



MIDTERM REPORT



NORCO
COLLEGE

Submitted to the
Accrediting Commission for
Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges
March 2017



NORCO COLLEGE • 2001 THIRD STREET NORCO, CA 92860-2600 • (951) 372-7000

Norco College

Midterm Report

Submitted by

Norco College
2001 Third Street
Norco, California 92860

Submitted to

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges,
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

March 15, 2017

Midterm Report Certification Page

March 15, 2017

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

From: Dr. Bryan Reece, President
Norco College
2001 Third Street
Norco, California 92860

We certify there was broad participation/review by the campus community and believe this Report accurately reflects the nature and substance of this institution.

Virginia Blumenthal, President, Board of Trustees Riverside Community College District	Date
---	------

Michael Burke, Ph.D., Chancellor Riverside Community College District	Date
--	------

Bryan Reece, Ph.D., President Norco College	Date
--	------

Diane Dieckmeyer, Ed.D., Vice President, Academic Affairs and Accreditation Liaison Officer, Norco College	Date
---	------

Peggy Campo, Academic Senate President and Associate Professor of Anatomy and Physiology, Norco College	Date
--	------

Kristine Anderson, Faculty Accreditation Co-chair and Professor of English, Norco College	Date
--	------

Andy Aldasoro, Vice President California School Employees Association	Date
--	------

Robbie Bishara, President Associated Students of Norco College	Date
---	------

Table of Contents

Statement of Report Preparation	3
Responses to Commission’s Recommendations	4
District Recommendation 1	4
District Recommendation 2	4
College Recommendation 1	5
College Recommendation 2	7
College Recommendation 3	9
College Recommendation 4	10
Data Trends Analysis	13
Responses to Actionable Improvement Plans	17
Actionable Improvement Plan II.A.2	18
Actionable Improvement Plan II.B.2.d	18
Actionable Improvement Plan III.B.1.a	19
Actionable Improvement Plan III.B.2.a	20
Actionable Improvement Plan III.D.1.a	20
Appendix: List of Evidence	22

Statement of Report Preparation

In February 2016, Norco College's Accreditation Liaison Officer and Faculty Accreditation Co-Chair met to establish a timeline and organization for the Midterm Report process. In March 2016, faculty, staff, and administrators associated with the areas to be addressed in the report became involved in compiling responses and assisting with evidence collection. Along with input and updates from various stakeholder groups, including the Academic Senate, the Institutional Strategic Planning Council (ISPC), and the Academic Planning Council (a committee of department chairs), those who provided expertise in the completion of the report include the following:

District Recommendation 1:	Associate Vice Chancellor of Information Technology Riverside Community College District Office of Information Technology
District Recommendation 2:	Vice Chancellor of Business and Financial Services Norco College Vice President of Business Services
College Recommendation 1:	Institutional Strategic Planning Council Administrative Co-Chair/Accreditation Liaison Officer Dean of Institutional Effectiveness Academic Senate President
College Recommendation 2:	Vice President of Academic Affairs Dean of Institutional Effectiveness Faculty Assessment Coordinator
College Recommendation 3:	Vice President of Business Services
College Recommendation 4:	Dean of Technology and Learning Resources/Technology Committee Co-Chair Classified Professional Instructional Production Specialist/Technology Committee Co-Chair College Technology Manager
Actionable Improvement Plan II.A.2:	Dean of Career and Technical Education Vice President of Academic Affairs/Accreditation Liaison Officer
Actionable Improvement Plan II.B.2.d:	Vice President of Student Services Dean of Instruction Dean of Student Services
Actionable Improvement Plan III.B.1.a:	Vice President of Business Services College Technology Manager Dean of Technology and Learning Resources/Technology Committee Co-Chair Classified Professional Instructional Production Specialist/Technology Committee Co-Chair
Actionable Improvement Plan III.B.2.a:	Vice President of Business Services Classified Professional Financial and Technical Analyst for Business Services
Actionable Improvement Plan III.D.1.a:	Accreditation Liaison Officer / Vice President of Academic Affairs Vice President of Student Services Vice President of Business Services

To familiarize the broad campus community with the report and its process, introduction to the Midterm Report was placed on the agendas for the ISPC on March 2, 2016 and the Committee of the Whole on March 3, 2016. The ISPC represents all constituent groups of the college, and the Committee of the Whole is open to all faculty, administrators, staff, and students.

Drafts of report sections were submitted to the accreditation co-chairs beginning in May 2016, and a full draft of the Midterm Report was shared with the entire College community via email on September 15, 2016. To facilitate broad understanding, dialogue, and participation, this first draft was discussed at ISPC on September 21, at Committee of the Whole on September 22, and at the Academic Senate on October 3, 2016.

A revised draft with the newly required Data Trends Analysis was then distributed to the College community via email on October 12, 2016, with a second/final reading and approval by the Academic Senate on October 17, ISPC on October 19, and Committee of the Whole on December 8.

The final draft was presented to the District Strategic Planning Committee on January 20, 2017, to the Chancellor's cabinet on January 30, and approved by the Board of Trustees on February 21, 2017.

Responses to the Commission's Recommendations

At its January 6-8, 2016 meeting, the Commission reviewed Norco College's Follow-Up Report ([R.1](#)), its previous Comprehensive Institutional Evaluation Report, and all submitted evidentiary documents, and found the College to have resolved all deficiencies and District and College recommendations, as well as having met all Eligibility Requirements.

As a result of Norco College's accreditation cycle falling prior to spring 2016, the College is now taking the opportunity in this Midterm Report to update the Commission on its progress to date related to previous recommendations and deficiencies.

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.

This recommendation was addressed satisfactorily in the Follow-Up Report.

The Information Technology Strategy Council (ITSC), which consists of the co-chairs of the college technology advisory groups and District Information Technology Services personnel, continues to meet monthly to discuss district-wide technology needs, including the status of the District Technology Plan ([DR1.1](#)) objectives for the current academic year. By the time of the Follow-Up Report, the ITSC had begun the process of working with each college's vice president of business and the Vice Chancellor of Business Services to determine financial sustainability as the District and colleges implemented their technology plans.

Every fall term, the council assesses the prior academic year's objectives (derived in large part from outstanding IT Audit ([DR1.2](#)) concerns). In fall 2016, the council was discussing compilation and prioritization of the list of 2016-2017 objectives based on the prior year's outstanding objectives in addition to new items brought forward from the colleges' and District's technology plans for 2016-2017.

Progress continues to be made toward a more comprehensive disaster recovery plan (District Technology Continuity Plan, Appendix 3 of the District Technology Plan, [DR1.3](#)). One step has been the completion of network redundancies between college and district locations, ensuring that locations are connected to each other in more than one way in case of outage at any single site. Work on this alternate network routing has been completed at Norco College and continues at Riverside City College. Implementation of a second district-wide internet connection at Moreno Valley College is in progress, which will provide additional redundancy as well as increased capacity to the entire District. In addition, data are being replicated between college sites on a scheduled basis. Also, faculty and staff email has been migrated to Office 365 at Microsoft for improved access and availability.

The colleges' vice presidents for business and the Vice Chancellor for Business and Financial Services continue to refine a financial sustainability plan for technology replacement and enhancements.

District Recommendation 2

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

This recommendation was addressed satisfactorily in the Follow-Up Report.

To address the Commission's recommendation regarding OPEB liability, the Other Post-Employment Benefits Obligation Funding Plan ([DR2.1](#)) was 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([DR2.2](#)) and the State Chancellor’s Accounting Advisory, Governmental Accounting Board Statement No. 45—Accounting and Financial Reporting by Employers for Post-Employment Benefits Other Than Pensions, GASB 45 ([DR2.3](#));

3. Contribute investment earnings over time 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 ([DR2.4](#)) and on February 27, 2015 ([DR2.5](#)), was also vetted through each of the colleges’ shared governance processes and reviewed by both the District Strategic Planning Council (January 30, 2015 and March 13, 2015) ([DR2.6a](#), [DR2.6b](#)) and the Chancellor’s cabinet (March 30, 2015). The final proposal was presented and discussed at the April 7, 2015 Resource Committee meeting ([DR2.7](#)). The Board approved the proposal at its April 21, 2015 meeting ([DR2.8](#)).

The District continues to implement its funding plan to ensure a reduction of its OPEB liability. An OPEB Committee was formed, with membership consisting of the Vice Chancellor of Business and Financial Services, a CTA representative, a management representative, a CSEA representative, and a community member. At the committee’s initial January 6, 2016 meeting, the group chose an asset-allocation strategy for a \$250,000 investment per fiscal year. The committee recommended a moderately conservative plan with medium risk (Strategy 2) within the CalPERS OPEB irrevocable trust. To follow shared government processes, the committee’s work was presented to Norco College’s Business and Facilities Planning Council at its February 16, 2016 ([DR2.9](#)) meeting and to the College’s Institutional Strategic Planning Council on March 2, 2016 ([DR2.10](#)). On September 12, 2016 the District OPEB Committee reviewed the trust’s performance and set future meeting dates for a minimum of two times a year.

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.

The recommendation has four components, each of which was addressed satisfactorily in the Follow-Up Report.

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

The College continues to evaluate all parts of its planning and resource allocation cycle, posting relevant documents to its Evaluation Procedures ([CR1.1](#)) webpage. Between 2011 and 2015, evaluation of the planning and resource allocation cycle at the College consisted of eight components, as designated in the Norco College Strategic Planning Committee Policy 2010-01. During 2015, the Institutional Strategic Planning Council (ISPC) reviewed and revised Policy 2010-01([CR1.2a](#), [CR1.2b](#)) to further improve and simplify evaluation processes at the College. One improvement made as a result of revising the policy concerned the Survey of the Committee of the Whole (COTW). Because the Survey of the COTW is administered only to those who attend the last meeting of the year, and is thereby not necessarily an accurate cross-section of all College faculty, administrators, and staff, the ISPC expanded the distribution of the survey to include the entire institution. Now called the Institutional Effectiveness and Planning Survey, all college employees with adequate knowledge of planning processes have an opportunity to provide input about which areas are effective and which need improvement.

