Minutes

Institutional Effectiveness Committee

Victor Valley College
9/17/10, 10:00-11:59 AM - Teaching Learning Center: ATC Building, Room 171

The family:

Members – (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)
P	Jessica Gibbs (Faculty)	P	Quynh Tran (Classified)
A	Shirley Gonzalez (Management)	P	Virginia Moran (Administrative Advocate)
A	Paul Williams (Dean)	P	Patrick Malone (Faculty)
P	Peggy Mayer (Faculty)	A	Christopher Mollenkamp (Board of Trustees)
Guests – None			

1. Minutes, 5/21/10

No additions, corrections, or arguments.

2. Institutional Research Priorities, 2010-2011

VM discussed the need for an Ad Hoc committee to prioritize Research Office tasks that involve support for institutional effective-relevant issues and activities (rather than ongoing, routine, and nonelective functions). Also needed is a processes that expands responsibility for exposure to and consultation on institutional data. VM described the despair experienced by the Research Office research office staff when decisions are made without looking at the data which they have worked so, so, so, so, so, so, so hard to produce. Five qualifying research priorities were described: data integrity, assessment (for placement), campus climate survey, program review data for 2010-2011, and persistence studies. VM explained that the IEC charge includes authority to serve as a Research Office advisory committee and establish research priorities. IEC committee members agreed that research on persistence should take priority over program review for the Fall 2010 term.

3. ARCC:

   ▪ 2010 Persistence Update: Counseling Department

PM reported that the procedures for probation and dismissal developed by the Counseling Department in Spring 2010 were published in the new college catalog and were implemented for Fall 2010. Students received probation letters but, because of an MIS error, were blocked from registration. The intended procedure is for students to be blocked from registration only after being identified as "subject to dismissal." VM commented that there are many MIS issues to be resolved in implementing this policy. PM also noted that counselors should (but do not currently) have the means and authority to lift blocks to enrollment. The IEC supports the position of the Counseling Department that effectively implementing the probation/dismissal procedure is the responsibility of the Dean of Student Services. VM stated that this position is in recruitment and should be filled in October 2010.

   ▪ ARCC 2009 VVC District Board Interaction

Minutes of the 6/8/10 BOT meeting show that the ARCC 2009 report for VVC was included as an "Information Item." VM noted that this documentation satisfies the 2009 ARCC requirement for "District Board interaction" with the ARCC report.

- ARCC 2010 VVC District Board Interaction

VM reported that District Board interaction with the ARCC 2010 report is on the BOT agenda for November.

- ARCC 2012 Improvement Goals

The VVC improvement goals for 2012 are "at or above the peer rates" for each of the six ARCC indicators. There is no coordinated planning for activities intended to achieve these goals, although improvement efforts are under way in identified Career Technical programs and Basic Skills. It is not clear where the responsibility should lie for taking action on the basis of ARCC data; periodic reminders about ARCC performance to the Academic Senate, Instruction Office, and Deans may be helpful. VM noted in particular that VVC's SPAR performance is largely unchanged for ARCC 2008-2010.

- ARCC 2011 Schedule

Dates have not yet been published for the 2011 schedule. The 2010 schedule involved a preliminary report in October, district data resubmissions by December, ARCC 2010 report with peer data by the beginning of February, district responses due by the beginning of March, BOT ARCC 2009 interaction by the middle of March, final ARCC 2010 issued by end of March.

4. Annual Report 2010 Update:

- 2010 Timeline

VM prepared a timeline for development of the Annual Report 2010: AR 2009 Post-mortem 4/1-6/30/2010; OIE update data 7/1-8/31/2010; IEC update and develop report 9/1/2010-2/24/2011; College Council Review 2/25/2011; BOT Information Item 3/9/2010; dissemination 3/12/2011.

- Progress to date

There has been no work done on data updates for the Annual Report for 2010. VM noted that no one used the AR 2009, but, despite such crushing indifference, courageously harbors a flickering flame of hope that someone, somewhere, somehow might talk about the use of data to improve institutional effectiveness. VM requested that the next IEC meeting be dedicated to a discussion of how the next edition of the Annual Report might be proportioned more realistically to the institutional circumstances within which it is to be received and used. In particular she suggested changing the time line and reducing the number of indicators.

