Accreditation Follow-Up Report

October 2015

Submitted to:

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Submitted by:

Norco College

2001 Third Street

Norco CA 92860

Certification of Institutional Follow-Up Report

September 25, 2015

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
           Western Association of Schools and Colleges

From: Paul Parnell, President
           Norco College
           2001 Third Street
           Norco, CA 92860-2600

We certify there was broad participation by the campus community in the development of this report, and we believe it accurately reflects the nature and substance of this institution.

Paul Parnell, President
Norco College

Virginia Blumenthal, President
RCCD Board of Trustees

Michael Burke, Chancellor
Riverside Community College District

Diane Dieckmeyer
Vice President, Academic Affairs/ALO

Arend Flick, Professor of English
Accreditation Co-Chair and Editor

Peggy Campo, President
Norco College Academic Senate

Collin Pacillo, President
Norco College Associated Students

Gustavo Segura
California Schools Employees Association

Table of Contents

Statement on Report Preparation

At its meeting on June 4-6, 2014, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges (ACCJC) reaffirmed Norco College's accreditation but required a Follow-Up Report to be submitted by October 15, 2015. Work on the Follow-Up Report began shortly after receipt of the action letter, which contained two District recommendations (one involving technology planning, the other related to implementing a plan to fund its post-employment benefits (OPEB) obligation) and four College recommendations (1. the evaluation of strategic planning processes, 2. outcomes assessment, 3. assessing of service area outcomes in Business Services, and 4. planning for technology replacement).

Over the course of the past year, Norco College used its existing governance and planning committees and councils to develop and implement policies and procedures to ensure that these recommendations were fully acted upon. The Institutional Strategic Planning Council (ISPC) was largely responsible for the work related to College Recommendation 1; the Norco Assessment Committee (NAC) provided leadership in ensuring compliance with College Recommendation 2; the Business and Facilities Planning Council (BFPC), and particularly the Vice President for Business Services, developed strategies related to meeting College Recommendation 3; and the College's Technology Committee was charged with responding fully to Recommendation 4. Work on the District Recommendations was overseen by the appropriate District wide committees: the Information Technology Strategic Council (ITSC) for District Recommendation 1 and the District Budget Advisory Council (DBAC) for District Recommendation 2. Coordinating these efforts and the writing of the report itself at the College were the Vice President of Academic Affairs, who is also the College's Accreditation Liaison Officer; and the faculty accreditation co-chair, who also edited the report.

The draft report was widely reviewed prior to submission to the Governing Board for approval on June 16, 2015. In early March, 2015, an initial draft was read and discussed at meetings of the Academic Senate, ISPC, and Committee of the Whole (COTW). The draft was also circulated to the entire college community on the nor-all distribution list. The document was revised in late March and April, 2015, in response to suggestions made by a number of individuals, and the final draft was approved by the Senate on May 4, by the ISPC on May 6, and the COTW on May 7.

Norco College is grateful for the dedicated work of its faculty, staff, and administrators not only on the Follow-Up Report itself but also on the development and implementation of plans and processes that provide ample evidence accreditation standards are fully met.

The Institutional Strategic Planning Council

Diane Dieckmeyer (Administrative Tri-Chair), Vice President, Academic Affairs
Ruth Leal (Staff Tri-Chair), Instructional Production Specialist

Melissa Bader (Faculty Tri-Chair), Associate Professor, English
Natalie Aceves, Educational Advisor
Greg Aycock, Dean of Student Success
Celia Brockenbrough, Professor of Library Services
Peggy Campo, President, Academic Senate; Associate Professor, Anatomy/Physiology
Mark DeAsis, Director of Enrollment Services
Beth Gomez, Vice President, Business Services
Monica Green, Vice President, Student Services
Ruth Jones-Santos, College Receptionist, Student Activities
Ana Molina, Administrative Assistant II
Barbara Moore, Associate Professor, Biology
Collin Pacillo, ASNC president
Jason Parks, Associate Professor, Mathematics
Jim Thomas, Associate Professor, Construction Technology
Diann Thursby, Grants Administrative Specialist
Deborah Tompsett-Makin, Professor of Political Science

Norco College Follow-Up Report Team

Greg Aycock, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness
Sarah Burnett, Associate Professor of Early Childhood Studies and Assessment Coordinator
Diane Dieckmeyer, Vice President of Academic Affairs and Accreditation Liaison Officer
Arend Flick, Professor of English and Faculty Accreditation Co-Chair
Beth Gomez, Vice President of Business Services
Ruth Leal, Instructional Production Specialist and Co-Chair, Technology Committee
Damon Nance, Dean, Technology and Learning Resources

District Follow-Up Report Team

Aaron Brown, Vice Chancellor, Business & Financial Services
Rick Herman, Associate Vice Chancellor, Information Technology & Learning Services
Sylvia Thomas, Interim Vice Chancellor, Diversity & Human Resources

District Recommendation 1

In order to meet standards, compile the various completed elements of technology planning into an integrated, comprehensive district technology plan that is accessible and transparent, including a disaster recovery plan and a plan to refresh aging and outdated technologies. Insure that the district technology plan is based on input from the colleges and is in alignment with college planning processes.

The 2014 District visiting team acknowledged, in its External Evaluation Report, that the District "has undergone a substantial amount of planning to address the technology needs of the District and the prioritization of technology resources." The team also acknowledged that the District "has conducted a technology audit and prioritized Information Services for the District in addition to completing a detailed District Administrative Unit Program Review and Assessment of Information Technology and Learning Services." However, the team noted that the various elements of technology planning have not yet been incorporated into a district wide technology planning document to provide an overarching framework for the evolving college technology plans. The visiting team also stated that the District "lacks a comprehensive disaster recovery plan, and could benefit from a plan that addresses the need to refresh aging and outdated technologies."

To address the recommendations from the 2014 visiting team, the Information Technology Strategic Council (ITSC), which consists of the co-chairs of the college technology advisory groups and district Information Technology Services personnel, began a series of meetings to implement components of the District Technology Audit and to develop a District Technology Plan. The co-chairs of the college technology groups worked to ensure that the new district plan aligns with and supports each college's technology plan. In addition, the ITSC updated and created an IT Audit Recommendation Project Status Summary that outlines the progress the District has made to address the concerns identified in the IT Audit. The new District Technology Plan assesses the District's technology environment, provides the basic principles and purpose of the plan, and aligns the District's technology goals with each college's technology plan and with the strategic themes in the RCCD Strategic Plan. Moreover, the new District Technology Plan includes a Disaster Recovery Plan and a Technology Refresh Plan.

The District Technology Plan has been reviewed and approved by the college technology advisory groups and has gone through the shared governance approval process. The ITSC has begun the process of working with each college's vice president of business and the Vice Chancellor of Business Services to determine the financial sustainability of the plans as the District and colleges implement their technology plans.

Evidence for District Recommendation 1

DR1.1 Information Technology Audit Status Report

**http://www.rccd.edu/administration/adminfinance/Documents/Information%20
Services/DSTP/Other%20Documents/IT%20Audit%20Status%20Report%20-
%20DSPC.pdf**

DR1.2 District Technology Plan
**http://www.rccd.edu/administration/adminfinance/Documents/Information%20Service
s/DSTP/Other%20Documents/District%20Technology%20Plan.pdf**

DR1.3 IT Audit Recommendation Project Status Summary
**http://www.rccd.edu/administration/informationservices/Documents/IT%20Audit%20P
roject%20Summary.pdf**

DR1.4 RCCD Centennial Strategic Plan 2013-2016
**http://www.rccd.edu/administration/educationalservices/ieffectiveness/Documents/RC
CD%20Centenial%20Strategic%20Plan%202013-16%20final.pdf**

District Recommendation 2

In order to meet Standards, implement a plan to fund contributions to the District's
other post-employment benefits (OPEB) obligation.

