Norco College
Committee of the Whole
September 22, 2016

MINUTES

Faculty
Bader, Melissa (co-chair)
Adams, Laura
Anderson, Kris
Beck, Rex
Bemiller, Quinton
Brockenbrough, Celia
Brotherton, Cathy
Buchanan, Courtney
Comstock, Tami
Covarrubias, Araceli
Frewing, Janet
Gray, Alexis
Harris, Vivian
Hitchcock, Dominque
Kamerin, Kim
Kazsuk, Tracy
Kerr, Brady
Kyriakos, Stephany
Midgett, Jethro
Miter, Carol
Muto, Jan
Olaerts, Ana Marie
Popiden, Saundra

Reade, Dan
Russell, Tim
Setmanant, José
Shirinian, Margarita
Sloniger, Mitzi
Spurbeck, Erin
Stevens, Walter
Van Hulle, Paul
Zamiska, Kara
Zwart, Gail

Staff
Leal, Ruth (co-chair)
Terrazas, Denise (recorder)
Brekke, Janelle
Boling, Susan
Castro, Miguel
Crawford, Leona
Darnell-Wallace, Jeanne
Hankins, Laurie
Hodawanus, Tricia
Kollar, Pam
Krutsch, Jennifer
Lambros, Daniel

Lemus, Gabriela
Marashi, Arezoo
Molina, Ana
Santa Cruz, Elena
Valencia, Jennifer

Administrators
Dieckmeyer, Diane (co-chair)
Etchison, Ashley
Farrar, Carol
Gomez, Beth
Green, Monica
Hartley, Mark
Henkels, Charles
Lopez, Jesse
McGraw, Shirley
Molko, Colleen
Nance, Damon
Sinclair, Maureen

Students
Bishara, Robbie
Hidalgo, Ricardo

Melissa Bader opened the meeting at 12:54pm

Approval of May 24, 2016 Minutes

Motion to Approve: Gail Zwart
Seconded: Kim Kamerin
Corrections/Discussion: none.
Vote: approved with 9 abstentions

Midterm report 1st reading

Diane Dieckmeyer introduced Kris Anderson, Accreditation Co-Chair for the college. The mid-term report in this form is the last one of its kind for Norco College as the requirements for midterm reports have changed. Kris Anderson briefly reviewed the 1st draft of midterm report which was sent out via email to the college. The goal is to move this through the approval process by the end of the term. The report will be disseminated for review and feedback with a 1st, 2nd and final reading which will be the report that is submitted to the Board. The mid-term report addresses the recommendations from the last self-study, showing sustainable and continued progress. The report addresses actionable improvement plans and shows how we have met those plans. Kris asked that everyone review the plan, only 25 pages with evidence making up a good portion. Areas to review are the recommendations and improvement plans to identify anything that affects the area you are involved in. Please contact Kris or Diane, to give feedback, ask questions, share concerns, or provide evidence or corrections. Thanks to the many who have contributed to this report and to those who continue to provide their input. The second reading will occur mid-October. Thank you for reading.

Budget Report

Beth Gomez shared a detailed account of the changes to revenues, FTE projections, fund balances and the Budget Allocation Model as they relate to the college. The 16-17 Budget was approved by the Board this month. Committee members requested that the budget update be shared electronically, see attached, and that a similar presentation be made for the committee on the college's budget.

- Beth acknowledged our new HR Liaison, Susan Boling. She is here Wednesdays and Fridays her office is located in the Operations Center.

Smoking Policy Update

Beth Gomez shared information on the status of a bill which prohibits smoking on college campuses. The bill has passed both houses and is expected to be signed by the Governor soon. Norco is the only college in the district that allows smoking therefore so we are looking to begin a plan to implement a smoking cessation campaign. The goal is to reimagine the smoking circle in a positive way. Once established, the plan will be vetted through our shared governance process and Board Policy changed.

COTW Guiding Principles
ISPC Co-chairs

The co-chairs of ISPC Diane Dieckmeyer, Melissa Bader and Ruth Leal presented a proposal for implementing guiding principles for Committee of the Whole meetings that they hope will address concerns raised from an open dialogue session last spring. The topics of concern are the following: 1) at times projects/proposals are vetted through shared governance only to be voted down at COTW 2) too many operational items come to COTW, since they must occur anyway, voting on them is a waste of time. Recognizing the importance of COTW including valued time of its members the ISPC co-chairs propose the following guiding principles to aid in streamlining COTW meetings:

1) Items which align with topics that require Board of Trustee (BOT) approval will be voting items.
   - Limits what is voted on here if we frame it around what goes to the BOT (i.e. Budgets, reports, plans).
2) Other items that have impact to the college at large will be agendized as information items.
3) Other items may be agendized as determined by a majority vote of the ISPC.

4) To encourage participation, confidential voting will be implemented whenever possible.
   - When a vote is needed the idea of confidential voting might empower members to feel more comfortable casting their vote. Clickers were mentioned but it seems that text voting is the more current technology and possibly a less expensive option.

