students with academic and non-academic issues. The academic advisors are located in each discipline (see 3C) and assist continuing students in their programs of study. These individuals also follow-up with students who have missed classes and students who were the subject of an "early

alert" from one or more faculty members. Although it is too early to evaluate the success of this new model, in general, students appeared satisfied with academic advising.

The review team had an opportunity to tour the college facilities. The college has adequate facilities to support the academic needs of the students including classrooms for general education courses as well as specialized laboratories for career and technical education programs, including barbering/cosmetology, business, auto collision repair technology, culinary arts, dental assisting, nursing and welding. There were adequate offices for academic and student support services. In addition, LCC recently finished construction on a large auditorium to house the college's commencement ceremonies as well as student performances and other college and community events. Title V grant funding had been secured to update many of the program-specific laboratories.

LCC has a Learning Resource Center for library resources including books, databases, and access to other resources at other libraries. Students are assisted with the effective use of research and information resources through English courses, which are required by all degree seeking students, as well as other Humanities courses according to the faculty who teach in these disciplines.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.E - Core Component 3.E

The institution fulfills the claims it makes for an enriched educational environment.

1. Co-curricular programs are suited to the institution's mission and contribute to the educational experience of its students.
2. The institution demonstrates any claims it makes about contributions to its students' educational experience by virtue of aspects of its mission, such as research, community engagement, service learning, religious or spiritual purpose, and economic development.

Rating

Met

Evidence

The college mission, "Creating Opportunities for You" is demonstrated both in the classroom and in a number of co-curricular activities. The college offers several co-curricular, service learning and community volunteer programs through the Student Senate, the Student Life office and through the academic programs. There are currently 10 active student clubs and organizations, most of these clubs and organizations are aligned with a specific academic program, such as the Student Nurse Association and the LCC Car Club. In addition, the college sponsors athletic teams, including softball and baseball. The student athletes also provide service to the community. Each club, team and student activity is supported by advisors who are committed to enhancing students' experience through involvement and participation.

The college has an active Student Senate and student leaders attended the open forum and discussed their activities, including their role in the new shared governance framework. Student Senate also shared that they host activities for students and community members, including a family-friendly haunted house during Halloween week and an annual barbeque.

Many of the academic programs also provide opportunities for faculty and students to engage with the local communities. Examples include offering dental assistance to low income populations, providing health care awareness through health fairs and providing business services through the Small Business Development Center. Other examples of students contributions include STEM students collaborating with the Los Alamos Labs and working with high school students on robotics, early childhood education students providing activities for families through the preschool lab and culinary arts students assisting in catering local events.

In summary, considering that Luna Community College is a small, rural commuter college and that many of the students have part-time jobs, the review team team found that a relatively large number of students participate in student government, student clubs, athletics and other community service or serving learning activities related to their academic programs. All of these co-curricular activities enrich the student learning experience and the overall educational environment.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.S - Criterion 3 - Summary

The institution provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.

Evidence

Overall, the college meets the requirements of Criterion 3. The institution provides quality education for its students through its faculty, who are prepared and current in their program areas; staff members who provide support to students; and opportunities for learning in and outside the classroom. The college's faculty credentialing policy and process is now in alignment with the Higher Learning Commission. Due to the large number of adjunct faculty, it is desirable to implement an annual evaluation system for these individuals similar to the evaluation system in place for full-time faculty.

The review team met with a large number of faculty, staff and students who are passionate about the education they are providing or receiving at the college. Some students reported that getting the classes they need to stay on their academic paths is sometimes difficult; however, the college is aware of these scheduling problems and is working to address these issues. Feedback from students on the availability of academic advising led to the hiring of seven additional academic discipline advisors as well as other student support staff members. LCC has also been responsive to the needs of students in the developmental education sequence and has been offering an academic summer bridge program before fall classes begin. These changes have assisted students in starting in their college-level courses sooner.

In summary, the college has implemented a number of positive changes in the past year relative to faculty credentials, access to advising, support for special student populations (including veterans), developmental education, facilities and laboratory equipment.

4 - Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

4.A - Core Component 4.A

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.

1. The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.
2. The institution evaluates all the credit that it transcripts, including what it awards for experiential learning or other forms of prior learning, or relies on the evaluation of responsible third parties.
3. The institution has policies that assure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.
4. The institution maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. It assures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.
5. The institution maintains specialized accreditation for its programs as appropriate to its educational purposes.
6. The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. The institution assures that the degree or certificate programs it represents as preparation for advanced study or employment accomplish these purposes. For all programs, the institution looks to indicators it deems appropriate to its mission, such as employment rates, admission rates to advanced degree programs, and participation rates in fellowships, internships, and special programs (e.g., Peace Corps and Americorps).

Rating

Met

Evidence

The review team conducted two meetings with faculty and staff related to evaluation and improvement of teaching and learning. Additionally, student meetings and a campus tour provided the opportunity to observe instructional areas and visit with students and faculty within programs.

The three-year cycle of academic program review for 2016-2019 includes the following criteria for each review: program enrollment; student retention and graduation rates; advisory committee work; student advising; annual return on investment; survey results; assessment plan; curriculum modifications; and external accreditation (if applicable). Program reports reviewed by the review team indicate that academic program reviews are current for all active programs within the current

three-year cycle.

Each academic year, all programs publicly present the results of the course learning outcome assessments (CLOA) within the department, to the Assessment Committee and to academic leadership. Meeting minutes for both groups and copies of the CLOA presentations indicate these presentations are happening on a regular basis.

The introduction of the WEAVE platform in spring 2018 is providing the ability to link assessment data for institutional-level, program-level, and course-level outcomes in one common location. The review team was provided a demonstration by the faculty leaders of this process and found that preliminary information has been uploaded for all programs. Faculty leaders reported that faculty are now entering course learning outcome assessment data in the WEAVE system. On-going professional development is being provided at least three times per year to assist faculty in assessment design, implementation, analysis, and program improvement.

Academic department reviews combine the information for all academic programs within a department and include the following information: department's strategic plan, programs within the department, faculty and staff, professional development, advisory committee work, alumni surveys, accreditation, department budget narrative, and evaluation of the department. The review team examined current reports for all seven academic departments.

Co-curricular and non-academic departments are beginning a process mirroring the academic department review. This report template for this process links the department's strategic goals to those in the college strategic plan, lists department staff, professional development, regulatory and accreditation compliance, department budget requests, and a narrative evaluation of the department. While this process is new during the current academic year, conversations with staff in these areas did confirm the process is underway within their departments. Staff members reported the process is valuable in helping them understand the areas that require more attention and clarification in order to improve.

The college accepts transfer of academic credits earned from institutions of higher learning whose accreditation is from a regional, national faith-based, or national career-related accrediting organization recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation. In addition to CLEP scores, Advanced Placement, and International Baccalaureate credit equivalencies, the college also accepts transfer credit from military schools, armed services educational experience, and other specialized training.

Students submit official transcripts to the registrar who evaluates general education courses for equivalency in accordance with state law and the New Mexico Higher Education Department (NMHED). A statewide crosswalk is maintained for courses approved to meet the New Mexico General Education Core. The registrar refers program-specific courses to the appropriate academic director for determination of equivalency. The review team confirmed these processes through conversations with the registrar and academic program directors and examination of the statewide crosswalk.

The review team reviewed a sample of course descriptions, course syllabi, and Curriculum Committee minutes in order to confirm course descriptions include any prerequisites and co-requisites. The descriptions might also include other preparatory course recommendations. Approval of any changes to these requirements and recommendations is the responsibility of the Curriculum Committee. The voting membership of the Curriculum Committee consists of one faculty member

from each academic department plus the registrar.

Specialized program accreditation is maintained with the following accrediting bodies: Accreditation Commission for Education in Nursing (ACEN) with conditions, Commission on Dental Accreditation (CODA), Accreditation Council for Business Schools & Programs (ACBSP), National Center for Construction Education and Research (NCCER), and National Automotive Technician Education Foundation (NATEF). Current status was confirmed through review of the most recent reports and statuses listed on the accrediting bodies' websites.

Courses and applicable course learning outcomes (CLOs) are mapped to program learning outcomes. These maps are present in the WEAVE platform for all programs and include the assessment connection to the New Mexico Department of Higher Education General Education Common Core that includes five general competencies. NMDHE has recently revised the requirements for the common core, and institutions will have until fall 2020 to provide the updated course proposals to meet the requirements. LCC has developed a timeline and plan to meet this deadline.

Based upon conversations with staff, examination of syllabi, and examination of personnel files, it is evident that LCC follows the same processes and requirements for all courses regardless of instructor, delivery method or course location. Online courses are subject to review by college faculty who are Quality Matters certified reviewers. Student learning resources are available to all students regardless of the course delivery method and include program area advisors, a 24/7 help desk, tutoring labs, computer labs, library resources, technology centers, study areas, and peer-to-peer support.

Graduate success is mainly an informal process where programs reach out to the graduates to determine if they are working in their field of study or if they have continued their education. Some programs maintain alumni contact via social media. Surveys are completed by graduates prior to the graduation ceremony to obtain information about the students' plans and contact information. As a result of meeting with the Assessment Committee, the review team learned that a more systematic, institution-wide process for evaluating graduate success will be implemented by the newly appointed Institutional Research Director.

The review team concludes concerns related to Core Component 4.A. indicated in the formal HLC notification dated July 9, 2018, have been addressed or are being adequately addressed.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No interim monitoring recommended.

4.B - Core Component 4.B

The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.

