July 3, 2014

Dr. Wolde-Ab Isaac  
Interim President  
Riverside City College  
4800 Magnolia Avenue  
Riverside, CA 92506

Dear President Isaac:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting on June 4-6, 2014, reviewed the Institutional Self Evaluation Report and the Report of the External Evaluation Team that visited Riverside City College March 3-6, 2014.

The Commission took action to **reaffirm accreditation** and require the College to submit a **Follow-Up Report** by **October 15, 2015** demonstrating resolution of College and District Recommendations noted below. The Report will be followed by a visit by Commission representatives.

Reaffirmation with a Follow-Up Report with visit is granted when an institution is found to substantially meet or exceed the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies, but has recommendations on a small number of issues which should be resolved in a short period of time. The Report should demonstrate, and the visiting team will verify, that the institution has addressed the recommendations noted below, resolved the deficiencies, and now meets Accreditation Standards.

**Need to Resolve Deficiencies:**

The Accreditation Standards, as an integrated whole, represent indicators of academic quality and institutional effectiveness. Deficiencies in any Standards will impact quality at an institution, and ultimately the educational environment and experiences of students. The Commission found Riverside City College deficient in meeting the following Accreditation Standards: I.B.6; I.B.7; II.A.2.e; III.A.6; III.B.2.a; III.B.2.b; III.C.2; III.D.3.h; III.D.3.c; IV.A.5; and IV.B.3.g; from College and District recommendations written to meet Standards.
College Recommendation #1
Evaluating processes including evaluation processes regularly.
In order to meet the standards, the College should systematically assess and use assessment results for improvement in the following areas:
   a. Assessing its evaluation mechanisms; (I.B.6, I.B.7)
   b. All resource areas including human, physical, technology, and financial; (III.A.6, III.B.2.b, III.C.2, III.D.3.h)
   c. Role delineation, decision-making structures and resources. (IV.A.5, IV.B.3.g)

College Recommendation #2
Evaluate all SLOs in a timely manner
In order to meet the standard, the College should evaluate all courses and programs in a manner that ensures a comprehensive and timely assessment of course and program SLOs is completed in all disciplines, so that the assessment of all SLOs can be included in curriculum review for maintaining relevant, current and responsive courses and programs, especially those that experience rapid changes in workforce competencies. (II.A.2.e)

College Recommendation #3
Total Cost of Ownership
In order to meet standards, the College should develop and implement a total cost of ownership methodology that can be included in the long-range capital plans. (III.B.2.a)

District Recommendation #1
Technology Planning
In order to meet standards, compile the various completed elements of technology planning into an integrated, comprehensive district technology plan that is accessible and transparent, including a disaster recovery plan and a plan to refresh aging and outdated technologies. Insure that the district technology plan is based on input from the colleges and is in alignment with college planning processes. (Standards I.B.6 and III.C.2)

District Recommendation #2
OPEB Obligation
In order to meet the standard, implement a plan to fund contributions to the District’s other post-employment benefits (OPEB) obligation. (Standard III.D.3.c)

Under U.S. Department of Education enforcement regulations, the Commission is required to take immediate action to terminate the accreditation of an institution which is out of compliance with any standard. In the alternative, the Commission can provide the institution with additional notice and a deadline for coming into compliance that is no later than two years from when the institution was first informed of the noncompliance.
In exceptional situations, if the institution has done all within its authority to reach compliance on any standard but remains out of compliance, the Commission is permitted by regulations to allocate a one-time, short-term “good cause extension” for the college to reach compliance prior to acting on the institution’s termination. However, continued noncompliance with multiple standards would diminish the appropriateness of such an extension.

The Commission notes that the deficiencies cited in College Recommendations 1-3 and District Recommendations 1-2 were first identified in June 2014. Riverside City College should fully resolve the noted deficiencies by October 2015.

During its institutional self evaluation, Riverside City College identified improvement plans for advancing its continuous improvement efforts. The Commission suggests that those plans for improvement be taken into account as the College continues into the next accreditation cycle. In its Midterm report, the College should address steps undertaken in those improvement areas.

The final External Evaluation Report that was sent to the institution provides details of the team’s findings with regard to each Eligibility Requirement and Accreditation Standard and should be read carefully and used to understand the team’s findings. Additional copies may now be duplicated.

The recommendations contained in the External Evaluation Report represent the best advice of the peer evaluation team at the time of the visit but may not describe all that is necessary to come into compliance. Institutions are expected to take all actions necessary to continuously comply with Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies. The Commission wishes to remind you that while an institution may concur or disagree with any part of the Report, Riverside City College is expected to use the External Evaluation Report to improve educational programs and services and to resolve issues identified by the Commission.

The Commission requires that the College give the Institutional Self Evaluation Report, the External Evaluation Report, and this letter appropriate dissemination to College staff and to those who were signatories of the College Self Evaluation Report. This group should include the Chancellor, campus leadership, and the Board of Trustees.

The Commission also requires that the College’s Institutional Self Evaluation Report, the External Evaluation Report, and this Commission action letter be made available to students and the public by placing a copy on the College website. Please note that in response to public interest in disclosure, the Commission now requires institutions to post accreditation information on a page no more than one click from the institution’s home page.
Dr. Wolde-Ab Isaac  
Riverside City College  
July 3, 2014

On behalf of the Commission, I wish to express continuing interest in the institution’s educational programs and services. Professional self-regulation is the most effective means of assuring institutional integrity, effectiveness, educational quality, and student success.

Sincerely,

Barbara A. Beno, Ph.D.  
President

BAB/tl

\[1\text{Institutions preparing and submitting Midterm Reports, Follow-Up Reports, and Special Reports to the Commission should review Guidelines for the Preparation of Reports to the Commission. It contains the background, requirements, and format for each type of report and presents sample cover pages and certification pages. It is available on the ACCJC website under College Reports to ACCJC at: (http://www.accjc.org/college-reports-accjc).}\]