Standard I: Mission, Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, and Integrity
G. Institutional Analysis

Standard I: Mission, Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, and Integrity

The institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes student learning and student achievement. Using analysis of quantitative and qualitative data, the institution continuously and systematically evaluates, plans, implements, and improves the quality of its educational programs and services. The institution demonstrates integrity in all policies, actions, and communication. The administration, faculty, staff, and governing board members act honestly, ethically, and fairly in the performance of their duties.

A. Mission

Standard I A.1. Mission
The mission describes the institution’s broad educational purposes, its intended student population, the types of degrees and other credentials it offers, and its commitment to student learning and student achievement. (ER 6)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard
The Rio Hondo College Mission Statement clearly describes the educational commitment of the College to academia and the community as a degree-granting institution, committed to student success through equity and social justice (I.A.01).

Analysis and Evaluation
The College meets this standard.

Standard I A.2. Mission
The institution uses data to determine how effectively it is accomplishing its mission and whether the mission directs institutional priorities in meeting the educational needs of students.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard
Rio Hondo College uses an accessible system of data, specifically Tableau data visualizations posted to the web and accessible to everyone, and regular analysis to support ongoing assessment of its effectiveness as an institution in achieving its mission (I.A.05). At the program level, data are used annually to assess program performance and identify areas of improvement through annual planning, program review, and resource allocation processes. Institutionally, data are analyzed in reference to institutional goals and objectives, as well as through California Community College Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO) initiatives, such as the Vision for Success and the Student Equity and Achievement Plan, to identify college-wide areas of strength and areas for improvement.

Analysis and Evaluation
The College meets this standard.
As specified and outlined in the College’s Educational Master Plan, regular data analysis and evaluation occur as part of the College’s comprehensive integrated planning process. Briefly, all College academic and operational programs, units, and areas submit annual plans, and the more comprehensive and detailed program reviews are submitted on a six-year cycle. Analysis for these plans inherently consider goals and progress towards them, as established through initiatives from the California Community College Chancellor’s Office (CCCCCO), such as Vision for Success, Student Equity and Achievement, Guided Pathways, as well as the College’s mission (I.A.06, I.A.07, I.A.08).

With the College mission always at the forefront of planning and actions, the College has established institutional targets for future student attainment of degrees, certificates, and transfer rates, in accordance with the Vision for Success, as well as the ACCJC institution-set and aspirational standards. Through the Student Equity and Achievement Plan, disproportionately impacted groups have been identified; and goals, objectives, activities, and metrics to evaluate College progress in achieving equity in student learning and success are regularly monitored (I.A.06, I.A.07, I.A.08). Further, during annual planning, program review, and resource allocation, programs are required to link their specific objectives and resource requests to institutional goals and objectives, which are data-based performance targets (I.A.09). The processes require that every instructional and operational College program assess its progress toward meeting its specific mission, institutional standards of performance, as well as their contribution to achieving the College mission and the ACCJC Institutional Standards.

For instructional programs, data analysis as part of annual planning, program review, and resource allocation is facilitated by examination of data through Tableau, the College’s platform for making data visualizations accessible and meaningful, provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. Instructional data visualizations include all of the achievement outcomes and institutional standards reported annually to the ACCJC, as well as disaggregation of data based on instructional modality, gender, ethnicity, and special population status, such as Veterans, Foster Youth, Disabled Students Program & Services (DSPS), among others (I.A.10, I.A.11). To assist in completing thoughtful program analyses, templates and guiding help-text questions and prompts set expectations that are aligned with the College’s goals and objectives, institution-set standards established for the ACCJC, Vision for Success, and Student Equity and Achievement. All planning is executed through Taskstream, the College’s planning software (I.A.10, I.A.11).

In addition, the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (IRP) fulfills special requests for data and data analysis initiated through their online Internal Research Request portal. Non-instructional and operational programs provide their own data to assess the effectiveness of their operations with respect to students’ needs or other College operations. Relevant data may include program outcomes, internal records, or user/client surveys. Data analysis is expected to identify program progress, find opportunities for program improvement, reflect on data trends, and identify resource needs (I.A.12). As an example, the Office of Institutional Research and Planning has identified client and service outcomes for their office that reflect their scope of work. For each outcome, a minimum acceptable standard has been set and described. Measures have been established and the methods and frequency of distribution have been recorded. The primary data collection methods for IRP outcomes are client surveys and document analysis. The data collection is done on an annual basis, according to the assessment timeline, and reported annually in the annual program plan. The assessment results help to determine the annual objectives and associated resource requests made by the program.

**Standard I A.3. Mission**

The institution’s programs and services are aligned with its mission. The mission guides institutional decision making, planning, and resource allocation and informs institutional goals for student learning and achievement.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

The Rio Hondo College mission is central to all College programs through planning and resource allocation efforts; the mission guides decision making, continuing development of programs and services, and the establishment and revisions of the College’s standards of performance.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.
The College’s programs and services are consistent with and reflect the College mission and the mission of the California Community Colleges. As outlined in the Rio Hondo College Mission Statement, the College seeks to facilitate students’ attainment of degrees, certificates, and transfer to four-year institutions. All components of the College planning process, including resource allocation and plans for improvement, are intrinsically linked to the College mission (I.A.1, I.A.13).

The Rio Hondo College Comprehensive Integrated Planning Model organically integrates master planning; initiatives from the California Community College Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO); local Board of Trustees’ Goals; and annual planning, program review, and resource allocation processes (I.A.13). No process or initiative stands alone, for all goals, objectives, activities, outcomes, and evaluations link to one another in an interconnected network through Taskstream, culminating in a concerted effort toward accomplishment and improvement.

An integral component of the College’s comprehensive integrating planning process is the Educational Master Plan (EMP), which “sets the direction for the implementation of the programs that are essential to fulfilling the District’s mission-based commitment” (I.A.13). As outlined in this document, the College’s Mission Statement “drives overall college planning and resource allocations” (I.A.13). Rio Hondo College Comprehensive Integrated Planning Model, informs Educational and Facilities Master Plans and the overall Strategic Plan. Thus, the Educational Master Plan is a mission-driven, long-term plan that serves as the “cornerstone of all planning” and sets the direction for programs and services over a 10-year period (I.A.13).

Through the Comprehensive Integrated Planning Model, systematic assessment of the College mission occurs yearly through annual planning, program review, and resource allocation processes (I.A.14). And as the College mission is guided by long-and mid-term initiatives such as the EMP and the CCCCO Vision for Success and Student Equity and Achievement plans, regular revisions are necessary (I.A.15). Therefore, annual planning and program review afford all programs the opportunity to regularly assess the extent to which their individual program missions reflect the overall mission of the College and its informing initiatives.

Resource allocation requests emanate from annual program planning and program review and are intrinsically linked to institutional goals and objectives, which are, in turn, linked to the mission of the College and its underlying initiatives (I.A.14, I.A.15, I.A.16). The institutional goals and objectives are reviewed annually to ensure their appropriateness with respect to the College’s mission (I.A.16).

Every functional aspect of the College is responsible to ensure it faithfully operates within the context of the College mission and its underlying structures and initiatives.

**Standard I A.4. Mission**

The institution articulates its mission in a widely published statement approved by the governing board. The mission statement is periodically reviewed and updated as necessary. (ER 6)

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

The Rio Hondo College Mission Statement is widely published. It appears in all major conference rooms and offices on campus and in College publications, such as the website, the Educational Master Plan, the College Catalog, and the annual report to the community, titled “In Service to Our Community.” It is reviewed by the College and the Board of Trustees every three years, in accordance with the schedule set forth in the College’s Comprehensive Integrated Planning Model (I.A.17, I.A.18, I.A.19).

