

# VICTOR VALLEY COLLEGE

18422 Bear Valley Road, Victorville, CA 92395



## MIDTERM REPORT

*On the Status of Resolutions to ACCJC  
External Evaluation Team Recommendations made  
on the basis of the April 19, 2012 Site Visit*

March 14, 2014

# Table of Contents

<b>Certification of Midterm Report 2014.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Statement on Report Preparation .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Responses to Team Recommendations and the Commission Action Letter .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Team Recommendation 1: Mission and Master Planning .....</b>	<b>6</b>
Institutional Response to Recommendation.....	6
Conclusion .....	8
Implications for Action .....	9
List of Supporting Evidence .....	9
<b>Team Recommendation 2: Integrated Planning and Continuous Improvement .....</b>	<b>10</b>
Institutional Response to Recommendations .....	10
Conclusion .....	30
Implications for Actions .....	31
List of Supporting Evidence .....	32
<b>Team Recommendation 3: Student Learning Outcomes .....</b>	<b>36</b>
Institutional Response to Recommendation.....	36
Conclusion .....	47
Implications for Action .....	47
List of Supporting Evidence .....	47
<b>Team Recommendation 4: Campus Climate .....</b>	<b>49</b>
Institutional Response to Recommendation.....	49
Conclusion .....	58
Implications for Action .....	59
List of Supporting Evidence .....	59
<b>Team Recommendation 5: Distance Education.....</b>	<b>61</b>
Institutional Response to Recommendation.....	61
Conclusion .....	67
Implications for Action .....	67
List of Supporting Evidence .....	68
<b>Team Recommendation 6: Long-Term Fiscal Plans .....</b>	<b>70</b>
Institutional Response to Recommendation.....	70
Conclusion .....	73
Implications for Action .....	74
List of Supporting Evidence .....	74

<b>Team Recommendation 7: Leadership and Participation in Governance .....</b>	<b>75</b>
Institutional Response to Recommendation.....	75
Conclusion .....	83
Implications for Action .....	84
List of Supporting Evidence .....	84
<b>Team Recommendation 8: Board Practices and Evaluation.....</b>	<b>86</b>
Institutional Response to Recommendation.....	86
Conclusion .....	97
Implications for Actions .....	97
List of Supporting Evidence .....	98
<b>Commission Recommendation 1: Board Ethics.....</b>	<b>101</b>
Institutional Response to Recommendation.....	101
Conclusion .....	101
Implications for Action .....	101
List of Supporting Evidence .....	102
<b><i>Responses to Institutional Self-Identified Planning Issues .....</i></b>	<b><i>103</i></b>
Planning Issue 1 – Mission Review .....	103
Planning Issue 2 – Educational Master Plan.....	103
Planning Issue 3 – SLO Assessment Procedures.....	104
Planning Issue 4 – Program Review Training.....	105
Planning Issue 5 – Assessment Processes .....	106
Planning Issue 6 – Early Alert Program .....	106
Planning Issue 7 – Facilities Planning .....	107
Planning Issue 8 – Technology Planning.....	107
Planning Issue 9 – Integrated Planning .....	108
Planning Issue 10 – Structural Budget Deficit .....	108
Planning Issue 11 – Integrated ERP .....	109
Planning Issue 12 – Integrated ERP .....	109
Planning Issue 13 – Campus Climate .....	109
Planning Issue 14 – Board Development.....	110

## Certification of Midterm Report 2014

We certify that this Follow-Up Report #4 accurately reflects the nature and substance of the College with respect to the Commission recommendations it has been asked to address, and that there was broad participation in the preparation of this Report.

Signed:

---

Peter Allan Interim Superintendent/President	Date
-------------------------------------------------	------

---

Dennis Henderson President, Board of Trustees	Date
--------------------------------------------------	------

---

Peter Maphumulo Executive Vice President, Instruction and Student Services Accreditation Liaison Officer	Date
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------

---

Tracy Davis President, Academic Senate	Date
-------------------------------------------	------

---

Justin Gatewood President, California School Employees Association Chapter 584	Date
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------

---

Evelyn Blanco President, Associated Student Body	Date
-----------------------------------------------------	------

## **Statement on Report Preparation**

Members of the College's Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) are listed below:

Claude Oliver	Joe Pendleton
Dave Oleson	David Gibbs
Jan Espinoza	Anthony Bonato
Jessica Gibbs	Patrick Malone
Mark Clair	Virginia Moran
Patty Golder (Editor)	Tim Adell
Peter Maphumulo (ALO)	Tracy Davis

Upon completion of Follow-Up Report #3, this team continued its work on the Midterm Report. A plan was developed by the Accreditation Liaison Officer, including tasks, timelines, and due dates. The team met on a weekly basis, and worked in small groups of 2 or 3 people to thoroughly cover each of the recommendations to meet the aggressive demands and deliverables of the work plan.

A first reading by the Academic Senate was conducted on February 6, 2014, by the Board of Trustees on February 11, 2014, and by the College Council on February 12, 2014. A second reading with adoption was conducted on February 26, 2014 by the College Council, and on March 6, 2014 by the Academic Senate.

The Board of Trustees conducted a second reading with adoption on March 11, 2014.

# Responses to Team Recommendations and the Commission Action Letter

## Team Recommendation 1: Mission and Master Planning

*In order to meet the Standards, the College should revise its planning documents to reflect the current mission so that the mission is central to institutional planning and decision-making. Furthermore, the College should adhere to its policy of annually reviewing its mission statement and update its Educational Master Plan using its current mission statement. (I.A.3, I.A.4)*

### Institutional Response to Recommendation

#### Description of Institutional Response

Administrative Procedure (AP) 1200 requires that the College Council initiate an annual review of the mission statement, the foundation of institutional planning and decision-making. If the Council finds that revision is in order, it makes a recommendation to that effect to the President, and a thorough evaluation and revision process commences. If the Council finds that revision is not needed, then the mission statement remains unchanged until the next review or until the next comprehensive master planning cycle. [\[R1-1\]](#)

The Board of Trustees last reviewed the mission in a Special Meeting on September 28, 2011, and concluded that from its perspective, revision of the mission statement was not warranted during 2011-12. [\[R1-2\]](#)

The College Council last reviewed the mission at its meeting on February 8, 2012. [\[R1-3\]](#). It was reaffirmed, and action was assigned to the chair of the Distance Education Task Force of the Academic Senate and the Academic Senate President to discuss how best to incorporate the mission. The Distance Education Plan [\[R1-5\]](#) was subsequently adopted on September 6, 2012 with a mission that is aligned to the District's overall mission.

In addition to the Educational Master Plan [\[R1-4\]](#), the following major planning documents reflect the current mission statement:

- Distance Education Plan [\[R1-5\]](#)
- Facilities Master Plan [\[R1-6a\]](#) and updates [\[R1-6b\]](#)
- Technology Master Plan [\[R1-7\]](#)
- Equal Employment Opportunity Plan [\[R1-8\]](#)
- Matriculation Plan [\[R1-9\]](#)
- Student Equity Plan [\[R1-10\]](#)
- Library Information Technology Plan [\[R1-11\]](#)

The College's annual program review, planning, and budget development processes, locally referred to as "PRAISE" (**P**rogram **R**eview, **A**llocations, and **I**nstitutional **S**trategies for **E**xcellence), is also aligned to the mission, goals, and strategies specified in the Educational Master Plan. As stated in the College's "Program Review Handbook [R1-12] these processes "are integral to the alignment of the programs' goals with the mission of the college for college-wide planning<sup>1</sup>."

At the unit level, non-instructional program reviews (NIPR) include a requirement to specify how annual plans link to district goals, strategic priorities, and the program's own long-term goals as stated in the Educational Master Plan (see NIPR PRAISE template [R1-13]). Those linkages are a consideration as unit-level plans are prioritized within each division pursuant to Administrative Procedure 6200, Budget Development [R1-14] and as the annual strategic direction for the college is determined (see division summary forms [R1-15; R1-16; R1-17]).

### **How Response Meets Eligibility Requirements**

*ER 2-Mission: "The institution's educational mission is clearly defined, adopted, and published by its governing board consistent with its legal authorization, and is appropriate to a degree-granting institution of higher education and the constituency it seeks to serve. The mission statement defines institutional commitment to achieving student learning."*

The College's vision, values, mission and goals are published on its website as Board Policy 1200 [R1-19], as well as in key publications of the college. Central to the mission is the College's commitment to student learning and facilitating student success through its many programs and services.

### **How Response Meets Accreditation Standards**

*Standard I.A.3: "Using the institution's governance and decision-making processes, the institution reviews its mission statement on a regular basis and revises it as necessary."*

The College established Administrative Procedure 1200, Review of District Vision, Values, and Mission & Goals [R1-1] in December 8, 2010 using established governance procedures. It has implemented this procedure as evidenced by College Council minutes of February 8, 2011 [R1-2] and Board of Trustees minutes of September 28, 2011 [R1-3].

*Standard I.A.4: "The institution's mission is central to institutional planning and decision-making."*

The College established annual program review and planning processes that provide the

---

<sup>1</sup> VVC Program Review Handbook, revised 9/4/2013, page 4.

basis for its budget development procedures formalized as Administrative Procedure 6200 [R1-14]. The mission is invoked during program review processes at the unit-level as evidenced by the reporting templates used [R1-13 thru R1-17] and by the rubric used by the Finance, Budget, and Planning Committee during budget development [R1-18].

### **How Response Has Been Sustained**

The college has established ongoing, systematic program review and planning processes wherein the mission plays a central, defining role in determining what defines institutional effectiveness. Such systems include but are not limited to the following:

- Program Review Committees align unit-level planning documents (PRAISE Reports) through a technical review process that provides formative feedback to program contacts [R1-19 for Instructional Programs; R1-20 for Non-Instructional Programs].
- Administrative Procedure 6200 (Budget Development), formally establishes the work system deployed to ensure budget priorities are aligned to Educational Master Plan goals and strategic priorities [R1-14].
- Evaluations of program review and planning processes have been conducted and disseminated, and improvements have been made for this year's planning cycle. Key findings were summarized in a memo from the joint Chairs of the Instructional Program Review, Non-Instructional Program Review, and Finance Budget and Planning Committees, and the Executive Dean of Institutional Effectiveness to the Superintendent/President and College Council [R1-21].

### **How Response has Increased Institutional Effectiveness**

The College has developed in recent years more and better documentation of its organizational structures and processes—in itself, an indicator of a maturing organization. As indicated by results on the 2011 Campus Climate Survey [R1-23], business operations have improved as a result of these focused efforts, as have shared governance practices. An update to the Campus Climate Survey is scheduled for Spring 2014.

The College publishes measures of institutional effectiveness through its Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard [R1-21]. Performance targets for indicators of District Goal 2 – Student Success will be discussed by the Board of Trustees, and a study session is scheduled for February 11, 2014 in connection with the Student Success Scorecard. Once established, college efforts on local mission-driven measures of institutional effectiveness will be facilitated.

## **Conclusion**

The College has fully resolved this recommendation. The College's planning documents have been revised to reflect a mission that is current and central to planning. The College has adhered to its policy of annually reviewing its mission statement; consideration of the



Educational Master Plan is embedded within its annual program review, planning, and budget development process.

### **Implications for Action**

- The College mission will be reaffirmed or updated this academic year.
- College plans that have not been updated within the last 3 years will be identified and resourced to ensure continuing alignment of operations with progress on the mission.

### **List of Supporting Evidence**

- R1-1. [Administrative Procedure 1200 \(Review of District Vision, Values, Mission & Goals\)](#)
- R1-2. [Board of Trustees Agenda Packet of September 28, 2011](#)
- R1-3. [College Council Minutes of February 8, 2012](#)
- R1-4. [Educational Master Plan 2012](#)
- R1-5. [Distance Education Plan 2012](#)
- R1-6. [\(a\) Facilities Master Plan and \(b\) Update Documents 2102](#)
- R1-7. [Technology Master Plan 2012](#)
- R1-8. [Equal Employment Opportunity Plan Revisions 2011](#)
- R1-9. [Matriculation Plan 2008-2009](#)
- R1-10. [Student Equity Plan 2008-2009](#)
- R1-11. [Library 5-Year Technology Plan 2010-2015](#)
- R1-12. [Program Review Handbook 2013](#)
- R1-13. [Non-instructional Program Review PRAISE Template](#)
- R1-14. [Administrative Procedure 6200 \(Budget Development\)](#)
- R1-15. [Tier 1 – Program Summaries template](#)
- R1-16. [Tier 1 – Division Priorities template](#)
- R1-17. [Tier 2 – College-wide Strategic Direction](#)
- R1-18. [Finance, Budget and Planning Committee budget development rubric, PRAISE 2012](#)
- R1-19. [Board Policy 1200 \(District Vision, Values, Mission & Goals\)](#)
- R1-20. [Instructional Program Review Committee Technical Review Rubric](#)
- R1-21. [Non-Instructional Program Review Committee Technical Review Rubric](#)
- R1-22. [VVC Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard](#)
- R1-23. [2011 Campus Climate Survey Findings](#)

## **Team Recommendation 2: Integrated Planning and Continuous Improvement**

*As noted in recommendations 1 and 6 of the 2005 Accreditation Evaluation Report, and in recommendations from the reports of 1993 and 1999, and in order to meet the Standards and the Eligibility Requirements, the College should establish and maintain an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes. (I.B.1, ER19) This process should include:*

- *Goals to improve effectiveness that are stated in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. (I.B.2)*
- *An evaluation of all programs throughout the College so that it assesses progress toward those goals and ensures that participation is broad-based throughout the College. (I.B.3, I.B.4)*
- *Documented assessment results for all courses, programs, and the institution. (I.B.5, II.A.1.a, II.B.4)*
- *Formal processes to evaluate the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes. (I.B.6, I.B.7)*
- *Integration of planning with decision-making and budgeting processes to ensure that decisions to allocate staff, equipment, resources, and facilities throughout the College are based on identified strategic priorities and to ensure a continuous cycle of evaluation and improvement based upon data. (I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.6, III.C.2, IV.B.2.b)*
- *An integration of the total cost of facilities' ownership in both the short- and long-term planning processes. (III.B.1.c) [NOTE: III.B.1.c does not exist; the team probably meant III.B.2.a, given context]*
- *An assessment of physical resource planning with the involvement of the campus community. (III.B.1.a, III.B.2.a, III.B.2.b)*
- *A systematic assessment of the effective use of financial resources, with particular regard to meeting the needs of Library materials and technological resources, and the use of the results of this assessment as the basis for improvement. (II.C.1, II.C.2, III.D.3)*

### **Institutional Response to Recommendations**

#### **Description of Institutional Response**

<p><i>"Goals to improve effectiveness that are stated in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. (I.B.2)"</i></p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The College continuously strives to improve effectiveness through measurement of its stated goals. District vision, values, mission and goals are stated in Board Policy 1200 and are reviewed and revised on a regular basis [R2-1; R2-2]. The College utilizes the Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard to measure the achievement of these goals [R2-3]. The Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard is available on the College website and is managed by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. The Superintendent/President identifies College Strategic Planning Priorities that, although not ranked, are aligned to each District goal outlined in Board Policy 1200 and are stated in the Educational Master Plan [R2-4; R2-5]. College Council monitors the alignment of the district goals using planning documents, including the Educational Master Plan (EMP), Technology Master Plan (TMP), Facilities Master Plan (FMP) and Distance Education Plan (DEP) per Administrative Procedure 1201 Implementing Institutional Effectiveness, and discusses progress towards these goals [R2-6; R2-7]. Additional avenues for discussion on progress toward goals include Flex and Convocation days and Campus Communication events [R2-8; R2-9; R2-10; R2-11]. The Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee also conducts assessment of Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) [R2-12], and results have been discussed at venues such as the 2013 Convocation [R2-9] and are made available on the public College website as part of the Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard [R2-3].

*“Formal processes to evaluate the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes. (I.B.6, I.B.7)”*

Although the College has engaged in the process of program review for many years, it has not been a consistent process, nor has it officially been utilized for institutional planning. Since the 2011 Self Study, the College has completely renovated the process of program review for institutional planning. The Instructional Program Review Committee (IPRC), an Academic Senate Committee, and the Non-Instructional Program Review Committee (NIPRC), recognized by College Council, developed, and have maintained, the Program Review Handbook [R2-13] that describes the purpose of program review and outlines the process of program review for the College. Additionally, the Program Review Handbook delineates a formal procedure to evaluate the effectiveness of the ongoing planning and resource allocation process for both the instructional and non-instructional programs of the College [R2-13].

The committees utilize surveys and peer technical reviews as instruments for measuring effectiveness [R2-14; R2-15]. Results for instructional surveys and reviews are reported to the Academic Senate Executive Team, discussed at Academic Senate meetings and are lodged on SharePoint [R2-16; R2-17; R2-18; R2-19]. Results for non-instructional surveys and reviews are published on the College’s website [R2-20; R2-21]. Results have been used to identify areas of strengths as well as areas for improvement regarding the process of program review at the College. To evaluate the improvement of instructional programs between past practice and the current process, the IPRC also conducted a survey of the template format and effectiveness for budget year 2012-2013 as well as performed peer technical review using a more general rubric based on accreditation requirements [R2-16; R2-17; R2-22; R2-23]. Discussion and planning for future program review cycles occur

between the chairpersons of the IPRC, NIPRC, Finance, Budget and Planning Committee (FPBC) chairperson and the Executive Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and is reported to College Council [R2-24] and through committee meetings [R2-25]. An example of action taken towards improving on the identified areas is the revision recommendations to the Budget Worksheet. The IPRC has discussed and has begun drafting revisions to the Budget Worksheet currently in use to include categorical prioritizations as well as object codes [R2-26] and will make a recommendation to the FPBC in the Spring 2014 term.

As previously described, the College evaluates its institutional effectiveness using the Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard [R2-3]. Four indicators are measured and gauged: Fiscal Stability, Student Success, Accreditation and Image. Each indicator has a formal evaluation instrument or instruments. Fiscal Stability is measured using the Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) report [R2-27] for Fiscal Health, total student contact hours per full-time faculty in one academic year for Productivity and section efficiency and course success rates for efficient use of resources. Student Success is measured using assessment results of the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) for Student Learning; data for overall course success rates and number of degrees and certificates awarded for Student Completion; and fall to fall persistence, transfer to four-year institutions and employment placement for CTE fields data to determine whether or not students are moving on. For the 2013 year, the ETS<sup>®</sup> Proficiency Profile examination was administered to a cohort of 260 students in their graduating year and results [R2-28] were compared to those of other 2-year schools. For the Accreditation indicator, the status of the College is reported and the most recent public disclosure notice is provided. Finally, image was evaluated using comments gathered from community focus groups [R2-3; R2-29], and Campus Climate surveys of College employees [R2-30] as well as students. These “word clouds” serve as qualitative evidence and the basis for discussion for improvement.

Examples of how the College addresses the data and areas for improvement include discussion of the ILO results during the fall 2013 Convocation [R2-9] and subsequent discussion by the SLOAC to draft a template similar to the Assessment Dialogue form that was utilized for SLO and PLO reporting in the fall 2013 term [R2-31]. Additionally, the IPRC has initiated discussions of including how programs address ILO identified areas for improvement as a prompt in the PRAISE and Annual Update templates [R2-32]. Examples of improvement regarding Image include the work of the Communications Task Force (CTF) that identified areas for improvement based on the 2011 Campus Climate Surveys [R2-29; R2-33]. The CTF made recommendations to College Council for improvement [R2-34; R2-35]. One action on the recommendations was the development of Campus Communication Days, events that convene all campus constituencies to discuss current matters of the College [R2-10; R2-11].

*“Integration of planning with decision-making and budgeting processes to ensure that decisions to allocate staff, equipment, resources, and facilities throughout the College are based on identified strategic priorities and to ensure a continuous cycle of evaluation and improvement based upon data. (I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.6, III.C.2, IV.B.2.b)”*

The College conducts planning and decision-making based on the processes outlined in Board Policy 1202 (Institutional Effectiveness) and the following Administrative Procedures: 1201 (Shared Governance) [R2-6]; 1202 (Implementing Institutional Effectiveness) [R2-39]; and 6200 (Budget Development) [R2-40]. Per proposed changes to Board Policy 1202 [R2-38], program review serves as the basis for short-term and long-term planning and resource allocation. Both instructional and non-instructional programs complete Program Review, Allocation and Institutional Strategies for Excellence (locally known as PRAISE), or Annual Updates on interim years for instructional programs, and begin the cycle outlined in Administrative Procedure 6200.

Programs evaluate themselves on a variety of qualitative and quantitative measures focused on program effectiveness and student learning. For example, the Office of Institutional Research provides student enrollment data to instructional programs for evaluation of effectiveness [R2-41; R2-42; R2-43]. Student Learning Outcome (SLO) assessment data and Program Learning Outcome (PLO) assessment data as well as internal and external factors are also used to evaluate program effectiveness and student learning [R2-42; R2-43]. Non-instructional areas evaluate program effectiveness using results of Service Area Outcome (SAO) assessments and by analyzing internal and external factors [R2-44]. All programs identify goals and resources required to achieve the goals based on these data. Discussion of the alignment of these goals with the College mission and vision are required for instructional programs [R2-45]. Non-instructional programs address alignment and progress towards the Strategic Planning Priorities [R2-46]. PRAISE reports are then evaluated for development of prioritized allocation requests through division summaries (Tier 1), which address impact on District goals and EMP Strategic Planning Priorities and result in Tier 2 summaries. Tier 1 and Tier 2 summaries advance to the FPBC for development of a campus-wide list recommended to the Superintendent/President [R2-47; R2-48; R2-49]. An example of the Administrative Procedures 1202 and 6200 is supported by the following: The Budget Year 2013-2014 Instructional PRAISE for the Administration of Justice Program included forty laptop computers for computer-based testing processes for students completing POST or STP courses [R2-50]. The Division Summary for HSPSIT and Tier 1 prioritized budget worksheets [R2-51; R2-52] for this area include these items and were ultimately prioritized by the FPBC for recommendation to the Superintendent/President [R2-53]. This prioritized item was funded by a donation to the College Foundation from the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians [R2-54]. Through a process of planning based on student learning and achievement, the College demonstrates effective use of funding, regardless of the funding source.

*“An evaluation of all programs throughout the College so that it assesses progress toward those goals and ensures that participation is broad-based throughout the College. (I.B.3, I.B.4)”*

The College’s Academic Senate adopted an official definition of programs on December 1, 2011 [R2-55; R2-56]. This original definition stated:

### **Definition of an Instructional Program**

*Title 5 § 5500 defines an educational program as “an organized sequence of courses leading to a defined objective, a degree, a certificate, a diploma, a license, or transfer to another institution of higher education. An instructional program is defined as a discipline and an organized sequence or grouping of courses leading to a defined objective such as a major, degree, certificate, license, the acquisition of selected knowledge or skills, or transfer to another institution of higher education.*

### **Definition of Non-Instructional Program**

*Any department that supports instructional programs as defined by “an instructional program is defined as a discipline and an organized sequence or grouping of courses leading to a defined objective such as a major, degree, certificate, license, the acquisition of selected knowledge or skills, or transfer to another institution of higher education.”*

After the budget year 2013-2014 planning cycle of program review, it became evident that the definition of instructional programs was unsuitable because a number of disciplines do not offer a sequence or group of courses that culminate into a certificate or degree. As defined, all disciplines were programs and, therefore, required to assess at the program level. To overcome this dilemma the Academic Senate proposed separate definitions for the term “program” within the instructional areas: a definition of programs for the purpose of program review and a definition of programs for the purpose of assessment at the program level.

The proposed changes to the definitions were widely discussed and ultimately adopted by the Academic Senate on May 2, 2013 [[R2-57](#)] and ratified by College Council on May 8, 2013 [[R2-58](#)]. The newly adopted definitions are as follows:

### **Definition of an Instructional Program for the Purpose of Program Review**

*For the purpose of Program Review, an “instructional program” is defined as an organizationally distinct planning and evaluation unit with formally recognized discipline leadership (coordinator, facilitator), which is specified in the Program List, and an identified function, mission, and/or purpose. A program may consist of a single discipline or a group of related disciplines which share joint leadership and academic purposes.*

**Definition of an Instructional Program for the Purpose of Program Learning Assessment**

*For the purpose of program learning assessment practice and reporting, an “instructional program” is a defined sequence or grouping of courses within a discipline required for the completion of a major, degree, or Chancellor approved certificate at Victor Valley College.*

The newly revised process of program review was implemented for the Budget Year 2013-2014 cycle, and a Program List was developed to delineate programs required to submit reports [R2-59]. The Program List was reviewed and revised for the Budget Year 2014-2015 cycle [R2-60]. While any organized entity on campus can participate in program review for purposes of continuous quality improvement, the established lists are used to indicate which programs are required to submit a program review as part of the annual PRAISE Cycle. Any program not listed is considered optional but is processed per the norm. For example, during the 2012-2013 PRAISE Cycle programs, submitting documents for planned improvements included Model United Nations, PACE, Honors, and Study Abroad. The following table demonstrates how the program participation works by providing specific examples.

**Table 1** shows program participation for last year’s and this year’s PRAISE cycle.

<b>Table 1. PRAISE Cycle</b>	<b>For Budget Year</b>	<b>#Required Program Reviews</b>	<b>#Programs Reviews Submitted</b>
2012-2013	2013-2014	Instructional = 47  Non-Instructional = 33	Instructional = 41 required; 5 optional for 46 total  Non-Instructional = 33
2013-2014	2014-2015	Instructional = 48  Non-Instructional = 31 (Program consolidation)	Instructional = 44  Non-Instructional = 26 submitted, (includes 1 optional); 6 in process

Instructional programs are on a three-year cycle rotating through Tracks A, B and C, and complete Annual Update reports in the interim years. For example, during the Budget Year 2014-2015 cycle, Track A completed the comprehensive PRAISE report while Tracks B and C completed the Annual Updates. For the Budget Year 2013-2014 cycle, all three tracks completed Annual Update reports. The Annual Update reports served as a bridge document to transition the newly implemented program review process from the previous program review process as well as a baseline for all instructional programs to move forward into the new three-year cycle. The Budget Year 2015-2016 cycle will continue with Track B completing the comprehensive PRAISE, while Tracks A and C complete the Annual Updates,



and so forth. In summary, the last complete PRAISE following the previous process was Budget Year 2012-2013 for all instructional programs. Budget Year 2016-2017, with reports due December 1, 2015, will mark the completion of one full turn of the new three-year rotation with Track A, B and C completing comprehensive PRAISE and will include three Annual Updates, including the bridge year, for each instructional program.

Instructional PRAISE and Annual Updates include Student Learning Outcomes assessments (SLOs) and Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for those programs required to assess at the program level. Process oversight is provided by the Instructional Program Review Committee (IPRC), which works closely with faculty as the processes for program review, planning, and budget development are implemented.

Non-instructional programs, as identified on the Program Lists, conduct comprehensive PRAISE reports annually and include SAO assessments. Process oversight is provided by the Non-Instructional Program Review Committee (NIPRC), which works closely with program managers as the annual processes for program review, planning, and budget development are implemented.

As discussed above, both the IPRC and NIPRC conduct technical reviews of PRAISE reports to continuously monitor and improve the process of program review at the College [R2-14; R2-15]. An example of how the effectiveness of PRAISE reporting has improved as a result of technical reviews is demonstrated by the development of the Assessment Dialogue reports [R2-61] and completed by instructional programs. The results of the technical review of the instructional Annual Updates for Budget Year 2013-2014 [R2-16; R2-17] indicated that the reports contained little discussion of assessment results for planning purposes. The IPRC, in conjunction with the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee (SLOAC), developed the Assessment Dialogue template [R2-62] to address the concerns of the Commission to base planning on student learning and achievement. Each instructional program completed the template, and the reports accompany the original Annual Update reports. The Assessment Dialogues will be incorporated into the Budget Year 2014-2015 PRAISE and Annual Update reports as well, as they will contain recent assessment analyses for planning. For the future, the IPRC will incorporate the content of the Assessment Dialogue template into the comprehensive PRAISE and Annual Update templates rather than continuing to report assessment analyses for planning separately.