5. Academic Senate Concerns:

- Retention Rate vs. Success Rate

MS reported that a concern raised at the May 2010 Academic Senate meeting regarding the method used by the Research office to calculate retention and success rates. Retention is the percentage of students

who remain enrolled until the final drop date. "Success," by contrast, is regarded by some members of the faculty as a meaningful and independent indicator only when it is calculated from the total number of students who are enrolled at the end of the class. The VVC Research Office calculates success rates on the basis of census enrollment. As a result, students who withdraw are treated as unsuccessful. Some faculty believe there is an important difference between a student who did not attempt to complete a class and withdrew, on the one hand, and a student who did attempt to complete a class and failed. Treating Ws as equivalent to Ds and Fs confuses two separate indicators and reduces the value of the data for the purposes of measuring and improving effectiveness. VM noted that VVC uses the system's definition of "success" and "retention."

- Output-based Schedule Development

MS reported that concern was also expressed at the May 2010 Academic Senate meeting over the use by one Dean of historical success rates for the purpose of determining which sections would be permitted in the class schedule. The members of the IEC murmured their troubled disapproval of this strategy for schedule development.

- Program Management/Discontinuation

There was much discussion of Program Discontinuation at the September 2010 Academic Senate meeting. Chairs or lead faculty in seven programs were notified in July by the Academic Senate Past President that these programs were on a discontinuation list, thereby initiating the discontinuance process defined in AP 4020. At the same time, chairs and lead faculty were informed that the discontinuance process was to be used for program improvement instead of discontinuation. Faculty noted at the Senate meeting that Program Reviews have been completed regularly for at least some of the identified programs, but there has been no comment from supervising Deans or other administrators about poor performance by these programs. Thus, it was unclear what criteria were used to select programs for discontinuation and, thus, difficult for faculty within these programs to respond to their selection. Finally, faculty complained that the process defined in AP 4020 was not followed and that a hitherto unknown "Program Management" process was substituted for the College Council approved discontinuation process.

6. Program Review Update:

- Status of PRAISE Report Submissions: Planning Year 2009-2010

GM prepared a summary of Program Review submissions for 2009-2010: Program, Program Code, submission status (on time, late, in process, other, off cycle, no submission), and program status (continuance, improvement). Submissions = 34. No submission/Other = 26. Continuance = 60. Improvement = 7 (the seven programs selected for "Discontinuance"). VM explained that her use of "improvement status" was derived from Perkins funding guidelines. Career Technical programs that needed improvement were identified by the Deans and were then eligible for improvement funding. Although the library is eligible for Perkins funds, general education programs are not.

- Academic Senate Program Review Evaluation Survey Results

Results of the Program Review Evaluation Survey completed by faculty in June 2010 and reported by the Program Review Chair were distributed to IEC members. As of the September 2010 Senate meeting, these results had not been provided to the Academic Senate officers and representatives. Although there were several positive comments, faculty members who completed the survey were consistently critical of the administration for failing to review and respond to the reports and also expressed skepticism about

the value of the program review process. MS stated that Program Review processes are an academic and professional matter for which the district must rely primarily on the recommendations of the Academic Senate. He commented that it is the role of the Senate to act on the survey results. VM stated that she would share the survey results with the Deans.

- Division Summary Final Report

There was no discussion of this topic.

- Planning for 2010-2011

There was no discussion of this topic.

- Program Review Evaluation for Non-instructional Departments.

There was no discussion of this topic.

7. Accreditation Self-Study Update

- Standard IB: Improving Institutional Effectiveness

There was no discussion of this topic.

8. Other
   - Institutional Effectiveness Software: TaskStream, Blackboard.
   - 2010 Campus Climate Survey
   - AP 4025: VVCC General Education Student Learning Outcomes
   - AP 3250: Institutional Planning

There was no discussion of these topics.

9. Fall 2010 Meeting Schedule

October 15, 2010 – 10:00-11:59 AM, TLC
November 19, 2010 – 10:00-11:59 AM, TLC

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.