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

The current Rio Hondo College Mission Statement was revised in a collaborative process including all constituencies beginning in February 2020 and adopted by the Board of Trustees on July 8, 2020. In accordance with the College’s new, Comprehensive Integrated Planning Model, approved by the Planning and Fiscal Council in spring 2020, the Mission Statement will be reviewed and revised as necessary by the College and Board of Trustees every three years (I.A.12).
Conclusions on Standard I.A. Mission

The College continuously strives to fulfill its role as a California Community College by reviewing and revising its Mission Statement on a regular basis. Each review includes defining the College’s broad educational purposes, the intended student population, the credentials it offers, and its commitment to student learning and achievement. The College meets standard I.A. because its mission meets the criteria with respect to the College’s purpose, population, awards, and commitment to student success. The College mission is the prime driver of plans, programs, and services, as well as its measurement standard, through identified performance standards, data analysis, evaluation, and assessment of the College’s goals and objectives. In essence, the College’s mission informs institutional effectiveness. The College Mission Statement is at the center of comprehensive integrated planning, and more specifically, annual planning, program review, and resource allocation processes. Resource allocation is based on analysis of these plans in terms of meeting the mission of the College. Lastly, the College mission is widely publicized, approved by the Board of Trustees, and regularly revised.

Improvement Plan(s)

Not Applicable.

Evidence List

I.A.01: Screenshot Rio Hondo College Mission Statement, Website
I.A.02: Institutional Planning Retreat Spring 2020, Document Packet
I.A.03: Minutes from the Board of Trustees, Mission Statement Presentation, July 2020
I.A.04: Minutes from the Board of Trustees, Board Meeting Minutes, Action Item Mission Statement, July 2020
I.A.05: Screenshot Office of Institutional Research Program Review and Planning Data Visualizations
I.A.06: EMP Rio Hondo College Vision for Success Goals and Targets, p. 8
I.A.07: EMP Student Equity and Achievement Plan Activities and Metrics, pp. 10 -11
I.A.08: Institutional Planning Retreat, 2019, 2020, ACCJC Institutional Standards
I.A.09: Institutional Goals and Objectives
I.A.12: Sample Data Analysis and Outcomes Sections of Annual Plans Fall 19, Fall 20
I.A.15: EMP Comprehensive Planning Model Detail, p. 4
I.A.17: College Catalogue, Mission, p. 8
I.A.18: EMP Mission, Vision, and Values p. 5
I.A.19: In Service to Our Community, Annual Report
B. Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness

Standard I B.1. Academic Quality

The institution demonstrates a sustained, substantive and collegial dialog about student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The College demonstrates sustained, substantive, and collegial dialogue regarding outcomes, equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement through the integration of outcomes assessment practice with the College annual planning and program review processes. Dialogue concerning these matters is also demonstrated through participatory/shared governance committees, such as the Outcomes Committee, the Student Equity Committee, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, and the Planning and Fiscal Council. Institutional dialogue also occurs at the annual institutional planning retreat.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Sustained, substantive, and collegial dialogue regarding student learning outcomes, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and achievement and equity occurs in multiple ways.

At the institutional level, dialogue regarding progress toward institution-set standards and performance targets for the California Community College Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO) initiatives, such as the Vision for Success and the Student Equity and Achievement Plan outcomes, occurs annually through the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC). Each year these committees examine achievement outcomes, such as those reported in the ACCJC annual report and performance targets set for CCCCO initiatives, dialogue about the College’s progress, and suggest revisions to local institution-set standards as appropriate (I.B.01).

The Student Equity (SE) Committee also examines progress toward meeting the targets set forth in the Student Equity and Achievement Plan of 2019-2022. Annually, the SE Committee reviews the five CCCCO equity metrics and the College’s identified Disproportionately Impacted (DI) groups. This review ensures that funding and program plans tie back to reducing the equity gaps identified in the Student Equity and Achievement Plan. In subsequent meetings, the committee reviews institutional data disaggregated by Disproportionately Impacted groups to measure growth over time. Additionally, each December the SE Committee prepares a Student Equity and Achievement (SEA) Annual Report to assess progress (I.B.02, I.B.03). The SEA Annual Report includes programmatic success stories and challenges that are shared with campus administrators and other constituency groups (I.B.04). In 2021, the SE Committee will lead a new equity gap study in preparation for the Student Equity and Achievement Plan of 2022-2025. This study will help measure progress in closing equity gaps over the last three years and will determine if the DI groups remain the same or have changed.

College performance and outcomes are further discussed at the annual Institutional Planning Retreat (I.B.05). Each year, during the planning retreat, College performance on ACCJC Standards are presented and discussed in terms of general performance as well as areas for improvement1. They are then further elaborated in discussions regarding institutional goals and objectives. Planning retreat participants are given the opportunity to provide input on strategies to ameliorate achievement gaps. These strategies are then reviewed by IEC and may be incorporated into institutional goals, objectives, and activities in the following year.

For example, the 2019 Institutional Planning Retreat involved stakeholders from across the campus and included presentations, activities, and small-group discussions. Student achievement was discussed and addressed throughout the event and in particular at the Vision for Success Local Goal Setting activity, Student Equity Planning activity, and Student-Centered Funding Formula activity. During these activities staff, faculty, and administrators, reviewed institutional data and identified ways the college could improve student outcomes and ameliorate achievement gaps (I.A.02).

1 The exception to this was Spring 2020 at the start of the pandemic. This was due to a lag in the CCCCO updating the data used for calculating the standards. In the absence of updated data, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee recommended rolling over the standards from the previous year.
Finally, presentations to the Board of Trustees culminate this institutional-level dialogue concerning student learning, achievement, and equity (I.B.04, I.B.06, I.B.07).

Institutional-level dialogue regarding student learning outcomes occurs through the Outcomes Committee as well as on Flex Day, division and department meetings, and during the College’s program planning and program review processes (I.B.08, I.B.09).

Program outcomes are evaluated through the program review process (I.B.10, I.B.11, I.B.49). All academic and operational College programs participate in program review once every six years, at which time serious consideration is given to their program-level outcomes, and the degree to which they have been achieved, by the program participants, as well as the program review committee of peers. Robust dialogue amongst the group yields recommendations for work well done, in addition to program- and institutional-level recommendations for improvement. The program review process culminates in institutional and programmatic recommendations for improvement and are presented to the Academic Senate, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, and the Planning and Fiscal Council (I.B.11, I.B.12). These recommendations are also considered at the College annual Institutional Planning Retreat (I.B.05).

More specifically, program level outcomes dialogue is accomplished by having at least one member of the Outcomes Committee sit on the Program Review Committee peer review panel. The committee review includes a discussion of all parts of the program including program outcomes and student learning outcomes, when relevant.

For example, during the outcomes discussion of the Political Science program review, faculty noted that they had robust conversations about outcomes assessment and that was reflected in their thoughtful recommendations on student learning outcomes. They also expressed an interest in revising their outcomes to increase uniformity across courses, and investigating new processes that would help faculty accomplish what is required and then allow time for reflection and improvement (I.B.63).

As well, during the Philosophy Department review, the program was asked about their Closing the Loop process. The program explained their process, saying that faculty submit their data and then the full-time faculty review the results. They went on to say that the process has resulted in instructional changes that better meet the needs of students and improved understanding of the class material (I.B.64).

Finally, the Administration of Justice review included a discussion on the rate of students who are employed after graduation. A program representative noted that 80% of graduates are from “minority groups” and 100% of those that complete the course in a satisfactory way are hired (I.B.65).

The Outcomes Committee is charged with reviewing and evaluating Institutional Level Outcomes (ILOs). This occurs once every three years in accordance with the Comprehensive Integrating Planning Model. Recommendations from the Outcomes Committee regarding ILOs are forwarded to the Academic Senate and the Planning and Fiscal Council for further dialogue and discussion.

