

OXNARD COLLEGE

MID-TERM REPORT

October 15, 2013



CERTIFICATION OF INSTITUTIONAL MIDTERM REPORT

Oxnard College - October 15, 2013

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges

From: Oxnard College
4000 South Rose Avenue
Oxnard, CA 93033

This institutional *Midterm Report* is submitted to the ACCJC for the purpose of assisting in the determination of the institution's accreditation status.

We certify that there was broad participation by the campus community and the District Administrative Center and believe that this report accurately reflects the nature and substance of this institution.

Mr. Bernardo M. Perez, Chair, Board of Trustees, Ventura County Community College District

Dr. Jamillah Moore, Chancellor, Ventura County Community College District

Dr. Richard Durán, President, Oxnard College

Dr. Linda Kama'ila, Academic Senate President, Oxnard College

Ms. Ashley Lajoie, Classified Senate President, Oxnard College

Mr. Nicholas Rodriguez, Student Trustee, Ventura County Community College District

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Statement of Report Preparation	1
Oxnard College Recommendation 1	4
Oxnard College Recommendation 2	7
Oxnard College Recommendation 3	9
Oxnard College Recommendation 4	13
Oxnard College Recommendation 5	17
Oxnard College Recommendation 6	19
Oxnard College Recommendation 7	20
Oxnard College Self-Improvement Plans	22
District Recommendation 1	36
District Recommendation 2	38
District Recommendation 3	41
District Recommendation 4	46
District Recommendation 5	49
District Recommendation 6	51
District Recommendation 7	54
District Commission Concern (February 1, 2012).....	56
District Commission Concern (January 31, 2011).....	63

Statement of Report Preparation

This *Midterm Report* describes Oxnard College's and the Ventura County Community College District's responses to the recommendations made by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) after its last comprehensive self-evaluation and accreditation team visit in October 2010.

We certify there has been considerable opportunity for the Board of Trustees, Ventura County Community College District constituents, and Oxnard faculty, classified staff and administrators to participate in the input and review of this report. We believe the *Midterm Report* accurately reflects the nature and substance of progress since the Team visits on October 31, 2011, April 16, 2012, and November 13, 2012.

The college-specific portions of this report were compiled by Dr. Erika Endrijonas, Oxnard College's Accreditation Liaison Officer and Executive Vice President. Dr. Endrijonas identified a small work-group to gather information regarding progress made on all seven College recommendations noted by the October 2010 visiting team and the college's self-identified improvement plans. The work-group met initially on February 1, 2013; March 1, 2013 was established as the deadline for all information and suggested updates to be sent to Dr. Endrijonas. During March, she completed a rough draft of the college's responses and updates and sent it, along with a draft of the district's responses, out to the college community for comment on April 2nd. In addition to receiving an electronic copy of the Midterm Report draft, all college faculty and staff received a SurveyMonkey to collect feedback on the report and to ask some questions about how well the college was doing in terms of communication. Dr. Endrijonas then held a college-wide Accreditation Forum to both outline the report and to collect feedback on April 24th. An updated draft of the report was completed over the summer and supporting evidence was identified and properly cited throughout the report. This draft was both submitted for first reading to the Board of Trustees at its September 2013 meeting and posted online on the college's Accreditation page for final comments from the college community.

The following faculty, staff, and administrators played a role in helping to draft this report:

Dr. Mike Bush, Vice President of Business Services
Dr. Robert Cabral, Business Instructor
Dr. Erika Endrijonas, Executive Vice President
Dr. Karen Engelsens, Dean
Ms. Carmen Guerrero, Dean
Dr. Carolyn Inouye, Dean
Dr. Linda Kamaila, Academic Senate President
Dr. Bola King-Rushing, Instructional Technologist
Mr. Tom Stough, Librarian
Ms. Diva Ward, Library & Learning Resources Supervisor

Additional feedback on the report was provided by the President's Cabinet, the Deans' Council, and the Academic Senate. The following people attended the Accreditation Forum:

Mr. Tom Stough
Ms. Karla Banks
Mr. Ken Sherwood
Mr. Joel Diaz
Ms. Darlene Inda
Dr. Cynthia Herrera
Ms. Diva Ward
Mr. Keenan Kibrick
Mr. Chris Renbarger
Dr. Armine Derdarian
Dr. Richard Durán
Mr. Robert Cabral
Mr. Frank Haywood
Dr. Linda Kama'ila
Dr. Bola King-Rushing
Mr. Jeff Erskine

The District-wide portions of this report were compiled by the District Director of Administrative Relations and the Vice Chancellors, with input and review by the Chancellor and the District Council on Accreditation and Planning (DCAP) and additional input and review feedback through the established participatory governance structure. The district-wide portion of the report was edited by Clare Geisen, District Director of Administrative Relations.

The District and the College have provided all reports from the ACCJC to the District communities to ensure transparency and clear communication of the various actions and steps taken to address the concerns of the Commission. The draft *Midterm Report* was made available to the entire District and College staff and to student leaders. The final reviews of the District portion of the report were conducted by the Board of Trustees, Chancellor, Chancellor's Cabinet, District Council on Accreditation and Planning (DCAP), and the Consultation Council, an advisory committee representing District and Colleges' constituencies.

RESPONSE TO TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS AND THE COMMISSION ACTION LETTER

OXNARD COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION 1

The team recommends, in order to meet Standards and reach sustainable continuous quality improvement for institutional planning, that the college further integrate long-range strategic planning inclusive of the Educational Master Plan, Facilities Master Plan, Technology Plan and District/College goals and use an institutional outcomes assessment process that leads to improved institutional effectiveness (Standards I.A.1, I.B.3, II.B.3, II.B.4, II.C.2, III.A.6, III.B.2, II.C.1, III.C.2, III.D.3, IV.A.1, IV.A.5, IV.B.2.b).

Conclusion from the ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report (October 31-November 1, 2011): *Oxnard College has defined its college-level goals, articulated the ways in which they are embedded within the district's goals. The college has moved to explicitly link the major planning processes and documents together. Included in this linkage will be greater coordination between the Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee and the Planning and Budgeting Council, two key participatory governance committees in Oxnard College's strategic planning effort. The college has identified goals and evidence in which progress towards institutional outcomes will be assessed. The team recommends that this be completed by spring 2012.*

Summary

Oxnard College completed its Educational Master Plan (EMP) for 2010-2015 in 2009. The EMP included a description of each program at the college as well as program-specific and college-wide goals for the five-year EMP. The college-wide goals were further refined in 2011 through a Goals Taskforce process led by the President to not only clarify the college's goals, but to help the college recognize its own goals as separate from, but in support of, the District Goals, which the Board sets or reaffirms each June at its annual planning session. Integration of the College's goals with the Board's goals and the progress being made by each was documented in a matrix entitled "Action Steps to Evidence for the Board's Strategic Goals" as a way to aid the college in reporting out each year on the progress being made towards the College and Board Goals. (OC1-01)

In addition to an All College Day presentation by the President in Fall 2011 during Flex Week regarding the four College Goals developed through the EMP and subsequent Goals Taskforce process, the campus has also turned its attention to evaluating institutional effectiveness. The Student Success committee has not only adopted the Voluntary Framework of Accountability (VFA) institutional effectiveness metrics, it has also hired a consultant to help the committee evaluate the full range of existing data available through the research office and other sources for decision making. (OC1-02, OC1-03, OC1-04) Once fully trained, the Committee will take the lead in analyzing the relevant data in order to make recommendations to the President's Cabinet to improve institutional effectiveness. In addition, the committee will create a workflow chart to accomplish this along with the process to provide feedback to the college as

a whole. Specific recommendations for improvement will be directed to the appropriate entity within the college for follow up and reporting.

Progress on Recommendation 1 for Continuous Quality Improvement and Integrating Long-Range Planning

Oxnard College has defined its college-level goals and articulated the ways in which they are embedded within the district's goals. There is greater coordination between the Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee (PEPC) and the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC), two key participatory governance committees in Oxnard College's strategic planning effort. The College has adopted the Voluntary Framework of Accountability metrics in order to provide a comprehensive assessment of institutional effectiveness based upon goals and metrics identified by the College and District.

As noted in the October 2011 Follow-Up Report, a College-wide dialogue regarding Continuous Quality Improvement has helped administrators, faculty and staff understand the important connection between assessment and planning. As noted under College Recommendation 4, Oxnard College has enhanced its program review process with the inclusion of more data analysis and the introduction of a multi-year in-depth program review cycle in addition to an annual program review, both of which must be completed as part of the resource allocation process. Measureable outcomes for each program have been identified both through the PSLO process and through stronger data elements included in the Program Effectiveness and Planning Reports (PEPRs). (OC1-05)

This connection was especially important as the college faced significant budget reductions and needed to engage in a program discontinuance process the 2011-2012 academic year. Weaknesses in the process used in Fall 2011 greatly informed and enhanced the process employed in Spring 2012, when the Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee completed a program review cycle, rated the PEPRs, ranked Resource Requests, and then forwarded all of the supporting documents to the Planning and Budgeting Committee in early Fall 2012. (OC1-06) The PBC then combined that information with financial data provided by the Vice President of Business Services to make program discontinuance recommendations. (OC1-07) The Planning and Budgeting Committee will receive similar program review ratings and rankings in early Fall 2013 to begin the process again, and to ensure that all resource allocations, the purview of PBC, are more closely tied to program review and effectiveness.