As described above, the program review reports drive the Administrative Procedure 6200 [R2-40] process, culminating into Tier 1 and Tier 2 summaries that are utilized by the FPBC for a final prioritized recommendation to the Superintendent/President. The College mission, vision, values and goals, Strategic Planning Priorities, EMP, TMP, FMP, and outcomes assessment are considered throughout the levels of planning. Budget Year 2014-2015 is the first to complete the process outlined by Administrative Procedure 6200. The FPBC designated a sub-committee comprised of management, classified staff, faculty and student representatives that used the Tier 1 and Tier 2 summaries and applied the prioritization rubric [R2-63] to produce the prioritized list [R2-64; R2-53; R2-65]. The first cycle of Administrative Procedure 6200 was closed following the communication of the



President/Superintendent on January 28, 2014 [R2-130]. While this date is later than the planned process dictates, the Budget Year 2013-2014 cycle of planning and resource allocation was the first to follow the newly adopted Administrative Procedure 6200, and the College experienced a learning curve for its first endeavor. Much has been learned from this process and planning for improvement has already begun for the Budget Year 2014-2015 cycle [R2-24].

*“Documented assessment results for all courses, programs, and the institution. (I.B.5, II.A.1.a, II.B.4)”*

Outcomes assessment occurs at all levels of the College. Instructional programs engage in regular assessment of course and program level assessments. Each discipline has a six-year action plan that outlines the frequency at which all courses will undergo assessment of stated SLOs [R2-66]. Per the current definition of an instructional program [R2-67], programs that offer a degree or a certificate of 18 units or greater and are Chancellor approved also conduct PLO assessments. Analyses and reporting of assessments results are documented in instructional program review reports as described above. The reporting began with the implementation of the Assessment Dialogue reports [R2-61] for 2012-2013 assessments and will be embedded into the Budget Year 2014-2015 program review reports. Future analyses and discussions will officially be reported within the PRAISE and Annual Update reports. Non-instructional programs assess SAOs yearly as a part of their PRAISE report [R2-46].

The College has 5 Institutional Learning Outcomes. Four of the five Institution Learning Outcomes have defined ongoing assessment methods, with the first assessment administered in the spring 2013 term. The fifth ILO, Information Competency, is a newly adopted ILO (Academic Senate Minutes from February 6, 2014) recently defined by the SLOAC and therefore will be assessed in 2014. Results from the ILO assessments are publically reported as part of the Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard on the College website [R2-12]. Results of the ILO assessment from spring 2013 were reported and discussed during the fall 2013 Convocation Day [R2-9]. The SLOAC is in the process of drafting a Dialogue Form that will require disciplines to address Institutional Learning Outcome (ILO) results, particularly around the area of critical thinking [R2-31]. The form will also require disciplines and support units to develop plans within courses and programs to improve student success.

TracDat© continues to serve as a central repository for instructional assessment data at the course, program, and institution levels. This repository facilitates the data entry, storage and distribution of instructional assessment reports for broad-based dialogue that are used in instructional program review annual updates. Because annual non-instructional program reviews are comprehensive, all assessment reports are embedded in the program review documents found in SharePoint and have not been updated in TracDat©. As the work system for campus-wide assessment reporting is evaluated and improved, TracDat© will be updated and will house all assessment reports.

*"An integration of the total cost of facilities ownership in both the short and long term planning processes. (III.B.1.c) [NOTE: III.B.1.c does not exist; the team probably meant III.B.2.a, given context]"*

*"An assessment of physical resource planning with the involvement of the campus community. (III.B.1.a, III.B.2.a, III.B.2.b)"*

The Facilities Committee is responsible for the major physical resources at the college and makes recommendations to the College Cabinet as appropriate using a designated form [R2-68; R2-69; R2-127]. The committee is currently revising the Facilities Committee Recommendation Tracking Form [R2-70] to include the following criteria: alignment with the EMP, FMP and the mission, goals and vision of the College; PRAISE reports; initial costs and total cost of ownership (TCO) [R2-71]; funding source and student success (SAOs and SLOs). The committee uses PRAISE reports as its planning resource [R2-72]. Total Cost of Ownership is discussed in committee meetings. The committee is also responsible for review and revision of the Facilities Master Plan [R2-73] as well as the 5-year construction plan [R2-74]. In January 2012 the committee began an evaluation of effectiveness of physical resource planning with a workshop. The Facilities Committee evaluates effectiveness of physical resource planning using an assessment instrument [R2-75; R2-76; R2-77; R2-78; R2-79] and contributes to the development of the of the Campus Climate Survey for evaluation of facilities by the campus community [R2-80].

Facilities planning development begins with the PRAISE process and continued through the budget and resource allocation planning processes outlined in Administrative Procedure 6200. Instructional and Non-instructional programs determine facilities needs based on their program evaluations. The Facilities Committee reviews the PRAISE reports from all programs to identify facilities needs of the campus as a whole then makes recommendations for effective use of space and recourses to Cabinet as discussed above. Examples of the role that the Facilities Committee plays in planning and institutional effectiveness include recommendations for designated space for the Math Success Center [R2-68], as well as for the relocation of the Campus Police to HC 1-3 [R2-69]. Integration of the planning processes of the Facilities Committee with PRAISE is demonstrated by the Math Success Center. The request for facilities for the Math Success Center is documented in PRAISE [R2-81], and through recommendation by the Facilities Committee and initial funding by a grant by Southern California Edison, the planning has been realized and facilitation of student learning has been positively improved, as reported in this year's Math program review [R2-82].

The Information Technology department performs a systematic assessment of financial and other resources for technology infrastructure, large projects and long-term needs and brings it to the shared governance Technology Committee for discussion. Several policies are in place that define technology use and planning at the College: Administrative Procedure 1201 [R2-6] details the shared governance structure, including the Technology Committee; Administrative Procedures 3720 (a) and 3720 (b) define computer use and email [R2-83; R2-84]. The College Technology Master Plan (TMP) [R2-87] was completed

and accepted by the Academic Senate on September 6, 2012 [R2-85] followed by College Council on October 24, 2012 [R2-86]. The Technology Committee is responsible for maintaining the TMP and carrying out the procedures outlined within. The TMP includes a Mission, Purpose, Vision and Goals as well as a definition of Technology and Guiding Principles such as facilitating measurable student learning outcomes, supporting the College mission, supporting learning and service programs to improve institutional effectiveness and requiring collaborative input through participatory governance. The TMP also identifies challenges, current assessment and, total cost of ownership [R2-88] and considers facilities and infrastructure for technology. Several long-term plans to improve communication are now being implemented, such as the SharePoint portal for campus-wide document storage and sharing. The College evaluates campus perception of current technology utilization and satisfaction in the Campus Climate Surveys [R2-128] in their planning processes. Additionally, the Technology Committee reports to the Campus Community in various ways for discussion such as at Academic Senate meetings [R2-89], College Council meetings [R2-90] and other avenues such as Campus Communication Day [R2-10; R2-11].

The PRAISE process addresses technology requests at the program level which are reviewed by the TIR Executive Dean. These requests follow the Administrative Procedure 6200 process, culminating into Tier 1 and Tier2 summaries and considered for prioritization by the FPBC.

*“A systematic assessment of the effective use of financial resources, with particular regard to meeting the needs of Library materials and technological resources, and the use of the results of this assessment as the basis for improvement. (II.C.1, II.C.2, III.D.3)”*

Recommendation 2 emphasized the need for ongoing assessment of effective use of financial resources for library materials and technological resources, citing standards II.C.1, II.C.2, and III.D.3. Accreditation Standard II.C requires the institution to provide sufficient library resources to support the curriculum for courses, regardless of location or mode of delivery. The standard requires the institution to evaluate library resources in meeting student needs by providing evidence that they contribute to student learning outcome achievement and to use this evidence as the basis for improvement. Standard III.D.3 requires the institution to have policies and procedures that ensure sound financial practices and stability.

Libraries throughout the California community college system were impacted by the loss of categorical state funds in 2009-10 with elimination of the Telecommunications Technology Infrastructure Plan (TTIP) and Instructional Equipment & Library Materials block grant. These funds were the sole budget source for the College’s library for database and periodical subscriptions and provided a major portion of the book budget. In response to the 2010-11 program review planning process, the library received a general fund augmentation for materials that is still intact as of the 2013-2014 fiscal year [R2-92]. The library received Perkins funds for library materials to support industry currency for career technical education for 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13 [R2-91]. A majority of the Perkins

funds were used to purchase legal reference materials to support paralegal studies and administration of justice programs; these expenses have been absorbed by the library's general fund budget. The library benefits from a 3-year (2012 through 2015) system-wide subscription for electronic databases provided by the Chancellor's Office. In 2013-14 the Chancellor's Office re-established the Instructional Equipment & Library Materials (IELM) grant to the community colleges, with an allocation of \$106,926 to the College. The library included a budget request in its 2013 PRAISE report for an allocation of IELM funds for library materials [\[R2-93\]](#).

The library supports student learning by providing reference services, library instruction, computing technology, a comfortable environment and a collection of information resources in a variety of formats (print, media and web-accessible) to meet students' research needs. Library planning for budget requirements and expenditures related to materials and technology are documented in the annual PRAISE report and are aligned with the district's mission, goals and Educational Master Plan. The acquisition of library materials is guided by the library's collection development policy, and a librarian serves on the Curriculum Committee to ensure library resources are adequate to support curriculum and program development. Technology planning is guided by the Library Five-Year Technology Plan, 2010-2015 [\[R2-94\]](#).

The library promotes student achievement of learning outcomes through its information competency program, which is a graduation requirement for the associate degree and supports the library program learning outcome: "students demonstrate information competency and critical thinking skills through their ability to effectively locate, retrieve, evaluate and utilize library and information resources within the guidelines of academic standards to meet collegiate and personal information needs." Effectiveness of information competency is assessed through pre- and post-tests and results are used to improve the instructional program, as documented in the library's SLO Assessment Reports for Information Competency and the library's PRAISE report [\[R2-91\]](#).

The library evaluates the effectiveness of its resources, services and instructional program through usage statistics for online databases, circulation and reference transactions, user satisfaction surveys, and information competency assessments. Usage statistics are reported in annual surveys, including the Annual Data Survey to the Chancellor's Office [\[R2-95\]](#) and the Association of College and Research Libraries Data Survey [\[R2-96\]](#), and incorporated into the library PRAISE report. In fall 2013, approximately 200 library users completed a survey that evaluated satisfaction with library resources and services. The survey was distributed in the library in a paper format and also linked as an online survey from the library's home page. Results from the survey were reported in the library's PRAISE report [\[R2-91\]](#).

Library planning and goals are outlined in the Educational Master Plan, Library Technology plan, and program review. Goals accomplished in the past year include: updating staff and circulation computers; transitioning the Sirsi automation system to a new server; increasing wireless access points in the library; implementing an online version of the

information competency workbook for distance education students; and expanding access to electronic resources (e-books, e-reference and databases) to support distance learners, off-campus centers, and technology-inclined students.

### **How Response Meets Eligibility Requirements**

*ER 19- Institutional Planning and Evaluation: "The institution systematically evaluates and makes public how well and in what ways it is accomplishing its purposes, including assessment of student learning outcomes. The institution provides evidence of planning for improvement of institutional structures and processes, student achievement of educational goals, and student learning. The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding improvement through an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation."*

*ER 21- Relations with the Accrediting Commission: "The institution provides assurance that it 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 accrediting status, and agrees to disclose information required by the Commission to carry out its accrediting responsibilities. The institution will comply with Commission requests, directives, decisions and policies, and will make complete, accurate, and honest disclosure. Failure to do so is sufficient reason, in of itself, to revoke candidacy or accreditation."*

The Strategic Planning Priorities identified in the College's Educational Master Plan [R2-4] are directly aligned with the most currently adopted District Goals [R2-1]. The achievement District Goals are evaluated using the Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard, and progress is posted on the College's public website [R2-3]. Evaluation of student learning and achievement at the institutional level occurs through ILO assessment, and results are integrated into the Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard [R2-12]. The College also evaluates effectiveness at the program level in two ways: (1) evaluation of the process of program review is conducted by the IPRC and NIPRC committees [R2-16; R2-17; R2-19; R2-20; R2-21]; (2) programs, as defined by the College's definition of programs, evaluate themselves for effectiveness by engaging in program review [R2-47; R2-48], and for student learning by completing PLO [R2-47] and/or SAO assessment cycles [R2-48]. Assessment progress is reported [R2-97] by the SLOAC and is available on the Center for Institutional Excellence (CFIE) page of the College Website [R2-98]. Program review reports are the basis for institutional planning and result in Division and Tier summaries that are utilized to derive the prioritized list for funding and resource allocations and are publically posted on the College website [R2-48]. Furthermore, the College regularly reviews and revises Board Policies and Administrative Procedures that govern the aforementioned processes [R2-1 ; R2-38; R2-39; R2-40].



*ER-21 – Integrity in Relations with the Accrediting Commission: “The institution provides assurance that it 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 accredited status, and agrees to disclose information required by the Commission to carry out its accrediting responsibilities. The institution will comply with Commission requests, directives, decisions and policies, and will make complete, accurate, and honest disclosure. Failure to do so is sufficient reason, in and of itself, for the Commission to impose a sanction, or to deny or revoke candidacy or accreditation (34 C.F.R. §668 – misrepresentation).*

The College strives to meet and exceed Eligibility Requirement 21- Relations with ACCJC through Follow-Up Reports by continually striving to remedy deficiencies and take seriously ACCJC recommendations and their resolution and by completing regularly scheduled Self-Study and Midterm reports. The College publicly posts all accreditation-related materials and status, with updates to the campus community and public at large. [[R2-99](#); [R2-100](#)].

#### **How Response Meets Accreditation Standards**

*Standard I.B.2: “The institution set goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purposes. The institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measureable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. The institutional members understand these goals and work collaboratively toward their achievement.”*

The district goals stated in Board Policy 1200 [[R2-1](#)] and the Strategic Planning Priorities stated in the College EMP [[R2-4](#)] are stated clearly and in measurable terms and are publically posted for the campus community and community at large. The goals and priorities are utilized by Shared Governance Committees for the development and maintenance of master planning and continuous quality improvement [[R2-87](#); [R2-73](#)].

*Standard I.B.3: “The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.”*

Program Review, Allocation and Institutional Strategies for Excellence (PRAISE) continues to be the process by which the College assesses its effectiveness at the program level. Other examples of evaluation, planning and re-evaluation at the College are demonstrated by master planning processes, including the EMP, FMP and TMP [[R2-4](#); [R2-73](#); [R2-87](#)]. Student learning is evaluated through cycles of SLO, PLO and ILO assessment, and student service and support areas perform SAO assessments on a yearly cycle. Analysis of data from these assessments, as well as student enrollment data provided by the Office of Institutional

Effectiveness and Research data, internal and external factors, and other data sources are used for PRAISE [R2-103]. The Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard reports progress towards current district goals [R2-3].

*Standard I.B.4: "The institution provides evidence that the planning is broad-based, offers opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness"*

Shared governance committees with representation by all constituencies play integral roles in institutional planning. Committees such as the Distance Education Shared Governance Committee, Technology Committee, the Facilities Committee, the Finance, Budget and Planning Committee and College Council are composed of faculty, classified staff and management/administration and develop master planning documents, make recommendations to Cabinet and produce prioritized recommendations for resource allocations. The Academic Senate participates in planning through PRAISE [R2-104], development of human resource prioritization [R2-105; R2-106] and the approval process of College policies and documents [R2-107]. Additionally, the Academic Senate committees, such as the IPRC, SLOAC and Curriculum Committees, participate in planning for instructional program and academic matters.

*Standard I.B.5: "The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies."*

The Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard, available on the College public website [R2-3], displays assessment results of the district goals as well as progress towards achieving those goals. Student learning is assessed and documented at the course, program and institutional levels. Instructional programs document course and program assessments within PRAISE [R2-47], as well as on TracDat© [R2-108] and SharePoint [R2-109]. Data from ILO assessments are incorporated into the Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard. Non-instructional programs document assessment data within PRAISE [R2-48]. The Public Information Officer reports matters of quality assurance to the campus community and community at large on the College website [R2-110].

*Standard I.B.6: "The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts."*

The College ensures effectiveness of the planning process through regular evaluation and revision. Since the 2011 ACCJC visit, the process of program review was evaluated and resulted in a major renovation. The IPRC and NIPRC jointly developed an official Program Review Handbook [R2-13], outlining a formal procedure, cycle and templates for the evaluation of instructional and non-instructional programs. Recently the budget planning process was formalized with the adoption of Administrative Procedure 6200 [R2-40], which describes the planning process beginning with PRAISE and culminating into a prioritized list of allocation requests to the President/Superintendent. Related policies to

Administrative Procedure 6200 (Budget Development), such as proposed changes to Board Policy 1202 (Institutional Effectiveness) [R2-38], and Administrative Procedure 1202 (Implementing Institutional Effectiveness), have also recently been reviewed and revised [R2-39]. Master planning processes are also reviewed and updated as exemplified by the Educational Master Plan [R2-4], Technology Master Plan [R2-87], and Facilities Master Plan [R2-73]. The College's definition of programs has been reviewed and revised for effectiveness of program review and student learning assessment practices. Other examples include formalizing the instructional hiring prioritization process and rubric by the Academic Senate [R2-105; R2-106] and development and adoption of the Distance Education Plan [R2-111].

*Standard I.B.7: "The institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services."*

Both the IPRC and NIPRC conduct surveys and technical reviews of instructional and non-instructional PRAISE to promote quality of the process of program review as well as the resulting reports by functioning to provide peer feedback for improvement [R2-16; R2-17; R2-19; R2-20; R2-21]. An example of evaluation of the various reporting levels outlined by Administrative Procedure 6200 is discussions in forums such as Administrative Manager Meetings [R2-112; R2-113; R2-114; R2-115]. The library evaluates the effectiveness of its resources, services and instructional program through usage statistics for online databases, circulation and reference transactions, user satisfaction surveys, and information competency assessments. Usage statistics are reported in annual surveys, including the Annual Data Survey to the Chancellor's Office, the Association of College and Research Libraries Data Survey, and in the Library PRAISE Report.

*Standard II.A.1.a: "The institution identifies and seeks to meet the varied educational needs of its students through programs consistent with their educational preparation and the diversity, demographics, and economy of its communities. The institution relies upon research and analysis to identify learning needs and to assess progress toward achieving stated learning outcomes."*

Chapters 1 through 3 of the College's Educational Master Plan identify the varied educational needs of its students and communities based on external scans. In the past, the College's Matriculation and Student Equity Plans provided the means to formally review research and develop a long-term vision for addressing the educational needs of a diverse student population. Recent legislative changes now require the College to develop a Student Success Plan on a regular basis; this task will be carried out by the Student Success and Support Committee as reflected in minutes from January 16, 2014 [R2-116].

Instructional programs analyze student enrollment data provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research. Outcomes Assessment data are discussed for planning purposes in many ways, including among faculty that teach the same course to identify areas for course or teaching pedagogy improvement (e.g., from Biology [R2-117])



and during department meetings for course and program improvement (e.g., from Humanities [R2-118]; English [R2-119]; Construction Technology [R2-120]). Student service areas also rely upon data to improve student success through assessment of SAOs in annual PRAISE Reports [R2-48], as well as other various forms of evaluation (e.g., EOPS [R2-121]). Other examples of identification of learning needs include the Distance Education Advisory Committee conducting surveys to assess and acquire data [R2-129] and ASB participation in Campus Climate Surveys [R2-122].

*Standard II.B.4: "The institution evaluates student support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement."*

Student Support Services identify, assess and discuss results of SAOs on an annual basis in non-instructional annual PRAISE Reports [R2-48]. These discussions are used as a basis for planning and program improvement. Additionally, some student support areas, such as Counseling, which offer Guidance courses, have additional identified SLOs where applicable; these are assessed according to the program's six-year plan and are reported in instructional PRAISE and Annual Updates [R2-123].

*Standard II.C.1: "The institution supports the quality of its instructional program by providing library and other learning support services that are sufficient in quantity, currency, depth, and variety to facilitate educational offerings, regardless of location or means of delivery."*

In addition to Library services, the College has several types of learning support services, including Guidance courses, Math Success Center, Writing Center and the Communication Center [R2-102]. The Library services and materials are supported by Perkins funding, general funding through the PRAISE planning process [R2-93]. The library also benefits from a 3-year (2012 through 2015) system-wide subscription for electronic databases provided by the Chancellor's Office and the re-establishment of the Instructional Equipment and Library Materials (IELM) grant. The Writing Center and Communication Center both receive funding through the PRAISE planning process [R2-124; R2-125]. The Math Success Center, which was implemented in the Fall of 2012, has been supported by a grant from Southern California Edison, the College Foundation as well as through PRAISE planning [R2-82].

*Standard II.C.2: "The institution evaluates library and other learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement."*

The library promotes student achievement of learning outcomes through its information competency program, which is a graduation requirement for the associate degree.

Effectiveness of information competency is assessed through pre- and post-tests, and results are used to improve the instructional program, as documented in the library's SLO Assessment Reports for Information Competency and the library's PRAISE report [R2-93]. The Writing Center completes annual PRAISE [R2-124] as part of the English program and evaluates effectiveness by tracking utilization and workshop participation, analysis of internal and external factors, setting goals related to student achievement and supporting the English program SLOs. The Communications Center establishes a central role that is closely aligned with the mission, goals and learning outcomes of the Communication Studies program. The Communication Center is open to all students but specifically partners with Communication Studies, Guidance, Political Science Model United Nations, English, Agriculture and Natural Sciences, American Sign Language and Math programs. Through analysis of Communication Studies assessment dialogue, the Communication Center identifies needs for student support such as extended evening hours. The Math Success Center also evaluates student needs based on learning assessments in the Math program.

*Standard III.B.1.a: "The institution plans, builds, maintains, and upgrades or replaces its physical resources in a manner that assures effective utilization and the continuing quality necessary to support its programs and services."*

*Standard III.B.2.a: "Long-range capital plans support institutional improvement goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership to new facilities and equipment."*

*Standard III.B.2.b: "Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of physical resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement."*

PRAISE is the root planning process in which all programs, instructional and non-instructional, identify physical resource needs through evaluation of the program. Physical resource planning is continued via the Administrative Procedure 6200 process for institutional planning for budget and resource allocation. The Facilities Committee is responsible for the major physical resources at the college and reviews PRAISE requests as well as performs evaluation of current campus facilities to develop recommendations to the College Cabinet. The Facilities Committee maintains and implements the Facilities Master Plan as well as other planning documents that guide the College in facilities planning. The Technology Committee maintains and implements the Technology Master Plan that guides the College in technology planning. Other resources, such as the Library, receive support through the PRAISE process.

The District uses two separate but similar planning documents for physical resources. The long range facilities master plan is the anchor for the District as far as facilities planning. The five-year capital outlay plan is how the District implements the long range plan.

The facilities master plan supports the district's value of excellence by guiding the ongoing planning, improvements, and maintenance of all district facilities and infrastructure using

sustainable practices. The facilities master plan serves as a guide in the vision and planning process for all future classrooms and educational facilities so the College can continue to provide outstanding educational facilities.

In past years, the District has used the FMP as a guideline but has found that the economic downturn has severely changed what can be accomplished. The FMP has included many local partnerships, State funding, and the passage of a \$297 million general obligation bond [R2-36] to accomplish a very large list of projects and improvements district wide. However, in order to better align facility planning with the current economic situation, the Facilities and Finance, Budget and Planning Committees made up of faculty, staff, students, and administrators worked collaboratively to gather data (e.g., 2012 room use analyses, 2012 five-year capital construction plan, 2012 space inventory report, 2012 PRAISE reports) and revise recommendations for capital construction projects.

Projects completed over the past 10-year period demonstrating the planning process is effective are: The completion of the Advanced Technology Center, Speech Drama Building, Adaptive Physical Education, the Regional Public Safety Training Center, campus street and parking lot replacement, and many other smaller projects all of which were vetted through campus planning processes, identified in the long range facilities plan and the 5-year Capital Outlay Plan [R2-74] and eventually constructed for student use.

The Board- approved project list (adopted on June 14, 2011 [R2-37]) includes projects like the Music building code compliance/renovation, new health/science building, and a vocational complex expansion for Automotive, Welding, and Agriculture. The Board-approved projects total \$25,000,000 in future ongoing construction for the District aiming for completion and occupancy by 2016.

*Standard III.C.2: "Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of technology resources and uses the results of evaluation as the basis for improvement."*

The shared governance Technology Committee oversees the effective use of technology resources for the College by maintaining and implementing the Technology Master Plan [R2-89]. The Technology Master Plan describes assessment procedure for analysis of technological use and needs. Additionally, the IT, IMS and MIS departments also systematically assess technology using the non-instructional PRAISE process annually [R2-48]. Campus Climate Surveys [R2-30] also address technology use and needs of the campus community [R2-128].

*Standard III.D.3: "The institution has policies and procedures to ensure sound financial practices and financial stability."*

The College follows a strict financial practice in conduct of procuring supplies and services, facilities, and the hiring and payroll processes. The annual external financial audits conducted by accounting firm of Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Co. LLP, have indicated "we did not

identify any deficiencies in internal control”)(p. 62). Furthermore, in its April 3, 2013 report, the Fiscal Crisis & Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) indicated that the College maintains a reliable position control system (p. 11) and that appropriate levels of internal controls are in place between the business and personnel departments to prevent fraudulent activities [R2-27]. The San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools serves as the fiscal agent for the District through its Division of Financial Services (DFS).

The procurement process requires approval at several nodes in the system, including final reviews by the College’s fiscal staff to ensure availability of funds and appropriateness of the purchase followed by similar review by the DFS staff. The County Superintendent of School in-house attorneys review contracts/agreements with vendors and partnerships before the services are obtained. The district also employs a strict hiring process, which includes reviews and approvals by the College Cabinet for positions in recruitment, followed by approvals by the human resources and budget office staff.

Similar to other college districts, the College experiences a budget deficit due to current national and California economic constraints and inflationary factors that have contributed to the bloating of the expense budgets. The College has submitted budgets during the past five years that are balanced on its current reserves. In order to reduce expenses and generate reserves, the college has taken assertive measures in reducing its utility costs and engaging in revenue-generating contracts. The utilities cost has been reduced by approximately \$600,000 over the past five years through energy efficiency and energy production efforts. The District won the 2013 California Community College Board of Governors for "District Leadership in Comprehensive Sustainability Program" award. The district has also engaged in revenue generating by leasing its excess physical capacity to a charter school that resides on its premises. A unique contractual relationship between the district and the Victor Valley College Foundation has expanded revenue generation capacity in the areas of contract education, community education, and grant writing efforts.

The district has also worked closely with the represented employee groups to reduce expenses. Two particular memoranda of understanding with the unions were designed and have effectively reduced the cost of welfare and health benefits. The parties are engaged in negotiations regarding economic related concerns. As of June 30, 2013, the District has a total of long-term and current reserves of approximately \$39 million (75% reserve) at its disposal to balance its budgets.

Fund 71 is a district fund in which the College deposits revenues from property tax (Redevelopment Agency funds [RDA]) and other sources that are earmarked for capital and infrastructure improvement projects. These funds may not be used to pay for district personnel costs. However, the College could use its resources to procure equipment, supplies and contract for labor and related services from vendors. The resources in this fund support maintenance projects in the Maintenance and Operations, IT, and facilities areas of the campus. The College has shifted as much of the on-going operational expenses for these three departments from general fund into fund 71 in order to reduce the operational expenses burden on the general fund.