Dialogue regarding student learning and achievement outcomes occurs at department and division meetings and by means of each academic program review and annual plan (I.B.46, I.B.47). Program reviews and annual plans require each program to gather outcomes data, dialogue about the results, recommend actions for improvement, and request resources needed to support areas identified for improvement. To ensure robust dialogue, instructional achievement data are provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (IRP) through Tableau, our data visualizations, and are disaggregated by various categories such as gender, ethnicity, and special populations, as well as instructional modality to assist and augment outcomes discussions. The Office of Institutional Research and Planning also fulfills specialized requests through their online research request form to assist programs in outcomes assessment and analysis. In addition, the ACCJC institution-set and aspirational standards are provided by IRP so that programs can gage their performance relative to the standards (I.A.05).

As an example of a specialized request to the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (IRP), the English Department began working with IRP on student learning outcomes in Fall 2019. The purpose was to make assessment of their two largest courses, English 101 and English 201, streamlined and meaningful. Starting with English 101, IRP identified representative samples for the courses, final papers from the identified sample were assessed by a volunteer committee, and then results were discussed in a department meeting. During the department meeting, IRP presented the results of the assessment and facilitated a discussion focused on areas of success and opportunities for improvement. To follow-up on the assessment findings, faculty formed taskforces to develop strategies to support improved outcomes for students (I.B.66, I.B.67).
Evidence of dialogue concerning course-level outcomes are recorded in each program’s annual plans’ Closing the Loop forms (I.B.15).

Non-instructional programs report their dialogue, results, and recommended actions for improvement directly into the Annual Program Plan template in Taskstream. (I.B.16)

**Standard I B.2. Academic Quality**

The institution defines and assesses student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services. (ER 11)

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

Rio Hondo College defines learning outcomes and assesses them at the course, program, support service, and institutional levels. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and corresponding assessments are documented in Taskstream, the College’s planning software system. Program outcomes are published in the College catalog.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.


Course-level outcomes are defined by department faculty, recorded in the Taskstream platform, and assessed in accordance with each department’s course outcomes assessment timeline (COAT) (I.B.13). At a minimum, each outcome is assessed once every six years so that all outcomes are assessed within the program’s six-year program review cycle. Review and revision of course-level outcomes is connected to the College curriculum cycle and, for existing courses, occurs when those courses are revised, at the minimum every five years; however, programs may more frequently revise their outcomes and do more frequently review their outcomes. New courses are required to define course-level learning outcomes as part of the course approval process (I.B.23).

Results from outcomes assessments are reported in the course outcomes workspace in Taskstream. Departments use these results, at least annually, to dialogue and create actionable improvement plans, which are recorded on Closing the Loop forms (I.B.14). Course Level Outcomes (CLOs) are mapped in Taskstream to the appropriate Program Level Outcomes (PLOs) and Institutional Level Outcomes (ILOs) (I.B.24, I.B.25). This mapping enables the reporting, assessment, and dialogue regarding the achievement of PLOs and ILOs. Program outcomes are assessed during the program review cycle and Institutional Level Outcomes are assessed once every three years in accordance with the College’s Comprehensive Integrated Planning Model. The results are reported in an outcomes report and posted to the Institutional Research and Planning channel on AccessRio (I.B.39).

Student support and learning services outcomes defined by service areas are recorded in Taskstream. Assessments of these outcomes occur during the annual planning and sexennial program review processes. Learning and support services are required to define and assess at least one program outcome per year and report results during the annual program planning process (I.B.44). Program review requires that each support and learning services program examine the results of all of their outcomes and make a holistic assessment of areas of strengths and plans for improvement (I.B.45).

As evidenced by the College catalog, Taskstream database, and the planning process documents, student learning outcomes are defined and assessed for all instructional programs and student support and learning services programs.

**Standard I B.3. Academic Quality**

The institution establishes institution-set standards for student achievement, appropriate to its mission, assesses how well it is achieving them in pursuit of continuous improvement, and publishes this information. (ER 11)

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

Rio Hondo College identifies and adopts achievement standards in compliance with ACCJC annual reporting requirements, reviews its performance relative to those standards, and publishes the information so that it is accessible to the public.
Through the annual planning and sexennial program review processes, instructional programs examine and respond to their achievement data in relation to the ACCJC institutional and aspirational standards.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

Each year, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) establishes the institution-set and aspirational standards that align with the College mission as required by the ACCJC and reports progress in achieving those standards to the Commission in accordance with the reporting deadlines set forth by the Commission ([I.A.05], [I.A.08], [I.B.01], [I.B.27]).

As part of that process, the IEC engages in an annual review and examines the degree to which the institution is making progress toward its ACCJC institution-set and aspirational standards, dialogues about the appropriateness of the standards with respect to the College mission, and makes recommendations for improvement ([I.B.01]). Institutional performance relative to the standards is presented and discussed at the annual Institutional Planning Retreat, where modifications of institutional goals and objectives are suggested as appropriate ([I.A.08]).

They are then reviewed by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and then forwarded to the Planning and Fiscal Council for discussion and adoption prior to submission in the ACCJC annual report ([I.B.27]). Once the standards are agreed upon, the Office of Institutional Research and Planning incorporates the standards into its annual planning and program review data visualizations ([I.A.05]).

At the program level, the ACCJC standards are incorporated into the annual planning and program review processes through data visualizations provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning ([I.A.05]). These benchmarks are used by programs to compare their actual success rates relative to the benchmarks, and they also evaluate via aggregated and disaggregated metrics. Programs report their performance relative to the ACCJC standards in either their annual plan, program review, or both depending on where they fall in the program review cycle ([I.A.12], [I.B.29]).

**Standard I B.4. Academic Quality**

The institution uses assessment data and organizes its institutional processes to support student learning and student achievement.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

Assessment and achievement data are incorporated into all institutional planning processes and linked to resource allocation in a broad institutional effort to continuously improve student learning and achievement.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

The College incorporates achievement and outcomes data into all of its planning processes. At the institutional level, the College’s Comprehensive Integrated Planning Model ensures performance standards for CCCCO initiatives, such as Student Equity and Vision for Success, are incorporated into institutional and/or strategic plan goals and objectives ([I.A.06], [I.A.13]). Additionally, achievement data and ACCJC performance standards are integral to the annual planning and program review processes, for they are included in the Tableau data visualizations so that programs can compare their performance to the ACCJC standards ([I.A.05]). This is evidenced in the Taskstream platform in the Data Analysis section of the planning and program review templates, as well as the data visualizations provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. The College further strives to engage all of its programs in meaningful analysis by thematically organizing its achievement data visualizations and posing critical questions and prompts essential to the understanding of program-level and institutional-level performances ([I.A.05], [I.A.07], [I.A.10], [I.A.11]).

Course and program outcomes assessment data are also essential components of the College’s annual planning and program review processes. Results from course assessments are incorporated into the annual plans utilizing Closing the Loop documents, while instructional program assessment occurs through their program reviews ([I.B.15], [I.B.29]). Because annual planning and program review are directly connected to resource allocation, it is expected that resource requests will emanate from analyses of outcomes assessments and performances relative to achievement standards. During annual planning and
program review, programs are asked to develop action plans and resource requests based on their findings in regard to student learning needs and achievement standards (I.A.16).

Noninstructional programs participate in outcomes assessment through the College’s annual planning process as well. These programs assess their observable and measurable outcomes according to their own established timelines. The outcomes are expected to be clearly derived from the programs’ missions and be statements about what a client (e.g. faculty, staff, students) will experience, receive, or understand (e.g. feel safe, receive access, have information) as a result of a given service. For example, the Office of Government and Community Relations (GCR) is responsible for the GO RIO program, which provides bus passes to students. As part of their assessment of this program, GCR implements a student ridership survey that assesses the impact of the program in terms of student self-perceptions of persistence and academic success (I.B.68).

Reporting for non-instructional outcomes and/or data analysis must include a description of the method of evaluation and minimum acceptable standards as well and their ideal standards, tabulations or description of the results, themes of success, areas for improvement, and associated recommendations for the future. Specific action steps must be identified to move the recommendations forward, including requests for resources (I.A.16).

The College’s annual planning, program review, and resource allocation processes are the primary means by which the College organizes itself to support gains in student learning and achievement. As currently designed, the resource request process stems from needs and priorities identified through programmatic and institutional dialogue, evaluation, and planning regarding student learning and achievement.

