

Institutional Effectiveness Committee

Victor Valley College
02/25/2011, 10:00-11:59 AM (approximately) - Teaching Learning Center: ATC Building, Room 171

Team IEC!

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

1. Welcome:

IEC members welcomed two new ASB representatives to the committee:

*Darcie Wasinger, ASB Student Development and Languages Senator
Gregory Harbor, ASB Fine Arts Senator*

2. Minutes, 11/19/10

The heading of the 11/19/10 minutes was changed from “Minuttes” to “Minutes.” Many thanks to the omniobservant Research Office staff for this correction.

3. ARCC: (Handouts)

- ARCC 2010 Board Interaction?

The required Board of Trustees interaction for the 2010 ARCC report has not yet occurred. No later than 3/8/11, the college must submit a copy of the Board of Trustees minutes showing this interaction (review and interaction with the report at a public meeting, with public comment allowed) to the Chancellor’s Office (email with a link to the board minutes). VM indicated that VVC Board of Trustees interaction with 2010 ARCC should occur on 3/8/11, which may be the absolute, final, last, possible date to get the job done but will still beat 2009 interaction by some months.

- ARCC 2011 February Draft – January 31, 2011:
<http://www.cccco.edu/Portals/4/TRIS/research/ARCC/ARCC%20Feb%20Draft.pdf>

The February draft of ARCC 2011 was posted on 1/31/11. ARCC 2011 data for VVC, including peer group comparisons, were distributed in advance of the meeting to IEC members. VVC 2011 performance was lower than ARCC 2010 on all seven indicators, while average peer group performance for 2011 improved over 2010 peer group performance on six out of seven indicators. VVC 2011 performance dropped below ARCC 2009 on five out of seven indicators.

- College and District Responsibilities for ARCC 2011

The college is expected to review the data of the ARCC 2011 February draft and prepare a written response that will be included in the final ARCC 2011 report. The designated audiences for this response are the VVC Board of Trustees, the California Department of Finance, and the Legislature (including the Legislative Analyst's Office). The college's self-assessment must receive final approval from the college President/Superintendent and is due no later than 5:00 PM on 3/4/11.

- Self-Assessment Guidelines

The district response is expected to include explanation and analysis of the data, describe the populations served, discuss mitigating circumstances, and both acknowledge and affirm the intention to further investigate low performance on any indicator. The maximum length for each district's self-assessment is 500 words.

- Draft: VVC ARCC 2011 Self-Assessment

A draft of VVC's ARCC 2011 self-assessment was prepared and distributed to IEC members by MS. He noted that it was necessary to finalize this draft at the February meeting so that it could be immediately sent to the Academic Senate President-- who will review the document for possible inclusion on the March Senate agenda. JL asked that incorrect FTES references in the draft be removed. IEC members agreed that the final paragraph of the draft should be revised to include the following VVC responses to low performance on persistence and SPA: analysis of scheduling priority effectiveness, review of scheduling priorities, and "first year experience" planning (including a model first year class schedule). IEC members commented on the potential of guidance classes and learning communities to improve first time student persistence. Implementation of intervention strategies and first year experience planning requires active support and leadership by the Dean of Student Services. VM commented that the current Interim Dean of SS can be counted on to exercise such leadership. MS is responsible for sending the revised ARCC self-assessment to the Academic Senate President, with copies to all IEC members. After presentation at the 3/3/11 Senate meeting, the self-assessment will be updated with any recommended Senate changes and returned to the OIE for submission no later than 3/4/11.

4. Accreditation Self-Study Update:

- ACCJC Team Site Visit: 3/14/11-3/17/11

The team arrives and tours the campus late on 3/14/11. Substantive meetings and interviews occur on the following two dates. A concluding presentation open to all members of the campus community is scheduled in PAC at 11:00 AM on 3/17/11. No formal action on the college's accreditation status is taken by the ACCJC until its June meeting, and the college should receive

formal notification of this action early in July. However, the presentation that concludes the site visit should provide a preview of the Team's findings and recommendations to the commission.

- Planning Summary and Timeline (Handout)

Copies of the Planning Summary (Agenda) and timeline were distributed to the IEC. VM noted that most of the activities to which the college is committed by the Planning Agenda are to be initiated during Winter and Spring 2011. She also noted that, at the direction of Dr. O'Hearn, the Superintendent/President is identified as the responsibility center for 10 out of 14 Planning Agenda items.