Student Services staff and faculty were also introduced to Continuous Quality Improvement concepts in Fall 2011. Improvement principles have been used each semester to evaluate matriculation services and as part of the program review and SLO assessment processes. Student surveys have provided insight from the student perspective, especially where needs and concerns have been identified. The Student Services Leadership Team has worked through two full SLO assessment cycles, which have helped the team gain a better understanding of how to use these tools to make our services more effective and efficient. The results of these assessments have been incorporated into the student services program review processes and corresponding resource requests. (OC1-08)

In sum, Oxnard College has developed a culture of “Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement” in terms of its institutional effectiveness metrics and planning. The college has integrated long-range strategic planning and linked college-level goals to the district goals. The connection between the Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee and Planning and Budgeting Council processes has been strengthened, which has led the way for a more meaningful assessment of ISLOs and evaluation of institutional effectiveness.

List of Evidence for Oxnard College Recommendation 1

- OC1-01 2012-2013 OC Board Goals Implementation Matrix - Action Steps
- OC1-02 Voluntary Framework of Accountability
- OC1-03 Student Success Committee Meeting Minutes (November 6, 2012)
- OC1-04 Institute for Evidence-Based Change Agreement
- OC1-05 2012-2013 Program Effectiveness and Planning Reports (PEPRs)
- OC1-06 Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee Meeting Minutes (September 25, 2012)
- OC1-07 Planning and Budgeting Council Meeting Minutes and Recommendations to the President (September 26, 2012)
- OC1-08 Student Services Leadership Team Meeting Minutes (December 13, 2012)

The team recommends that the College develop and implement a communication plan that facilitates awareness within the college community regarding institutional efforts to achieve goals and improve student learning. (Standards I.B.1, IV.A.3, IV.B.2.e)

Communication has been a major focus since the Visiting Team left Oxnard College in October 2010. In addition to fully developing a SharePoint website to serve as the major repository for all meeting agendas, minutes, forms and accreditation evidence, all Participatory and Standing Committees committed to utilizing a common format for agendas and minutes. The SharePoint site is available to all managers, staff and faculty members, and the Instructional Technology Services unit has provided both individual and group training opportunities to ensure the college community can access and utilize the site.

The college has held at least two Budget Forums each academic year, one in Fall and one in Spring, and one Accreditation Forum each year, usually in the Spring, to keep the college informed about the current state of the budget and accreditation. (OC2-01) These forums are in addition to the presentations made by the President, Executive Vice President and Vice President of Business Services on All College Day each Fall on both the budget and accreditation. (OC2-02) Accreditation has also been added as a regular topic to most Participatory Governance Committees agendas, such as Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee, Learning Outcomes Team Committee, the Planning and Budgeting Council, and Student Success, among others, to ensure that information about the college's accreditation efforts and status is communicated to the college community on a consistent basis. (OC2-03)

In Fall 2012, the President initiated the publication of a monthly newsletter from his office. Updates are provided by the executive management team, in addition to submissions from each of the Deans and the Director of the STEM grant. (OC2-04)

A Strategic Communications Plan has been developed and reviewed by the President's Cabinet. (OC2-05) It offers a narrative and visual description of the ways in which various areas at the college communicate their needs to each other, especially since committee memberships overlap somewhat but not enough to ensure that everyone at the college is sufficiently informed. The plan, which focuses on the role that all committees play on campus, offers a road map to how the District and College Goals and Objectives are connected and the ways in which the existing committees provide the structure necessary to solve problems and to facilitate Continuous Quality Improvement. The initial implementation of the Communications plan has already begun through college-wide use of SharePoint and the common format of agendas and minutes. A comprehensive review of the Communications Plan will be a component of the revision to the college's Educational Master Plan, which will occur after the District's Master Plan is completed in Fall 2013. (OC2-06)

In sum, the college has made great strides in terms of communication since the October 2010 visit. In addition to efforts to increase awareness of the college's progress on meeting institutional goals and accreditation standards as described above, the Strategic

Communications Plan will be vetted and implemented in the 2013-2014 academic year to fully address this recommendation.

List of Evidence for Oxnard College Recommendation 2

- OC2-01 Accreditation Budget Forum PowerPoint Presentations
- OC2-02 All College Day PowerPoint Presentations
- OC2-03 Planning and Budgeting Council, Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee, Learning Outcomes Team and Student Success Committee Meeting Agenda Examples
- OC2-04 OC Campus Update Newsletters
- OC2-05 OC Communications Plan
- OC2-06 OC Educational Master Plan Revision – Timeline Matrix

The team recommends that the college accelerate its schedule for the development and assessment of course, program, and institutional SLOs in order to reach proficiency by fall of 2012. The process should be faculty driven (Standards I.B.3, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.g, II.B.4, II.C.2).

Conclusion from the ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report (October 31-November 1, 2011): *The college has revised and/or completed SLOs at all three levels and is scheduled to begin another assessment process in the 2011-2012 academic year in order to reach Proficiency by Fall 2012. Each program has completed a Program Assessment Calendar and the LOT Committee, along with the Office of Student Learning, is monitoring progress. Faculty members, with leadership from the Academic Senate, are leading the process with the administration facilitating progress.*

Summary

Prior to Fall 2010, the Student Learning Outcomes effort at Oxnard College was led by one or two full-time faculty with some release time. These faculty worked with their colleagues to develop course-level SLOs and program-level SLOs. It was a paper-based process, where faculty first submitted SLOs to the Curriculum Committee for approval on one form and then reported their assessment results on a different colored form. The process was similar for the program-level SLOs, although the reporting form specifically asked the faculty to describe the program or department dialogue that had occurred regarding the PSLO assessment results.

Beginning in Fall 2010, the Learning Outcomes Team (LOT), which had previously been an ad hoc committee designed to support the part-time SLO coordinators, became a participatory governance committee. The LOT Committee is co-chaired by the Academic Senate President or designee and the Executive Vice President. As a participatory governance committee, LOT had much greater faculty participation and support in its first year than it did as an ad hoc committee. In addition to drafting the new institutional-level SLOs which were affirmed by the Academic Senate, Classified Senate and by Management in Fall 2010, LOT also created and fine-tuned the Program Assessment Cycle Calendar form, which each department was required to submit in Fall 2010. This form was part of the transition to a four-semester assessment cycle for each class in all programs across the college. A four-semester process was introduced to help faculty schedule all courses in their programs for assessment and to establish a realistic timeframe in which to conduct assessments and to incorporate the results.

Once the ISLOs were finalized in Fall 2010 and the PSLOs in Spring 2011, all three levels of SLOs were loaded into eLumen, a database system designed to house SLOs and to facilitate SLO assessments, prior to the training sessions held on April 28-29, 2011. For those programs who did not want to enter all of their course SLOs, the Office of Student Learning took responsibility for inputting all of them into eLumen in advance of this training so that when faculty were doing hands-on training, they would be working on their own courses.

The Student Services areas also revised and/or reaffirmed their PSLOs in Spring 2011. One of the eLumen training sessions held in late April 2011 focused on the Student Services areas.

Assessment benchmarks were identified for key student service areas by the Student Services Leadership Team (SSLT). SSLT members also participated in eLumen training.

The Library also completed and submitted PSLOs which were mapped to the relevant ISLOs. Connecting the PSLOs and ISLOs to course-level SLOs has been more challenging because Library instruction and orientation are not course-specific and occur within the context of other classes. Similarly, SLOs have been developed for Tutoring and Library Resource services.

Overall, the LOT Committee has demonstrated that the SLO process is faculty-driven at Oxnard College. While the Executive Vice President and the Office of Student Learning have provided structure, and one of the instructional Deans, the Instructional Technologist and the Instructional Design Specialist have worked to make the eLumen implementation happen, it has been the faculty development of ISLOs, PSLOs and missing course SLOs that have made the difference since 2010.

Once SLOs were established at all three levels, the focus shifted towards assessment. During Flex Week, prior to the beginning of the Fall 2011 semester, the Executive Vice President conducted a workshop on Rubrics and Assessment. The Instructional Technologist, Instructional Design Specialist and select faculty members have offered eLumen training during Flex Week for faculty at the beginning of each academic year.

Progress on College Recommendation 3 on the Development and Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes at the Course, Program and Institutional Levels

The college has made great strides in its SLO efforts. The college achieved “Proficiency” in Fall 2012 because it revised and/or completed SLOs at all three levels and completed assessments at the course and program levels, and made initial efforts to evaluate the Institution-level SLOs. Faculty are at the center of this process and most understand that this is primarily their responsibility. (OC3-01)

Since the Follow-Up Visit, systems have been put into place to ensure that the development and assessment of Student Learning Outcomes is an on-going expectation of the faculty and part of a larger dialogue of the program review process. The Office of Student Learning monitors eLumen to ensure that programs are assessing their classes as indicated on the Program Assessment Cycle Calendars. (OC3-02) Department Chairs and Deans also monitor eLumen to ensure that faculty teaching courses scheduled for assessment are regularly uploading assessment data. (OC3-03)

Program Assessment Calendars, first completed in Fall 2010, were updated in Fall 2012. Assessment of CSLOs is being conducted as planned with 98% of scheduled assessments completed in Spring 2012.