5) To increase understanding of institution-wide issues, brief summary descriptions that include the shared governance approval history of the item, and the name of a contact person associated with the item, will accompany agenda items whenever possible.

ISPC voted and approved the COTW Guiding Principles, at this time the proposal is for information only and will be an action item for the next meeting.

Good of the Order

Monica Green noted the addition of the 25 year memorabilia to the wall of CSS-217 thank you to Art Yalong for his skilled craftsmanship and to Quinton Bemiller for his artful eye.

Meeting adjourned: 1:44pm

Norco College 2017 Midterm Report Draft

(15 September 2016)

Table of Contents

Responses to the Commission's Recommendations

At its January 6-8, 2016 meeting, the Commission reviewed Norco College's Follow-Up Report, 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 Strategic 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 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.

At the beginning of fall 2016, the council was in process of assessing the status of 2015-2016 academic year objectives (derived in large part from outstanding IT Audit concerns). At the September 2016 meeting, the council compiled and prioritized the list of 2016-2017 objectives based on outstanding 2015-2016 objectives in addition to new items brought forward from the colleges' and District's technology plans for 2016-2017.

In addition, progress continues to be made toward a more comprehensive Disaster Recovery Plan. One step has been the completion of network redundancies between college and district locations. Work on alternate network routing has been completed at Norco College and Moreno Valley College and continues at Riverside City College. Data is being replicated between college sites on a nightly basis. Also, faculty and staff email has been migrated to Office 365 at Microsoft for improved access and availability.

Moving forward, 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.

Evidence for District Recommendation 1
- District Technology Plan
  http://rccd.edu/administration/adminfinance/Documents/Information%20Services/DSTP/Other%20Documents/RCCD_Strategic_Technology_Plan.pdf
- IT Audit
  http://rccd.edu/administration/adminfinance/Documents/Information%20Services/DSTP/Other%20Documents/IT%20Audit%20-%20Final%20Draft_1_28_11.pdf
- Minutes of monthly Information Technology Strategy Council meetings

---

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, a funding plan 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 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;
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 and on February 27, 2015, 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) and the Chancellor's cabinet (March 30, 2015). The final proposal was presented and discussed at the April 7, 2015 Resource Committee meeting. The Board approved the proposal at its April 21, 2015 meeting.

   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 using the CalPers OPEB irrevocable trust, a moderately conservative plan with medium risk. To follow shared government processes, the committee's work was presented to the Business and Facilities Planning Council at its February 16, 2016 meeting and to the College's Institutional Strategic Planning Council on March 2, 2016.   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.

Evidence for District Recommendation 2
- OMB Circular A-21
  https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars_a021_2004/
- GASB-45
  http://www.gasb.org/st/summary/gstsm45.html
- DBAC Minutes, 23 January 2015
  http://www.rccd.edu/administration/adminfinance/Documents/BAM_DBAC/Meeting%20Minutes%20and%20Agendas/2015/01-23-15%20DBAC%20Agenda_Backup.pdf
- DBAC Minutes, 27 February 2015
  http://www.rccd.edu/administration/adminfinance/Documents/BAM_DBAC/Meeting%20Minutes%20and%20Agendas/2015/DBAC%20Agenda_Backup%2002-27-15w.pdf
- DSPC Minutes, 30 January 2015
  http://www.rccd.edu/administration/educationalservices/ieffectiveness/Pages/dspc.aspx
- DSPC Minutes, 13 March 2015
  http://www.rccd.edu/administration/educationalservices/ieffectiveness/Pages/dspc.aspx
- Resource Committee Minutes, 7 April 2015
  http://www.rccdistrict.net/eb/PDF%20Conversions/April_7_2015_Complete.pdf
- Board of Trustees Minutes, 21 April 2015
  http://www.rccdistrict.net/eb/PDF%20Conversions/April_21_2015_Complete.pdf
- BFPC Minutes, 16 February 2016
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/bfpc/2015-16/2016-02-16-BFPC-Minutes.pdf
- ISPC Minutes, 2 March 2016
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/ispc/2015-16/2016-03-02-ISPC-Minutes.pdf

> College Recommendation 1
>
> In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College consistently evaluate all parts of the planning and resource allocation cycle; develop a standard assessment instrument for all participatory governance committees; develop a process to assess the evaluation mechanisms used in integrated planning and resource allocation to ensure that those evaluations are effective in improving programs, processes, and decision-making structures; and develop strategies to broadly communicate the results of these evaluations to the entire College community.

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 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 the 2015-2016 academic year, the Institutional Strategic Planning Council (ISPC) reviewed and revised Policy 2010-01 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 what 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
2. Report of Effectiveness of Academic Senate and Senate Standing Committees
3. Memorandum from College President to Norco College
4. Progress Report on Strategic Planning/Educational Master Plan Goals, Objectives and "Dashboard Indicators"
5. Institutional Effectiveness and Planning Survey
6. Report of Resource Allocation
7. Report on Annual Evaluation

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](#). Base year data have been gathered, and one-year and six-year targets established, for such indicators as college preparedness, college-level readiness in mathematics and English, CTE program enrollment, 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 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 slightly modified beginning in the 2015-2016 academic year. Online surveys were moved to late spring, and dialogue sessions that focus on the effectiveness of the committee's planning and decision-making process are now held once a semester by each committee. One Academic Senate meeting per semester focuses on assessment reports from standing committees, and committees file these reports with the senate. The senate makes and receives recommendations from each committee based on the results of the evaluation and discussion.