Perkins resources are federally allocated funds in support of instructional programs in the area of vocational and technical education. The funds are allocated to the colleges and public schools based on FTES/ADA enrollment. The federal government mandates strict accountability of the funds and inventory of the capital equipment that are purchased with the funds.

- *Standard IV.B.2.b: “The president guides the institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by the following:*
- *establishing a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities;*
- *ensuring that evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis on external and internal conditions;*
- *ensuring that educational planning is integrated with resource planning and distribution to achieve student learning outcomes; and*
- *establishing procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts.”*

The president is empowered to guide institutional improvement through several key board policies [[R2-101](#)] and related administrative procedures:

- Board Policy 1201 [[R2-126](#)] establishes shared governance as the means through which college-wide discussion occurs regarding the improvement of teaching and learning, and overall college operations. Administrative Procedure 1201 [[R2-6](#)] describes the shared governance committee structure and corresponding charge as each contributes to “better solutions using the expertise of participants so the college can be more effective.”
- Evaluation, planning, and the use of data and analysis are central to the College’s definition of institutional effectiveness pursuant to proposed changes to Board Policy 1202 (Institutional Effectiveness) [[R2-38](#)], and is specified in Administrative Procedure 1202 [[R2-39](#)] as the means through which institutional effectiveness is implemented at the College.

### **How Response Has Been Sustained**

The College demonstrates sustained accomplishment of this response through the completion of last year’s cycle of program review and budget and resource allocation process and has progressed into the current year’s cycle. As a result of technical review, survey, collaborative discussion, revision and implementation of changes, the College has achieved sustainable, continuous quality improvement. Finance, Budget and Planning, Program Review and SLOAC committees have been instrumental in the effectiveness and productivity of our institutional planning processes. Established shared governance participation ensures contribution by all campus constituencies in the efforts to maintain

the level of quality in planning and budget and resource allocation processes that the College has achieved. The College has also taken steps to ensure continued support for planning processes by expanding Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator positions from one coordinator only to one coordinator for each of the three academic divisions as well as adding a Program Review Coordinator position for instructional program review.

### **How Response Has Increased Institutional Effectiveness**

The College has matured significantly in its ability to effectively plan with student learning and program improvement as the roots since the 2011 Self Study. Examples of increased effectiveness such as, but not limited to, are:

- The efforts of Program Review and SLO Coordinators have improved faculty understanding, involvement and proficiency in assessment and planning at the program level for the College.
- TracDat© and SharePoint have both provided concrete portals and lodging houses for reports, planning and for documenting information necessary for ACCJC requirements.
- The College's response has resulted in a working, relevant process of connecting program review to budget allocation and institutional planning, which was absent in the past.
- College Council has reviewed their charge and purpose and is making strides to monitor the planning and budgeting process institutionally.
- Academic Senate and College Council have increased their coordination and effectiveness of reviewing, revising and adopting and accepting planning documentation.
- Budget, regardless of source, is used for resources that have undergone a prioritization process based on student learning and program improvement.
- Creation of and updates to Master Plans and the Distance Education Plan keep current goals that drive planning at many levels.

### **Conclusion**

The College has fully resolved this recommendation. The annual College PRAISE cycle integrates planning, resource allocation, and continuous improvement from the program level to the institutional level in both instructional and non-instructional areas. Program review committees monitor, evaluate and guide the PRAISE cycle and procedure to assure continuous quality and improvement. The College has clarified the definition of "program" in the instructional areas so that program reviews and PLO assessment can be conducted effectively. The Instructional and Non-Instructional program lists operationally define the

programs required to complete a program review, in addition to enabling any optional submissions for other work entities seeking to improve. All Instructional and Non-Instructional programs have completed a program review for Budget Year 2013-2014 and have commenced the current PRAISE cycle for budget year 2014-2015. The instructional comprehensive program reviews and annual updates will incorporate Assessment Dialogues within the report for this year and continue to include assessment analyses for planning as a standard component of the instructional PRAISE template; non-instructional program reviews already include assessments and their results in its annual comprehensive program reviews. This ensures that all program reviews conducted include defined outcomes, assessment results, and the application of these elements to needed improvements. Data provided through the Institutional Effectiveness and Research Office as well as data collected through local program practices is also utilized for planning within PRAISE. Campus-wide dialogue for institutional planning occurs along many avenues, including Shared Governance Committees, Academic Senate and Academic Senate Committees, Convocations and Campus Communication Day events.

Revisions to the Educational Master Plan, Facilities Plan and Technology Plan keep current the alignment of planning priorities and objectives with district goals. Discussion of the total cost of ownership occurs in facilities planning meetings among Administrative Services managers, architects, and other contractors, and assessment of physical resource planning also occurs. Assessment of technology resource and total cost of ownership consideration is also demonstrated by the Technology Master Plan. Finally, the needs for Library materials and technological resources are addressed through the PRAISE process on an annual basis. (See Team Recommendation 6 below regarding assessment and improvement of effective use of financial resources; III.D.3.). Administrative Procedures, process documents, and institutional agreements support sustainable continuous quality improvement pursuant to the ACCJC Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness.

More detailed explanation and examples of this recommendation may be found in Follow-Up Report #4.

## **Implications for Actions**

The College has identified the following actions for improvement to continue the success of the response to Recommendation 2:

- The current cycle, and future cycles, of Administrative Procedure 6200 cycle must adhere to the timeline outlined.
- The CFIE must continue to be officially staffed, provided a permanent location and functioning effectively.
- Revisions to the Program Review processes based on results of last cycle's evaluations need to be completed before the commencement of the Budget Year 2015-2016 cycle.



- The Program List for Instructional programs needs to be revised to reflect the new Discipline Facilitator structure (which is dictated by the currently accepted definition of programs for program review).
- The Program Review Handbook needs to be updated to reflect new templates, Program List and other changes based on evaluations.
- There must be increased inclusion of classified staff in planning processes.

## List of Supporting Evidence

- R2-1. [Board Policy 1200 \(District Vision, Values, Mission & Goals\)](#)
- R2-2. [Administrative Procedure 1200 \(Review of District Vision, Values, Mission & Goals\)](#)
- R2-3. [College IE Scorecard](#)
- R2-4. [Educational Master Plan](#)
- R2-5. [Educational Master Plan 2013 Addendum](#)
- R2-6. [Administrative Procedure 1201 \(Shared Governance Structure and Responsibilities\)](#)
- R2-7. [College Council Agenda 11-06-2013](#)
- R2-8. [College Voluntary Flex Day 09-09-2011](#)
- R2-9. [2013 Convocation Report, Academic Senate](#)
- R2-10. [Campus Communication Day Agenda 12-4-2012](#)
- R2-11. [Campus Communication Day Itinerary 03-27-2013](#)
- R2-12. [Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard- Spring 2013 ILO Results](#)
- R2-13. [Program Review Handbook](#)
- R2-14. [Instructional Peer Technical Review Rubric](#)
- R2-15. [Non-Instructional Technical Review Rubric](#)
- R2-16. [Instructional Program Review 2013 Chair Report](#)
- R2-17. [Instructional Program Review Chair Report Evidence Items](#)
- R2-18. [Academic Senate Meeting Minutes 11-14-2013](#)
- R2-19. [Instructional Program Review Peer Technical Review Report](#)
- R2-20. [Non-Instructional Program Technical Review and Survey Results](#)
- R2-21. [Summary of SAOs from NIPR](#)
- R2-22. [Instructional Program Review 2012 Chair Report](#)
- R2-23. [Instructional Program Review 2011 Survey](#)
- R2-24. [College Council Meeting Agenda 10-23-2013](#)
- R2-25. [Instructional Program Review Committee Meeting Minutes 11-09-2012](#)
- R2-26. [Instructional Program Review Committee Meeting Minutes 10-25-2013](#)
- R2-27. [Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team Report](#)
- R2-28. [ETS© Proficiency Profile](#)
- R2-29. [Community Focus Group Report of Findings](#)
- R2-30. [Campus Climate Survey 2011 Findings](#)
- R2-31. [Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes 11-22-2013](#)
- R2-32. [Instructional Program Review Committee Meeting Minutes 09-13-2013](#)
- R2-33. [College Council Minutes 8-13-2012 Formation of Communications Task Force \(CTF\)](#)
- R2-34. [College Council Minutes 9-12-2012 Report of CTF progress](#)



- R2-35. [College Council Minutes 10-3-2012 CTF Recommendations to College Council](#)
- R2-36. [College Bond \(Measure JJ\) information onwww.vvc.edu](#)
- R2-37. [Board of Trustees Minutes, 06-14-2011, approving construction projects](#)
- R2-38. [Proposed change to Board Policy 1202 \(Institutional Effectiveness\)](#)
- R2-39. [Administrative Procedure 1202 \(Implementing Institutional Effectiveness\)](#)
- R2-40. [Administrative Procedure 6200 \(Budget Development\)](#)
- R2-41. [Instructional Programs Student Enrollment Data: Budget Year 2014-2015](#)
- R2-42. [Budget Year 2014-2015 PRAISE- History](#)
- R2-43. [Budget Year 2014-2015 Annual Update- Physical Science](#)
- R2-44. [Budget Year 2013-2014 PRAISE- Institutional Effectiveness and Research Office](#)
- R2-45. [Instructional PRAISE report template](#)
- R2-46. [Non-instructional PRAISE template](#)
- R2-47. [Instructional PRAISE reports on SharePoint](#)
- R2-48. [Non-instructional PRAISE Reports on www.vvc.edu](#)
- R2-49. [Division Summaries and Budget Prioritizations website](#)
- R2-50. [Administration of Justice Budget Year 2013-2014 PRAISE](#)
- R2-51. [HSPSIT Division Summary](#)
- R2-52. [HSPSIT Tier 1 Budget Worksheet](#)
- R2-53. [Budget Year 2013-2014 Priority Ranking List](#)
- R2-54. [Funding for Administration of Justice Computers from San Manuel](#)
- R2-55. [Academic Senate Minutes 12-01-2011](#)
- R2-56. [Definition of Programs 12-01-2011](#)
- R2-57. [Academic Senate Meeting Minutes 05-02-2013](#)
- R2-58. [College Council Meeting Minutes 05-08-2013](#)
- R2-59. [Program List for Budget Year 2013-2014 program review cycle](#)
- R2-60. [Program List for Budget Year 2014-2015 program review cycle](#)
- R2-61. [2012 - 2013 Instructional Assessment Dialogues](#)
- R2-62. [Assessment Dialogue template](#)
- R2-63. [Finance, Budget and Planning Committee Prioritization Rubric](#)
- R2-64. [Finance, Budget and Planning Committee Minutes 08-07-2013](#)
- R2-65. [Finance, Budget and Planning Committee Minutes 09-04-2013](#)
- R2-66. [Instructional Six-Year Action Plans](#)
- R2-67. [Program Definition 05-02-2013](#)
- R2-68. [Cabinet Recommendation Form - Math Success Center](#)
- R2-69. [Cabinet Recommendation Form - Move Campus Police](#)
- R2-70. [Facilities Committee Recommendation Tracking Form – Draft Revisions](#)
- R2-71. [Total Cost of Ownership \(Facilities\)](#)
- R2-72. [2013 Compiled List of Facilities Needs](#)
- R2-73. [Facilities Master Plan Documents](#)
- R2-74. [5-Year Capital Outlay Plan](#)
- R2-75. [Facilities Observable Outcomes Questionnaire](#)
- R2-76. [Facilities Notes on Observable Outcomes Questionnaire Results](#)
- R2-77. [Facilities Observable Outcomes Questionnaire Comments](#)
- R2-78. [Facilities Observable Outcomes Physical Resource Summary](#)
- R2-79. [Facilities Observable Outcomes Process Summary](#)

- R2-80. [Facilities Committee Minutes, 02-22-2013 – Campus Climate Discussion](#)
- R2-81. [Math PRAISE, Budget Year 2012-2013](#)
- R2-82. [Math Annual Update, Budget Year 2014-2015](#)
- R2-83. [Administrative Procedure 3720a \(Computer Use\)](#)
- R2-84. [Administrative Procedure 3720b \(Email Procedures\)](#)
- R2-85. [Academic Senate Minutes, 09-06-2012](#)
- R2-86. [College Council Minutes, 10-24-2012](#)
- R2-87. [Technology Master Plan](#)
- R2-88. [Technology Total Cost of Ownership per FTES](#)
- R2-89. [Academic Senate Minutes, 04-05-2012](#)
- R2-90. [College Council Meeting Minutes, 05-23-2012](#)
- R2-91. [Library PRAISE Budget Year 2012-2013](#)
- R2-92. [Library Annual Update Budget Year 2013-2014](#)
- R2-93. [Library PRAISE Budget Year 2014-2015](#)
- R2-94. [Library 5-Year Technology Plan](#)
- R2-95. [Annual Data Survey to the Chancellor’s Office](#)
- R2-96. [Association of College and Research Libraries Data Survey](#)
- R2-97. [2013 Assessment Report](#)
- R2-98. [Center for Institutional Excellence](#)
- R2-99. [Accreditation status and reports site on \[www.vvc.edu\]\(http://www.vvc.edu\)](#)
- R2-100. [Accreditation Updates on \[www.vvc.edu\]\(http://www.vvc.edu\)](#)
- R2-101. [Board policies on \[www.vvc.edu\]\(http://www.vvc.edu\)](#)
- R2-102. [Communication Center on \[www.vvc.edu\]\(http://www.vvc.edu\)](#)
- R2-103. [Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research - Program Review Support Data](#)
- R2-104. [Academic Senate PRAISE 2013-2014](#)
- R2-105. [Academic Senate Hiring Procedure](#)
- R2-106. [Academic Senate Hiring Procedure Rubric](#)
- R2-107. [Academic Senate Minutes 03-07-2013](#)
- R2-108. [Instructional Assessment on TracDat©](#)
- R2-109. [Instructional Assessment on SharePoint](#)
- R2-110. [Office of Marketing and Public Relations on \[www.vvc.edu\]\(http://www.vvc.edu\)](#)
- R2-111. [Distance Education Plan](#)
- R2-112. [Administrative Manager Meeting Agenda 05-25-2012](#)
- R2-113. [Administrative Manager Meeting Agenda 06-6-2013](#)
- R2-114. [Administrative Manager Meeting Agenda 12-06-2013](#)
- R2-115. [Administrative Manager Meeting Agenda 01-17-2014](#)
- R2-116. [Student Success and Support Committee Minutes 01-16-2014](#)
- R2-117. [Biology 211 Spring 2012 Assessment Discussion](#)
- R2-118. [Humanities Department Meeting 03-13-2013](#)
- R2-119. [English Department Meeting Minutes 03-12-2013](#)
- R2-120. [Construction Technology Fall 2013 Meeting](#)
- R2-121. [Extended Opportunity Program and Services Spring Progress Report Form](#)
- R2-122. [Student Campus Climate Survey 2013-2014](#)
- R2-123. [Guidance Budget Year 2014-2015 PRAISE](#)
- R2-124. [English \(including Writing Center\) 2013 PRAISE](#)

- R2-125. [Communication Studies 2013 PRAISE](#)
- R2-126. [Board Policy 1201 \(Shared Governance\)](#)
- R2-127. [Cabinet Recommendation Form – Bond Projects](#)
- R2-128. [Technology Results from Campus Climate Survey](#)
- R2-129. [Distance Education Student Satisfaction, Fall 2012](#)
- R2-130. [Budget Augmentation Requests for 2013-2014](#)

## **Team Recommendation 3: Student Learning Outcomes**

*As noted in Recommendation 2 of the 2005 Accreditation Evaluation Report, and in order to meet the Standards and the Eligibility Requirements, the College should complete the development of student learning outcomes for all programs and ensure that student learning outcomes found on course syllabi are the same as the student learning outcomes found on the approved course outlines of record. The institution must accelerate its efforts to assess all student learning outcomes for every course, instructional and student support programs, and incorporate analysis of student learning outcomes into course and program improvements. This effort must be accomplished by fall 2012 as a result of broad-based dialogue with administrative, institutional and research support. Student learning outcomes need to become an integral part of the program review process, including incorporating detailed documented analysis from SLO assessments and data-based research. Additionally, faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated learning outcomes should have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes (I.B.1-7, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a-b, II.A.2.e-f, II.B.4, II.C.2, III.A.1.c, Eligibility Requirement 10).*

### **Institutional Response to Recommendation**

#### **Description of Institutional Response**

Identification of outcomes at the course and program level had a slow start for the College. Since the 2011 accreditation visit, the College has significantly accelerated the progress on this recommendation. For course and program levels, including non-instructional areas, 100% have identified Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Service Area Outcomes (SAOs). Instructional SLOs are found on course syllabi [R3-1], TracDat© [R3-2], CurricUNET© [R3-3] and Ellucian Colleague UI [R3-4]. To ensure consistency of the stated SLOs, the instructional dean offices confirm that all syllabi have matching SLOs to official course outlines of record as they are submitted by faculty for each term [R3-5]. PLOs are stated in the College Catalogue [R3-6] and also in TracDat© [R3-7].

As of the fall of 2013 term, the numbers of courses that now have ongoing assessments drastically increased (see Annual SLO report [R3-26]). Out of the 944 courses that were offered, 816 had been assessed. Many of the courses that have not yet been assessed have not been offered since 2011 or have been moved to another department, and some of the courses have not been offered as of yet [R3-8].

To ensure that assessments were being done on a regular basis, the college has established a six-year assessment plan of course-level assessment for each discipline [R3-9] based on the availability of courses. Courses that are offered regularly will be assessed twice in a three-year period; courses that are offered irregularly will have their assessments done accordingly. There is also a six-year plan for Program Level Assessments [R3-10].

Data no longer resides solely with the individual instructor. The College uses the software TracDat© for the housing of all assessment data for reporting purposes. Currently course

and program level data is submitted into SharePoint workspace folders and then placed into TracDat© . Department chairs and Discipline facilitators can then run reports and view data for the purpose of discussion and writing PRAISE reports.

Program level SLOs, defined as Program Level Outcomes (PLOs) at the College, are published in the College Catalog [R3-6] as well as publically displayed on the Center for Institutional Excellence (CFIE) page of the College website [R3-11]. Since the 2011 ACCJC visit, the College has adopted and revised its definition of programs. The original definition adopted by the Academic Senate in December of 2011 was as follows:

An instructional program is defined as a discipline and an organized sequence or grouping of courses leading to a defined objective such as a major, degree, certificate, license, the acquisition of selected knowledge or skills, or transfer to another institution of higher education (Senate approved on December 1, 2011). [R3-12]

After a cycle of program review the Academic Senate realized the need for separate definitions of a program for the purpose of program review and for the purpose of assessment. Under the original definition (above) many disciplines did not offer a series of courses that lead to a degree or certificate. In May of 2013 the Academic Senate [R3-13] revised and adopted a new definition of programs and was agreed upon by consensus in College Council. The revised definition is as follows:

**Definition of an Instructional Program for the Purpose of Program Review**

*For the purpose of Program Review, an “instructional program” is defined as an organizationally distinct planning and evaluation unit with formally recognized discipline leadership (coordinator, facilitator), which is specified in the Program List, and an identified function, mission, and/or purpose. A program may consist of a single discipline or a group of related disciplines that share joint leadership and academic purposes.*

**Definition of an Instructional Program for the Purpose of Program Learning Assessment**

*For the purpose of program learning assessment practice and reporting, an “instructional program” is a defined sequence or grouping of courses within a discipline required for the completion of a major, degree, or Chancellor approved certificate at Victor Valley College.*

Now, only programs that offer a degree or a chancellor-approved certificate containing 18 units or more are required to assess their PLOs. The College currently has a total of 24 programs that are required to assess their PLOs per the current definition. Of those, 20 have assessed their PLOs, or a total of 83%. Departments that are in anticipation of a Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) degree have already begun to assess their PLOs [R3-14].

The College has 5 Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs). All ILOs have defined and ongoing assessment methods. Four of the five were assessed in the spring 2013 term. The fifth, Information Competency, is a newly adopted ILO that will be assessed in 2014. The results of the ILO assessments are reported in the Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard on the College website [R3-15]. Discussions of the results as well as identification of areas for improvement occurred during the fall 2013 Convocation Day [R3-16].

A total of 33 non-instructional programs have participated in program review with defined SAOs; 27 reported some type of assessment in last year's PRAISE Report. The majority of the SAOs in non-instructional programs are not direct measures of student learning, but rather customer service, program quality, or transactional indicators used to improve business processes. The bulk of student-level assessment is conducted in Student Services programs in the form of surveys. The NIPRC conducted a technical review of non-instructional PRAISE reports [R3-17], including SAO assessments. Improvements necessary for this year's cycle include (1) management involving staff in the process; (2) refining related documents, particularly budget worksheets; (3) adjusting and adhering to critical due dates, among other things identified in a memo to the College Council from the joint chairs of the IPRC, NIPRC, and FBPC. [R3-18]

*"Student learning outcomes need to become an integral part of the program review process, including incorporating detailed documented analysis from SLO assessment and data-based research."*

Assessment at the course and instructional program levels are required to be discussed for planning purposes within the Program Review, Allocation, and Institutional Strategies for Excellence (PRAISE) report templates. The Institutional Program Review Committee (IPRC) conducted a technical review of the Budget Year 2013-2014 reports and determined that the reports contained little evidence of assessment discussion. At the time the reports were due, faculty were still in the evaluation of evidence stage of assessment practice. As a result of the technical review, the IPRC and the Student Learning and Assessment Committee (SLOAC) developed a Dialogue Template form that was used to facilitate dialogue within departments. [R3-19] The Dialogue Templates are then used to complete the Budget Year 2013-2014 program review reports. The dialogue template requires the following: how assessments provide meaningful dialogue, examples of strengths and weaknesses, what changes the department has made based on their data, examples of where loops have been closed and examples of where assessments led to the identification of required resources. These Assessment Dialogue reports are housed on the College SharePoint portal with the program review reports [R3-20] and will also be incorporated into the Budget Year 2014-2015 program review reports since they contain recent assessment data. In the future assessment discussions will become a standard component of program review reporting documents. Widespread dialogue is now evident through several avenues, including department meeting discussions [R3-21], program review report documents [R3-22], and Convocation Day events [R3-16].

The 2013-2014 Convocation was used to stimulate widespread dialogue. There was



widespread dialogue on the proper use of SLOs and PLOs to help improve student learning, courses and programs, along with how they should be used for program planning and budget allocation requests. The convocation was also used facilitate to discussion and develop dialogue drafts.

Non-instructional programs incorporate SAO assessment into the non-instructional PRAISE template and are conducted on a yearly cycle. Results are posted publically on the College website [[R3-23](#)].

*“Additionally, faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated learning outcomes should have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes.”*

Each semester student learning outcomes are part of a self-evaluation and peer evaluation process as they are shared and analyzed during discipline meetings. Data collected in the previous semester is evaluated and used to plan the next evaluation cycle as well as to enhance student learning. Improvement of instruction is also part of the self-evaluation component of the tenured full-time faculty evaluation process (see Article 15: Full-Time Tenured Faculty Evaluations, in the Victor Valley College Agreement between the Victor Valley Community College District and the Victor Valley College Faculty Association). [[R3-24](#)] In their self-evaluations, faculty must show improvement of instruction by addressing course revisions, improvement in teaching technique and procedure, and contributions to department and program development. It is also expected that student learning outcome (SLO) assessments are addressed in this section of the evaluation. Furthermore, in an effort to insure the effectiveness of the SLO process, the District has chosen Article 15 as one of their spring 2014 negotiation re-openers [[R3-25](#)].

### **How Response Meets Eligibility Requirements**

*ER 10- Student Learning and Achievement: “The institution defines and publishes for each program the program’s expected student learning and achievement outcomes. Through regular and systematic assessment, it demonstrates that students who complete programs, no matter where or how they are offered, achieve those outcomes.”*

Course level outcomes, or SLOs, are stated on all course syllabi and provided to students [[R3-1](#)]. PLOs are published in the College Catalog [[R3-6](#)]. ILOs are located on the College Website [[R3-15](#)]. As previously described, as of the fall 2013 term the College has assessed 83% of its stated SLOs and 20 of 24 programs, as defined for assessment, have completed PLO assessments [[R3-8](#)]. The College continues to move forward with SLO and PLO assessments and documents its progress in the Assessment Report produced by the SLOAC [[R3-26](#)]. The instructional programs follow 6-year plans for assessment and report data in program review reports [[R3-9](#)]. ILOs have been assessed using the ETS examination [[R3-16](#)], and results are reported as part of the Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard. SAOs are stated in non-instructional PRAISE documents, produced yearly, that are available on the

College website [\[R3-23\]](#).

### **How Response Meets Accreditation Standards**

*Standard I.B.1: "The institution maintains ongoing, collegial self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional process."*

*"An important factor in limiting progress on this Standard is the fact that the College has not come to an agreement on what exactly a program is, either for the purposes of program review or for the establishment of and assessment of student learning outcomes. These definitions need not be the same, but each must be agreed upon before significant progress can be made in either area. The team received various reports from different groups regarding the level of progress that had been made on both program review and outcomes assessment, and much of the confusion as to the level of progress can be traced back to this lack of an agreed upon definition regarding what constitutes a program for either purpose. (I.B.1, I.B.4)"*

After a cycle of program review, the Academic Senate realized the need for separate definitions of a program for the purpose of program review and for the purpose of assessment. Under the original definition (above) many disciplines did not offer a series of courses. In May of 2013 the Academic Senate revised and adopted [\[R3-13\]](#) a new definition of program that was ratified by College Council. The revised definition is as follows:

#### **Definition of an Instructional Program for the Purpose of Program Review**

*For the purpose of Program Review, an "instructional program" is defined as an organizationally distinct planning and evaluation unit with formally recognized discipline leadership (coordinator, facilitator), which is specified in the Program List, and an identified function, mission, and/or purpose. A program may consist of a single discipline or a group of related disciplines that share joint leadership and academic purposes.*

#### **Definition of an Instructional Program for the Purpose of Program Learning Assessment**

*For the purpose of program learning assessment practice and reporting, an "instructional program" is a defined sequence or grouping of courses within a discipline required for the completion of a major, degree, or Chancellor approved certificate at Victor Valley College.*

Now, only programs that offer a degree or a chancellor-approved certificate containing 18 units or more are required to assess their PLOs. The College currently has a total of 24 programs that are required to assess their PLOs per the current definition. Of those, 20 have assessed their PLOs, or a total of 83%. The four that have not been assessed do not have a terminal class or set of students that have completed the program as of yet [\[R3-14\]](#). These programs are currently engaged in how to approach PLO assessment in their areas.



Departments that are in anticipation of a Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) degree have already begun to assess their PLOs.

*Standard I.B.2: "The institution sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purpose. The institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. The institutional members understand these goals and work collaboratively toward their achievement."*

As per Board Policy 1200 and the EMP [R3-27], [R3-28] the College has clear and measurable goals that are posted for the campus community and community at large. The goals and priorities are utilized in Shared Governance Committees for the development and maintenance of master planning and continuous quality improvement.

*Standard I.B.3: "The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and reevaluation. Evaluation is based on analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data."*

Program Review, Allocation and Institutional Strategies for Excellence continue to be the process by which the College assesses its effectiveness at the program level. Other examples of evaluation, planning and re-evaluation at the College are demonstrated by master planning processes, including the EMP, FMP and TMP [R3-29; R3-30; R3-31]. Student learning is evaluated through cycles of SLO, PLO and ILO [R3-9, R3-32] assessment and student service, and support areas perform SAO assessments on a yearly cycle [R3-23]. Analysis of data from these assessments, as well as student enrollment data provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research data, internal and external factors, and other data sources are used for PRAISE [R3-22]. The Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard reports progress towards current district goals [R3-33].

