Date: September 13, 2022

To: Dr. Kristin Clark, Chair (Chancellor, West Hills Community College District); Dr. Angelica Suarez, Vice Chair (President, Orange Coast College); Dr. Gohar Momjian, ACCJC Staff Liaison (Vice President, ACCJC)

From: Melanie Dixon, President, American River College

CC: Frank Kobayashi, Accreditation Liaison Officer, American River College

Re: College Update on Core Inquiries

American River College is looking forward to the upcoming Focused Site Visit. In order to facilitate the team's review process, please see the College's responses below.

Core Inquiry 1: The team would like to understand what action for improvement the institution takes when it does not meet its own institution-set standards.
Standards or Policies: Standard I.B.3
Briefly describe any institutional improvements, strengthening of processes, documented outcomes, discussions or reflections which have occurred pertaining to Core Inquiry 1. (300 words max.) The Institutional Effectiveness Council agendized this Core Inquiry as a discussion item during its March 21, 2022 meeting. The Council discussed providing additional context to the visiting team, as well as working on a documented process for improvement when the institution does not meet its own institutional set standards. Subsequent discussions and collaboration between members of the Institutional Effectiveness Council, the Office of Equity, Institutional Effectiveness and Innovation, and the Office of

Institutional Research resulted in the drafting of a comprehensive process for the reporting and publication of institution-set standards, both for college-level and program-level metrics of achievement. This comprehensive process includes (1) an annual institution-set standards (ISS) report where all the college's ISS and actions needed for improvement are reported, and (2) an ISS reporting form used to document actions for improvement the institution takes when it does not meet its own institution-set standards. If the actions are at the program-level, then these programs will be reminded to include these actions in their subsequent Annual Unit Plan by the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and Innovation.

The annual ISS report will be shared with the Institutional Effectiveness Council, Student Success Council, Executive Leadership Team, and President's Executive Team every Spring following submission of the ACCJC annual report.

The Institutional Effectiveness Council discussed this comprehensive process and provided consensus support to proceed with implementation during its April 18th, 2022, meeting.

To allow for meaningful dialogue, the initial implementation of the ISS reporting form will occur in Fall 2022. Subsequently, a regular cycle for reporting will be implemented to coincide with the availability of the data (a Fall reporting for department set standards and a Spring reporting for all other metrics).

The ISS Annual Report and results from the ISS Reporting form will be published and publicly available on the ARC website.

Evidence: Provide the list of evidentiary documents which will assist the team to better understand college processes, outcomes, and activities pertaining to Core Inquiry 1. (documents should be separate pdf files on submitted flash drive)

1. Institution-Set Standards at American River College Annual Report 2021-2022
2. Institution-Set Standards Reporting Form

Context/additional information (if applicable): Please feel free to provide any additional relevant information that provides context for the college's work. (300 words max.)

Core Inquiry 2: The team reviewed the evidence in the ISER and would like to further understand the college's role in using the facilities master plan and long-range capital plan to support institutional improvement goals for new facilities and equipment, which includes projections of the total cost of ownership.

Standards or Policies: Standard IIIB.4

Briefly describe any institutional improvements, strengthening of processes, documented outcomes, discussions or reflections which have occurred pertaining to Core Inquiry

2. (300 words max.)

The Operations Council agenized this Core Inquiry as a discussion item during its March 22, 2022 meeting. The Council discussed providing additional evidence and context regarding the college's role in using the facilities master plan and long-range capital plan to support institutional improvement goals for new facilities and equipment.

The principal tool used for long-range facilities planning is the Facilities Master Plan (FMP). A unique FMP is prepared and/or updated for each college every 4 to 5 years through an extensive shared governance process.

American River College has a Campus Master Planning Leadership Committee as well as a Campus Planning Team that contains members of all constituency groups on campus.

In the FMP planning meetings, ARC provides input and discussion on defining design guidelines. For example, the campus identified Inclusion, Social Justice and Equity as guidelines need to be added to the other 10 design guidelines to keep up with the constantly evolving needs of the campus.

ARC also provides input on new content of the FMP to be included into the plan such as Zone Guidelines (Wayfinding). ARC's role in Projects in Detail include working in conjunction with District Facilities Maintenance (FM), to take all criteria into consideration for prioritization of buildings including age and needs of the campus.

The intent of this process is to ensure that each college's facilities support the current and the future educational needs of the college. The FMP identifies both growth opportunities (based on increasing enrollment) and modernization projects (based on the age and condition of existing buildings) needed to support the college's educational mission. The physical condition of all District facilities is evaluated on a regular basis by the CCCCO and District facilities staff. Every two to three years, the CCCCO prepares a Facilities Condition Index (FCI) report for all districts for use in evaluating and determining which facilities may require repair, modernization or replacement. This data is used to inform decisions when the District updates its Facility Master Plans for each college. Additionally, the District's web-based work order management system (CMMS) tracks all maintenance and repair work performed in all District buildings that allows the District to prioritize which of its facilities are in the greatest need of modernization or replacement. The CMMS also tracks costs associated with this work over the course of a building's lifespan, which allows the District to determine the Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) that further informs the prioritization of facilities that should be modernized or completely replaced. Based on CCCCO guidelines, a facility must be at least twenty-five years old to be considered for modernization or replacement.