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. 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 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. They 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, followed by a retreat on December 2, 2015. 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, 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 and Institutional Research webpages. In the 2013 Norco College accreditation survey, 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."

Beginning in spring 2015, the College also created a biannual strategic planning newsletter to further facilitate communication of evaluation results. The fall 2015 newsletter 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 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 also can be found on the Strategic Planning webpage. 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.

Evidence for College Recommendation 1
- Evaluation Procedures webpage
  http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Pages/Evaluation-Procedures.aspx
- 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
- ISPC Minutes, 4 November 2015
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/ispc/2015-16/2015-11-04-ISPC-minutes.pdf
- 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
- Report of Effectiveness of Academic Senate and Senate Standing Committees
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/academic-affairs/Documents/SS-Research/AS_StandingCommittees_2015-16%20Data%20Summary.pdf
- Memorandum from College President to Norco College
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/2016%20Year%20End%20Letter%20from%20the%20President%2006_08.pdf
- Progress Report on Strategic Planning/Educational Master Plan Goals, Objectives and "Dashboard Indicators"
- Institutional Effectiveness and Planning Survey
- Report of Resource Allocation
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/business-services/Documents/BudgetPresentations/2015-16%20Budget%20Presentation.pdf.pdf
- Report on Annual Evaluation Cycle
- Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) Framework of Indicators
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/academic-affairs/Pages/Research.aspx
- IEPI Goals Framework (Year One), 2014-2015
- IEPI Goals Framework (Year Two), 2015-2016
- Senate Overview of the 2015-2016 Assessment Survey of the Senate and Its Standing Committees
- Standing Committee Reports to the Academic Senate, Fall 2015 and Spring 2016

- Annual Strategic Planning Retreat minutes, 3 December 2014
  http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/ispc/2014-15/2014-12-03-ISPC-minutes.pdf
- Annual Strategic Planning Retreat minutes, 2 December 2015
  http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/ispc/2015-16/2015-12-02-ISPC-Minutes-Retreat.pdf
- Annual Strategic Planning Retreat minutes, __ December 2016
- Institutional Research website
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/academic-affairs/Pages/Research.aspx
- 2013 Norco College Accreditation Survey
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/academic-affairs/Documents/SS-Research/Accreditation%20Survey%20Report%202013.pdf
- Strategic Planning Newsletter, Fall 2015
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/newsletter/fa15-strategicplanning-newsletter.pdf
- Strategic Planning Newsletter, Spring 2016
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/newsletter/sp16-strategicplanning-newsletter_final-final.pdf
- Strategic Planning Newsletter, Fall 2016
- Strategic Planning Webpage
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Pages/index.aspx

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. Creating 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, 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 from the Faculty Resources webpage. The shells also are referenced in the Norco College Faculty Guide. The syllabus shells are updated annually to reflect curricular changes, and faculty continue to utilize them each term.

2. Implementing more 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 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.

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 2015-16 were AOEs 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 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. Completing the 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 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. Developing, implementing, and assessing an evaluation mechanism to assess 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 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, 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-

11

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 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.

Evidence for College Recommendation 2
- Syllabus Shell Example
- Course Syllabus Shells Webpage
  http://norcocollege.edu/employees/faculty/Pages/syllabus.aspx
- Faculty Guide, 2016-2017
- Assessment Resources Webpage
  http://norcocollege.edu/employees/faculty/Pages/Outcomes-Assessment.aspx
- Rotation Plan for Outcomes Assessment at Norco College
  http://norcocollege.edu/employees/faculty/Documents/OutcomesAssessment/Rotation-Plan-for-Outcomes-Assessment-at-Norco-College-Revised-fall-2015.pdf
- 2016 ACCJC Annual Report
  http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/Accreditation/Documents/Reports%20and%20Letters/ACCJC_Annual_Report_2016.pdf
- 2015 ACCJC Annual Report
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/Accreditation/Documents/Reports%20and%20Letters/ACCJC_Annual_Report_2015.pdf
- General Education Assessment Report 2013-2014
  http://norcocollege.edu/employees/faculty/Documents/OutcomesAssessment/GE%20Assessment%20Report-Self%20Development%20Global%20Awareness%202014.pdf
- General Education Assessment Report 2014-2015
  http://norcocollege.edu/employees/faculty/Documents/OutcomesAssessment/GE%20PLO%202013-2015%20report%20loop%20closing%20activity.pdf
- General Education Assessment Report 2015-2016
- Annual Program Review Template
- Key Indicators Report, 2014-2015
  http://norcocollege.edu/employees/faculty/Documents/OutcomesAssessment/Key-Indicators-Analysis-2015.pdf
- Key Indicators Report, 2015-2016

> 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. <u>Systematic assessment of service area outcomes in Business Services</u>

At Norco College, Business Services comprises four departments: College 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](#). 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](#) (mandatory for all Business Services staff), held at the end of each fiscal year, focuses on team building, program review, 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 Student Services. [Survey results](#) 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. <u>Use of assessment results for improvement</u>

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](#) 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 Police, a Norco College Cadet program was implemented, with several cadets being added to this department. Facilities Department (Maintenance) was able to implement an automatic feedback survey on all work orders to maintain and improve their service delivery and customer satisfaction. Furthermore, the Food Services 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.