*Standard I.B.4: "The institution provides evidence that the planning is broad-based, offers opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness."*

*Standard I.B.5: "The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies."*

Shared governance committees with representation by all constituencies play integral roles in institutional planning. Committees such as the Distance Education Shared Governance Committee, Technology Committee, the Facilities Committee, the Finance, Budget and Planning Committee and College Council are composed of faculty, classified staff and management/administration and develop master planning documents, make recommendations to Cabinet and produce prioritized recommendations for resource allocations. The Academic Senate participates in planning through PRAISE [R3-34],

development of human resource prioritization [R3-35; R3-36] and the approval process of College policies and documents [R3-37]. Additionally, the Academic Senate committees, such as the IPRC, SLOAC and Curriculum Committees, participate in planning for instructional program and academic matters.

The Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard, available on the College public website [R2-33], displays assessment results of the district goals as well as progress towards achieving those goals. Student learning is assessed and documented at the course, program and institutional levels. Instructional programs document course and program assessments within PRAISE [R3-38] as well as on TracDat© [R3-39] and SharePoint [R3-40]. Data from ILO assessments are incorporated into the Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard. Non-instructional programs document assessment data within PRAISE [R3-23]. The Public Information Officer reports matters of quality assurance to the campus community and community at large on the College website [R2-33].

*Standard I.B.6: "The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation process by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts."*

The College ensures effectiveness of planning process through regular evaluation and revision. Since the 2011 ACCJC visit, the process of program review was evaluated and resulted in a major renovation. The IPRC and NIPRC jointly developed an official Program Review Handbook [R3-41] outlining a formal procedure, cycle and templates for the evaluation of instructional and non-instructional programs. Recently the budget planning process was formalized with the adoption of Administrative Procedure 6200 [R3-42], which describes the planning process beginning with PRAISE and culminating into a prioritized list of allocation requests to the President/Superintendent. Related policies to Administrative Procedure 6200, such as Board Policy 1202 [R3-43], and Administrative Procedure 1202, have also recently been reviewed and revised [R3-44]. Master planning processes are also reviewed and updated as exemplified by the EMP, TMP and FMP [R3-29; R3-30; R3-31]. The College's definition of programs has been reviewed and revised for effectiveness of program review and student learning assessment practices [R3-13; R3-45]. Other examples include formalizing the instructional hiring prioritization process and rubric by the Academic Senate [R3-35; R3-36] and development and adoption of the Distance Education Plan [R3-46].

*Standard I.B.7: "The institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services."*

Both the IPRC and NIPRC conduct surveys and technical reviews of instructional and non-instructional PRAISE to promote quality of the process of program review as well as the resulting reports by functioning to provide peer feedback for improvement [R3-47; R3-48 R3-49; R3-50]. An example of evaluation of the various reporting levels outlines by Administrative Procedure 6200 is a survey conducted by the Office of Institutional

Effectiveness VM survey on the division summary process. Additionally, the program review and resource allocation processes are discussed in other forums such as Manager Meetings [R3-51]. The library evaluates the effectiveness of its resources, services and instructional programs through usage statistics for online databases, circulation and reference transactions, user satisfaction surveys, and information competency assessments. Usage statistics are reported in annual surveys, including the “Annual Data Survey to the Chancellor’s Office” and “Association of College and Research Libraries Data Survey”, and incorporated into the library PRAISE report [R3-52; R3-53; R3-54].

*Standard II.A.1: “The institution demonstrates that all instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, address and meet the mission of the institution and upholds its integrity.”*

*Standard II.A.1.c: “The institution identifies student learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees; assesses student achievement of those outcomes; and uses assessment to make improvements.”*

*“The lack of adequate and quantitative data in the annual praise reports reinforces this critical component in the SLO process. (II.A 1)”*

*“There needs to be more consistency between the SLOs documented in the course outline and the class syllabus handed out on the first day of instruction. In looking at a sample of syllabi provided by the respective divisions at the College, it was not uncommon to see different, or unclear SLOs stated in the course syllabus than those that are on the course outlines. (IIA.1.c)”*

To address the “lack of adequate and quantitative data in the annual praise reports,” there was the development of the SLO/PLO Assessment dialogue forms, which were paired with the 2012 annual updates. This dialogue form will be included in all future program review documents, beginning with the 2013 Comprehensive PRAISE and Annual Update reports that were due December 1, 2013. [R3-38]

Instructional SLOs are found on course syllabi and on the official course outline of record that is found on Ellucian Colleague UI, CurricUNET© and TracDat© . To ensure the uniformity of SLOs on all syllabi, they are submitted to the appropriate instructional dean’s office for review [R3-1] [R3-2] [R3-4].

*Standard II.A.2.a: “The institution uses established procedures to design, identify learning outcomes for, approve, administer, deliver, and evaluate courses and programs. The institution recognizes the central role of its faculty for establishing quality and improving instructional courses and programs.”*

*Standard II.A.2.b: "The institution relies on faculty expertise and assistance of advisory committees when appropriate to identify competency levels and measureable student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, program, including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution regularly assesses student progress towards achieving those outcomes."*

*"It appears that the assessment cycle for SLOs has not been well defined. The PRAISE documents are supposed to include information; however, only a few 2010-11 reports include them. The SLOs seem to continually be evolving, and they are not always reflected in the official course outline but in the course syllabus. The reason behind this may be because of the lengthy process required by the Curriculum Committee to approve course outlines. (II.A.2.a)"*

*"While faculty expertise is relied upon for academic and professional matters, there is a concern that faculty are not currently fully engaged in program review or full documentation of SLOs and corresponding assessment of them. (II A.2.b)"*

The assessment cycle is now well defined with a six-year assessment plan. Every department created its own plan based on the availability of courses. Courses that are offered regularly are scheduled to have all SLOs assessed twice in a three-year period. Courses that are not offered on a yearly basis will have their SLOs assessed appropriately [R3-9].

The IPRC, in conjunction with SLOAC, created a template that is used to create in-depth dialogue regarding assessment results; these dialogue forms were then used in the Budget Year 2014-2015 PRAISE documents and Annual Updates. The dialogue forms are designed to stimulate dialogue between all department members and rely on the assessment data that is housed on TracDat©. [R3-19] [R3-20] The content of the Dialogue form will be formally incorporated into the instructional PRAISE and Annual Update templates for the future.

*Standard II.A.2.e: "The institution evaluates all courses and programs through an on-going systematic review of their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans."*

*Standard II.A.2.f: "The institution engages in ongoing, systematic evaluation and integrated planning to assure currency and measure achievement of its stated student learning outcomes for courses, certificates and programs, including general and vocational education and degrees. The institution systematically strives to improve those outcomes and makes the results available to appropriate constituencies."*

*"The regular review of data to make data-driven decisions does not seem to be occurring. As indicated above, ongoing, systematic evaluation and integrated planning does not appear to be occurring at the college. While SLOs have been developed, the next step of assessing them and then developing program SLOs and doing overall program review is not evident. As such, it is difficult to measure achievement of stated student learning outcomes for certificates, programs and degrees. It does not appear, based on limited evidence found, that the College*

*systematically strives to improve their outcomes or that the College communicates the results to appropriate constituencies. (II.A.2.f)”*

The assessment of SLOs is now a firmly established practice at the College with 86% of courses with ongoing assessments [R3-8] and the establishment of a six-year plan to have every course on a schedule to have all SLOs assessed twice in a three-year period where possible [R3-9]. All programs now have PLOs, but due to the new definition of a program for the purpose of assessment [R3-45], only programs with a chancellor-approved certificate or degree is required to assess their PLOs. At this time, 20 out of the 24 identified programs that are required to assess have done so [R3-14]. The four that have not been assessed do not have a terminal class or set of students that have completed the program as of yet. These programs are currently engaged in how to approach PLO assessment in their areas. The dialogue of both PLO and SLO has been added to program review by the addition of the dialogue template that has been added to the program review [R3-19].

Assessment at the course and instructional program level are now discussed and used for planning purposes within the PRAISE reports. The IPRC conducted a technical review of the Budget Year 2013-2014 reports, and it was determined that the reports contained a limited amount of assessment dialogue. At this time faculty were still in the process of conducting assessments and gathering data. As a result, the IPRC in conjunction with SLOAC created the SLO assessment dialogue template to facilitate meaningful dialogue [R3-19]. The dialogues were then used to complete the Budget Year 2013-2014 program review. The dialogue templates will be incorporated as part of the standard template into the 2014-2015 PRAISE reports [R3-38].

<p><i>Standard II.A.2.i: The institution awards degrees and certificates based on student achievement of a program’s stated learning outcomes.</i></p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*“It appears that program SLOs have not yet been entirely developed or assessed. In the Self Study, the College clearly indicates that it has not completed all of the program SLOs, but it suggests that because students are completing courses with program learning outcomes in them, that they are in fact meeting both the overall program learning outcomes and the student learning outcomes at the same time. (II.A.2.i)”*

The college has had a significant transformation when the new definitions of a program were adopted so that the level of ambiguity in what constitutes a program for the purpose of program review and what constitutes a program for the purpose of assessment no longer exists. [R3-45] The College defines program level SLOs as Program level Outcomes (PLOs). Due to the new definition, there are 24 programs on campus that offer a degree or chancellor-approved certificate that must use a unique method of assessment of their PLOs. Currently 20 of the 24 programs have completed the direct and unique assessment of their PLOs [R3-14]. The four remaining programs that need to assess their programs have not done so due to a need to identify a terminal course or set of students that are near the end of their program.



*Standard II.B.4: "The institution evaluates student support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement."*

Student Support Services identifies and assesses SAOs on an annual basis. The analyses and discussion of results of SAO assessments occur in non-instructional annual PRAISE [R3-48] and are used as a basis for planning and program improvement. Additionally, some student support areas, such as Counseling, which offer Guidance courses, do have identified SLOs where applicable and are assessed based on the program's six-year plan and are reported in instructional PRAISE and Annual Updates [R3-56].

*Standard II.C.2: "The institution evaluates library and other learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement."*

The library promotes student achievement of learning outcomes through its information competency program, which is a graduation requirement for the associate degree. Effectiveness of information competency is assessed through pre- and post-tests, and results are used to improve the instructional program, as documented in the library's SLO Assessment Reports for Information Competency and the library's PRAISE report [R2-52]. The Writing Center completes annual PRAISE [R2-38] as part of the English program and evaluates effectiveness by tracking utilization and workshop participation, analysis of internal and external factors, setting goals related to student achievement and supporting the English program SLOs. The Communications Center establishes a central role that is closely aligned with the mission, goals and learning outcomes of the Communication Studies program. The Communication Center is open to all students but specifically partners with Communication Studies, Guidance, Political Science Model United Nations, English, Agriculture and Natural Sciences, American Sign Language and Math programs. Through analysis of Communication Studies assessment dialogue, the Communication Center identifies needs for student support such as extended and evening hours. The Math Success Center also evaluates student needs based on learning assessments in the math program [R3-55].

*Standard III.A.1.c: Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes."*

Each semester student learning outcomes are part of a self-evaluation and peer evaluation process as they are shared and analyzed during discipline meetings. Data collected in the previous semester are evaluated and used to plan the next evaluation cycle as well as to enhance student learning. Improvement of instruction is also part of the self-evaluation component of the tenured full-time faculty evaluation process (see Article 15: Full-Time

Tenured Faculty Evaluations, in the Victor Valley College Agreement between the Victor Valley Community College District and the Victor Valley College Faculty Association). In their self-evaluations, faculty must show improvement of instruction by addressing course revisions, improvement in teaching technique and procedure, and contributions to department and program development. It is also expected that student learning outcome (SLO) assessments are addressed in this section of the evaluation. Furthermore, in an effort to insure the effectiveness of the SLO process, the District has chosen Article 15 as one of their spring 2014 negotiation re-openers. [[R3-25](#)]

## Conclusion

The College has fully resolved this recommendation. It has completed the development of student learning outcomes for its courses and programs and ensures syllabi include official course outcomes from the course outline of record. Efforts were accelerated to assess outcomes for courses and student support programs and to use results for improvement. More detailed explanation and examples of this recommendation may be found in Follow-Up Report #4.

## Implications for Action

The College has identified the following actions for improvement to increase the College's assessment competence:

- Refine work system for regular reporting of student learning and service administrative outcomes.
- Continue faculty development in use of assessments in instructional improvement, and of managers/administrators in program improvement.
- Embed program assessment training in management orientation and development.

## List of Supporting Evidence

- R3-1. [Example Syllabi with SLOs](#)
- R3-2. [Same course with SLOs on TracDat©](#)
- R3-3. [Course Outline Records CurricUNET©](#)
- R3-4. [Course SLOs in Ellucian Colleague UI](#)
- R3-5. [Example of syllabi from dean's office](#)
- R3-6. [PLOs in course catalogue](#)
- R3-7. [PLOs In TracDat©](#)
- R3-8. [Table of courses assessed from report](#)
- R3-9. [Six-Year-Action-Plan-Schedule](#)
- R3-10. [Facilities Cabinet Recommendation Form- Math Success Center](#)
- R3-11. [PLOs on CFIE website](#)
- R3-12. [Academic Senate Minutes-Program Definition 12-01-2012](#)



- R3-13. [Academic Senate Minutes-Program Definition 05-12-2013](#)
- R3-14. [PLOs Assessed](#)
- R3-15. [2013 ILO Assessment Results](#)
- R3-16. [Convocation-Fall-2013-ILO-Discussion](#)
- R3-17. [NIPRC technical review of non-instructional PRAISE reports](#)
- R3-18. [College Council 10-23-2013 \(Joint Chair Memo\)](#)
- R3-19. [SLO Assessment Dialog template IPRC r2SLOAC](#)
- R3-20. [Dialogues Forms](#)
- R3-21. [Department Meeting Minutes](#)
- R3-22. [Budget Year 2014-2015 Instructional Program Review](#)
- R3-23. [Non-instructional PRAISE on OIER webpage](#)
- R3-24. [VVCFA Agreement, Article 15](#)
- R3-25. [2013-2014 District article 15 re-opener](#)
- R3-26. [2013 Annual Assessment Report](#)
- R3-27. [Board Policy 1200 District Vision](#)
- R3-28. [Education Master Plan \(EMP\)](#)
- R3-29. [Education Master Plan Addendum](#)
- R3-30. [Facility Master Plan \(FMP\)](#)
- R3-31. [Technology Master Plan \(TMP\)](#)
- R3-32. [SLOAC Meeting Minutes November 22, 2013](#)
- R3-33. [Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard](#)
- R3-34. [Budget Year 2014-2015 Academic Senate PRAISE](#)
- R3-35. [Academic Senate Hiring Prioritization](#)
- R3-36. [Academic Senate Prioritization Rubric](#)
- R3-37. [Academic Senate meeting minutes March 7, 2013](#)
- R3-38. [Budget Year 2014-2015 English PRAISE](#)
- R3-39. [Assessment Results on TracDat \(Sample\)](#)
- R3-40. [Instructional PRAISE Reports on SharePoint](#)
- R3-41. [Program Review Handbook](#)
- R3-42. [Administrative Procedure 6200 Budget Development](#)
- R3-43. [Board Policy 1202 Institutional Effectiveness](#)
- R3-44. [Administrative Policy 1202 Implementing Institutional Effectiveness](#)
- R3-45. [Definition of a program](#)
- R3-46. [Distance Education Plan](#)
- R3-47. [IPRC Peer Technical Review Report](#)
- R3-48. [NIPRC Budget Year 2013-2014 Evaluation](#)
- R3-49. [IPRC 2013 Chair Report](#)
- R3-50. [IPRC 2013 Chair Report Evidence](#)
- R3-51. [Manager Meeting Minutes](#)
- R3-52. [Budget Year 2014-2015 Library PRAISE](#)
- R3-53. [Annual Library Data Survey](#)
- R3-54. [Library ACRL Data Survey](#)
- R3-55. [Budget Year 2014-2015 Math Annual Update](#)
- R3-56. [Budget Year 2014-2015 Guidance PRAISE](#)

## Team Recommendation 4: Campus Climate

*As noted in recommendation 6 of the 2005 Accreditation Evaluation Report, and in order to meet the Standards, the College should cultivate a campus environment of empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence by creating a culture of respect, civility, dialogue and trust. (I.B.1, I.B.4, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.C.1.a, III.A, III.A.1.d, III.A.4.c, IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.3, IV.A.5, IV.B.2.b [emphasis on "collegial process"])*

### Institutional Response to Recommendation

#### Description of Institutional Response

The College has sustained many of the processes and procedures that led to the improvements recognized by the Evaluation Team and has continued to develop a climate where shared governance is a major part of the campus culture. There have been some setbacks and significant challenges as the college has undertaken the development of better approach to shared governance, but the College has been successful in institutionalizing many substantial and sustainable practices:

1. The College has encountered setbacks with ensuring stability in the administration of the college but has responded to these challenges in ways that demonstrate the improved climate of trust and cooperation. [[R4-1](#), [R4-2](#); [R4-3](#)]
2. Greater participation in shared governance and improved communications between the faculty and administration have been sustained and enhanced through the efforts of the Academic Senate (AS). [[R4-5](#), [R4-6](#), [R4-7](#)]
3. The Communications Task Force (CTF) embodied the efforts of administration, faculty and classified staff to examine and respond to the problems with Campus Climate that were identified in the 2011 Campus Climate Survey. [[R4-6](#), [R4-8](#)]
4. The administration has sustained its efforts to communicate more effectively with faculty and classified staff and have substantially improved transparency by establishing better communication throughout the campus regarding issues that are often contentious. [[R4-5](#), [R4-8](#)]
5. A Culture of Evidence has been established through extensive use of the SharePoint medium to disseminate important documents, records of meetings and evidence of participation in decision making. [[R4-10](#)]
6. A process of reviewing and updating policies and procedures on routine bases has been established and voted on by the Academic Senate. All procedures and policies are posted at the College webpage. [[R4-11](#); [R4-12](#); [R4-13](#)]
7. A culture of transparency has extended to receiving feedback on institutional effectiveness from all constituencies with the VVC Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard [[R4-40](#)] and from students with the Student Campus Climate Survey [[R4-41](#)].

## **Deficiencies and Progress**

At the time of the visit, the Evaluation Team stated that the College needed to maintain a “campus environment of empowerment, innovation and institutional excellence” and a “culture of respect, civility, dialogue and trust.” Making real improvements in the campus climate was not something that could be taken care of quickly but would require sustained efforts focusing on developing trust from the different constituencies. The Evaluation Team recognized in the Follow-Up Visit Report of April 19, 2012, that the College had made “some clear, definitive strides regarding this recommendation.” The Follow-up Visit Report saw evidence of improvements in “communication processes and clearer guidelines on processes and procedures” but pointed out that the College needed to sustain what had been accomplished. [\[R4-1\]](#)

The Evaluation Team recognized in the Follow-Up Visit Report of April 19, 2012, that the College had made “some clear, definitive strides regarding this recommendation.” The Follow-up Visit Report saw evidence of improvements in “communication processes and clearer guidelines on processes and procedures” but pointed out that the College needed to sustain what had been accomplished. [\[R4-1\]](#)

## **Stabilizing Leadership**

The Evaluation Team identified that the stability with the administration had proven to be a significant challenge. The college has developed procedures and levels of trust that have allowed it to better deal with successions within the administration.

The College’s president left the college in May 2013 due to health concerns. This provided significant challenges with maintaining stability in the administration. The response at the college has, however, been effective at maintaining stability. The College Board, with the support of the Faculty Association and the Academic Senate, acted to promote the Interim-Vice President to the position of President and hired a permanent replacement for the Vice-President’s position. [\[R4-2; R4-3\]](#)

The Interim-President has been at the College for more than two decades and has previously served as an Interim vice-president. There was agreement among all the major constituent groups on campus to the President’s abilities to lead the campus until a permanent replacement was found. [\[R4-2\]](#)

The new permanent Vice-President has come to the college with many years of experience in dealing with many of the issues that the campus is facing. He has taken leadership on many important committees and has engaged many of the campus community to participate. [\[R4-3\]](#)

Management beneath the President has remained stable. The three primary academic deans—the Dean of Humanities, Dean of STEM and Dean of Career and Technical

Education--have served at the college for many years and have provided excellent leadership for the faculty. The Deans of STEM and Career and Technical Education were promoted from within the College, providing years of institutional memory. The college also promoted from within to fill the position of Dean of Student Services. [\[R4-4\]](#)

The end result is that the effects of the recent developments in the administration have not significantly disrupted the efforts of the College to meet its responsibilities to the community and in the accreditation cycle. The infrastructure beneath the President has remained largely the same, providing a firm foundation on which to build.

### **Greater Participation in Shared Governance**

The Academic Senate has undertaken a concerted effort to increase participation on committees throughout the campus. The Academic Senate Vice-President undertook an extensive examination of the participant lists for the campus committees and solicited participants throughout the campus to fill vacancies and to re-energize committees that were no longer meeting regularly. According to an Academic Senate Report, there was a 35% increase in participation in shared governance committees during the previous year. [\[R4-14\]](#)

The College conducted a voluntary In-Service Day on August 30, 2013, which was a resounding success. The voluntary In-Service Day involved both classified staff and faculty. The Academic Senate was asked to organize the faculty portion of this event, participation was voluntary but all faculty were encouraged to attend. The Academic Senate's planning workshops were related to accreditation, program review, and assessments and were open to anyone. There were 94 faculty members in attendance for the full day of workshops. More In-Service Days/Convocations are planned for both the Spring and Fall 2014 semesters. [\[R4-15; R4-45\]](#)

The Campus has begun to hold Campus Communication Days. The first was held on November 16, 2013 as an opportunity for employees to get together to discuss issues and processes on campus, followed by a moderated Q&A session. The event was planned monthly at different days and times to accommodate schedules. All of the sessions were well attended by administrators, faculty, staff and the community. A few went past time with heated questions and answers. These Campus Communication Days have developed into the Flex Days/Convocations. [\[R4-16; R4-17; R4-18; R4-19; R4-20; R4-21; R4-45; R4-46\]](#)

The Employee Development Committee was provided with positive feedback regarding monthly themes aimed at improving positive campus climate. The events organized by the committee address issues that were sometimes directly related to campus issues and sometimes related to issues of personal concern. April 2012 was addressed to wellness, while the subsequent month was addressed to employee appreciation. The Committee will continue to hold such seminars and provide such informational services. [R4-22]

Furthermore, the Employee Professional Development Committee developed the Campus Grant Program and encouraged faculty and classified staff to apply from throughout the campus. Classified staff and faculty attended workshops for training and expertise in areas. Travel expenses to conferences were also covered. [R4-22]

Instructional Assistants and Augmentation Funds—the President/Superintendent brought the idea to the Academic Senate of using augmentation funds to keep IAs for several months. [R4-23]

### **Improvements in Communications**

The Communications Task Force (CTF) was formed in the Summer of 2012 with the purpose of examining the Fall 2011 Campus Climate Survey and evaluating the College's response to the results of the survey. The CTF examined factors identified through the 2011 survey, including: 1) the silo effect or lack of information and cooperation among groups 2) lack of participation, 3) lack of civility, respect and trust, 4) shared/participatory governance, 5) formalized feedback loops (institutionalized, transparent and documented processes), 6) campus community (lack of action or events that build community), 7) employee acknowledgement and 8) culture of evidence (reliance on hearsay rather than reliable information and data). [R4-24]

The CTF made six recommendations that the College has either completed or begun to institutionalize, including: 1) reinstating "All Staff Days", 2) encouraging participation in surveys, events, workshops and in-service days, 3) establishing a culture of quality, 4) developing a strategic communication plan, 5) adhering to a campus-wide evaluation policy, 6) requiring training for all shared governance committee leaders. [R4-24]

These recommendations directly address the concerns of the Evaluation Team and have provided concrete and realizable goals for the College to achieve. Most of the recommendations have either been accomplished or are being addressed:

1. The Flex Days/Convocations have been reestablished and saw very good levels of participation; [R4-16; R4-17; R4-18; R4-19; R4-20; R4-21]
2. The Campus Climate Survey has proven effective at identifying strengths and weaknesses on the campus and the Communications Day saw wide participation from all segments of the campus; [R4-16; R4-17; R4-18; R4-19; R4-20; R4-21]
3. The use of PRAISE reports for setting program and college budgeting

priorities is well established throughout the College, and SharePoint has become more commonly accepted and has become a focal point of shared information. All committee minutes, times of meetings, procedures and policies are now easily available to the whole campus. It does, however, need to be employed more consistently; [R4-25]

4. The administration has made efforts to employ more consistent evaluations, but still need to ensure consistency; [R4-27; R4-28; R4-29; R4-30;R4- 31]
5. Training for shared governance leaders in areas such as Distance Education has been employed but is not mandatory. [R4-32; R4-33]

The Academic Senate discussed many “informational only” items that were presented at many of their meetings. A few were: Definition of E-Lecture [R4-47], the Deputy Sector Navigator, Small Business, IE/Desert [R4-48], Curriculum Committee Minutes at most senate meetings. [R4-11; R4-12; R4-13; R4-14; R4-15]

The Police Chief undertook a process of informing and training faculty and staff in campus safety and security. The participation of faculty and staff on the committee was essential to developing a broader understanding of the issues and was also essential to undertaking campus-wide California Shakeout Exercise and the Active Shooter Drill. Both activities required extensive participation by the campus community and contributed to greater awareness of safety on campus. [R4-34]

The Chief Financial Officer involved the faculty in the ACCJC Recommendations regarding the budget process by appearing at the Academic Senate for a special presentation. He has continued to involve the campus in the budget process with the support of the Budget Committee. [R4-35]

### **Improved Transparency**

The administration has sustained a number of important practices that have greatly improved the transparency of decision making on campus.

When serving as Interim Vice-President, the Interim-President began sending Accreditation Updates, “Accreditation Live” [R4-36], to the campus in October 2011 to inform faculty and classified staff where the college was in the accreditation process and what tasks remained to be accomplished. At last count there were 27 Accreditation Updates. The Accreditation Updates have continued even as he was appointed Interim President. [R4-37]

The Interim President/Superintendent’s communications regarding the accreditation process have been well received by all the campus groups and have allowed staff and faculty to develop an understanding of the process. He also sent out dozens of e-mails as both interim Vice-President and as Interim President. The e-mails have been detailed and have allowed the campus to better appreciate the importance and urgency of the process. [R4-37]

The Academic Senate has started publishing the “Faculty Forum,” which is available on the College’s website [[R4-38](#)]

The Academic Senate has started the process of downloading all committee guidelines, by-laws and minutes to SharePoint [[R4-25](#)]

The Academic Senate is now posting all Executive Committee minutes on SharePoint, and general meetings provide time for public comments [[R4-11](#); [R4-12](#); [R4-13](#); [R4-14](#); [R4-15](#), [R4-25](#)]

Board of Trustees meetings may be viewed on streaming video [[R4-39](#)]

The Interim-President’s communications regarding the accreditation process have been well received by all the campus groups and have allowed staff and faculty to develop an understanding of the process. The College’s current Interim-President continued the practice he began as Interim-Vice President and sent out dozens of e-mails that have been detailed and have allowed the campus to better appreciate the importance and urgency of the process. [[R4-25](#)]

The use of PRAISE reports has become standardized for the College. Each program is required to submit a PRAISE report that summarizes their goals, challenges and particular needs. The composition of the PRAISE report is the responsibility of the individual programs, but it becomes the primary source for making resource allocations by the administration. All the individuals involved in the program are given equal voice and each hold a pivotal position in the assessment of the program. The PRAISE reports are posted on SharePoint and are available to the campus community. [[R4-25](#)]

The process of using PRAISE reports from each department has been implemented and refined. PRAISE reports are developed by each discipline and allow the administration to assess the personnel and resource needs of each department. The PRAISE reports allow the faculty within each discipline to provide an accurate picture of the programs and allow the administration to assess the needs in a more balanced manner. The PRAISE reports have enabled the College to follow better defined roles and implement shared governance in a concrete process. [[R4-25](#)]

The College has made significant strides in improving the informal practices that led to a climate of distrust. The perception on campus was that a small group was primarily involved in the governance of the college. [[R4-38](#)]

The Academic Senate has undertaken an extensive and sustained effort to increase participation on committees throughout the College. The Vice-President of the Academic Senate has enlisted faculty from throughout the campus to participate on Academic Senate



committees and has made participation open to all faculty, including part-time faculty. [[R4-42](#)]

The Academic Senate has started a Process and Efficiency Committee that includes several faculty and provides regular reports to the Academic Senate. [[R4-43](#)]

The Academic Senate has taken a lead role in ensuring the process of evaluating SLOs and PLOs is achieved in a professional and effective manner. Many workshops and informational seminars were and continue to be offered addressing SLOs and PLOs. The faculty have provided repeated workshops and Voluntary In-Service days to assist both faculty and department chairs as they learn how to conduct evaluations and how to use the evaluations to examine and develop courses and programs for students. [[R4-17](#); [R4-18](#); [R4-19](#); [R4-20](#); [R4-21](#)]

The campus came together to review and write a new Educational Master Plan. Even the process of writing this report has brought many new people from across the campus together in a single cause, which has brought a sense of how the campus works and how all constituents fit into its success. [[R4-16](#); [R4-17](#); [R4-18](#); [R4-19](#); [R4-20](#); [R4-21](#)]

### **Culture of Evidence**

A culture of evidence has become a significant part of the college and is constantly being refined and improved. The need to develop a culture of evidence addressed the problem that had developed with too many employees relying on hearsay and rumor to form their opinions about the processes of decision making.