Program-level SLOs were assessed in Spring 2012 through a LOT Committee-initiated process. Course assessment data was collected and entered into eLumen. (OC3-04) The lead faculty member then developed a Section Improvement Plan (SIP) using a rubric created by LOT. Courses with multiple sections then aggregated the results to create a Course Improvement

Plan (CIP). The SIPs and CIPs served as the foundation for a Program Improvement Plan (PIP), again with LOT-generated rubrics; the PIP was required in order for programs to complete their Program Effectiveness and Planning Report (PEPR) as part of the program review process. (OC3-05)

Over the summer, and into early Fall 2012, all departments then mapped their PIPs, or PSLO assessments, to the relevant ISLOs within eLumen. This cycle was repeated in Spring 2013 as part of the program review process, although instead of attaching the PIP, departments utilized it as part of their analysis, and instead, attached the Assessments by Programs report from eLumen which offers more data in support Program review analysis than the PIPs. (OC3-06)

The connection between assessment of Institutional Effectiveness and ISLOs is now the primary focus. Previous discussions of institutional effectiveness have focused mostly on ARCC data reports rather than on a comprehensive assessment of whether the college is meeting its ISLOs. All ten ISLOs have established rubrics. (OC3-07) The college's Research Analyst has been charged with providing committees and/or faculty and managers with the relevant data to facilitate this evaluation.

In the coming year, greater emphasis will be placed on analyzing the ISLOs data in eLumen as part of the college-wide effort to study institutional effectiveness and to set appropriate benchmarks as part of our continuous quality improvement efforts. LOT, which is now a sub-committee of Curriculum, will work closely with the Student Success Committee in this effort.

When Student Services personnel first established their SLOs, there was not a full understanding of how they were utilized as an improvement tool. Since they have been through several cycles, there is a better understanding of the role that SLOs play in planning for improved outcomes. The Student Services Leadership Team has developed an annual calendar for their bi-weekly meetings to ensure that sufficient time is spent in the Fall semester to gather data, and to analyze SLO assessment results as part of the Program Review process. (OC3-08) This information is then used for planning purposes during the Spring semester.

In sum, Oxnard College accelerated its efforts and reached "Proficiency" in Fall 2012 as expected. Through a faculty-driven process, the college developed SLOs for all courses, programs, general education and for the institution. Assessments have been scheduled for all SLOs, and most have been completed on time. Further refinement of the assessment process and results is necessary in order to reach "Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement" before this accreditation cycle ends in 2016.

List of Evidence for Oxnard College Recommendation 3

- OC3-01 College Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation (October 2012)
- OC3-02 Sample Student Learning Outcome Assessment Calendars
- OC3-03 SLO Hot List
- OC3-04 Learning Outcomes Team Meeting Agenda and Minutes (April 17, 2012)

- OC3-05 Sample Section Improvement Plan, Course Improvement Plan, Program Improvement Plan, Program Effectiveness and Planning Report (2012)
- OC3-06 Sample Assessments by Programs (Spring 2013)
- OC3-07 Institutional Student Learning Outcome Rubrics in eLumen
- OC3-08 Student Services Leadership Team Planning Calendar

In order to meet Standards, the team recommends that the college enhance its program review process by implementing a multi-year approach which includes the documentation of completing a comprehensive analysis of relevant data, identifying measurable outcomes, conducting periodic assessments, and making improvements based on those assessments (Standards I.B.3, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.i, II.B.3, II.B.4, II.C.2).

Conclusion from the ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report (October 31-November 1, 2011): *The college has developed program review and resource allocation timelines that reflect the state and district/college budgeting cycle and make more explicit the integration of program review data in resource allocation decisions. The program review process has been strengthened to include a more rigorous evaluation of programs using data analysis and a multi-year approach.*

Summary

The instructional program review process at Oxnard College is conducted by the Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee (PEPC), which is a participatory governance committee. PEPC is co-chaired by the Academic Senate President and the Executive Vice President, with membership that includes all of the instructional deans and the department chairs. The committee meets once per month during the academic year.

The Program Review process used to occur each Fall; however, beginning in the 2011-2012 academic year, the process was shifted to Spring to align more closely with the budgeting cycle of the state and the district. The College's Research Analyst provides basic data for each department, including several years' enrollment numbers, success and retention rates, and productivity ratios. PEPC also reviews its reporting form, known as the Program Effectiveness and Planning Report (PEPR), and makes alterations as necessary to provide a structured program review document. Department Chairs are then given the Spring semester to analyze the data, to reflect upon their program, and then to address the various elements of the PEPR. In addition to relevant Program Student Learning Outcome report(s), the program's Resource Request form(s) with requests that are linked to the identified needs or gaps in the PEPR are also attached.

This process is a vast improvement over the program review process that was in place at the beginning of the last accreditation cycle. Faculty were left to interpret "raw" data and the PEPR did not delve deeply enough to produce the results one would anticipate from a Continuous Quality Improvement-driven process. The old PEPC process was designed to be more of a unit plan than a process that prompted departments to really evaluate their program effectiveness. It also did not sufficiently require programs to engage in planning as the name of the committee might suggest.

During the Spring 2011 PEPC meetings, the move to a new, multi-year PEPC process was discussed and 8 departments volunteered to go through the new process in the 2011-2012 academic year. (OC4-01) It was agreed that those 8 departments would be given their data at the first PEPC meeting in August. The other departments completed a brief, less rigorous "unit

plan” but one that included resource requests so as not to lose the connection between program review and allocation of resources.

In addition to the revisions to the Program Effectiveness and Planning process, the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) also reviewed and revised the college Planning and Budgeting Handbook to reflect the current resource allocation process, and to incorporate changes to the resource allocation review criteria, such as the inclusion of Total Cost of Ownership principles, which ensures that the college addresses Total Cost of Ownership with the construction of new buildings. (OC4-02) To facilitate the review of resource requests, the college developed a resource allocation request form that was reviewed by several college participatory governance groups for input and refinement. This form assisted the PBC with determining resource rankings and priority, as well as helped to identify the necessary source of funding for the request to assist units and the college with budget planning. This form is updated each year as necessary to reflect needed changes as determined by the PBC.

PEPC originally began as a committee that also addressed Student Services program reviews. However, there was a disconnect between the format needed for instructional programs and those components most appropriate for evaluating the effectiveness of the Student Services areas. In the 2009-2010 academic year, PEPC was directed solely towards instructional programs, and the Student Services areas embarked on an area-based program review process. In the 2010-2011 academic year, the Dean of Student Services and the Executive Vice President met with each Student Services area lead faculty or supervisor to discuss their program review. It was clear through these individual meetings that the Student Services program review structure was insufficiently rigorous, and the lack of metrics and/or feedback or data left little room for in-depth analysis of each area.

In response to this lack of analysis, the Dean of Students embarked on a Student Services Division-wide program review process in Summer 2011 to identify future program effectiveness components and metrics to provide data for analysis. (OC4-03) The program review template was updated, and is now being used by all student service areas to include more data, rigorous analysis, and quality improvement plans. (OC4-04) Program reviews are now scheduled on a three-year rotation, allowing sufficient time for in-depth analysis and review across the division.

The Student Services areas utilized the Student Services Leadership Team, the student services equivalent to PEPC, to review and rank resource requests. Their list of resource requests were then forwarded to PBC for consideration and overall ranking in April 2011. The Student Services program review and resource ranking processes is completed each year and the results are forwarded to PBC in Fall of each year for program and resource prioritization.

The Business Services area utilizes its Business Services Council for the annual review and ranking of its resource requests. The Council consists of members from each operational area, and, after ample discussion of each proposed request, group consensus is obtained for the ranking or removal of any proposed request. Upon agreement, the final list of resource requests are then sent to the college PBC for their consideration and ranking at their late Spring and early Fall meetings.

The Business Services area, consistent with the other two college units, transitioned to a multi-year program review process beginning in the 2011-2012 academic year, with plans to be submitted by designated units every three years. (OC4-05) The units continue, however, to utilize annual survey data to assist them with their program planning and improvement, consistent with continuous quality improvement, and complete their program reviews by no later than December of each academic year. Program reviews are then discussed, with any appropriate resource requests in January of each academic year, with approved requests submitted from the Council to the PBC. This process keeps the area in line with the state budget review process and with the timelines stated in the college Planning and Budgeting Manual.

Progress on Recommendation 4 on Program Review

The program review process has been strengthened since the Follow-Up Visit. Greater, more rigorous evaluation of programs has resulted from more focused attention on data analysis. The Program Effectiveness and Planning Report (PEPR) has been revised to incorporate assessment data which has closed the loop between course and program assessment and program review. (OC4-06) The Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee has adjusted the schedule for completion of the PEPRs and evaluating Resource Requests to Spring to meet Planning and Budgeting Council's resource allocation process. The multi-year Program Review process began in the 2011-2012 academic year with 8 programs completing the more in-depth process; the other programs completed an "annual" program review process. Another 8 programs were identified for the multi-year process for 2012-2013. (OC4-07) Each Fall, the Program Effective and Planning Committee reviews both the multi-year and annual form and makes adjustments based on what did not work in the prior year.

The Program Review process for Student Services has also evolved, both to become a more effective tool for the division and to better reflect the parallel processes in instruction and business services. Each year to date, the program review template has been modified to better address planning and assessment objectives and to more consistently reflect our institutional partners' processes.