Evidence: Provide the list of evidentiary documents which will assist the team to better understand college processes, outcomes, and activities pertaining to Core Inquiry 2.
(documents should be separate pdf files on submitted flash drive)

3.   [2019 ARC Facilities Master Plan](#)

Context/additional information (if applicable): Please feel free to provide any additional relevant information that provides context for the college's work. (300 words max.)

Core Inquiry 3: The Team was impressed with the institution's commitment to diverse student views and their participation in informing and shaping college practices as evidenced by the Student Design Team initiative. The team would like to learn more about this initiative.

Standards or Policies: Standard IVA.2

Briefly describe any institutional improvements, strengthening of processes, documented outcomes, discussions or reflections which have occurred pertaining to Core Inquiry

 3. (300 words max.)

The Student Success Council agendized ISER Core Inquiries update at its March 15, 2022 meeting. At a subsequent meeting of the President's Executive Team, the Dean and Supervisor with oversight over the Student Design Team initiative were provided guidance regarding completing a Student Design Team Report.

Evidence: Provide the list of evidentiary documents which will assist the team to better understand college processes, outcomes, and activities pertaining to Core Inquiry 3. (documents should be separate pdf files on submitted flash drive)

4. **Student Design Team Report**

Context/additional information (if applicable): Please feel free to provide any additional relevant information that provides context for the college's work. (300 words max.)

Core Inquiry 4: The Team would like to know how the college ensures that it follows required policies/processes on distance education and publication of SLOs (Student Learning Outcomes) on syllabi.

Standards or Policies: Standard II.A.3 and Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education

Briefly describe any institutional improvements, strengthening of processes, documented outcomes, discussions or reflections which have occurred pertaining to Core Inquiry

4. (300 words max.)

A review of all 45 classes from Fall 2021 that were submitted to the ISER Visiting team was carried out by Academic Senate President Alisa Shubb and Accreditation Faculty Co-Chair Bill Simpson. Their findings are attached as evidence. In summary, the College found that:

- The application of regular and substantive interaction did take place in the majority of classes submitted.
- SLO's were consistently included in syllabi.
- The College incorrectly submitted classes for review that were not asynchronous.

The College has included a random sample of distance education courses from Spring 2022.

On April 26, the Vice President of Instruction provided guidance to all Instructional Deans reaffirming the College's practice of collecting syllabi at the beginning of each term. Syllabi for sampled classes from Fall 2021 and Spring 2022 are attached as evidence. Our current

process ensures that SLOs are included in the syllabus, but the process can be improved. The Student Learning Outcomes Assessment committee (SLOAC) will provide more information and training starting Fall 2022.

The Foundations of Canvas Course Design (Foundations) training is a resource to assist faculty in becoming dynamic instructors in the online course modality. Developed by Los Rios Online Course Design Coordinators with consultation by the Learning Management System (LMS) coordinators, the asynchronous training can be completed in approximately 15 hours over the course of two weeks, and is facilitated by a faculty member with extensive experience teaching online.

ARC Online Teaching Institute addresses regular substantive interaction and has been completed by hundreds of ARC faculty, including over 85 since the pandemic began.

The Performance Review process as outlined in the Collective Bargaining Agreement with the Los Rios College Federation of Teachers serves as another way that the College ensures required policies/practices on distance education are followed, particularly on regular and substantive instructor-initiated contact.

Evidence: Provide the list of evidentiary documents which will assist the team to better understand college processes, outcomes, and activities pertaining to Core Inquiry 4.
(documents should be separate pdf files on submitted flash drive)

5.   Fall 2021 Review and Analysis
6.   Fall 2021 Syllabi List
7.   Fall 2021 Syllabi
8.   Spring 2022 Sample of Distance Education Classes
9.   Spring 2022 Syllabi List
10.   Spring 2022 Syllabi
11.   Syllabi Memo
12.   Academic Senate Syllabus Guidance
13.   District training requirement for online faculty
14.   ARC Online Teaching Institute
15.   SLOs on Course Syllabi
16.   Collective Bargaining Agreement with the Los Rios College Federation of Teachers

Context/additional information (if applicable): Please feel free to provide any additional relevant information that provides context for the college's work. (300 words max.)

District Core Inquiry 1: The team would like to better understand how the Board ensures a regular cycle of review of its board policies to ensure their effectiveness in fulfilling the district's mission and revises the policies as necessary.