**Standard I B.5. Institutional Effectiveness**

The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of goals and objectives, student learning outcomes, and student achievement. Quantitative and qualitative data are disaggregated for analysis by program type and mode of delivery.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

Rio Hondo College assesses the degree to which it accomplishes its mission through its annual planning, program review, and resource allocation processes. These processes rely upon qualitative and quantitative learning outcomes and achievement data. Achievement data is disaggregated by demographic characteristics, modes of delivery, and special populations.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

At Rio Hondo College, all instructional and noninstructional programs undergo yearly program planning and every six years, program review (I.A.14, I.B.48, I.B.49). With both the College and program missions at the forefront of their planning and evaluation, programs review their goals and objectives, which are, in turn, mapped to the College’s institutional goals and objectives. Program review requires programs to identify their long-term direction or goals, and as part of the College planning process, programs are required to map their individual objectives to institutional goals and objectives. In this way, the individual effort and contributions of each program are directly connected to the College’s achievement of its goals and objectives, and ultimately its mission (I.A.16).

Annual planning and program review processes include the review and analysis of outcomes assessments and achievement data, both qualitative and quantitative (I.B.29). For instructional programs, Closing the Loop forms allow for substantive qualitative and quantitative analysis and improvement recommendations for course-level outcomes (I.B.15). Tableau data visualizations provide quantitative data related to student achievement outcomes, prompting robust dialogue (I.A.05). These data are viewable in both aggregated and disaggregated formats. Disaggregation is by student demographic characteristics and instructional modality. This allows programs to examine performance historically and by comparison to both institutional standards and performance targets, by various subpopulations of students, and to similar or like disciplines or departments. Both the annual planning and program review processes require programs to examine data, both qualitative and/or quantitative, in relation to program performance (I.A.10, I.A.11, I.B.29). During program review, course-level outcomes data, which is mapped to program outcomes, are reported and programs analyze performance for all program outcomes. The analysis is used to identify actions to be taken and/or the future direction of the program.
Institutionally, the College examines its performance and effectiveness through its program review process, the annual review and evaluation of the institutional performance standards set for the ACCJC Annual Report, Vision for Success, and Student Equity Plan (I.A.09, I.A.14). These reviews occur through participatory/shared governance committees, such as the IEC, the Planning and Fiscal Council, and the Institutional Planning Retreat (I.A.06, I.A.07, I.A.08, I.A.02).

**Standard I B.6. Institutional Effectiveness**

The institution disaggregates and analyzes learning outcomes and achievement for subpopulations of students. When the institution identifies performance gaps, it implements strategies, which may include allocation or reallocation of human, fiscal and other resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

Through its Comprehensive Integrating Planning Model and the annual planning, program review, and resource allocation processes, the College makes regular use of disaggregated data for subpopulations of students, assesses performance gaps, and allocates resources accordingly.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

Institutionally, the College’s Comprehensive Integrating Planning Model is the mechanism by which institutional-level priorities with respect to disproportionately impacted students are monitored and prioritized (I.A.13, I.A.15). The California Community College Chancellor’s Office initiatives, such as the Student Equity Plan and Vision for Success, include local goals and performance targets for mediating performance gaps (I.B.69, I.B.70). These initiatives are data-based and require the College to analyze and disaggregate data in order to assess performance and set performance targets. The College incorporates these plans in its Institutional Goals and Objectives, which are linked to individual program objectives in the Taskstream platform (I.A.09).

At the program level, the College regularly uses disaggregated quantitative data to support its annual planning and program review processes. Disaggregated data are an important part of the College annual planning and program review processes and are provided to instructional programs in the form of data visualizations produced by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (I.A.05). The data visualizations allow for analysis of success rates and completion for various subpopulations of students. Subpopulations include ethnicity, gender, age, and special populations, such as Veteran, Foster Youth, and students registered with Disabled Student Programs & Services. When achievement gaps are identified, resource requests to address those gaps are made through the resource allocation component of the program planning and review processes. Resources such as personnel, technology, supplies, and facilities are requested based on analysis and evidence of needs as they relate to performance gaps (I.A.16). Resource requests are also mapped to institutional goals and objectives in the Taskstream platform. Resource requests are generated at the program level, then prioritized within the planning unit, and then within the planning area (I.A.14). After prioritization occurs at the area level, resource requests move to participatory/shared governance committees, i.e. resource allocation committees for deliberation with guided rubrics, which contain the criteria for supporting and prioritizing the requests (I.B.31, I.B.32).

**Standard I B.7. Institutional Effectiveness**

The institution regularly evaluates its policies and practices across all areas of the institution, including instructional programs, student and learning support services, resource management, and governance processes to assure their effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of mission.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

The College has established board policies across all areas of the institution to facilitate the effectiveness of its instructional programs, student learning and support services, resource management, and governance processes. These policies are systematically reviewed and evaluated by the Policies and Procedures Committee (PPC). In addition, the annual planning, program review, and resource allocation processes ensure the regular review and evaluation of College practices in support of institutional effectiveness.
Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Throughout each academic year, selected board policies (BPs) and administrative procedures (APs) are systematically reviewed, evaluated, and improved through the Policy and Procedures Council (PPC) (I.B.34), which reports to the Planning and Fiscal Council. The PPC meets regularly, reviews BPs and APs, makes recommendations for revisions to the Planning and Fiscal Council, and then to the Board of Trustees (I.B.33, I.B.34, I.B.35, I.B.36). Specific policies germane to this standard include the following:

- BP 3225 – Institutional Effectiveness (I.B.52)
- BP 3250 – Institutional Planning (I.B.53)
- BP 4020 – Program, Curriculum, and Course Development (I.B.54)
- BP 4040 – Library and Learning Support Services (I.B.55)
- BP 5050 – Student Success and Support Programs (I.B.56)
- BP 5120 – Transfer Center (I.B.57)
- BP 5130 – Financial Aid (I.B.58)
- BP 5140 – Disabled Student Programs and Services (I.B.59)
- BP 5300 – Student Equity (I.B.60)
- BP 6200 – Budget Preparation (I.B.61)
- BP 6300 – Fiscal Management (I.B.62)

The College engages in a robust institutional planning process. The process is data based and systematically evaluates the effectiveness of all College programs and services. The annual planning and program review processes culminate in the creation of program specific and institutional recommendations, which are discussed in several participatory/shared governance committees, such as the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, the Planning and Fiscal Council, the Academic Senate, and at the annual Institutional Planning Retreat (I.A.08, I.B.12, I.B.38, I.B.39). Institutional recommendations include recommendations that are institutional in scope such as safety, operations, fiscal management, and facilities as well as those related to improvements in institutional practices with respect to the annual planning, program review, and resource allocation processes, as well as outcomes assessment. Recommendations regarding these practices are also reviewed at the Academic Senate.

With respect to shared governance processes, evaluation of shared governance committees occurs every three years, using qualitative and descriptive data, in accordance with the comprehensive, integrated planning schedule (I.A.13, I.A.15).

Standard I B.8. Institutional Effectiveness

The institution broadly communicates the results of all of its assessment and evaluation activities so that the institution has a shared understanding of its strengths and weaknesses and sets appropriate priorities.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The institution communicates the results of its assessment and evaluation activities through presentations of program and institutional recommendations generated from its annual planning and program review process; annual reviews of progress toward meeting performance targets set for the ACCJC and CCCCO initiatives such as Vision for Success and the Student Equity and Achievement Plan; through shared governance committees; and through publication of data visualizations that allows for ongoing assessment of performance relative to ACCJC performance standards (I.A.05, I.A.08, I.B.01, I.B.05, I.B.06, I.B.07, I.B.12, I.B.29).
The College meets this standard.