As noted later under a Self-Improvement Plan response, as a result of the State budget crisis, the college intentionally understaffed service units in Business/college services, which has impacted the quality of service being delivered. Consequently, the Business Service Council has revamped their program review process to add a self-study template to the customer service survey, so service units can articulate resources needs for continuous quality improvement. (OC4-08) Business Service Council conducted surveys in April in 2013 and service units completed their self-study templates in May of 2013. (OC4-09)

In sum, Oxnard College has enhanced its program review processes. A multi-year process has been implemented, and both the multi-year and the annual Program Effectiveness and Planning Reports have been revised and strengthened each year over the past three years to include more data and more analysis. A strong, clear link has been established between program review and student learning outcomes assessments through the incorporation of outcomes

data in the review process. All three areas of the college – instruction, student services and business services – have improved their individual processes, and all three have established the connection between the program review process and the allocation of resources.

List of Evidence for Oxnard College Recommendation 4

- OC4-01 Sample Annual and Multi-Year Program Effectiveness and Planning Reports
- OC4-02 Revised Budget Planning, Development and Management Process Handbook (May 4, 2011)
- OC4-03 Student Services Leadership Team Program Review Template
- OC4-04 Revised Student Services Leadership Team Program Improvement Plan Template
- OC4-05 Business Services Council Meeting Minutes - Program Review Discussion (April 8, 2011)
- OC4-06 2012-2013 Program Effectiveness and Planning Report Form
- OC4-07 Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee Meeting Minutes - Multi-Year Program Review Process (September 25, 2012)
- OC4-08 Business Services Council Customer Service Survey
- OC4-09 Business Services Council Meeting Minutes (May 13, 2013)

In order to meet Standards, the team recommends that capital planning and resource allocation processes include total cost of ownership principles (Standards II.C.1.c, III.A.2, III.A.6, III.B.2.a, III.B.2.b, III.D.1.c, III.D.2.a).

Conclusion from the ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report (October 31-November 1, 2011): *The process, as modified for the 2012-13 budget development, is well thought out and includes broad college participation in developing requests that includes costs of ownership principles.*

Summary

Since the implementation of the Measure “S” bond, the college has worked with the District Capital Planning and Facilities Committee to identify its capital planning needs and construct needed facilities within the resources allocated from the bond measure. However, at the time of the October 2010 site visit, the college had not formalized, through its various participatory governance groups, the review of new facility operational needs, which included personnel, utilities and other related costs. Since that site visit the college has, through the use of the college Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC), incorporated total cost of ownership principles in its review of facility needs and resource allocation requests. (OC5-01)

The “Total Cost of Ownership” is a criterion now used in college planning to ensure that we have accounted for all anticipated costs of new building construction and that these types of requests are included in the resource allocation model in order to ensure that they are accounted for and funded. For example, for the 2011-2012 fiscal year, anticipated utility costs for the new Performing Arts Building have been incorporated into the projected utility budget for the year. These costs are part of the District/college allocation model, are determined annually, and are a fixed cost that is set aside to ensure that we have the appropriate funding to meet our estimated facility operating costs.

Progress on College Recommendation 5 regarding of Total Cost of Ownership Principles

Through the college Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC), the college continues to incorporate total cost of ownership principles in its review of facility needs and resource allocations. Recent budget challenges have necessitated a review of programs for reduction or elimination. Total cost of ownership was a major component in PBC formulation of program discontinuance recommendations to the Executive Vice President in Fall 2012. (OC5-02)

The college has addressed the costs of new construction to ensure that utilities, staffing, and other expenses such as scheduled maintenance, are included within existing resources. In November 2012, the college hired a performing arts technician to operate and maintain our lighting and sound equipment. In January 2013, the college hired a Weekend and Evening Activities Attendant, to oversee outside organizations renting college facilities. Any related costs for personnel continue to be funded through rental fees assessed on groups for their usage of the facility. In conjunction with the District Administrative Center and the other two

colleges, the Vice President of Business Services analyzed existing Civic Center rates and recommended appropriate fee adjustments. The Board of Trustees approved the fees on March 12, 2013. (OC5-03) We will continue to assess required staffing and funding needs, and make changes as appropriate.

In sum, the “total cost of ownership” is now a key part of the resource allocation process at Oxnard College.

List of Evidence for Oxnard College Recommendation 5

- OC5-01 Planning and Budgeting Council Meeting Minutes (February 16, 2011)
- OC5-02 Planning and Budgeting Council Meeting Minutes (September 26, 2012)
- OC5-03 New Civic Center Fee Schedule (July 1, 2013)

In order to meet Standards, the team recommends that the college ensure the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and within intervals established by district policy (Standard III.A.1.b).

Conclusion from the ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report (October 31-November 1, 2011): *The College has made substantial progress in developing a process of systematically evaluating its faculty and staff and has followed through on implementing the process. Continued compliance with the schedule and follow-up should result in a sustainable, effective, and systematic evaluation process. The team believes the college would benefit from the district's development of an electronic follow-up process to better ensure compliance.*

Summary

Already identified as a Self-Improvement Plan for Standard III.A.1.b in the Fall 2010 comprehensive self-evaluation, beginning in Fall 2010, all managers were required to create an Evaluation Matrix to map out when evaluations would be completed in their respective areas. Each Dean and Director also created a matrix of classified staff and faculty evaluations to be completed. While the classified staff evaluations are completed on an annual basis, faculty evaluations vary depending upon tenure dates and/or full-time/part-time status. Because the faculty evaluation process is labor- and meeting-intensive, especially for tenure-track faculty, it has been difficult for the Deans to bring their faculty evaluations up to date in a single year. Therefore, the Deans have created an annual schedule for classified evaluations, and a multi-semester/multi-year plan for completing all regular and outstanding faculty evaluations in their areas. All managers are required to post their Evaluation Matrices in a dedicated but protected folder in the SharePoint 2016 website.

Progress on College Recommendation 6 regarding Timely Evaluations

All managers conducted their evaluations as scheduled in the 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 academic years. (OC6-01) Each manager also updated their evaluation matrix as evaluations were completed. As the Accreditation Liaison Officer, the Executive Vice President is responsible for monitoring the Evaluation Matrices folder in SharePoint and working with any manager or director whose evaluations have not been completed as scheduled to ensure compliance to this Standard.

In sum, in the absence of a district-wide, electronic solution, evaluations are being conducted in a timely manner, and completion of this important task is being monitored by the Executive Vice President.

List of Evidence for Oxnard College Recommendation 6

OC6-01 Examples of Employee Evaluation Matrices

The team recommends that the College ensure a comparable level of support services is provided to all students regardless of location or mode of delivery. (Standards II.B.1, II.B.3.a, II.C.1)

Oxnard College has an ongoing commitment to ensuring that all support services are comparable regardless of mode of delivery. The course catalog, library and learning resources, and registration and enrollment are all offered online. (OC7-01) Since the 2010 team visit, many more services have become available to students online.

For example, bookstore services now include an online component; students can find out which textbooks are required for their courses and then order them online via the college bookstore's webpage as required by the 2008 Higher Education Reauthorization Act. (OC7-02)

With an upgrade in 2011-2012 to the online portal, all financial services for students can now be handled online, including billing, tuition and fee payments, financial aid, parking permits, and refunds. (OC7-03)

An online student orientation, which has been under development thanks to a Title V Cooperative grant with our sister institution, Ventura College, will be adapted for Oxnard College in Spring 2014. (OC7-04) This grant is also helping fund the development of other online services projects. In particular, these funds have been used to support a redesign of both the online portal and the website to make both of them more functional, easier to use, and more attractive.

Online tutoring is being piloted in the Library Learning Resource Center. The pilot, which is a joint effort of an Instructional Technologist and the Library Learning Resources Supervisor, offers online support for a wide variety of disciplines, including Math, Chemistry, Anatomy, Physiology, Biology, Philosophy, History, Paralegal Studies, and English. (OC7-05)

Also related to the Library services is the implementation of the PRIMO search database program as a part of the new Voyager library system that was implemented when the new library opened in Summer 2012. (OC7-06) Students now have access to additional online services through the PRIMO search database, such as a real-time chat and an online search tool that will allow students the opportunity to search databases within and outside the district.

In Fall 2012, the district launched DegreeWorks, which offers both degree auditing and educational planning services to both on-ground and online students. While it's early in the process of getting students trained to use it, DegreeWorks will be enhanced in Fall 2013 when the district implements a document imaging system to ensure timely evaluation and articulation of external transcripts and all of the information necessary to do accurate educational planning. (OC7-07)

Also starting in 2011, the college has hired a part-time webmaster to help improve the college's website so that more information and services can be offered online. The college has begun to

utilize social media tools, such as Facebook, as a way to enhance online communication with students as well. (OC7-08)

Finally, an English faculty member focused her sabbatical leave during the Spring 2013 semester to researching and developing a plan to fill in identified gaps in distance or online services.

In sum, the college has made great strides since the October 2010 visit to address this recommendation. Many services have been introduced, and additional refinements and student and staff training over the next year will increase the number of services available to students regardless of mode of delivery.