The District's medical plan. a single-employer defined benefit healthcare plan, is
administered by the District. The plan provides a paid medical insurance benefit to eligible
retired academic, classified, confidential, and management employee and one dependent
until age 65 (BP/AP 7380). Eligibility is available to all retirees who have a minimum of 10
years of service with the District and who have reached the age of 55.

On July 1, 2014, an actuarial valuation was performed to determine the District's liability for
its post-employment benefits. Currently, the District utilizes the pay-as-you-go method to
finance its OPEB contributions.

The net OPEB obligations for each of the fiscal years 2010 through 2014, ending June 30,
are as follows:

Year	Annual OPEB Cost	Actual Contributions	Percentage Contributed	Net OPEB Obligation
2010	$1,462,715	$ 766,350	52%	$1,653,090
2011	$2,262,462	$ 577,224	26%	$3,338,328
2012	$2,242,316	$1,199,115	53%	$4,381,529
2013	$2,872,832	$1,209,729	42%	$6,044,632
2014	$2,960,168	$1,159,902	39%	$7,844,898

To date, the District has partially allocated resources to support future liabilities related to
post-employment benefits, leave time, and other related obligations. Leave balances are
paid when used through existing resources, and the District finances its current post-
employment benefit obligations annually. The District's annual required contribution is
$3,041,672 and annual OPEB cost is $2,960,168 based on the FY 2013-14 Annual Audit.

All audits of the institution have been unqualified. The District plans for and, to date, has used a "pay-as-you-go" methodology to allocate appropriate resources for the payment of liabilities and future obligations, including other post-employment benefits (OPEB), compensated absences, and other employee related obligations as disclosed in all annual audits. However, the District has not funded the future cost of the Annual Required Contribution (ARC).

In addressing the Commission's recommendation regarding OPEB liability, the District considered a number of options. These included the formation of an irrevocable trust, the establishment of a restricted fund, the issuance of OPEB bonds, or the initiation of a self-assessment. The District has historically maintained a "pay-as-you-go" methodology and, since the inception of Governmental Accounting Standard Board Statement No. 45—Accounting and Financial Reporting by Employers for Post-Employment Benefits Other than Pensions (GASB 45)—has not funded the future cost of the ARC. Annual "pay-as-you-go" costs of the ARC approximate $1.2 million. The most recent actuarial valuation puts the annual funding of the future cost of the ARC at approximately $1.2 million. Therefore, to fund the GASB 45 liability completely, additional annual contributions of between $.80 million and $1.0 million (the remaining portion would presumably be from investment earnings) would be necessary. To address the recommendation, a funding plan has been developed. The plan consists of the following:

1. Effective July 1, 2015, establish an irrevocable trust to pay current retiree health costs and to accumulate funds for future costs to offset the OPEB liability;

2. Develop a rate to apply to every dollar of payroll, in all Resources that have payroll, to cover the annual current cost ("pay-as-you-go") plus a minimum of $250,000 annually to begin providing for future retiree health costs, including application of the rate to grant and categorical programs in accordance with the federal government's OMB Circular A-21 and the State Chancellor's Accounting Advisory—GASB 45 Accounting for Other Post-Employment Benefits;

3. Investment earnings over time will contribute to the reduction of the outstanding OPEB liability, so the total amount of funds set aside by the District and accumulated to pay for future retiree health costs will be limited to a maximum of 50% of the outstanding OPEB liability.

4. At least annually, transfer all funds provided by the retiree healthcare rate to the irrevocable trust;

5. Pay all retiree healthcare costs out of the irrevocable trust.

This proposal, discussed with the District Budget Advisory Council (DBAC) on January 23, 2015 and on February 27, 2015, was also vetted through each of the colleges' shared

governance processes and has been reviewed by both the District Strategic Planning Council (January 30, 2015 and March 13, 2015) and the Chancellor's cabinet (March 30, 2015). The final proposal was presented and discussed at the April 7, 2015 Resource Committee meeting. The Board approved the proposal at its April 21, 2015 meeting.

Evidence for District Recommendation 2

DR2.1 Board of Trustees BP/AP 7380 Retiree Health Benefits
http://www.rccd.edu/administration/board/New%20Board%20Policies/7380BPAP.pdf

DR2.2 Actuarial Valuation for Post-Employment Benefits, 2013-2014
http://www.rccd.edu/administration/adminfinance/Documents/GASB%2045%20Valuation%20Reports/RCCD%20FY%202013-2014%20GASB%2045%20Valuation%20Report.pdf

DR2.3 Fiscal Year 2013-2014 Annual Audit
http://www.rccd.edu/administration/adminfinance/Documents/Audit%20Reports/District/District%20Audit%202013-2014.pdf

DR2.4 GASB-45
http://www.gasb.org/st/summary/gstsm45.html

DR2.5 OMB Circular A-21
https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars_a021_2004/

DR2.6 DBAC Minutes, 23 January 2015
http://www.rccd.edu/administration/adminfinance/Documents/BAM_DBAC/Meeting%20Minutes%20and%20Agendas/2015/01-23-15%20DBAC%20Agenda_Backup.pdf

DR2.7 DBAC Minutes, 27 February 2015
http://www.rccd.edu/administration/adminfinance/Documents/BAM_DBAC/Meeting%20Minutes%20and%20Agendas/2015/DBAC%20Agenda_Backup%2002-27-15w.pdf

DR2.8 DSPC Minutes, 30 January 2015
http://www.rccd.edu/administration/educationalservices/ieffectiveness/Pages/dspc.aspx

DR2.9 DSPC Minutes, 13 March 2015
http://www.rccd.edu/administration/educationalservices/ieffectiveness/Pages/dspc.aspx

DR2.10 Resource Committee Minutes, 7 April 2015
http://www.rccdistrict.net/eb/PDF%20Conversions/April_7_2015_Complete.pdf

DR2.11 Board of Trustees Minutes, 21 April 2015
http://www.rccdistrict.net/eb/PDF%20Conversions/April_21_2015_Complete.pdf

---

College Recommendation 1

In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College consistently evaluate all parts of the planning and resource allocation cycle; develop a standard assessment instrument for all participatory governance committees; develop a process

to assess the evaluation mechanisms used in integrated planning and resource allocation to ensure that those evaluations are effective in improving programs, processes, and decision-making structures; and develop strategies to broadly communicate the results of these evaluations to the entire College community.

This recommendation has four parts that are addressed separately below:

1. Consistently evaluate all parts of the planning and resource allocation cycle

Norco College Strategic Planning Committee Policy 2010-01 (revised in December 2011) established an evaluation process for the College planning and resource allocation cycle. During the revision of the College strategic planning process, the policy was further modified and can be found in the *Norco College Strategic Plan and Process 2013 – 2018.* Evaluation of the planning and resource allocation cycle has consisted of eight components, referred to in the policy as Evaluation Procedures:

1. *Annual Survey of Effectiveness of the Planning Councils: Academic Planning Council, Business and Facilities Planning Council and Student Services Planning Council* is conducted each year in late November. It asks members of each of the three planning councils to indicate their degree of satisfaction with committee-level planning, program review, and resource allocation and decision-making processes. Members also evaluate the criteria by which they rank resource requests and indicate the degree to which they think these processes are effective.
2. *Annual Survey of Effectiveness of Academic Senate and Senate Standing Committees* requires that each standing committee and the Academic Senate will survey its membership each fall and participate in dialogue sessions to evaluate the effectiveness of their planning and decision-making processes during the previous academic year. The Academic Senate receives an executive summary from each standing committee for review and discussion, and it makes recommendations to and receives recommendations from each of the committees based on the results of the evaluation and discussion.
3. *Memorandum from College President to Norco College* is sent as an e-mail to the nor-all distribution list annually in June. It identifies which faculty and staff positions (identified in the previous year's program review and prioritized by the planning councils) will be recommended for funding. As an accountability measure, it contributes to the process by which planning is evaluated.
4. *Annual Progress Report on Educational Master Plan Goals, Objectives and "Dashboard Indicators,"* produced annually in mid-November by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, is presented to both Institutional Strategic Planning Council (ISPC) and the Committee of the Whole (COTW). This

report reviews progress made toward achieving the seven goals and objectives in the strategic plan 2013-18.