1. The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.
2. The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.
3. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.
4. The institution's processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff members.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Luna Community College faculty and staff continually strive to improve the assessment of student learning processes. Prior to this review, LCC had in place a process to develop and maintain program mappings of course learning outcomes to program learning outcomes. Annually, faculty from each program review the assessment data and present the results to the academic leadership.

During the past year, an Assessment Committee has been formed to combine the departmental processes to provide an institution-wide focus to student learning assessment. The Assessment Committee researched and selected WEAVE assessment software as the platform to standardize the assessment data collection process and to provide linkages among statewide general education requirements, program outcomes, and course outcomes. Two faculty members have been responsible for populating the WEAVE platform with the general education outcomes, program outcomes, and course outcomes for all programs and provided a detailed demonstration for the review team (see 4A). The data entry process is now complete and faculty are beginning to use the software to collect and ultimately report on student learning progress. Professional development in the use of the WEAVE system is ongoing with two additional sessions scheduled for spring 2019.

The New Mexico Higher Education Department (NMHED) determines the common core of general education courses for all colleges and universities in New Mexico. NMHED recently revised the common core and LCC has until September of 2020 to make any necessary adjustments to the general education courses. NMHED defines five essential skills to be met by the general education core. These skills include: communication, critical thinking, information and digital literacy, quantitative reasoning, and personal and social responsibility. LCC has incorporated all of these essential skills into the WEAVE platform with a plan to assess the first three skills this academic year and incorporate the other two skills by 2020.

In addition to the student learning assessment results indicated through the WEAVE software, many program learning outcomes are validated through external evaluation sources including SkillsUSA

competitions, Welding (AWS) certifications, ServSafe certifications, OSHA certifications, Snap-On tool certifications, and licensing in the nursing and dental programs.

Faculty in all programs are involved with the student learning assessment processes. Conversations with faculty members indicate student learning assessment has led to changing the capstone course in the business programs, providing additional credentialing options for students in career and technical education programs, and contributing to the development of the summer bridge program for developmental education.

Although the college has made a great deal of progress in assessing student learning at the course, program and general education levels, it appears as though little has been done to assess student learning achievement in the co-curricular areas. As mentioned in 4A, the college is beginning to establish a process for the review of co-curricular and educational support units. Additionally, limited co-curricular assessment is conducted through student competitions, including SkillsUSA, and participation in student government.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

4.C - Core Component 4.C

The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs.

1. The institution has defined goals for student retention, persistence, and completion that are ambitious but attainable and appropriate to its mission, student populations, and educational offerings.
2. The institution collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence, and completion of its programs.
3. The institution uses information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs to make improvements as warranted by the data.
4. The institution's processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs reflect good practice. (Institutions are not required to use IPEDS definitions in their determination of persistence or completion rates. Institutions are encouraged to choose measures that are suitable to their student populations, but institutions are accountable for the validity of their measures.)

Rating

Met

Evidence

The review team met with members of the Assessment Committee, Recruitment and Completion Committee, Curriculum Committee, Institutional Research Director and other academic administrators to discuss student retention, persistence and completion. These groups provided concrete examples of the commitment to educational improvement within a very student-centered environment. Through review of committee minutes, program reports, data reports and conversations, the review team observed a high level of attention by faculty and staff in addressing student retention, persistence and completion.

The Retention and Completion Committee, with sub-committees for tutoring, advising, distance education, and recruitment, reports to the Assessment Committee. A detailed three-year student retention and completion action plan has been developed and implemented. The action plan is directly tied to the new strategic plan and details focus areas, reporting procedures, and assigns responsibility for each area to the appropriate sub-committee. New retention initiatives include the hiring of seven new academic advisors, one for each academic department, which was completed in fall 2018. Additional steps taken include appointing an Institutional Research Director, conducting student retention surveys, expanding and improving tutoring services, maximizing access to improved online services and standardizing advising processes.

The previous HLC review team noted a lack of institutional leadership related to data collection and decision making. The newly appointed Institutional Research Director has begun compiling data from several sources to present accurate reports and usable data sets to departments, the Retention and Completion Committee, the Assessment Committee, shared governance committees,

and administration. The Fact Book and dedicated web page provide high-level institutional data as well as program enrollment and completion data. LCC is now using data to lead program and course offering decisions. Based upon review of data, the institution has suspended several certificate level programs and an Associate of General Studies degree based upon low enrollments and a lack of transfer opportunities.

The previous HLC review team also indicated the student retention goals set by LCC appeared to be unattainable. However, the Assessment Committee and the faculty are convinced that the retention targets they have set are attainable and point to the improved fall 2018 to spring 2019 retention rate of 77.8 percent. The target for fall to spring retention was set at 80 percent, and while it was not met this year, the current fall to spring retention rate does reflect a 12.4 percent increase over the previous year. This leads to the conclusion that the college may attain a 10 percent increase in fall 2018 to fall 2019 retention. However, many of the college's retention initiatives, as listed above, are newly implemented, and retention targets may need to be adjusted after the fall enrollment numbers are finalized.

It was also noted by the previous HLC review team that classes were being cancelled after the start of the term. The review team requested a list of all cancelled courses for the current academic year and found the list to be of acceptable length. The vice president of instruction also described how program directors are working on pathways for each program and that administration is actively reducing the number of selective and elective courses offered each term with the end result of fewer course cancellations. Students indicated there were a few instances of having a class cancelled, but they had been accommodated by another course section. The review team concludes this issue has largely been resolved.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

4.S - Criterion 4 - Summary

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

Evidence

Luna Community College meets the requirements of Criterion 4. The College has continued to improve its program review process and should be successful in connecting program review to the general education and course outcome assessment processes using the new WEAVE platform. Programs are at different stages of completion with this project; however, the college should be able to have all programs functioning in the system by the end of the calendar year. The college has processes in place to ensure the quality of credit it accepts and awards across different disciplines and modes of delivery. The college has markedly improved its commitment to education improvement through the use of data to inform decisions and improve academic programs and course offerings. At this time, the College is in the early stages of establishing assessment systems and processes for co-curricular and non-academic (educational support) units and activities.

5 - Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

5.A - Core Component 5.A

The institution's resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

1. The institution has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered.
2. The institution's resource allocation process ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas or disbursement of revenue to a superordinate entity.
3. The goals incorporated into mission statements or elaborations of mission statements are realistic in light of the institution's organization, resources, and opportunities.
4. The institution's staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.
5. The institution has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expense.

Rating

Not Met

Evidence

Luna Community College does not meet Core Component 5A regarding the ability of its resources to support "its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future." Although the institution has developed a new three-year strategic plan, there is no evidence of a multi-year financial plan to support the plan. According to the LCC Fact Book, overall enrollment was 1,657 students in the fall of 2013 and 1,093 students in the fall of 2018, a decline of more than 34 percent over five years translating into a sharp decline in tuition revenue. Moreover, the college's enrollment projections (including both new and continuing students) do not appear feasible given current enrollment trends and regional demographic patterns. (However, as noted in 4C, LCC is making considerable progress in improving student retention rates).

The majority of the college's revenues are received annually in an allocation from the state via a formula based on a three-year moving average of enrollment, as well as supplemental state dollars for designated expenditures including retention and completion, capital and nursing programs. This three-year rolling average formula has mitigated the impact of the institution's declining enrollment. In concert with the annual state appropriations process, the college uses an annual incremental

budgeting process.

In addition to its lack of budget projections, the review team received reports of alleged purchasing and personnel practices that conflict with best practices in these areas (see Criterion 2 for specific examples).

Repeated material weaknesses relative to the college's Foundation also remain in the FY2018 audit report. Although the college secured accounting assistance to allow it to close the Foundation books for 2018, no progress has been made in re-creating the organizational structure or developing the necessary legal documents to define its relationship to the college. Further, no scholarships have been distributed for at least the past three years. The Foundation's potential ability to effectively support the college is further called into question by newspaper reports that the State Attorney General is investigating the former Foundation director for possible money laundering, racketeering, fraud, forgery and embezzlement involving the Foundation and issued a related search warrant in November 2018. LCC's past interim president, chief financial officer and one member of the former Foundation Board confirmed that the case remains active, and also reported that the former director has filed suit against the Foundation regarding his termination. The absence of a complete Foundation Board is complicating resolution of all these matters and preventing the Foundation from contributing student financial assistance. The college's Board of Trustees confirmed the current status and issues relative to the Foundation; however, board members stated that they had no ability to influence or change the current situation.

The college's CFI for 2018 is above the review zone at 1.14 when the impact of GASB 68 is included and it is 6.49 (well above the review zone) when those obligations are removed. However, for both FY2017 and FY2018, the college reported declines in net position of approximately \$400,000 each year in their statements of revenues, expenses, and changes in net position.

The college is looking to commission a facilities master plan, but currently prioritizes its capital needs on an annual basis. The college lacks a capital equipment renewal plan. While the facilities director has identified needed building and land improvements and renovations, the amount of deferred maintenance, while appearing significant from observations of the grounds, has not been quantified. Capital needs are funded by a modest annual appropriation from the state (primarily for equipment) and a state process requiring proposals to the Department of Education, which vets and determines the amount and type of funding to be allotted among all state higher education institutions.

Although the college reports the acquisition of federal and state grant funds and staffs a grants position in the Finance office, the review team noted the lack of TRIO funding, Perkins funding and other forms of federal and private grants. It should be noted that Perkins funding was not renewed when the organization went on show cause. Staff members mentioned that the college used to be more active in grant writing, and the college appears well-positioned, based on its geography, student demographics and career and technical education programs, to apply for additional grant funding. As described above, the current situation with the Foundation makes it extremely difficult for the college to engage in any type of fundraising.