Institutional performance with respect to assessment and evaluation is shared in multiple ways and in multiple venues. Specifically, program reviews and recommendations generated from program review in the form of Executive Summaries are shared with the individual programs and are published on the Office of Institutional Research and Planning AccessRio channel (I.B.12, I.B.38, I.B.39, I.B.42, I.B.43). Institutional recommendations are shared with the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, the Planning and Fiscal Council, the Academic Senate, and at the annual planning retreat. Additionally, institutional performance with respect to ACCJC performance targets, Vision for Success, and the Student Equity and Achievement plan targets are presented during Flex Day and annually at the Institutional Planning Retreat, Institutional Effectiveness Committee, and to the Board of Trustees (I.A.08, I.B.05, I.B.06, I.B.07). Finally, data visualizations, which incorporate ACCJC institutional performance standards, are published on the IRP website and communicate to College constituencies and the public institutional strengths and weaknesses relative to the performance standards (I.A.05, I.A.08).

At the annual Institutional Planning Retreat, the College’s performance relative to the institution-set standards is reviewed and recommendations are forwarded to the Institutional Effectiveness Committee for consideration and incorporation into the planning and resource allocation process for the following year.

**Standard I B.9. Institutional Effectiveness**

The institution engages in continuous, broad based, systematic evaluation and planning. The institution integrates program review, planning, and resource allocation into a comprehensive process that leads to accomplishment of its mission and improvement of institutional effectiveness and academic quality. Institutional planning addresses short- and long-range needs for educational programs and services and for human, physical, technology, and financial resources. (ER 19)

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

The College has an established Comprehensive Integrated Planning Model which ensures systematic integrated evaluation, planning, and resource allocation in support of its mission and improvement of institutional effectiveness. The Comprehensive Integrated Planning Model incorporates, long-, mid-, and short-range planning efforts in support of high-quality educational programs and services.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

The College has a Comprehensive Integrated Planning Model which incorporates long- and mid-range planning, as well as annual planning, evaluation, and resource allocation (I.A.13, I.A.15). The Comprehensive Integrated Planning Model incorporates the College mission as the driving influence of all other institutional planning efforts. Further, long-range plans, such as the Educational and Facilities Master Plans and the Technology Plan, guide program development and the facilities and technological requirements needed to support those programs (I.A.13, I.A.15). Mid-range plans such as those required by the CCCCO are also incorporated and integrated into the College-wide planning efforts through objectives and performance targets, which are then linked to resource allocation through institutional goals and objectives (I.A.13).

College planning processes are created, managed, and housed in the Office of Institutional Research and Planning with the support of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, which reports to the Planning and Fiscal Council. Program planning and evaluation occur for all College programs and services, including those housed in instruction, student services, facilities, Information Technology (IT), and Human Resources (I.A.13, I.A.14).

**Conclusions Standard I B. Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness**

Rio Hondo College meets Standard I.B. The College has established a Comprehensive Integrated Planning Model, centered on its mission, incorporates long- and mid-range plans, evaluates progress and effectiveness, and connects planning and evaluation to resource allocation. Academic quality is systematically assessed and evaluated through annual planning, program review, resource allocation, and outcomes assessment. Through these annual activities, substantial and frequent dialogue occurs both programmatically and institutionally; outcomes are assessed; standards for academic achievement are set; and data are evaluated institutionally, programmatically, by modality, and are disaggregated for specific populations of students. Data are also used to inform effectiveness of College policies and practices. Our evaluative process, along with results, are communicated broadly and publicly shared.
Improvement Plan(s)

Not Applicable

Evidence List

I.B.01: IEC Meeting Agendas and Minutes 2019, 2020, Discussion and Recommendation of Vision for Success Targets, ACCJC Institutional Standards
I.B.02: Student Equity Committee Meeting Agenda, Discussion, and Recommendations of SEA Plan Targets
I.B.03: Student Equity and Achievement Plan Annual Report
I.B.04: Presentation to the Board of Trustees Student Equity and Achievement Plan Progress Update
I.B.05: Institutional Planning Retreat Agendas, 2019, 2020
I.B.06: Presentations to the Board of Trustees Vision for Success
I.B.07: Presentation to the Board of Trustees Student Success Scorecard
I.B.08: Outcomes Committee Meeting Minutes Discussion and Recommendations Regarding Achievement of ILOs
I.B.09: Institutional Learning Outcomes Report
I.B.10: Program Learning Outcomes Report
I.B.11: Examples Program Review Executive Summary
I.B.13: Examples Course Outcomes Assessment Timelines (COATs)
I.B.14: Examples Instructional Program Plans
I.B.15: Examples Closing the Loop Documents
I.B.16: Examples Noninstructional Program Plans
I.B.17: Rio Hondo Catalog Outcomes pp. 259-280
I.B.18: Rio Hondo Taskstream Course Outcomes
I.B.19: Examples Course Level Outcomes Assessments from Instructional Program Plans
I.B.20: Examples Program Level Outcomes Assessment Report
I.B.21: Taskstream Institutional Level Outcomes Assessment Report
I.B.22: Outcomes Committee ILO Report
I.B.23: Outcomes Assessment Cycle
I.B.24: Course Level Outcomes Mapping to Program Level Outcomes
I.B.25: Course Level Outcomes Mapping to Institutional Level Outcomes
I.B.26: Comprehensive, Integrated Planning Model Detail p. 3-14 EMP
I.B.27: ACCJC Annual Reports
I.B.28: Planning and Fiscal Council Minutes ACCJC Standards
I.B.29: Example Program Reviews
I.B.30: Visual Diagram Resource Allocation Process
I.B.31: Rubrics, Staffing Committees
I.B.33: Policies and Procedures Council Roster
I.B.34: Policies and Procedures Council Cycle of Review
I.B.35: Planning and Fiscal Council Minutes for BP/AP Review and Recommendation
I.B.36: Board of Trustees Minutes for BP Review and Adoption
I.B.37: Academic Senate Minutes – Program Review Institutional Recommendations
I.B.38: Planning and Fiscal Council Minutes – Program Review Institutional Recommendations
I.B.39: Publishing of Program Review and Program Plans AccessRio
I.B.40: Sample Executive Summaries Program Review
I.B.41: Institutional Effectiveness Committee Minutes, Institutional Recommendations Program Review
I.B.42: Flex Presentation Spring 2020
I.B.44: Institutional Research and Planning Program Plan Guide pp. 8-13, Noninstructional Outcomes Assessment
I.B.45: Institutional Research and Planning Program Review Guide Overview and Outcomes Assessment
I.B.46: Example Outcomes Assessment Reports, English
I.B.47: Division Meeting Agendas Fall Flex
I.B.48: Examples Annual Planning Calendars
I.B.49: Examples Program Review Cycles
I.B.50: Resource Allocation Prioritization
I.B.51: Policy and Procedures Council Charge
I.B.52: BP 3225, Institutional Effectiveness
I.B.53: BP 3250, Institutional Planning
I.B.54: BP 4020, Program, Curriculum, and Course Development
I.B.55: BP 4040, Library and Learning Support Services
I.B.56: BP 5050, Student Success and Support Programs
I.B.57: BP 5120, Transfer Center
I.B.58: BP 5130, Financial Aid
I.B.59: BP 5140, Disabled Student Programs and Services
I.B.60: BP 5300, Student Equity
I.B.61: BP 6200, Budget Preparation
I.B.62: BP 6300, Fiscal Management
I.B.63: Program Review Fall 2020 Transcription, Political Science
I.B.64: Program Review Fall 2020 Transcription, Philosophy
I.B.65: Program Review Fall 2020 Transcription, Administration of Justice
I.B.66: English 101 Course Outcomes Pilot Project
I.B.67: English 201 Course Outcomes Pilot Project
I.B.68: Government and Community Relations GO RIO Outcomes Assessment/Data Analysis
I.B.69: EMP Vision for Success Targets p. 8
I.B.70: EMP Student Equity Plan Targets pp. 10-11
C. Institutional Integrity