List of Evidence for Oxnard College Recommendation 7

- OC7-01 Online Course Catalog, LLRC Resources, Registration and Enrollment Services Examples
- OC7-02 Online College Bookstore Webpage
- OC7-03 Online Financial Aid Services Example
- OC7-04 Online Student Orientation Example
- OC7-05 Online Tutor Schedule and Instruction on How to Access Services
- OC7-06 PRIMO Instructions
- OC7-07 DegreeWorks Training Material Examples
- OC7-08 Social Media Tool Examples

The Planning and Budgeting Committee will lead a review process for the college's current mission within the five-year time frame and will establish a process to institutionalize future review. Both the 2010 review and the process for future services of the college mission will ensure that all college constituencies have an opportunity to participate. (I.A.3)

The Planning and Budget Council (PBC) charged the President with conducting a review of the college mission statement during the 2010-11 academic year. After a series of campus-wide forums that took place in Fall 2010 facilitated by Dr. William Cordiero, a CSUCI Business faculty with extensive experience in helping organizations develop effective mission statements, the strength of the college's mission statement was confirmed with only a few minor revisions. The college's mission statement was then presented to the Board for approval in March 2011. (OC SIP1-01) The PBC co-chairs also developed a Mission Review Process through which the college will review the mission statement every five years. This process was reviewed by PBC committee members and approved at the April 2011 meeting. (OC SIP1-02)

Although the review of the college mission statement is not formally scheduled to take place until the 2015-16 academic year, as a result of the District's newly updated Educational Master Plan, Oxnard College will embark upon an early update of its Educational Master Plan (EMP) to ensure that the College's goals and plan aligns with the District. Central to completing an EMP update is reviewing and revising, if necessary, the College's mission statement, which will begin in Fall 2013.

The Planning and Budgeting Committee, in consultation with the Academic Senate, the Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee, and Student Services and Business Services representatives, will review the evaluation and planning processes established for student services and business services for their effectiveness in leading to the continuous improvement of student learning. (I.B.1)

The college has separate program review processes in place for the major areas of the college (instructional programs, student services, and business/college services). The decision to have separate but parallel processes for review of program effectiveness was made so each program/service area would be able to better address their own unique functions and needs. Information from each of the major areas across the campus is shared by representatives at the Planning and Budget Council (PBC) so discussions can take place on planning and resource allocations, and recommendations can be made to the President.

The Program review process for Student Services has evolved in the past few years, both to become a more effective tool for the division and to better reflect the parallel processes occurring in the Instructional areas. The Student Services program review template has been modified to better address planning and assessment objectives and to more consistently reflect other college processes. Each department/program completes an annual update (which includes a planning document, SLO assessment information, and resource requests). (OC SIP2-01) A more in-depth program review of each Student Services area is conducted every three years according to a schedule agreed to by the Student Services Leadership Team.

As a result of the State budget crisis, the college intentionally understaffed service units in Business/college services, which has impacted the quality of service being delivered. Consequently, Business Service Council revamped their program review process to add a self-study template to the customer service survey, so service units can articulate resources needs for continuous quality improvement. The Business Services Council conducted surveys in April in 2013 and service units completed their self-study templates in May of 2013. (OC SIP2-02)

Continue to provide accomplishments with regard to the five District imperatives to the Board of Trustees annually. (I.B.2)

The college continues to align its goals and objectives to the priorities that have been set by the district. The five District Imperatives (Student Success, Community Needs, Diversity, Organizational Dynamics and Communication, and Fiscal Integrity) that were in place at the time of the last accreditation self-study have undergone change in the past few years. In 2010, the Board adopted six board objectives: (1) Access and Student Success, (2) Partnerships with High Schools, College, and Universities, (3) Instructional Productivity While Maintaining Quality, (4) Economic Development and Workforce Training, (5) Prudent Fiscal Stewardship, and (6) Professional Development for Faculty and Staff. These board objectives were once again refined after careful review and discussion. In September 2012, the district's Board of Trustees adopted a revised set of board goals incorporating the previous objectives. These three Board goals (Provide Access and Student Success, Maintain Instructional Quality within Budgetary Limits, and Prudent Fiscal Stewardship) also list a number of strategic objectives under each goal as well as responsible parties.

Each year, the college sets its goals and objectives that incorporate or reflect the Board goals and objectives. In order to more effectively monitor activities and accomplishments that address college as well as district goals and objectives, matrices have been developed to help track progress. These matrices are reviewed and updated on an ongoing basis in President's Cabinet meetings. (OC SIP3-01)

The Planning and Budgeting Committee, in consultation with the Academic Senate, the Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee, and Student Services and Business Services representatives, will review the effectiveness of the evaluation and planning processes established for Student Services and Business Services, in leading to the continuous quality improvement of student learning through student services and institutional processes. (I.B.3)

Please see response to I.B.1 above.

Conduct a public survey to assess communication with the public. (I.B.5)

The college has sought input from the community and relevant constituency groups by a variety of means. The Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs have active advisory committees that give input to the college about the community needs of CTE programs. (OC SIP4-01) There is also a Citizens' Advisory Body that gives input to the Board about issues affecting the three colleges and the community. (OC SIP4-02) As part of a district-wide effort, the college participated in a number of campus and community focus groups in Spring 2013 to gather input on developing a new educational

master plan that will help shape the direction of the district and the college in addressing the needs of our students and the community.(OC SIP4-03)

The college's Marketing Advisory Committee began work on the development of an environmental scan/survey in 2010-11 to identify community perceptions of the college as well as campus marketing needs. Based on the needs of the college, the Marketing Advisory Committee was discontinued and a new college committee was created in 2012 to better meet the needs of the college and the community. (OC SIP4-04) This new group, the Community Outreach and Events Committee, has expanded not only the charge of the original group but also its membership to include community participants. (OC SIP4-05)

The College will review its college-specific research needs in light of recent College and District changes to ensure that processes are in place for systematic evaluation and planning to refine key processes and improve student learning. (I.A.6)

Following its participatory-governance processes, the College will review and modify, if warranted, the planning and resource allocation processes for non-instructional programs.

At the time of the last accreditation self-study and team visit, the college and district were undergoing changes in the structure of their research offices. The college has continued to have a Research Analyst who reports directly to the President as well as works closely with the Executive Vice President. There continues to be a primary emphasis on providing research and other information for planning and decision-making. To support program review efforts, there are numerous reports that the research office provides to departments and programs. (OC SIP5-01) Research support is available to assist in data review and interpretation, although college faculty and staff are now more experienced and comfortable with using data and other information to evaluate the effectiveness of their programs.

The planning and resource allocation processes at the college, through the coordination of the Planning and Budget Council, have undergone some changes in the last year to provide more meaningful data for decision-making and for sending recommendations to the President. This has included cost information for instructional programs which was particularly important for making difficult decisions about program reduction and discontinuance in light of severe budget constraints. Instructional support programs, such as the library and tutoring, also completed program reviews and submitted resource requests in the last academic year (2011-12). (OC SIP5-02)

By the end of Spring 2011, every program will have created a two-year assessment calendar to ensure assessment of course-level SLOs for all courses required for a degree. The implementation of eLumens software will facilitate completion of this calendar. (II.A.1)

In Fall 2010, a four-semester(two-year) Program Assessment Calendar was vetted by the Learning Outcomes Team Committee and then disseminated to the committee members and to the Department Chairs at their October 2010 Department Chair meeting. (OC SIP6-01) Department Chairs were given until the end of Spring 2011, which coincided with the implementation of eLumen software as the college's SLO repository, to complete the Program Assessment Calendar for all courses in all programs currently being offered. All programs met this deadline, and the Program Assessment Calendars were

entered into eLumen. Two years later, in Fall 2012, the Assessment Calendars were updated and expanded through to Fall 2015. (OC SIP6-02)

The college will continue movement towards achieving “proficiency” of SLOs by Fall 2012. (II.A.1.a)

As articulated in the College Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation filed in October 2012, the college has achieved “Proficiency” with respect to the development and assessment of SLOs at the course, program and institutional level. SLOs exist for all courses currently being offered, and as recently as Spring 2012, assessment data was entered into eLumen for 98% of the courses scheduled for assessment that semester. All PSLOs are listed in the college catalog, and every program completed PSLO assessments in the Spring, and submitted their Program Improvement Plans as part of their annual or multi-year program review documentation. Finally, all course and program-level SLO assessments have been mapped to the appropriate ISLOs within eLumen. (OC SIP7-01) As part of the college’s effort to reach Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement, the ISLO mapping and associated assessment data will be analyzed as part of a larger effort to evaluate overall institutional effectiveness.

Through its participatory decision-making structure, the college will conduct a holistic review of online instruction and services. (II.A.1.b)

This review will take place beginning in the 2013-2014 academic year once the implementation of DegreeWorks is completed, the district portal and college websites have been upgraded, and once the newest version of Desire2Learn, the online LMS system, has been fully deployed. Other services to be evaluated include the effort to provide online tutoring in addition to developing options for online counseling. The scope of technological changes in process made conducting this review any earlier inadvisable.

1) eLumen will be piloted in 2010-2011. (II.A.1.c, II.A.2)

It was piloted in 2010-2011 and was fully implemented in 2011-2012.

2) Department Chairs and division Deans will take the lead in completing the development of SLOs with help from the Office of Student Learning.

The department chairs took the lead in ensuring that SLOs were developed for all courses currently being offered. Area deans provided support for this area, as did the Office of Student Learning which provided clerical support to any faculty member who wanted or needed help entering course and/or program-level SLOs into eLumen. The Office of Student Learning also took primary responsibility for maintaining the official files – both hard copy and in eLumen – and correcting any mistakes where noted. The Executive Vice President further ensured compliance by stating that any course without SLOs in the Fall 2011 schedule of classes would be pulled on April 15th unless SLOs were provided; there was 100% compliance and no courses were removed from the Fall schedule or subsequent class schedules.

3) LOT will develop a plan – to include training, coordination, and support - to achieve college-wide proficiency with student learning outcomes by 2012.