5. Campus Climate Survey 2010:

- Results: <http://www.vvc.edu/offices/oie/campusclimate2010.shtml>

The original password restriction has been removed, as requested by the Superintendent/President, and complete CCS 2010 results are now available to the public at the above URL.

- Next Steps

2011 Accreditation Self-Study Planning Agenda #13 assigns responsibility to the Superintendent/President to ensure the completion of the "Recommended Actions and Next Steps for Improvement" that were recommended by the OIE on the basis of CCS 2010. VM explained that these steps include review by each shared governance committee of CCS 2010 results relevant to their respective committee charges. Proposals for the revision of a committee's charge and/or for addressing needed improvements within areas relevant to this charge are to be forwarded to College Council. VM suggested that the IEC devote one meeting to this task. It was agreed that CCS 2010 actions and steps would be the primary focus of the March IEC meeting.

- Timeline for Reassessment

Self-Study Planning Agenda #13 also calls on the Superintendent/President to ensure regular monitoring of the campus climate. JL cautioned against repeating the survey before constructive actions have been taken to address the identified deficiencies. VM agreed to plan for a biannual assessment of campus climate, with the next CCS scheduled for Fall 2012.

6. Annual Report 2010:

- Progress to Date

Work on Annual Report 2010 has been suspended while the Research Office ... with MIS staff over the accuracy of data needed to complete the report.

- Format, Access, and Feedback/Evaluation Tool

There was no discussion of these topics.

- Publication Timeline

There was no discussion of this topic.

7. Program Reviews:

- Update on the 2010-2011 Cycle

On 2/16/11 the VPAS notified faculty and administration that Program Reviews and budget development worksheets are due by 3/15/11.

- New Template for Instructional Programs (handout)

On 2/17/11 the Faculty Senate President informed faculty that instructional programs would be using a simplified Program Review template rather than the one used in former years. The simplified instructional template includes the following components: Abstract, Departmental Needs, Review of Prior Requests, Student Learning Outcomes, Additional Explanations. IEC members commented positively on the SLO section but expressed the following concerns regarding the new template:

- 1. Although “processes for program review” is an area for which the district relies primarily on the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate (BP 4035), the new instructional template was distributed without being properly vetted. There was, for example, no presentation, discussion, and vote at a Senate Meeting, and shared-governance committees who have a recognized function in program review were not consulted or given the opportunity to comment in advance*
- 2. The new template includes budget requests, but does not call for a critical analysis of needs or a careful justification of any requests that are made. This approach could be described as “wish list planning.”*
- 3. The new template fails to meet the ACCJC requirement that program review include quantitative and qualitative data.*
- 4. Because data are not included in the new template, faculty no longer have the incentive to review, reflect on, and analyze the performance data that will be used by administrators for the purpose of planning and decision making in a time when major reductions in funding are anticipated.*
- 5. The new template overlooks the functions of evaluation and improvement that are defining purposes of the program review process.*

- Division Summary Doubts

The Program Review Division Summary template, rubric, and review procedure will be placed on a future IEC agenda for discussion and possible revision.

- Program Review Evaluation for Non-instructional Departments

There was no discussion of this item.

8. Other:

National Institute of Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA), "From Gathering to Using Assessment Results: Lessons from the Wabash National Study" (January, 2011).
<http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org/occasionalpapereight.htm> (handout)

VM recommends this article to the IEC. The authors' main theme is that institutions consistently fail to translate assessment data into improvements in student learning.

9. Spring 2011 Meeting Schedule:

- March 18, 2011 - 10:00-11:59 AM, 21-171.
- April 8, 2011 - 10:00-11:59 AM, 21-171.
- May 20, 2011 - 10:00-11:59 AM, 21-171.

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE (AP 1201)

Charge

Identifies, defines, reviews, and reports performance measures of institutional effectiveness.
Responsible for monitoring and assessing the effectiveness of college evaluation, planning, and improvement processes.
Evaluates and recommends improvements for systematic and regular program review of all college programs.
Reports progress on the assessment of student learning at the course, program, and college levels.
Provides feedback loop to ensure that college effectiveness is constantly improved by consideration of objective performance data.

Information Flow

Direct to College Council on policy-related issues. Direct to Superintendent/President on improvements to operational issues.
Annual report directly to Board of Trustees.

"INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS:"

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

Or

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