From a personnel perspective, the college appears modestly though adequately staffed. The recent addition of seven academic advisors provides needed student services as well as some additional instruction. Because of its rural location and limited finances, faculty leaders and administrators report difficulty in finding appropriately credentialed faculty, particularly in areas such as nursing and accounting. Faculty and staff are provided both with local in-service opportunities as well as

professional development through attendance at state, regional and national conferences.

The institution has processes in place for budgeting and for monitoring expenses. Beginning in January 2019, senior leaders developed a new process that departments will follow to align department objectives, budget requests and associated reporting with the Strategic Plan 2019-2021. On January 11, 2019, department managers attended a workshop where this process was explained, and this new budget process has been implemented beginning in the spring semester of 2019. However, at this time, it is too early to evaluate the effectiveness of this process.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

5.B - Core Component 5.B

The institution's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.

1. The governing board is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight of the institution's financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities.
2. The institution has and employs policies and procedures to engage its internal constituencies—including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff, and students—in the institution's governance.
3. Administration, faculty, staff, and students are involved in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort.

Rating

Not Met

Evidence

As mentioned previously, LCC has and employs policies and procedures to engage its internal constituencies, including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff, and students, in the institution's governance through its shared governance groups and the newly created Shared Governance Council. The review team documented that administration, faculty and staff are involved in setting academic requirements, policies, and processes through collaborative efforts, and a great deal of progress has been made in the academic areas of the college since the last HLC review as described in previous sections of this report.

However, the Board of Trustees and senior administration at the college have been in flux for several years. In February 2019, the interim president, hired in 2017 to shepherd the college to its new permanent president, left the college although the presidential search was incomplete. The vice president of instruction was then appointed to the role for a short time. Two weeks prior to the review team's visit, Dr. Rolando Rael was appointed president by a 3 to 2 vote of the Board of Trustees. At approximately this same time, two board members resigned in protest; notably two other Board members resigned earlier in 2018, one because he relocated to another state and one because of Board dissension.

The 3 to 2 split vote on the hiring of the new president reflects on-going dissension among Board members. The lack of Board consensus on major issues and concerns is creating a "disempowered" workforce according to some administrators, faculty and staff who spoke to team members. The presence of Board members at meetings with the review team led employees to request a separate meeting without Board members whose presence they believed limited their ability to speak freely (see Criterion 2).

Faculty and staff expressed concerns about a lack of transparency and integrity in the presidential search process. While representatives of the new shared governance structure (Faculty Senate and

Staff Advisory Senate) were engaged in initial phases of the search, both faculty and staff expressed concerns that without continued external pressure and HLC oversight shared governance might be ignored in the future. The review team observed, from recordings of Board meetings, that the Board is still wrestling with understanding appropriate meeting protocols as well as the interaction between themselves, the shared governance groups and their representatives. Board members appear to be struggling with how to appropriately engage the faculty and staff governance representatives. For example, faculty and staff representatives were involved in interviews of candidates to fill Board positions vacated in 2018, but the Board chairman indicated that this process may not be utilized to fill current vacancies. The current Board policy states that "all vacancies caused in any other manner than by the expiration of the term of office shall be filled by appointment by the remaining members."

Some, but not all, Board members have attended short training sessions, one led by an ACCT consultant. Board members in attendance in the meeting with the review team acknowledge the need for continued training but were unable to articulate specific topics beyond parliamentary procedure. The Board chair advocates mandatory training for Board members but stated that lacking such a policy, the dynamics of the Board may change priorities. This is consistent with input received from college administrators that Board members are "struggling with the limitations of their roles." For example, in discussion with Board members, the schedule, purpose and responsibilities of the Audit/Finance Committee were not well understood. Moreover, the Board member present who serves on the committee was unaware that the committee serves as the institution's Audit as well as Finance Committee. The Board's lack of knowledge or concern relative to the ongoing problems of the college's Foundation was also disconcerting.

The Board is involved in approval of the annual budget but has not engaged in long-term financial or facilities planning (see 5A). With the hiring of the Director of Institutional Research in 2018, the Board has begun to receive data from which to make evidence-based decisions. However, Board members interviewed were unable to provide examples of decisions or improvements made as a result of data review or analysis.

Despite the college's serious governance and financial issues, administrators, faculty, staff, and students are involved in setting academic requirements, policies, and processes. Board members, including the chair, stated several times that the president is their only employee. and they are not involved in academic or personnel issues. The review team did not learn of situations where the Board was inappropriately engaged in specific academic matters.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.C - Core Component 5.C

The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.

1. The institution allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities.
2. The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.
3. The planning process encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups.
4. The institution plans on the basis of a sound understanding of its current capacity. Institutional plans anticipate the possible impact of fluctuations in the institution's sources of revenue, such as enrollment, the economy, and state support.
5. Institutional planning anticipates emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization.

Rating

Met With Concerns

Evidence

Luna Community College meets Core Component 5C with concerns. As described in 1A, numerous steps have been taken to improve the college's planning processes and resource allocation strategies. It is too early in the process, however, to determine if the stated plans will be fully developed, implemented and evaluated. At this time, the review team found little evidence that the institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.

Although the college engaged in a robust process for development its new Strategic Plan 2019-2021, materials supplied in the Assurance Argument and discussions with campus administrators provided no evidence that a comprehensive environmental scan or assessment of developing factors had been included as part of the planning process. These factors include declining population in the college's service area, a changing regional economy, and increasing globalization. For example, although there was information provided relative to current and projected declines in the population of surrounding communities, that information was not interpreted or used to formulate strategies for student recruitment beyond a goal statement about "working in partnership" with K-12 schools, employers and other agencies. Although a few programs with no or low enrollments were removed, new programs were not included in the plan to address evolving local, state and regional economies.

The college's mission did not change during the recent strategic planning process; however, the guiding principles were updated and reflect a greater commitment to cultural diversity. The strategic plan goals are articulated in largely measurable terms; however, as noted above, it is unclear how the college will manage to increase enrollments given the current and projected demographics. In general, at this time, each goal in the plan lacks specific strategies that will be utilized, or action steps that will be taken, to reach that goal.

The development of the Strategic Plan 2019-2021 did include reaching out to community members through a survey instrument to secure their input. Internal stakeholders, including administrators, faculty and staff members, participated in the plan's development, and individuals from these internal constituencies continue to provide oversight of the implementation of the plan through the Strategic Planning and Institutional Research Committee.

In January 2019, a new process to link department budget requests and related reporting to the strategic plan was shared with faculty and staff. The review team learned that the college is in the process of developing the FY2020 budget using the strategic plan as a device for screening departmental budget requests. The budget request document has been revised to align with the strategic plan and to incorporate information from unit program reviews, when available. However, when asked about enrollment projections, which have been noticeably optimistic in the past (forecasting growth despite population declines in area communities and continued declines in attendance), the chief financial officer was unable to explain projections for upcoming years and admitted that the institution "keeps planning for growth." Consequently, it is too early to discern the efficacy of the new budget strategy and process, due to the year-long cycle from budget development to implementation to evaluation.

Faculty and staff expressed hope that there will be quarterly or semiannually reviews of progress against the goals with analysis of which activities are successful, which are not and why. Board members also expressed the desire to incorporate the strategic plan and progress toward goals into an effective instrument to evaluate the president.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.D - Core Component 5.D

The institution works systematically to improve its performance.

1. The institution develops and documents evidence of performance in its operations.
2. The institution learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its component parts.

Rating

Met With Concerns

Evidence

Luna Community College meets Core Component 5D with concerns as this core component requires evidence of an institutional culture of performance improvement and translation of past results into improved capabilities and enhanced sustainability. In the Assurance Argument, the institution provides a list of activities that have been recently undertaken as well as a list of surveys and reports. Many recent improvements, including a new shared governance framework, faculty credentialing, academic program review, assessment of student learning outcomes and attention to factors that impact student retention and completion (including the addition of numerous advisors), stem from HLC communications stating these areas needed to be addressed. The results of student surveys were also used to inform some of these improvements.

Discussions with faculty members, administrators and the relatively new director of institutional research indicate that there is a fledgling culture of data-informed decision-making. The recently implemented strategic plan includes metrics for assessing progress. These metrics are tied to the targets submitted to the New Mexico Independent Community Colleges (NMICC), a collective of independently governed community colleges and liaison to the Department of Education. NMICC shares comparative data from its eight member institutions in annual reports published on its website. Similar information is available on the college's website and, new in 2019, in the Institutional Fact Book.

The college is actively working to improve the linkage between planning and budgeting. As described in 1A, in January 2019, a new strategic plan, along with a revised budget reporting process, was implemented to ensure consistency across curricular and co-curricular departments. Although departments have traditionally aligned budget requests with the college's strategic plan, there were inconsistencies in reporting that should be address with the new process.

The institutional research director is also working to improve institutional reporting through improved data management and analysis. She reports that she is working with staff in the registrar's office to clarify data definitions to provide for improved reporting capabilities and is also working to educate users on the use of data to improve operations. For example, a week prior to the visit, she presented a new report to the Retention and Completion Committee that shows members how to use the data they have been gathering to identify actionable improvement steps.

