California State Auditor Recommendations for ARC

Rec 24: We recommended that American River College should develop procedures to monitor and periodically review the accessibility of instructional materials. On the website you describe how Canvas helps professors post accessible materials. However, the description does not address how ARC monitors or reviews the accessibility of instructional materials, and I can't see from what you submitted that this is a formalized procedure of the college. I need to see that ARC has developed procedures to monitor and periodically review the accessibility of instructional materials. Absent further documentation, I will rate this recommendation as PENDING.

Rec 25: We recommended that ARC should develop procedures to monitor website accessibility and incorporate steps to prevent instructors from publishing inaccessible content on the college's website. These procedures should include a tracking mechanism to demonstrate how many accessibility errors the college identifies and how long it takes to fix those errors. The procedure you provided me incorporates steps to prevent instructors from publishing inaccessible content. However, it does not address procedures to monitor website accessibility or include a tracking mechanism for accessibility errors and determining how long it takes to remedy those errors. Absent further documentation, I will rate this recommendation as PENDING.

Rec 28: To ensure that it fully implements its technology master plan, by June 2018, American River should establish an implementation plan with detailed steps for achieving the goals in its technology master plan that it has not yet accomplished. Further, it should develop an implementation plan in conjunction with the development of its future technology master plan. ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION NEEDED

Rec 29: We recommended that ARC should establish procedures requiring its departments to document attendees, input received, and agreements reached during meetings to consider instructional technology equipment requests. After reviewing the annual unit plan and training slides, I don't see where ARC's procedures require departments to document attendees of the annual review process, to document input received in the meetings, or to document the agreements reached during meetings to consider institutional technology equipment requests. Absent further documentation, I will rate this recommendation as PENDING.