5. *Survey of Committee of the Whole Membership* is conducted at the last COTW each spring, with a report compiled by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and placed on its website each fall. Members of the COTW (constituting all College faculty, staff, students, and administrators) are asked to indicate their degree of satisfaction with College planning processes as well as their perceptions regarding the degree to which these processes are effectively linked.

6. *Report of Resource Allocation*, produced by the Vice President of Business Services annually in mid-fall (after board of trustees approval of the budget), is transmitted to the COTW membership, providing the committee with ample opportunity for institution-wide dialogue on budget decisions that impact the College and District.

7. *Annual Open Dialogue Session*, conducted annually in late spring, provides all College stakeholders an opportunity to discuss their views about the extent to which planning processes contribute to the achievement of course-, program-, and institutional-level student learning outcomes. A report summarizing the discussion is produced by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and posted on its website.

8. *Annual Evaluation Report,* produced by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness annually in early fall and placed on the IR website, summarizes the findings contained in the other seven evaluation components. It is transmitted to the ISPC each fall. The ISPC uses the report to assess the overall efficacy of the planning process and makes recommendations for revising procedures and processes as warranted, which (if approved by the College president) are incorporated into the next year's cycle.

Since the current revision of the planning evaluation process was first implemented in 2012, every report, session, memorandum, and survey has been completed consistently as scheduled. (One of the standing committees of the Academic Senate did not complete its survey in 2012 during a transitional period in its leadership. Steps have been taken to ensure this problem—noted by the visiting team in its report—does not happen again.) The team also noted that it had difficulty verifying in some instances whether an annual report had been produced or not because the College sometimes changes the name of a particular annual report over time. The College has worked to ensure greater consistency in naming protocols, most recently by placing a "Strategic Planning Timeline" on the Strategic Planning website that clarifies the names of all evaluation procedures. The eight evaluation procedures listed above are named in ways that are consistent with planning document Norco College Strategic Planning Committee Policy 2010-01 and with "Norco College Strategic Plan and Process 2013 – 2018." In addition, the strategic planning website was reorganized and now contains a specific page

referred to as "Evaluation Procedures," which enable readers to more clearly find and identify the reports and documents associated with each of the eight procedures.

Norco College has also evaluated and modified its Institution-Set Standards (ISS) as part of its planning processes. Vigorous analysis and discussion of ISS began in 2013, primarily in meetings of the Institutional Strategic Planning Council (ISPC). ISS were initially identified in five areas: course completion (success), student retention (persistence), degree completion rate, transfer rate, and certificate completion. Baseline standards were established as one standard deviation below a five-year mean. After two readings of the ISS, they were approved by ISPC on May 1, 2013 and by the Committee of the Whole on May 28, 2013. After a year of study, during which the ISPC reviewed its ISS as compared to seven other nearby colleges, the College recognized that its ISS were too low and so further revised them to be one-half standard deviation below the mean. The Academic Senate also drafted a document called "Senate Recommendation Regarding Institutional Set Standards-Procedural Response," indicating what steps would be taken if institutional outcomes ever fall below standard.

Discussions that began in ISPC during the 2014-15 academic year also led the College to add four more areas to the list of Institution-Set Standards: CTE job placement rate, number of students completing degrees in the academic year, number of students completing certificates in the academic year, and number of students transferring to a four-year college or university in an academic year. ISS areas and methodology will henceforth be reviewed and if necessary modified every regularly by the ISPC.

In sum, the College can provide ample evidence that it consistently evaluates all parts of its planning and resource allocation cycle.

2. Develop a standard assessment instrument for all participatory governance committees

Norco College has three distinct types of participatory governance committees included in its strategic planning process: 1) standing committees of the Academic Senate (the assessment committee, the program review committee, professional development committee, library committee, curriculum committee, and distance education committee; 2) standing committees that are not associated with the Academic Senate (the student success committee, the grants committee, the technology committee, the legacy committee, the safety committee, and the Associated Students of Norco College); and 3) three planning councils (academic, business and facilities, and student services). (The Academic Planning Council is a standing committee of the senate.) The councils are tasked with (among other things) evaluating and prioritizing resource requests in their various areas. The work

of the planning councils and the standing committees which are not associated with the academic senate is coordinated by the Institutional Strategic Planning Council, which ensures that all phases of planning and resource allocation at the College emanate from program review, have improvement of student learning as the highest priority, and are driven by the College Mission and the Educational Master Plan.

Since 2013, the College has employed a standard evaluation instrument for the standing committees of the academic senate and a slightly different evaluation instrument for both the planning councils and the other strategic planning committees. This variance is because the responsibilities of the councils are somewhat different from that of the committees. Each October, the standing committees of the senate complete the "Academic Senate Standing Committee Survey of Effectiveness" (an online survey using SurveyMonkey) and discuss the survey results at a meeting later in the semester. The chair of each committee sends an executive summary of the survey results and the committee's analysis of those results to the Academic Senate, which reviews and discusses the summaries at the last senate meeting in November. The Academic Senate makes recommendations to and receives recommendations from each of the standing committees based on this information. The senate president reports on these evaluations to the ISPC, and a summary of the results is posted on the Institutional Research and Strategic Planning websites.

In response to the recommendation to standardize assessment instruments for all participatory governance structures, the other standing committees within the strategic planning process now use the same standard evaluation instrument employed by the standing committees of the academic senate. Led by their respective chairs, those committees similarly review and respond to the survey results. However, those committees report their findings directly to the Institutional Strategic Planning Council rather than to the academic senate.

The Planning Councils complete a similar survey each November, also through SurveyMonkey, to determine their degree of satisfaction with committee-level planning, program review, resource allocation, and decision-making processes. They also evaluate the criteria used in evaluating resource requests as well as the degree to which these processes are effective and linked at the planning council level. These evaluations are also reviewed by the ISPC, and a summary of the results is posted on the Institutional Research website.

3. **Develop a process to assess the evaluation mechanisms used in integrated planning and resource allocation**

Between 2010 and 2013, evaluation mechanisms for planning and resource allocation at the College were assessed regularly but in an ad hoc way, with the various planning councils and committees making suggestions for altering the

evaluation mechanisms as or after they were employed. Improvement in the evaluation mechanisms is manifested in their modifications over these years and in alterations in the strategic plan itself from its first iteration in 2010 to Norco College Strategic Plan and Process 2013 – 2018. The College also added several evaluation mechanisms for its strategic planning process during this time, specifically the academic senate / standing committees survey and the resource allocation report.

As a result of the visiting team's recommendation that suggests the College institute a more formal process for assessing its evaluation of planning and resource allocation efforts, Norco College determined to hold an annual strategic planning retreat in late fall, for the primary purpose of assessing its evaluation mechanisms. The first of these annual retreats occurred on December 3, 2014 and brought together all of the co-chairs of the standing committees and planning councils, the full membership of the Institutional Strategic Planning Council, the College president, and additional guests totaling some 30 faculty, staff, administrators, and students to consider whether, and to what extent, the eight evaluation procedures impact College programs, processes, and decision-making structures.