The ISPC also determined that an additional component of the 2011-2015 evaluation process—the Open Dialogue session held each May—was not effective as an evaluation procedure. The session was felt to have value in other areas and will continue to be held, but it has been dropped from the list of evaluation components. The total number of components by which the College evaluates its planning, program review, resource allocation, and decision-making process has therefore been reduced from eight to seven:

1. Survey of Effectiveness of the Planning Councils (CR1.3)
2. Report of Effectiveness of Academic Senate and Senate Standing Committees (CR1.4)
3. Memorandum from College President to Norco College (CR1.5)
4. Progress Report on Strategic Planning/Educational Master Plan Goals, Objectives and “Dashboard Indicators” (CR1.6)
5. Institutional Effectiveness and Planning Survey (CR1.7)
6. Report of Resource Allocation (CR1.8)
7. Report on Annual Evaluation (CR1.9)

Minor changes were also made to several other evaluation procedures. For example, the Annual Evaluation Report was renamed Report on Annual Evaluation Cycle, and it was further specified that this report should be used as a tool to make improvements in planning processes.

In addition, Norco College now reports out on all 22 goals related to its Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) Framework of Indicators (CR1.10a, CR1.10b). Base year data have been gathered, and one-year and six-year targets established, for such indicators as completion rate, remedial rate, CTE completion rate, successful course completion, number of degrees and certificates, and FTES.

The College is confident that its process for evaluating its planning and resource allocation cycle is effective. The component parts of the process are themselves regularly evaluated, and thereby the overall cycle itself improved.

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

As noted in the 2015 Follow-Up Report, Norco College has three different types of participatory committees: 1) standing committees of the Academic Senate, 2) standing committees not associated with the Academic Senate, and 3) planning councils that, among other things, evaluate and prioritize resource requests in their specific area. Beginning in 2011, members of standing committees of the Academic Senate completed an online Academic Senate Standing Committee Survey ([CR1.11a](#)) each October. Survey results were discussed by the membership and an executive summary/analysis of the results developed by each committee chair. The senate received an executive summary from each standing committee for review and discussion, and it made recommendations to each of the committees based on the results of the evaluation and discussion. The senate president reported on these evaluations to the Institutional Strategic Planning Council (ISPC), and a summary of the results was posted on the Institutional Research and Strategic Planning websites. In order to create an opportunity for more thoughtful feedback and evaluation, this process was modified slightly beginning in the 2015-2016 academic year. Online surveys were moved to late spring; following the survey, each committee discusses the results. In spring semester, each committee confers about its planning and decision-making processes during the academic year and how it has fulfilled its goals, filing reports with the senate (Academic Senate minutes, May 23, 2016) ([CR1.11b](#)). The senate makes and receives recommendations from each committee based on the results of the evaluations and discussions. In the fall, the senate president reports on committee evaluations to ISPC, and an annual report, the Senate Overview of the Assessment Survey of the Senate and Its Standing Committees, is posted on the Strategic Planning website ([CR1.4](#)). The College will continue to assess the timeline and effectiveness of this revised process.

Members of standing committees not associated with the Academic Senate (for example, the Grants Committee, the Technology Committee, the Associated Students of Norco College) complete an online survey each spring to gauge their level of satisfaction with the committee’s planning and decision-making process that year ([CR1.12](#)). Led by their respective chairs, those committees similarly review and respond to the survey results. These committees report their findings directly to the ISPC rather than to the Academic Senate.

Planning council members complete a similar online survey ([CR1.13](#)) each spring to determine their level of satisfaction with committee-level planning, resource allocation, and decision-making. 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. The ISPC also reviews these evaluations. The Results of the Survey of Effectiveness for the Planning Councils report ([CR1.14](#)) are posted on the Institutional Research website.

The instrument through which participatory governance committees assess their work is therefore standardized to the extent permitted by their specific compositions, roles and responsibilities, and relationship to other committees and councils. Some questions are tailored to the specific committee or council. In addition, the College has determined that an online survey for Academic Senate standing committees be supplemented with dialogue sessions for generating useful

assessment information. The College will continue to refine and modify its committee assessment methodology on a regular basis.

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

The College established a process and cycle for assessing its evaluation mechanisms, which is to occur every second and fourth year of the Strategic Planning cycle during the fall Strategic Planning Retreat, as noted on the revised Policy 2010-01. The first of these retreats was held on December 3, 2014 (CR1.15), followed by a retreat on December 2, 2015 (CR1.16). For the 2015 retreat, the focus was not to assess the evaluation mechanisms since it was off cycle; however, the Institutional Strategic Planning Council focused on decision-making processes, engaging in an activity to gauge members' understanding of the flow of decision-making. The dialogue involved an understanding of the differences between what is strategic and what is operational, and the acknowledgement that not all decisions require committee approval.

As part of its evaluation of its evaluation mechanisms, the ISPC voted to continue to hold the Annual Open Dialogue, which occurs at the end of each spring. However, though the decision was made to continue these sessions as a valued element of the College's culture and to promote continued transparency, the ISPC also noted that it should not be included among the College's methods of evaluation.

The fall 2016 Strategic Planning Retreat (CR1.17), and biennially after that, will be devoted largely to assessing the evaluation mechanisms used in integrated planning and resource allocation.

4. Develop strategies to broadly communicate evaluation results

As noted in the Follow-Up Report, the College has employed a number of methods in recent years to communicate evaluation results to the college community. Evaluation results are discussed regularly in council and committee meetings, and they are often considered in department meetings and by the president's cabinet. Reports and findings for each of the evaluation procedures are posted on the Evaluation Procedures (CR1.1) webpage. In the 2013 Norco College accreditation survey (CR1.18), only two of 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." This item also was included on the 2016 Institutional Effectiveness and Planning Survey (CR1.7). Again, a minority of respondents (12 of 115) disagreed with the statement.

Beginning in spring 2015, the College also created a biannual strategic planning newsletter to further facilitate communication of evaluation results. The fall 2015 newsletter (CR1.19) contained articles on the Completion Initiative (designed to increase the percentage of Norco College students who transfer or obtain a degree within four years of enrollment), the revised Evaluation Procedures, and overviews of the roles of the Academic Senate and the Associated Students of Norco College in the evaluation process. The College President also wrote an article on strategic planning highlights. The spring 2016 issue of the newsletter (CR1.20) included an update on the Completion Initiative as well as pieces on the role of the Academic Senate, the Business and Facilities Planning Council, and the Student Success Committee in the evaluation process. The newsletter, published each year in November and May, is distributed electronically and in hard copy. The most recent newsletter (CR1.21) also can be found on the Strategic Planning webpage (CR1.22). While wide-ranging in focus, it underscores the improvements that have been made to planning and decision-making processes through the use of evaluation procedures.

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 the following four components, each of which was addressed satisfactorily in the Follow-Up Report.

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

As explained in the Follow-Up Report, Norco College has developed a standardized course syllabus shell for use by full- and part-time faculty. The syllabus shell (example shell, fall 2016, CR2.1), fully implemented in fall 2015, provides students with non-instructor-specific information (e.g., disability resources, learning resources, etc.) and also provides faculty with the current SLOs for each course already pre-loaded. Faculty can access shells for their particular courses by following a link to the Course Syllabus Shells website ([CR2.2](#)) from the Faculty Resources webpage. The shells also are referenced in the Norco College Faculty Guide ([CR2.3](#)). The syllabus shells are updated annually to reflect curricular changes, and faculty continue to utilize them each term.

2. Direct assessment of program-level student learning outcomes

To meet this part of the recommendation, the College created a clear and systematic Rotation Plan for Outcomes Assessment ([CR2.4](#)) for both course- and program-level assessment. During the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic years, a new assessment software program, TracDat, was piloted and then fully implemented with faculty. As of spring 2016, 88.9% of eligible courses were engaged in ongoing assessment, as indicated in the College's 2016 Annual Report to ACCJC ([CR2.5](#)).

The College has also continued to conduct direct assessment of student learning in the Area of Emphasis (AOE) degree, in Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs), and CTE programs. The programs scheduled for assessment during 2015-2016 were AOE in Administrative and Information Systems, Math and Sciences, and Kinesiology, Health and Wellness; ADTs in Anthropology, Math, Physics, Computer Science and Communication Studies; CTE programs in Business-Logistics, Business-Real Estate, Commercial Music-Performance, Digital Electronics, Drafting Technology, Game Art-Character Modeling, Game Programming, Logistics Management, and Mobile Applications Development; and in General Education, Communications PLO. As of spring 2016, 76.1% of all programs were involved in ongoing assessment as reported in the 2016 ACCJC Annual Report. This is marked improvement from the 2015 ACCJC Annual Report ([CR2.6](#)) which showed ongoing assessment of program learning outcomes at 48.2%. Since 2016-2017 is the last year of our four-year cycle, all programs should have completed and reported assessment by early fall 2017.

3. Completion of general education assessment cycle

At present, four general education learning outcomes (GELOs) comprise the General Education program: 1) critical thinking, 2) information competency and technology literacy, 3) communication, and 4) self-development and global awareness. These GE learning outcomes have been assessed authentically since they were adopted by the Board of Trustees in fall 2013. That semester, the Norco College Assessment Committee (NAC) agreed on a plan to assess each of the outcomes cyclically, in successive years.

