

Institutional Effectiveness Committee

Victor Valley College

04/08/2011, 10:11-11:51 AM - Teaching Learning Center: ATC Building, Room 171

Who We Are!

Attendance Key: P = Present; A = Absent; T = Tardy; L = Left Early.			
P	Mark Clair (Classified)	P	Jennifer Larriva (Classified)
P	Donna Derryberry (Classified)	P	Marc Skuster (Faculty)
A	Jessica Gibbs (Faculty)	A	Quynh Tran (Classified)
P	Paul Williams (Dean)	A	Virginia Moran (Administrative Advocate)
P	Patrick Malone (Faculty)	TL	Deanna Turnbeau (Administration)
P	Peggy Mayer (Faculty)	P	Darcie Wasinger (ASB)
T	Deedee Orta (Administration)	P	Gregory Harbor (ASB)
Guests: None to speak of.			

1. MINUTES, 03/18/2011

No additions or corrections. PkM observed that the minutes were boring.

2. ARCC:

- Date for ARCC 2011 Board Interaction

VM was not present to report on her efforts to ensure that the BOT ARCC 2011 interaction will be completed during the Board's 2011 Summer Retreat.

- ARCC 2011 Response: IR Action Plans
 - Leavers Survey
 - Nonpersistence Study

MC and JL reported that there has been no progress on developing action plans and timelines for above two components of VVC's response to ARCC 2011.

- ARCC 2011 Response: Tasks for the Student Services Committee
 - Registration priorities: Review, Analysis, Revision, Implementation
 - Intervention Practices: Review, Analysis, Revision, Implementation
 - First Year Model Class Schedule

MS reported on a meeting with Tim Johnston, Interim Dean of Student Services, on the subject of the ARCC 2011 report and VVC's 2011 Self-Assessment. Dean Johnston described his progress on convening the college-wide Student Services Committee and agreed that the above three components of VVC's 2011 ARCC response would be appropriate and worthwhile activities for this committee to address. He expects that the Student Services Committee will begin meeting during the last half of

the Spring 2011 semester. MS commented that the SSC should include IEC members who will be responsible for ensuring that ARCC deficiencies are understood and addressed and for reporting on progress to the IEC. MC and JL (if appointed by CSEA) will be on the committee. PM expressed strong interest in joining the committee and promised to contact Dean Johnson.

- ARCC 2011 Response: Tasks for Office of Instruction and Academic Senate
- Scheduling Priorities: Review, Analysis, Revision, Implementation (Handout)

On 3/25/11 MS sent the following formal request to the VPI (with copies to the Instructional Deans and IEC members):

Dear Dr. Zacovic.

This message and request are the result of discussions by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee regarding proposals for addressing performance deficiencies documented in VVC's 2011 ARCC Report. As noted in the attached district self-assessment for 2011, performance on two indicators (SPAR, Persistence) was low and declined significantly over the previous year. Actions that were proposed to address these deficiencies included implementing a Leavers Survey; analysis of data on nonpersisting students; review, analysis, revision, and implementation of registration and scheduling priorities; and development of a first year model class schedule.

An ongoing concern identified through IEC discussion of the annual ARCC reports is the need for improving college-wide awareness of this performance data and for engaging college-wide participation in actions designed to improve institutional performance. The IEC commends the Office of Instruction for initiating a review of scheduling priorities, for its consideration of the thorough analysis provided by the Office of Institutional Research and the budget analyst, and for using explicit guidelines contained in "Guiding Principles of 2011-2011 Schedule Development." This approach is a welcome improvement over past practice.

The IEC recommends that the Office of Instruction expand the scope of participation in the schedule priorities review process by (1) consulting with faculty from all divisions on the further refinement of the schedule development principles and rubric; (2) improving the consistency and effectiveness of consultation between Division Deans and faculty during the implementation of revised scheduling priorities; and (3) engaging IR in an ongoing evaluation of implemented priorities for their effectiveness in improving the rates of persistence and success among Victor Valley College students--again, ARCC indicators which have declined significantly in recent years.

Thank you for your consideration. The IEC looks forward to your response.

Marc Skuster, Chair
Institutional Effectiveness Committee

Dr. Zacovic (zuh-koe'-vick; MS alt.: zack'-oh-vick) has not responded to this message. MS reported that the Academic Senate President reviewed and expressed approval of the message prior to its being sent. PW commented that he believed the Deans concurred with the recommendations sent to the VPI, but a procedure for implementation has not yet been developed. One possible approach would be the Senate President's recommendation to form an Enrollment Management Committee that includes faculty representatives as members.

- ARCC 2010 Customized Report?

Customized ARCC reports are no longer provided by the system, but MC created a 2010 customized VVC report (from the full report) and will post it on the IR Reports page with the customized 2008 and 2009 ARCC reports.

3. ACCREDITATION SELF-STUDY UPDATE:

- Visiting Team Detailed Report?

The VPI-ALO reported at the 4/7/11 Academic Senate meeting that the team report from VVC's 2011 site visit will be made available to the CEO only for the purpose of correcting of factual errors. The final report will not be distributed to the college workforce until after the ACCJC's June meeting. MS distributed a notice from the Spring 2011 ACCJC Newsletter, "Deficiencies Leading to Sanction." Only four colleges are current on sanction for Program Review deficiencies. Deficiencies that are most likely to lead to sanction now include the following: use of assessment results in integrated planning (15), Board roles and responsibilities (14), financial management or stability (13), and staffing (12). IEC members commented that the team recommendations announced in the March exit report included several of the deficiencies that most frequently lead to sanction.

4. PROGRAM REVIEW UPDATE:

- Data Quality: MIS + IR Action Update

DT discussed a plan under development to improve data quality by educating staff in the appropriate departments on the importance of correcting errors and on the responsibility of departments from which data originates to make these corrections. This plan has not yet been implemented, and DT was reserved in her expectations regarding the degree to which its outcomes will be achieved.

