

## Report Abstract

This is a summative assessment of how well Victor Valley College meets the standards as a whole. Since the last comprehensive accreditation self study in 2005, the College has actively addressed and resolved the previous recommendations in the midst of significant organizational changes. As a result, while the College meets all the accreditation standards, several opportunities for improvement have been identified in three of the four standards:

### **Standard I**

***Institutional Mission.*** The College's current mission statement was adopted by the Board of Trustees on October 9, 2007. In accordance with recently adopted AP 1200, it is appropriate at this time to initiate a formal and collaborative review of the College's vision, mission, values, goals, and priorities. The College's Master Educational Plan was based on the mission statement of 2003 and was not updated following the adoption of a new mission statement in 2007.

***Improving Institutional Effectiveness.*** Substantial internal and external changes that occurred subsequent to the adoption of the current Educational Master Plan require the development of a new Master Plan that is consistent with economic conditions within the District, State funding projections, District organization and leadership, and the reviewed and revised statement of the College's mission, vision, values, and goals to be completed by the Board of Trustees in January 2011. While significant progress has been made at the course-level, insufficient documentation exists of student learning outcomes assessment for program, general education, and dialogue and planning for the improvement of learning.

### **Standard II**

***Instructional Programs.*** There is a need to resolve the conflict about what constitutes faculty responsibility for assessment, specify the expectations for supporting effective assessment practice on the part of faculty and administration, and move quickly to institutionalize assessment data management, sound analysis of that data, and regular, productive dialogue about quality improvement of teaching and learning across the College.

There are examples of course-level and program SLO assessment across campus, but no systematic means of documenting the dialogue and action resulting from such assessment activities. Moreover, faculty have yet to discuss an assessment schedule or to develop and operationalize a College-wide plan for assessment, and the College has not begun to explore its options for managing assessment data.

***Student Support Services.*** Pre-term interventions like the "Success Contract" and mid-term progress reports like those used in the special population programs (EOPS/CARE, Puente, for example) offer another layer of learning support that warrant further study to determine whether completion, grade average and persistence do indeed improve. Additionally, the processes themselves also need to be evaluated to determine whether improvements are needed.

**Library.** The library must continue to meet the learning needs of a growing student population by providing adequate access to high quality information resources and computer technology. As off-campus learning centers are developed, the library must plan to provide seamless access to information resources for off-campus students. Simultaneously we are dealing with challenges related to budget reductions to the online and printed collections and staffing deficiencies resulting from a full-time faculty librarian vacancy. The library will use institutional planning processes for program review to request replacement of the full-time faculty librarian position, a designated library department chair, and general fund budget restoration for library materials. The library will implement an assessment program that will be used to improve student learning, library instruction and services, and the collection.

**Learning Resources.** Student retention and transfer rates need improvement. Learning Support Services and resources should be integrated and deployed based on an Educational Master Plan and student performance data.

### **Standard III**

**Human Resources.** The College must review and update the Educational Master Plan to ensure that planning and decision-making are guided by current community needs and College priorities. Once this is accomplished, the College can recruit for much needed positions and enhance staff development and diversity training.

The College continues to make improvement with its human resources, but is faced with meeting hiring priorities and training staff with increasing budgetary challenges and the retirements of experienced faculty and staff. The opportunity to improve future human resources planning will be the result of the Educational Master Plan.

The College must take steps to streamline processes with fewer staff due to budget constraints and provide appropriate training to ensure that employees are current in their professions.

**Physical Resources.** The Facilities Master Plan is a living document and will continue to be a work in progress; therefore, these planning documents need the ability to be flexible. Through annual evaluation, these planning tools help to ensure effectiveness and accuracy of the needs of the students, faculty, and staff.

To improve efforts to meet the legal requirements for holding regular College safety meetings, the Environmental Health and Safety Committee has implemented nine Cal-OSHA mandated programs through its insurance carrier.

Administration will work diligently with faculty and staff through the Finance, Budget and Planning Committee to ensure adequate funds become available to support both the maintenance department and scheduled maintenance projects. The College plans to continue its commitment to see the long range Facilities Master Plan to completion, meeting the needs of the projected 20,000 plus student campus of the future. By continually drawing on updated documentation from the Educational Master Plan, the College works to fulfill the future educational needs of the growing community and serving students.