Evidence for College Recommendation 3

- Administrative Program Reviews webpage with links to 2014-2015 Business Services Program Reviews
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/programreview/Pages/Administrative-Unit-Program-Review.aspx
- Business Services Retreat, 7 November 2014
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/business-services/Documents/Business%20Services%20retreat%20110714.pdf
- Business Services Retreat, 17 June 2015
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/business-services/Documents/Norco%20College%20Bus%20Srvcs%20Retreat-06%2017%202015.pdf
- Business Services Retreat 2016
  - Agenda
    http://norcocollege.edu/about/business-services/Documents/Agendas/BS_Retreat_Agenda_6_14_16.pdf
  - PowerPoint presentation
  - Program Review Notes, 14 June 2016
    http://norcocollege.edu/about/business-services/Documents/Retreats/BS_Retreat_Program_Review_Summary_by_Dept_6%20_4_16.pdf
- Business Services Retreat, 14 June 2016, Survey Results
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/business-services/Documents/Retreats/BS_Retreat_Survey_2016_Results.pdf
- Technology Support Services Webpage
  http://norcocollege.edu/techservices/Pages/index.aspx

- College Police Administrative Program Review, 2015
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/programreview/Documents/adminunit/2015/CollegePolice_AUPR_2015.pdf
- Norco College Cadet Program
- Facilities Department (Maintenance) Program Review, 2015
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/programreview/Documents/adminunit/2015/Maintenance_AUPR_2015.pdf
- Facilities Operation and Maintenance Automatic Feedback Survey
- Food Services Program Review, 2015
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/programreview/Documents/adminunit/2015/Food_AUPR_2015.pdf
- Food Services—Coffee Cart/Coffee Bar

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

Norco College's Technology Committee coordinates with the College's Microcomputer Support staff and the Instructional Media Center to plan for replacement, reassignment, and evaluation of technology resources. In spring 2016, the Technology Committee revised the Norco College Technology Principles and Guidelines 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 College's Replacement of Technology Infrastructure and Equipment Plan 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 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 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, and the list was placed on the 2015 Annual Administrative Program Review for Technology Support Services. In the program review process, the recommendation was listed as a high priority, and 77

15

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. On April 28, 2016, the Technology Committee 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 and for software that were reviewed and approved by the District Information Technology Strategy Council on October 24, 2014. Units requesting technology resources as part of their annual program reviews must complete a streamlined version of the Technology Request Form modified specifically for program review. A more detailed version of the Technology Request Form is available to use for purchases.
       Requests for technology equipment are reviewed by the Technology Committee and the College's technology departments for evaluation of technical specifications and costs associated with the equipment as well as inventory purposes. For purchases, the total cost of ownership for the item is calculated on the basis of the information provided in the form, which is returned to the requesting unit. In submitting its annual program review, the unit utilizes a Technology Total Cost of Ownership document and provides specific TCO data in the section of the program review that lists resource requests, as well as on the Technology Request Form. The Technology Total Cost of Ownership form contains sections detailing the initial cost of the resource as well as the total operating costs for the item. This enables the College to make informed decisions about whether to grant particular requests.
        The Technology Committee continues to assess and improve the effectiveness of the Technology Request Form. In the 2015 Program Review cycle, after making the recommendations for technology requests, the Technology Committee reviewed and discussed the process, as well as the Technology Request Form document. The committee decided to work with the Student Services Planning Council to incorporate questions from the Technology Request Form into the Student Services Program Review template as a pilot. This revision would help to speed up the recommendation process by providing needed information directly from the program review form. If the revised document succeeds in being a more effective, the committee plans to work on revising the administrative program review template for 2017 as the next step. Also, as part of the Technology Committee's 2015 assessment of the Technology Request Form, the Technology Total Cost of Ownership Form was revised to reflect standard estimated costs for technology equipment such as computers, printers, and monitors to provide ease of usage and consistency.

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, faculty, and staff was conducted in spring 2015 to assess technology use, resources, and needs. The results of the technology survey were evaluated by the Technology Committee in fall 2015 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 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.

4. <u>Using the results of evaluation as the basis for improvement</u>

The Technology Committee continues to evaluate technology requests from program review utilizing the criteria stated in the [Replacement of Technology Infrastructure and Equipment Plan](#) 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.

