



*Outcomes | Innovation | Improvement*

ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR  
COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

---

## **CORE INQUIRIES**

**Chaffey College**  
5855 Haven Avenue  
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91737

The Core Inquiries are based upon the findings of the peer review team that conducted Team ISER Review on March 27, 2023.

Dr. Joe Wyse  
Team Chair

## Contents

Peer Review Team Roster.....	3
Summary of Team ISER Review.....	4
Core Inquiries.....	5

Chaffey College

Peer Review Team Roster

**Team ISER Review**

March 27, 2023

Dr. Joe Wyse, Chair Superintendent/President, Shasta College	Mr. Mitch Charles, Vice Chair President, Carrington College
<b>ACADEMIC MEMBERS</b>	
Ms. Cheryl Aschenbach English Professor, Lassen Community College	Ms. Melynie Schiel Vice President of Academic Affairs, Copper Mountain College
Dr. Sunyeen Pai Digital Initiatives Librarian, Kapi'olani Community College	Dr. Allison Moore Professor of Accounting, Los Angeles Southwest College
Mr. Christopher Howerton Professor of Communication Studies/ SLO Coordinator/ Senate VP, Woodland Community College	
<b>ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBERS</b>	
Mr. Brian Murphy Director of Institutional Research, Butte College	Dr. Bradley Olin Assistant Superintendent/Vice President, Finance and Administrative Services, Cabrillo College
Mrs. Kira Tippins Dean of Students, Clovis Community College	
<b>ACCJC STAFF LIAISON</b>	
Dr. Catherine Webb Vice President, ACCJC	

## Summary of Team ISER Review

INSTITUTION: Chaffey College

DATE OF TEAM ISER REVIEW: March 27, 2023

TEAM CHAIR: Dr. Joe Wyse

A 10 member accreditation peer review team conducted Team ISER Review of Chaffey College on March 27, 2023. The Team ISER Review is a one-day, off-site analysis of an institution's self-evaluation report. The peer review team received the college's institutional self-evaluation report (ISER) and related evidence several weeks prior to the Team ISER Review. Team members found the ISER to be a comprehensive, well written, document detailing the processes used by the College to address Eligibility Requirements, Commission Standards, and Commission Policies. The team confirmed that the ISER was developed through broad participation by the entire College community including faculty, staff, students, and administration. The team found that the College provided a thoughtful ISER containing several self-identified action plans for institutional improvement. The College also prepared a Quality Focus Essay.

In preparation for the Team ISER Review, the team chair attended a team chair training workshop on December 1, 2022 and held a pre-review meeting with the Chaffey College CEO on January 11, 2023. The entire peer review team received team training provided by staff from ACCJC on February 7, 2023. Prior to the Team ISER Review, team members completed their team assignments, identified areas for further clarification, and provided a list of requests for additional evidence to be considered during Team ISER Review.

During the Team ISER Review, team members spent the morning discussing their initial observations and their preliminary review of the written materials and evidence provided by the College for the purpose of determining whether the College continues to meet Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and US ED regulations. In the afternoon, the team further synthesized their findings to validate the excellent work of the college and identified standards the college meets, as well as developed Core Inquiries to be pursued during the Focused Site Visit, which will occur in October of 2023.

Core Inquiries are a means for communicating potential areas of institutional noncompliance, improvement, or exemplary practice that arise during the Team ISER Review. They describe the areas of emphasis for the Focused Site Visit that the team will explore to further their analysis to determining whether standards are met and accordingly identify potential commendations or recommendations. The college should use the Core Inquiries and time leading up to the focused site visit as an opportunity to gather more evidence, collate information, and to strengthen or develop processes in the continuous improvement cycle. In the course of the Focused Site Visit, the ACCJC staff liaison will review new or emerging issues which might arise out of the discussions on Core Inquiries.

## Core Inquiries

Based on the team's analysis during the Team ISER Review, the team identified the following core inquiries that relate to potential areas of clarification, improvement, or commendation.

