

Institutional Effectiveness Committee

Victor Valley College

03/18/2011, 10:10 AM-12:52 PM - Teaching Learning Center: ATC Building, Room 171

Roster?

Attendance Key: P = Present; A = Absent; T = Tardy; L = Left Early.			
P	Mark Clair (Classified)	P	Jennifer Larriva (Classified)
P	Donna Derryberry (Classified)	P	Marc Skuster (Faculty)
P	Jessica Gibbs (Faculty)	P	Quynh Tran (Classified)
T	Paul Williams (Dean)	P	Virginia Moran (Administrative Advocate)
P	Patrick Malone (Faculty)	T	Deanna Turnbeau (Administration)
A	Peggy Mayer (Faculty)	A	Darcie Wasinger (ASB)
A	Deedee Orta (Administration)	A	Gregory Harbor (ASB)
Guests: Roderick Gray, ASB Public Relations Senator; Jeremiah Brosowske, ASB Business and Math Senator. (Replacing DW and GH who were in Washington, D.C., representing VVC at the American Student Association of Community Colleges.)			

1. Minutes, 2/25/11

JL and VM noted that the MC was incorrectly identified as L (Left Early) when he was in fact T (Tardy) for the 2/25/11 meeting. JL expressed intense dissatisfaction with word choice in the following statement: "Work on Annual Report 2010 has been suspended while the Research Office bickers with MIS staff over the accuracy of data needed to complete the report." Particular umbrage was taken over the verb "bickers," as, JL opined, this word "trivializes a long standing problem with lack of resources and support in MIS." The IEC Secretary noted that the word in question was chosen to highlight disapproval of the ongoing failure to resolve the problem rather than to suggest that the problem itself was a trivial one.

2. ARCC:

- ARCC 2010 Board Interaction

VM reported that Board of Trustees interaction with the ARCC 2010 report occurred at the 3/8/11 BOT meeting. Unapproved minutes were submitted thereafter to the Chancellor's Office by VM. In order to improve BOT understanding of ARCC, as well as the quality of interaction, VM will request that ARCC 2011 interaction be included in the BOT retreat during the Summer of 2011.

- ARCC 2011 Self-Assessment: Action Plans
 - Leavers Survey
 - Nonpersistence Study
 - Registration priorities: Review, Analysis, Revision, Implementation
 - Scheduling Priorities: Review, Analysis, Revision, Implementation
 - First Year Model Class Schedule

Action plans and timelines for the Leavers Survey, Nonpersistence Study, and Registration Priorities will be developed and presented at the April IEC meeting by the OIE. VM noted that the college-wide Student Services Committee is being convened and will consider the topic of registration priorities.

MS distributed "Office of Instruction Guiding Principles for 2011-2012 Schedule Development," a list of guidelines and rubric that were part of the recent deliberations among Instructional Division Deans and VPI that resulted in substantial reductions to the (already developed) Summer 2011 schedule of classes. MS asked IEC approval for a memo to the VPI requesting consultation with faculty on the refinement of 2011-2012 schedule development principles as well as enhanced consultation of Deans with discipline faculty in the implementation of these principles.

- Local Publication: OIE/Research/Reports

MS noted that the customized VVC ARCC 2008 and 2009 reports are published under OIE/Institution Research/Reports, but only VVC data are published for 2010. MC will determine if the customized reports are still being produced and could be posted for 2010 and 2011.

3. Accreditation Self-Study Update:

- Visiting Team Exit Comments?

VM distributed a list of commendations and recommendations that were announced in the Accreditation Team Visit exit report presented on 3/17/11 at 11:00 AM: Commendations: ASB, faculty, classified staff, student centered facilities, sustainable projects and practices, outreach programs. Recommendations: mission, integrated planning and evaluation, distance education, SLOs, leadership development, finances, board development, campus climate.

- Schedule for ACCJC Action

The ACCJC acts on reports at its June meeting and colleges receive notification of actions around July 1st.

4. Program Review Update:

- Instructional Program Participation: 2011

The Academic Senate President requested that Program Reviews be sent to faculty chairs or members of the Facilities, Finance and Budget, and Institutional Effectiveness Committees. MS reported receiving Program Reviews from 23 of 46 instructional programs by the due date of 3/15/11. MS will forward all program reviews to VM for posting.

- IEC Responsibilities (Handout: AP 1202)

AP 1200 defines the IEC role in Program Review as to review Division Summaries "for evaluation of institutional effectiveness overall and recommended organizational priorities for enhancements/improvements."

- Academic Senate Program Review Committee: IEC Representation

The Academic Senate Executive Team has decided to convene a faculty Program Review Committee and the Senate Vice-President has distributed a call for members. MS commented that program

review is an important theme in the IEC charge and that a faculty member of the IEC should be on the Senate Program Review Committee. Jessica Gibbs agreed to join this committee if meetings are scheduled on days/times that she is available.

- Data Quality: Issues and Action Plan

The Academic Senate President explained at the 3/3/11 Senate meeting that one of the reasons for revising the instructional program review template was a lack of faculty confidence in the accuracy of the data being produced to support program review. DT acknowledged concerns about data integrity and data entry standards but expressed doubt that action on these issues had been prioritized by the Datatel Steering Committee. Following discussion of procedures and MIS staffing, DT agreed to schedule a meeting between Christina Moreno, MC, and JL.