In summary, core components of the HLC criteria that were previously evaluated as "met with concerns" or "unmet" have been serving as the blueprint for improvements across the college. In addition, pockets of faculty and staff in some programs and offices throughout the college are using data to better schedule courses, monitor student loan re-payments, determine the viability of specific academic programs and track graduate success. The college uses a number of tools, including surveys and reports, to collect and share data with internal stakeholders. However, at this time, the review team observed few substantial changes resulting from the use of data to inform programmatic or operational improvements. Particularly concerning was the fact that members of the Board of Trustees could not describe any decisions they had made based on data or reports that were shared with them by college administrators.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.S - Criterion 5 - Summary

The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

Evidence

Luna Community College has initiated some new processes and practices to better assure alignment of resources with mission and outcomes. However, the college continues to budget on an annual basis and provided no evidence of strategic thinking relative to the major external forces impacting higher education, including demographic changes, economics, globalization or technology. Since the majority of the new planning and budgeting processes were initiated in the past three months, it is too early in their implementation to ascertain if they will be successfully maintained and effectively utilized to improve the institution and enhance student success. Significant declines in enrollment, combined with minimal grant activity and an inactive Foundation, are creating decreased revenue streams for the college. Reported strains between internal stakeholder groups, including the Board of Trustees, administration, faculty and staff, further challenge the college's ability to plan for its future.

Review Dashboard

Number	Title	Rating
1	Mission	
1.A	Core Component 1.A	Met
1.B	Core Component 1.B	Met
1.C	Core Component 1.C	Met
1.D	Core Component 1.D	Met
1.S	Criterion 1 - Summary	
2	Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct	
2.A	Core Component 2.A	Not Met
2.B	Core Component 2.B	Met
2.C	Core Component 2.C	Met With Concerns
2.D	Core Component 2.D	Met With Concerns
2.E	Core Component 2.E	Met
2.S	Criterion 2 - Summary	
3	Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support	
3.A	Core Component 3.A	Met
3.B	Core Component 3.B	Met
3.C	Core Component 3.C	Met
3.D	Core Component 3.D	Met
3.E	Core Component 3.E	Met
3.S	Criterion 3 - Summary	
4	Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement	
4.A	Core Component 4.A	Met
4.B	Core Component 4.B	Met
4.C	Core Component 4.C	Met
4.S	Criterion 4 - Summary	
5	Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness	
5.A	Core Component 5.A	Not Met
5.B	Core Component 5.B	Not Met
5.C	Core Component 5.C	Met With Concerns
5.D	Core Component 5.D	Met With Concerns
5.S	Criterion 5 - Summary	

Review Summary

Conclusion

Luna Community College has made significant progress in addressing the serious concerns outlined in the July 9, 2018, letter from the Higher Learning Commission. The college has spent the past several months engaged in a comprehensive strategic planning process that resulted in the new Strategic Plan 2019-2021. In addition, the review team documented substantial improvements in the areas of faculty qualifications, diversity, community outreach, academic program review, assessment of student outcomes, and student retention and completion. Faculty members are involved in all of these academic initiatives and are taking this work very seriously. The review team also met with a large number of students who appeared to very satisfied with the education they are receiving as well as their opportunities for community engagement.

However, despite the implementation of a new shared governance structure, board training sessions and several new Board policies, the review team found evidence that concerns remain relative to the integrity of the Board of Trustees. These concerns are related to shared governance, ethics, transparency, freedom of expression and an oppressive work environment for some employees. For example, a number of faculty members, staff members and administrators were critical of the extended presidential search process that ended with the appointment of an internal candidate and the resignation of two Board members. Board members acknowledged the search process encountered numerous setbacks and one Board member labeled it a failure.

Faculty and staff members who asked to meet privately with the review team shared a number of concerns about behaviors of individual Board members including favoritism, sexism, bullying, and retaliation. These faculty and staff members also stated that individual Board members often direct personnel and activities at the college creating a climate of fear and distrust. When interviewed, Board members stated repeatedly that they only manage one employee, the president, and that they do not interfere in the daily activities of the college. The Board chair appeared to believe many employee issues stemmed from poor communication. It is evident that expectations, roles and responsibilities of all parties involved in shared governance require clarification and that communication channels need to be improved.

Finance also continues to be an issue for the college. According to the LCC Fact Book, overall enrollment was 1,657 students in the fall of 2013 and 1,093 students in the fall of 2018, a decline of more than 34 percent over five years translating into a sharp decline in tuition revenue. Although new enrollment projections are optimistic, they are not supported by regional demographics, specific strategies or additional resources to recruit additional students. Further, the college lists grant funding as one of the goals in its strategic plan; however, grants are not a major component of the college's current budget. The college's Foundation continues to be inactive due to unresolved financial and legal issues.

Although the college does produce an annual budget, the review team found no evidence of long-term financial planning or any type of long-term facilities planning. The institution does not meet Assumed Practice D.3, "The institution has future financial projections addressing its long-term sustainability," for reasons cited earlier in the report under Criterion Five, Core Component 5. A. Moreover, when interviewed, both individually and as a group, Board members did not appear to be very knowledgeable or engaged in financial matters, including the ongoing situation with the college Foundation. Finally, as noted by the previous review team, "the linkage of budgeting to student learning, evaluations of operations and planning is in its infancy."

Relative to the Federal Compliance Worksheet, the review team found deficiencies in two areas. Under Title IV

Program Responsibilities, the team found deficiencies in the college's financial responsibility requirements (as described above) and student loan default rates as the current default rate is more than twice the national average and continues to increase. Under Review of Student Outcomes Data, the team found that the college is not entering data into the College Scorecard.

In summary, in addition to the compliance issues described above, the review team found the following Core Components to be Unmet: 2.A, 5A and 5B. Moreover, the following Core Components were found to be Met with Concerns: 2C, 2D, 5C and 5D.

Overall Recommendations

Criteria For Accreditation

Not Met

Sanctions Recommendation

Not Applicable to This Review

Pathways Recommendation

Not Applicable to This Review

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.



Federal Compliance Worksheet for Evaluation Teams

Evaluation of Federal Compliance Components

This worksheet is to be completed by a Federal Compliance reviewer or by the peer review team that conduct the on-site visit. If a Federal Compliance reviewer completes the form, the reviewer will evaluate the materials in advance of the visit and refer any issues to the team for further exploration and confirmation. The team chair will confirm that the team has reviewed the Federal Compliance reviewer's findings, make any necessary adjustments to the worksheet following the on-site visit, and submit the worksheet as part of the team's final report.

The Federal Compliance reviewer or the team should review each item identified in the *Federal Compliance Filing by Institutions* (FCFI) and document their findings in the appropriate spaces below. Peer reviewers are expected to supply a rationale for each section of the Federal Compliance Evaluation. Refer to the [Federal Compliance Overview](#) for information about applicable HLC policies and explanations of each requirement.

Generally, if the team finds in the course of this review that there are substantive issues related to the institution's ability to fulfill the Criteria for Accreditation, such issues should be raised in the appropriate parts of the team report. If the team recommends monitoring on a Federal Compliance Requirement in the form of a report or focused visit, the recommendation should be included in the Federal Compliance monitoring sections below and added to the appropriate section of the team report.

Submission Instructions

Federal Compliance reviewer: Email this worksheet and the *Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours* in an editable format to the team chair. The team chair's email address is provided in the Assurance System.

Team chair: Send the draft of this worksheet and the *Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours* to the HLC staff liaison for review and then to the institution for corrections of errors of fact. Submit the final worksheets to HLC at finalreports@hlcommission.org.

Institution under review: Luna Community College

Please indicate who completed this worksheet:

- Evaluation team
- Federal Compliance reviewer

To be completed by the evaluation team chair if a Federal Compliance reviewer conducted this part of the evaluation:

Name: Dr. Julie Furst-Bowe

I confirm that the evaluation team reviewed the findings provided in this worksheet.

Assignment of Credits, Program Length and Tuition

(See FCFI Questions 1–3 and Appendix A)

1. Complete the [Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours](#). Submit the completed worksheet with this form.
 - Identify the institution's principal degree levels and the number of credit hours for degrees at each level (see the institution's Appendix A if necessary). The following minimum number of credit hours should apply at a semester institution:
 - Associate's degrees = 60 hours
 - Bachelor's degrees = 120 hours
 - Master's or other degrees beyond the bachelor's = At least 30 hours beyond the bachelor's degree
 - Note that 1 quarter hour = 0.67 semester hour.
 - Any exceptions to this requirement must be explained and justified.
 - Review any differences in tuition reported for different programs and the rationale provided for such differences.
2. Check the response that reflects the evaluation team or Federal Compliance reviewer's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

LCC requires 30 semester credit hours of course work for certificate programs and 60 semester credit hours of course work for associate degree programs (Associate of Arts, Associate of Science and Associate of Applied Science). There are no differences in tuition for specific programs. This information was verified by a review of program plans at the college. Class meeting times for 8-week and 4-week compressed terms were also verified by the team at the college as two of these compressed courses appeared to require excessive classroom or

contact hours. The institution documented that the 4-credit Nursing Assistant Training course meets for 81 hours in an 8-week time period to ensure that each student is prepared for the New Mexico Nurse's Aid Certification Examination at the conclusion of the course. The 4-credit Commercial Driver's License Lab course includes 128 contact hours of lab and road activity including inspecting, testing, operating and driving various vehicles in various road conditions. This course prepares students to meet the requirements for a commercial driver's license.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Institutional Records of Student Complaints

(See FCFI Questions 4–7 and Appendixes B and C)

1. Verify that the institution has documented a process for addressing student complaints and appears to be systematically processing such complaints, as evidenced by the data on student complaints since the last comprehensive evaluation.
 - Review the process that the institution uses to manage complaints, its complaints policy and procedure, and the history of complaints received and resolved since the last comprehensive evaluation by HLC.
 - Determine whether the institution has a process to review and resolve complaints in a timely manner.
 - Verify that the evidence shows that the institution can, and does, follow this process and that it is able to integrate any relevant findings from this process into improvements in services or in teaching and learning.
 - Advise the institution of any improvements that might be appropriate.
 - Consider whether the record of student complaints indicates any pattern of complaints or otherwise raises concerns about the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation or Assumed Practices.
2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The College presented a gradually stepped systematic process for the review and resolution of student complaints in a timely manner. This process has been documented in the Student Handbook (Appendix B) and referred to in the Grievances section of the attached College Catalog (Supplement B1; page13). There were five cases of student complaints logged in between the period of July 2018 and January 2019 (Appendix C). Conversations with students indicated that, in general, they were not familiar with this formal complaint process. However, given the size of the college, most students interviewed could describe where they would go to have a concern addressed citing faculty members or offices in students services.