Through its twice-monthly meetings in 2010-2011, and its once-monthly meetings in 2011-2012 and 2012-2013, the Learning Outcomes Team Committee has provided structure and support to facilitate the development and assessment of SLOs at the course and program level. Many meeting

agendas were devoted to updates on the college's progress in implementing eLumen, not to mention serving as the body where issues could be resolved. (OC SIP8-01) An Instructional Technologist was especially crucial in implementing eLumen and in getting the faculty trained initially. Thanks to a new STEM grant, an Instructional Design Specialist was hired in Spring 2012 to help faculty develop and assess SLOs and to provide comprehensive training throughout the year on an individual basis and in large-group trainings. (OC SIP8-02) Both the Instructional Technologist and the Instructional Design Specialist are located in the Library, near the Faculty Resource Center, which has been key to the college's success with regard to SLOs. Both the Technologist and the Design Specialist attend the LOT meetings, which is a productive way for them to address faculty concerns directly and to get a sense of what other training might be necessary.

- 4) LOT will be engaged with the use of eLumen to facilitate faculty development and assessment of student learning outcomes. Aided by division Deans and Department Chairs, LOT will facilitate the development of an assessment calendar for all courses currently being offered and/or revised for degree completion.**

Please see responses to College Recommendation 3 and II.A.1. above.

The college will continue its efforts to achieve "proficiency" in the development and assessment of student learning outcomes, and where appropriate, draw upon relevant advisory committee input. (II.A.2.b)

Please see responses to College Recommendation 3 and II.A.1.a. above.

As noted elsewhere, the college will continue progress towards achieving "proficiency" through the LOT Committee, in conjunction with division Deans and Department Chairs. A four-semester assessment calendar for all courses will be developed by the end of Spring 2011. (II.A.2.c)

Please see responses to College Recommendation 3 and II.A.1. above.

Absent faculty coordinators for SLOs, the newly formed participatory-governance LOT committee, working in conjunction with division Deans and Department Chairs, will provide the needed structure to move to the "proficiency" level. The Learning Outcomes Team will continue to refine and facilitate development and assessment of Student Learning Outcomes at the section, course, and program levels. (II.A.2.f)

This effort will be facilitated by the implementation of eLumen software which will help faculty to develop an assessment calendar for course and program level SLOs. Stronger linkage to the program review process will also enhance the assessment of all aspects on instruction.

Please see responses to College Recommendation 3 and II.A.1, II.A.1.a., II.A.1.c., II.A.2. above.

The Learning Outcomes Team, in conjunction with division Deans and Department Chairs, will facilitate an assessment of program-level SLOs by the end of the 2010-11 academic year. This effort will include the implementation of eLumens software. The Learning Outcomes Team will propose to the Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee that beginning with the 2010-11 academic year,

Program SLO reports be coordinated with and included in the Program Effectiveness Planning review cycle. (II.A.2.i)

As suggested, the Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee did incorporate more discussion of course and program SLOs into the Program Effectiveness and Planning Reports (PEPR). Whereas faculty had to include their Program Improvement Plans as an attachment to their PEPRs in Spring 2012, the PEPRs being submitted for Spring 2013 included an analysis of the program's course and program assessment results. All PEPRs were required to include the Assessments by Program report. (OC SIP9-01)

The General Education Subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee will complete development of SLOs for each area within the general education pattern and develop an assessment cycle. The program-level SLOs will be mapped with the institutional SLOs and assessed accordingly. (II.A.3.a, II.A.3.b, II.A.3.c)

The GE Subcommittee, comprised of members from the Curriculum Committee, was charged with the creation of GE SLOs at Oxnard College by the Learning Outcomes Team (LOT) when they determined that General Education was to be considered a program. The GE Subcommittee decided its members would be assigned as leads in their departments, guiding them through the creation of GE SLOs by GE area, reporting progress and bringing drafts of GE SLOs back to the GE Subcommittee for feedback. The GE Subcommittee reviewed and edited or made suggestions for revisions to the GE SLO drafts and the leads then took these back to their departments for further discussion and/or revision. This process began in Fall 2009 and ended in Spring 2011 when the final versions of the GE SLOs were presented by the GE Subcommittee to the Curriculum Committee on March 9, 2011 for approval. (OC SIP10-01) After approval by the Curriculum Committee, the GE SLOs were then subsequently published in the 2011-2012 college catalog. (OC SIP10-02) Beginning in Fall 2011, GE SLOs became a key component in the review of courses proposed for GE placement.

In Spring 2012, GE areas and GE SLOs for those areas and the corresponding courses approved in those areas were all added to eLumen by the GE Subcommittee Chair. A request was sent to all department chairs/lead faculty by the GE Subcommittee in Fall 2012 asking that they map their CSLOs to the GE SLOs in the GE area where the course was approved and then the results were all mapped in eLumen. (OC SIP10-03)

In the 2012-2013 academic year, the ad hoc District GE Committee charged each campus GE Committee with reviewing the placement of GE courses deemed comparable across the district that had varying GE placement with a goal of alignment across the district. The GE Subcommittee began review of an initial list of courses in December 2012 and a second list in February 2013, examining the CSLOs and their alignment with the area GE SLOs as part of the determination of proper GE placement. Recommendations for GE course placement retention, removal, or additions were emailed to faculty teaching these courses and their department chairs and were presented by the GE Subcommittee to the Curriculum Committee in two readings, giving faculty time for input or to provide more information for consideration between these meetings. The Curriculum Committee approved both lists of GE placement recommendations presented. (OC SIP10-04)

The college will develop and implement a process to track students' success on licensure exams as a way to document students' successful demonstration of technical and professional competencies. (II.A.5)

Oxnard College's CTE programs have developed a variety of methods to track licensure exam passage rates by students. For those programs where online testing systems are utilized, passage rates and data are downloaded by faculty or staff. In those cases where online access is limited to the testing candidate, students self-report their performance. And finally for those programs where students take licensure exams off-campus, students again self-report. In all cases, passage information is periodically forwarded to the college's institutional research office, with a final reporting of passage information in mid-Spring for annual reporting purposes. (OC SIP11-01)

1) The 2011-2012 Catalog will include an explanation of the link between Institutional SLOs/Core Competencies and program/degree requirements. (II.A.6)

Beginning in the 2010-2011 catalog, the following statement was added to explain the connection between the ISLOs and the degree programs:

"Throughout your education at Oxnard College, you will hear about Student Learning Outcomes, or what the faculty of Oxnard College believes you should have achieved before you graduate with a degree or certificate. Below, you will find the institution-level SLOs, and those have been mapped to program-level SLOs which you will find later in the catalog where program requirements are listed. All courses have SLOs which can be found in individual course syllabi."(p.10, 2013-2014 catalog) (OC SIP11-02)

2) Prior to each semester, the Office of Student Learning will disseminate to all faculty expectations for minimum standards for course syllabi along with instructions for accessing Course Outlines of Record. The Office of Student Learning will also request that all faculty provide copies of their syllabi to their respective deans' offices each semester. Copies of syllabi are vital to ensure that not only are students being provided with a syllabus for each class but also to ensure that the course objectives are consistent with the approved Course Outline of Record.

The Faculty Handbook, which is revised each year, includes the following description of the necessary elements of a syllabus:

"Course information provided to students at the beginning of the semester should include grading information, required textbooks, the quiz or examination schedule with particular emphasis given to the date and time of the final exam, a schedule of reading assignments and general topics considered, and instructor availability for consultation."

As well, the requirement that all syllabi must have SLOs and be submitted to the Dean's office is included in the Handbook as follows:

All course syllabi must also include the Student Learning Outcomes associated with each course. All current course SLOs are handled within eLumen....Faculty must submit a copy of their syllabus electronically for each course to their respective Dean's office by the end of the first week of class. (2013-2014 Faculty Handbook, p. 21) (OC SIP11-03)

The college website will be reviewed on an annual basis to ensure the accuracy of all information, especially the college's mission, programs and services. (II.A.6.c)

The President's Office hired a part-time webmaster beginning in Fall 2012 to help the college keep its website up to date. The webmaster discusses website revisions with the President's Cabinet, Deans' Council and consults with individual departments and faculty. With graphic design as a background, the webmaster also possesses the technical skills to design and/or edit webpages as necessary. The entire website has been updated and at least 50 individual webpages with outdated information and/or broken links have been deleted. This review will continue on annual basis to ensure the accuracy of the information being provided to current and prospective students. As well, the Instructional Services Unit, which includes two Instructional Technologists and an Instructional Design Specialist, have improved the website by adding a great deal of content and professional development training materials for faculty and staff. (OC SIP12-01)

The Office of Student Learning will update the Faculty Handbook annually and disseminate hard copies to all faculty, in addition to posting the most current version on the college website. (II.A.7)

The Faculty Handbook is revised each summer and is made available to all faculty in both online and hard copy format on or before the first day of the Fall semester. Work on revising the Faculty Handbook usually begins in June each year and is completed largely by the Executive Vice President, the Deans, and the Academic Senate President. The Office of Student Learning takes responsibility for all editing and printing of the Handbook, and faculty are invited to provide feedback and/or corrections for future editions. Finally, in the interest of clarity, the cover of the Faculty Handbook has either the same cover or a similar cover as the Catalog for that year to ensure that faculty easily recognize the most current version of the Handbook. (OC SIP13-01)

English, ESL, and math faculty, in conjunction with the Transitional Studies Committee and the Student Success Committee, will address the need for assessment-instrument validation to make more effective course placement recommendations with those responsible for the college's research function. (II.B.3, II.B.3.e)

Faculty and student services staff on the Transitional Studies Committee spent several semesters reviewing data, identifying research needs, conducting research, analyzing data, and discussing the results. One of the areas of focus was assessments. (OC SIP14-01) In addition to conducting validity studies, the larger question of the role of assessments in preparing students for success was discussed at length. In addition to committing to strengthening the current assessment process (better pre-assessment information, confirmed cut-scores), the committee explored various options to the standardized assessment. As a result, a new transitional math program was developed to support pre-college level math preparation. The college has elected to participate with the Early Assessment Program (CSU's outreach to HS students) as a pilot. It is expected that the resulting data will help create meaningful summer bridge programs to promote math and English readiness for new students.