- Instructional Programs: Participation Report (Handout)

Instructional PR reports were to be submitted to Deedee Orta (Finance Budget Committee), Dave Hollomon (Facilities Committee), Lisa Harvey (Academic Senate), and MS (IEC) as well as to the supervising Dean and VPI. MS reported receiving reports from thirty departments or disciplines. These reports were sent to VM for posting on the Program Review WebPage. There is no college definition of "program" for the purpose of PR, and this makes it difficult to determine the compliance rate. Depending on what is counted as a "program," as many as sixteen departments or disciplines did not submit reports. DO commented that this list may be incomplete since she received program reviews from a variety of sources. DO will send MS a complete count of reports that she received.

- Academic Senate Program Review Committee: Membership and Tentative Charge (Handout)

The following information about the newly revived Academic Senate Program Review Committee was distributed by Senate VP Tracy Davis:

Tentative Charge:

- Responsibility to roll out the Program Review Process during the first week of the Fall semester each year. Making sure all necessary groups receive Program Review information (such as the Facilities Committee as one example).
- What will be included in the Program Review form.

- Examining the Assessment section of the Program Review process (must be implemented by 2012) and look at what other colleges are doing in this area.

Membership as of 3/22/11: Blanchard, Debra; Claude Oliver; Eartha Johnson; Ed Burg; Ed Heaberlin; Karen Tomlin; Marc Skuster; Marsha Cole; Tim Adell

JG volunteered at the March IEC meeting to serve on the PR Committee and report on its activities to the IEC. PkM agreed to volunteer for the same committee if JG is unable to attend meetings.

- Noninstructional Programs: Participation Report

VM was not present to report on noninstructional PR compliance. DO reported that Campus Support PRs were submitted from M & O, Facilities Construction, Payroll, and IR. The STEM Division Summary has been completed.

- IEC Responsibilities (Handout: AP 1202)

As stated in AP 1202, The IEC reviews Division Summaries “for evaluation of institutional effectiveness overall and recommended organizational priorities for enhancements/improvements.”

- Review/Revise Division Summary Template and Rubric (Handouts)

The detailed rubric that was developed in Spring 2010 for IEC members to evaluate Division Summaries turned out to be difficult to use. MS requested that committee members (1) reflect on what they believe the purpose should be for IEC evaluation of division summaries—in light of the statement of functions given in the IEC charge—and (2) critically evaluate the rubric and bring suggestions for revision to the May committee meeting.

5. CAMPUS CLIMATE SURVEY 2010:

- IEC Response Draft (Handout)

The OIE created a template for shared governance committees to use in documenting and reporting plans for action and improvement as a result of CCS2010.

Revisions to the Template:

1. *JL suggested that the template should include a deadline for submission to College Council.*
2. *JL also suggested that shared governance committees should be instructed to include a completion date for each proposed action.*

Revisions:

1. *Delete Strategy 1.1: Everyone email of IEC meeting dates, agendas, and minutes.*
2. *Delete Strategy 2.1: Collaborate on ways to monitor assessment. SLO Facilitator Lisa Harvey approved a suggestion by MS to develop a set of survey questions on assessment practice that would be distributed to faculty via Survey Monkey. However, VVC 2011 Self-Study agenda #3 indicates that the Academic Senate has responsibility for developing recommendations on assessment reporting by June, 2011. The Academic Senate’s Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee was recently reformed. JG volunteered for this committee and will be able to report on its activities to the IEC.*

Reports:

1. *PkM reported that an initial planning meeting took place on 3/31/11 on Strategy 1.2: “Create formal opportunities for employee input on institutional evaluation, planning, and improvement.” The Opportunities for Input subcommittee has not yet prepared a proposal for IEC consideration.*
2. *DO reported that Strategy 1.3 (“Collaborate with Finance, Budget, and Planning Committee to ensure quality communications and work flows re: program review, planning, and improvement of effectiveness.”) was on the agenda for the 4/6/11 FBPC. However, the item was not discussed because VM was unable to attend this meeting.*
3. *MC reported the OIE/IR has discussed revisions to the climate survey tool that relate to Strategy 1.4 “Conduct further analysis of Campus Climate 2010 survey item responses of “no opinion/’don’t know.” In addition, MC distributed a report of additional analysis of the IEC items from CSS2010. In general, faculty don’t know about service level outcome assessment, and classified staff don’t know about SLO assessment, and Part-Time faculty and classified staff don’t know about use of program review, planning, student data, and the Annual Report to evaluation and/or improve institutional effectiveness. On the whole there’s nothing that administrators and managers don’t know.*
4. *IR is prepared to act on Strategy 1.6 “Expand access to research and reports.” The college Webmaster, who has been out of the office for weeks, is expected to return during the Week of 4/11/11. Posting of additional research reports requires the Webmaster’s cooperation.*

6. NEXT AND LAST MEETING FOR SPRING 2011:

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

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE (AP 1201)

Charge

Identifies, defines, revises, and reports performance measures of institutional effectiveness.

Responsible for monitoring and assessing the effectiveness of college evaluation, planning, and improvement processes.

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

Reports progress on the assessment of student learning at the course, program, and college levels.

Provides feedback loop to ensure that college effectiveness is constantly improved by consideration of objective performance data.

Information Flow

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

Annual report directly to Board of Trustees.

“INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS:”

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

Or

How well shared governance processes operate (pursuant to Administrative Procedure 1201)

How engaged workforce members are in those processes; and

How consistent prevailing business practices are with our core organizational values of excellence, integrity, accessibility, diversity, collaboration, and innovation (see Administrative Procedure 1202).