Initial public discussion of these questions produced widespread consensus that programs have been impacted by evaluation procedures 4 and 6 (as numbered above); processes have been impacted by procedures 1, 2, 4, and 6; and decision making has been impacted by procedures 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6. In order to generate more detailed data, electronic clickers were distributed to participants, who were asked to rate (using a 10-point scale, with one indicating not at all effective and 10 indicating very effective) how effective they would judge the impact of those evaluation procedures on programs, processes, and decision making. The table below shows the mean scores for each of the mechanisms:

Mechanism	Programs	Processes	Decision Making
1/Annual Survey of Effectiveness of Planning Councils		6.41	6.57
2/Annual Survey of Effectiveness of Academic Senate and Senate Committees		6.67	6.18
3/Memorandum from College President to Norco College			6.91
4/Annual Progress Report on EMP Goals, Objectives, and Dashboard Indicators	6.04	5.83	6.27
5/Survey of COTW Membership			
6/Report on Resource Allocation	6.38	6.55	6.84
7/Annual Open Dialogue Session			
8/Annual Evaluation Report			

As part of the process to assess the effectiveness of the evaluation mechanisms, the retreat itself and the data it generated were analyzed and discussed by the

ISPC at its March 4, 2015, April 1, 2015, April 22, 2015, and May 6, 2015 meetings, and modifications were made to several of the evaluation mechanisms, with one eliminated entirely. An extensive review and discussion of Evaluation Procedure #5, Survey of COTW Membership, at the April 1 meeting led to a motion to modify the questions of the survey and to include all College stakeholders in future surveys, not just COTW. Retreat results were also included in the Annual Evaluation Report in fall 2015. Discussion at the April 22 ISPC meeting focused on Evaluation Procedure #7, the Annual Open Dialogue Session. There was widespread agreement that the session has been a valuable activity, but not one that contributes effectively to the evaluation of strategic planning processes. A review of attendance histories also revealed that staff have not been participating in the session in significant numbers. Accordingly, ISPC voted 1) to incorporate the session into the existing COTW structure (where staff regularly attend) in order to provide opportunities for broader input from the entire College community, and 2) to eliminate it from the list of formal evaluation mechanisms. These changes will take effect beginning fall 2015. At its May 6, 2015 meeting, ISPC assessed the Annual Evaluation Report as a strategic planning evaluation mechanism. It was agreed that while the report largely serves the purpose of collecting and summarizing information contained in the other evaluation mechanisms, it could become even more useful if ISPC devoted one meeting early in fall semester to reviewing its contents. It was also noted that more rigorous efforts to review the Annual Evaluation Report could act as an additional method of evaluating the effectiveness of the overall evaluation process. At the time of this writing, the College expects to employ annually a process very similar to this to systematically assess its strategic planning evaluation mechanisms.

The College is confident that its approach to assessing its strategic planning evaluation mechanisms is sound, and especially appropriate to its own particular culture. The approach has its foundation in John Dewey's influential theory of reflective practice. In his influential 1933 book *How We Think*, Dewey defined reflective practice, and specifically reflective thought, as the "active, persistent, and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in light of the grounds that support it and the further conclusions to which it tends." For Dewey, reflective or evaluative dialogue is best engaged in by practitioners themselves, whose experiences can produce the best judgments about the value of any practice. Norco College aspires to put Dewey's theories into practice in its assessment of strategic planning evaluation.

4. Strategies to broadly communicate evaluation results

Results of evaluation mechanisms have been communicated to the College community in various ways over the past four years. Evaluation results are shared in ISPC and COTW meetings, and they are often a central topic of department meetings, governance committees, and president's cabinet. The reports and

findings for each of the eight evaluation procedures are now posted to the newly created Evaluation Procedures strategic planning webpage. Six of the eight evaluation procedures are posted to the Institutional Research website, and a seventh—the Memorandum from the College President—is sent directly to the entire nor-all College community in an annual e-mail. In the College's 2013 Accreditation Survey, only two (1.5%) of the 132 faculty, staff, administrator, and student respondents disagreed with the statement "Norco College strategic planning goals are regularly assessed and results shared with campus constituencies."

The visiting team's recommendation that the College needs to further improve and systematize its communication methods has led to an additional way of keeping the College community informed about evaluation results: the creation of a biannual newsletter, published in late fall and spring and distributed throughout the College both electronically and in hard copy, with the first newsletter launched in spring 2015. The newsletter provides updates for the College community on all aspects of planning and resource allocation, with a particular emphasis on improvements in the process that have been generated by the application of the evaluation procedures.

Evidence for College Recommendation 1

CR1.1 Norco College Strategic Planning Committee Policy 2010-01
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/PlanningDocs/NSPC%20Policy%202010-01(2).pdf

CR1.2 Norco College Strategic Plan and Process 2013 – 2018
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/documents/norco%20strategic%20plan%202013-2018.pdf

CR1.3 Annual Survey of Effectiveness of Planning Councils
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/academic-affairs/Documents/SS-Research/Planning%20Councils%20Survey%20Summary-2014-15.pdf

CR1.4 Annual Survey of Effectiveness of Academic Senate and Senate Standing Committees
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/academic-affairs/Documents/SS-Research/AS%20Standing%20Committee%20Evaluation%20of%20Effectiveness%202013-14.pdf

CR1.5 Memorandum from College President to Norco College
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/President%20Memo%2013-14.pdf

CR1.6   Annual Progress Report on Educational Master Plan Goals, Objectives and "Dashboard Indicators"
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/academic-affairs/Documents/SS-

Research/Annual%20Progress%20Report%20on%20EMP%20Goals%20Objectives%20 0and%20Dashboard%20Indicators%202013-14.pdf

CR1.7 Survey of Committee of the Whole Membership
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/academic-affairs/Documents/SS-Research/COTW%20Survey%20Summary-2014.pdf

CR1.8 Report on Resource Allocation
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/business-services/Documents/BudgetPresentations/2014-15%20Budget%20Presentation.pdf

CR1.9 Annual Open Dialogue Session
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/academic-affairs/Documents/SS-Research/Open%20Dialogue%20Executive%20Summary-2014.pdf

CR1.10 Annual Evaluation Report
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/academic-affairs/Documents/SS-Research/Annual%20Evaluation%20Report%202013-14.pdf

CR1.11 "Strategic Planning Timeline"
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/PlanningDocs/Norco%20College%20Strategic%20Planning%20Timeline-2.pdf

CR1.12 "Evaluation Procedures"
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Pages/Evaluation-Procedures.aspx

CR1.13 ISPC Minutes, 5 November 2014
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/ispc/2014-15/2014-11-05-ISPC-minutes.pdf

CR1.14 "Senate Recommendation Regarding Institution Set Standards-Procedural Response"
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/PlanningDocs/ISS%20Procedural%20Response.pdf

CR1.15 Summary of Academic Senate Survey of Effectiveness
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/academic-affairs/Documents/SS-Research/AS%20Standing%20Committee%20Evaluation%20of%20Effectiveness%20 2013-14.pdf

CR1.16 Summary of Planning Councils Survey of Effectiveness
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/academic-affairs/Documents/SS-Research/Planning%20Councils%20Survey%20Summary-2013-14.pdf

CR1.17 ISPC Minutes, 3 Dec 2014
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/ispc/2014-15/2014-12-03-ISPC-minutes.pdf

CR1.18 ISPC Minutes, 4 March 2015
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/ispc/2014-15/2015-03-04-ISPC-minutes.pdf

CR1.19 ISPC Minutes, 1 April 2015
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/ispc/2014-15/2015-04-01-ISPC-minutes.pdf

CR1.20 ISPC Minutes, 22 April 2015
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/ispc/2014-15/2015-04-22-ISPC-minutes.pdf

CR1.21 ISPC Minutes, 6 May 2015
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/ispc/2014-15/2015-05-06-ISPC-minutes.pdf

CR1.22 2013 Accreditation Survey
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/academic-affairs/Documents/SS-Research/Accreditation%20Survey%20Report%202013.pdf

CR1.23 Strategic Planning Newsletter, Spring 2015
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/newsletter/sp15-strategicplanning-newsletter.pdf

College Recommendation 2

In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College create a system to ensure consistency in transferring student learning outcomes on official course outlines of record to course syllabi, implement more direct assessment of student learning at the program level; complete its cycle of evaluation for all general education outcomes; and develop, implement, and assess an evaluative mechanism to review all parts of the student learning outcomes process in an ongoing and systematic way.

 This recommendation has four parts that are addressed separately below:

1. Creation of a system to ensure consistency in transferring student learning outcomes on official course outlines of record to course syllabi.