The procedure used to assess GELOs begins by selecting a representative sample of courses that have an assignment/test/project that authentically assesses the selected GE learning outcome. In TracDat, faculty are provided a roster for each class to be assessed, along with a rubric on which they can score each student according to the following scale:

- 1: Little or no evidence of competency
- 2: Limited evidence of competency
- 3: Adequate evidence of competency
- 4: Strong evidence of competency

Faculty GELO rubric scorings for each student are then exported from TracDat into a spreadsheet for analysis. GELO scores for students are then merged with student enrollment data, and total units of successfully completed general education coursework are then calculated for each student. Once this student-level data is derived, significance testing analysis (through statistical models called analysis of variance, or ANOVA) is applied to three groups of students:

- Group 1: fewer than 12 units of GE
- Group 2: 12-24 units of GE
- Group 3: more than 24 units of GE

Through the results of ANOVA, significant differences among the mean GELO competency scores of the three groups can be derived. If Group 2's scores are significantly greater than those in Group 1, and Group 3's scores are significantly greater than those in Group 2, learning for the GELO can be attributed to increased exposure to general education courses. In other words, general education courses appear to be making a difference in learning for that outcome. This

linear relationship is occasionally found, but sometimes the relationship is not so clear. Thus, faculty are called together to help explain data patterns and also to make plans for improvement in learning, if warranted.

In addition to the ANOVA data, learning outcomes were disaggregated by ethnicity, gender, and age for the 2015-2016 academic year, and a disproportionate impact analysis was conducted to determine if any of these groups are experiencing learning gaps. Each year, GE assessment reports ([CR 2.7a](#), [CR2.7b](#), [CR2.7c](#)) are written to capture the data and faculty input. During 2016-2017, the critical thinking GELO is scheduled to be assessed, and this will complete the full cycle of GELO evaluation as identified in the recommendation.

4. Development, implementation, and assessment of an evaluation mechanism to review all parts of the student learning outcomes process in an ongoing and systematic way

The College's instructional annual program review (APR) was identified as the most logical source of data for creating an evaluative mechanism to review the student learning outcomes process. The program review template ([CR2.8](#)) presently includes a rubric that is used by members of the Norco Assessment Committee to score academic disciplines in each area of the SLO process. These scores form the basis of the evaluative mechanism for reviewing all parts of the SLO process.

Calculating the mean for each part of the SLO process creates key indicator scores that quantitatively summarize the state of assessment at the College. In the 2014-2015 report ([CR2.9](#)), key indicators were Level of Loop-Closing, Improvement of Learning, Dialogue on Results, and Participation in Program Assessment with scores of 2.4, 2.1, and 1.9, respectively, for the first three indicators (excluding 0 scores for disciplines that did not complete the assessment portion of the APR). These three indicators represented each part of the SLO process, with the overall average 2.2 on a three-point scale. The scores show that, for the disciplines that engaged in assessment, clear levels of loop closing, improvement of learning, and dialogue were involved in the process. The final key indicator was Participation in Program Assessment; ten out of 27 disciplines (37%) indicated active involvement in program assessment.

During 2015-2016, the rubric was modified slightly. An extra scoring area was added to capture initial SLO assessment activity. Also, since TracDat has become the monitoring tool for assessment, an additional rubric area was added to identify whether assessments had been input into the system. In total there were six key indicators for the SLO process as scored on the 2015-2016 program reviews: Initial SLO Assessments, Loop-Closing Assessments, TracDat Input, Improvement of Learning, Dialogue across Discipline, and Participation in Program Assessment. The 2015-2016 Key Indicators Report ([CR2.10](#)) shows the results for these areas as 2.5, 2.3, 2.3, 2.3, 1.6, and 0.423 (or 42.3%), respectively. These outcomes show modest increases in all areas over the previous year with the exception of Dialogue, which decreased 0.3. These trends are encouraging for most parts of the SLO process. However, during 2016-2017, NAC will discuss methods of improving dialogue across the discipline for the next program review cycle.

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 the following two components, each of which was addressed satisfactorily in the Follow-Up Report.

1. Systematic assessment of service area outcomes in Business Services

At Norco College, Business Services comprises four departments: College Safety and Police, Facilities (including Administrative, Custodial, Grounds, and Maintenance), Food Services, and Technology Support Services. Since 2008, units within Business Services have conducted annual program reviews (due by August 31 each year) that provide analysis of changes within the unit over the previous year as well as significant new resource needs. A central component of the program review process is outcomes assessment. Each unit is expected to describe its previous year's outcomes assessment (service area outcomes addressed, assessment method or methods used, target or benchmark, results, expected use of results) as well as the current year's assessment plan. In addition, each unit responds to the question, "What did you learn that will impact your unit for the future?" These program review documents are housed at the College's Administrative Unit Program Review webpage ([CR3.1](#)). The rigor and the cyclical nature of the College's administrative and instructional unit program review processes ensure that service area outcomes assessment is systematic for all Business Services departments.

Service area outcomes (SAO) assessment is also a regular agenda item at monthly Business Office Administrative Team (BOAST) meetings. BOAST develops the agenda and identifies the activities for Business Services' annual open house and retreat, ensuring that assessment is a key topic for both events. The open house provides an opportunity for new faculty and staff to become acquainted with Business Services personnel and familiar with processes and procedures of the office, including the need for regular SAO assessment. The annual retreat ([CR3.2a](#), [CR3.2b](#), [CR3.2c](#), [CR3.2d](#)) (mandatory for all Business Services staff), held at the end of each fiscal year, focuses on team building, program review ([CR3.2e](#)), SAO assessment results of the previous year, and SAO assessment plans for the upcoming year. The retreat includes sharing of thoughts and ideas, with discussion time facilitated by the Vice President of Business Services. Survey results ([CR3.3](#)) indicate that it is especially helpful for department managers in their preparation of their program reviews, allowing for more comprehensive goal setting.

As noted in the Follow-Up Report, 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 Follow-Up Report detailed some of the ways in which Business Services program reviews from 2013-2014 reported the current or previous use of assessment results for improvement. The 2014-2015 program reviews (Business Services, [CR3.4a](#); College Police, [CR3.4b](#); Facilities, Administrative, [CR3.4c](#); Facilities, Custodial, [CR3.4d](#); Facilities, Grounds, [CR3.4e](#); Facilities, Maintenance, [CR3.4f](#); Food Services, [CR3.4g](#); Technology Support Services, [CR3.4h](#)) demonstrated that departments had further refined their identification of service area outcomes for assessment and the methods used to assess them. For example, one of Business Services' goals was to improve coordination of information technology functions within the College. As a result of dialogue within the District's Information Technology Strategy Council (ITSC), Business Services advocated for the decentralization of microcomputer support, moving from a District-based to a College-based system. Instructional Media was combined with Microcomputer Support to form a new division called Technology Support Services. With this decentralization, the College gained a Technology Manager and 2.5 FTE of Microcomputer Support staff. As a result, Norco College has a team of technicians, along with a technology supervisor, that is able to provide more immediate delivery of services to the College.

Program reviews completed in summer 2015 by other departments in Business Services also identify areas where assessment results were used for improvement. In the area of College Safety and Police ([CR3.4b](#)), a Norco College Cadet program was implemented, with several cadets being added to this department. Facilities Department (Maintenance) ([CR3.4f](#)) was able to implement an automatic feedback survey ([CR3.5](#)) on all work orders to maintain and improve their service delivery and customer satisfaction. Furthermore, the Food Services ([CR3.4g](#)) department was able to increase their delivery and options by opening a coffee cart and a coffee bar in the cafeteria area. These and other improvements are the result of the ongoing outcomes assessment process.

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 the following four components, each of which was addressed satisfactorily in the Follow-Up Report.

1. Planning systematically for the replacement of technology infrastructure and equipment

In spring 2016, the Technology Committee revised the Norco College Technology Principles and Guidelines ([CR4.1a](#), [CR4.1b](#)) to improve the process to be more inclusive of stakeholders at the College. The Technology Committee coordinates with departments and disciplines to ensure that the replacement technology meets specific programmatic needs. The committee coordinates with Technology Support Services staff to plan for replacement, reassignment, and evaluation of technology resources, and coordinates with grants administrators to identify possible funding.

The Norco College Replacement of Technology Infrastructure and Equipment Plan ([CR4.2](#)) calls for a staggered replacement cycle in which a portion of the computer inventory (approximately 25%) is recommended for replacement

each year. An annual computer/equipment inventory ([CR4.3](#)) is also mandated, with custodial records of all technology equipment maintained by the College's Technology Support 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 ([CR4.4](#)) as part of the staggered replacement.

To illustrate, on May 21, 2015, the Technology Committee approved the Computer Equipment Refresh 2015 Recommendations list for office computer equipment ([CR4.5](#)), and the list was placed on the 2015 Annual Administrative Program Review for Technology Support Services ([CR4.6](#)). In the program review process, the recommendation was listed as a high priority, and 77 computers were funded in spring 2016. Replaced computers were returned to Technology Support Services staff for evaluation of remaining life and possible reassignment, as mandated by the Technology Strategic Plan ([CR4.7](#)). On April 28, 2016, the Technology Committee ([CR4.8](#)) approved the recommendation for the next 25% of computer inventory for office computers as well as classroom labs to be placed on the 2016 Annual Administrative Program Review.

2. Projecting total cost of ownership for new equipment

The College developed a total cost of ownership process for technology requests that was implemented in 2014-2015. The Technology Committee developed and approved Technology Request Forms for hardware ([CR4.9](#)) and for software ([CR4.10](#)) that were reviewed and approved by the District Information Technology Strategy Council on October 24, 2014 ([CR4.11](#)). Beginning fall 2015, units requesting technology resources as part of their annual program reviews completed a streamlined version of the Technology Request Form modified specifically for program review ([CR4.12](#)), as approved by the Technology Committee on April 23, 2015 ([CR4.13](#)) and also presented to the Program Review Committee on April 23, 2015 ([CR4.14](#)).

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 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. Through fall 2016, when submitting an annual program review, units utilized a Technology Total Cost of Ownership document ([CR4.15](#)) and then provided 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 to grant particular requests.

The Technology Committee continues to assess and improve the effectiveness of the Technology Request Form. In fall 2016, the Program Review Committee discussed revisions to the form titled Equipment & Technology Not Covered by Current Budget, and at its December 1, 2016 meeting ([CR4.16a](#)) voted to approve the form ([CR4.16b](#)), which has been incorporated into the current instructional program review template. This revision will help speed up the recommendation process by providing needed information directly on the program review form: the asset tag number for replacements to ascertain the age of the equipment and information regarding programmatic needs. These are criteria outlined in the Norco College Technology Principles and Guidelines to determine when equipment will be replaced.