The spring annual Technology Survey 2015, which assesses technology resources for the College, was reviewed in fall 2015 by the Technology Committee. The committee identified areas for improvement, such as faculty, staff, and students' desire for more technology troubleshooting support, and students' need for technical support. The Technology 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](#), 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. In spring 2016, 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 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.

Evidence for College Recommendation 4
- Norco College Technology Principles and Guidelines (rev. spring 2016)
- Minutes from Technology Committee meeting in which Principles and Guidelines were revised?
- Replacement of Technology Infrastructure and Equipment Plan http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/Replacement%20of%20Technology%20Infrastructure%20Equipment%20Plan.pdf

- Annual Computer/Equipment Inventory
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/Norco-College-Computer-Equipment-Inventory-2015.pdf
- Computer Equipment Refresh 2015 Recommendations list
- 2015 Annual Adminstrative Program Review for Technology Support Services
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/programreview/Documents/adminunit/2015/TechSupport_AUPR_2015.pdf
- Norco College Technology Strategic Plan 2013-2016
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/PlanningDocs/Norco%20Technology%20Plan%2013-16.pdf
- Technology Committee minutes, 28 April 2016
- Technology Request Form, Hardware
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/TechRequestFormEquip.pdf
- Technology Request Form, Software
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/TechRequestFormEquip.pdf
- ITSC Meeting Minutes, 24 October 2014
  http://rccd.edu/administration/adminfinance/Documents/Information%20Services/DSTP/Minutes/ITSC%20Meeting%20Minutes_10-24-14.pdf
- Technology Request Form, Program Review
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/TechRequestFormProgramReview.pdf
- Technology Total Cost of Ownership Document
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/TechnologyTotalCostofOwnership.pdf
- Student Services Administrative Program Review, 2015
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/programreview/Documents/adminunit/2015/SSV_AUPR_2015.pdf
- Annual Technology Survey of Norco College Students, 2015
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/TechSurvey2015-Student.pdf
- Annual Technology Survey of Norco College Faculty, 2015
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/TechSurvey2015-Faculty.pdf
- Annual Technology Survey of Norco College Staff, 2015
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/TechSurvey2015-Staff.pdf
- Technology Committee Minutes
- Lynda.com
  http://norcocollege.edu/lynda/Pages/index.aspx
- Technology Committee Evaluation of Lynda.com (Spring 2016)
- Lynda.com Satisfaction Survey (Winter 2016)

Responses to Actionable Improvement Plans

> 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 AS 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 to be submitted for review at its March 6, 2014 meeting. The report was reviewed and vetted internally by the college's Academic Senate, Institutional Strategic Planning Council, Committee of the Whole, and approved by the Board of Trustees. 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 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.

Evidence for Actionable Improvement Plan II.A.2

- Norco College Substantive Change Proposal, 21 January 2014
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/Accreditation/Documents/Reports%20and%20Letters/SCR%20Norco%20College_Jan%2021-2014.pdf
- Letter from ACCJC Documenting Approval of the Substantive Change Proposal, 7 March 2014
  http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/Accreditation/Documents/Reports%20and%20Letters/Substantive%20Change%20Approval%202014-03.pdf

---

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—Student Grievance Process for Instruction and Grade Related Matters and BP/AP5524—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 and Student Request for Formal Hearing. The Student Consultation Request form is completed after the student attempts to resolve the issue informally per AP5522 or 5524. 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) and matters other than instruction, grades, or discipline (AP5524).

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 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. 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.

Evidence for Actionable Improvement Plan II.B.2.d.
- Student Request for Consultation http://www.norcocollege.edu/Documents/Student%20Consultation%20Request%20Form%20-%20FINAL%2006%2024%2014.pdf
- Student Request for Formal Hearing http://www.norcocollege.edu/Documents/Student%20Request%20for%20Formal%20Hearing%20Form%20-%20FINAL%2006%2024%2014.pdf
- AP 5522 http://www.norcocollege.edu/Documents/ap5522-chart.pdf
- AP 5524 http://www.norcocollege.edu/Documents/ap5524-chart.pdf
- Complaint Process webpage (http://www.norcocollege.edu/Pages/Complaint-Procedures.aspx
- President's Cabinet meeting training

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 Goal VI, Strategy #2, "Make Recommendations for Technology Structure/Strategic Model," the Technology Committee reviewed the District IT Audit 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 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 among technology personnel within 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, and the Recommendation for Decentralization of the District's Microcomputer Support Function was discussed at the Technology Committee's March 19, 2015 meeting. The decentralization and merger of Microcomputer Support and IMC was approved at the Board of Trustees meeting on June 16, 2015. The newly formed Technology Support Services 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 of 2016 as reported by TSS at the Technology Committee meeting on September 15, 2016.