However, the logged complaint data does not provide any meaningful information about the cause of student complaint other than stating the mere category of the incident nor does it provide any information describing how the issue was resolved. For example, four of the five student complaints the team reviewed fell in the 'harassment' category; however, the nature of these alleged harassment incidents has not been properly captured in the logged table.

After discussions with College administrators who are involved in the process, the team believes there is an opportunity for improvement relative to regularly distributing and reviewing the complaint data. The collected student complaint data could be shared and analyzed and with appropriate college leaders on a periodic basis with the objectives of identifying trends and patterns and improving college policies, processes and the overall environment for teaching and learning.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Publication of Transfer Policies

(See FCFI Questions 8–10 and Appendixes D–F)

1. Verify that the institution has demonstrated it is appropriately disclosing its transfer policies to students and to the public. Policies should contain information about the criteria the institution uses to make transfer decisions.
 - Review the institution's transfer policies.
 - Review any articulation agreements the institution has in place, including articulation agreements at the institution level and for specific programs and how the institution publicly discloses information about those articulation agreements.
 - Consider where the institution discloses these policies (e.g., in its catalog, on its website) and how easily current and prospective students can access that information.
 - Determine whether the disclosed information clearly explains any articulation arrangements the institution has with other institutions. The information the institution provides to students should explain any program-specific articulation agreements in place and should clearly identify program-specific articulation agreements as such. Also, the information the institution provides should include whether the articulation agreement anticipates that the institution (1) accepts credits from the other institution(s) in the articulation agreement; (2) sends credits to the other institution(s) in the articulation agreements; (3) both offers and accepts credits with the institution(s) in the articulation agreement; and (4) what specific credits articulate through the agreement (e.g., general

education only; pre-professional nursing courses only; etc.). Note that the institution need not make public the entire articulation agreement, but it needs to make public to students relevant information about these agreements so that they can better plan their education.

- Verify that the institution has an appropriate process to align the disclosed transfer policies with the criteria and procedures used by the institution in making transfer decisions.
2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
- The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

LCC has well-established transfer policies that are articulated through its published 2019-2021 College Catalog (pages 34-35; Appendix B1) and institutional website (www.luna.edu/admissions). The transfer policy explicitly discloses the criteria used in transferring course credits from CHEA accredited institutions and the transfer credit appeal process. The transfer information is available to current and prospective students. The transfer policy is also available on the New Mexico Higher Education Department (NMHED) website. The institution has provided forms titled “Academic Transcript Quality Assurance” in Appendix F to authenticate that an appropriate process is followed to align transfer policies with the criteria and procedures used by the institution in making transfer decisions. The team chair also reviewed articulation agreements between LCC and state universities and found them to meet the requirements specified above.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Practices for Verification of Student Identity

(See FCFI Questions 11–16 and Appendix G)

1. Confirm that the institution verifies the identity of students who participate in courses or programs provided through distance or correspondence education. Confirm that it appropriately discloses

additional fees related to verification to students, and that the method of verification makes reasonable efforts to protect students' privacy.

- Determine how the institution verifies that the student who enrolls in a course is the same student who submits assignments, takes exams and earns a final grade. The team should ensure that the institution's approach respects student privacy.
- Check that any costs related to verification (e.g., fees associated with test proctoring) and charged directly to students are explained to the students prior to enrollment in distance or correspondence courses.

2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

- The institution meets HLC's requirements.
- The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
- The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
- The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

LCC uses secure student login and password credentialing through the institutional Learning Management System in order to ensure that the institution is awarding credit to the student who actually completes the course assignments and takes tests to demonstrate course proficiencies. However, the use of basic LMS credentials is a minimal deterrent against academic integrity violations. Currently, there is a wide array of effective and trusted authentication methods available including live proctoring and additional online identity verification tools. Personally identifiable challenge-based questions and biometric analysis methods that rely on physical characteristics of the student, including hand-drawn passwords and keystroke recognition, are additional possibilities.

Each student admitted to LCC is assigned to a unique Student Identification Number (SIN) that becomes part of the secure Student Identification System and the SIN is used for subsequent registration and course enrollment purpose. The College charges a \$25 per course Distance Education Fee that is disclosed in its Academic Policies and Procedures manual published in each semester as a part of the course schedule (Appendix G). FERPA training is made available to both new and continuing employees each year.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Title IV Program Responsibilities

(See FCFI Questions 17–24 and Appendixes H–Q)

1. This requirement has several components the institution must address.
 - The team should verify that the following requirements are met:
 - **General Program Requirements.** The institution has provided HLC with information about the fulfillment of its Title IV program responsibilities, particularly findings from any review activities by the Department of Education. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department has raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities.
 - **Financial Responsibility Requirements.** The institution has provided HLC with information about the Department's review of composite ratios and financial audits. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department has raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion 5 if an institution has significant issues with financial responsibility as demonstrated through ratios that are below acceptable levels or other financial responsibility findings by its auditor.)
 - **Default Rates.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its three-year default rate. It has a responsible program to work with students to minimize default rates. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department has raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. Note that for 2012 and thereafter, institutions and teams should be using the three-year default rate based on revised default rate data published by the Department in September 2012; if the institution does not provide the default rate for three years leading up to the comprehensive evaluation visit, the team should contact the HLC staff.
 - **Campus Crime Information, Athletic Participation and Financial Aid, and Related Disclosures.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution's policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations.
 - **Student Right to Know/Equity in Athletics.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution's policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The disclosures are accurate and provide appropriate information to students. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion 2, Core Component 2.A if the team determines that the disclosures are not accurate or appropriate.)
 - **Satisfactory Academic Progress and Attendance Policies.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The institution has demonstrated that the policies and practices meet state or federal requirements and that the institution is appropriately applying these policies and practices to students. In most cases, teams should verify that these policies exist and are available to students, typically in the course catalog or student handbook and online. Note that HLC does not necessarily require that the institution take attendance unless required to do so by state or federal regulations but does anticipate that institutional attendance policies will provide information to students about attendance at the institution.
 - **Contractual Relationships.** The institution has presented a list of its contractual relationships related to its academic programs and evidence of its compliance with

HLC policies requiring notification or approval for contractual relationships. (If the team learns that the institution has a contractual relationship that may require HLC approval and has not received HLC approval, the team must require that the institution complete and file the change request form as soon as possible. The team should direct the institution to review the Substantive Change Application for Programs Offered Through Contractual Arrangements on HLC's website for more information.)

- **Consortial Relationships.** The institution has presented a list of its consortial relationships related to its academic programs and evidence of its compliance with HLC policies requiring notification or approval for consortial relationships. (If the team learns that the institution has a consortial relationship that may require HLC approval and has not received HLC approval, the team must require that the institution complete and file the form as soon as possible. The team should direct the institution to review the Substantive Change Application for Programs Offered Through Consortial Arrangements on HLC's website for more information.)

- Review all of the information that the institution discloses having to do with its Title IV program responsibilities.
- Determine whether the Department has raised any issues related to the institution's compliance or whether the institution's auditor has raised any issues in the A-133 about the institution's compliance, and also look to see how carefully and effectively the institution handles its Title IV responsibilities.
- If the institution has been cited or is not handling these responsibilities effectively, indicate that finding within the Federal Compliance portion of the team report and whether the institution appears to be moving forward with the corrective action that the Department has determined to be appropriate.
- If issues have been raised concerning the institution's compliance, decide whether these issues relate to the institution's ability to satisfy the Criteria for Accreditation, particularly with regard to whether its disclosures to students are candid and complete and demonstrate appropriate integrity (*Core Components 2.A and 2.B*).

2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

- The institution meets HLC's requirements.
- The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
- The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
- The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion 5.A.

Rationale:

The institution provided information about the fulfillment of its Title IV program responsibilities. LCC appears to be fulfilling its responsibilities relative to Title IV and there are no issues reported from the Department of Education at this time.

Of greater concern are the overall finances of the college. The college's CFI for 2018 is barely above the review zone at 1.14 when the impact of GASB 68 is included, although it is 6.49 (well above the review zone) when those obligations are removed. For both FY2017 and FY2018, the college reported declines in net position of approximately \$400,000 each year in their statements of revenues, expenses, and changes in net position. Although the institution's 2017 CFI is above the zone, it can be concluded that the institution is in a worsening financial status both in terms of operating performance and overall performance between fiscal years 2016 and 2017.