Student learning outcomes have been a required component of course syllabi for many years at Norco College. All syllabi must be submitted to the Office of the Dean of Instruction, where they are archived in a syllabus repository accessible through a shared administrative file. Syllabi are also examined as part of the Improvement of Instruction

process. During its 2014 visit, the accreditation team noticed some inconsistencies in the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) that appeared in different sections of the same course, as well as SLOs being different from the Course Outlines of Record (COR). This problem has been traced to multiple factors such as confusion in using CurricUNET as well as the ongoing struggle to communicate curriculum updates to associate faculty. The following steps have been taken to ensure the SLOs as worded in the most recently approved COR are used by each faculty member when constructing a syllabus.

To further ensure that correct SLOs appear in each course syllabus, the College has developed a standardized course syllabus shell for use by full- and part-time faculty. The syllabus shell provides information to students in areas that are not instructor-specific (e.g., disability resources, learning resources, etc.) but is also provided to faculty with the SLOs for each course already pre-loaded. It was approved by the Academic Planning Council on November 14, 2014 and its use piloted in mathematics and communication courses during spring 2015. On March 2, 2015, The College Academic Senate voted to endorse the shell, and full implementation occurred in fall 2015. Faculty can access shells for their particular courses by following a link to the Course Syllabus Shells Website from the Faculty Resources webpage. The shells are also referenced in the Norco College Faculty Guide.

2. Direct assessment of program-level student learning outcomes.

The program-level assessment cycle at the College is developed and periodically modified by the Norco College Assessment Committee (NAC); it may be accessed at the Resources section of the NAC website. It calls for three-year cycles for assessing all interdisciplinary areas of emphasis (AOE) programs and associate degree for transfer (ADT) programs, three-year cycles for assessing all career technical education (CTE) programs, and a four-year cycle for assessing general education (GE). As specified in the recently created program assessment guidelines, direct assessment methods must be employed in each program assessment project, though in some instances they may be supplemented with the additional use of indirect methods (e.g., student learning gains or satisfaction surveys, focus groups). Using both direct and indirect methods can provide the kind of multiple assessment measures that ensures evaluative validity.

Areas of Emphasis Programs

The seven AOE majors were introduced in fall 2008. Since then, more than 80% of Norco College A.A. or A.S. graduates have received an AOE degree, a percentage that has held steady from year to year. After having assessed these programs with learning gains surveys for several years, the College implemented a comprehensive plan to assess all of them by direct methods in 2013. Faculty leaders for each program identified specific courses that a significant number of degree-seeking students were likely to take. Instructors of these classes were then recruited to evaluate a late-term

assignment against a rubric developed by the faculty leaders, with results forwarded to the Office of the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness for analysis. Student identification numbers were provided for each score. Data were disaggregated according to how many courses within the major the student had taken previously, with student performance also broken down by ethnicity to permit consideration of equity issues related to student learning. The results of this project, which led to the identification of a number of areas in which the programs could be improved, were reported in the "Areas of Emphasis Assessment Report 2013" and further summarized in the "Norco College Assessment Report: 2013-2014." In spring 2014, a loop-closing assessment of the Humanities, Philosophy, and History program was undertaken, also employing direct assessment methods, and a report completed and posted in November 2014. The other six AOE programs are scheduled for follow-up assessment projects in 2015 and 2016, all employing direct assessment methods.

Associate Degrees for Transfer Programs

As of fall 2015, the College has 14 approved ADT programs. Direct assessment of these very new programs began during the 2013-14 academic year, with assessment projects developed and reports completed in summer 2014 for the English and Early Childhood Education ADTs. It is expected that these projects will become models for assessing the other ADTs, scheduled for initial assessment in 2015 – 2017.

The English ADT assessment project looked at work by students who self-identified as English majors (or probable English majors) in the two literature courses offered at the college in spring 2014: English 7 (British Literature Survey II) and English 30 (Children's Literature). All of these students demonstrated competency in written expression and critical thinking about literature, though writing skills were markedly superior to critical thinking skills. Recommendations were made on the basis of the study to modify the program itself by adding some classes and deleting others.

The Early Childhood Education ADT project also employed direct assessment methods and demonstrated to faculty satisfaction that the program was preparing students to be successful in their internships and eventually as preschool teachers. The assessment data also suggested that Ear-19 needed to be made a prerequisite for EAR-30 and that a third course, EAR-28, needed to be reexamined, with SLOs perhaps revised and assignments reworked.

Career Technical Education Programs

All of the CTE programs have been assessed using direct methods, using methods ranging from eportfolios to capstone courses. The Rotation Plan for Outcomes Assessment at Norco College divides the 29 CTE programs into three groups, with Group A scheduled for a second round of direct assessment in 2014-15, Group B scheduled for 2015-16, and Group C scheduled for 2016-17.

Direct assessment of Norco College programs has been aided greatly by the purchase and implementation of TracDat software. This permits the College to aggregate course-level assessment data provided by individual instructors for program assessment purposes. In sum, the College is systematically employing direct assessment methods to evaluate all of its programs and using the information it gathers to improve those programs.

3. Completion of general education assessment cycle.

The Riverside Community College District has a common curriculum and a common general education program. The program was assessed through the use of learning gains surveys in the period between 2009 and 2013 as well as by means of several forms of direct assessment, many of which focused on "quasi-capstone" GE courses like English 1A. GE competencies like written communication skills, critical thinking, and information competency were assessed directly at both the District and the College level during this period on multiple occasions. One of the significant results of this work was the modification and simplification of the existing GE outcomes by a District wide GE work group. The new GE SLOs were approved by the Board of Trustees on September 18, 2012.

The revised GE outcomes comprise four broad learning domains: 1) critical thinking, 2) information competency and technology literacy, 3) communication, and 4) self-development and global awareness. In fall 2013, the Norco College Assessment Committee (NAC) agreed on a plan to assess each of the outcomes cyclically, in successive years. Since critical thinking and communication skills had been emphasized in prior assessments, NAC decided to begin with an assessment of self-development and global awareness. Information competency and technical literacy was then assessed in 2014-15, with critical thinking and communication skills the focus in each of the next two years. It is expected that the College will continue to assess each outcome quadrennially.

For the self-development / global awareness assessment project (begun in fall 2013 and completed in spring 2014, with a comprehensive report filed in fall 2014), the College asked instructors from six multi-section courses with SLOs that map to this GE outcome to assess late-term work by their students against a common rubric. Students were also surveyed on their perception of the extent to which they achieved these outcomes in these classes, and faculty were surveyed about their practices as teachers of self-development or global awareness. Instructor scores correlated, for the most part, with number of units of GE the student had completed, thereby providing some evidence that the program as a whole contributes to student achievement of this outcome. Similarly, the great majority of students (85%) said in their survey responses that the course had helped them achieve the GE SLO; 78% said that their other coursework at the college had also contributed. Of the more than 1200 students

surveyed, 36% were very confident their other coursework helped them achieve the GE SLO and another 42% were somewhat confident.

A similar approach was used in fall 2014 to assess information competency and technology literacy, though with a particular focus on English 1A, the only required course in the RCCD GE program. (Sections of Philosophy 11, Critical Thinking, were also included in the project.) A report on that project was completed in August 2015.

At the District level, a reconfigured General Education workgroup began discussions in spring 2015 to modify the existing GE program in light of these assessment data and the expectations for GE as defined in California Ed Code and the new ACCJC accreditation standards. Thus, an initial cycle of direct GE assessment at the College is well underway for the revised GE SLOs.

4. **Developing, implementing, and assessing an evaluation mechanism to assess all parts of the student learning process in an ongoing and systematic way.**

As mentioned previously, Norco College first began developing a college-specific student learning outcomes process in 2010, when it was accredited as a separate institution. The process has been evaluated and modified in a number of ways during the period between 2010 and 2014. For example, the assessment section of the annual program review template was changed as a result of faculty input in 2011. The assessment committee (NAC) routinely assesses and tries to improve its performance through annual anonymous surveys of its membership. Changes in the College's approach to assessment methodology have also been driven by evaluative mechanisms: the purchase of TracDat software for gathering and analyzing assessment data was the result of an evaluation that the existing CurricUNET software was deficient for this purpose. Additional examples of evaluative efforts regarding the assessment process are detailed in the 2013-14 Norco College Assessment Report.