3. Assessing the effective use of technology resources

Norco College continues to sustain and improve the processes for evaluation of technology resources. An annual survey of College students ([CR4.17a](#)), faculty ([CR4.17b](#)), and staff ([CR4.17c](#)) was again conducted in spring 2015 to assess technology use, resources, and needs. The results of the technology survey were evaluated by the Technology Committee at its September 17, 2015 ([CR4.18](#)) meeting, and the committee used the data from the 302 responses for decision-making and improvement regarding computer access for students, technology support, and technology maintenance. For example, in the survey, over 38% of students identified their main access to a college computer was in the library, and feedback from students identified the need for additional computers in the library. In March 2016, library computers were accessed 10,850 times by students. The committee informed the library staff of the survey results, and based on this discussion, a recommendation was made at the May 19, 2016 Technology Committee meeting ([CR4.1b](#)) for five library-based laptops to be placed on the next Library Program Review.

In its annual review of the Technology Survey, the committee decided to maintain the previous years' questions for consistency and comparison, but added one open-ended question for comments and feedback. The 2016 survey was launched to the college community after spring break and had 395 responses. The survey was reviewed at the September 15, 2016 Technology Committee meeting ([CR4.19](#)).

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

The Technology Committee continues to evaluate technology requests from program review utilizing the criteria stated in the Replacement of Technology Infrastructure and Equipment Plan [\(CR4.2\)](#) and information received from the Technology Request Form. The committee made its priority level (high, medium, low) recommendations from the 2015 annual program review, of which 15 high-priority technology requests were funded in spring 2016.

In addition, in reviewing results from the spring 2015 annual Technology Survey, the Technology Committee identified areas for improvement, such as faculty, staff, and students' desire for more technology troubleshooting support, and students' need for technical support. The committee determined that additional human resources were needed at the District's Help Desk and recommended to the Information Technology Strategy Council the need for a Help Desk Support Technician to be placed as a high priority in the District's annual program review for Information Technology and Learning Services.

Lynda.com [\(CR4.20\)](#), a leading online learning site that provides videos and tutorials in the use of classroom technology, pedagogy, learning techniques, and other educational tools, is the College's primary source for technology training for staff, faculty, and students. At its meeting of April 28, 2016 [\(CR4.8\)](#), the Technology Committee evaluated Lynda.com for user satisfaction, usage, and professional development needs. Statistics showed that in 2015 a total of 4,743 hours of Lynda.com videos were viewed by users. On the Lynda.com Satisfaction Survey [\(CR4.21\)](#) launched in winter 2016, over 75% of respondents stated they were likely to use Lynda.com again. Based on this information, the Technology Committee recommended to renew the Lynda.com subscription for 2016-2017.

Data Trends Analysis

Annual Report ([DT1.1](#), [DT1.2](#), [DT1.3](#))

Institution-Set Standards

Category	Reporting year		
	2014	2015	2016
STUDENT COURSE COMPLETION			
Standard	64.4%	67.5%	67.9%
Performance	69.6%	67.6%	69.9%
Difference between Standard and Performance	+ 5.2%	+ 0.1%	+ 2.0%
<p>Analysis: Data over this period show that students are successfully completing courses in encouraging numbers. In each year, course completion performed above the institution-set standard. In fall 2015, the College experienced its highest rate in course completion since data began to be collected, almost 70%.</p>			

Category	Reporting year		
	2014	2015	2016
DEGREE COMPLETION			
Standard	(reported as 10.5) = 380	422	432
Performance	525	555	554
Difference	+145	+133	+122
<p>Analysis: Although data over this period show that students are successfully completing degrees in encouraging numbers—in each year, degree completion exceeds the institution-set standard—Norco College has undertaken a college-wide Completion Initiative to increase the number of students who attain their academic goals of obtaining certificates, degrees, or transfer.</p>			

Category	Reporting year		
	2014	2015	2016
CERTIFICATE COMPLETION			
Standard	(reported as 5.6) = 125	128	127
Performance	131	159	126
Difference	+6	+31	-1
<p>Analysis: Data show that, in general, students are successfully completing certificates in encouraging numbers. In each year except the most recent, certificate completion exceeds the institution-set standard. This reduction may reflect the fact that the College has discontinued a number of programs and deleted a number of rarely taught or never-taught courses during this period in order to better serve present student needs in light of developing trends in employment. New programs and courses continue to be developed to serve those same needs. In fall 2016, the Academic Senate, in conjunction with the strategic governance process, was in the process of applying established protocol to analyze and respond to 2016 data (DT1.4). In addition, Norco College has undertaken a college-wide Completion Initiative to increase the number of students who attain their academic goals of obtaining certificates, degrees, or transfer (Academic Senate approval, April 18, 2016 DT1.5, ISPC approval, May 4, 2016 DT1.6).</p>			

TRANSFER	Reporting year		
	2014	2015	2016
Standard	(reported as 18) = 383	640	664
Performance	440	840	1,126
Difference	+57	+200	+462

Analysis: These data show that students are successfully transferring in encouraging numbers. In each year, transfer exceeds the institution-set standard. The significant increase in students transferring from year to year most likely reflects Norco College's definition of "transfer" (see the Institutional Research document titled Transfer Students at Norco College 2013-14: Definitions and Outcomes, [DT1.7](#)), which defines transfer using In-State Private (ISP)/Out-of-State Institutions (OOS) methodology. This methodology identifies cohorts of first-time students by college where they completed their first credit course. Norco College was accredited as a separate college in 2010, so individuals beginning their coursework prior to that time would have identified themselves as Riverside Community/City College students. As more students have begun their coursework at Norco College, and as Norco College's identity as a separately accredited institution has become clearer to students, the number of transferring students has risen.

LICENSURE PASS RATE N/A

JOB PLACEMENT RATE

Program Name	CIP Code	Institution Set Standard			Performance			Difference		
		2014	2015	2016	2014	2015	2016	2014	2015	2016
Architecture & Architectural Technology	04.09	61.3%	56.3%	58.38%	90.91%	46.7%	71.43%	+29.61%	-9.6%	+13.05%
Business and Commerce, General	52.01	61.3%	61.9%	69.53%	66.67%	100%	75%	+5.37%	+38.1%	+5.47%
Accounting	52.03	61.3%	61.9%	59.89%	70%	63%	76.92%	+8.7%	+1.1%	+17.03%
Business Administration	52.02	N/A	N/A	77.99%	N/A	N/A	92.31%	N/A	N/A	+14.32%
Business Management	52.02	61.3%	61.9%	59.79%	100%	79%	85.71%	+38.7%	+17.1%	+25.92%
Marketing & Distribution	52.18	61.3%	61.9%	61.81%	66.67%	100%	100%	+5.37%	+38.1%	+38.19%
Logistics & Materials Transportation	52.02	61.3%	61.9%	50.17%	50%	71.4%	54.55%	-11.3%	+9.5%	+4.38%
Real Estate	52.15	61.3%	61.9%	53.03%	100%	40.5%	78.79%	+38.7%	-21.4%	+25.76%
Digital Media	09.07	61.3%	46.2%	44%	0%	42.1%	56.52%	-61.3%	-4.1%	+12.52%
Computer Information Systems	11.01	61.3%	37%	62.42%	0%	80%	60%	-61.3%	+43%	-2.42%
Computer Software Development	11.02	61.3%	37%	44%	100%	50%	61.11%	+38.7%	+13%	+17.11%
Engineering Technology, General	15.00	61.3%	59.2%	59.91%	79.17%	55.6%	76.92%	+18.4%	-3.6%	+17.01%
Electronics & Electrical Technology	47.01	61.3%	59.2%	44%	100%	50%	71.43%	+38.7%	-9.2%	+27.43%
Drafting Technology	15.13	61.3%	59.2%	55.14%	71.43%	64.3%	62.01%	+10.13%	+5.1%	+6.87%
Manufacturing & Industrial Technology	15.06	61.3%	59.2%	59.45%	100%	75%	75%	+38.7%	+15.8%	+15.55%

Civil and Construction Management Technology	46.04	61.3%	59.2%	62.17%	80%	50%	80%	+18.7%	-9.2%	+ 17.83%
Commercial Music	50.09	N/A	N/A	44%	N/A	N/A	55.56%	N/A	N/A	+ 11.56%
Child Development/Early Care and Education	19.07	61.3%	53.1%	53.27%	50%	62.3%	75%	-11.3 %	+9.2%	+ 21.73%
Administration of Justice	43.01	61.3%	48.7%	51.27%	100%	42.9%	75%	+38.7%	-5.8%	+ 23.73%

Analysis: As a result of feedback from the 2014 comprehensive accreditation visit, the College revisited the methodology of the ISS to determine whether they were set too low. In doing so, we reviewed numerous other colleges' ISSs, including the three most common methodologies we found in the field. These results were discussed via our shared governance process, which led to a revision of our methodology. The Academic Senate, in conjunction with the strategic governance process, developed a response protocol (DT1.4) to be followed in cases in which a program falls below the institution-set standard. The first implementation of the protocol occurred in fall 2015, at which time a task force was convened with the faculty in the associated programs as well as various other administrators and members of the senate (DT1.8). During the meeting, various issues were discussed, such as possible reasons for the drop in job placement rates of a particular program, as well as possible solutions. The response process, which will continue to be implemented as needed, was viewed favorably by faculty and was an example of integrated planning across areas.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

	2014	2015	2016
Total number of College courses	434	419	368
Number of courses assessed	434 (100%)	292 (69.7%)	327 (88.9%)
Total number of College programs	62	56	46
Number of programs assessed	62 (100%)	27 (48.2%)	35 (76.1%)
Number of Institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined	4	4	4
Number of institutional outcomes (ILOs) with ongoing assessment	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)

Analysis: The College's understanding and focus on assessment have deepened over the years, reflected in what appear to be anomalies in some of the reported data. For example, the College employed more indirect assessment techniques in 2013 and 2014 (e.g., learning gains surveys of students), but beginning in 2015, the College has focused on direct assessment of courses and programs, which is arguably a more challenging process. The College continues to hone techniques for ongoing and meaningful assessment.