Evidence for Actionable Improvement Plan III.B.1.a.
- Norco College Technology Strategic Plan 2013-2016
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/PlanningDocs/Norco%20Technology%20Plan%2013-16.pdf
- District IT Audit
  http://rccd.edu/administration/adminfinance/Documents/Information%20Services/DSTP/Other%20Documents/IT%20Audit%20-%20Final%20Draft_1_28_11.pdf
- Technology Committee Minutes, 20 March 2014
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/2013-14/2014-03-20-Technology-minutes.pdf
- ITSC Meeting Minutes, 6 March 2015
  http://rccd.edu/administration/adminfinance/Documents/Information%20Services/DSTP/Minutes/ITSC%20Meeting%20Minutes_3-6-15.pdf
- Norco College Technology Committee Minutes, 19 March 2015
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/technology/2014-15/2015-03-19-Technology-minutes.pdf
- Board of Trustees Minutes, 16 June 2015
  http://www.rccdistrict.net/eb/PDF%20Conversions/June_16_2015_Complete.pdf
- Technology Committee Minutes, 16 September 2016

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) and that the total should be defined. On March 11, 2014, BFPC 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 tool was vetted through the Business and Facilities Planning Council (BFPC) throughout 2013 and 2014 and was presented at the Committee of the Whole on October 2, 2014. Assessment of the TCO prompted its addition to the program review template and resulted in the addition of links on the College's website (Business Services webpage and Program Review webpage) to ensure ease of use by faculty, staff, and administrators.
        Assessment of the TCO by the Technology Committee 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 has been updated to for a 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.

Evidence for Actionable Improvement Plan III.B.2.a.
- BFPC Minutes, 10 December 2013
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/bfpc/2013-14/2013-12-10-BFPC-Minutes.pdf
- BFPC Minutes, 11 March 2014

http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/bfpc/2013-14/2014-03-11-BFPC-meeting.pdf

- BFPC Minutes 2013-2014, for meetings in which the TCO tool was vetted
  - 10 December 2013 http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/bfpc/2013-14/2013-12-10-BFPC-Minutes.pdf
  - 14 January 2014 http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/bfpc/2013-14/2014-01-14-BFPC-Minutes.pdf
  - 11 March 2014   http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/bfpc/2013-14/2014-03-11-BFPC-meeting.pdf
  - 13 May 2014 http://www.norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/bfpc/2013-14/2014-05-13-BFPC-Minutes.pdf
- COTW Minutes, 2 October 2014
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/cotw/2014-15/2014-10-02_COTW_Minutes.pdf
- Program Review Template
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/programreview/Pages/Annual-Instructional-Program-Review.aspx
- Business Services Webpage, with TCO Link
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/business-services/Pages/index.aspx
- Program Review Webpage, with TCO Link
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/programreview/Pages/index.aspx
- Total Cost of Ownership Spreadsheet, 2016-2017

> 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) and the 2015-2016 memo (dated June 15, 2016) may be compared to earlier memos, as found on the Evaluation Procedures 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."

Evidence for Actionable Improvement Plan III.D.1.a.
- Memorandum from College President to Norco College, 2014-2015
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/President%20Memo%2014-15.pdf
- Memorandum from College President to Norco College, 2015-2016
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Documents/2016%20Year%20End%20Letter%20from%20the%20President%2006_08.pdf
- Strategic Planning Evaluation Procedures Webpage
  http://norcocollege.edu/about/president/strategic-planning/Pages/Evaluation-Procedures.aspx

Budget Update

COTW-COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
September 22, 2016

BETH GOMEZ, VICE PRESIDENT

BUSINESS SERVICES

NORCO COLLEGE

Topics - Agenda

▶Revenues

▶FTES Projections

▶Challenges

▶Fund Balance

▶Budget Allocation Model (BAM)

NORCO COLLEGE

RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
FY 2016-2017 Final Budget
(In Millions)

	RCCD	NC (Est. 23%)
FY 2016-17 Ongoing Revenue Budget		
Beginning Ongoing Revenue Budget	$161.97	$37.25
FY 2015-16 Apportionment Increase	3.98	.92
FY 2016-17 Apportionment:		
COLA (0%)	--	--
Access (2.92%)	4.19	.96
Deficit (.50%)	(0.80)	(.18)
General Operating Base Increase	1.97	.45
RDA Revenue Deferral Reversed	1.13	.26
Other	0.32	.07
Total Ongoing Revenue Budget Adj.	$10.79	$ 2.48
Total Ongoing Revenue Budget	$172.76	$39.73

COTW September 22, 2016

NORCO COLLEGE

RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
FY 2016-2017 Final Budget
(In Millions)

Restricted Revenues	CCC System
Deferred Maintenance and Instructional Equipment	$184.6
Proposition 39 - Energy Revenues	49.2
Total Restricted Revenues	**$233.8**

Other	
Academic Senate	$ .3
Strong Workforce Program	200.0
Career Technical Ed. Pathways (SB1070)	48.0
Basic Skills Program	30.0
Cal Grant B and C	2.2
Innovation Awards	25.0
Zero-Textbook-Cost Degrees	5.0
Institutional Eff. - Implementing Statewide Performance Strategies	10.0

Source – BOT Committee Meeting 9/6/2016

NORCO COLLEGE

RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
FY 2016-2017 Final Budget
(In Millions)