The audit report for the 2018 fiscal year did identify one deficiency in internal control of financial reporting that could be considered as "material weakness" but disclosed no instances of non-compliance related material deficiency. In addition, the auditors provided unmodified opinion on material compliance of major federal programs and internal controls. The auditors found "significant deficiency" on control over Fixed Assets caused by improper booking of depreciation expenses. The institution continues to have unresolved financial and legal issues with its Foundation and the Foundation is not functional at this time.

Official student loan default rates have been provided for 2013 (25.3 percent), 2014 (24.2 percent) and 2015 (27 percent). The unofficial default rate for 2016 is 28.3 percent. Although the default rate is increasing, the number of students in default status is decreasing from 34 students in 2013 to 19 students in 2016. Although these default rates are significantly higher than national averages, they are comparable to peer institutions in New Mexico, and the institution claims that its default rates have not crossed the Departmental threshold or triggered a Department review. LCC has uploaded a default prevention service agreement (Appendix K) in engaging the New Mexico Student Loan Guarantee Corporation with student loan default management services. Interviews with the Financial Aid Director indicate that LCC is working aggressively with students to reduce the number of students entering default status.

LCC appropriately discloses campus crime information, athletic participation and financial aid information. LCC complies with Student Right to Know/Equity in Athletics regulations. LCC also provided information on Satisfactory Academic Progress and Attendance Policies. All of this information can be found on the institution's website, in the college catalog or in the student handbook. The institution has no contractual or consortial relationships at this time.

Additional monitoring, if any:

The institution's general financial situation, the status of the college Foundation and progress on reducing student default rates should be examined during the next HLC visit, preferably in one year.

Required Information for Students and the Public
(See FCFI Questions 25–27 and Appendixes R and S)

1. Verify that the institution publishes accurate, timely and appropriate information on institutional programs, fees, policies and related required information. Verify that the institution provides this required information in the course catalog and student handbook and on its website.
2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

LCC publishes accurate, timely and appropriate information on institutional programs, fees, policies and procedures and related required information. The required information is provided in the college catalog and student handbook.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Advertising and Recruitment Materials and Other Public Information

(See FCFI Questions 28–31 and Appendixes T and U)

1. Verify that the institution has documented that it provides accurate, timely and appropriately detailed information to current and prospective students and the public about its accreditation status with HLC and other agencies as well as about its programs, locations and policies.
 - Review the institution’s disclosure about its accreditation status with HLC to determine whether the information it provides is accurate, complete and appropriately formatted and contains HLC’s web address.
 - Review the institution’s disclosures about its relationship with other accrediting agencies for accuracy and for appropriate consumer information, particularly regarding the link between specialized/professional accreditation and the licensure necessary for employment in many professional or specialized areas.
 - Review the institution’s catalog, brochures, recruiting materials, website and information provided by the institution’s advisors or counselors to determine whether the institution provides accurate, timely and appropriate information to current and prospective students about its programs, locations and policies.
 - Verify that the institution correctly displays the Mark of Affiliation on its website.

2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

- The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
- The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
- The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
- The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

LCC discloses its accrediting relationship with the HLC and other accrediting agencies on its website with appropriate detail. The college provides accurate, timely and appropriately detailed information on its web site and in its recruitment and marketing materials to current and prospective students and to the public. The college has submitted a communication plan in Appendix U.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Review of Student Outcome Data

(See FCFI Questions 32–35 and Appendix V)

1. Review the student outcome data the institution collects to determine whether they are appropriate and sufficient based on the kinds of academic programs the institution offers and the students it serves.
 - Determine whether the institution uses this information effectively to make decisions about planning, academic program review, assessment of student learning, consideration of institutional effectiveness and other topics.
 - Review the institution’s explanation of its use of information from the College Scorecard, including student retention and completion and the loan repayment rate.
2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

- The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

LCC stated that it doesn't participate in College Scoreboard and therefore the federal metrics on student retention rate, graduation rate, and placement rate are not provided with federal compliance filings. However, the institution does maintain a Fact Book that includes student enrollment, retention and completion data for each department and program. The review team found evidence that this information was being used in the academic program review process and for making decision's on eliminating programs with low enrollments.

The college collects student learning outcomes data at the course level and accordingly each course syllabus is required to include course-level Student Learning Outcomes (SLO's) and artifacts that are used to measure those outcomes. The review team found evidence that data were being collected and student learning outcomes were being assessed at the course, program and general education levels.

Additional monitoring, if any:

LCC needs to begin using the College Scorecard to be in compliance relative to review of student outcomes data. This issue should be addressed at the time of the next HLC review.

Publication of Student Outcome Data

(See FCFI Questions 36–38)

1. Verify that the institution makes student outcome data available and easily accessible to the public. Data may be provided at the institutional or departmental level or both, but the institution must disclose student outcome data that address the broad variety of its programs.
 - Verify that student outcome data are made available to the public on the institution's website—for instance, linked to from the institution's home page, included within the top three levels of the website or easily found through a search of related terms on the website—and are clearly labeled as such.
 - Determine whether the publication of these data accurately reflects the range of programs at the institution.
2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

- The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The new LCC Fact Book includes student outcomes data, as described above, at the institutional and program levels. LCC also publishes course level Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) data on its website. The latest data are available for the Spring 2017 and there is a two-year gap between the final reported two data cycles (Spring 2015 and Spring 2017). However, student names appeared in some of the publicly disclosed student performance information, such as that of Introduction to Psychology (PSYC 101), which violates student privacy. It is recommended that all names be removed from student outcomes data that is publicly accessible.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Standing With State and Other Accrediting Agencies

(See FCFI Questions 39–40 and Appendixes W and X)

1. Verify that the institution discloses accurately to the public and HLC its relationship with any other specialized, professional or institutional accreditors and with all governing or coordinating bodies in states in which the institution may have a presence.

The team should consider any potential implications for accreditation by HLC of a sanction or loss of status by the institution with any other accrediting agency or of loss of authorization in any state.

Note: If the team is recommending initial or continued status, and the institution is now or has been in the past five years under sanction or show-cause with, or has received an adverse action (i.e., withdrawal, suspension, denial or termination) from, any other federally recognized specialized or institutional accreditor or a state entity, then the team must explain the sanction or adverse action of the other agency in the body of the assurance section of the team report and provide its rationale for recommending HLC status in light of this action.

- Review the list of relationships the institution has with all other accreditors and state governing or coordinating bodies, along with the evaluation reports, action letters and interim monitoring plans issued by each accrediting agency.
 - Verify that the institution's standing with state agencies and accrediting bodies is appropriately disclosed to students.
 - Determine whether this information provides any indication about the institution's capacity to meet HLC's Criteria for Accreditation. Should the team learn that the institution is at risk of losing, or has lost, its degree or program authorization in any state in which it meets state presence requirements, it should contact the HLC staff liaison immediately.
2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

- The institution meets HLC's requirements.
- The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
- The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
- The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

LCC appropriately disclosed its institutional and programmatic accreditation status on the college's website. The College is part of the enhanced fiscal oversight program with the New Mexico Higher Education Department (NMHED). The LCC Business program and Collision Repair and Refinishing Technician program are accredited by the Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP) and National Automotive Technicians Education Foundation (NATEF), respectively. The Nursing program is accredited with conditions by the Accreditation Commission for Education in Nursing (ACEN) and the Dental Assisting program is approved with reporting requirements by the Commission on Dental Accreditation (CODA).

Additional monitoring, if any:

Public Notification of Opportunity to Comment (FCFI Questions 41–43 and Appendix Y)

1. Verify that the institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third-party comments. The team should evaluate any comments received and complete any necessary follow-up on issues raised in these comments.

Note: If the team has determined that any issues raised by third-party comments relate to the team's review of the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation, it must discuss this information and its analysis in the appropriate section of its report in the Assurance System.

- Review information about the public disclosure of the upcoming visit, including copies of the institution's notices, to determine whether the institution made an appropriate and timely effort to notify the public and seek comments.
 - Evaluate the comments to determine whether the team needs to follow up on any issues through its interviews and review of documentation during the visit process.
2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

- The institution meets HLC's requirements.
- The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

- The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
- The evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

Although the college didn't initially realize they were required to solicit third-party comments for this visit, after a discussion with the HLC Liaison, LCC began soliciting third-party comments via its website on March 6, 2019. Comments were received through this process from employees, community members and students and these comments have been reviewed and incorporated into this report as appropriate.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Competency-Based Programs Including Direct Assessment Programs/Faculty-Student Engagement

(See FCFI Questions 44–47)

1. Verify that students and faculty in any direct assessment or competency-based programs offered by the institution have regular and substantive interactions: the faculty and students communicate on some regular basis that is at least equivalent to contact in a traditional classroom, and that in the tasks mastered to assure competency, faculty and students interact about critical thinking, analytical skills, and written and oral communication abilities, as well as about core ideas, important theories, current knowledge, etc. (Also, confirm that the institution has explained the credit hour equivalencies for these programs in the credit hour sections of the Federal Compliance Filing.)
 - Review the list of direct assessment or competency-based programs offered by the institution.
 - Determine whether the institution has effective methods for ensuring that faculty in these programs regularly communicate and interact with students about the subject matter of the course.
 - Determine whether the institution has effective methods for ensuring that faculty and students in these programs interact about key skills and ideas in the students' mastery of tasks to assure competency.
2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

- The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
- The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

Not applicable.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Institutional Materials Related to Federal Compliance Reviewed by the Team