- Noninstructional Program Participation: 2011

VM and DT noted that managers responsible for noninstructional program reviews were given very short notice of the deadline. As a result, no list of submitted reports was available.

- Division Summary Template and Rubric

This subject was deferred until the April IEC meeting.

5. Campus Climate Survey 2010:

- Review and discuss summary of findings and related data tables specific to IEC as charged by AP 1201 as well as general findings relating to shared governance. (Handouts)
- Brainstorm and prioritize for action those results indicating opportunities for improvement.
- Develop, document, and implement a plan of action that addresses improvement priorities including timeline, responsibility center, and intended outcomes or impacts.
- Formally report that action plan to College Council for monitoring and evaluation over time the effects on intended outcomes or impacts. (OIE Template)

As directed by VM, members of the committee meditated solemnly for a time on the IEC charge. No changes were suggested and VM directed the committee to review Campus Climate Survey 2010 relevant to the IEC;

#25: "Employee recommendations are considered in the development of institutional evaluation, planning, and improvement." SD/D = 49%, SA/A = 34%, NO/DK = 18%. VM recruited a subgroup consisting of VM, PatrickM, and one student member of the IEC to discuss strategies for encouraging or facilitating conversation about evaluation/planning/improvement. One suggestion was to arrange for an open forum on the subject.

#27: "Quality performance measures are used to evaluate VVC's institutional effectiveness via the Annual Report." SD/D = 30%, A/SA = 36%, NO/DK = 34%. VM indicated her interest in targeting the large percentage of persons who responded NO/DK, and stated that College Council should address the awareness issue. JG suggested that once each semester the whole campus should receive a report of the IEC's activities. VM commented that this could take the form of a shared governance newsletter that functions as a communication tool for all shared governance committees. Better Annual Report publicity is needed to expand awareness of the performance measures that it reports.

#28: "I know the mission, vision, and values of VVC and how I contribute to them as a workforce member." SD/D = 17%, A/SA = 75%, NO/DK = 8%. No actions were suggested for this item.

#30: “Opportunities exist for me to provide recommendations regarding the college’s institutional effectiveness.” SD/D = 41%, A/SA = 47%, NO/DK = 12%. When compared with the results for #25, this item suggests that most members of the campus community believe opportunities exist for recommending improvements even if those recommendations are not considered. VM suggested that Program Review training enhances the opportunities for recommendation to managers who have the authority to take appropriate action.

#37: “Student learning outcomes are assessed campus wide.” SD/D = 38%, A/SA = 31%, NO/DK = 27%. VM suggested that the SLO Facilitator be asked to provide a list of courses and programs assessed, dialogued, etc. each semester.

#38: “Student data are systematically monitored and measured as a basis for improvement.” SD/D = 28%, A/SA = 31%, NO/DK = 38%. VM noted that more communication is needed about student data and that a wider array of data could be made more widely available across campus.

#39: “Planning documents are regularly reviewed for continuous quality improvement.” SD/D = 32%, A/SA = 21%, NO/DK = 45%. VM stated that a constituency analysis is needed on the NO/DK responses. IEC members commented on observed behaviors and attitudes that counteract efforts at CQI, including apathy, failure to recognize/appreciate work, indifference, and chronic inaction on the part of management. VM noted that the Finance and Budget Committee should improve communication regarding CQI as they work through Program Review and that CQI should be an explicitly acknowledged component of planning and budget development processes.

#40: “Service level outcomes are assessed in campus support areas.” SD/D = 35%, A/SA = 20%, NO/DK = 43%. VM recommended that managers publish performance reports on their respective WebPages. Annual Report 2010 will maintain and improve service level outcome reporting.

#41: “PRAISE Reports are consistently compiled and reviewed at the division level to ensure effective annual strategic planning.” SD/D = 32%, A/SA = 25%, NO/DK = 41%. No action was recommended on this item.

The OIE will create a template to be used by IEC and all shared governance committees to report action plans to College Council.

6. Spring 2011 Meeting Schedule:

- April 8, 2011 - 10:00-11:59 AM, 21-171.
- May 20, 2011 - 10:00-11:59 AM, 21-171.

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE (AP 1201)

Charge

Identifies, defines, reviews, and reports performance measures of institutional effectiveness.
Responsible for monitoring and assessing the effectiveness of college evaluation, planning, and improvement processes.

Evaluates and recommends improvements for systematic and regular program review of all college programs.

Reports progress on the assessment of student learning at the course, program, and college levels.
Provides feedback loop to ensure that college effectiveness is constantly improved by consideration of objective performance data.

Information Flow

Direct to College Council on policy-related issues. Direct to Superintendent/President on improvements to operational issues.

Annual report directly to Board of Trustees.

“INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS:”

Whether and how well an institution fulfills its purposes (mission), embodies its values, and achieves its goals.

Or

- How well shared governance processes operate (pursuant to Administrative Procedure 1201)
 - How engaged workforce members are in those processes; and
- How consistent prevailing business practices are with our core organizational values of excellence, integrity, accessibility, diversity, collaboration, and innovation (see Administrative Procedure 1202).