Other (continued)	CCC System
Data Security – Tele. & Technology Infrastructure Program	15.0
Apprenticeship Program	1.8
Adult Education Block Grant Support	5.0
Online Education Course Exchange	20.0
CalWORKS	8.7
Part-Time Faculty Office Hours	3.7
Puente Program	2.4
Early Childhood Education Apprenticeship Pilot Program	1.4
California Promise Program	15.0
"I Can Afford College" Program	2.5
Equal Employment Opportunity Program	2.0
Total Other	**$398.0**

Source – BOT Committee Meeting 9/6/2016

NORCO COLLEGE

RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
FY 2016-2017 Final Budget
(In Millions)

Unrestricted Ongoing Revenues	CCC System	RCCD	NC (Est. 23%)
Growth/Access (2.0%/2.92%)	$114.7	$ 4.2	$.97
COLA (0%)	---	---	---
General Operating Base Increase	75.0	2.0	.46
Total Unrestricted Ongoing Revenues	**$189.7**	**$6.2**	**$1.43**
Unrestricted One-Time Revenues			
State Mandate Block Grant	$105.5	$2.6	$.60
Total Unrestricted Revenues	**$295.2**	**$8.8**	**$2.03**

Source – BOT Committee Meeting 9/6/16

NORCO COLLEGE

RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
FY 2016-2017 Final Budget

FY 2016-17 Credit FTES Projects

Base FTES	28,599.64
Growth/Access (System 2.0%; RCCD 2.92%)	835.11
Total Funded FTES	29,434.75
Unfunded FTES (.49%)	144.14
FTES Target	**29,578.89**

FTES Production for FY 2016-17

Growth	835.11
Unfunded	144.14
Summer 2016 Rolled to FY 2015-16	440.56
	1,419.81

Source – BOT Committee Meeting 9/6/2016

NORCO COLLEGE

RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
FY 2016-2017 Final Budget

	FY 2016-2017 Credit FTES	Credit FTES Targets %
RCC	15,913.45	53.80%
NC	6,832.72	23.10%
MVC	6,832.72	23.10%
Total	29,578.89	100.00%

Source – BOT Committee Meeting 9/6/2016

NORCO COLLEGE

Challenge and Opportunities

- ▶ Expiring Sales Tax and personal Income Tax Rates under Proposition 30

- ▶ Multi-year Rate Increases for STRS and PERS

- ▶ Double Digit Rate Increases to the District Health Costs

  - ❑ Impact of Affordable Care Act

  - ❑ Rising 65+ Retiree Health Care Costs For PPO Plan

  - ❑ Increasing in the number of employees choosing PPO Plan

  - ❑ Retirement Incentive Retirees Obligation

NORCO
COLLEGE

RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
FY 2016-2017 Final Budget

		Moreno Valley	Norco	Riverside	DSS	DO
Contingency Budget from FY 2015-2016	$ 10,447,116					
Apportionment						
Basic Allocation	$ 11,404,097					
Cr FTES (MVC - 6,606.52; NC - 6,606.52; RCC - 15,386.60 (28,599.64))	143,044,800					
COLA at 0.00%	-					
Full-Time Faculty Hiring	-					
Base Increase + FT Faculty and FON Base Adjustments	1,973,534					
Growth at 2.92% (MVC - 226.20; NC - 226.20; RCC - 526.85 (686.39))	4,179,099					
Total Gross Apportionment	$ 160,601,530					
Plus, RDA PY Apportionment Deferral Reversal	1,126,438					
Less, Property Taxes	(38,734,367)					
Less, Enrollment Fees	(8,428,741)					
Less, Estimated Deficit Factor (.0050)	(804,290)					
Total Net Apportionment	$ 113,760,570					
Total Beginning Balance and Apportionment	$ 124,207,686					
Less, Contingency Reserve (Board Policy at 5.00% or more)	(11,987,323)					
Less, DO Allocation	(2,306,700)					
Less, DSS Allocation	(18,268,001)					
Less, Outgoing Transfer for CSJCL (Resource 1120)	(168,706)					
Less, Outgoing Transfer for DSPS Match, FWS Support and Veterans Educ	(1,032,605)					
Total Funds for Per Credit FTES Calculation	$ 90,444,351					
Target Credit FTES Target	29,578.89					
Total Funding Rate Per Target Credit FTES	$ 3,057.7331					
Total Funding Rate Per Target Credit FTES (Adjusted per Entity)	$ 3,057.7331	$ 3,135.5642	$ 2,586.2446	$ 3,225.4443		
Target Credit FTES Target	29,578.89	6,832.72	6,832.72	15,913.45		
Total Funds for Per Credit FTES Calculation	$ 90,444,351	$ 21,429,385	$ 17,675,170	$ 51,339,796		
FY 2015-16 Excess (Shortfall) of Budgeted Revenues	7,255,349	1,306,561	1,928,568	4,020,220	457,779	-
FY 2015-16 Excess (Shortfall) of Budgeted Expenditures	477,568	107,395	815,664	(445,491)	-	17,879,372
Non-Credit FTES	256,438	21,545	-	234,893	-	-
Federal Revenues	196,606	59,867	50,016	86,723	-	-
Other State Revenues	6,955,508	1,495,429	1,977,218	3,482,861	2,618,622	-
Local Revenues	51,459,593	11,197,997	11,512,922	28,748,674	135,277	-
Incoming Transfer from Bookstore (Resource 1110)	1,051,333	135,035	590,796	325,502	-	-
Total Available Funds	$ 158,096,746	$ 35,753,214	$ 34,550,354	$ 87,793,178	$ 3,211,678	$ 17,879,372
Base Expenditures for FY 2016-2017						
FY 2016-2017	(158,096,746)	(36,479,228)	(34,485,536)	(87,131,982)	(21,479,679)	(20,186,072)
Budget (Shortfall) or Excess	$ -	$ (726,014)	$ 64,818	$ 661,196	$ (18,268,001)	$ (2,306,700)