Provide a list of materials reviewed here:

1. 2018 Student Handbook produced by Luna Community College – Student Success Center
2. 2019-2021 Luna Community College Catalog (Effective Spring 2019)
3. Spring 2018 & Fall 2018 Class Schedule
4. Admissions Brochure
5. Transfer of Credit Policy
6. New Mexico General Education Model
7. LCC General Education Core Curriculum
 - a. Associate of Applied Science (15 Credit Hours)
 - b. Associate of Arts (31 Credit Hours)
 - c. Associate of Science (31 Credit Hours)
8. Academic Transcript Quality Assurance Form
9. Academic Transcript Quality Assurance Worksheet
10. Transfer of Credit Evaluation
11. Spring 2019 Policies and Procedures
12. Financial Statements & Independent Auditors Report (June 30, 2018)
13. Notes to Financial Statements
14. Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting & on Compliance in Accordance with Government Auditing Standards
15. Consumer Information 2017-2018- Student Financial Assistance, Full Time First Time Freshmen Cohort Retention Rates, Graduation Rates, and Enrollment till 2016-2017, Default Rates for Fiscal Year 2013, 2014, 7 2015
16. Gainful Employment Disclosure https://luna.edu/gainful_employment_data/
17. Satisfactory Academic Progress Policy

18. Fall 2018 Student Learning Outcomes Achievement Report
19. Student Grievances Log
20. Institutional Credit Hour Policy
21. Luna Community College Communication Plan
22. Programmatic Accreditation Evaluation Reports- Accreditation Council for Business Schools & Programs, Commission on Dental Accreditation, Accreditation Commission for Education in Nursing, New Mexico Board of Nursing, National Automotive Technicians Education Foundation, and New Mexico Higher Education Department Enhanced Fiscal Oversight Program (July 2016)
23. The Luna Light
24. Public Comments
25. Website- <https://luna.edu/>



Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours

Institution Under Review: Luna Community College, New Mexico

Review the *Worksheet for Institutions on the Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours*, including all supplemental materials. Applicable sections and supplements are referenced in the corresponding sections and questions below.

Part 1. Institutional Calendar, Term Length and Type of Credit

Instructions

Review Section 1 of Appendix A. Verify that the institution has calendar and term lengths within the range of good practice in higher education.

Responses

A. Answer the Following Question

1. Are the institution's calendar and term lengths, including non-standard terms, within the range of good practice in higher education? Do they contribute to an academic environment in which students receive a rigorous and thorough education?

Yes No

Comments:

LCC offers courses in traditional seated and online asynchronous modalities within the 16-week fall and spring semesters in addition to compressed 8-week fall, spring, and summer calendar formats. These calendar and term lengths are consistent within the range of good practice in higher education. The students are expected to receive a rigorous and thorough education provided the courses are delivered by well-credentialed faculty.

B. Recommend HLC Follow-Up, If Appropriate

Is any HLC follow-up required related to the institution's calendar and term length practices?

Yes No

Rationale:

Identify the type of HLC monitoring required and the due date:

Part 2. Policy and Practices on Assignment of Credit Hours

Instructions

Review Sections 2–4 of the *Worksheet for Institutions on the Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours*, including supplemental materials as noted below. In assessing the appropriateness of the credit allocations provided by the institution the team should complete the following steps. The outcomes of the team’s review should be reflected in its responses below.

1. **Format of Courses and Number of Credits Awarded.** Review the *Form for Reporting an Overview of Credit Hour Allocations and Instructional Time for Courses* (Supplement A1 to the *Worksheet for Institutions*) completed by the institution, which provides an overview of credit hour assignments across institutional offerings and delivery formats.
2. Scan the course descriptions in the catalog and the number of credit hours assigned for courses in different departments at the institution (see Supplements B1 and B2 to *Worksheet for Institutions*, as applicable).
 - At semester-based institutions courses will be typically be from two to four credit hours (or approximately five quarter hours) and extend approximately 14–16 weeks (or approximately 10 weeks for a quarter). The descriptions in the catalog should reflect courses that are appropriately rigorous and have collegiate expectations for objectives and workload. Identify courses/disciplines that seem to depart markedly from these expectations.
 - Institutions may have courses that are in compressed format, self-paced, or otherwise alternatively structured. Credit assignments should be reasonable. (For example, as a full-time load for a traditional semester is typically 15 credits, it might be expected that the norm for a full-time load in a five-week term is 5 credits; therefore, a single five-week course awarding 10 credits would be subject to inquiry and justification.)
 - Teams should be sure to scan across disciplines, delivery mode and types of academic activities.
 - Federal regulations allow for an institution to have two credit-hour awards: one award for Title IV purposes and following the federal definition and one for the purpose of defining progression in and completion of an academic program at that institution. HLC procedure also permits this approach.

3. Scan course schedules to determine how frequently courses meet each week and what other scheduled activities are required for each course (see Supplement B3 to *Worksheet for Institutions*). Pay particular attention to alternatively structured or other courses completed in a short period of time or with less frequently scheduled interaction between student and instructor that have particularly high credit hour assignments.
4. Sampling. Teams will need to sample some number of degree programs based on the headcount at the institution and the range of programs it offers.
 - For the programs sampled, the team should review syllabi and intended learning outcomes for several courses, identify the contact hours for each course, and review expectations for homework or work outside of instructional time.
 - At a minimum, teams should anticipate sampling at least a few programs at each degree level.
 - For institutions with several different academic calendars or terms or with a wide range of academic programs, the team should expand the sample size appropriately to ensure that it is paying careful attention to alternative format and compressed and accelerated courses.
 - Where the institution offers the same course in more than one format, the team is advised to sample across the various formats to test for consistency.
5. **Direct Assessment or Competency-Based Programs.** Review the information provided by the institution regarding any direct assessment or competency-based programs that it offers, with regard to the learning objectives, policies and procedures for credit allocation, and processes for review and improvement in these programs.
6. **Policy on Credit Hours and Total Credit Hour Generation.** With reference to the institutional policies on the assignment of credit provided in Supplement A2 to *Worksheet for Institutions*, consider the following questions:
 - Does the institution's policy for awarding credit address all the delivery formats employed by the institution?
 - Does that policy address the amount of instructional or contact time assigned and homework typically expected of a student with regard to credit hours earned?
 - For institutions with courses in alternative formats or with less instructional and homework time than would be typically expected, does that policy also equate credit hours with intended learning outcomes and student achievement that could be reasonably achieved by a student in the time frame allotted for the course?
 - Is the policy reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that HLC will expect that credit hour policies at public

institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)

- If so, is the institution's assignment of credit to courses reflective of its policy on the award of credit?
 - Do the number of credits taken by typical undergraduate and graduate students, as well as the number of students earning more than the typical number of credits, fall within the range of good practice in higher education?
7. If the answers to the above questions lead the team to conclude that there may be a problem with the credit hours awarded the team should recommend the following:
- If the problem involves a poor or insufficiently detailed institutional policy, the team should call for a revised policy as soon as possible by requiring a monitoring report within no more than one year that demonstrates the institution has a revised policy and provides evidence of implementation.
 - If the team identifies an application problem and that problem is isolated to a few courses or a single department, division or learning format, the team should call for follow-up activities (a monitoring report or focused evaluation) to ensure that the problems are corrected within no more than one year.
 - If the team identifies systematic noncompliance across the institution with regard to the award of credit, the team should notify the HLC staff immediately and work with staff members to design appropriate follow-up activities. HLC shall understand systematic noncompliance to mean that the institution lacks any policies to determine the award of academic credit or that there is an inappropriate award of institutional credit not in conformity with the policies established by the institution or with commonly accepted practices in higher education across multiple programs or divisions or affecting significant numbers of students.

Worksheet on Assignment of Credit Hours

A. Identify the Sample Courses and Programs Reviewed by the Team

The following sample courses and academic programs were reviewed by the Federal Compliance Reviewer in determining adequacy of credit hour assignment policies and practices by the institution:

Associate in Applied Science (60 semester credit hours)

1. English Composition I (ENG 111 and ENG 111E- Distance Learning)
2. Principles of Microeconomics (ECON 209 and ECON 209E- Distance Learning)
3. General Chemistry I (CHEM 111 and CHEM 111L)
4. American History I (HIS 161 and HIS 161E Distance Education)

5. College Algebra (MATH 180 and MATH 180E- Distance Education)
6. Principles of Management (MGMT 207 and MGMT 207E- Distance Education)
7. Principles of Finance (BUS 120 and BUS 120E- Distance Education)
8. Principles of Nursing Practice (NRSG 1100)

Associate of Science (60 Semester Credit Hours)

1. Computer Use- Scientific Research (STEM 105)
2. Introduction to Computer Science (CS 105 and CS 105E- Distance Education)
3. Introduction to Engineering (STEM 117)

Associate of Arts (60 Semester Credit Hours)

1. Introduction to Business (BUS 105 and BUS 105E- Distance Education)
2. Introduction to Anthropology (ANTH 103 and ANTH 103E- Distance Education)
3. Child Growth, Development, & Learning (EDUC 201 T- Distance Education)

Certificate (30 Semester Credit Hours)

1. Medical Terminology (AH 113 and AH 113E- Distance Education)
2. Estimation for Collision Repair (CRT 140)
3. Cosmetology Theory IV (CSMT 239)

B. Answer the Following Questions

1. Institutional Policies on Credit Hours

- a. Does the institution's policy for awarding credit address all the delivery formats employed by the institution? (Note that for this question and the questions that follow an institution may have a single comprehensive policy or multiple policies.)