Annual Fiscal Report ([DT1.9](#), [DT1.10](#), [DT1.11](#))

NOTE: The Annual Fiscal Reports report District data.

Category	Reporting year		
	2014	2015	2016
General Fund Performance			
Revenues	166,229,407	173,624,650	187,612,346
Expenditures	161,236,480	171,718,114	184,045,827
Expenditures for Salaries and Benefits (included in total above)	134,442,320	140,833,151	149,031,896
Surplus/Deficit	4,992,927	1,906,536	3,566,519
Surplus/Deficit as % Revenues (Net Operating Revenue Ratio)	3.00%	1.10%	1.90%
Reserve (Primary Reserve Ratio) (Revenue/Expenditures)	1.03	1.01	1.02
<p>Analysis of the data: As noted in the 2014 accreditation self-evaluation, financial resources at the College continue to be sufficient to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. From 2014 to 2015, the surplus decreased as a result of the percentage increase in expenditures being higher than the percentage increase in revenue (6.5% and 4.5% respectively). From 2015 to 2016, the surplus increased as a result of the percentage increase in expenditures being lower than the percentage increase in revenue (7.1% and 8.0% respectively). The level of financial resources at the District and the College provides reasonable expectation of both short-term and long-term financial solvency.</p>			

Other Post Employment Benefits

Actuarial Accrued Liability (AAL) for OPEB	24,642,278	24,161,707	24,161,707
Funded Ratio (Actuarial Value of plan Assets/AAL)	0%	0%	0%
Annual Required Contribution (ARC)	2,925,208	3,041,672	3,041,672
Amount of Contribution to ARC	1,209,729	1,159,902	1,203,398
<p>Analysis of the data: The Annual Required Contribution (ARC) is approximately \$3M per year. The amount of annual contribution to the ARC is approximately 40% of the ARC. At this contribution level, it appears that the Actuarial Accrued Liability (AAL) will stay level (little increase or decrease).</p>			

Enrollment

Actual Full Time Equivalent Enrollment (FTES)	25,119	26,400	27,660
<p>Analysis of the data: FTES increase proportionately to revenue and expenditure increase. The amount of increase is approximately 4% and 5%, well above the Net Operating Revenue Ratio.</p>			

Financial Aid

USDE official cohort Student Loan Default Rate (FSLD - 3 year rate)	17%	16%	15%
<p>Analysis of the data: The cohort Student Loan Default Rate continues to decrease as a result of College efforts in this area. Norco College has contracted with North Star Services for default management.</p>			

Responses to Actionable Improvement Plans

<i>Actionable Improvement Plan</i>	<i>Relationship to College Planning Processes</i>	<i>Timeline for Completion</i>	<i>Responsible Party</i>
AIP II.A.2. Substantive Change Proposal	Approved by Academic Senate, Institutional Strategic Planning Council, Committee of the Whole (COTW), and Board of Trustees.	Completed	Accreditation Liaison Officer and Dean of Instruction, CTE
AIP II.B.2.d. Maintaining records of student complaints/grievances	Board Policies/Administrative Procedures 5522 and 5524. Process posted to College's homepage.	Completed	Vice President of Student Services
AIP III.B.1.a. District IT Audit and decentralization of other technology support services	Norco College Technology Committee working with District Information Technology Strategy Council. Approved by District Strategic Planning Council. Presented to College's Business and Facilities Planning Council. Approved by Board of Trustees.	Completed	Vice President of Business Services and Technology Committee
AIP III.B.2.a. Procedure for implementation of Total Cost of Ownership	Vetted through Business and Facilities Planning Council, assisted by Technology Committee, and presented to COTW.	Completed	Vice President of Business Services
AIP III.D.1.a. College President's annual communication of resource allocation to support student learning	Norco College Self-Study 2014. Annual memo from President distributed college-wide.	Completed	President and Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, Business Services, and Student Services

II.A.2. Actionable Improvement Plan

The College will complete a Substantive Change Proposal and submit it for approval to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges.

This item has been resolved.

In 2012, Norco College was contacted by a private company, International Rectifier, interested in collaborating to create a unique, for-credit, contract education program to benefit its current employees. In partnership with the District Office of Economic Development, Norco College entered into a unique partnership with International Rectifier, a Fortune 100 semi-conductor manufacturer, located in Temecula, California. International Rectifier has over 500 employees and sought to provide a cohort of employees (nearly 40 students) a certificate and Associate of Science degree in Digital Electronics to upgrade their technical ability and encourage both personal and professional advancement. General education courses were completed at Mt. San Jacinto College, while the degree-specific Digital Electronics courses were completed via Norco College at the company site in Temecula. The three-year program was scheduled from fall 2013 through spring 2016.

International Rectifier's corporate headquarters contains multiple training rooms that mirror college classrooms (desks, chairs, internet, projector, instructor's station, natural lighting, ADA compliant bathrooms, etc.). All courses were provided in accordance with California Education Code §78020-78023. Instructors were hired based on subject matter expertise and in accordance with California Education Code §78022(a) which states, "Faculty in all credit and noncredit contract education classes shall be selected and hired according to procedures existing in a community college district for the selection of instructors for credit classes." All college and ACCJC standards were met for the duration of the program.

Upon being notified of this agreement, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges requested a Substantive Change Proposal ([II.A.2.1](#)) be submitted for review at its March 6, 2014 meeting. The report was reviewed and vetted internally by the college's Academic Senate ([II.A.2.1a](#)), Institutional Strategic Planning Council ([II.A.2.1b](#)), Committee of the Whole ([II.A.2.1c](#)), and approved by the Board of Trustees ([II.A.2.1d](#)). In response to this Actionable Improvement Plan as documented on page 147 of the Norco College 2014 Institutional Self Evaluation Report, Norco College submitted a 73-page Substantive Change Proposal in February 2014. The Commission acted to accept the Norco College Substantive Change Proposal at its March 6, 2014 ([II.A.2.2](#)) meeting.

During the Follow-Up visit, the team evaluated the status of the College's Digital Electronics course offerings at the International Rectifier location, and praised the superb work of the College in serving the employees of Intentional Rectifier through this innovative program.

Norco College completed the International Rectifier program in spring 2016. Twenty students completed the program, earning both their certificate and Associate of Science degree in Digital Electronics from Norco College.

II.B.2.d. Actionable Improvement Plan

The College will develop a system for maintaining records of student complaint/ grievances.

This item has been resolved.

By the end of 2013, the Riverside Community College District Board of Trustees approved two Board Policies (BP) and Administrative Procedures (AP) related to student grievances: BP/AP5522([II.B.2.d.1](#)) — Student Grievance Process for Instruction and Grade Related Matters and BP/AP5524 ([II.B.2.d.2](#)).— Student Grievance Process for Matters Other Than Instruction, Grades, or Discipline.

While the College historically maintained student grievances in individual departments, the compilation and access to all grievances over multiple years were areas for improvement. Following approval of BP/AP5522 and BP/AP5524, the College assembled a team to devise a standardized system for maintaining records. A link to the complaint procedures, forms, and resources is available on the College's homepage.

The College developed forms identified in the policy: Student Request for Consultation [\(II.B.2.d.3\)](#) and Student Request for Formal Hearing [\(II.B.2.d.4\)](#). The Student Consultation Request form is completed after the student attempts to resolve the issue informally per AP5522 or AP5524. Following policy, students have 120 days from the date of the incident or situation to initiate the consultation process. The Student Request for Formal Hearing form, submitted to the College President, is to be completed after the student has made attempts to resolve the issue informally and through a consultation with the appropriate administrator. While the website has direct links to the approved Board policies, the College also developed flowcharts to assist students in understanding the two distinct processes for addressing grievances for instruction and grade-related matters (AP5522, [II.B.2.d.5](#)) and matters other than instruction, grades, or discipline (AP5524, [II.B.2.d.6](#)).

In researching best practices, the College administrative team determined that the complaint process must be visible on the College's homepage. In addition, the Complaint Procedures webpage [\(II.B.2.d.7\)](#) includes easily accessible links to the Board policies, forms, flowcharts, and resources. The resource links include the District's webpage on discrimination/harassment complaint reporting along with links to the California Community College Chancellor's Office and Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior College's Complaint Reporting.

Once the Complaint Procedures webpage went live, an email notification was released to the College community, and managers received training during a President's Cabinet meeting (AIP II.B.2.d.8). The College maintains all student grievance issues in a shared file that includes case notes and resulting action. This shared file is accessible to the President, vice presidents, deans, and their respective administrative assistants.

III.B.1.a. Actionable Improvement Plan

The College will address the recommendations of the District Information Technology Audit and move toward decentralization of other technology support services from the District to the College.

This item has been resolved.

As part of the College's Technology Strategic Plan's [\(III.B.1.a.1\)](#) Goal VI, Strategy #2, "Make Recommendations for Technology Structure/Strategic Model," the Technology Committee reviewed the District IT Audit [\(III.B.1.a.2\)](#) for items that correspond to the College. The committee discussed levels of priority (high, medium, low) to provide feedback to the District. Recommendations of specified items were approved by the Technology Committee on March 20, 2014 [\(III.B.1.a.3\)](#) and were then forwarded to the District ITSC for consideration.