**Technology Resources.** While much progress has been made to improve campus technology resources and systems in recent years, many items identified in the campus-wide technology assessment conducted by PlanNet in 2008 are yet to be prioritized. The Technology Plan must be updated to ensure that technology resources support College priorities in order to prioritize the remaining recommendations put forward in the campus-wide technology assessment of 2008. In general, a primary focus on balancing availability of resources and campus need, as well as placing instruction and its associated activities as a primary support goal should be maintained.

**Financial Resources.** The College's 2010-2011 General fund Expenditures budget is \$63,043,497. District utilizes various resources to meet its current and future obligations and liabilities, in addition to relying on a total cost of ownership model for any major acquisitions. Resources include state apportionment, local property taxes, enrollment fees, as well as other local revenues. Partnerships are an important component to the College's financial landscape. They include the HeadStart program, leases for campus facilities, Southern California Edison agreement, campus cellular tower, state capital grants, Mojave Sustainability Project, CAHSEE, and Workforce Investment Board. A bond, known locally as Measure JJ, was approved by voters in the fall of 2008 for \$297.5 million of capital improvements. The funds are earmarked to build a new Workforce Development Center on the westside of the region, a Public-Safety Training Center on the eastside, and to improve the main campus' deteriorating classrooms, aged plumbing, and other repairs. Measure JJ provides resources to support expansion of District educational services and to reduce operating costs.

Contributions from the Victor Valley College Foundation support students and faculty by allocating funds for scholarships, educational expenses and securing instructional equipment, supplies, and travel costs. District administration incorporated the effect of these sources of revenue on the expense budget while developing the institutional operating budget.

#### **Standard IV**

**Decision-Making Roles and Processes.** The College's participative governance structures were formalized in 2007 and have since been implemented. Recent results from the Campus Climate Survey 2010 indicate a review of established administrative procedures may be needed to make the necessary improvements to both campus climate and in participative governance operations.

Other findings in the Campus Climate Survey 2010 indicate improvements must be addressed in the College's participative governance system and its overall institutional effectiveness. This will ensure that decision-making roles and processes are well understood across campus, and that fair and equitable access by all members of the College workforce to those processes is safeguarded.

**Board and Administrative Organization.** The District has a 5-member Board of Trustees elected at large. Each member serves for 4-year staggered terms.

## Organization for the Self Study

Accreditation Liaison Officer: Mark Zacovic

Steering Committee: (Debra Blanchard and Christopher O'Hearn, co-chairs)

Peter Allan	Greta Moon	Becky Palmer	Marc Skuster
Lisa Harvey	Virginia Moran	Mary Pringle	Paul Williams
Leslie Huiner			

Standard I Team (Marc Skuster and Virginia Moran, co-chairs):

Mark Clair	Said Ngobi	Carl Smith	Susan Tillman
Sheri Nolan Foster	Debbie Peterson	Jaye Tashima	Diane Wollan
Bill Greulich			

Standard II Team (Leslie Huiner, Greta Moon, and Lisa Harvey, co-chairs):

Tim Adell	Yoko Inagi	Patricia Luther	Carol Stump
John Akins	Tim Johnston	Mike McCracken	John Sweet
Patricia Bejarano-Vera	Greg Jones	Dave Oleson	Shane Thomas
Donna Derryberry	Janet Long	Robert Sewell	Steve Toner

Standard III Team (Peter Allan and Mary Pringle, co-chairs):

Steve Garcia	Christopher Hylton	Jennifer Larriva	Marie Vidana-Barda
Andrea Glebe	Gh Javaheripour	Renate Longoria	Fusako Yokotobi
Chris Guinotte	Scott Jones	Frank Smith	
Dave Holloman	Leonard Knight	Paul Toning	

Standard IV Team (Becky Palmer and Paul Williams, co-chairs):

Dino Bozonelos	Lori Kildal	Chris Mollenkamp	Michael Visser
Ron Fields	Patrick Malone	Deanna Turnbeau	Sandy Visser
Patty Golder			

Figure 4. VVC Self Study Timeline