<p><b>Core Inquiry 1:</b> The team seeks to clarify how the institution identifies and regularly assesses learning and student support outcomes to continuously improve programs and services and how the results of these assessments are being communicated.</p>
<p><b>Standards or Policies:</b> Standards I.B.8, II.A.3, and II.C.2.</p>
<p><b>Description:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>The team was unclear as to how the institution broadly communicates the results of all of its assessment and evaluation activities, such as learning outcome achievement.</li><li>The team reviewed evidence supporting that the institution identifies learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees using established institutional procedures and that student learning outcomes that match the course outline of record are included in course syllabi. The team was unable to ascertain that those learning outcomes are being regularly assessed. The team acknowledges the PSRs indicate that SLOs are being assessed; however, limited evidence was presented showing SLO assessment.</li><li>The team reviewed the Peer Assistance for Learning (PAL) data and found this to be a strong example of instructional learning support; however, this was the only evidence provided to the team. The team was unclear as to how the institution broadly identifies and assesses outcomes appropriate to student support services offered at the institution.</li></ol>
<p><b>Topics of discussion during interviews:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>What are the processes used to ensure that learning outcomes assessments regularly occur?</li><li>What are the processes used to identify and assess effectiveness of student support services?</li><li>How are the results of assessments activities being communicated to ensure shared understanding of strengths and weaknesses?</li></ol>
<p><b>Request for Additional Information/Evidence:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>Access or reports from TaskStream.</li><li>Program review or assessment data of student support services.</li><li>Examples of institutional communication of assessment activities developing a shared understanding of strengths and weaknesses.</li><li>Examples of action taken as a direct result of assessment.</li></ol>
<p><b>Request for Observations/Interviews:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>CIO</li><li>SLO coordinator(s)</li><li>Members of outcomes assessment committees</li><li>CSSO</li><li>Instructional and non-instructional faculty and staff involved in assessment of learning and student support outcomes</li></ol>

**Core Inquiry 2:**

The team seeks to understand how Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) is integrated into long-range capital facilities and equipment plans in support of overall institutional improvement goals.

**Standards or Policies:**

III.B.4.

**Description:**

- a. The team reviewed evidence to support the College's long-range capital plans are integrated with institutional improvement goals. The team also observed evidence of initial efforts to explore the Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) as it relates to facilities and equipment. The team is unclear on understanding how TCO is woven into the decision-making and planning framework.
- b. The team did not find sufficient evidence to demonstrate how long-term facility and equipment planning is captured in TCO discussions and resource allocation recommendations. There was not enough evidence to inform the team as to the incorporation of TCO in the college's decision-making processes.
- c. The team saw evidence of initial discussion around facilities TCO planning from 2018, but nothing more recent. The evidence provided was regarding TCO for technology acquisition, but not facilities or equipment.

**Topics of discussion during interviews:**

- a. What is the College's TCO strategy for facilities and equipment?
- b. What policies/procedures/processes for managing and evaluating TCO are being developed or implemented?
- c. How a facilities and equipment TCO framework might support future bond planning efforts.

**Request for Additional Information/Evidence:**

- a. Templates, spreadsheets, scoring rubrics, or other documents that provide objective analysis of the costs and benefits of major capital facilities and equipment investments.
- b. Facilities Condition Assessment / Index / Life Cycle Analysis

**Request for Observations/Interviews:**

- a. Interviews with facilities planning and administration managers (CBO, Chief Facilities Officer)
- b. Interviews with cabinet/executives regarding decision-making framework and the resource allocation committee (RAC) process
- c. RAC constituents who are stakeholders

**Core Inquiry 3:** The Team seeks to understand how the institution ensures regular and substantive interaction (RSI) between students and instructors in all distance education courses.

**Standards or Policies:** *Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education*

**Description:**

- a. The Team verified the College has clear procedures for regular and substantive interaction exist in AR 4105 Distance Education.
- b. Of the courses provided for review, the team was unable to validate how regular and substantive interaction consistently occurred across the courses.

**Topics of discussion during interviews:**

- a. What instructor interactions occur that are not available to reviewers with the access provided? Examples could be through Canvas inbox, campus email, or other external communication tools.
- b. How is RSI ensured at the class level? What reviews of RSI are conducted? What processes and efforts are in place to ensure requirements for RSI are met in all distance education courses?

**Request for Additional Information/Evidence:**

- a. The team is interested in reviewing evidence of instructor interactions that may not have been available with the access given for initial review.
- b. The team is interested in seeing evidence of how the college ensures RSI regularly occurs within course sections.
- c. Per the ACCJC DE protocol, the Team will review a sampling of courses from the Spring 2023 term immediately prior to the site visit.

**Request for Observations/Interviews:**

- a. DE Coordinator
- b. Administrator overseeing distance education
- c. Sampling of faculty teaching online
- d. Academic senate representatives engaged in DE policy review