The primary evaluative mechanism for assessment has been the annual report itself, which contains data (much of it longitudinal to permit the tracking of trends) regarding number of course assessment reports received in the past year, number of programs assessed, performance of individual instructional disciplines in assessing learning in the discipline as measured by an analytic rubric, etc. The report also contains information on academic unit, student services, and institution-level assessment. However, in response to the ACCJC visiting team's recommendation that the College develop and implement an "evaluation mechanism" to evaluate "all parts of the student learning outcomes process," the College has—under the leadership of NAC—also developed a comprehensive "Key Indicators Analysis" process that provides even more systematic evaluation of the state of assessment at the College. As part of this process, the assessment section of the Annual Program Review (APR) template was further revised to request more detailed information from instructional units regarding which courses

(and course SLOs) underwent initial assessment in the previous year, which courses (and course SLOs) were or were not improved as a result of assessment data in the previous year, etc. The Key Indicators for assessment include such criteria as level of loop-closing, improvement of learning, dialogue on results, and participation in program assessment. The Norco College Assessment Coordinator develops the list of Key Indicators each summer with the help of the office of institutional effectiveness, and it is discussed and analyzed by NAC each fall with an eye toward using the indicators to improve outcomes assessment at the College. This evaluation process will itself be assessed each year by NAC, with particular focus on the Key Indicators process, including the list of indicators themselves, as well the assessment portion of the APR template and the rubric by which instructional units are evaluated for their work in outcomes assessment.

<u>Evidence for College Recommendation 2</u>

CR2.1 Academic Planning Council Minutes, 14 November 2014
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/apc/2014-15/2014-11-14-APC-Minutes.pdf

CR2.2 Academic Senate Minutes, 2 March 2015
http://www.norcocollege.edu/academicsenate/Documents/2014-15/2015-03-02-NAS-Minutes.pdf

CR2.3 Course Syllabus Shells Website
http://www.norcocollege.edu/employees/faculty/Pages/syllabus.aspx

CR2.4 Norco College Faculty Guide
http://www.norcocollege.edu/employees/faculty/Documents/NorcoFacultyGuide.pdf

CR2.5 Norco College Assessment Cycle
http://www.norcocollege.edu/employees/faculty/Documents/OutcomesAssessment/Rotation-Plan-for-Outcomes-Assessment-at-Norco-College-Revised-fall-2015.pdf

CR2.6 Program Assessment Guidelines
http://www.norcocollege.edu/employees/faculty/Documents/OutcomesAssessment/PLO%20ASSESSMENT%20GUIDELINES%20FALL%202015.pdf

CR2.7 Areas of Emphasis Assessment Report 2013
http://www.norcocollege.edu/employees/faculty/Documents/OutcomesAssessment/Area%20of%20Emphasis%20Assessment%20Report%202013.pdf

CR2.8 Norco College Assessment Report 2013-2014
http://www.norcocollege.edu/employees/faculty/Documents/OutcomesAssessment/2013-14%20Norco%20College%20Assessment%20Report.pdf

CR2.9 Area of Emphasis Report 2014—Humanities, Philosophy, and Art

http://www.norcocollege.edu/employees/faculty/Documents/OutcomesAssessment/HPA%20program%20assessment%20report.pdf

CR2.10 English ADT assessment report
> **http://www.norcocollege.edu/employees/faculty/Documents/OutcomesAssessment/English%20ADT%20assessment%20report%202014.pdf**

CR2.11 Early Childhood Studies ADT assessment report
> **http://www.norcocollege.edu/employees/faculty/Documents/OutcomesAssessment/Associated%20Degree%20for%20Transfer%20ADT%20Report%20-%20ECE%202014.pdf**

CR2.12 Board of Trustees Minutes, 18 September 2012
> **http://www.rccdistrict.net/eb/Attachments/091812MIN.pdf**

CR2.13 Follow-Up Report on English 1A Assessment for General Education Outcomes: Spring 2012
> **http://www.norcocollege.edu/employees/faculty/Documents/OutcomesAssessment/English%201A%20assessment%20report%202012.pdf**

CR2.14 General Education Assessment Report 2013-2014
> **http://www.norcocollege.edu/employees/faculty/Documents/OutcomesAssessment/GE%20Assessment%20Report-Self%20Development%20Global%20Awareness%202014.pdf**

CR2.15 General Education Assessment Report 2014-2015
> **http://www.norcocollege.edu/employees/faculty/Documents/OutcomesAssessment/GE%20PLO%202013-2015%20report%20loop%20closing%20activity.pdf**

CR2.16 Key Indicators Report 2014-15
> **http://www.norcocollege.edu/employees/faculty/Documents/OutcomesAssessment/Key-Indicators-Analysis-2015.pdf**

College Recommendation 3

In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that service area outcomes are systematically assessed for all areas in Business Services and the results of the evaluation are used to make improvements.

This recommendation has two parts that are addressed separately below:

1. Systematic assessment of service area outcomes in Business Services

The visiting team found that the Business Services division began creating service outcomes several years ago, but consistent follow-through on assessment of outcomes was lacking in the area of facilities and maintenance.

The Vice President of Business Services leads the effort to ensure that service area outcomes are defined and assessed in Business Services.

Ongoing assessment exists in every department of the Business Services area. External and internal assessment is extensively performed on the facilities, food services, and police areas. Inspections and compliance audits are the major tools which are regularly used to assess the facilities of the College. Inventory and financial reports are assessed daily, weekly, and monthly in the food services area. Police services are assessed by reports in the area of parking and Clery Reports.

Periodic (annual) assessment takes place in the program review cycle. In the 2013-14 cycle of program review, a variety of assessment measures were reported as having been used, with many of the Business Services units administering surveys to gauge the extent to which they were achieving the SAO and/or to determine a benchmark for future improvements. For example, in a survey of 47 faculty, administrators, and staff, the maintenance department determined that while more than half of respondents rated the department as outstanding for courtesy and professionalism, less than half did so for quality of work done. There were also concerns expressed by more than half of the respondents about promptness in response to maintenance requests. These will be areas that the unit targets for improvement in 2014-15. Similarly, the custodial unit received a total of 47 responses to its survey about the cleanliness of bathrooms, classrooms, and public areas. Although more than half of the respondents agreed that these areas were well maintained, the unit now has benchmarks enabling it to gauge its improvement from year to year.

The Business Office Administrative Team (BOAST) meets monthly and conducts focused discussions regarding outcomes and assessment. Additionally, BOAST held several retreats in 2014-2015 devoted largely to assessing SAOs. On November 7, 2014, Business Services held a staff retreat, facilitated by the Norco College Vice President of Business Services and the East Los Angeles College Vice President of Administrative Services, at which a significant portion of the time was spent on SAO assessment. A second retreat in June 2015, led by the Vice President, Administrative Services, Los Angeles Trade Technical College, was devoted to refining and improving upon Business Service's goals, outcomes statements, and assessment procedures for the current year's program review process. More recently, on July 27, 2015, Business Services managers met with the Norco College assessment coordinator to discuss the draft of its goals, outcomes, and assessment for 2015-16 (notes from this meeting available in hard copy). The assessment coordinator held in-depth conversation with managers to facilitate the development of more authentic forms of assessment that can help the division gauge the impact it is having on student learning and determine how it can better assist in improving learning.

Norco College Business Services is committed to the process of defining measurable service area outcomes, evaluating the extent to which they are achieved, and using

results to improve. This process will continue to be refined and documented in the annual program reviews.