RCCD Reserve History

RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Sep
FY 2016-2017 Final Budget

Contingency History

FY		Adopted Contingency Balance	% of Avaliable Funds		Ending Fund Balance	% of Avaliable Funds
2015-16*	$	10,447,116	5.45%	$	36,517,185**	17.97%
2014-15	$	7,801,811	4.28%	$	14,667,967	8.69%
2013-14	$	6,358,532	4.23%	$	12,743,536	7.65%
2012-13	$	4,560,030	3.23%	$	11,407,409	7.95%
2011-12	$	5,840,447	3.94%	$	6,805,919	4.73%
2010-11	$	8,729,056	5.60%	$	13,217,249	8.48%
2009-10	$	8,391,878	5.50%	$	11,253,316	7.22%
2008-09	$	12,566,801	7.68%	$	13,903,627	8.74%
2007-08	$	9,423,484	6.14%	$	19,259,076	12.37%

*Estimate
**Includes $15 million of one-time State Mandate Block Grant funds set-aside for future years as a hedge against increasing costs such as PERS, STRS, health insurance, Bargaining Unit Contract increases, retirement incentive costs and revenue reductions. Without the one-time funds, the ending fund balance would be $21,513,185 {10.51%).

Source – BOT Committee Meeting 9/6/2016

NORCO
COLLEGE

Questions

NORCO
COLLEGE

WHAT IS CURRENTLY HAPPENING. . . .

THERE IS NEWS ON THE SMOKING LEGISLATION FRONT. THE BILL WENT BACK AND FORTH BETWEEN ASSEMBLY AND SENATE AND HAS NOW APPEARED TO HAVE PASSED BOTH HOUSES.

- PASSED THE SENATE ON AUGUST 23RD AND THE ASSEMBLY ON AUGUST 30TH.

- HAVING PASSED BOTH SENATE AND ASSEMBLY, SIGNING OF THE BILL WILL PROBABLY BE DONE SOON.

- IT HAS NOT YET BEEN CODIFIED INTO THE LEGAL DATABASES (IT WILL REPLACE THE CURRENT CAL. GOV'T CODE SECTION 7597.1).

- AS IT IS WRITTEN, HERE'S THE BOTTOM LINE. . . . . . THE LAW SAYS THAT THE BAN OF ALL TOBACCO PRODUCTS, INCLUDING E-CIGS, ON COMMUNITY COLLEGE CAMPUSES WILL BE IMPLEMENTED BY 2018.

- WE ARE ABLE TO SELF-DETERMINE OUR POLICIES BEFORE THAT TIME, BUT THE REGULATION WILL NOT FORCE US TO DO UNTIL THAT TIME.

- WE WILL CONTINUE TO MONITOR AND PROVIDE MORE INFORMATION WHEN THE GOVERNMENT CODE IS ACTUALLY CHANGED . . . .

NORCO COLLEGE

NEXT STEPS. . .

- WILL NEED TO BEGIN A PLAN TO PHASE OUT SMOKING AT OUR COLLEGE – (WITH A TIMELINE)

- ONCE APPROVED THROUGH OUR SHARED GOVERNANCE PROCESS, BOARD POLICY WILL HAVE TO BE CHANGED

NORCO
COLLEGE

QUESTIONS?

NORCO
COLLEGE

Committee of the Whole

Guiding Principles

Fall 2016

In an effort to increase institutional effectiveness, the Institutional Strategic Planning Council (ISPC) has established guiding principles to assist the institution in determining when and if an item should be taken to the Committee of the Whole (COTW). The ISPC recognizes that it is not possible to plan for every contingency; therefore, it will seek to follow the *spirit of the guiding principles*, as new situations arise.

1) Items which align with topics that require Board of Trustee (BOT) approval will be voting items.

2) Other items that have impact to the college at large will be agendized as information items.

3) Other items may be agendized as determined by a majority vote of the ISPC.

4) To encourage participation, confidential voting will be implemented whenever possible.

5) To increase understanding of institution-wide issues, brief summary descriptions that include the shared governance approval history of the item, and the name of a contact person associated with the item, will accompany agenda items whenever possible.