The primary method of making evidence part of the culture of the college has involved the improvements in the use of PRAISE reports to set priorities for programs and for the college. The reports allow significant input from the programs into how they are evaluated. Posting the PRAISE reports on SharePoint allows evidence for decisions at the college-wide level to be examined more openly and transparently. [[R4-25](#)]

The use of SharePoint to post important documents for the entire campus has allowed information to be spread more widely. Faculty and staff can now access the documentation that is used for decision making and understand more the underlying factors involved in the decision. [[R4-25](#)]

The use of the Campus Climate Survey has proved to be a very useful tool for measuring campus climate in a more empirical manner. The surveys of 2010 and 2011 provided insight into the nature of the problems on the campus and also provided a means of addressing the problems. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness has already prepared to conduct the follow-up survey in Spring 2014. [[R4-44](#)]

The procedures for conducting and evaluating SLOs have been implemented far more effectively than previously. Programs now have timelines to ensure regular evaluation of

SLOs. The campus climate had been adversely affected when initial attempts were undertaken to collect and evaluate SLOs, but the college has effectively undertaken the effort to collect SLOs and connect them to PLOs and ILOs. Both full-time and part-time faculty participated in the effort. The improved climate resulted in a near complete assessment of the SLOs throughout the campus. During the process of collecting SLOs, the college has not only improved the general climate on campus, but has developed a climate of documentation and transparency. [R4-25]

The campus efforts to assess SLOs required broad participation and made it impossible that only a few individuals would be responsible for completing the task. Dozens of meetings were held within departments and within divisions with various faculty, both full-time and part-time, to ensure that SLOs were completed. Continual discussions and review are written into the procedures for SLO and PLOs. [R4-25]

### **How Response Meets Eligibility Requirements**

*ER 19—Mission. The institution systematically evaluates and makes public how well and in what way it is accomplishing its purposes, including assessment of student learning outcomes. The institution provides evidence of planning for improvement of institutional structures and processes, student achievement of educational goals, and student learning. The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding improvement through an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation.*

The College has faced this dynamic challenge with a more stable administration composed of personnel who have been at the College for decades and been promoted into higher management positions. The Dean of Student Services came up from within that division; the Dean of Humanities has been at that position for five years; the Dean of Career and Technical Education was promoted from Director of Nursing and has been at that position for more than a decade. The Dean of STEM was promoted from Night Manager of the Advanced Technology Building. The College has changed its President, but the managerial infrastructure and corresponding support structure have remained steady and consistent. As described above, the Vice President of Instruction has joined the College recently but brought with him considerable experience dealing with accreditation issues analogous to those the College faces. He has the added advantage of coming from another state, providing a fresh viewpoint.

The procedures for conducting and evaluating SLOs have been implemented far more effectively than previously. The campus climate had been adversely affected when initial attempts were undertaken to collect and evaluate SLOs, but the college has effectively undertaken the effort to collect SLOs and connect them to PLOs and ILOs. Both full-time and part-time faculty participated in the effort. The improved climate resulted in a near complete assessment of the SLOs throughout the campus. During the process of collecting SLOs, the college has not only improved the general climate on campus, but has developed

a climate of documentation.

The campus efforts to assess SLOs required broad participation and made it impossible that only a few individuals would be responsible for completing the task. Dozens of meetings were held within departments and within divisions with various faculty, both full-time and part-time, to ensure that SLOs were completed.

The process of using PRAISE reports from each department has been implemented and refined. PRAISE reports are developed by each discipline and allow the administration to assess the personnel and resource needs of each department. The PRAISE reports allow the faculty within each discipline to provide an accurate picture of the programs and allow the administration to assess the needs in a more balanced manner. The PRAISE reports have enabled us to follow better defined roles and implement shared governance in a concrete process.

### **How Response Meets Accreditation Standards**

*Standard IV: Leadership and Governance -- The institution recognizes and utilizes the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for continuous improvements of the institution. Governance roles are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and chief administrator.*

The college has developed a number of facilitator positions to ensure that a broader selection of faculty is involved in the daily operations of the college's disciplines and departments. These facilitator positions ensure that experts within each discipline have a greater level of participation in the administrative decision making regarding their disciplines.

The Academic Senate of VVC has undertaken a concerted effort to expand participation in college-wide committees. Many of the lists of participants were not current and needed updating. Many faculty also wanted opportunities to participate on certain committees and were not seeing opportunities to do so. The efforts of the President and Vice President in this have led to greater participation in the process of shared governance.

The college re-instituted Flex Day/Convocation activities on a voluntary basis and saw excellent participation. Flex Days had been discontinued due to negative assessments, but have been more successful recently.

The college has developed a culture of greater transparency through the processes of writing PRAISE reports and the assessment and evaluation of SLOs, PLOs and ILOs. The PRAISE reports were not the efforts of one department chair, but involved input from faculty throughout the departments, including part-time faculty. The process of assessing and evaluating SLOs, PLOs and ILOs has also involved the efforts of a diverse faculty. The results of these processes have been posted online at SharePoint where the entire VVC

community can follow what has been developed and accomplished and what still needs to be undertaken. The open sharing of the documentation from these processes has greatly contributed to transparency. The campus climate has greatly benefited from the transparency as a better level of trust has developed.

### **How Response Has Been Sustained**

The implementation of set processes of assessment in PRAISE reports has improved the college's methodology. These processes have been institutionalized for the last year, and procedures are in place to ensure that the culture of documentation has been institutionalized. This process is becoming part of the College's operational rhythms. It is a shared culture of transparency that has united all constituencies in an effort to maximize our institutional effectiveness. Such maximization has required transparent communication among classified staff, faculty and administration.

The PRAISE reports, SLO assessments, facilitator positions, wider committee participation, use of SharePoint for campus-wide communication and Flex Day and Communication Days activities have been conducted for several years and are now part of the campus culture and climate.

In addition to improvements in campus climate among members of the workforce, the College has extended its attention to campus climate by surveying students. Using both online and paper-pencil surveys, over 1500 students responded to Part 1 of the College's inaugural Student Campus Climate Survey during Fall 2013. A joint collaboration between the Associated Student Body (ASB) and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research (IER), preliminary results were presented to the ASB Council on February 21, 2014, and posted to the VVC Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard for District Goal 4 [R4-40]. IER staff will facilitate a review, discussion, and analysis of results with members of the ASB Council. Then findings will be distributed to the campus community, and the next phase of this project will commence: Assessing student perceptions of institutional effectiveness and academic life through focus groups and an online survey, pursuant to the conceptual model of Student Campus Climate established [R4-41].

### **How Response has Increased Institutional Effectiveness**

The broader impact of these institutional changes is assessed through the Campus Climate Surveys conducted in 2010 and 2011. These surveys are going to be conducted periodically, but not annually. The College has institutionalized a process of assessment of campus climate along with the processes for assessing SLOs and other college functions.

## **Conclusion**

This recommendation is resolved. The College has assessed Campus Climate from the perspective of employees and students, relies upon its well-established system of shared governance (Administrative Procedure 1201 [R4-49], and has held specific events to maintain ongoing communication across the campus. These efforts have contributed to

creating a culture of respect, civility, dialogue and trust and, more importantly, have established a sound, sustainable foundation for continued improvement.

## Implications for Action

The processes that have been put in place need to be continued, including the use of PRAISE reports for budgeting, the campus-wide assessment of SLOs, the broader participation on committees by faculty and staff, and the conducting of the Campus Climate Survey.

## List of Supporting Evidence

- R4-1. [Follow-Up Visit Report. April 24, 2012](#) , Page 8.
- R4-2. [Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, 6-11-2013](#) (6.2)
- R4-3. [Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, 5-14-2013](#),(11.0)
- R4-4. [Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, 9-10-2013](#),(11.2)
- R4-5. [College Council Minutes, 10-26-2011](#) item 4
- R4-6. [College Council Minutes 8-13-2012](#), item 2
- R4-7. [College Council Minutes 2-8-2012](#), item 4
- R4-8. [College Council Minutes 12-7-2011](#), item 9
- R4-9. [College Council Minutes 4-4-2012](#), Accreditation Update
- R4-10. [College Council Minutes 1-25-2012](#), item 5
- R4-11. [Academic Senate Minutes 11-1-2012](#), item 1.1 -4
- R4-12. [Academic Senate Minutes 5-2-2013](#),1.3-3
- R4-13. [Academic Senate Minutes 12-6-2012](#), item 1.2-3
- R4-14. [Academic Senate Minutes 12-6-2012](#) (2.1)
- R4-15. [Academic Senate Minutes 9-5-2013](#), 2.2
- R4-16. [Campus Communication Day Agenda 11-13-2012](#)
- R4-17. [Campus Communication Day Agenda 12-4-2012](#)
- R4-18. [Campus Communication Day Agenda 2-25-2013](#)
- R4-19. [Campus Communication Day Agenda 04-25-2013](#)
- R4-20. [Campus Communication Day Agenda 5-21-2013](#)
- R4-21. [Campus Communication Day Survey](#)
- R4-22. [Committee Charge](#)
- R4-23. [Academic Senate Meeting Minutes 4-4-2012](#)
- R4-24. [2012 Communications Task Force Key Findings](#)
- R4-25. [Program Review Minutes 8-31-2012](#)
- R4-26. [College Mission Statement](#)
- R4-27. [Confidential-Eval-Process-and-Form-FILLABLE.pdf](#)
- R4-28. [Adjunct Faculty Evaluation Procedures](#)
- R4-29. [Full-time Faculty Evaluation Procedure](#)
- R4-30. [Classified Staff Evaluation Form](#)
- R4-31. [Management Evaluations Process](#)
- R4-32. [Distance Education Plan](#)
- R4-33. [Funded Distance Education Plan](#)

- R4-34. [Academic Senate Minutes 11-14-2013](#)
- R4-35. [Academic Senate Minutes 10-3-2013](#)
- R4-36. [College Council Minutes 5-8-2013](#)
- R4-37. [Accreditation Update](#)
- R4-38. [Faculty Forum 6-2013](#)
- R4-39. [Board-of Trustee-Board-Meeting](#)
- R4-40. [2014-SCCS ONE WORD WORDLE](#)
- R4-41. [2014-Student Campus Climate-Survey](#)
- R4-42. [Call for committee members ASM 3-7-2013, item 3.2](#)
- R4-43. [ASM 5-11-2013](#)
- R4-44. [Preliminary IER work on Campus Climate Survey 2014](#)
- R4-45. [Fall Convocation Narrative](#)
- R4-46. [Spring In-Service Day Narrative](#)
- R4-47. [E-lecture definition](#)
- R4-48. [ASM, 11-14-2013, second bullet on “Special Presentations”](#)
- R4-49. [Administrative Procedure 1201 \(Shared Governance Structure\)](#)

## **Team Recommendation 5: Distance Education**

*In order to meet the Standards, the College should examine and provide evidence that appropriate leadership ensures the accessibility, quality and eligibility of online and hybrid courses and programs and that such programs demonstrate that all services, regardless of location or means of delivery, support student learning and enhance achievement of the mission of the institution. (II.A, II.B, IV.A.1)*

### **Institutional Response to Recommendation**

#### **Description of Institutional Response**

By September 2011, a Distance Education (DE) Coordinator and DE Facilitator were approved by College administration, under the Vice President of Instruction. This formalized these two positions, assigned specific authority and responsibility for DE supervision and leadership. This confirmation of DE leadership enabled action on DE Plan goals to commence, resulting in completion of many of the initial goals in the 2012 DE Plan, and coordinate information with the Technology Master Plan. This confirmation of DE leadership reflects and supports the importance of the DE Program: according to the College Educational Master Plan (EMP), in 2011 11.4% (530) of full-time equivalent students (FTEs) had enrolled in DE courses (p.33). At the same time, 20.7% of the college's credit sections were offered as online or hybrid classes. To ensure authentic discussion of DE, courses will take place on the discipline and department level, the Student Learning Outcome (SLO) Dialogue Template has been included in comprehensive Program Reviews, beginning Fall 2013 with Track "A" Programs. This template will enable faculty to use program review and assessment data for the purpose of dialogue about low success rates in DE classes and plans for future improvement. [[R5-1](#); [R5-2](#); [R5-5](#); [R5-6](#); [R5-58](#)]

Under the guidance of the DE Coordinator, who is responsible for providing leadership in DE accessibility and copyright compliance, several DE accessibility workshops have been scheduled so all DE courses are accessible for students with disabilities. In Spring 2014, a DE class quality rubric with detailed accessibility guidelines will be presented by the DEAC to the Academic Senate for review and approval. [[R5-27](#); [R5-33](#); [R5-34](#); [R5-33](#)]

The College has emphasized the importance of quality in DE courses, specifically in faculty readiness training and professional development opportunities for faculty who currently teach DE courses, as well as faculty interested in developing DE courses. Workshops in DE address both pedagogy and technical components of DE, using the College-approved Blackboard learning management system. In addition to workshops created and presented by the Blackboard support team, @One, a group based at Mt. San Jacinto College (MSJC), has presented workshops in Fall 2012, Spring 2013, and Fall 2013. In addition, College faculty and others involved with DE have a "standing invitation" to attend the semi-annual MSJC DE Academies. These activities have resulted in increased consistency and quality of the College's DE Program. In addition, these activities assist in expanding the College's DE program, alert the College community to new requirements and standards for DE, and



provide a conduit for maintaining quality in DE courses. [[[R5-24](#); [R5-25](#); [R5-26](#); [R5-27](#); [R5-28](#); [R5-29](#); [R5-30](#); [R5-31](#); [R5-32](#); [R5-33](#); [R5-34](#); [R5-35](#); [R5-33](#); [R5-37](#); [R5-38](#); [R5-39](#); [R5-40](#); [R5-51](#)]

The Substantive Change Proposal for the DE Program was approved by the ACCJC Committee on Substantive Change at its 11/15/12 meeting. [[R5-12](#); [R5-13](#)]

Since the confirmation of DE leadership (Coordinator and Facilitator), the implementation of the DE Plan 2012, the workshops noted above, there has been improvement of coordinating the DE Program in terms of vision, leadership, support personnel, learning management platform, scheduling, and consistency of the DE Program and DE courses.

### **How Response Meets Eligibility Requirements**

*ER 8-Educational Programs: The institution's principal degree programs are congruent with its mission, are based on recognized higher education field(s) of study, are of sufficient content and length, are conducted at levels of quality and rigor appropriate to the degrees offered, and culminate in identified student outcomes. At least one degree program must be of two academic years in length.*

All College courses taught online have faculty-generated and Curriculum Committee approved Course Outlines of Record (CORs) with specifics to DE courses, including requirements for regular effective contact, as part of the COR and subject to separate review and approval by the Committee. [[R5-22](#)]

The College DE Program meets ER-8, and is congruent with the College's mission, goals, and EMP, and is a vital part of the College's commitment to student learning and student success. [[R5-45](#)]

### **How Response Meets Accreditation Standards**

*Standard II.A: The institution offers high-quality instructional programs in recognized and emerging fields of study that culminate in identified student outcomes leading to degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education institutions or programs consistent with its mission. Instructional programs are systematically assessed in order to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and achieve stated student learning outcomes. The provisions of this Standard are broadly applicable to all instructional activities offered in the name of the institution.*

*Standard II.B: The institution assures the quality and improvement of all instructional courses and programs offered in the name of the institution, including collegiate, developmental, and pre-collegiate courses and programs, continuing and community education, study abroad, short-term training courses and programs, programs for international students, and contract or other special programs, regardless of type of credit awarded, delivery mode, or location.*

*Standard IV.A.1: Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. They encourage staff, faculty, administrators, and student no matter what their official titles, to take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation.*

*Standard IIA1a: The institution identifies and seeks to meet the varied educational needs of its students through programs consistent with their educational preparation and the diversity, demographics, and economy of its communities. The institution relies upon research and analysis to identify student learning needs and to assess progress toward achieving stated learning outcomes.*

The institution identifies and seeks to meet the varied educational needs of its students through programs consistent with their educational preparation and the diversity, demographics, and economy of its communities. The institution relies upon research and analysis to identify student learning needs and to assess progress toward achieving stated learning outcomes.

With the ACCJC approval of the College's SCP, the College fulfilled the Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education: "Institutions are expected to provide the commission advance notice of the intent to offer program, degree, or certification in which 50% or more of the courses are via distance education..." [[R5-12](#); [R5-13](#)]

All College courses have SLOs in the CORs, and those SLOs are used for both face-to-face courses and DE courses. [[R5-54](#)]

All College SLOs are assessed, regardless of mode of delivery, according to each program's/discipline's six-year SLO action plan. [[R5-47](#)]

All College CORs, regardless of mode of delivery, are required by AP 4000 to be reviewed, updated, and approved at least once every six years. [[R5-53](#)]

All current College DE faculty have the opportunity for ongoing training in DE pedagogy and technical skills necessary to conduct successful DE courses; individual training is available on request from the Blackboard Support Team. [[R5-26](#); [R5-29](#); [R5-32](#); [R5-34](#); [R5-36](#); [R5-38](#); [R5-40](#)]

Standard IIA2d: A comprehensive Distance Education Plan for the College was developed by the DEATF and approved by College Council March 7, 2012, and the Academic Senate September 6, 2012. [[R 5-1](#); [R5-44](#); [R5-45](#)] This plan defined standards of quality for the coordination, support, design, and delivery of the college's DE courses and programs. In addition, the plan defined five improvement goals for DE at the College for which detailed actions plans were developed. Following approval of the plan, implementation of these actions plans has included the following improvements:

1. DE Management and Coordination:

- The current Dean of STEM has been formally recognized as the college's DE Coordinator, and the Faculty DE Facilitator position has been awarded a stipend equal to 60% reassigned time. The Coordinator reports to the Executive Vice President for Instruction and Student Services and is responsible for ensuring compliance with standards and regulations, recordkeeping, reporting, supervising the Blackboard Support Team, and managing the budget. The Facilitator chairs the DEAC and is responsible for providing leadership in DE planning, professional development, course and program development. The Coordinator, Facilitator, and DEAC are jointly responsible for evaluating and improving the DE program.

2. Standards for Campus and Student Services Support for DE:

- The College has a readiness questionnaire online for students who are considering taking DE courses. Students are also provided with information on DE via the "Successful Student" workshop conducted by Counseling. The College Blackboard support team is in the process of writing/designing an online course/orientation for students as an introduction to online courses. [[R5-23](#); [R5-50](#)]
- Each DE student's Blackboard Homepage includes a link to over fifty Quick Tutorials and Getting Started Guides. [[R5-50](#)]
- The Online Classes @VVC Webpage provides a number of useful student resources, including the following: Frequently Asked Questions, a Student Self-Assessment survey, a Browser Check, Blackboard Login Instructions, and contact information for the student Help Desk. [[R5-50](#)]
- Improvements in DE technical support include transferring supervision of the support staff from IT to Instruction, the addition of a support staff member to assist faculty with instructional design, and implementation of a policy for Blackboard course copying and availability. [[R5-1](#); [R5-51](#)]
- The DEAC and the Blackboard Support Team have collaborated on developing and implementing a form for Online Blackboard Support faculty requests for team assistance, including course copying, technical issue reporting, and training requests. [[R5-51](#)]
- On the College's Blackboard website, under 'Faculty Resources', faculty support documents are posted, including End of Semester Checklist, Course Availability instructions, and information about accessibility of copyright requirements. [[R5-41](#); [R5-47](#); [R5-51](#)]

3. Standards for expansion and quality:

- Following completion of a curriculum audit that identified 23 degrees and 32

certificates offered at the College for which 50% of more of the courses are offered via DE, the DEAC completed a DE substantive change proposal for the college that was approved by the ACCJC Substantive Change Committee on 11/15/12. [[R5-12](#); [R5-13](#)]

- The DE Program has developed practices and procedures to support student integrity, including Senate recommendation of the WCET Best Practice Strategies to Promote Academic Integrity in Online Education, adopting a DE student authentication and integrity policy, and publication of district policies regarding cheating, plagiarism, and financial aid. [[R5-46](#)]
- Senate approval of a policy and accompanying syllabus language for Regular and Effective Contact. [[R5-18](#)]
- Senate review and adoption of definitions and practices regarding “No Show, Last Day of Attendance, Academic Engagement.” [[R5-20](#)]
- Development for Senate review and approval of a DE Class Quality rubric to use by faculty to evaluate and improve the effectiveness and compliance of the DE classes that they teach. [[R5-55](#)]

#### 4. Faculty Training:

- The College Distance Education Academies presented by @One were held on campus on the following dates: 10/19/12, 3/22/13, 11/8/13. Training was offered during these well-attended events on the following topics: quality, accessibility, online rubrics, innovation in online education, effective practices, student success and retention, interactive lectures, and utilizing video in DE courses. [[R5-24](#); [R5-25](#); [R5-26](#); [R5-27](#); [R5-28](#); [R5-29](#); [R5-30](#); [R5-31](#); [R5-32](#)]
- The Bb Support Team offered eight mini training sessions during Summer 2013 and a series of six workshops during Fall 2013. [[R5-33](#); [R5-34](#); [R5-35](#); [R5-36](#)]
- College faculty have received an open invitation to attend at no cost the semi-annual MSJC Academies beginning with the Summer 2012 event. [[R5-7](#)]
- The DEAC developed certification standards for new DE instructors at the college and forwarded the proposal to the Academic Senate for review and approval. [[R5-17](#)]

#### 5. DE evaluation and improvement:

- The college’s Institutional Research Office provided extensive support for the preparation of VVC’s DE Plan and Substantive Change Proposal for DE. The DEAC has requested ongoing research support for DE evaluation and improvement, including comparative DE/F2F student retention and success, enrollment, courses

and sections offered, FTES generated and student characteristics.

- Additional data on DE at VVC was made available for the purpose of evaluation and improvement through the college's participation in the CCC\_Distance\_Education\_Student\_Satisfaction\_Survey\_Fall\_2012 and ECAR Study of Undergraduate Students and Technology 2013. [[R5-38](#); [R5-39](#)]
- At the request of the DEAC, program review data provided for each discipline now includes separate DE and F2F data, making possible comparable analysis for the purpose of program evaluation. [[R5-48](#); [R5-58](#)]
- AP 1202 Implementing Institutional Effectiveness was revised to include a review of Program Review reports and Annual Updates by the DEC for the purpose of evaluating DE effectiveness and recommending planning priorities. [[R5-4](#)]
- In Spring 2014, the DE Coordinator, in conjunction with the DE Facilitator and DEAC, have prepared the first Program Review, Allocation, and Institutional Strategies for Excellence (PRAISE) for DE, which will create a separate budget for the College's DE Program. The dedicated budget will enable the College's DE Program to fund essential elements of the DE Plan. [[R5-60](#)]

Standard IV.A.1: As noted above, the College's leaders actively support and empower the DE Program: DE course development, improvement, quality, and sustainability are demonstrated by DE leadership's participation in established governance structures, such as College Council, through the Dean of STEM/DE Coordinator.

Demonstrable evidence of College leadership support of the DE Program:

- DE Coordinator position formalized [[R5-2](#)]
- DE Facilitator position formalized [[R5-1](#)]
- DE Plan approved in College governance structure [[R5-44](#); [R5-45](#)]
- DE workshops – continuous, both in-house and guest speakers [[R5-24](#); [R5-25](#); [R5-26](#); [R5-27](#); [R5-28](#); [R5-29](#); [R5-30](#); [R5-31](#); [R5-32](#); [R5-33](#); [R5-34](#); [R5-35](#); [R5-36](#); [R5-37](#); [R5-38](#); [R5-39](#); [R5-40](#); [R5-51](#)]
- DE Program supported by leadership [[R5-48](#)]

### **How Response Has Been Sustained**

Currently, the DEAC is updating and revising the 2012 DE Plan. New goals will replace goals completed in the 2012 DE Plan. This task will be completed Spring 2014 for Fall 2014 implementation.

Training workshops and events scheduled for Spring 2014, including the Spring 2014 Convocation and the Spring 2014 Distance Education Academy, presented by @One. The

Blackboard Support Team also publishes a newsletter to promote and sustain best practices in DE at the College [[R5-51](#); [R5-55](#); [R5-56](#); [R5-57](#)]

### **How Response has Increased Institutional Effectiveness**

The College DE Plan will provide consistency for faculty and the College as a whole in sustaining an expanding DE Program. There are continuous training, workshops and other professional development activities for faculty, classified and management in DE pedagogy and technical skill.

- Participant evaluation surveys from VVC's DE Academies.
- The VVC Scorecard contains data relevant to contributing to institutional effectiveness. [[R8-19](#)]
- CCC\_Distance\_Education\_Student\_Satisfaction\_Survey\_Fall\_2012 [[R5-38](#)]
- ECAR Study of Undergraduate Students and Technology 2013 [[R5-39](#)]
- Program Review data on student performance. [[R5-58](#)]

### **Conclusion**

The College has fully resolved this recommendation through its provision of leadership that ensures the accessibility, quality, and eligibility of its distance education program. All services, regardless of location or means of delivery, support student learning and enhance achievement of the College's mission.

### **Implications for Action**

To continue the sustainability, quality and vitality of the College's DE Program, the following needs to be accomplished:

- Develop procedures manuals for DE Faculty and Bb Support.
- Ongoing Accessibility training and monitoring.
- Continue to work toward a District-wide student email system to improve communication efficiency and support student access to online courses and information
- Clarify and formalize status, authority, and responsibilities of DEAC and DEC.
- Complete DE plan revision.
- Work with the Office of Institutional Research to supply with DE data on a regular basis.

- Work with Instructional Program Review Committee (IPRC) to revise PR Templates to include comment on DE performance.
- Initiate the practice of compiling an Annual Report on DE activity, in compliance with the requirements of Title 5, Section 55210.
- Develop faculty and student evaluation instruments for technical support, class design, and coordination.
- Organize and expand the College's DE homepage.
- As per Standards II.A.2.d and IV.A, creation and implementation of a separate DE budget; currently, the DE budget is part of the VPI/SS budget.