Yes No

Comments:

The LCC provided a definition of credit hours, which requires a minimum of 750 minutes of instructional time per semester or compressed term for each semester hour of credit award in a lecture course, whereas it requires 1,500 minutes of instruction time per semester or compressed term for each semester hour of credit award for a laboratory course.

- b. Does that policy relate the amount of instructional or contact time provided and homework typically expected of a student to the credit hours awarded for the classes offered in the delivery formats offered by the institution? (Note that an institution's policy must go beyond simply stating that it awards credit solely based on assessment of student learning and should also reference instructional time.)

Yes No

Comments:

The review of a selected sample of LCC course syllabi revealed that the expected out of class course preparation and homework time is limited to one hour per week for every hour of instructional contact time and this expected additional out of the class course preparation time falls under the traditional rule of thumb of two clock hours of preparation time per hour per week of instruction. In addition, the submitted course syllabi failed to show the necessary time adjustments for courses offered outside the scope of the 16-week semester schedule.

- c. For institutions with non-traditional courses in alternative formats or with less instructional and homework time than would be typically expected, does that policy equate credit hours with intended learning outcomes and student achievement that could be reasonably achieved by a student in the time frame and utilizing the activities allotted for the course?

Yes No

Comments:

The allotted time and activities in some of the courses, particularly those that are offered in online and compressed course delivery modes, are not consistent with the set course-level student learning outcomes and student achievements. However, these specific courses, which involved extensive laboratory and/or skills practice time were explained during the site visit. The LCC's credit hour policy needs to contain explicit statements regarding work expectations so that any course level deviation, as reflected in individual course syllabi, can be avoided

- d. Is the policy reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that HLC will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)

Yes No

Comments:

The instructional contact time set in the institutional credit hour policy is reasonable within the federal definition as well as a range of good practice in higher education.

2. Application of Policies

- a. Are the course descriptions and syllabi in the sample academic programs reviewed by the team appropriate and reflective of the institution's policy on the award of credit? (Note that HLC will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)

Yes No

Comments:

The course descriptions as reflected in the college catalog and the reviewed course syllabi in the sample academic degree programs are appropriate and reflective of the institution's policy to award credit.

However, occasionally, the course descriptions presented in the course syllabus such as that of the Principles of Finance course deviated from the catalog descriptions of the course.

b. Are the learning outcomes in the sample reviewed by the team appropriate to the courses and programs reviewed and in keeping with the institution's policy on the award of credit?

Yes No

Comments:

There are at least 4-5 student learning outcomes presented in each course syllabus and these learning outcomes are consistent with the institutional policy on the award of credit.

c. If the institution offers any alternative-delivery or compressed-format courses or programs, are the course descriptions and syllabi for those courses appropriate and reflective of the institution's policy on the award of academic credit?

Yes No

Comments:

There are no differences observed in terms of course descriptions and syllabi between the courses offered in differential delivery modes.

d. If the institution offers alternative-delivery or compressed-format courses or programs, are the learning outcomes reviewed by the team appropriate to the courses and programs reviewed and in keeping with the institution's policy on the award of credit? Are the learning outcomes reasonable for students to fulfill in the time allocated, such that the allocation of credit is justified?

Yes No

Comments:

There are no differences found in student learning outcomes between the courses offered in differential delivery modalities.

e. Is the institution's actual assignment of credit to courses and programs across the institution reflective of its policy on the award of credit and reasonable and appropriate within commonly accepted practice in higher education?

Yes No

Comments:

The institution's assignment of credit to course and programs across the institution is reflective of its policy on the award of credit and appropriate within the commonly accepted norms in higher education.

C. Recommend HLC Follow-up, If Appropriate

Review the responses provided in this worksheet. If the team has responded “no” to any of the questions above, the team will need to assign HLC follow-up to assure that the institution comes into compliance with expectations regarding the assignment of credit hours.

Is any HLC follow-up required related to the institution’s credit hour policies and practices?

Yes No

Rationale:

Identify the type of HLC monitoring required and the due date:

D. Systematic Noncompliance in One or More Educational Programs With HLC Policies Regarding the Credit Hour

Did the team find systematic noncompliance in one or more education programs with HLC policies regarding the credit hour?

Yes No

Identify the findings:

Rationale:

Part 3. Clock Hours

Instructions

Review Section 5 of *Worksheet for Institutions*, including Supplements A3–A6. Before completing the worksheet below, answer the following question:

Does the institution offer any degree or certificate programs in clock hours or programs that must be reported to the Department of Education in clock hours for Title IV purposes even though students may earn credit hours for graduation from these programs?

Yes No

If the answer is “Yes,” complete the “Worksheet on Clock Hours.”

Note: This worksheet is not intended for teams to evaluate whether an institution has assigned credit hours relative to contact hours in accordance with the Carnegie definition of the credit hour. This worksheet solely addresses those programs reported to the Department of Education in clock hours for Title IV purposes.

Non-degree programs subject to clock hour requirements (for which an institution is required to measure student progress in clock hours for federal or state purposes or for graduates to apply for licensure) are not subject to the credit hour definitions per se but will need to provide conversions to semester or quarter hours for Title IV purposes. Clock hour programs might include teacher education, nursing or other programs in licensed fields.

Federal regulations require that these programs follow the federal formula listed below. If there are no deficiencies identified by the accrediting agency in the institution's overall policy for awarding semester or quarter credit, the accrediting agency may provide permission for the institution to provide less instruction so long as the student's work outside class in addition to direct instruction meets the applicable quantitative clock hour requirements noted below.

Federal Formula for Minimum Number of Clock Hours of Instruction (34 CFR §668.8):

- 1 semester or trimester hour must include at least 37.5 clock hours of instruction
- 1 quarter hour must include at least 25 clock hours of instruction

Note that the institution may have a lower rate if the institution's requirement for student work outside of class combined with the actual clock hours of instruction equals the above formula provided that a semester/trimester hour includes at least 30 clock hours of actual instruction and a quarter hour includes at least 20 semester hours.

Worksheet on Clock Hours

A. Answer the Following Questions

1. Does the institution's credit-to-clock-hour formula match the federal formula?

- Yes No

Comments:

2. If the credit-to-clock-hour conversion numbers are less than the federal formula, indicate what specific requirements there are, if any, for student work outside of class.

3. Did the team determine that the institution's credit hour policies are reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that if the team answers "No" to this question, it should recommend follow-up monitoring in section C below.)

- Yes No

Comments:

4. Did the team determine in reviewing the assignment of credit to courses and programs across the institution that it was reflective of the institution's policy on the award of credit and reasonable and appropriate within commonly accepted practice in higher education?

Yes No

Comments:

B. Does the team approve variations, if any, from the federal formula in the institution's credit-to-clock-hour conversion?

Yes No

C. Recommend HLC Follow-up, If Appropriate

Is any HLC follow-up required related to the institution's clock hour policies and practices?

Yes No

Rationale:

Identify the type of HLC monitoring required and the due date:

Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

INSTITUTION and STATE:	Luna Community College, NM
TYPE OF REVIEW:	Sanctions Probation
DESCRIPTION OF REVIEW:	The institution has been removed from Show-Cause and placed on Probation because while it has demonstrated that its accreditation should not be removed at this time, it remains out of compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. The institution does not meet Core Components 2.C, 4.C, 5.A, 5.B, 5.C, and 5.D. The institution meets Core Components 1.C, 1.D, 2.A, 2.D, 3.C, and 4.A with concerns. The institution is required to host a comprehensive evaluation no later than May 2019 to determine whether the institution has ameliorated the findings that led to the imposition of the sanction. Federal Compliance reviewer is Dr. Haseeb Ahmed.
DATES OF REVIEW:	3/25/2019 - 3/27/2019
<input type="checkbox"/>	No Change in Institutional Status and Requirements

Accreditation Status

Nature of Institution

Control: Public

Recommended Change: no change

Degrees Awarded: Associates

Recommended Change: no change

Reaffirmation of Accreditation:

Year of Last Reaffirmation of Accreditation: 2017 - 2018

Year of Next Reaffirmation of Accreditation: 2018 - 2019

Recommended Change:

Accreditation Stipulations

General:

Prior Commission approval is required for substantive change as stated in Commission policy.

Recommended Change: no change

Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

Additional Location:

Prior HLC approval required.

Recommended Change: no change

Distance and Correspondence Courses and Programs:

Approval for distance education is limited to courses and one program. The institution has not been approved for correspondence education.

Recommended Change: no change

Accreditation Events

Accreditation Pathway

Under Review

Recommended Change: no change

Upcoming Events

Monitoring

Upcoming Events

None

Recommended Change: no change

Institutional Data

Educational Programs

Undergraduate

Certificate 17

Associate Degrees 16

Baccalaureate Degrees 0

Graduate

Master's Degrees 0

Specialist Degrees 0

Doctoral Degrees 0

Recommended Change:



Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

Extended Operations

Branch Campuses

None

Recommended Change: no change

Additional Locations

Santa Rosa Satellite, 213Fourth Street, Santa Rosa, NM, 88435 - Active

Springer Satellite, P.O.Box 755, 516 Maxwell Ave, Springer, NM, 87747 - Active

Recommended Change: no change

Correspondence Education

None

Recommended Change: no change

Distance Delivery

52.0201 - Business Administration and Management, General, Associate, Associate of Applied Science in Business Administration

Contractual Arrangements

None

Recommended Change: no change

Consortial Arrangements

None

Recommended Change: no change