Standard I C.1. Institutional Integrity

The institution assures the clarity, accuracy, and integrity of information provided to students and prospective students, personnel, and all persons or organizations related to its mission statement, learning outcomes, educational programs, and student support services. The institution gives accurate information to students and the public about its accreditation status with all of its accreditors. (ER 20)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Rio Hondo College makes available to the public its accreditation status through the College website, specifically a page devoted to accreditation (I.C.01). It also publishes a print and electronic version of its College catalog and an electronic version of the class schedule, with precise, accurate, and current information (I.C.02, I.C.03). These publications, along with the College website, include general information including the official name, address(es), telephone number(s) and website URL of the institution; educational mission; course, program, and degree offerings; academic calendar and program length; academic freedom statement; available student financial aid; available learning resources; names and degrees of administrators and faculty; learning outcomes, and names of governing board members (I.C.04). Also included in these publications and on the website are requirements for admission, student fees and other financial obligations, and information on degrees, certificates, graduation, and transfer (I.C.05). Major policies affecting students that can also be found on the website include academic regulations, including academic honesty; nondiscrimination; acceptance of transfer credits; grievance and complaint procedures; sexual harassment; and refund of fees (I.C.06).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The institution makes its accredited status available to the public and informs the public about Commission actions through its website. The institution has a dedicated page for accreditation so that the information related to its status can be easily located by students and members of the public (I.C.01).

The primary means by which the College ensures the clarity, accuracy, and integrity of information is through the annual publication, both electronically and in print format, of the College catalog. The College catalog includes information on the College mission, program and institutional learning outcomes, all of its educational programs and services, and other important policies as referenced above. Additionally, the Rio Hondo College Mission Statement is published on the College homepage and on the President’s Office dedicated webpage (I.C.01, I.C.07, I.C.08). In addition to the College catalog, support services are widely advertised on the College website, on social media, and on instructor syllabi (I.C.09, I.C.10).

Learning outcomes are published in the College catalog and online through the electronic class schedule program. Learning outcomes are published in the College catalog while institutional learning outcomes are published in Taskstream (I.B.17, I.B.21). Course learning outcomes are published electronically and linked to the online schedule of classes.

Standard I C.2. Institutional Integrity

The institution provides a print or online catalog for students and prospective students with precise, accurate, and current information on all facts, requirements, policies, and procedures listed in the “Catalog Requirements” (ER 20).

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

As referenced above in the Evidence of Meeting the Standard section I.C.1, the College annually reviews, updates, and publishes, both in electronic and print form, its catalog. Electronic publication of the catalog ensures that it is available to current and prospective students as well as members of the public (I.C.02, I.C.11).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The College has an established calendar and process for updating its catalog on an annual basis (I.C.12, I.C.13). Every spring semester, the Catalog Committee is convened by the Office of Instructional Operations in order to review the information in
the catalog and make the appropriate revisions, deletions, and additions to ensure that all catalog requirements are updated to reflect the criteria that will be in place for the upcoming academic year (I.C.11, I.C.12, I.C.13). Each section of the catalog is assigned to appropriate representatives with expertise in and knowledge of their assigned areas. The Catalog Committee is composed of deans, directors, the curriculum chair, the articulation officer, the registrar, coordinators (including the Outcomes Coordinator), and faculty (I.C.13). This process culminates in the annual publication of the catalog in both print and online formats.

**Standard I C.3. Institutional Integrity**

The institution uses documented assessment of student learning and evaluation of student achievement to communicate matters of academic quality to appropriate constituencies, including current and prospective students and the public (ER 19).

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

Rio Hondo College conducts an annual institutional planning process in support of its mission and Comprehensive Integrated Planning Model (IB.48). The institutional planning process assesses progress toward achieving the College’s stated goals and performance targets and allows the College to make decisions regarding improvement through a systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and reevaluation (I.A.05, I.A.13). At the institutional level, the process includes strategic planning, program planning and program review, integration of learning and achievement outcomes in the annual planning and program review processes, and resource allocation as a means to improve institutional effectiveness and institutional structures (I.A.13, I.A.15). College performance relative to achievement standards is accessible to current and prospective students and the public through the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (IRP) website (I.A.05). Matters of academic quality are also communicated through annual planning; program review; resource allocation documents; and presentations made to the Board of Trustees, shared governance and Academic Senate committees, and at the annual institutional planning retreat (I.A.05, IB.03, IB.04, IB.06, IB.07, IB.09, I.C.45, I.C.46).

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets this standard.

As part of the College’s Comprehensive Integrated Planning Model and the annual program planning, review, and resource allocation processes, the College documents and makes student achievement outcomes available to its constituencies and the public (I.A.05, I.A.08, I.C.45). These data and performance standards are published on the IRP website and in the Educational Master Plan (I.A.05, IB.03, IB.04, IB.06, IB.07, IB.09, I.C.45, I.C.46).

Data visualizations published by IRP and used for program planning and program review incorporate the ACCJC institution set standards (I.A.05). Any current or potential student, program staff, or member of the public can access success rates at the course, discipline, and program level and compare them to our ACCJC institution set standard. During annual planning and program review, programs are asked to compare their performance to the ACCJC standards, to their own history, and to like programs within their division (I.A.10, I.A.11).

Course and program-level learning outcomes are available through the Taskstream platform and are made available to appropriate constituencies through the annual planning and program review and outcomes assessment processes (IB.10, IB.19). Participatory/shared governance and Academic Senate committees such as the Outcomes Committee, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, Program Review Committees, various resource allocation committees, and the Planning and Fiscal Council also have access to learning outcomes data through the Office of Institutional Research and Planning and the Taskstream platform.

**Standard I C.4. Institutional Integrity**

The institution describes its certificates and degrees in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, and expected learning outcomes.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

The College publishes information regarding its degrees and certificates in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, and expected learning outcomes on its website and in the College catalog, which is published in both print and electronic format (ER.3.01, I.C.15).
Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The College describes its certificates and degrees in terms of purpose, content, course requirements, and expected learning outcomes in its College catalog (I.B.17, I.C.16). The College catalog is accessible to current and prospective students, as well as members of the public, in both print and electronic formats (I.C.02). Print copies are available for purchase at the College bookstore.

Additionally, and in accordance with implementation of the Guided Pathways model, the College’s certificates and degrees are presented on the newly redesigned College website according to Areas of Interest and described via mapped pathways (I.C.17). The mapped pathways include required courses and electives and provide students with an estimate of the number of courses and semesters they may need to complete their pathway (I.C.18). Additionally, degrees and certificates are also linked to labor market information, job market trends, and prospective salaries (I.C.19).

Standard I C.5. Institutional Integrity

The institution regularly reviews institutional policies, procedures, and publications to assure integrity in all representations of its mission, programs, and services.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Through its Policies and Procedures Council (PPC), the College systematically reviews all Board Policies (BPs) and Administrative Procedures (APs) (I.B.34). Board Policies are submitted to the Board of Trustees for final approval; APs are submitted as information items to the Board of Trustees (I.B.36). Other College publications are reviewed by the appropriate programs with the respective expertise and/or in their respective participatory/shared governance committees to ensure integrity.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The College systematically reviews and updates its Board Policies and Administrative Procedures through its Policy and Procedure Council (PPC) (I.B.34). College policies and procedures are on a six-year revision rotation, ensuring each policy and procedure is reviewed and updated in accordance with the College’s established cycle (I.B.34). Flexibility exists in the review process so that policies may be reviewed and updated out of schedule should the need arise. Board Policies (BPs) and Administrative Procedures (APs) are available on the College website and include the latest review date on the document (I.C.48). Following review and revision by the PPC, revised policies are forwarded to the Planning and Fiscal Council (PFC) for discussion, after which they are either submitted to the Board of Trustees for approval or sent back to PPC for further revision.

The College annually reviews and publishes updates to its catalog, the primary vehicle for communicating information about its mission, programs, and services to students and the public (I.C.12, I.C.13). The review process for the Catalog incorporates reviews and updates by the respective programs and committees, such as the Curriculum Committee, charged with developing and implementing changes to curriculum and programs, as well as a review for conformance with applicable BPs and APs.