### **List of Supporting Evidence**

- R5-01 [Distance Education Plan 2012](#)
- R5-02 [DE Coordinator Confirmation E-mail](#)
- R5-03 [AP 1201 Shared Governance](#)
- R5-04 [AP 1202 Implementing Institutional Effectiveness](#)
- R5-05 [Technology Master Plan 2012](#)
- R5-06 [Educational Master Plan \(EMP\)](#)
- R5-07 [MSJC DE Academy e-mail](#)
- R5-08 [Curriculum Course Definitions](#)
- R5-09 [Academic Senate Committees: Distance Education Committee](#)
- R5-10 [Academic Senate DE Committee SharePoint Site](#)
- R5-11 [Distance Education Advisory Committee - SharePoint](#)
- R5-12 [Substantive Change Proposal \(SCP\)](#)
- R5-13 [ACCJC Letter for DE SCP](#)
- R5-14 ["Online Student Readiness Survey"](#)
- R5-15 [Dialogue-Template- SLOAC-Program-Review](#)
- R5-16 [Online Proctoring Policy](#)
- R5-17 [1<sup>st</sup> Reading "VVC Distance Education Faculty Certification Requirements"](#)
- R5-18 [Regular Effective Contact for Distance Education Courses](#)
- R5-19 [VVC Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard](#)
- R5-20 ["No Show, Last Day of Attendance, Academic Engagement"](#)
- R5-21 [Syllabus Template Language for Distance Education Classes](#)
- R5-22 [Curriculum-Committee-Minutes03-28-2013 -DE page-in-CurricUnet](#)



- R5-23 [Student-DE-Orientation-Welcome-to-the-Successful-Student-Workshop](#)
- R5-24 [DE Academy Fall 2012 Workshop Flyer](#)
- R5-25 [DE Academy Fall 2012 Schedule](#)
- R5-26 [DE-Academy-Participant-List-Fall-2012](#)
- R5-27 [DE Academy Fall 2013 Workshop Flyer](#)
- R5-28 [DE Academy Fall 2013 Schedule](#)
- R5-29 [DE Academy Participant List Fall 2013](#)
- R5-30 [DE-Academy-Spring-2013-Workshop-Flyer](#)
- R5-31 [DE Academy Spring 2013 Schedule](#)
- R5-32 [DE Academy Participant List Spring 2013](#)
- R5-33 [Participant-List-for-Summer-and-Fall-2013-BB-Support-Mini-Workshops](#)
- R5-34 [Summer-and-Fall-2013-Blackboard-Support-Team-Mini-Workshops](#)
- R5-35 [Accessibility Session November 27, 2013](#)
- R5-36 [@One Evaluation Surveys Fall 2012](#)
- R5-37 [Senate Distance Education Committee Handbook \(Draft\)](#)
- R5-38 [CCC Distance Education Student Satisfaction Survey Fall 2012](#)
- R5-39 [ECAR Study of Undergraduate Students and Technology 2013](#)
- R5-40 [E-Lecture Definition](#)
- R5-41 [End of Semester DE Checklist](#)
- R5-42 [BP 1200 \(Mission and Goals\)](#)
- R5-43 [Example of Six-Year SLO Assessment Plan](#)
- R5-44 [College Council Minutes, March 7, 2012](#)
- R5-45 [Academic Senate Minutes, September 6, 2012](#)
- R5-46 [Draft Authentication Policy](#)
- R5-47 [Draft: VVC Blackboard Class Availability Policy](#)
- R5-48 [DE Institutional Data 2010-2012](#)
- R5-49 [VVC Academic Senate Meeting Agenda 2-6-14](#)
- R5-50 [Blackboard Entry Page](#)
- R5-51 [Blackboard Faculty Resource page](#)
- R5-52 [Office of Institutional Effectiveness Reports Page: DE](#)
- R5-53 [AP 4000](#)
- R5-54 [REC page in CurricUNET](#)
- R5-55 [DE Quality Checklist](#)
- R5-56 [Spring 2014 Convocation Report](#)
- R5-57 [Spring 2014 @One DE Workshop](#)
- R5-58 [DE and Face to Face Comparison](#)
- R5-59 [@One Evaluation Surveys Fall 2013](#)
- R5-60 [DE PRAISE Report Spring 2014](#)
- R5-61 [Blackboard Support Team Newsletter January 2014](#)
- R5-62 [Blackboard Support Team Newsletter March 2014](#)

## **Team Recommendation 6: Long-Term Fiscal Plans**

*In order to meet the Standards, the College should develop long-term fiscal plans that support student learning programs and services that will not rely on using unrestricted reserves to cover deficits. Additionally, the College should provide timely, accurate and comprehensive financial data and budget projections for review and discussion throughout the institution. (III.D, III.D.1.a, III.D.1.c, III.D.2.b, III.D.2.c, Eligibility Requirement 17)*

### **Institutional Response to Recommendation**

#### **Description of Institutional Response**

In order to meet the Standards, the College should develop long-term fiscal plans that support student learning programs and services that will not rely on using unrestricted reserves to cover deficits. Additionally, the College should provide timely, accurate and comprehensive financial data and budget projections for review and discussion throughout the institution. (III.D, III.D.1.a, III.D.1.c, III.D.2.b, III.D.2.c, Eligibility Requirement 17)

#### **Conclusions from Team Report, 11/7/2012**

*“The Board of Trustees, Superintendent/President and college staff understands (sic) the importance of fixing the structural unrestricted budget deficit. The College entered into an agreement with FCMAT to help identify a fiscal plan to correct the long term deficit position, but at the time of the visit, the plan was not complete. The college did negotiate medical benefit cost reductions and will fund the Other Post-Employment Benefits liability so future years will be funded by interest earnings.”*

#### **Response Letter from ACCJC, 2/11/2013**

*“The College has provided timely, accurate, and comprehensive financial data and budget projections for review and discussion throughout the institution, but implementation of a plan to correct the long-term structural budget deficit has not been accomplished and is vital to the long-term health of the college; results of the FCMAT team will enable the College to develop and implement this plan.”*

The College has made great strides in terms of embarking on a sustainable path towards achieving a comprehensive plan that will correct the long term-term structural budget deficit. As will be shown in the Special Report for Recommendation 6, the College has been engaged in discussions with College stakeholders throughout the institution about the long-term imperative to have a balanced budget whereby revenues equal expenses at the end of each fiscal year. As noted by the College in its Follow-Up Report 3, fiscal resources at the College are constrained by appreciable decline in public funding sources. Nonetheless, the College has exercised a constant and disciplined effort to both cut and contain overall expenditures under these very severe financial circumstances. The College has always maintained a balanced budget with required reserves.

As other California community colleges were turning away students and cutting critical programs, the College weathered the financial storm while maintaining programs and service levels to meet student needs. Several indicators support the College's continuing fiscal stability, some of which are reported on the College Scorecard [R6-1]:

- Maintained enrollment target for a mid-sized college and the minimum full-time faculty obligation, despite losing full-time faculty to retirement.
- Online technologies have been leveraged to accommodate student access to support services without expanding the budget.
- Scheduling efficiencies (high, stable fill rates) have been achieved with no negative impact on student achievement.
- Many cost saving strategies have been implemented to reduce annual operating costs—an important component of the College's Long Range Financial Strategies and Action Plans (described in detail below [R6-2]).

As indicated on the team report and response letter, a Fiscal Review was completed on April 3, 2013 by the Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team (FCMAT). The report was distributed to the campus community and made available to the public from the [College website](#).

The Finance, Budget and Planning Committee (FBPC) charged its members with reading the report in preparation for discussion at its regularly scheduled committee meetings on May 1 and 15, 2013 [R6-3], for the purpose of developing and submitting its formal recommendations to the Superintendent/President—recommendations that provide some key strategies in the District's long-term fiscal plan. The recommendations approved by the FBPC on June 5, 2013 and formally submitted to the College Council and Executive Cabinet are as follows:

*After due consideration of the Fiscal Review dated April 3, 2013 conducted by the Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team (FCMAT), members of the Finance, Budget and Planning Committee hereby make the following recommendations to the Superintendent/President:*

1. *It is recommended that the Board of Trustees reconsider Board Policy 6320, Investments, in light of the FCMAT recommendation to determine whether current language meets district needs—to wit "The investment program must remain sufficiently flexible to permit the district to meet all operating requirements."*
2. *It is recommended that the District negotiate salary caps for all employees.*
3. *It is recommended that the District negotiate benefit caps for all employees.*
4. *It is recommended that the District develop and implement a long-term Faculty and Staff Hiring Plan to guide future new hires consistent with the College Educational Master Plan for 2012 and beyond.*

5. *It is recommended that the District's collective bargaining team representing administration include a representative from the budget or fiscal services offices to ensure that financial analyses of proposals at the table are conducted and discussed before an agreement is reached.*

Due to the absence of important constituency groups at the June 12, 2013 College Council meeting [R6-4], these recommendations were postponed for further discussion at the next meeting on September 11, 2013. At that meeting, the recommendations were forwarded to Executive Cabinet with commentary [R6-5]. Of particular concern among constituency groups represented were recommendations regarding salary and benefit caps. The FBPC recommendations *in toto* were subsequently approved by Executive Cabinet. Based on those recommendations, the FBPC continued its work on a long range plan for District finances [R6-2]. The FBPC identified a work group that developed strategies and the action plans, taking into account much of the work completed over recent years that has addressed deficit spending with reductions in expenditures across campus.

The College's long range planning document is currently being vetted. Included in that plan are 5 strategies:

- Strategy 1 – Cost Saving Measures
- Strategy 2 - Realigning District Investment Policy
- Strategy 3 – Mitigating District Structural Budget Deficit
- Strategy 4 – Developing a Human Resources Plan
- Strategy 5 – Sustaining Sound Financial Practices

Each strategy includes specific objectives and actions to be taken to meet those objectives. Once agreement is reached on planning objectives through established shared governance channels, specific metrics will be developed in order to monitor and report on the College's progress.

While the College's long-range planning document specifies its key strategies for addressing its future fiscal stability, several areas of progress should be noted relative to the College's response to FCMAT recommendations:

- Based on evaluation of last year's process, this year's Program Review Allocations and Institutional Strategies for Excellence (PRAISE) cycle was refined through use of a detailed rubric for evaluating the augmentation requests prioritized for each of 5 divisions: Executive, Instruction, Student Services, Human Resources, and Administrative Services.
- The District negotiating teams have eliminated the Point of Services (POS) option of the health and welfare benefits.
- The District has agreed to an "opt out" for employees with other health insurance coverage, thereby minimizing costs.

- The District has included the VP of Administrative Service on its negotiation team to ensure analysis of fiscal impact is conducted on items being negotiated.
- The District has adopted a revised management salary schedule, which reduces the entry level range in order to minimize costs of future hires.
- The College will consider all FCMAT recommendations—for example: summer pay for faculty; maximum/minimum class size and their costs; numbers of elective courses; 75/25 compliance; section caps for adjunct faculty; full-time faculty hires; voluntary “stacking” of classes in certain appropriate disciplines; retiree health benefits re-enrollment plan; budget alignment with payroll activity; salary ranges for classified staff; costs of longevity.

In addition to progress on documenting the College’s Long Range Financial Strategies and Action Plans, and as positively noted by the Commissioners in their February 11, 2013 Action Letter, the College continues to provide timely, accurate and comprehensive financial data and budget projections for review and discussion throughout the institution. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- The Vice President of Administrative Services presents budget workshops before the Board of Trustees on a regular basis. [\[R6-6\]](#)
- College Council meetings have robust discussions regarding budget matters and reports from the Finance, Budget and Planning Committee. [\[R6-7\]](#)
- The Fall 2013 Convocation had several in-depth budget discussions. [\[R6-8\]](#)
- The bi-monthly Finance, Budget and Planning Committee regularly discusses the College budget and related issues. [\[R6-3\]](#)
- The Academic Senate has regular reports on the College budget and related issues at the monthly general meetings. [\[R6-9\]](#) [\[R6-10\]](#)
- The College President posts the institution’s budget message on the Fiscal Services page of the College website [\[or watch video here\]](#). Included are the college’s CCFS-311 reports, audit reports, and links to pertinent financial information, and budget statements. [\[R6-11\]](#)
- Instructional and Non-Instructional Program Reviews include budget needs which are prioritized and considered based on Administrative Procedure 1202 [\[R6-12\]](#) and Administrative Procedure 6200 [\[R6-13\]](#).

## Conclusion

This recommendation is resolved. The College has developed its Long Range Financial Strategies and Action Plans consistent with recommendations by FCMAT in its Fiscal Review Report dated April 3, 2013. Several key strategies have been implemented, with the remaining strategies to be implemented at various times throughout this academic year. The plan considers multiple approaches of ensuring the College’s future fiscal stability—from cost saving measures, to evaluating and updating board policies and administrative

procedures, to creating and monitoring its plans using established structures and work systems. In this way, the College strengthens the organizational foundation upon which practices and operations are conducted. More detailed explanation and examples of this recommendation may be found in Follow-Up Report #4.

## **Implications for Action**

The College will implement its Long Range Financial Strategies and Action Plans, pursuant to the plan proposed by the Superintendent/President in an email to the campus community on February 28, 2014 [R6-14]. More detailed explanation and examples of this recommendation may be found in Follow-Up Report #4.

## **List of Supporting Evidence**

- R6-1. [College Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard – Fiscal Stability](#)
- R6-2. [Long-Range Financial Strategies and Action Plans](#)
- R6-3. [Finance, Budget, and Planning Committee Agenda and Minutes](#)
- R6-4. [College Council Minutes, June 12, 2013](#)
- R6-5. [College Council Minutes, September 11, 2013](#)
- R6-6. [2013-14 Budget Workshop Presentation](#)
- R6-7. [College Council Agenda and Minutes](#)
- R6-8. [2013 Fall Convocation Report](#)
- R6-9. [College Academic Senate Newsletters and Board Reports](#)
- R6-10. [College Academic Senate Minutes](#)
- R6-11. [Budget Information on the College Website](#)
- R6-12. [Administrative Procedure 1202 \(Implementing Institutional Effectiveness\)](#)
- R6-13. [Administrative Procedure 6200 \(Budget Development\)](#)
- R6-14. [Plan for Resolving Budget Deficit, February 28, 2014](#)

## **Team Recommendation 7: Leadership and Participation in Governance**

*In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the College build and maintain a system for effective, stable and sustainable leadership, to include:*

- *Creating a process for succession planning in order to avoid gaps in leadership.*
- *Assisting all employees and students to grow professionally by developing their leadership skills and encouraging their participation in governance groups.*
- *Addressing leadership needs in the key campus areas of student services and distance learning. (IV.A, IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.2.b, IV.A.3, IV.A.5, IV.B.1, IV.B.1.j, IV.B.2, IV.B.2.a)*

### **Institutional Response to Recommendation**

#### **Description of Institutional Response**

##### **Succession Planning and Leadership Skills:**

Since the last comprehensive visit by the Commission in 2011, the College has multiplied its effort to strengthen its succession planning efforts. The Board of Trustees (BOT) reviewed succession planning, and began discussions of the issue of effective organizational planning. Board Policy 2431 [\[R7-1\]](#) and Board Policy 2432 [\[R7-2\]](#) addresses the selection and succession of leadership in the event of Superintendent/President temporary or permanent absences. These policies are consistent with the process and requirement to maintain a stable platform for leadership within the district by the California Education Code, Section 70902(d) and California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Section 53021(b). Further, in June of 2012, the BOT convened a workshop [\[R7-3\]](#)--hosted by an outside consultant--in which a discussion of responsibilities towards teamwork and leadership succession took place.

The Vice President of Human Resources surveyed colleges statewide to get samples of succession planning activities, and the results indicated that such activities were mostly confined to leadership development [\[R7-4\]](#). As a result, the college has continued to invest resources and attention to the college's need to have *qualified* candidates to replace planned and unplanned losses of key leaders.

To support succession planning, data collected by the college indicate that the VVC has been very successful in terms of the percentage of executive level vacancies that are actually filled with an internal promotion versus an external hire. The Director of Maintenance and Operations, the College's acting Superintendent/President, the Dean of Student Services, the Dean of STEM, and the Director of Admissions and Records were all internal hires. Indeed, not all these leaders had completed succession planning, but these



numbers show that the College is doing well in promoting from within and tapping into the internal leadership pool.

Within the ranks of faculty, many full and part-time instructors serve dual roles in managing their respective programs to ensure continuity, communication, transparency and the promotion of leadership, while maintaining instructional obligations in the classrooms and labs. Additionally, some faculty maintain industry-specific accreditation standards that are required of their programs, such as Respiratory Care (Commission on Accreditation of Respiratory Care Programs - CoARC), Fire Technology (State Fire Training /State Fire Marshal – SFT/SFM) and Emergency Medical Services (Committee on Accreditation of Educational Programs for Emergency Medical Services Professions – CoAEMSP). Within the past 10 years, at least two faculty serving in these programs have earned advanced degrees in leadership while employed at the college and now serve in leadership roles for their respective programs and departments.

To insure the College's future continuity and performance, VVC has been providing ongoing training to help employees develop personally and professionally, and the college has established goals in order to track progress. An example of this process is exemplified in the Upward Mobility Program for classified staff [R7-5] [R7-6] in which assistance is offered to promote the achievement of career goals – to include college coursework towards advanced degrees, mentoring and cross-training. Additionally, the college continues to provide Management Training Programs that will help middle managers acquire fundamental leadership skills that are central to successful leadership. [R7-7] [R7-8] [R7-9][R7-10] [R7-11].

Lastly, the college has continued to host staff development opportunities for all groups towards the advancement of teamwork and collegiality. While some of these opportunities promote leadership development, other activities encourage teamwork and participation in the college community. [R7-12] [R7-13] [R7-46].

#### **Effective Participation in Shared Governance:**

Administrative Policy (AP) 1201 [R7-14] outlines the active shared governance committees and their membership rosters, encompassing all constituency groups. The district maintains easily accessible webpages for internal and external viewing of documents associated with committee activity. Since 2011, active committees have begun storing agendas, minutes, membership lists and related documents on SharePoint.

- Diversity Committee [R7-15]
- Environmental Health & Safety Committee [R7-16]
- Facilities Committee [R7-17]
- Finance, Budget & Planning Committee [R7-18]

- Employee Professional Development Committee (formerly Staff Development) [[R7-19](#)]
- Student Success & Support Committee (formerly Student Success) [[R7-20](#)]
- Technology Committee [[R7-21](#)]

Additionally, Administrative Procedure 1201 [[R7-14](#)] specifies information flow from shared governance committees to College Council and, ultimately, Cabinet and/or Board of Trustee (BOT) meetings to acknowledge effective communication and participation amongst all constituency groups. Examples of shared governance committee work and ideas that have demonstrated a positive flow of information towards policy change and/or an improvement in processes include:

- Environmental Health and Safety Committee:
  - Implementation of Mass Alert System [[R7-22](#)] [[R7-23](#)] [[R7-24](#)]
- Facilities Committee:
  - Student Parking Access [[R7-25](#)] [[R7-26](#)]
  - One Stop [[R7-27](#)] [[R7-28](#)] [[R7-29](#)]
  - Physical Resource Planning [[R7-30](#)]

The College Council has coordinated a systematic evaluation of the effectiveness of shared governance structures and processes through a review of committee charges that began in 2012 [[R7-31](#)]. Subsequently, in March of 2012, each of the shared governance committees reported that a review of the charges had been completed and improvements identified [[R7-32](#)]. In October of 2013, another survey was initiated to verify meeting times and active membership lists. Lastly, the development of an organizational handbook – outlining each committee purpose, and function – was delegated to the College Council for development. As a direct result, the Administrative Procedure 1201 Task Force has been formed and tasked with not only the development of the VVC Organizational Handbook, but a complete review of Administrative Procedure 1201 during the Spring 2014 semester [[R7-33](#)] [[R7-34](#)].

To improve and encourage participation in shared governance committees, the administration offered three workshops hosted by PPL Consultants on effective committee participation in 2012 [[R7-35](#)].

- Student government – February 3, 2012
- Management – February 10, 2012
- Faculty and staff – April, 5 2012

The Associated Student Body (ASB) attends ongoing leadership retreats, conducted annually, for student leadership development, growth and participation in shared governance. This practice has been in effect for a number of years and includes notable speakers in areas of finance, budget, legislation and transformational leadership as well as small group activities that encourage teamwork and problem solving. [R7-36] [R7-37].

### **Student Services and Distance Learning Leadership:**

Since the 2011 report, the district has taken decisive steps to fill the leadership vacancies in Student Services and Distance Education.

- Student Services: Tim Johnson was hired as the Dean of Student Services shortly thereafter and remained in position until the summer of 2013. Arthur Lopez was named Director of Student Services in the fall of 2013 and was promoted to Dean of Student Services later that same semester.
- Distance Education: Dr. Rolando Regino began serving as the Acting Dean of Distance Education shortly after the 2011 report and is now serving as the permanent Dean of Distance Education.

### **How Response Meets Eligibility Requirements**

*ER 2-Mission: "The institution's educational mission is clearly defined, adopted, and published by its governing board consistent with its legal authorization and is appropriate to a degree-granting institution of higher education and the constituency it seeks to serve. The mission statement defines institutional commitment to achieving student learning."*

The college's leadership succession is clearly addressed in Board Policy 2432 [R7-2] and leadership development – as a response to planning – is ongoing through discussions, committee work, workshops and coursework attended by all constituency groups.

### **How Response Meets Accreditation Standards**

*Standard IV.A. "The institution recognizes that ethical and effective leadership throughout the organization enables the institution to identify institutional values, set and achieve goals, learn, and improve."*

Board Policy 1200 [R7-47] specifically identifies "Integrity" as "guiding the college's actions with an internally consistent framework of principles." Furthermore, Administrative Procedure 1200 [R7-48] states: "The vision, values, mission, and goals of Victor Valley College define the district's purpose and identity and are the basis for institutional planning and the evaluation of institutional effectiveness."

*Standard IV.A-1. Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. They encourage staff, faculty, administrators, and students, no matter what their official titles, to take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation.*

The College has seven shared governance committees that meet regularly, have diverse membership, and regularly present proposals and ideas to the College Council. These committees are effective, and there is ample evidence of robust discussion and eventual implementation of various committee initiatives.

The College also fosters “an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence” through the creative collaboration between programs and the VVC Foundation. The VVC Foundation helps interface with the community in order to cross-pollinate ideas, resources and relationships. This is yet another source of innovation and strength for the College. An example of the effectiveness of this collaboration is Solar Technician Program in Construction Technology. The VVC Foundation helped link together a partnership between a local solar company looking to hire qualified workers and the Construction Technology department, which was looking to develop a Solar Technician Program. The collaboration brought together academic resources, physical resources, industry relevance, and instructional expertise that resulted in a 90% employment rate as of Jan 31, 2014 for program graduates and a robust for-credit, Curriculum Committee-approved Solar Program in the Construction Technology Department. The results of this ongoing project were presented during the “Superintendent’s/President’s Report” at the Nov 12, 2013 Board of Trustees meeting and can be seen starting at time: 19:16 on the video [[R7-39](#)].

The PRAISE Report process, as described in detail in Recommendation #4 is an example of an institutionalized improvement process that gathers ideas at the classroom level and circulates them into institutional planning. The result is continuous improvement driven by systematic participative processes.

*Standard IV.A-2: “The institution establishes and implements a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making processes. The policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas from their constituencies and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose bodies.”*

Administrative Procedure 1201 [[R7-14](#)] describes the structure and flow of information from committees to College Council to Cabinet and/or Board of Trustees as appropriate. There are many examples that demonstrate effective execution of the shared governance process described in Administrative Procedure 1201. The membership of shared governance committees includes members from faculty, staff, administrators and student body, and the minutes reflect attendance as well as input from all of these constituents in

various committees.

*Standard IV.A-2a: "Faculty and administrators have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise. Students and staff also have established mechanisms or organizations for providing input into institutional decisions."*

The committees regularly discuss substantial policy issues, resource allocation, planning objectives and budget allocation in their meetings. Furthermore, the committees forward their recommendations to the College Council, and there are many examples of committee output impacting institutional decisions. [\[R7-24\]](#)

*Standard IV.A-2b. "The institution relies on faculty, its Academic Senate or other appropriate faculty structures, the Curriculum Committee, and academic administrators for recommendations about student learning programs and services."*

The faculty are fully engaged in shaping student learning programs and services. The SLO/PLO process that the College has been working on diligently on for several years has been a collaborative effort of faculty committees, the Curriculum Committee, the Academic Senate, and academic administrators.

The Curriculum Committee meets regularly and works in collaboration with submitting faculty to develop courses and programs for students that are in compliance with Chancellor's Office guidelines. Hundreds of courses were reviewed, updated, and/or introduced in 2013 as evidence by the committee's posted minutes. [\[R7-40\]](#)

The Academic Senate coordinates faculty and committee work with regards to student learning programs and services. The Academic Senate meets regularly, and its minutes reflect robust discussion and faculty collaboration on a wide-variety of learning program and student service issues. [\[R7-41\]](#)

*Standard IV.A-3. "Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the Governing Board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. These processes facilitate discussion of ideas and effective communication among the institution's constituencies."*

The shared governance committees regularly see their ideas reviewed by the College Council [\[R7-23\]](#), the Cabinet [\[R7-26/R7-28\]](#), and the Board of Trustees [\[R7-29\]](#). There is often an exchange of ideas about the best course of action on the ideas presented, which stimulates communication and effective decision-making.

*Standard IV.A.5. "The role of leadership and the institution's governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement."*

The College Council has coordinated a systematic evaluation of the effectiveness of shared governance structures and processes through a review of committee charges and memberships that began in 2012 and remains in effect [R7-32]. Additionally, the Administrative Procedure 1201 Task Force – formed in late 2013 – will begin to review, revise and realign the shared governance policy function and purpose with institutional goals [R7-33].

*Standard IV.B.1. "The institution has a governing board that is responsible for establishing policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution. The governing board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the chief administrator for the college of the district / system."*

The Board of Trustees established Board Policy 2431 (Superintendent/President Selection Process) [R7-1]. Board Policy 2432 [R7-2] describes the processes for assigning administrative responsibilities in the event of College President/Superintendent absence for less than 30 days as well as absences longer than thirty days. Board Policy 2435 [R7-42] describes the process the Board will use to evaluate the College President/Superintendent.

*Standard IV.B.1.j. "The governing board has the responsibility for selecting the district system chief administrator (most often known as the chancellor) in a multi-college district system or the college chief administrator (most often known as the president) in the case of a single college. The governing board delegates full responsibility to him/her to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds him/her accountable for the district/system or college, respectively."*

The Board of Trustees established Board Policy 2430 (Delegation of Authority to Superintendent/President) [R7-38] on September 11, 2001 that clearly defines the ability of the Superintendent/President to administer, execute and interpret Board Policies.

*Standard IV.B.2. "The president has primary responsibility for the quality of the instruction he / she leads. He / she provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness."*

The College's commitment to management, faculty, staff and student development is evidenced through consistent budgeting and planning of leadership opportunities – such as Upward Mobility for Management [R7-7] and Upward Mobility for Classified Staff [R7-5]. The College also demonstrates opportunity for promotion within the organization as



evidenced by recent advancements to leadership positions in Student Services, Distance Education, Maintenance and Operations and Admissions and Records.

*Standard IV.B.2.a. "The president plans, oversees and evaluates an administrative structure organized and staffed to reflect the institution's purposes, size and complexity. He / she delegates authority to administrators and others consistent with their responsibilities, as appropriate."*

As the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the College, the Superintendent/President ensures that appropriate authority is delegated to administration, faculty and classified staff within the established Shared/Participatory Governance structure. The College Superintendent/President, in conjunction with appropriate constituency groups, ensures that all employment processes are conducted according to state and federal laws [R7-14 and [R7-43].

Since the 2011 Report, the college has worked to continually improve performance with regards to (a) succession planning and leadership continuity (b) professional development and shared governance and (c) filling critical leadership vacancies in Student Services and Distance Education.