2. Use of assessment results for improvement

The 2013-14 APRs for Business Services identify a number of areas where assessment results are being used or have been used for improvement. For example, the maintenance and operations department employed surveys to measure the services they provide. Areas assessed centered around efficiency, safety, and quality of work performed. As a result of the survey feedback, additional positions in the areas of custodial and grounds were prioritized at the highest level during the resource allocations process and additional new positions were subsequently funded and filled. In addition, a number of other units made improvements in 2014 based on the previous year's assessments. For example, Business Services (General) was able to realize its goal of adding additional classroom space for students by successfully negotiating for the transfer of modular title from RCOE. Buildings were remodeled and additional classroom space added in spring 2015. Similarly, the Facilities Department (Administrative Support) increased efficiency levels of footprint work orders by means of regularly update of its work order system. Finally, Food Services set up mobile locations (one at the new STEM center) to relieve long lines at the Corral, the main food service venue, thus leading to increased customer satisfaction. In all of these areas (and further examples could be supplied), Business Services is using SAO assessment results to improve.

Evidence for College Recommendation 3

CR3.1 Maintenance Department APR 2013-2014
   http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/programreview/Documents/adminunit/2014/Maintenance_AUPR_2014.pdf

CR3.2 Custodial APR 2013-2014
   http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/programreview/Documents/adminunit/2014/Custodial_AUPR_2014.pdf

CR3.3a Business Services Staff Retreat, 7 November 2014
   http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/business-services/Documents/Business%20Services%20retreat%20110714.pdf

CR3.3b Business Services Staff Retreat, 17 June 2015
   http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/business-services/Documents/Norco%20College%20Bus%20Srvcs%20Retreat-06%2017%202015.pdf

CR3.3c Business Managers Retreat, 27 July 2015 (meeting notes available in hard copy)

CR3.4 Business Services (General) APR 2013-14
       **http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-
       planning/programreview/Documents/adminunit/2014/Bus_Srv_AUPR_2014.pdf**

CR3.5 Facilities Department (Administrative Support) APR 2013-2014
       **http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-
       planning/programreview/Documents/adminunit/2014/Facilities_Admin_AUPR_2014.pdf**

CR3.6 Food Services APR 2-13-2014
       **http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-
       planning/programreview/Documents/adminunit/2014/Food_Services_AUPR_2014.pdf**

College Recommendation 4

In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College systematically
plan for the replacement of technology infrastructure and equipment, reflect
projections of total cost of ownership for new equipment, systematically assess the
effective use of technology resources, and use the results of evaluation as the basis for
improvement.

This recommendation has four parts that are addressed separately below:

**1. A systematic plan for the replacement of technology infrastructure and
   equipment.**

As detailed in the Norco College Technology Principles and Guidelines, Norco
College systematically plans for the replacement of technology and equipment. The
College's Technology Committee coordinates with the College's Microcomputer
support staff and the Instructional Media Center to plan for replacement,
reassignment, and evaluation of technology resources.

In 2013-14, this committee developed a Norco College Replacement of Technology
Infrastructure and Equipment Plan, which was approved by the Business and
Facilities Planning Council, the Institutional Strategic Planning Council, and the
Committee of the Whole. The technology replacement plan calls for the
replacement of all standard office technology (e.g., faculty and staff workstations,
laptops, and tablets, etc.) every four years; the replacement of special use items like
large screen multimedia computers, internet servers and switches, projectors, and
video displays on a case-by-case basis (a life cycle of three – five years is
expected); and replacement of out-of-cycle technology as warranted.

As a way of controlling costs and minimizing disruption of College operations, the
technology replacement plan calls for a staggered replacement cycle in which a
portion of the computer inventory (approximately 25%) is recommended for

replacement each year. Equipment will be replaced based on age and programmatic needs. The plan further mandates that all replaced technology be returned to College microcomputer support staff for evaluation of remaining life and possible reassignment. An annual inventory of College technology is also mandated, with custodial records of all technology equipment maintained by College technology services and reviewed by the Technology Committee for evaluation of technology resources on campus. The annual inventory will be used to determine the technology-related items that will be placed on the recommended list as part of the staggered replacement.

2. **Total cost of ownership for new equipment.**

The Norco College Technology Principles and Guidelines, approved by the Technology Committee on August 28, 2014, defines Technology Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) as "a structured approach to calculating the full costs associated with buying and using a technology asset or acquisition over its entire life cycle. Technology TCO takes the purchase cost of an item into account, . . . but also considers infrastructure, installation maintenance, repairs, training, and support as well as the future replacement of the item."

The College developed a total cost of ownership process for technology requests that was implemented in 2014-15. The Technology Committee developed and approved a "Technology Request Form" that was reviewed and approved by the District Information Technology Strategy Council. Units requesting technology resources as part of their annual program reviews must complete a streamlined version of the "Technology Request Form" modified specifically for program review. A more detailed version of the "Technology Request Form" is available to use for purchases.

Requests for technology equipment are reviewed by the Technology Committee and the College's technology departments for evaluation of technical specifications and costs associated with the equipment, comments as well as inventory purposes. For purchases, the total cost of ownership for the item is calculated on the basis of the information provided in the form, which is returned to the requesting unit. In submitting its annual program review, the unit utilizes a "Technology Total Cost of Ownership Document" and provides specific TCO data in the section of the program review that lists resource requests, as well as on the "Technology Request Form." The "Technology Total Cost of Ownership" form contains sections detailing the initial cost of the resource as well as the total operating costs for the item. This enables the College to make informed decisions about whether or not to grant particular requests.

The process provides a path for the cyclical refurbishment of technology on campus. Besides disclosing the initial as well as the operating costs of a

technology item, the process assists the College in determining how well the item fits the needs of the unit and the College, how fully it meets industry standards, and how competitive it is in the educational marketplace. This is the technology Total Cost of Ownership model.

While the College is optimistic that this process will be effective in projecting TCO for new equipment in a way that will facilitate sound resource allocation decisions, the process will be evaluated annually by the Technology Committee and modified as necessary. The Request Form will also be reviewed annually with input from the College's technology departments regarding user satisfaction and effectiveness. The TCO Spreadsheet has been added to the Program Review section of the College website to provide accessibility and support during the Program Review process.

3. Assessing the effective use of technology resources.

An annual survey of College students, faculty, and staff was conducted in spring 2014 to assess technology use, resources, and needs. The results of the technology survey were evaluated by the Technology Committee in fall 2014 and the committee used the data from the 147 responses for decision-making and improvement regarding future technology workshops, equipment recommendations in the program review process, and proposals for technology resources. For example, in the survey, 24% of students said that their main access to a college computer was in the library. In the 2014 program review requests, the Library requested 11 additional computer workstations to accommodate the average usage of 13,000 logins by students each fall and spring semester. Therefore, the Technology Committee set this request as a medium priority and recommended that computers from inventory be installed in the library to meet student needs. The recommendation was approved in the strategic planning process and the 11 computer stations were added to the Library's computer lab in spring 2015. In its review of the survey, the Technology committee also considered such issues as its timeliness, the number of the questions contained in the survey, and the focus of the questions. The committee determined that the 2015 survey would be conducted in late spring. It also developed a series of specific questions for the purpose of evaluating technology on campus and the College's use of resources. Finally, it decided to eliminate some questions to better facilitate completion. The 2015 Technology Survey received almost twice the number of responses to the first survey (204 students, 50 faculty, 48 staff) and the committee plans to review it in fall 2015.

4. Using the results of evaluation as the basis for improvement.

As part of the creation of the Norco College Technology Strategic Plan 2013-2016, the Technology Plan Task Force mapped the current state of the College

technology environment, expressed in seven comprehensive planning assumptions. It also conducted a series of focus group meetings related to technology on campus, and it surveyed students and associate faculty on their technology needs, habits, and concerns.   Analysis of these assessments led to the identification of nine distinct challenge areas having to do with the use of technology on campus (e.g., the difficulty of accessing the campus network from off campus, the absence of a technology help desk for students), listed in the Strategic Plan itself. The Technology committee addressed these findings in its 2013 -2014 and 2014-15 meetings and forwarded feedback to the Information Technology Strategy Council for District consideration. For example, the committee discussed wi-fi access for students and the cumbersome process of signing up that delays access by weeks. Changes in the process of uploading student email addresses to the District's authentication servers have allowed much simpler and more immediate access to the RCCD_Inet wireless network. These changes to the wi-fi access have resolved two identified student concerns regarding technology on campus.