College management has developed time sensitive schedules to complete all evaluations in accordance with the two employee bargaining agreements. (III.A.1.b)

In the Ventura County Community College District, all permanent classified staff and managers are evaluated during the Spring semester and/or prior to June 30th; tenured faculty are evaluated once every three years, and probationary faculty are evaluated each Fall semester during their four-year

tenure track. Oxnard College managers developed evaluation matrices in 2010-2011 in accordance with the two employee bargaining agreements. The matrices are updated annually to reflect the evaluations that were completed in the previous academic year and to document the evaluations scheduled for the current academic year. The evaluation matrices are housed on the college's SharePoint website in a protected file. As noted in the college's response to Recommendation 6, the Executive Vice President monitors the evaluation matrices to ensure that the matrices are updated on an annual basis and to ensure that all evaluations are being completed according to the established schedule. (See narrative and evidence for Recommendation #6)

An Administrative Procedure for the Employee Code of Ethics will be developed during the 2010-11 academic year. (III.A.1.d)

On November 3, 2009 the Ventura County Community College District (VCCCD) Board of Trustees adopted BP 2715, Board Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice. This board policy was most recently reviewed on June 19, 2012. (OC SIP15-01) The administrative procedure to implement the above board policy is AP 2715(A) which was adopted on July 14, 2009 and most recently reviewed on June 19, 2012.

Board policies governing employee code of ethics are:

- BP7205, Employee Code of Ethics (adopted by the VCCCD board on June 16, 2012 and last reviewed on November 13, 2012); (OC SIP15-02)
- BP 7310, Nepotism (adopted by the board on May 17, 2007 and currently under review as part of the Board's two-year review cycle for Board Policies and Procedures) (OC SIP15-03)
- BP 7700, Whistleblower Protection (adopted by the board on May 17, 2007 and last reviewed on November 13, 2012) (OC SIP15-04)

AP 7705, Employee Code of Ethics, is the Administrative Procedure that describes the processes to be followed for the above three board policies, plus an additional number of California Education Codes, California Fair Political Practices Commission requirements, California Government Codes, and Personnel Commission Rules was last reviewed by the board on November 13, 2012. (OC SIP15-05)

All Board Policies and Administrative Procedures are reviewed by various constituent groups the Participatory Governance process prior to being reviewed by the Board Sub-Committee on Policy and final Board approval. All policies and procedures are posted online through the VCCCD BoardDocs portal.

Total cost of ownership considerations will be included in the FMP at the next revision. (III.B.2.a)

In preparation for updating the Facilities Master Plan, the Director of Facilities has updated schedule maintenance costs in the California Community College Chancellors' Office FUSION facility data system. The Director of Facilities, in conjunction with the Vice President of Business Services, is also compiling total cost of ownership estimates for the newly constructed Performing Arts Building and the Library and Learning Resource Building as well as the soon to be constructed Dental Hygiene building. The Facilities Master Plan (FMP) will be updated in early Fall 2013.

The Technology Committee will address, review and update the Oxnard College strategic technology plan during the 2010-2011 academic year. (III.C.1)

The Technology Committee reviewed and updated the College technology plan during the 2010-2011 academic year. During the year, the committee discussed its own role and that of District IT in the generation of both the District and the College technology plans. The Committee received reports on the progress of the District technology plan with an eye toward using it as a framework for the campus plan, and they examined the relationship between the two documents. In addition, the committee reviewed the existing and potential connections between the technology plan and other college planning documents, particularly the Educational Master Plan, the Facilities Master Plan, the Strategic Goals, and the college Mission Statement. (OC SIP16-01)

The District portal provides many opportunities for professional growth in the area of technology, however more training and publicity is needed to inform employees of what is available. The college administration will work with IT to develop higher profile training materials and additional training opportunities. (III.C.1.a)

The district has contracted with Lynda.com for online training with technology tools. Access to the Lynda.com system is available to all employees directly via the MyVCCCD portal (<http://www.myvccd.edu>), and information is available on the Faculty/Staff Technology Resources webpage. Starting in 2011, District IT has conducted OmniUpdate training for staff and faculty every semester; this training is advertised locally via email to all users. (OC SIP17-01; OC SIP17-02)

Technology budgets will continue to be reviewed and analyzed as one-time funding sources end. Sustaining the existing and planned technology will be a priority.

District-wide technology budgets are reviewed annually by the District-wide Operations Committee (DOC), which includes the Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services and the three college Vice Presidents of Business Services, as well as other business services staff. The Associate Vice Chancellor of Information Technology submits district-wide IT budgets to the committee each year for review and discussion. The Associate Vice Chancellor of Information Technology also chairs the Administrative Technology Advisory Committee where technology purchases and projects are prioritized by the Executive Vice Presidents, Vice Presidents of Business, and Vice Chancellors of Business and Human Resources prior to resource allocation. The local college IT budget is reviewed and developed by the Vice President of Business Services in consultation with the Associate Vice Chancellor and with the college Technology Support Supervisor. (OC SIP18-01)

New technologies, such as desktop and application virtualization and cloud computing, will be considered as possible solutions to increase efficiency in order to maintain the ever-growing technology infrastructure.

The Virtual Desktop Initiative (VDI) has been implemented in several buildings, with 277 thin clients installed since 2011: 25 in LS-7, 35 in OE-2, 25 in OE-3, 12 in the LLRC writing center, 42 in the LLRC

math center, 90 in the LLRC open access lab, 36 in LLRC-101, and 23 in the Welcome Center in the Student Services and Administration building foyer.

The college will need to address the funding of the Instructional Technologist position when the STEM grant ends in late 2011.

The college was able to move the funding for the Instructional Technologist position to a Title V Cooperative grant that expires in 2015. Each year, the college covers more of the cost of this Instructional Technologist position, which will be fully institutionalized at the conclusion of the grant. In addition, the college was granted a second STEM grant which began in Fall 2011. Funds from that grant are being used to provide a second Instructional Technologist, in addition to funding an Instructional Design Specialist position to continue to provide adequate support for faculty use of technology in the classroom and as part of the Student Learning Outcome assessment efforts.

Training of faculty on the new Desire2Learn learning management system will continue. (III.C.1.b)

Group and individual training in Desire2Learn is ongoing. This includes training activities during Flex Week and throughout the year. (OC SIP19-01) The Distance Education Committee initiated a system, approved by the Academic Senate, in which they coordinate a required training process for new online instructors that includes training with Desire2Learn. (OC SIP19-02)

The training available to faculty and staff has been made more public and available through flex activities and other college-wide announcements to allow all users to take advantage of the training titles available. Trainings are publicized via all-user emails, flyers, announcements in committees, and on the college website. (OC SIP19-03)

District IT is exploring options to offer additional help desk support for all online faculty and students during non-traditional hours. The vast majority of requests for assistance occur in the week prior and the first few weeks of the fall and spring semesters. Adding evening support during those time periods is being evaluated from a cost and logistical standpoint.

During the opening weeks of each semester, the district's help desk is now open for extended hours, often until midnight. The effectiveness of these extended hours is being reviewed and analyzed by the district.

The current Oxnard College strategic technology plan will be revised and updated during the 2010-2011 academic year. (III.C.1.c)

Please see response to III.C.1 above.

The mission and the composition of the college Technology Committee will be revisited during the fall 2010 semester, with the recommended changes made after the review.

During the 2010-2011 year, the mission and role of the Technology Committee were reviewed. It was determined that the committee's role might be appropriately folded into another body. During the 2011-2012 year, review and discussion of the committee's function continued as part of the revision of the college's Participatory Governance Manual. Ultimately, it was decided to dissolve the committee and incorporate its functions into the Campus Use, Development, and Safety (CUDS) Committee. (OC

SIP20-01) This change was implemented in the 2012-2013 year. In addition to CUDS as a local body, the district's Instructional Technology Advisory Committee allows for technology-related issues to be communicated between the campuses and the district center. (OC SIP20-02)

The effectiveness of the District reorganization and consolidation of technology services will be evaluated during the 2010-2011 academic year. (III.C.1.d)

All IT projects, major tasks, and service effectiveness are reviewed by various committees at both a district and college level. The committees include the Chancellor's Cabinet, ATAC (Administrative Technology Advisory Committee), ITAC (Instructional Technology Advisory Committee), the Banner Student Project Group (Banner issues), DOC (District-wide Operations Committee, dealing with Finance), Portal Task Force, and IRAC (Institutional Research Advisory Committee), as well as the college Deans' Council and President's Cabinet. There are also numerous working groups that provide input on IT effectiveness at both a district and college level.