One item on the District's audit list was the recommendation to restructure the Instructional Media Center (IMC) under District Information Services, but the committee did not recommend restructuring IMC. The discussion of this item was furthered at ITSC, and the council decided to merge IMC and Microcomputer Support as proposed in the District IT Audit, but instead of centralizing IMC at the District, the merged departments would be decentralized to the colleges. The intent was to provide better localized IT support services and increase collaboration between technology services and the College community while providing a single point of service for the end users. A draft recommendation with input from the College was approved by ITSC on March 6, 2015 [\(III.B.1.a.4\)](#) and approved by the District Strategic Planning Council on March 13, 2015 [\(III.B.1.a.5\)](#). The proposed decentralization was presented at the College's Business and Facilities Planning Council's March 10, 2015 [\(III.B.1.a.6\)](#) meeting, and the Recommendation for Decentralization of the District's Microcomputer Support Function was discussed at the Technology Committee's March 19, 2015 [\(III.B.1.a.7\)](#) meeting. The decentralization and merger of Microcomputer Support and IMC was approved at the Board of Trustees meeting on June 16, 2015 [\(III.B.1.a.8\)](#). The newly formed Technology Support Services (TSS) was created on July 1, 2015 and included a Technology Manager, who would manage the two full-time and one part-time Microcomputer Support staff and the IMC staff located on the College campus.

Another item of the District IT Audit that the Technology Committee has addressed is the replacement of end-of-life projectors. As part of the annual program review process, the Technology Committee makes recommendations for technology equipment according to a priority level (high, medium, low). The committee determined that the replacement of all projectors for the Industrial Technology (IT) building and upgraded audiovisual equipment in the Applied Technology (ATEC) building were high priorities. As a result of the recommendations, the projectors in the IT building and audiovisual equipment in the ATEC building were replaced in summer 2016 as reported by TSS at the Technology Committee meeting on September 15, 2016 [\(III.B.1.a.9\)](#).

III.B.2.a. Actionable Improvement Plan

The College will refine and develop a procedure for implementation of Total Cost of Ownership.

This item has been resolved.

The 2014 Self Evaluation identified a need to develop a total cost of ownership (TCO) procedure and guidelines for use by College leadership when new equipment or facilities are acquired or built.

Since the original concept of TCO was discussed at the Business and Facilities Planning Council (BFPC) in September of 2013, assessment determined that it should include costs of personnel salary, benefits, equipment, and facilities in order to quantify costs in program reviews (BFPC Minutes, December 10, 2013, [III.B.2.a.1](#)) and that the total should be defined. On March 11, 2014, BFPC ([III.B.2.a.2](#)) approved the definition of TCO: "TCO is used to determine the cost of a proposal or initiative. The TCO ensures that all costs are considered inclusive of all types of resources needed. Our comprehensive approach when considering TCO relates to new facilities, personnel, programs, services and other initiatives. This integrates the strategic planning, resource allocation and decision-making process."

To meet this definition, the tool itself was developed to summarize total expenses related to programs, projects, and new initiatives, including personnel, equipment, and supply needs as well as facilities and operating expenses. A utilities analysis was performed to help estimate utilities costs by square foot, and staffing standards for maintenance and operations were included for information. Additionally, the technology equipment portion was provided by the Technology Committee.

The TCO Spreadsheet tool ([III.B.2.a.3](#)) was vetted through the BFPC throughout 2013 and 2014 (meetings of December 10, 2013, [III.B.2.a.1](#); January 14, [III.B.2.a.4a](#); March 11, [III.B.2.a.2](#); and May 13, 2014, [III.B.2.a.4b](#)) and was presented at the Committee of the Whole on October 2, 2014 ([III.B.2.a.5](#)). Assessment of the TCO prompted its addition to the program review template ([III.B.2.a.6](#)) and resulted in the addition of links on the College's website (Business Services webpage [III.B.2.a.7](#) and Program Review webpage [III.B.2.a.8](#)) to ensure ease of use by faculty, staff, and administrators.

Assessment of the TCO concept by the Technology Committee (minutes of December 10, 2015, [III.B.2.a.9](#)) suggested the need for the technology equipment portion to include standardized estimated costs for equipment and replacement costs with corresponding escalators for inflation. For 2016-2017, the technology "tab" of the TCO ([III.B.2.a.3](#), III.B.2.a.10) has been updated for PC and MAC. It also pulls in an approximate cost for annual maintenance/contract and an estimated cost for future upgrade/replacement of the computer.

III.D.1.a. Actionable Improvement Plan

To further enhance communication, the College President will formally communicate annually the impact of resource allocation to support student learning.

This item has been resolved.

In its 2014 accreditation self-study, Norco College noted that while resource allocation and institutional planning were effectively integrated, the College needed to do a better job of communicating the ways in which that allocation supports student learning. It determined that the annual memorandum from the College President to Norco College (already designated one of the mechanisms by which the College evaluates its planning and resource allocation cycle) could be modified to ensure that this relationship between resource allocation and learning is made more apparent to the College community.

The 2014-2015 memo (dated June 4, 2015, [III.D.1.a.1](#)) and the 2015-2016 memo (dated June 8, 2016, [III.D.1.a.2](#)) may be compared to earlier memos, as found on the Evaluation Procedures ([III.D.1.a.3](#)) webpage, to see how much more explicit the connection between resource allocation and student learning now is. The 2014-2015 memo notes that new faculty positions in history, political science, and Spanish had been approved based on the Academic Planning Council (APC) evaluation of program reviews in which disciplines made requests for resources linked to how directly they would contribute to student learning. The APC itself ranked resource requests using a rubric in which student learning was a

primary criterion. Similarly, the 2014-2015 memo noted that requests by disciplines and units for equipment and facilities improvement were also evaluated by the planning councils and prioritized by means of rubrics in which the extent to which the request would contribute to the improvement of student learning was a key consideration.

Similarly, the 2015-2016 memo points out the five newly approved faculty positions (in English, sociology, psychology, mathematics, and electronics) were identified through a comprehensive evaluation of program reviews by the APC in which the contribution to student learning at the College played a central role. The memo goes on to note that resource allocation decisions for staff and administrative hiring, as well as equipment purchase and facilities improvement, were made in the previous academic year according to a similar evaluative process that prioritized student learning. In his memo, the interim President went on to promise that the College “will continuously assess and measure how [its] allocation of resources improves student completion processes and . . . student success.”

Appendix: List of Evidence

Evidence for District Recommendation 1

- DR1.1 District Technology Plan, pages 14-31
http://rccd.edu/administration/adminfinance/Documents/Information%20Services/DSTP/Other%20Documents/RCCD_Strategic_Technology_Plan.pdf
- DR1.2 IT Audit
http://rccd.edu/administration/adminfinance/Documents/Information%20Services/DSTP/Other%20Documents/IT%20Audit%20-%20Final%20Draft_1_28_11.pdf
- DR1.3 District Continuity Technology Plan (pp. 32-40 of District Technology Plan)
http://rccd.edu/administration/adminfinance/Documents/Information%20Services/DSTP/Other%20Documents/RCCD_Strategic_Technology_Plan.pdf

Evidence for District Recommendation 2

- DR2.1 Other Post-Employment Benefits Obligation Funding Plan
http://www.rccd.edu/administration/adminfinance/Documents/Other%20Documents/04072015_OPEBFundingPlan.pdf
- DR2.2 OMB Circular A-21
https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars_a021_2004/
- DR2.3 GASB-45
<http://www.gasb.org/st/summary/gstsm45.html>
- DR2.4 DBAC Minutes, 23 January 2015
http://www.rccd.edu/administration/adminfinance/Documents/BAM_DBAC/Meeting%20Minutes%20and%20Agendas/2015/DBAC%20Agenda_Backup%2002-27-15w.pdf
- DR2.5 DBAC Minutes, 27 February 2015
http://www.rccd.edu/administration/adminfinance/Documents/BAM_DBAC/Meeting%20Minutes%20and%20Agendas/2015/03-27-15%20DBAC%20Agenda_Backup.pdf
- DR2.6a DSPC Minutes, 30 January 2015
<http://rccd.edu/administration/educationalservices/ieffectiveness/Documents/DSPC/1-30-15%20minutes.docx>
- DR2.6b DSPC Minutes, 13 March 2015
<http://rccd.edu/administration/educationalservices/ieffectiveness/Documents/DSPC/3-13-15%20Minutes.docx>
- DR2.7 Resource Committee Agenda, 7 April 2015
http://www.rccdistrict.net/eb/PDF%20Conversions/April_7_2015_Complete.pdf
- DR2.8 Board of Trustees Minutes, 21 April 2015
http://www.rccdistrict.net/eb/PDF%20Conversions/June_16_2015_Complete.pdf
- DR2.9 BFPC Minutes, 16 February 2016
<http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/bfpc/2015-16/2016-02-16-BFPC-Minutes.pdf>
- DR2.10 ISPC Minutes, 2 March 2016
<http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/ispc/2015-16/2016-03-02-ISPC-Minutes.pdf>

Evidence for Responses to the Commission's Recommendations

- R.1 Accreditation Follow Up Report, October 2015, Norco College
http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/Accreditation/Documents/Reports%20and%20Letters/Norco%20College-Follow%20Up%20Report_Oct2015.pdf

Evidence for College Recommendation 1

- CR1.1 Evaluation Procedures Webpage
<http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Pages/Evaluation-Procedures.aspx>
- CR1.2a Norco College Strategic Planning Committee Policy 2010-01 (revised Fall 2016)
<http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/PlanningDocs/NSPC%20Policy%202010-01%20Revised%2005-2016.pdf>
- CR1.2b ISPC Minutes, 4 November 2015
<http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/ispc/2015-16/2015-11-04-ISPC-minutes.pdf>
- CR1.3 Annual Survey of Effectiveness of the Planning Councils
<http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/academic-affairs/Documents/SS-Research/Planning%20Councils%20Survey%20Summary-2015-16.pdf>