One example of the College's use of evaluation results for improvement in the area of technology is the Technology Committee's recommendations to the planning councils regarding technology requests from program review. Based on the information received from the *Technology Request Form* for each technology request, the Technology Committee uses the criteria stated in the [*Replacement of Technology Infrastructure and Equipment Plan*](#) to evaluate the requests and determine priority level (high, medium, low) and recommended action, such as replacing with an item in inventory or notification of grant funding to meet a particular need. This is a new process, documented in the Technology Principles and Guidelines, and implemented in the fall 2014 program review process. The recommendations were accepted by the Business and Facilities Planning Council. In winter-spring 2015, the recommendations were acted upon in some cases by funding the items identified as being high priority and in other cases by approving the replacement of old equipment with newer existing inventory.

Assessment of technology resources through such instruments as the spring annual *Technology Survey 2014* also led to the discovery that faculty, staff, and students desired access to more technology training than the College had been offering and for it to be offered online as well as face-to-face. Accordingly, the Technology Committee (with support from the Associated Students of Norco College, the District Education Committee, and the Professional Development Committee) made a recommendation for online training via Lynda.com (a leading online learning site that provides videos and tutorials in the use of classroom technology, pedagogy, learning techniques, and other educational tools). This recommendation was formalized as a resource request in the annual administrative program review for Library/Learning Resources. The request was evaluated by the planning councils and given a high priority in the annual ranking of resource requests. As a result, The College purchased a one-year license to Lynda.com, widely publicized its existence,

conducted training in the use of the site for the entire campus community, and made it available free of charge to students, staff, and faculty.

The use of Lynda.com itself was evaluated during the 2014-15 academic year to ensure that it is effectively meeting the needs that earlier technology assessments had identified. The Technology Committee conducted a "Lynda.com Satisfaction Survey" at the end of fall 2014. A total of 75 valid responses were received, a majority of which were from students. Results showed high satisfaction rates on the usefulness, convenience, and quality of the courses. The committee monitored the number of registered users to assess the effectiveness of marketing Lynda.com as well as the extent to which the entire online training site is used. As of March 17, 2015, Lynda.com had 1776 registered users, sixty-one percent of full-time faculty, sixty-nine percent of staff, and fifteen percent of students. Over 450 courses were viewed, including ones devoted to the use of Microsoft Office, Photoshop, and AutoCAD, as well as others identified in the 2014 Technology Survey. These assessment tools were used to evaluate and recommend in spring 2015 the continued purchase of Lynda.com as a technology training tool for the College.

The Technology Committee developed and scheduled three technology training workshops in fall 2014 and three workshops in spring 2015 that were held as part of the response to the feedback from the Technology Survey. The topics were identified using the results from the Technology Survey 2014, taking into consideration which courses were available via online tutoring at Lynda.com. The committee plans to conduct three workshops per term in fall and spring targeted to faculty and staff. The workshops in fall of 2014 were well attended with over 50 attendees; spring 2015 workshop had 30 attendees.

Evidence for College Recommendation 4

CR4.1 Norco College Technology Principles and Guidelines
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/TechnologyPrinciplesandGuidelines.pdf

CR4.2 Norco College Replacement of Technology Infrastructure and Replacement Plan
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/Replacement%20of%20Technology%20Infrastructure%20Equipment%20Plan.pdf

CR4.3 Annual Computer Equipment Inventory 2015
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/Norco-College-Computer-Equipment-Inventory-2015.pdf

CR4.4 Technology Committee Minutes, 28 August 2014

http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/2014-15/2014-08-28-Technology-minutes.pdf

CR4.5 Technology Request Form
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/TechRequestFormProgramReview.pdf

CR4.6 Technology Total Cost of Ownership Form
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/TechnologyTotalCostofOwnership.pdf

CR4.7a Annual Technology Survey 2014: Faculty
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/TechSurvey2014-Faculty.pdf

CR4.7b Annual Technology Survey 2014: Staff
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/TechSurvey2014-STAFF.pdf

CR4.7C Annual Technology Survey 2014: Students
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/TechSurvey2014-STUDENTS.pdf

CR4.8a Annual Technology Survey 2015: Faculty
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/TechSurvey2015-Faculty.pdf

CR4.8b Annual Technology Survey 2015: Staff
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/TechSurvey2015-Staff.pdf

CR4.8c Annual Technology Survey 2015: Students
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/TechSurvey2015-Student.pdf

CR4.9 Norco College Technology Strategic Plan 2013-2016
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/PlanningDocs/Norco%20Technology%20Plan%2013-16.pdf

CR4.10 Lynda.com Satisfaction Survey 2014
http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/LyndaComSatisfactionSurvey-2014.pdf

Comprehensive Evidence List

2013 Accreditation Survey
Academic Planning Council Minutes, 14 November 2014
Academic Senate Minutes, 2 March 2015
Actuarial Valuation for Post-Employment Benefits, 2013-2014
Annual Computer Equipment Inventory 2015
Annual Evaluation Report
Annual Open Dialogue Session
Annual Progress Report on Educational Master Plan Goals, Objectives and "Dashboard Indicators"
Annual Survey of Effectiveness of Academic Senate and Senate Standing Committees
Annual Survey of Effectiveness of Planning Councils
Annual Technology Survey 2014 (Faculty, Staff, Students)
Annual Technology Survey 2015 (Faculty, Staff, Students)
Area of Emphasis Report 2014—Humanities, Philosophy, and Art
Areas of Emphasis Assessment Report 2013
Board of Trustees BP/AP 7380 Retiree Health Benefits
Board of Trustees Minutes, 18 September 2012
Board of Trustees Minutes, 21 April 2015
Business Services (General) APR 2013-14
Business Services Staff Retreat, 7 November 2014
Business Services Staff Retreat, 17 June 2015
Course Syllabus Shells Website
Custodial APR 2013-2014
DBAC Minutes, 23 January 2015
DBAC Minutes, 27 February 2015
District Technology Plan
DSPC Minutes, 13 March 2015
DSPC Minutes, 30 January 2015
Early Childhood Studies ADT assessment report
English ADT assessment report
"Evaluation Procedures"
Facilities Department (Administrative Support) APR 2013-2014
Fiscal Year 2013-2014 Annual Audit
Follow-Up Report on English 1A Assessment for General Education Outcomes: Spring 2012
Food Services APR 2-13-2014
GASB-45
General Education Assessment Report 2013-2014
General Education Assessment Report 2014-2015
Information Technology Audit Status Report
ISPC Minutes, 5 November 2014
ISPC Minutes, 3 Dec 2014

ISPC Minutes, 4 March 2015
ISPC Minutes, 1 April 2015
ISPC Minutes, 22 April 2015
ISPC Minutes, 6 May 2015
IT Audit Recommendation Project Status Summary
Key Indicators Report 2014-15
Lynda.com Satisfaction Survey 2014
Maintenance Department APR 2013-2014
Memorandum from College President to Norco College
Norco College Assessment Cycle
Norco College Assessment Report 2013-2014
Norco College Faculty Guide
Norco College Replacement of Technology Infrastructure and Replacement Plan
Norco College Strategic Plan and Process 2013 – 2018
Norco College Strategic Planning Committee Policy 2010-01
Norco College Technology Principles and Guidelines
Norco College Technology Strategic Plan 2013-2016
OMB Circular A-21
Program Assessment Guidelines
RCCD Centennial Strategic Plan 2013-2016
Report on Resource Allocation
Resource Committee Minutes, 7 April 2015
"Senate Recommendation Regarding Institution Set Standards-Procedural Response"
"Strategic Planning Timeline"
Strategic Planning Newsletter, Spring 2015
Summary of Academic Senate Survey of Effectiveness
Summary of Planning Councils Survey of Effectiveness
Survey of Committee of the Whole Membership
Technology Committee Minutes, 28 August 2014
Technology Request Form
Technology Total Cost of Ownership Form