

# Institutional Effectiveness Committee

Victor Valley College  
10/15/10, 10:00-11:48 AM - Teaching Learning Center: ATC Building, Room 171

## *The family:*

<b>Members</b> – (P = Present; A = Absent; T = Tardy; L = Left Early)			
<b>P</b>	Mark Clair (Classified)	<b>P</b>	Jennifer Larriva (Classified)
<b>P</b>	Donna Derryberry (Classified)	<b>P</b>	Marc Skuster (Faculty)
<b>P</b>	Jessica Gibbs (Faculty)	<b>P</b>	Quynh Tran (Classified)
<b>A</b>	Shirley Gonzalez (Management)	<b>P</b>	Virginia Moran (Administrative Advocate)
<b>P</b>	Paul Williams (Dean)	<b>P</b>	Patrick Malone (Faculty)
<b>P</b>	Peggy Mayer (Faculty)	<b>A</b>	Christopher Mollenkamp (Board of Trustees)
<b>Guests</b> – None			

## **1. Minutes, 9/17/10**

*On the ever helpful advice of IEC members, the numbering of topics in the 9/17/10 minutes was corrected. After some discussion about how best to characterize the attitude in question, it was agreed that the word “unsympathetically” would be deleted from the sentence, “VM **unsympathetically** noted that VVC uses the system’s definition of “success” and “retention.””*

## **2. ARCC:**

- 2010 ESL Improvement Update: Research Office Report

*JL reported progress in tracking improvement for the Math Department: success rate of students who moved from a lower level course to the next higher level course (Math 50/90/109). JL also reported that no work has been done on ESL improvement—the ARCC indicator for which the Academic Senate leadership identified inaccuracies—because any data produced by the Research Office would simply duplicate the ARCC 2011 data that is to be distributed by the end of October 2010. VM indicated that it should be verified that curriculum changes made by ESL faculty to correct ARCC inaccuracies are represented in datatel. If not, VM noted, the responsibility for inaccurate reporting of this data could have its source in the management of curriculum records by the Office of Instruction.*

- 2010 Persistence Update: Counseling Department

*PM described a recent case in which one student was dismissed, in accordance with the Academic Senate approved “Academic Standards” procedure, but the dismissal was overridden by the supervising Vice President. This action was taken despite the fact that there is no provision in the procedure for an appeal or VP review. VM recommended that the Academic Standards procedure could be adopted as an Administrative Procedure. Since it has been approved by the Academic Senate, the Senate*

*representatives should place it on a College Council agenda so that all relevant college personnel are fully informed of its provisions as well as accountable for following these provisions in practice.*

### **3. Annual Report 2010?????**

*Despite the beauty and genius of its design and execution, the unhappy truth is that nobody much looked at AR 2009. AR 2010 is now four months behind schedule and is due in three months. AR 2009 is cited and described repeatedly in Standard I of the Accreditation Self-Study Report, where it is claimed to be the centerpiece of VVC's procedures for evaluating and improving institutional effectiveness. Because it is titled "Annual" Report, the ACCJC team that visits in March 2011 will expect to see a completed update for 2010—especially since the AR development timeline is included in the Self Study evidence list. IEC members noted that the AR target audience is the entire campus so maybe there should be a survey to the campus asking which AR indicators were helpful, but there is agreement that the report needs to be trimmed down which is complicated since we do not know who the users are and what they need and there are some people that just go "Data bad...I stay in cave" which leaves us with a "culture of anecdote" vs. a "culture of evidence" so maybe the solution is to make everybody believe that data is oh so hot, but that's pretty much impossible which leaves the strategy of making data a necessity like maybe the AR as the only place to get your program review information. VM resolved to place the issue of the Annual Report before Cabinet on Tuesday, 10/19/10. Meanwhile, the Research Office will schedule AR meetings each Friday for the purpose of simplifying the project and present a proposal and revised timeline at the next IEC meeting.*

### **4. Campus Climate Survey 2010:**

- Purpose and Design

*The Survey was a response to a 2005 ACCJC Site Team recommendation. It was intended to assess "the level of respect, civility, dialogue, and trust" across campus; perceptions of how well shared governance processes are functioning; engagement of the campus workforce in shared governance processes; and views about the consistency of current business practices with official district values.*

- Summary of Results

*There were 199 respondents out of a population of about 760. An average of 22% did not respond to the final 37 survey items that assessed perceptions of institutional effectiveness. These blank responses will be removed from the final report so that only percentages selecting "deficient," "adequate" or "exemplary" for each item are reported. Individual comments volunteered by survey respondents will be distributed in edited and aggregated form.*

- Distribution Plan

*Survey results will be validated and the report cleaned up by 10/22/10. A revised summary and report will be sent to the Accreditation Self-Study chairs 10/29/10 for use in the 2011 Accreditation Self-Study Report. The shared governance committee chairs will receive a report of the survey results sometime thereafter.*

- Integration into Planning and Evaluation Processes?

*The Research Office will meet with the chair and administrative advocate of each shared governance committee in order to review and discuss survey results relevant to the committee's charge. Chairs and*

*advocates will be given guidelines for how to respond to the survey, including an action plan that addresses identified deficiencies. The action plan for each committee will be submitted to College Council, and committees will be expected to report progress on these plans to College Council in the future.*

## **5. Program Review Update:**

- Division Summary Final Report

*VM explained that the division summary addendum to program review was a flop because of less than thorough implementation. She promised to resend the Adobe score sheet that was to be used by IEC members to assess division summaries. This will allow committee members to complete evaluations that were not done in June at the conclusion of the last program review cycle. The submitted division summaries are posted in the global Teaming workspace for PRAISE Reports. VM will attempt to obtain the STEM division summary and post it to this folder.*

- Planning for 2010-2011

*VM stated that Cabinet will have to initiate program review for the current year.*

- Program Review Evaluation for Non-instructional Departments.

*VM will develop a dirty program review evaluation for non-instructional areas.*

## **6. Accreditation Self-Study Update**

- Standard IB: Improving Institutional Effectiveness

*MS or VM will send the current Self Study draft of Standard I to IEC members. At present, the Standard I section is closer to its final form than the remainder of the report.*

## **7. Other**

- Planning/Evaluation Software: TaskStream, Blackboard.

*Demos of planning software will be scheduled for the Spring. VM divined that funds would be available for this purpose following the ACCJC team site visit in March, 2011.*

- AP 3250: Institutional Planning

*There was no discussion of this subject.*

## **8. Fall 2010 Meeting Schedule**

- November 19, 2010 – 10:00-11:59 AM, TLC (Holiday appropriate attire required: please come dressed as a Pilgrim, an Indian, or a turkey.)

## 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).