- CR1.4 Report of Effectiveness of Academic Senate and Senate Standing Committees / Senate Overview of the Assessment Survey of the Senate and Its Standing Committees
<http://norcollege.edu/about/academic-affairs/Documents/SS-Research/Senate%20Overview%20of%20the%202016-2017%20Assessment%20Survey.pdf>
- CR1.5 Memorandum from College President to Norco College
http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/2016%20Year%20End%20Letter%20from%20the%20President%2006_08.pdf
- CR1.6 Progress Report on Strategic Planning/Educational Master Plan Goals, Objectives and “Dashboard Indicators”
<http://norcollege.edu/about/academic-affairs/Documents/SS-Research/Annual-Progress-Report-on-EMP-Goals-Objectives-DashboardIndicators-2015-16.pdf>
- CR1.7 Institutional Effectiveness and Planning Survey
http://norcollege.edu/about/academic-affairs/Documents/SS-Research/IEP_Survey_Summary_2016.pdf
- CR 1.8 Report of Resource Allocation
<http://norcollege.edu/about/business-services/Documents/BudgetPresentations/2015-16%20Budget%20Presentation.pdf.pdf>
- CR1.9 Report on Annual Evaluation Cycle
<http://norcollege.edu/about/academic-affairs/Documents/SS-Research/Annual-Evaluation-Report-2015-16.pdf>
- CR1.10a IEPI Goals Framework (Year One), 2015-2016
 CR1.10b IEPI Goals Framework (Year Two), 2016-2017
- CR1.11a Annual Online Survey of Standing Committees of the Academic Senate
<http://norcollege.edu/about/academic-affairs/Documents/SS-Research/Standing-Committees-Survey-Instrument-2014.pdf>
- CR1.11b Standing Committee Reports to the Academic Senate, Spring 2016: Academic Senate Minutes, 23 May 2016
http://norcollege.edu/academicssenate/Documents/2015-16/052316_NAS_Minutes.pdf
- CR1.12 Standing Planning Committees Survey of Effectiveness
<http://www.norcollege.edu/about/academic-affairs/Documents/SS-Research/Strategic%20Planning%20Committee%20Survey%20Effectiveness%20Instrument.pdf>
- CR1.13 Annual Online Survey of Planning Councils
<http://norcollege.edu/about/academic-affairs/Documents/SS-Research/Planning%20Councils%20Survey%20Instrument.pdf>
- CR1.14 Results of the Survey of Effectiveness for the Planning Councils, Fall 2015
<http://norcollege.edu/about/academic-affairs/Documents/SS-Research/Planning%20Councils%20Survey%20Summary-2015-16.pdf>
- CR1.15 Annual Strategic Planning Retreat Minutes, 3 December 2014
<http://www.norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/ispc/2014-15/2014-12-03-ISPC-minutes.pdf>
- CR1.16 Annual Strategic Planning Retreat Minutes, 2 December 2015
<http://www.norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/ispc/2015-16/2015-12-02-ISPC-Minutes-Retreat.pdf>
- CR1.17 Annual Strategic Planning Retreat Agenda, 7 December 2016
<http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/ispc/2016-17/ISPC%20Retreat%20Agenda%20120716.pdf>
- CR1.18 Norco College Accreditation Survey, 2013
<http://norcollege.edu/about/academic-affairs/Documents/SS-Research/Accreditation%20Survey%20Report%202013.pdf>
- CR1.19 Strategic Planning Newsletter, Fall 2015
<http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/newsletter/fa15-strategicplanning-newsletter.pdf>
- CR1.20 Strategic Planning Newsletter, Spring 2016
http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/newsletter/sp16-strategicplanning-newsletter_final-final.pdf
- CR1.21 Strategic Planning Newsletter, Fall 2016
<http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/newsletter/fa16-StrategicPlanning-newsletter.pdf>

CR1.22 Strategic Planning Webpage
<http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Pages/index.aspx>

Evidence for College Recommendation 2

- CR2.1 Syllabus Shell Example—Philosophy 10
- CR2.2 Course Syllabus Shells Webpage
<http://norcollege.edu/employees/faculty/Pages/syllabus.aspx>
- CR2.3 Faculty Guide, 2016-2017
<http://norcollege.edu/employees/faculty/Documents/NorcoFacultyGuide2016.pdf>
- CR2.4 Rotation Plan for Outcomes Assessment at Norco College
<http://norcollege.edu/employees/faculty/Documents/OutcomesAssessment/Rotation-Plan-for-Outcomes-Assessment-at-Norco-College-Revised-fall-2015.pdf>
- CR2.5 2016 ACCJC Annual Report
http://www.norcollege.edu/about/president/Accreditation/Documents/Reports%20and%20Letters/ACCJC_Annual_Report_2016.pdf
- CR2.6 2015 ACCJC Annual Report
http://norcollege.edu/about/president/Accreditation/Documents/Reports%20and%20Letters/ACCJC_Annual_Report_2015.pdf
- CR2.7a General Education Assessment Report 2013-2014
<http://norcollege.edu/employees/faculty/Documents/OutcomesAssessment/GE%20Assessment%20Report-Self%20Development%20Global%20Awareness%202014.pdf>
- CR2.7b General Education Assessment Report 2014-2015
<http://norcollege.edu/employees/faculty/Documents/OutcomesAssessment/GE%20PLO%202013-2015%20report%20loop%20closing%20activity.pdf>
- CR2.7c General Education Assessment Report 2015-2016
http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/Communicatons_GELO_Data_Report.pdf
- CR2.8 Annual Program Review Template
http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/programreview/Documents/annual_IPR/Annual_Instructional_Program_Review_Template_2017.docx
- CR2.9 Key Indicators Report, 2014-2015
<http://norcollege.edu/employees/faculty/Documents/OutcomesAssessment/Key-Indicators-Analysis-2015.pdf>
- CR2.10 Key Indicators Report, 2015-2016
http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/Key_Indicators_Analysis_2016.pdf

Evidence for College Recommendation 3

- CR3.1 Administrative Program Reviews Webpage with Links to 2014-2015 Business Services Program Reviews
<http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/programreview/Pages/Administrative-Unit-Program-Review.aspx>
- CR3.2a Business Services Retreat, 7 November 2014
<http://norcollege.edu/about/business-services/Documents/Business%20Services%20retreat%20110714.pdf>
- CR3.2b Business Services Retreat, 17 June 2015
<http://norcollege.edu/about/business-services/Documents/Norco%20College%20Bus%20Srvcs%20Retreat-06%2017%202015.pdf>
- CR3.2c Business Services Retreat, 14 June 2016, Agenda
http://norcollege.edu/about/business-services/Documents/Agendas/BS_Retreat_Agenda_6_14_16.pdf
- CR3.2d Business Services Retreat, 14 June 2016, PowerPoint Presentation
- CR3.2e Business Services Retreat, 14 June 2016, Program Review Notes
http://norcollege.edu/about/business-services/Documents/Retreats/BS_Retreat_Program_Review_Summary_by_Dept_6%20_4_16.pdf
- CR3.3 Business Services Retreat, 14 June 2016, Survey Results
http://norcollege.edu/about/business-services/Documents/Retreats/BS_Retreat_Survey_2016_Results.pdf
- CR3.4a Business Services Administrative Program Review 2014-2015
http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/programreview/Documents/adminunit/2015/Business_AUPR_2015.pdf

- CR3.4b College Police Administrative Program Review, 2015
http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/programreview/Documents/adminunit/2015/CollegePolice_AUPR_2015.pdf
- CR3.4c Facilities Department (Administrative) Program Review, 2015
http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/programreview/Documents/adminunit/2015/Fac_Admin_AUPR_2015.pdf
- CR3.4d Facilities Department (Custodial) Program Review, 2015
http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/programreview/Documents/adminunit/2015/Custodial_AUPR_2015.pdf
- CR3.4e Facilities Department (Grounds) Program Review, 2015
http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/programreview/Documents/adminunit/2015/Grounds_AUPR_2015.pdf
- CR3.4f Facilities Department (Maintenance) Program Review, 2015
http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/programreview/Documents/adminunit/2015/Maintenance_AUPR_2015.pdf
- CR3.4g Food Services Program Review, 2015
http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/programreview/Documents/adminunit/2015/Food_AUPR_2015.pdf
- CR3.4h Technology Support Services Program Review, 2015
http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/programreview/Documents/adminunit/2015/TechSupport_AUPR_2015.pdf
- CR3.5 Examples of Facilities Department (Maintenance) Automatic Feedback Survey

Evidence for College Recommendation 4

- CR4.1a Norco College Technology Principles and Guidelines (Revised Spring 2016)
<http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/TechnologyPrinciplesandGuidelines.pdf>
- CR4.1b Technology Committee Minutes, 19 May 2016
<http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/2015-16/2016-05-19-Technology-minutes.pdf>
- CR4.2 Replacement of Technology Infrastructure and Equipment Plan
<http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/Replacement%20of%20Technology%20Infrastructure%20Equipment%20Plan.pdf>
- CR4.3 Annual Computer/Equipment Inventory
<http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/Norco-College-Computer-Equipment-Inventory-2015.pdf>
- CR4.4 Computer Equipment Refresh 2015 Recommendations list
- CR4.5 Technology Committee Minutes, May 21, 2015
<http://www.norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/2014-15/2015-05-21-Technology-minutes.pdf>
- CR4.6 Annual Administrative Program Review for Technology Support Services, 2015
http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/programreview/Documents/adminunit/2015/TechSupport_AUPR_2015.pdf
- CR4.7 Norco College Technology Strategic Plan 2013-2016
<http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/PlanningDocs/Norco%20Technology%20Plan%2013-16.pdf>
- CR4.8 Technology Committee Minutes, 28 April 2016
<http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/2015-16/2016-04-28-Technology-minutes.pdf>
- CR4.9 Technology Request Form, Hardware
<http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/TechRequestFormEquip.pdf>
- CR4.10 Technology Request Form, Software
<http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/TechRequestFormSoftware.pdf>
- CR4.11 ITSC Meeting Minutes, 24 October 2014
http://rccd.edu/administration/adminfinance/Documents/Information%20Services/DSTP/Minutes/ITSC%20Meeting%20Minutes_10-24-14.pdf