Consistency and integrity of publications, both online and print, is coordinated by the lead office or administrator charged with responsibility for particular areas and includes appropriate staff and constituencies with expertise in the subject. For example, the Office of Instructional Operations coordinates the publication process for the catalog, both print and electronic, to ensure consistency and integrity of information between print and online versions (I.C.12, I.C.13). Additionally, staff and constituent groups vet the Organizational Structure and Governance Manual prior to publication to ensure consistency and integrity. The website updates for BPs and APs as well as the governance manual are then coordinated by the Superintendent/President’s office, also, to ensure consistency and integrity (I.C.22).
Standard I C.6. Institutional Integrity

The institution accurately informs current and prospective students regarding the total cost of education, including tuition, fees, and other required expenses, including textbooks, and other instructional materials.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The College publishes information regarding the total cost of attendance on its website and in the catalog.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The College annually updates and informs current and future students about the cost of attending Rio Hondo College. This is accomplished through the Admissions website, the College catalog, the financial aid website, and through annual reporting to the federal government through the Integrated Post-secondary Education Data System (IPEDS) (I.C.23, I.C.24). Estimated costs include tuition, fees (such as enrollment fees, health fees, GoRio, ASB, parking, etc.), books, supplies, transportation, room and board, and personal expenses.

Standard I C.7. Institutional Integrity

In order to assure institutional and academic integrity, the institution uses and publishes governing board policies on academic freedom and responsibility. These policies make clear the institution’s commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge and its support for an atmosphere in which intellectual freedom exists for all constituencies, including faculty and students. (ER 13)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The College has a long-established Board Policy regarding academic freedom, BP 4030: Academic Freedom, which is published on the College website (I.C.26). Academic freedom is an important part of instruction at the College and is further emphasized in the Faculty Handbook (I.C.27).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The College has a long-established Board Policy (BP) on academic freedom and responsibility, BP 4030: Academic Freedom, which sets forth its philosophy and underscores the importance of the institutional commitment to academic freedom and responsibility. Specifically, the Philosophy statement presented in BP 4030 states the following.

The maintenance of freedom of speech, publication, religion, and assembly (each of which is a component of intellectual freedom) is the breath of life in a democratic society. The need is greatest in fields and institutions of higher learning, where the use of reason and the cultivation of the highest forms of human expression are the basic methods for maintaining those freedoms. Society has come to rely upon colleges and universities as a principal means of acquiring new knowledge and new techniques, of conveying the fruits of past and present learning to the community, and of transmitting these results to generations to come. Without freedom to explore, to criticize existing institutions, to exchange ideas, and to advocate solutions to human problems, faculty members, staff and students cannot perform their work, cannot maintain their self-respect. Society suffers correspondingly (I.C.26).

The College further emphasizes the importance of academic freedom and responsibility by including said policy regarding academic freedom in the Faculty Handbook (I.C.27).

Standard I C.8. Institutional Integrity

The institution establishes and publishes clear policies and procedures that promote honesty, responsibility, and academic integrity. These policies apply to all constituencies and include specifics relative to each, including student behavior, academic honesty, and the consequences for dishonesty.
Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Through its Board Policies and Administrative Procedures, the College catalog, and the College website, the College publishes clear policies and procedures that promote honesty, responsibility, and academic integrity. These policies and procedures are applicable to all constituencies and include specific policies and procedures dealing with student conduct, academic honesty, and the consequences for dishonesty.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The College establishes and publishes policies and procedures that promote honesty, integrity, and a workplace free from discrimination and harassment for all of its constituents. For example, BP 3050 outlines the Institutional Code of Ethics, and BP 2715 outlines the Code of Ethics for the Board of Trustees (I.C.28, I.C.29). Board Policies 3410 and 3430 outline policies of Nondiscrimination and Sexual Harassment (I.C.30, I.C.31). Additionally, at the time of hiring, employees must sign a Code of Ethics acknowledgement (I.C.32).

With regard to students, BP 5500 outlines the Student Code of Conduct and defines elements of academic dishonesty and behavioral violations of the Code at the College (I.C.33). The full description and procedures associated with the Student Code of Conduct are posted on the Student Affairs webpage and are linked to the appropriate Board Policies (I.C.34). With regard to consequences for academic dishonesty, BP 5520: Student Discipline Procedures, describe the disciplinary actions used to address instances of academic dishonesty and behavioral violations (I.C.35).

Standard I C.9. Institutional Integrity

Faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline. They present data and information fairly and objectively.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Board Policy 4030: Academic Freedom ensures that faculty can express their views freely while distinguishing personal conviction and professionally accepted viewpoints within a discipline and that information is presented fairly and objectively.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The College has protections in place for students and faculty with respect to academic freedom, personal convictions, and presenting information fairly and objectively. These are described in BP 4030: Academic Freedom, which includes a discussion of policy, philosophy, and guidelines (I.C.26). Section III, Guidelines, includes several subsections specific to this standard. Specifically, section III.C states the following:

Faculty members are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subjects that may include related controversial issues. Faculty should help the students develop techniques for considering controversial questions—techniques that they will habitually use in later life. The handling of a controversial question in a college should be free from assumption that there is one correct answer to be taught authoritatively to the student (BP 40430, section III).

Section III.E also states, “Faculty members will avoid exploiting the students for private advantage and will protect the students’ academic freedom.”

Further, Section III.F states, “Campus members should at all times attempt to be accurate, should exercise judiciousness, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should indicate when they are not speaking for the College.”

Standard I C.10. Institutional Integrity

Institutions that require conformity to specific codes of conduct of staff, faculty, administrators, or students, or that seek to instill specific beliefs or world views, give clear prior notice of such policies, including statements in the catalog and/or appropriate faculty and student handbooks.
Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Board Policy 2715: Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice, Board Policy 3050: Institutional Code of Ethics, and BP/AP 5500: Standards of Student Conduct outline the College’s commitment to ethical standards of behavior amongst its Board of Trustees, employees, and students.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Rio Hondo College meets this standard by following its Board Policy 3050: Institutional Code of Ethics, which clearly states (I.C.28):

“The employees of Rio Hondo Community College District are committed to providing a high-quality learning environment to help our students successfully achieve their educational goals and objectives. Accordingly, employees have an interest and commitment to ethical behavior. Ethical persons are those who abide by principles and exemplify virtues as understood within a given moral framework. Many believe that virtue is intrinsically rewarding. At the very least, that one be perceived as ethical is instrumental in establishing credibility and trust. To support Rio Hondo’s “commitment to ethical behavior”, college employees adhere to standards of ethical and professional behavior related to their duties, and have responsibilities to the institution and to individuals they serve.”

This policy further outlines the standards of ethical and professional behavior and engagement between employees and students. The BP draws attention to further detailed policies and procedures related to non-discrimination (BP/AP 3410), the prevention of sexual harassment (BP/AP 3430), and academic freedom (BP/AP 4030) (I.C.30, I.C.31, I.C.26). It also highlights the connection between employee groups (classified staff, administrators, and faculty) and the codes of ethics of their related professional organizations. The Board of Trustees itself is subject to its own detailed Code of Ethics (BP 2715) (I.C.29). The Vision, Mission, and Values of the College, the Institutional Code of Ethics, and Faculty Responsibilities, are also found in the Faculty Handbook (I.C.36).

Students of the College are also held to high standards of behavior and conduct while on campus or participating in off-campus or online College courses/activities. Student rights and responsibilities are clearly outlined in the College catalog and on the College website. Standards of student conduct are also detailed in Board Policy and Administrative Procedures 5500 and further highlighted in pages 19-21 of the 2021-22 College catalog (I.C.37).

Standard I C.11. Institutional Integrity

Institutions operating in foreign locations operate in conformity with the Standards and applicable Commission policies for all students. Institutions must have authorization from the Commission to operate in a foreign location.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Not applicable. Rio Hondo College does not operate in foreign locations.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College has not established, nor does it maintain, any operations based in foreign locations.

