

MAY 18 2007

MAY 16 2007

**PROGRESS VISIT REPORT**

**Victor Valley College  
18422 Bear Valley Road  
Victorville, CA 92392-5849**

**A Confidential Report Prepared for the Accrediting Commission  
for Community and Junior Colleges**

**This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited  
Victor Valley College on May 3, 2007**

**Dr. Christopher C. O'Hearn, President, Mt. San Antonio College  
Dr. Jeffrey L. Bobbitt, Vice President, College of the Redwoods**

May 11, 2007

TO: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

FROM: Christopher C. O'Hearn, Ph.D., Team Chair

SUBJECT: Report of Progress Report,  
Victor Valley College, May 3, 2007

**Introduction:**

A comprehensive visit was conducted at Victor Valley College on March 8-10, 2005. At its meeting of June 8-10, 2005, the Commission acted to require of Victor Valley College a Progress Report, to be followed by a visit. The Progress Report visiting team, Dr. Christopher C. O'Hearn and Dr. Jeffrey L. Bobbitt, conducted the required site visit to Victor Valley College on November 9, 2005. The purpose of the team visit was to verify the assertions made in the Progress Report prepared by the College and to determine if the College had responded appropriately to seven recommendations identified in the comprehensive visit as areas needing significant focus. At its meeting on January 11-13, 2006, the ACCJC/WASC took action to reject the report and required that the College submit another Progress Report by March 15, 2006, to be followed by a visit.

On April 10, 2006, a second Progress Report visit was conducted at Victor Valley College. The visiting team consisted of Dr. Christopher C. O'Hearn, Dr. Jeffrey L. Bobbitt, and Ms. Christina L. Dyer. During the visit the Team met with members of the college community including the President of the College and the President's Cabinet, representing instruction, student services, administrative services, human resources, and research. Likewise, the Team met with a student and several faculty members who were members of the Academic Senate. At its meeting on June 7-9, 2006, the Commission took action to accept the report and required that the College submit another Progress Report by March 15, 2007, to be followed by a visit.

On May 3, 2007, a third Progress Report visit was conducted at Victor Valley College. The visiting team consisted of Dr. Christopher C. O'Hearn and Dr. Jeffrey L. Bobbitt. During the visit, the team met with the President of the Board of Trustees, the Interim Superintendent/President, the Assistant Superintendent, the Vice President of Student Services, and the Vice President of Administrative Services. *add Executive Dean*

The Commission requested that the Progress Report focus on the progress made by the College in complying with the three specific recommendations cited in the Commission's action letter of June 2006.

### **Recommendation 1: Improving Institutional Effectiveness**

The team recommends that the College provide evidence that it assesses progress toward achieving its 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. This continuing cycle should include long-term master planning; short-term strategic planning, including technology planning; and an effective, institutionalized program review process. When fully implemented, this cycle of planning, evaluation and program improvement should result in the creation of a culture of research and evidence that supports all of the college's decision-making processes.

The college continues to make progress in its response to this recommendation. An Office of Institutional Effectiveness has been established, headed by a newly appointed Executive Dean of Institutional Effectiveness. Institutional research, and support for planning and evaluation are being centralized in this office.

A new annual planning and budget development process was implemented for a second annual cycle in 2006-2007. In this development iteration, a formal program review process was integrated into the process as a basis for evaluating planning and budget augmentation requests.

In this process, the instructional deans and the Executive Vice President for Student Learning review plans and budget requests forwarded by program areas within the instructional divisions. However, the current involvement of the instructional deans with program review and planning at the unit level is inconsistent. The college believes that more systematic involvement of the deans in the development of annual planning and budget augmentation requests prior to higher level reviews could strengthen the overall planning and budgeting process.

The Faculty Senate Budget Committee also reviews annual budget augmentation requests originating from academic program areas. Standard criteria for these reviews are currently being developed.

A Budget Resource Identification Committee (BRIC) reviews annual budget augmentation requests from administrative and student services units and makes recommendations to the President's Cabinet, where final budget allocation decisions are made. This process currently does not include a review of recommendations made by the Faculty Senate Budget Committee, which are handled through a separate review process. There are six positions on the BRIC for faculty representatives, which the faculty have chosen not to fill. There is some concern that until a fully representative review of both faculty and administrative planning activities and budget requests is implemented, the college's institutional effectiveness efforts cannot be considered fully integrated.

Program review and an annual process for planning and budget augmentation review for non-instructional areas are still under development. The college anticipates that the

process currently being developed will be finalized this year and implemented for the first time next year.

**Conclusion:**

The College has made progress in addressing this recommendation.

**Recommendation 2: Student Learning Outcomes**

**To meet the standards' focus on ensuring student success and the quality of programs and services, the team recommends the College conduct meaningful, timely, and inclusive dialogue with all campus constituents to identify student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels. The College should also systematically assess these student learning outcomes and use the results of these assessments for the improvement of institutional effectiveness.**

The college's curriculum development process now includes the development of student learning outcomes at the course level and the inclusion of student learning outcome statements on official course outlines. The college is also developing a process for compiling evidence to evaluate and document the extent to which these learning outcomes are being achieved. Leadership for the development of this process has been assigned to the Faculty Senate's Learning Assessment Committee. This committee plans to work in collaboration with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to create a proposal for developing, implementing, and evaluating student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels. This work will be coordinated by the Executive Dean of Institutional Effectiveness.

**Conclusion:**

The College has made progress in addressing this recommendation.

**Recommendation 3: Organizational Structure and Staffing**

**The team recommends that the College evaluate and address its organizational structure and staffing needs. The evaluation should include, but not be limited to, technology support, risk management, maintenance and operations, and human resources. The College should take appropriate actions to implement the results of the evaluation and must address the lack of sufficient staffing.**

The college continues to make progress in addressing this recommendation. Since the last progress report, the college's president has resigned and an interim president has been in place since September of 2006. A new Vice President for Human Resources, a new Executive Vice President for Student Learning, and an Executive Dean for Institutional Effectiveness have been appointed. Efforts to recruit and appoint a permanent president are in progress with the intent that a new president be in place by July 1, 2007.

## **Conclusion**

The College has made progress in addressing this recommendation.

In conclusion, the College should be commended for taking the recommendations seriously and for providing the team with appropriate and substantial documentation verifying its progress. Nevertheless, the team believes that for the College to be effective, several areas of concern need to be addressed, the most compelling of which are:

- ✖ 1. That the Board of Trustees has not unified itself in support of the mission and goals of the college with a focus on student success.
- ✖ 2. That represented groups, particularly CSEA and CTA, continue to act negatively, violating standards of good practice.
- ✖ 3. The turnover of personnel in executive management.
- ✖ 4. The lack of meaningful institutional dialogue to address and resolve issues affecting institutional effectiveness.
- ✖ 5. The College's need to seriously embrace accreditation as a process for institutional improvement, rather than merely responding to team recommendations.

From the team's perspective, the Board of Trustees and the College must commit themselves to meeting or exceeding each accreditation standard, and it must begin the process immediately. As the district is in a search for a new superintendent/president, there is opportunity for the College to reinvent itself.