- CR4.12 Technology Request Form, Program Review
<http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/TechRequestFormProgramReview.pdf>
- CR4.13 Technology Committee Minutes, 23 April 2015
<http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/2014-15/2015-04-23-Technology-minutes.pdf>
- CR4.14 Program Review Committee Minutes, 23 April 2015
<http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/pr/2014-2015/2015-04-23-Program-Review-Minutes.pdf>
- CR4.15 Technology Total Cost of Ownership Document
<http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/TechnologyTotalCostofOwnership.pdf>
- CR4.16a Program Review Committee Agenda, 1 December 2016
<http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/pr/2016-2017/2016-12-01%20ProgramReview-Agenda.pdf>
- CR4.16b Equipment & Technology Not Covered by Current Budget, page 10 of Annual Instructional Program Review Template
http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/programreview/Documents/annual_IPR/Annual_Instructional_Program_Review_Template_2017.docx
- CR4.17a Annual Technology Survey of Norco College Students, 2015
<http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/TechSurvey2015-Student.pdf>
- CR4.17b Annual Technology Survey of Norco College Faculty, 2015
<http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/TechSurvey2015-Faculty.pdf>
- CR4.17c Annual Technology Survey of Norco College Staff, 2015
<http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/TechSurvey2015-Staff.pdf>
- CR4.18 Technology Committee Minutes, 17 September 2015
<http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/2015-16/2015-09-17-Technology-minutes.pdf>
- CR4.19 Technology Committee Minutes, 15 September 2016
<http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/2016-17/2016-09-15-Technology-minutes.pdf>
- CR4.20 Lynda.com
<http://norcocollege.edu/lynda/Pages/index.aspx>
- CR4.21 Lynda.com Satisfaction Survey (Winter 2016)
<http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/Lynda%20Satisfaction%20Survey%202015.pdf>

Data Trends Analysis

- DT1.1 Norco College 2014 Annual Report to ACCJC
http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/Accreditation/Documents/Reports%20and%20Letters/ACCJC_Annual_Report_2014.pdf
- DT1.2 Norco College 2015 Annual Report to ACCJC
http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/Accreditation/Documents/Reports%20and%20Letters/ACCJC_Annual_Report_2015.pdf
- DT1.3 Norco College 2016 Annual Report to ACCJC
http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/Accreditation/Documents/Reports%20and%20Letters/ACCJC_Annual_Report_2016.pdf
- DT1.4 Senate Recommendation Regarding Institutional Set Standards—Procedural Response
<http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/PlanningDocs/ISS%20Procedural%20Response.pdf>
- DT1.5 Academic Senate Minutes, 18 April 2016
<http://norcocollege.edu/academicsenate/Documents/2015-16/2016-04-18-NAS-Minutes.pdf>
- DT1.6 ISPC Minutes, 4 May 2016
<http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/ispc/2015-16/2016-05-04-ISPC-Minutes.pdf>

- DT1.7 Transfer Students at Norco College 2013-14: Definitions and Outcomes
<http://norcollege.edu/about/academic-affairs/Documents/SS-Research/Transfer%20Students%20at%20Norco%20College%202013-14.pdf>
- DT1.8 Institutional Set Standards Task Force, Fall 2015
- DT1.9 Annual Fiscal Report – 2014
<http://norcollege.edu/about/president/Accreditation/Documents/Reports%20and%20Letters/Norco%20Annual%20Fiscal%20Report%202014.pdf>
- DT1.10 Annual Fiscal Report - 2015
<http://norcollege.edu/about/president/Accreditation/Documents/Reports%20and%20Letters/Norco%20Annual%20Fiscal%20Report%202015.pdf>
- DT1.11 Annual Fiscal Report – 2016
<http://norcollege.edu/about/president/Accreditation/Documents/Reports%20and%20Letters/Norco%20Annual%20Fiscal%20Report%202016.pdf>

Evidence for Actionable Improvement Plan II.A.2

- II.A.2.1 Norco College Substantive Change Proposal, 21 January 2014
http://norcollege.edu/about/president/Accreditation/Documents/Reports%20and%20Letters/SCR%20Norco%20College_Jan%2021-2014.pdf
- II.A.2.1a Academic Senate Minutes, 2 December 2013
<http://norcollege.edu/academicsenate/Documents/2013-14/2013-12-02-NAS-Minutes.pdf>
- II.A.2.1b ISPC Minutes, 20 November 2013
<http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/ispc/2013-14/2013-11-20-ISPC-minutes.pdf>
- II.A.2.1c Committee of the Whole Minutes, 5 December 2013
http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/cotw/2013-14/2013-12-05_COTW_Minutes.pdf
- II.A.2.1d Board of Trustees Minutes, 21 January 2014
http://www.rccd.net/eb/PDF%20Conversions/February_18_2014_Complete.pdf
- II.A.2.2 Letter from ACCJC Documenting Approval of the Substantive Change Proposal, 7 March 2014
<http://www.norcollege.edu/about/president/Accreditation/Documents/Reports%20and%20Letters/Substantive%20Change%20Approval%202014-03.pdf>

Evidence for Actionable Improvement Plan II.B.2.d.

- II.B.2.d.1 Board Policy/Administrative Procedures 5522
<http://www.rccd.edu/administration/board/New%20Board%20Policies/5522AP.pdf>
- II.B.2.d.2 Board Policy/Administrative Procedures 5524
<http://www.rccd.edu/administration/board/New%20Board%20Policies/5524AP.pdf>
- II.B.2.d.3 Student Request for Consultation
<http://www.norcollege.edu/Documents/Student%20Consultation%20Request%20Form%20-%20FINAL%2006%2024%2014.pdf>
- II.B.2.d.4 Student Request for Formal Hearing
<http://www.norcollege.edu/Documents/Student%20Request%20for%20Formal%20Hearing%20Form%20-%20FINAL%2006%2024%2014.pdf>
- II.B.2.d.5 AP 5522-Chart of Student Grievance Process for Instruction and Grade Related Matters
<http://www.norcollege.edu/Documents/ap5522-chart.pdf>
- II.B.2.d.6 AP 5524-Chart of Student Grievance Process for Matters Other Than Instruction, Grades, or Discipline
<http://www.norcollege.edu/Documents/ap5524-chart.pdf>
- II.B.2.d.7 Complaint Procedures Webpage
<http://www.norcollege.edu/Pages/Complaint-Procedures.aspx>
- II.B.2.d.8 President’s Cabinet Meeting Minutes, 14 January 2015

Evidence for Actionable Improvement Plan III.B.1.a.

- III.B.1.a.1 Norco College Technology Strategic Plan 2013-2016 (p. 19)
<http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/PlanningDocs/Norco%20Technology%20Plan%2013-16.pdf>
- III.B.1.a.2 District IT Audit
http://rccd.edu/administration/adminfinance/Documents/Information%20Services/DSTP/Other%20Documents/IT%20Audit%20-%20Final%20Draft_1_28_11.pdf

- III.B.1.a.3 Technology Committee Minutes, 20 March 2014
<http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/2013-14/2014-03-20-Technology-minutes.pdf>
- III.B.1.a.4 ITSC Meeting Minutes, 6 March 2015
http://rccd.edu/administration/adminfinance/Documents/Information%20Services/DSTP/Minutes/ITSC%20Meeting%20Minutes_3-6-15.pdf
- III.B.1.a.5 DSPC Meeting Minutes, 13 March 2015
<http://rccd.edu/administration/educationalservices/ieffectiveness/Documents/DSPC/3-13-15%20Minutes.docx>
- III.B.1.a.6 BFPC Meeting Minutes, 10 March 2015
<http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/bfpc/2014-15/2015-03-10-BFPC-Minutes.pdf>
- III.B.1.a.7 Norco College Technology Committee Minutes, 19 March 2015
<http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/2014-15/2015-03-19-Technology-minutes.pdf>
- III.B.1.a.8 Board of Trustees Minutes, 16 June 2015
<http://www.rccdistrict.net/eb/PDF%20Conversions/08182015Complete.pdf>
- III.B.1.a.9 Technology Committee Minutes, 15 September 2016
<http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/2016-17/2016-09-15-Technology-minutes.pdf>

Evidence for Actionable Improvement Plan III.B.2.a.

- III.B.2.a.1 BFPC Minutes, 10 December 2013
<http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/bfpc/2013-14/2013-12-10-BFPC-Minutes.pdf>
- III.B.2.a.2 BFPC Minutes, 11 March 2014
<http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/bfpc/2013-14/2014-03-11-BFPC-meeting.pdf>
- III.B.2.a.3 Total Cost of Ownership Spreadsheet, 2016-2017
<http://norcollege.edu/about/business-services/Documents/TCO%20Spreadsheet.xls>
- III.B.2.a.4a BFPC Minutes, 14 January 2014
<http://www.norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/bfpc/2013-14/2014-01-14-BFPC-Minutes.pdf>
- III.B.2.a.4b BFPC Minutes, 13 May 2014
<http://www.norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/bfpc/2013-14/2014-05-13-BFPC-Minutes.pdf>
- III.B.2.a.5 COTW Minutes, 2 October 2014
http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/cotw/2014-15/2014-10-02_COTW_Minutes.pdf
- III.B.2.a.6 Annual Instructional Program Review Template, 2015
http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/programreview/Documents/annual_IPR/Annual_Instructional_Program_Review_Template_2015.doc
- III.B.2.a.7 Business Services Webpage, with TCO Link
<http://norcollege.edu/about/business-services/Pages/index.aspx>
- III.B.2.a.8 Program Review Webpage, with TCO Link
<http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/programreview/Pages/index.aspx>
- III.B.2.a.9 Technology Committee Minutes, 10 December 2015
<http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/2015-16/2015-12-10-Technology-minutes.pdf>
- III.B.2.a.10 Technology Tab—Total Cost of Ownership Spreadsheet, 2016-2017

Evidence for Actionable Improvement Plan III.D.1.a.

- III.D.1.a.1 Memorandum from College President to Norco College, 2014-2015
<http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/President%20Memo%202014-15.pdf>
- III.D.1.a.2 Memorandum from College President to Norco College, 2015-2016
http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/2016%20Year%20End%20Letter%20from%20the%20President%2006_08.pdf
- III.D.1.a.3 Strategic Planning Evaluation Procedures Webpage
<http://norcollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Pages/Evaluation-Procedures.aspx>