Standards or Policies: IV.C.7

Briefly describe any institutional improvements, strengthening of processes, documented outcomes, discussions or reflections which have occurred pertaining to Core Inquiry

1. (300 words max.)

All policies and regulations are reviewed annually through the General Counsel's Office and brought to the Board of Trustees for reaffirmation. It is only when a policy or regulation is revised that the date is recorded to indicate that a change has been made. Some Board Policies and Regulations have not needed to be updated or changed for years (as noted in District Core Inquiry 1), and the date attached to that policy or regulation would reflect this.

It's understandable that a team member reviewing policies and regulations could conclude that the date attached to a policy or regulation actually indicates when it was last reviewed. To correct this misperception, the General Counsel's Office has more clearly outlined the review process on its website and indicated that all policies and regulations are reviewed annually.

The General Counsel's Office invites suggestions for changes to policies and regulations at any time as described in the Policy and Regulation Review Process, a collegial process which includes all appropriate constituencies and stakeholder groups. Dr. Jake Knapp, General Counsel, will be available to discuss this process in more detail and answer any questions during the team visit.

Evidence: Provide the list of evidentiary documents pertaining to Core Inquiry 1 which will assist the team to better understand current college processes and outcomes.
(documents should be separate pdf files on submitted flash drive)

17.   [Board Policy 3112 (2.2.7)](#)
18.   [Policy and Regulation Review Process](#)

District Core Inquiry 2: The team would like to deepen its understanding of the specific delineation of college and district roles and responsibilities in order to better understand the following:

- The interface between district level governance and college level governance
- The autonomy of the colleges
- The functions carried out at the district office
- The impact of completed reorganizations on the colleges and the district office
- The analyses being done for planned reorganizations

Standards or Policies: IV.D.2, IV.D.3, IV.D.4, IV.D.7

Briefly describe any institutional improvements, strengthening of processes, documented outcomes, discussions or reflections which have occurred pertaining to Core Inquiry

2. (300 words max.)

The first three items of Core Inquiry 2 are interrelated and pertain to how the district and college participatory governance groups interact and which organizational functions are primarily the responsibility of the District and which functions are primarily the responsibility of the colleges.

- The interface between district-level governance and college-level governance
- The autonomy of the colleges

- The functions carried out at the district office

District-level participatory governance groups are described in Regulation 3412 and include Senate-led groups (i.e. District Curriculum Coordinating Committee and District Equity and Student Success Committee) and other District-level participatory governance groups (i.e. Educational Technology Committee, District Budget Committee, District Accreditation Coordinating Committee, Program Placement Council, Staff Development Committee, International Education Committee, Academic Calendar Committee). These participatory governance groups allow for collaboration and coordination across the District. Additionally, the Chancellor's Cabinet, with representatives from all constituency groups, functions as the primary participatory governance group and may take up issues of District-level significance.

The LRCCD Function Map illustrates how the colleges and District manage the distribution of responsibilities by function as it pertains to the accreditation standards. To provide a clearer overview of the functions and operations performed by the District Office, follow-up interviews with District Office staff and the District Academic Senate President might be helpful.

The functional areas for which the District Office has primary responsibility are outlined in the LRCCD Function Map. The following individuals can assist with clarifying the delineation of specific responsibilities between the District and the colleges.

Interviews:

Dr. Jamey Nye, Deputy Chancellor
Alisa Shub, District Academic Senate President
Mario Rodriguez, Vice Chancellor of Finance
Gabe Ross, Associate Vice Chancellor of Strategy and Communications

Paula Allison, Associate Vice Chancellor of Resource Development
Dr. Chanelle Whittaker, Associate Vice Chancellor of Human Resources
Dr. Jake Knapp, General Counsel
Dr. Sonia Ortiz-Mercado, Associate Vice Chancellor of Student Services
Dr. Tammy Montgomery, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor of Instruction
Pablo Manzo, Associate Vice Chancellor Facilities Management
Manveer Bola, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor of Information Technology

The last two items in Core Inquiry 2 pertain to the process for changing the organizational structure in Los Rios. The A&R and Financial Aid Redesign Project (link below) illustrates the collegial consultation, transparency, and comprehensive planning involved in making well-informed, student-centered organizational changes in Los Rios.

Evidence: Provide the list of evidentiary documents pertaining to Core Inquiry 1 which will assist the team to better understand current college processes and outcomes.
(documents should be separate pdf files on submitted flash drive)

19.   Participatory Governance (Regulation 3411)
20.   Participatory Governance Committees
21.   Senate-led District Committees (Regulation 3412)
22.   Chancellor's Cabinet (Regulation 3411)
23.   Chancellor's Cabinet Agendas and Minutes
24.   A&R and Financial Aid Redesign Project
25.   LRCCD Function Map