With regard to succession planning, Board Policy 2301 and Board Policy 2302 were reviewed by the College leadership to ensure the policies were consistent with California Education Code. Surveys conducted by the Vice President of Human Resources led to increased focus towards internal staff development and training. As a result, the College has allocated resources and maintained an array of programs to develop staff at all levels, and those programs have been widely utilized each year by administrators, faculty, and classified personnel. The development of staff within the College has allowed the institution to promote from within in many cases and retain institutional knowledge. Specifically, the Director of Maintenance and Operations, the College's acting President/ Superintendent, the Dean of Student Services, the Dean of STEM, and the Director of Admissions and Records were all internal hires.

The shared governance committees have met regularly, discussed and recorded substantive proposals, and participated in the governance of the College. The committees have reviewed their charge on an annual basis and have reported regularly to College Council. Many of these proposals have in turn been forwarded on and become policy and practice.

Since the 2011 report, the district has taken decisive steps to fill the leadership vacancies in Student Services and Distance Education. Tim Johnson was hired as the Dean of Student Services shortly thereafter and remained in position until the summer of 2013. Arthur Lopez was named Director of Student Services in the fall of 2013 and was promoted to Dean of Student Services later that same semester. In Distance Education, Dr. Rolando Regino began serving as the Acting Dean of Distance Education shortly after the 2011 report and is now serving as the permanent Dean of Distance Education.



### **How Response has Increased Institutional Effectiveness**

Leadership changes have occurred and will continue to occur at the College. The focus on staff development and training has greatly reduced the negative consequences of leadership changes because the College has improved on internal development of its staff. For example, Peter Allan, who has 30 years of institutional knowledge was able to seamlessly fill the President's position in 2013. These types of transitions are occurring with increasing regularity throughout the College organization because of improved staff development programs and availability that are resulting in an increased number of qualified candidates for promotion. For example, Arthur Lopez was promoted to Dean of Student Services when Tim Johnson left.

Shared governance committees meet regularly, discuss and act on substantive topics, and regularly communicate their minutes to the entire campus and community by posting them on-line. As a result, all constituency groups are empowered to stay informed about committee discussions, decisions, and recommendations as various topics work their way through the shared governance process. The various committees, whether it be the Facilities Committee, Curriculum Committee, or the Health, Environmental & Safety Committee, can point to specific impacts their respective committee has had on the campus.

Having seamless leadership in the Distance Education and Student Services has had a positive impact on those areas. Distance Education conducts regular, campus-wide training of faculty to ensure compliance with the Education Codes as well as valuable technical training to enable instructors to utilize technology more effectively in their respective class offerings [R7-44]. Student Services has seen improvements in administrative support, implementation of technology and automation, and increased access for a broad-spectrum of student populations [R7-45].

As described in Recommendation 5 of this report, *"A comprehensive Distance Education Plan for the College was developed by the DEATF and approved by College Council March 7, 2012, and the Academic Senate September 6, 2012. [R5-1; R5-48; R5-49] This plan defined standards of quality for the coordination, support, design, and delivery of the college's DE courses and programs. In addition, the plan defined five improvement goals for DE at the College for which detailed actions plans were developed."* Recommendation 5 goes on to describe how Student Services has improved its support of Distance Education through training, support services, and other programs. These are just some of the examples of the benefits the College, and its students, have garnered from stable leaderships in those areas.

### **Conclusion**

This recommendation is resolved. The College is building and maintaining a system for effective, stable and sustainable leadership that includes ongoing professional development of employees and encourages active participation in governance processes. Leadership needs in student services and distance learning have been filled.

## Implications for Action

The College has commenced its search for a permanent Superintendent/President, with a start date of July 1, 2014.

Staff development has been highly successful but should be more regularly tracked and assessed. The Staff Development Committee will be putting into place mechanisms that track the utilization of staff development resources and the results of existing programs. The Staff Development Committee will use this information to make recommendations on how best to continually improve staff development programs and effectiveness.

Overall, the various committees are effective shared-governance mechanisms, and it would serve the College well to encourage accountability, sharing of best practices, and continual improvement. The College Council is developing a template for an annual report from each committee with the purpose of regularly auditing the effectiveness and accomplishments of each committee. Furthermore, the annual report will promote self-reflection, including a scorecard that prompts fulfillment on all elements of a given committee's charge in order to combat the tendency to focus on only certain elements.

## List of Supporting Evidence

- R7-1. [Board Policy 2431 \(Superintendent/President Selection\)](#)
- R7-2. [Board Policy 2432 \(Superintendent/President Succession\)](#)
- R7-3. [Board of Trustees Workshop, June 2012](#)
- R7-4. [Succession Planning Survey and Leadership Training](#)
- R7-5. [Classified School Employees Association Group Upward Mobility Program](#)
- R7-6. [2012-2013 Funding Allocations for Classified – Upward Mobility](#)
- R7-7. [Management Group-Upward Mobility Program](#)
- R7-8. [2010-2013 Funding Allocations for Management – Upward Mobility](#)
- R7-9. [Southern California Community College Districts Employee Relations Consortium – Survey Summary 2012/2013](#)
- R7-10. [Association of California Community College Administrators scholarship awards 2012](#)
- R7-11. [Association of California Community College Administrators scholarship awards 2013](#)
- R7-12. [Staff Development minutes 2/21/12 – Growing Roses in Concrete Event – Dr. Andrade, conducted on March 14, 2012](#)
- R7-13. [Staff Development minutes 3/19/13 – Rams Day Event scheduled for May 17, 2013](#)
- R7-14. [Administrative Policy 1201, Shared Governance Structure and Responsibilities](#)
- R7-15. [Diversity Committee SharePoint Page](#)
- R7-16. [Environmental Health & Safety Committee SharePoint Page](#)
- R7-17. [Facilities Committee SharePoint Page](#)
- R7-18. [Finance, Budget & Planning Committee SharePoint Page](#)
- R7-19. [Employee Professional Development Committee SharePoint Page](#)

- R7-20. [Student Success & Support Committee SharePoint Page](#)
- R7-21. [Technology Committee SharePoint Page](#)
- R7-22. [Environmental Health & Safety Committee minutes 3/3/13](#)
- R7-23. [Environmental Health & Safety Committee minutes 5/8/13](#)
- R7-24. [College Council minutes 5/22/13](#)
- R7-25. [Facilities Committee meeting minutes 1/3/12](#)
- R7-26. [Cabinet Recommendation Form- Student Parking Access](#)
- R7-27. [Facilities Committee meeting minutes 3/25/11](#)
- R7-28. [Cabinet Recommendation Form – One Stop](#)
- R7-29. [Board of Trustees meeting minutes 6/14/11](#)
- R7-30. [Facilities Committee meeting minutes 10/8/10](#)
- R7-31. [College Council meeting minutes 2/8/12](#)
- R7-32. [College Council meeting minutes 3/7/12](#)
- R7-33. [College Council meeting minutes 10/9/13](#)
- R7-34. [Administrative Procedure 1201 Task Force Volunteer list \(e-mail from Claude Oliver, Academic Senate VP\)](#)
- R7-35. [Shared Governance Workshop sign-in sheets for 2/3/12, 2/10/12 and 4/5/12](#)
- R7-36. [ASB Leadership Conference Agenda 2013](#)
- R7-37. [ASB Leadership Conference Agenda 2014](#)
- R7-38. [Board Policy 2430 \(Delegation of Authority to Superintendent/President\)](#)
- R7-39. [Board of Trustees Meeting Video for 11/12/2013](#)
- R7-40. [Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes](#)
- R7-41. [Academic Senate Meeting Minutes](#)
- R7-42. [Board Policy 2435 \(Superintendent Evaluation\)](#)
- R7-43. [Administrative Policy 3420 \(Equal Employment Opportunity\)](#)
- R7-44. [Rolando Regino e-mail \(DE highlights of positive impact\)](#)
- R7-45. [Art Lopez e-mail \(Student Services highlights of positive impact\)](#)
- R7-46. [2013 Convocation](#)
- R7-47. [Board Policy 1200 \(District, Vision, Mission and Values\)](#)
- R7-48. [Administrative Procedure 1200 \(Review of Mission\)](#)

## **Team Recommendation 8: Board Practices and Evaluation**

*In order to meet the Standards, members of the Board of Trustees must limit their role in governing the College to those responsibilities established in Board Policy, including delegating power and authority to the Superintendent/President to lead the District and to make administrative decisions regarding the effective implementation of Board Policies without Board interference. Trustees must avoid micromanaging institutional operations including their participation in campus committees and governance groups. Additionally, the Board must establish and follow a specific, regular time interval for evaluating its performance. (IV.B, IV.B.1, IV.B.1.a-e, IV.B.1.g, IV.B.1.j, IV.B.2, IV.B.2.a-e)*

### **Institutional Response to Recommendation**

#### **Description of Institutional Response**

In the 2011 ACCJC Team Report, there were several deficiencies identified in relation to the College Board of Trustees. These deficiencies involved “misunderstanding as to what the appropriate role of a Trustee is” (p.50); “the Board has not established provisions for orientation and professional development of Board members” (p.52); “Board self-evaluation has not occurred regularly” (p.52); “several instances in which Board members’ activities on campus venture beyond their established roles as policy makers, monitors of educational quality, and financial decision-makers” (p.52); and, “members of the institution are unfamiliar with the appropriate roles and functions of the Board of Trustees” (p.53).

The ACCJC Team Report recommended specific actions by the College to address these deficiencies, including “the College should establish a policy for orienting new Board members and for providing regular updates” (p.51); and “The Board needs to make concerted efforts to follow its own policies” (p.53-4).

Since 2011, a concerted effort by the College Board to remedy these deficiencies has been implemented. Board workshops, both in-house and through the Community College League of California (CCLC), have been attended by all current Board members in addition to College Board Retreats. [[R8-38](#); [R8-40](#); [R8-45](#); [R8-47](#); [R8-50](#); [R8-71](#); [R8-72](#); [R8-53](#); [R8-55](#); [R8-56](#); [R8-98](#); [R8-99](#); [R8-100](#); [R8-101](#)]

In addition, the College Board has renewed its efforts to adhere to established Board policies, and in some cases, revisit and discuss revision of said policies. [[R8-62](#)]

College Board meetings have been streamed live since December 13, 2011, which enables the College community and community at large to monitor Board activities to ensure compliance with public meeting regulations and transparency. The first meeting to be archived on the website for the public to view at any time was April 10, 2012. [[R8-36](#)]

College Board members do not attend or serve on College committees, nor do they

participate in the operational business of the College, as noted in the VVC 2012 Follow-Up Report. [\[R8-37\]](#)

### **How Response Meets Eligibility Requirements**

*ER 3-Board: The Institution has a functioning board responsible for the quality, integrity, and financial stability of the institution and ensuring that the institution's mission is being carried out. This board is ultimately responsible for ensuring that the financial resources of the institution are used to provide a sound educational program. Its membership is sufficient in size and composition to fulfill all board responsibilities.*

*The governing board is an independent policy-making body capable of reflecting constituent and public interest in board activities and decisions. A majority of the board members have no employment, family, ownership, or other personal financial interest in the institution. The board adheres to a conflict of interest policy that assures that those interests are disclosed and that they do not interfere with the impartiality of governing body members or outweigh the greater duty to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the institution.*

The College has a five-member Board whose members are elected by the community at large for staggered four-year terms of office. [\[R8-21\]](#)

All College Board policies and administrative procedures are available to the public through the college's website [\[R8-35\]](#)

The College Board has a conflict of interest policy: Board Policy 2710 [\[R8-6\]](#).

The College Board examines and votes on financial matters, as noted in College Board minutes and special budget workshops. [\[R8-14; R8-15; R8-16; R8-48; R8-52; R8-60; R8-61\]](#)

### **How Response Meets Accreditation Standards**

*Standard IV.B: In addition to the leadership of individuals and constituencies, institutions recognize the designated responsibilities of the governing board for setting policies and of the chief administrator for the effective operation of the institution. Multi-college districts/systems clearly define the organizational roles of the district/system and the colleges.*

*Standard IV.B1: The institution has a governing board that is responsible for establishing policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution. The governing board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the chief administrator for the college or the district/system.*

*Standard IV.B.1a-e:*

*The governing board is an independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in board activities and decisions. Once the board reaches a decision, it acts as a whole. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or pressure.*

*The governing board establishes policies consistent with the mission statement to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them.*

*The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.*

*The institution or the governing board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board's size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures.*

*The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly evaluates its policies and revises them as necessary.*

*Standard IV.B.1.g: The governing board's self evaluation [sic] processes for assessing board performance are clearly defined, implemented, and published in its policies and bylaws.*

*Standard IV.B.1j: The governing board has the responsibility for selecting and evaluating the district/system chief administrator (most often known as the chancellor) in a multi-college district/system or the college chief administrator (most often known as the president) in the case of a single college. The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to him/her to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds him/her accountable for the operation of the district/system or college, respectively.*

*Standard IV.B.2: The president has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution he/she leads. He/she provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness.*

*Standard IV.B.2.a-e:*

*The president plans, oversees, and evaluates an administrative structure organized and staffed to reflect the institution's purposes, size, and complexity. He/she delegates authority to administrators and others consistent with their responsibilities, as appropriate.*

*The president guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by the following:*

*Establishing a collegial process that sets values, goals and priorities;*

*Ensuring that evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis on external and internal conditions;*

*Ensuring that educational planning is integrated with resource planning and distribution to achieve student learning outcomes; and*

*Establishing procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts.*

*The president assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with mission and policies.*

*The president effectively controls budget and expenditures.*

*The president works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution.*

*Standard IV.B: In addition to the leadership of individuals and constituencies, institutions recognize the designated responsibilities of the governing board for setting policies and of the chief administrator for the effective operation of the institution. Multi-college districts/systems clearly define the organizational roles of the district/system and the colleges.*

The College Board has specific Board Policies (BP) defining their role, their mission and the role of the College Superintendent/President. Board Policy 2430 provides for Delegation of Authority to the Superintendent/President. Each of the delegations of authority is listed in the Board Policy. Board Policy 2200 clearly lists the responsibilities of the Board of Trustees. Board Policy 2210 and 2220 list the activities that the Board exercises to discharge its responsibilities. Board Policy 2410 designates how Board Policies are interpreted into Administrative Policies. The Superintendent/President develops administrative policies which implement Board Policies. In the case of a new Trustee, Board training is scheduled as soon as possible after the Trustee takes office. On March 10<sup>th</sup> 2014, a Trustee workshop was held by a representative of the CCLC, an experienced Board of trustee member from Northern California. In general, new Trustee orientation takes place in two parts. After potential Trustees have declared their candidacy for the position, the Superintendent/President conducts orientation workshops to orient the candidates on the intricacies of serving on the Board of Trustees. Once the election is complete, the successful candidates are given the opportunity to attend Trustee workshops provided by the CCLC in San Francisco or Sacramento. Three of the Victor Valley Trustees (including the newest appointed Trustee) have signed up for "Excellence in Trusteeship program"



through the CCLC. [[R8-1](#); [R8-2](#); [R8-74](#); [R8-75](#); [R8-76](#)]

*Standard IV.B1: The institution has a governing board that is responsible for establishing policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution. The governing board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the chief administrator for the college or the district/system.*

The College Board has a policy to assure students and the public of the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of student learning programs and services. Board Policy 6100 provides for the Board of Trustees to delegate the supervision of the general business procedures to the Superintendent/President. This policy requires that the Superintendent/President provide periodic reports to the Board of Trustees. At every Board meeting, the President provides a report about academic or other topics to the Board. In addition, the Superintendent/President provides a weekly summary of activities and events to each Board member. [[R8-12](#); [R8-13](#)]

The College Board has policies to assure financial stability. Board Policy 6200 provides for the budget development and preparation methodology. Administrative Procedure 6200 is intended to satisfy the implementation of Board Policy 6200. [[R8-13](#); [R8-14](#); [R8-15](#); [R8-16](#); [R8-30](#)]

The College Board has policies for selecting and evaluating the chief administrator of the College. [[R8-17](#); [R8-18](#)]

*Standard IV.B.1a-e:*

*a. The governing board is an independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in board activities and decisions. Once the board reaches a decision, it acts as a whole. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or pressure.*

As the College Board is elected by the community, the Board makes decisions and sets policy based on the public interest. Members of the Board of Trustees are independently elected by their constituents. They meet monthly to enact policy that is in the public interest. A process is available to the public to complete speaker request cards at every meeting. As an example of a situation where the Board of Trustees had different ideas about an issue, but was able to resolve it and come together, was the resignation of a Board member. The procedure for appointing a Board member after a resignation is embodied in Board Policy 2110. In this case, two board members decided that a person who had run in the prior election should be appointed to the Board to fill the remaining term. The other two members felt that applications should be taken from the community to fill the vacant seat. After discussion and negotiations, the Board agreed on a process and a member of the community was seated. [[R8-21](#); [R8-22](#); [R8-77](#)]

*b. The governing board establishes policies consistent with the mission statement to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them.*

Board Policy 2200 defines the role of the College Board in advocating for the institution. At each Board of Trustee meeting the Board has a consent agenda and an action agenda. The consent agenda consists of approval items that have been authorized within the delegated authority of the Superintendent/President. The Board is asked only to ratify those agreements. Within those agreements are numerous expense and procedural approvals that affect Student learning and Student Services. The action agenda are those things that require Board approval that are generally outside the delegated authority of the Superintendent/President. Each Vice-President forwards the items needed in order to meet the needs of his or her area for approval. All items are read and approved by the Superintendent/president before being placed on the Board of Trustees' agenda. Resources required for the performance of College functions are reviewed and approved by the Vice-President of Administrative Services prior to being submitted to the Board for approval. Board Policy 4000 provides for the standards of excellence that will be upheld by the Board of Trustees in order to achieve student success. Board Policy 4020 outlines the procedure that must be followed in developing and offering curriculum to students. The Board follows all applicable California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title V regulations in approving curriculum for the College. [[R8-1](#); [R8-78](#)]

Board Policy 4000 (Standards of Educational Excellence) supports student learning, quality, and integrity. Board Policy 6200 states that budget preparation "shall support the district's master and educational plans". Board Policy 1200 details the district's vision, values, mission and goals. [[R8-12](#); [R8-14](#); [R8-23](#)]

*c. The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.*

In addition to the provisions of Board Policy 4000, Board Policy 6200, Board Policy 6250 (Budget Management), Board Policy 6300 (Fiscal Management), Board Policy 3810 demonstrates the College Board's legal responsibilities in district matters; Board Policy 3410, 3430, and 3515 deal with issues of harassment, discrimination and crime reporting on campus, further demonstrating the College Board's legal integrity. The Board has ultimate responsibility for all educational quality, legal matters and financial integrity. At each Board meeting the Board is asked to approve the recommendations of the Academically-led curriculum committee for that month. The Board received a report about the Student Success Scorecard and has participated in a workshop on how the success scorecard is calculated, the components of the scorecard, implications of the scorecard, and receives academic input into ways that success can be improved. The Board of Trustees meets with legal counsel on a regular basis. At each Board meeting, legal counsel provides an update n all claims and litigation in closed session. The Board of Trustees holds an annual budget review meeting in which the Board is made aware of all budget implications. The Board requires that the College maintain a balanced budget whilst maintaining a

prudent reserve. The Board uses its reserves prudently. [[R8-12](#); [R8-14](#); [R8-15](#); [R8-24](#); [R8-25](#); [R8-26](#); [R8-27](#); [R8-65](#); [R8-102](#); [R8-103](#); [R8-104](#); [R8-105](#); [R8-107](#)]

*d. The institution or the governing board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board's size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures.*

The VVC College Board has clearly defined policies defining Board's size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures. Board Policies 2010 through 2745 include all of the Board's policies and procedures. Board Policy 2010 through 2310 specifies the Board's size, duties, responsibilities and structure. Board Policy 2410 specifies how policies are to be enacted, revised, added to, or amended. While the Superintendent/President normally enacts Administrative Policies to conform with Board Policies, according to Board Policy 2410, the Board may also revise A's to make them consistent with their own policies. The Board is the ultimate decision maker in matters assigned to it by State and Federal Law. Academic faculty, Staff and Students shall participate in decision making as permitted by CCR Title V. [[R8-1](#); [R8-2](#); [R8-3](#); [R8-4](#); [R8-5](#); [R8-6](#); [R8-7](#); [R8-8](#); [R8-9](#); [R8-10](#); [R8-11](#); [R8-17](#); [R8-18](#); [R8-21](#); [R8-22](#); [R8-23](#); [R8-74](#); [R8-75](#); [R8-76](#); [R8-77](#); [R8-78](#); [R8-79](#); [R8-80](#); [R8-81](#); [R8-82](#); [R8-83](#); [R8-84](#); [R8-85](#); [R8-86](#); [R8-87](#); [R8-88](#); [R8-89](#); [R8-90](#); [R8-91](#); [R8-92](#); [R8-93](#); [R8-94](#); [R8-95](#)]

*e. The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly evaluates its policies and revises them as necessary.*

The College Board has robust discussion of Board and College policies on a regular basis. In 2013, there was discussion of revision of BPs relating to the role of the public at Board meetings. The College Board recognizes the necessity of reviewing, analyzing and, as needed, updating Board policies to comply with changes in state and federal educational policies, as well the evolution of the institution, its mission and goals. The Governing Board acts in a consistent manner with its policies. Board Policy 2745 requires that the Board self-evaluate annually to determine if they are following their own procedures, and are complying with Federal and State mandates. The results of such evaluations are used to identify accomplishments, and set goals for the following year. Recently, the Board decided to change the process of public speaker requests at their regularly scheduled meetings. Previously, the Board required that speaker cards be submitted before the closed session of the Board began. The new adopted procedure allows the public to submit cards up the beginning of the open session meeting. This change was well received by the public, and those college community members who wish to speak to the Board. Secondly, the Board changed the timing in which speakers may address the Board. Previously, speakers would have to address the Board about any and all agenda items at the beginning of the meeting. The Board elected to change this procedure and now allows speakers to speak when the item is called. This allows the Trustees to have a better recollection of the speaker at the time of decision making. Again this change was well received by the public and the College Community. The Board is always aware of issues that might arise, such as the two examples described above and will be willing and able to make changes to make the policies easier to

understand and follow. [[R8-11](#); [R8-62](#); [R8-68](#); [R8-69](#); [R8-70](#)]

*g: The governing board's self evaluation[sic] processes for assessing board performance are clearly defined, implemented, and published in its policies and bylaws.*

Board Policy 2745 commits the Board to “assessing its own performance as a Board in order to identify its strengths and areas in which it may improve its functioning.” As described above, the Board has a self-evaluation process in Board Policy 2745. The process involves the creation of an evaluation instrument each year during the April Board session. The evaluation instrument incorporates criteria contained in Board policies regarding Board operations, as well as criteria defining Board effectiveness promulgated by recognized practitioners in the field. On March 11, 2014, the Board held a 4-hour training session using the services of Bill McGinnis an experience Board member from the Yuba College District. One of the primary topics of discussion will be effective Board evaluation techniques. [[R8-11](#); [R8-68](#); [R8-69](#); [R8-70](#); [R8-96](#)]

The Board of Trustees has taken several concrete steps to ensure that members understand their roles and execute their responsibilities appropriately, including a four-hour workshop on Board roles and responsibilities on May 21, 2011. This workshop involved improving communication, working together as a group, promoting better adherence to Board roles, strategies to improve Board effectiveness, review of communication protocols between the Board and the Superintendent/President, and review of policies on ethics and the College mission. Extensive discussions focused on the standards of practice listed in Board Policy 2715. [[R8-7](#)]

On May 21, 2011 and October 9, 2012, Board members completed a self-evaluation, comprised of two sections: the five-member Board as a collective entity, and the Board members individually. In these self-evaluations, the Board completed a 10-point rubric dealing with ethics, public meeting requirements, communication, educational policy literacy, Board responsibilities in the context of the governance structure of the College, and related legal requirements. [[R8-66](#); [R8-67](#)]

In 2011, the Board section of this evaluation had a cumulative score of 3.18 for all 10 points, with individual Board members' scores ranging from 2.8 to 3.9 on their overall effectiveness. Individually, the cumulative score was 3.92, with Board members evaluating their performance from 3.4 (2) to 4.0 (3). The conclusion reached by the 2011 survey is that individually, Board members believed they were responding appropriately to their established roles; collectively, they were not as confident. [[R8-66](#)]

In 2012, using the same rubric, the collective self-evaluation (although not numerically summarized on the evaluation form, as in 2011), was noticeably higher, with individual Board members ranking their performance no lower than 3, and more than one Board member ranking their performance as excellent. In the individual section, the same increase in Board perception of their performance was clear: in almost all of the 10

categories, the Board members rated themselves no lower than 4/4. Once again, it is clear that the individual Board members believe that they are on the right track in fulfilling their elected positions in serving the College. [R8-69]

The June 12, 2012, College Board Retreat was another opportunity for the Board to learn and dialogue about Board responsibilities, the role and hiring of Chief Executive Officers (CEO) and examples of what other California Community Colleges (CCC) were doing for continuous quality improvement. [R8-98; R8-99; R8-100; R8-101]

In February and March of 2014, more workshops for the Board was held at the College. Since the Board did not complete a self-evaluation in 2013 (although the Board did respond in a narrative form to how they addressed ACCJC Standards – see below), the Board will prioritize this activity for 2014, to demonstrate continued commitment to the College and its constituency groups. [R8-40; R8-53; R8-70; R8-96]

In terms of the self-evaluation process, at the September 28, 2011, Special Board Meeting, members engaged in a wide-ranging discussion of accreditation requirements that included this self-evaluation process. Future self-evaluations will include a brief narrative outlining specific achievements, contributions and service the College Board collectively and individually have completed in their established governance role. [R8-41]

In preparation for the expansion of the College Board self-evaluation to include narrative, in February 2014, members of the College Board provided narrative of their training, accomplishments, and compliance with their policy-making role. The individual narratives have been merged into a brief report to demonstrate the Board's commitment to self-reflection and continuous quality improvement. The College Board has a self-evaluation scheduled for March 2014 [R8-70; R8-107]

*j. The governing board has the responsibility for selecting and evaluating the district/system chief administrator (most often known as the chancellor) in a multi-college district/system or the college chief administrator (most often known as the president) in the case of a single college. The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to him/her to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds him/her accountable for the operation of the district/system or college, respectively.*

Board Policy 2431 covers the hiring of a Superintendent /President. In addition, Board Policy 2432 covers the delegation of Presidential duties in the event of the absence of the Superintendent/President. At the moment there is corresponding Administrative Procedure to describe the process that the Board will follow in selecting a new President. The Board therefore can select its own process. This process is on the Board agenda for February 11th, 2014. At that meeting the Board will decide on a process to be followed in the hiring of a new permanent Superintendent/President. The last three permanent Superintendent/Presidents were hired following the process outlined in Administrative Procedure 7120 "Recruitment and Hiring Procedure," and while not required to do so,

Board can choose to adopt that procedure in the hiring of a new Superintendent/President. Board Policy 2430 describes the delegation of authority to the Superintendent/President. In order to avoid micro-managing, the Board delegates to the Superintendent/President the executive responsibility for administering the policies adopted by the Board and executing all decisions of the Board requiring administrative action. The Board delegates to the Superintendent/President authority up to \$ 64,000 on behalf of the District. As described above, all expenditures of \$ 250 or more must be ratified by the Board of Trustees. The Superintendent/President may accept the resignation of any District employee, and may hire District employees (except academic managers). In addition, the Superintendent/president has the power to reasonably interpret Board Policy. If there is no relevant Board Policy, the Superintendent/President can act on the Board's behalf. The Board of Trustees conducts regular evaluations of the Superintendent/President (Board Policy 2435) The criteria for evaluation shall be based on Board policy, the Superintendent/President job description, and performance goals and objectives developed in accordance with Board Policy 2430. [[R8-17](#); [R8-4](#); [R8-97](#); [R8-18](#); [R8-2](#)]

*Standard IV.B.2: The president has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution he/she leads. He/she provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness.*

As per established College Board Policies, the Superintendent/President has the appropriate authority to organize and conduct the operational business of the College, including planning, budget and personnel. The College Superintendent/President is also ultimately responsible for ensuring institutional effectiveness and institutional excellence [[R8-2](#); [R8-4](#); [R8-28](#); [R8-29](#); [R8-30](#)]

*Standard IV.B.2.a-e:*

*The president plans, oversees, and evaluates an administrative structure organized and staffed to reflect the institution's purposes, size, and complexity. He/she delegates authority to administrators and others consistent with their responsibilities, as appropriate.*

As the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the College, the Superintendent/President ensures that appropriate authority is delegated to administration, faculty and classified staff within the established Shared/Participatory Governance structure. The College Superintendent/President, in conjunction with appropriate constituency groups, ensures that all employment processes are conducted according to state and federal laws. [[R8-31](#); [R8-32](#)]

*b. The president guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by the following:*

*- Establishing a collegial process that sets values, goals and priorities;*



- Ensuring that evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis on external and internal conditions;

Under the provisions of Shared/Participatory Governance, the College Superintendent/President guides the institution by acknowledging the contribution of all campus constituencies. [[R8-28](#); [R8-31](#)]

*c. The president assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with mission and policies.*

As per the responsibilities outlined in established BPs, the College Superintendent/President assures that the College Board implements, follows and evaluates its own procedures, and informs the College Board of necessary changes in policy and procedure consistent with the College mission, policies and adherence to accreditation standards. [[R8-1](#); [R8-2](#); [R8-12](#)]

*d. The president effectively controls budget and expenditures.*

As per established College Board policies and Administrative Procedures (APs), the College Superintendent/President guides the College Board and campus community in responsible fiscal practices, including periodic audits of the institution. [[R8-13](#); [R8-14](#); [R8-15](#); [R8-16](#); [R8-33](#); [R8-34](#)]

*e. The president works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution.*

The College Superintendent/President effectively communicates and works with all campus constituencies, as well as building dynamic and effective relationships with the local communities in the service district of the College. The College Superintendent supports and encourages all groups to propose and implement effective strategies to improve the reputation of the institution and validate the contribution of all campus constituencies. [[R8-19](#); [R8-65](#)]

### **How Response Has Been Sustained**

Although College Board meeting minutes reflect discussion and proposed revision of certain Board Policies, there will be increased emphasis on supporting sustainability and adherence to established policies via review of existing BPs in the Spring 2014 semester, and via workshops in February and March 2014, designed to inform the board of new educational policies affecting the California Community Colleges. [[R8-62](#)]

The College Board continues to strive for improvement in understanding their assigned role on the campus by attending workshops, including the upcoming workshop on February 11, 2014, on campus. [[R8-66](#)]



### **How Response has Increased Institutional Effectiveness**

The College Board has committed to attending Board workshops; budget workshops; self-evaluation (August 9, 2011; October 9, 2012); delegating more responsibility to the Superintendent/President; they recognize they are policy-making body, not an operational body, and their ultimate responsibility is for educational quality and the fiscal health of the college. [[R8-28](#); [R8-39](#); [R8-40](#); [R8-41](#); [R8-42](#); [R8-43](#); [R8-44](#); [R8-45](#); [R8-46](#); [R8-47](#); [R8-48](#); [R8-49](#); [R8-50](#); [R8-53](#); [R8-55](#); [R8-56](#); [R8-60](#); [R8-2](#); [R8-13](#); [R8-67](#); [R8-68](#); [R8-69](#); [R8-70](#); [R8-72](#)]

As the Board has approved the hiring of PPL in the search for a permanent Superintendent/President, the process advertising, screening and selecting applicants, interviewing candidates, and recommending to the Board final candidates will ensure effective and impartial process. The Board will conduct final interviews and hire the best candidate for Victor Valley College. [[R8-64](#)]

### **Conclusion**

This recommendation is resolved. Policies of the College governing board clearly identify it as a policy-making body that delegates power and authority to the Superintendent/President, who then implements board policies without interference by any member of the governing board.