Standard I C.12. Institutional Integrity

The institution agrees to comply with Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, Commission policies, guidelines, and requirements for public disclosure, institutional reporting, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. When directed to act by the Commission, the institution responds to meet requirements within a time period set by the Commission. It discloses information required by the Commission to carry out its accrediting responsibilities. (ER 21)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The Rio Hondo College Board of Trustees and Superintendent/President, through BP 3200: Accreditation, provide assurance that the College adheres to the Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards and Policies of the Commission, publicly discloses information required by the Commission to carry out its accrediting responsibilities, and complies
Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Rio Hondo has a designated Accreditation Liaison Officer who works with the President’s Office and the broader College community to ensure the College follows all Commission requirements, policies, and guidelines (I.C.39). The College Accreditation webpage is the primary means of communication and public disclosure on matters of accreditation for the College and is accessible to anyone at any time (I.C.01). The Accreditation webpage includes easily accessible sections for Commission correspondence, as well as College reports. The website is maintained and updated by the Superintendent/President’s Office. Additionally, the Accreditation webpage includes a link to the Commission Complaint Process website so that members of the public are aware of the process and are able to contact the Commission if needed.

Standard I C.13. Institutional Integrity

The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies, including compliance with regulations and statutes. It describes itself in consistent terms to all of its accrediting agencies and communicates any changes in its accredited status to the Commission, students, and the public. (ER 21)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Through BP 3200: Accreditation the Rio Hondo College Board of Trustees and Superintendent/President provide assurance that the College adheres to the Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards and Policies of the Commission, describes itself in identical terms to all its accrediting agencies, communicates any changes in its status, and agrees to disclose information required by the Commission to carry out its accrediting responsibilities. By means of this Board Policy, the College makes a commitment to comply with Commission requests, directives, decisions, and policies by making complete, accurate, and honest disclosures to its external agencies.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The College is a fully accredited by the ACCJC and maintains regular contact with the Commission on matters relating to institutional accreditation, academic quality, and compliance. Communications and reports are published on the College Accreditation website and are maintained by the Superintendent/President’s Office in collaboration with the Accreditation Liaison Officer (I.C.01). Required reports to the Commission are accurate and timely (I.C.01, I.C.47).

The College maintains good working relationships with external agencies responsible for programmatic accreditation, such as the California Board of Registered Nurses and the Peace Officer Standards and Training boards, as described in the List of Accredited Programs, and regulatory bodies, such as the California Community College Chancellor’s Office, the U.S. Department of Education, and the National Science Foundation. Examples of compliance with regulations and statutes include implementation of AB 705 and temporary emergency orders related to COVID-19, specifically dealing with remote/online instruction and student withdrawal policies, as well as timely reporting of expenditures and effectiveness of categorical programs such as Strong Workforce and the Student Equity and Achievement programs (I.C.40, I.C.41, I.C.42, I.C.47). Compliance and cooperation with federal agencies include on-time reporting of IPEDS information, filing required annual program reports (APRs) and expenditures for federally funded grants, such as NSF, Title V, and Trio (I.C.40, I.C.41, I.C.42).

Standard I C.14. Institutional Integrity

The institution ensures that its commitments to high quality education, student achievement and student learning are paramount to other objectives such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests.
Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The College ensures it is committed to high quality education, student achievement, and student learning above other financial objectives and external interests through its annual planning, program review, and resource allocation processes, as well as the integrity of its budget and external audit reports.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

The College engages in an annual, systematic review and evaluation of its programs and services, which is linked to its resource allocation process. The annual planning and program review processes incorporate performance standards for student learning and achievement (LA.05, LA.13). The College expects that all of its programs and services develop resource requests in accordance with their self-assessment and evaluation of performance relative to institutional and program standards. Resource requests are ranked by participatory/shared governance committees in accordance with institutional priorities, goals, and performance objectives (LB.50). These expectations ensure that the institution is committed to high quality education above all other interests.

Additionally, the College has an established budget cycle and calendar, which includes presentations of to the Board of Trustees of the tentative budget and the adopted budget (LC.43). Ranked resource requests are presented at the annual planning retreat (LB.50). These presentations ensure transparency and inclusion of constituencies in the budget development process, thus ensuring the commitment to high quality education through the allocation of resources to institutional priorities.

Conclusions on Standard I C. Institutional Integrity

The College meets this standard by demonstrating a commitment to achieving its mission through its culture of planning, evaluation, and resource allocation based on standards of performance that are accessible to the public. The College further demonstrates its achievement of this standard through integrity in its dealings with external agencies and members of the public through communication, disclosures, and compliance with Commission expectations. The administration, faculty, staff, and governing board members act in accordance with applicable Board Policies and Administrative Procedures specific to honesty, ethics, freedom, and fairness.

Improvement Plan(s)

Not Applicable

Evidence List

LC.01: Rio Hondo College Accreditation Web Page
LC.02: Rio Hondo College Catalog Web Page
LC.03: Rio Hondo College Class Schedule Web Page
LC.04: Rio Hondo College Catalogue Catalog Requirements Various Pages
LC.05: Rio Hondo College Catalogue Admission Requirements, pp. 22-28
LC.06: Rio Hondo College Web Page, Academic Honesty
LC.07: Rio Hondo College Home Page Mission Statement
LC.08: Office of the President Web Page College Mission Statement
LC.09: Examples Social Media Posts Educational Programs
LC.10: Examples of Syllabi, Support Services
LC.11: Rio Hondo College Catalog Requirements pp. 56-59, 60-65, 79-274
LC.12: Email Notification of Catalog Revisions to the Catalog Committee
LC.13: Rio Hondo College Catalog Committee, Committee Roster
I.C.15: Rio Hondo College Web Page Degree and Certificate Information
I.C.16: Rio Hondo College Catalog Degree and Certificate Information pp. 55-273
I.C.17: Guided Pathways Areas of Interest Web Page
I.C.18: Guided Pathways Areas of Interest Course Sequence Web Page
I.C.19: Guided Pathways Areas of Interest Labor Market Information Web Page
I.C.20: Organizational and Governance Manual Review Process
I.C.21: Coordination of BP/AP and Organizational and Governance Manual by President’s Office
I.C.22: Rio Hondo College Catalog Total Cost of Attendance, pp. 22-28
I.C.23: Web Pages Financial Aid and Admissions and Records, Total Cost of Attendance
I.C.24: Examples Program Costs Career Technical Education Programs Web Pages
I.C.25: Board Policy 4030, Academic Freedom
I.C.26: Faculty Handbook Academic Freedom pp. 7
I.C.27: BP 3050, Institutional Code of Ethics
I.C.28: BP 2715, Code of Ethics Board of Trustees
I.C.29: BP 3410, Non-Discrimination
I.C.30: BP 3430, Sexual Harassment
I.C.31: Example Code of Ethics Acknowledgement Human Resources
I.C.32: BP 5500, Student Code of Conduct
I.C.33: Student Affairs Web Page, Student Code of Conduct
I.C.34: BP 5520, Student Discipline Procedures
I.C.35: Faculty Handbook, Faculty Responsibilities pp. 16-44
I.C.36: Rio Hondo College Catalog 21-22 pp. 19-21
I.C.37: BP 3200, Accreditation
I.C.38: College Organizational Chart, Dean IRP/ALO Reporting Structure
I.C.39: Evidence of IPEDS Submissions
I.C.40: Examples of Annual Performance Reports NSF, Title V, Strong Workforce Program
I.C.41: Evidence of Program Accreditation Nursing
I.C.42: Rio Hondo College Budget Development Calendar
I.C.43: Office of the President Web Page
I.C.44: Screenshot Student Equity and Achievement Plan
I.C.45: AccessRio Institutional Planning Retreat ACCJC Progress Reports
I.C.46: Submission to ACCJC - COVID Compliance, Remote/Distance Education
I.C.47: Board Policies and Administrative Procedures Web Page