Peer Review Team Follow-up Report

Napa Valley College 2277 Napa-Vallejo Highway Napa, CA 94558

This report represents the findings of the Peer Review Team that conducted a follow-up visit to Napa Valley College April 9, 2025. The Commission acted on the accredited status of the institution during its June 2025 meeting and this team report must be reviewed in conjunction with the Commission's Action letter.

> Dr. Roger Schultz Team Chair

Table of Contents

Peer Review Team Roster	1
Purpose of Follow-Up Visit	2
Team Analysis of Institution Responses to College Requirement 3	
Team Analysis of Institution Responses to College Requirement 4	4

Napa Valley College

Peer Review Team Roster

Roger Schultz, Team Chair Mt. San Jacinto Community College Superintendent/President

ACADEMIC MEMBERS

Amanda Taintor Reedley College Faculty Coordinator Instructional Design and Outcomes

ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBERS

Jonah Nicholas Chabot-Las Positas Community College District Vice Chancellor, Business Services

ACCJC STAFF LIAISON

Nickawanna Shaw Vice President

Purpose of Follow-Up Visit

INSTITUTION: Napa Valley College

DATES OF VISIT: April 9, 2025

TEAM CHAIR: Dr. Roger Schultz

Purpose of Site Visit

The peer review team conducted its comprehensive peer review of Napa Valley College from October 10-12, 2022. At its June 5-6, 2024 meeting, the Commission determined noncompliance with Standards III.B.4 and III.C.2 (College Requirement #3) and Standards III.D.1, III.D.2, III.D.3, and III.D.4 (College Requirement #4) and acted to require a Follow-Up Report due no later than March 1, 2025 followed by a visit from a peer review team. Members of the peer review team conducted its follow-up site visit to Napa Valley College on April 9, 2025.

The purpose of the visit was to verity that the Follow-Up Report prepared by the Institution was accurate, through examination of evidence, and interviews with Institution representatives, to determine if the Institution now meets the Standards noted in the following compliance requirements:

Standards III.B.4 and III.C.2 (College Requirement 3):

In order to meet the Standards, the Commission requires that the College plan for and evaluate total cost of ownership of its physical and technological resources.

Standards III.D.1, III.D.2, III.D.3, and III.D.4 (College Requirement 4):

In order to meet the Standards, the Commission requires that the College integrate its planning and resource allocation for institutional and annual unit plans to ensure that resources meet both short-term and long-term needs of the institution and support and sustain student learning programs and services.

During the visit, team members met with 13 faculty, administrators, and classified staff in formal meetings, group interviews and individual interviews. The team thanks the Institution staff for hosting the site visit, coordinating meetings, providing additional documentation, and ensuring a smooth and collegial process.

Team Analysis of Institution Responses to College Requirement 3

Standard III.B.4 and III.C.2 (Institution Requirement 3): In order to meet the Standards, the Commission requires that the College plan for and evaluate the total cost of ownership of its physical and technological resources.

Findings and Evidence:

The College's response to College Requirement 3 is expansive and comprehensive in scope and includes a detailed inventory of facilities and technology resources, an evaluation process to determine facilities management costs and technology replacement cycles, and processes to disseminate the information to appropriate College committees. In conversations with management and applicable committees, it is apparent that the evidence provided supports the implemented processes.

Plans addressing physical and technological resources include multi-year replacement schedules and forecasts, with specific metrics developed under a total cost of ownership model. These plans were developed with input from all constituency groups at the College and reflect an extremely thoughtful process. Overall, the College has taken significant institutional effort to address College Requirement 3 and has developed a substantive plan to evaluate the total cost of ownership of its physical and technological resources (Standards III.B.4 and III.C.2).

Conclusion:

The institution has addressed the College Requirement 3, corrected the deficiencies, and meets Standards III.B.4 and III.C.2.

Team Analysis of Institution Responses to College Requirement 4

Standard III.D.1 and III.D.2 (Institution Requirement 4): In order to meet the Standards, the Commission requires that the College integrate its planning and resource allocation for institutional and annual unit plans to ensure that resources meet both short-term and long-term needs of the institution and support and sustain student learning programs and services.

Findings and Evidence:

The College's response to College Requirement 4 details its effective practices to ensure financial stability, integrate institutional planning with resource allocation, distribute necessary and approved resources through the Annual Planning Process, and provide widespread communication of the totality of the process. The revision of the annual planning and resource allocation process and integration of Facilities and District Technology committees created the avenue for the College to demonstrate clear integration of resource management and planning within both short- and long-term planning processes (Standards III.D.1 and III.D.2).

Conclusion:

The institution has addressed the College Requirement 4, corrected the deficiencies, and meets Standards III.D.1 and III.D.2.