### **Implications for Actions**

Although the College Board has made tremendous strides to address ACCJC deficiencies, the following still needs to be accomplished to fully define the College Board as a policy-making body:

- The College Board of Trustees needs to establish a Board Policy for reviewing, analyzing and updating current Board Policies on a regular basis.
- A Board Policy needs to be created and implemented to establish provisions for orientation and professional development for Board members. (IV.B.1.f)
- The College Board of Trustees need to establish a Board Policy for Administrative Evaluations in compliance with Educational Code 87663(i). Although the College Board has a Board Policy to evaluate the Superintendent/President, there currently is no Board Policy reflecting evaluation of other College administrators.
- The College Board does not have by-laws, only policies. The College President/Superintendent will make a recommendation to the Board to adopt bylaws that will control which Board items can be heard in closed vs. open session, in accordance with Brown Act requirements.

- The College Board needs to examine the Board agenda to ensure it reflects needed dialogue about College policy.
- The College Board needs tutorials in meeting decorum and organization to adhere to public meeting requirements.
- College Board self-evaluations need to be systematic and regularly administered.

## List of Supporting Evidence

- R8-1. [Board Policy 2200 \(Board Duties and Responsibilities\)](#)
- R8-2. [Board Policy 2430 \(Delegation of Authority to Superintendent/President\)](#)
- R8-3. [Board Policy 2305 \(Annual Organizational Meeting\)](#)
- R8-4. [Board Policy 2432 \(Superintendent/President Succession\)](#)
- R8-5. [Board Policy 2510 \(Participation in Local Decision Making\)](#)
- R8-6. [Board Policy 2710 \(Conflict of Interest\)](#)
- R8-7. [Board Policy 2715 \(Code of Ethics\)](#)
- R8-8. [Board Policy 2716 \(Political Activity\)](#)
- R8-9. [Board Policy 2720 \(Communications\)](#)
- R8-10. [Board Policy 2740 \(Education\)](#)
- R8-11. [Board Policy 2745 \(Self-Evaluation\)](#)
- R8-12. [Board Policy 4000 \(Standards of Educational Excellence\)](#)
- R8-13. [Board Policy 6100 \(Delegation of Financial Authority to Superintendent/President\)](#)
- R8-14. [Board Policy 6200 \(Annual Presentation of the Budget\)](#)
- R8-15. [Board Policy 6250 \(Budget Management\)](#)
- R8-16. [Board Policy 6300 \(Fiscal Management\)](#)
- R8-17. [Board Policy 2431 \(Superintendent/President Selection\)](#)
- R8-18. [Board Policy 2435 \(Evaluation of Superintendent/President\)](#)
- R8-19. [Campus Communication Days Media link/Office of Marketing/Public Relations](#)
- R8-20. [Follow-Up Report #2](#)
- R8-21. [Board Policy 2010 \(Membership\)](#)
- R8-22. [Board Policy 2100 \(Elections\)](#)
- R8-23. [Board Policy 1200 \(Vision, Values, Mission and Goals\)](#)
- R8-24. [Board Policy 3810 \(Claims Against the District\)](#)
- R8-25. [Board Policy 3410 \(Nondiscrimination\)](#)
- R8-26. [Board Policy 3430 \(Prohibition of Harassment\)](#)
- R8-27. [Board Policy 3515 \(Reporting of Crimes\)](#)
- R8-28. [Administrative Procedure 1202 \(Institutional Effectiveness\)](#)
- R8-29. [Administrative Procedure 4000 \(Sustaining Institutional Excellence\)](#)
- R8-30. [Administrative Procedure 6200 \(Budget Development\)](#)
- R8-31. [Administrative Procedure 1201 \(Shared Governance\)](#)
- R8-32. [Administrative Procedure 3420 \(Equal Employment Opportunity\)](#)
- R8-33. [Administrative Procedure 6330 \(Purchasing Matrix\)](#)
- R8-34. [Administrative Procedure 6400 \(Audits\)](#)
- R8-35. [Board of Trustees VVC Website](#)

- R8-36. [Board of Trustees Streaming Video Website](#)
- R8-37. [2012 VVC Follow-up Report](#)
- R8-38. [Special Board Meeting, May 21, 2011 \(Retreat\)](#)
- R8-39. [Board Budget Workshop, June 14, 2011](#)
- R8-40. [Board Meeting, August 9, 2011 \(Self-Evaluation/Retreat Discussion\)](#)
- R8-41. [Board Meeting, September 28, 2011 \(Agenda; no minutes available\)](#)
- R8-42. [Board Meeting, November 8, 2011 \(IT/MIS Workshop\)](#)
- R8-43. [Board Meeting, January 10, 2012 \(ACCJC Standards/Recommendations Discussion\)](#)
- R8-44. [Board Meeting, January 24, 2012 \(Progress on ACCJC Recommendations\)](#)
- R8-45. [Board Meeting, February 14, 2012 \(CCLC Workshop report\)](#)
- R8-46. [Board Meeting, March 13, 2012 \(ACCJC Follow-Up report\)](#)
- R8-47. [Board Meeting, June 12, 2012 \(Matthew Lee Board Workshop\)](#)
- R8-48. [Special Board Meeting, June 21, 2012 \(Budget/Facilities Workshop\)](#)
- R8-49. [Board Meeting, July 10, 2012 \(ACCJC Meeting June 2012\)](#)
- R8-50. [Special Board Meeting, July 25, 2012 \(Trustee Accreditation Workshop\)](#)
- R8-51. [Board Meeting, August 12, 2012 \(Accreditation Information to Board\)](#)
- R8-52. [Board Meeting, September 11, 2012 \(Accreditation Progress/FCMAT Approval\)](#)
- R8-53. [Board Meeting, October 9, 2012 \(Board Self-Evaluation\)](#)
- R8-54. [Board Meeting, January 15, 2013 \(Accreditation Meeting Report\)](#)
- R8-55. [Board Meeting, March 12, 2013 \(CCLC Workshop Report and ARCC Report\)](#)
- R8-56. [Board Meeting, April 9, 2013 \(CCLC Conference Report\)](#)
- R8-57. [Board Meeting, May 14, 2013 \(Presentation to Board on ACCJC Recommendations\)](#)
- R8-58. [Accreditation Steering Committee Presentation, May 14, 2013](#)
- R8-59. [Board Meeting, July 9, 2013 \(ACCJC Visit Report\)](#)
- R8-60. [Board Meeting, September 10, 2013 \(Budget Workshop\)](#)
- R8-61. [Special Board Meeting, September 23, 2013 \(Recommendation 6 update\)](#)
- R8-62. [Board Meeting, October 8, 2013 \(Proposed Revision of BPs 2210 and 2350\)](#)
- R8-63. [Board Meeting, November 12, 2013 \(Presidential Search Company discussion\)](#)
- R8-64. [Board Meeting, January 14, 2014 \(Presidential Search Committee/PPL Presentation\)](#)
- R8-65. [President's Office VVC Website](#)
- R8-66. [Board Meeting, February 11, 2014 \(Agenda\)](#)
- R8-67. [Board Meeting \(Trustee Workshop on Student Success Scorecard\), February 11, 2014](#)
- R8-68. [Board Self-evaluation, August 9, 2011](#)
- R8-69. [Board Self-evaluation, October 9, 2012](#)
- R8-70. [Board Self-evaluation Narrative Report, February 2014](#)
- R8-71. ["Major Milestones" Trustee Workshop, July 25, 2012](#)
- R8-72. ["Synopsis of Status on ACCJC Recommendations" Trustee Workshop, July 25, 2012](#)
- R8-73. ["ARCC Report" Board Meeting Information Item, March 12, 2013](#)
- R8-74. [Board Policy 2210 \(Board Officers\)](#)
- R8-75. [Board Policy 2220 \(Board Committees\)](#)
- R8-76. [Board Policy 2410 \(Administrative Procedure\)](#)
- R8-77. [Board Policy 2110 \(Vacancies\)](#)
- R8-78. [Board Policy 4020 \(Development and Discontinuance\)](#)
- R8-79. [Board Policy 2015 \(Student Members\)](#)
- R8-80. [Board Policy 2105 \(Election of Student Members\)](#)

- R8-81. [Board Policy 2310 \(Regular Meetings\)](#)
- R8-82. [Board Policy 2315 \(Closed Sessions\)](#)
- R8-83. [Board Policy 2320 \(Special Meetings\)](#)
- R8-84. [Board Policy 2330 \(Quorum and Voting\)](#)
- R8-85. [Board Policy 2340 \(Agendas\)](#)
- R8-86. [Board Policy 2345 \(Public Participation\)](#)

## Commission Recommendation 1: Board Ethics

*In order to meet Standards, the Commission recommends that the Board of Trustees amend its ethics policy (Board Policy 2717) to include a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates the policy. (IV.B.1.h)*

### Institutional Response to Recommendation

#### Description of Institutional Response

On September 13, 2011, the Board of Trustees amended Board Policy 2715 (Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice) to include the following language on the consequences of behavior that violates the policy:

- All Board members are expected to maintain the highest standards of conduct and ethical behavior and to adhere to the Board's Code of Ethics. The Board will be prepared to investigate the factual basis behind any charge of complaint of trustee misconduct. A Board member may be subject to a resolution of censure by the Board should it be determined that trustee misconduct has occurred. Censure is an official expression of disapproval passed by the Board.
- A complaint of trustee misconduct will be referred to an ad hoc committee composed of two trustees not subject to the complaint. In a manner deemed appropriate by the committee, a fact-finding process shall be initiated and completed within a reasonable period of time to determine the validity of the complaint. The committee shall be guided in its inquiry by the standards set forth in the Board's Code of Ethics as defined in policy. The trustee subject to the charge of misconduct shall not be precluded from presenting information to the committee. The committee shall, within a reasonable period of time, make a report of its findings to the Board for action. [[CR1-1](#)]
- At the Board's Special Meeting on September 28, 2011, members discussed the revised ethics policy as part of their broader strategic conversation about the College's Vision, Mission, Values, and Goals. [[CR-2](#)]

### Conclusion

The College has fully resolved this recommendation. The amended Board Policy 2715 (Code of Ethics/Standard of Practice) now includes language describing consequences of behavior that violates the policy.

### Implications for Action

None.

## **List of Supporting Evidence**

CR1-1. Board Policy 2715 (Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice)

CR1-2. Board of Trustees Special Meeting Agenda, September 28, 2011

## Responses to Institutional Self-Identified Planning Issues

### Planning Issue 1 – Mission Review

*Commencing Spring 2011, the Superintendent/President will implement Administrative Procedure 1200, Annual Mission Statement Review, by recommending that the Board of Trustees undertake a formal review and revision, if needed, of its vision, mission, goals, and priorities in order to ensure that institutional identity and operational direction support current student and community needs, and in order to reinforce the central role of the mission statement in institutional planning and decision making (IA3; IA4).*

#### **Progress**

A formal administrative procedure has been established and followed. The Board of Trustees last reviewed the mission in a Special Meeting on September 28, 2011, and concluded that from its perspective, revision of the mission statement was not warranted during 2011-2012. In addition, the College Council last reviewed and re-affirmed the mission at its meeting on February 8, 2012.

#### **Conclusion**

This planning issue is resolved. Efforts to sustain continuous quality improvement relative to mission review have been prioritized and are part of established administrative procedures for annual program review, planning, and budget development. Details and evidence are specified in the College's response to [Team Recommendation 1: Mission and Master Planning](#).

### Planning Issue 2 – Educational Master Plan

*No later than September 2011, the Superintendent/Superintendent/President will initiate a process by which the campus community will review and update the District Educational Master Plan in order to ensure that institutional planning and decision making are directly responsive to current community needs and guided by current College goals and priorities (IA2; IA3).*

#### **Progress**

The Educational Master Plan provides the foundation for all other planning efforts:

- Distance Education Plan
- Facilities Master Plan



- Technology Master Plan
- Equal Employment Opportunity Plan
- Matriculation Plan
- Student Equity Plan
- Library Information Technology Plan
- Long-Range Financial Strategies and Action Plans

In addition to its master plans, the College's annual program review, planning, and budget development processes, locally referred to as "PRAISE" (**P**rogram **R**eview, **A**llocations, and **I**nstitutional **S**trategies for **E**xcellence), is also aligned to the mission, goals, and strategies specified in the Educational Master Plan. As stated in the College's Program Review Handbook these processes "*are integral to the alignment of the programs' goals with the mission of the college for college-wide planning*<sup>2</sup>."

Evidence of this linkage between annual planning and the EMP is available: Following last year's PRAISE cycle, several instructional programs (Aviation, Nursing, and Athletics) updated their EMPs to more accurately reflect what was learned in that cycle of evaluation and planning.

At the unit level, non-instructional program reviews (NIPRs) include a requirement to specify how annual plans link to district goals, strategic priorities, and the program's own long-term goals as stated in the Educational Master Plan (see NIPR PRAISE template). Those linkages are a consideration as unit-level plans are prioritized within each division pursuant to Administrative Procedure 6200 (Budget Development) and as the annual strategic direction for the college is determined.

### **Conclusion**

This planning issue is resolved. Several opportunities for sustaining continuous quality improvement relative to maintaining progress on the Educational Master Plan have been formalized as part of annual process for program review, planning, and budget development. Details and evidence are specified in the College's response to [Team Recommendation 1: Mission and Master Planning](#), and [Team Recommendation 2: Integrated Planning and Continuous Improvement](#).

### **Planning Issue 3 – SLO Assessment Procedures**

*By June 2011, the Academic Senate will develop recommendations regarding College acquisition of software for assessment data management and approve a procedure for systematic learning assessment documentation across the institution to be integrated into the*

---

<sup>2</sup> Program Review Handbook, revised 9/4/2013, page 4.

*College's existing program review and planning procedures (IB2; IB3).*

### **Progress**

The Academic Senate recommended the College use TracDat© as its assessment data management system. The College acquired TracDat© and compensated a faculty member to serve as Student Learning Outcomes Assessment (SLOA) Coordinator, whose task was to implement TracDat© ©. At this time, the procedures developed for SLO assessment reporting involved data entry by that SLOA Coordinator.

Assessment Reporting has been an integral part of program review for both instructional and non-instructional programs. Student learning outcomes (SLO) assessments are housed in TracDat©, while service area outcomes (SAOs) are reported at least annually in PRAISE Reports from non-instructional programs.

What remains to be accomplished is a formal evaluation of current processes for the purpose of designing a better work system for SLO and SAO assessment reporting. Such a system should empower all assessment practitioners to own and manage their respective data, and should afford access by all people to data and reports needed to support institutional improvement across campus.

### **Conclusion**

This planning issue is resolved. With the acquisition of TracDat©, the College has a means through which it can systematically manage SLO and SAO assessment data. The initial approach of a single faculty coordinator who keys assessment results into TracDat© has proven to be ineffective, particularly as assessment practice matures across campus . Details and evidence are specified in the College's response to [Team Recommendation 3: Student Learning Outcomes](#).

## **Planning Issue 4 – Program Review Training**

*The Office of Institutional Effectiveness, in consultation with the Academic Senate and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, will develop by November 2011 a program review training procedure for chairs, managers, and student support staff in order to improve understanding and use of data, as well as standardize and improve follow through and communication for program improvement (IB3).*

### **Progress**

Training for program review is conducted each year by the Instructional Program Review Committee for instructional programs, and by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research for non-instructional programs.

Reporting assessment results are an integral part of program review for both instructional and non-instructional programs. As such, opportunities exist to document discussion about

data, and communicate to stakeholders how data will be used for program improvement.

### **Conclusion**

This planning issue is resolved. Program review training is an ongoing activity that is part of the College's annual program review, planning, and budget development cycle. Improvements are made as deemed necessary pursuant to evaluation findings conducted on an annual basis by the process owners: Instructional Program Review Committee, Non-instructional Program Review Committee, and the Finance, Budget, and Planning Committee. Details and evidence are specified in the College's response to [Team Recommendation 2: Integrated Planning and Continuous Improvement](#).

## **Planning Issue 5 – Assessment Processes**

*By January 2012 the Superintendent/President will identify processes to support discussion of assessment data and the use of assessment to improve teaching, learning, and service. Such processes should include quality training of faculty, staff, and administrators, as well as software to facilitate the collection, management, analysis, and constructive use of assessment data (IB3; IIA1; IIA2).*

### **Progress**

Processes to support discussion of assessment data and the use of assessment to make improvements have been developed, implemented, evaluated, and formalized. Quality training of faculty, staff, and administrators has occurred annually since the last comprehensive institutional self-evaluation; this year's training will provide a particular emphasis on data analysis and its constructive use in planning and decision-making.

### **Conclusion**

This planning issue is resolved. As described under Planning Issues 3 (SLO Assessment Procedures,) and 4 (Program Review Training,), current assessment processes support discussion of assessment data through program review. Training for program review processes are held in conjunction with the annual planning cycle, and an information system (TracDat©) has been acquired for managing assessment data. Details and evidence are specified in the College's response to [Team Recommendation 3: Student Learning Outcomes](#).

## **Planning Issue 6 – Early Alert Program**

*The Division of Student Services will expand the Early Alert program to improve student progress, persistence, and success by enabling an electronic request by faculty for early support intervention no later than August 2011 and completing the implementation and evaluation of the "Success Contract" by January 2012 (IIB1; IIB4).*

### **Progress**

This planning issue has been resolved. The Student Success and Support Committee in collaboration with the Academic Senate, and the Dean of Student Services developed a monitoring, notification, and intervention system for students on academic or progress probation.

### **Conclusion**

Monitoring and notifying students of their academic progress is now an ongoing business process, and as such is subject to evaluating and improving as necessary. However, in support of sustaining continuous quality improvement, the College's institutionalization of the Student Success Initiative will include additional strategies for increasing student retention and persistence.

## **Planning Issue 7 – Facilities Planning**

*The Administrative Services Division will ensure that procedures for assessing and improving the College's physical plant operations are integrated into the existing annual review and resource allocation cycle for planning year 2011-2012 (IIB1b).*

### **Progress**

All program review formats include questions related to facilities and program needs. As the process of updating the facilities master plan commences during the Fall 2013 term, information about facilities needs has been collected from the Educational Master Plan, 2012 and from annual PRAISE Reports. In this way, facilities planning is clearly linked to annual review and resource allocation processes and longer-term planning perspectives from the Educational Master Plan.

In addition to assessing and improving the College's physical plant through long-term facilities planning, SAOs in key programs enable improvements on a more frequent basis.

### **Conclusion**

This planning issue has been resolved. This is an ongoing business process subject to established practices for evaluating and improving as necessary. No specific priorities have been identified.

## **Planning Issue 8 – Technology Planning**

*Commencing Spring 2012, the Superintendent/President will make certain that the College's Technology Plan is updated, implemented, and evaluated to ensure its alignment with the Educational Master Plan (IIC1c; IIC2).*

### **Progress**

The College's Technology Master Plan (TMP) was updated on September 9, 2012. During the Spring 2014 semester, the Technology Committee will be reviewing and updating the TMP as deemed necessary. One of the goals is to verify that linkages to the Educational Master Plan are clear. It is the goal of the Technology Committee to plan for and seek improvement of the College's technology infrastructure in order to help the College and its staff be more efficient and, therefore, improve performance on student learning outcomes particularly with respect to computer literacy.

### **Conclusion**

This planning issue has been resolved. Integration of the Technology Plan and other institutional planning documents is described in detail in [Team Recommendation 1: Mission and Master Planning](#), and [Team Recommendation 2: Integrated Planning and Continuous Improvement](#). The Technology Committee is in the process of reviewing the Technology Master Plan the Spring 2014 semester in order to ensure clear linkages to the Educational Master Plan.

## **Planning Issue 9 – Integrated Planning**

*The Superintendent/President will oversee updating and execution of Administrative Procedures 1202 and 3250 to formalize the integration of institutional planning and budgeting for use in planning for the 2011-2012 budget year (IID1a).*

### **Progress**

[Administrative Procedure 1202 \(Implementing Institutional Effectiveness\)](#), was updated on April 30, 2013. No administrative procedure was developed for institutional planning *per se*; rather, the Fiscal, Budget, and Planning Committee oversaw development and adoption of [Administrative Procedure 6200 \(Budget Development\)](#), which serves as a means to formalize a systematic process for integrating planning and budgeting.

### **Conclusion**

This planning issue has been resolved. Details and evidence are specified in the College's response to [Team Recommendation 2: Integrated Planning and Continuous Improvement](#).

## **Planning Issue 10 – Structural Budget Deficit**

*No later than December 2011, the Superintendent/President will develop a plan to overcome the College's structural budget deficit and balance the budget by the end of fiscal year 2014-2015 (IID1c).*

### **Progress**

The College has developed its Long Range Financial Strategies and Action Plans consistent with recommendations by FCMAT in its Fiscal Review Report dated April 3, 2013. Several key strategies have been implemented, with the remaining strategies to be implemented at various times throughout this academic year. The plan considers multiple approaches of ensuring the College's future fiscal stability—from cost saving measures, to evaluating and updating board policies and administrative procedures, to creating and monitoring its plans using established structures and work systems. In this way, the College strengthens the organizational foundation upon which practices and operations are conducted.

### **Conclusion**

This planning issue is being addressed. Details and evidence are specified in the College's response to [Team Recommendation 6: Long-Term Fiscal Plans](#).

## **Planning Issue 11 – Integrated ERP**

*No later than Summer 2012, the Superintendent/President will oversee the development and implementation of the College plan for improving accuracy and efficiency by integrating finance, human resources, and payroll management information systems with its enterprise resource platform (IIID2b; IIID2g).*

### **Progress**

The College continues to focus on improving accuracy and efficiency of business processes that traverse across programs (e.g., finance, human resources, and payroll) through its annual program review, planning, and budget development processes. However, this planning issue has not and will not be addressed by acquiring additional modules in the College's current enterprise resource platform (Colleague© by Ellucian). While the Superintendent/President in place at the time of Self Study 2011 prioritized this task, reconsideration of this strategy by subsequent senior administrators revealed better solutions at far lower costs.

### **Conclusion**

This planning issue is resolved.

## **Planning Issue 12 – Integrated ERP**

*This is a duplication of Planning Issue 11 as published in the Self-Study of 2011.*

## **Planning Issue 13 – Campus Climate**

*The Superintendent/President will ensure successful completion of the Recommended Actions and Next Steps for Improvement document. This includes but is not limited to revising*

*relevant administrative procedures, designing and implementing strategies for improving, and regular monitoring of campus climate by the end of academic year 2011-2012 (IVA1; IVA2; IVA5).*

**Progress**

The College has institutionalized a process of assessment of campus climate along with the processes for assessing SLOs and other college functions. These processes have been put in place and repeated for employees; a survey of student's experiences with campus climate has also been administered for the first time with generally favorable results.

**Conclusion**

This planning issue is resolved. The College community has worked together to cultivate a campus environment of empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence by creating a culture of respect, civility, dialogue and trust. . Details and evidence are specified in the College's response to [Team Recommendation 4: Campus Climate](#).

**Planning Issue 14 – Board Development**

*The Superintendent/President will oversee development and adoption of an administrative procedure to formalize processes for board development and orientation, and will ensure implementation of Board Policy 2745, Board Self-Evaluation (IVB1).*

**Progress**

The College's governing board has committed to attending Board workshops; budget workshops; self-evaluation (August 9, 2011; October 9, 2012); delegating more responsibility to the Superintendent/President; they recognize they are policy-making body, not an operational body, and their ultimate responsibility is for educational quality and the fiscal health of the college. While the previous Superintendent/President was remiss in developing a more formal system of board development, current campus leadership has identified many opportunities for improving in this area.

**Conclusion**

This planning issue is resolved. Policies of the College governing board clearly identify it as a policy-making body that delegates power and authority to the Superintendent/President, who then implements board policies without interference by any member of the governing board. Although the College governing board has made tremendous strides to address ACCJC deficiencies, there are many tasks to accomplish to fully define the College governing board as a policy-making body. Details and evidence are specified in the College's response to [Team Recommendation 8: Board Practices and Evaluation](#).