ATAC approves all major IT initiatives, with the college Vice President of Business and the Executive Vice President participating. The effectiveness of district-wide IT is evaluated at ATAC on an ongoing basis. (OC SIP21-01) ITAC was recently formed and addresses distance learning and classroom technology issues.

Funding from the STEM grant for the Instructional Technologist position is currently scheduled to end in October of 2011. The college will need to address the funding of this position when the STEM grant ends in late 2011.

Please see response to III.C.1.a. above.

PEPC, the Student Services Leadership Team, the Business Services Council, and the PBC, will review their operating processes and documents to assure that the college mission remains visibly central to college planning. (III.D.1.a)

The agendas for all Participatory Governance and Standing Committees include the College's mission in the upper-left hand column just above the charge of the committee. The Planning and Budgeting Council and the Business Services Council formally reviewed their processes and documentation in April 2013, to ensure the college mission remains central to planning.

The college must continue to work with the District to address long-term liabilities, including the total cost of ownership of new college buildings. (III.D.1.c)

The college continues to work with the District to address long-term liabilities. The District has established and begun funding a retiree health benefit trust. The District received an actuarial study of Retiree Health Liabilities conducted February 4, 2013, and will adjust budgeted retiree costs in the 2014 fiscal year budget. The Vice President of Business attends District Operation Council meetings where long-term liabilities are discussed and reviewed. The Vice President of Business and Academic Senate President attend the District Council of Administrative Services where budget recommendations for funding long-term liabilities are reviewed and approved to move to the Budget

Committee of the Board of Trustees. In fiscal year 2013, the District implemented an infrastructure funding model to begin to address costs of scheduled maintenance (long-term maintenance expenses, such as roofs and painting), furniture and equipment replacement, library materials and technology refresh. The college is continuing to develop total cost of ownership of new buildings which will be included in our updated facility master plan.

List of Evidence for Oxnard College’s Self-Improvement Plans

- SIP1-01 VCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes (March 2011)
- SIP1-02 Planning and Budgeting Council Meeting Minutes (May 4, 2011)

- SIP2-01 Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee Program Review Template
- SIP2-02 Business Services Council Program Review Template

- SIP3-01 VCCCD Board Strategic Plan - OC Implementation Plan Matrix 2012-2013

- SIP4-01 Examples of Oxnard College Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
- SIP4-02 VCCCD Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting Agendas/Minutes
- SIP4-03 VCCCD Educational Master Plan Schedule/Process
- SIP4-04 President’s Cabinet Meeting Minutes (2012)
- SIP4-05 Various Community Outreach and Events Committee Meeting Agenda/Minutes

- SIP5-01 Sample Institutional Research Reports
- SIP5-02 Planning and Budgeting Council Cost Information (Fall 2012)

- SIP6-01 Sample Program Assessment Form
- SIP6-02 Updated Program Assessment Calendar

- SIP7-01 College Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation (October 2012)

- SIP8-01 Various Learning Outcome Team Meeting Agendas/Minutes
- SIP8-02 eLumen Training Materials/Schedule Examples

- SIP9-01 Program Effectiveness and Planning Report Examples (2011-2012, 2012-2013)

- SIP10-01 Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes (March 9, 2011)
- SIP10-02 Sample General Education Student Learning Outcomes from OC College Catalog
- SIP10-03 Examples of General Education Student Learning Outcome Map from eLumen
- SIP10-04 Curriculum Committee Meeting Agenda (March 27, 2013)

- SIP11-01 2013 Annual Report to the ACCJC
- SIP11-02 Oxnard College Catalog, page 10 (2013-2014)
- SIP11-03 Oxnard College Faculty Handbook – Course Syllabus, page 21 (2013-2014)

- SIP12-01 Instructional Technology Services Webpage

- SIP13-01 Oxnard College Faculty Handbooks (2012-2013, 2013-2014)

SIP14-01	Transitional Studies Committee Meeting Minutes
SIP15-01	VCCCD Board of Trustees Code of Ethics (adopted November 3, 2009)
SIP15-01	VCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes (November 3, 2009)
SIP15-02	Board Policy 7205: Employee Code of Ethics (adopted June 16, 2012)
SIP15-03	District Council on Human Resources Meeting Minutes (Spring 2013)
SIP15-04	Board Policy 7700: Whistleblower Protection (adopted May 17, 2007)
SIP15-05	VCCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes (November 13, 2012)
SIP16-01	Technology Plan (Spring 2012)
SIP17-01	Lynda.com Webpage
SIP17-02	Omni Update Training Schedule
SIP18-01	Technology Budget/Plan
SIP18-02	Curriculum Committee (April 13, 2011), Distance Education Committee (April 7, 2011), and Academic Senate (April 25, 2011) Meeting Minutes
SIP19-01	Flex Week Programs (2012-2013, 2013-2014)
SIP19-02	Curriculum Committee (April 13, 2011), Distance Education Committee (April 7, 2011), and Academic Senate (April 25, 2011) Meeting Minutes
SIP19-03	Flex Week Handouts (2013-2014)
SIP20-01	Campus Use, Development and Safety Meeting Agendas/Minutes (October 9, 2012)
SIP20-02	Instructional Technology Advisory Committee Meeting Agendas/Minutes Example
SIP21-01	Administrative Technology Advisory Committee Meeting Agendas/Minutes Example

DISTRICT RESPONSES TO TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMISSION ACTION LETTER

ACCREDITATION MIDTERM REPORT

DISTRICT RESPONSES TO TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMISSION ACTION LETTER

Final Version Due October 15, 2013

[*Note: This document is written as if completed in October 2013.*]

District Recommendation 1. In order to meet the Standards, the District, in concert with the three Colleges, shall develop clearly defined organizational maps that delineate the primary and secondary responsibilities of each, the College-to-College responsibilities, and that also incorporate the relationship of major District and College committees established to assure the integrity of activities related to such areas as budget, research, planning, and curriculum. (IV.B.3.a-b, IV.B.3.g)

Conclusion from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report (November 13-14, 2012):

The District, in concert with the three Colleges, completed its functional mapping and has incorporated College-to-College responsibilities and their relationship to the District. Further, there was evidence of incorporating District and College committees relating to budget, academic (curriculum) and student services, strategic planning and research. The teams concluded that VCCCD has addressed all components of this recommendation, resolved the deficiencies and now meet Standards.

Summary

During the period of February through June 2012, the District and Colleges, through the District Consultation Council, completed the work of revising the District-wide *Participatory Governance Handbook* to reflect a clearly defined organizational flow and functional mapping narrative and developed the *VCCCD Governance: Advisory and Recommendation Pathways*, a governance process chart that delineates and illustrates the relationships of major District and College committees. The *Participatory Governance Handbook* and its accompanying *VCCCD Governance: Advisory and Recommendation Pathways* ensure delineation of roles and responsibilities and provide venues within the District/College governance structure to host participatory dialogues.

The *Participatory Governance Handbook* review process and development of the *VCCCD Governance: Advisory and Recommendation Pathways* resulted in recommended changes to participatory governance groups, including the creation of a District Council on Accreditation and Planning (DCAP) to develop, monitor, and evaluate District-wide planning and accreditation cycle activities, and a District Council on Academic Affairs (DCAA) to advise the Chancellor regarding instructional program development and related Board policies and administrative procedures. Discussion addressing gaps within existing governance committees further resulted in modifying the District Technical Review Workgroup (DTRW) and District Council on Student Learning (DCSL). The modified groups are now called the District Technical Review Workgroup – Instruction (DTRW-I) and the District Technical Review Workgroup – Student Services (DTRW-SS), and the Workgroups advise the District Council on Academic Affairs (DCAA) on academic and professional matters. DTRW-I and DTRW-SS focus on instruction and student services in program development and review/suggest revisions to Board policies and administrative procedures in these areas as needed.

The *Participatory Governance Handbook* was communicated District-wide, and constituents were given opportunities to provide input for improvement. The *Participatory Governance Handbook* was presented to the Board of Trustees for information in June 2012, and the Board approved an updated BP 2205 Delineation of System and Board Functions to include the completed *Participatory Governance Handbook* and functional mapping documents.

In fall 2012, the District Council on Accreditation and Planning (DCAP) completed a *VCCCD Operational/Functional Mapping Table* that supplements the Functional Mapping narrative provided in the District-wide *Participatory Governance Handbook*. The supplementary *VCCCD Operational/Functional Mapping Table* provides an “at-a-glance” view of functional mapping between the District and Colleges.

In the revised *Participatory Governance Handbook*, the District clearly delineates and communicates functions between the District and the individual Colleges and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice. The *Handbook* and its accompanying *VCCCD Governance: Advisory and Recommendation Pathways* serve as the manual of governance and operations within the District and Colleges. By clearly defining and delineating the roles and responsibilities of the District and the Colleges, effective and efficient services and support are provided to the Colleges to achieve the District’s vision and mission.

Progress on District Recommendation 1 for Improvement and Sustainability

The District and Colleges will assess, on an annual basis, the appropriateness of constituent role delineation and responsibilities involved in District-wide governance processes, identifying gaps in governance structures and resources, as well as the overall effectiveness of the process by administering online surveys and holding public forums to gather data for further refinement.

In February 2012, District Consultation Council and the Chancellor’s Administrative Council discussed and agreed upon a review process and timeline for an annual assessment of the *Participatory Governance Handbook* and accompanying *VCCCD Governance: Advisory and Recommendation Pathways* and *VCCCD Operational/Functional Mapping Table*. During February and March 2013, District Consultation Council members and the Chancellor’s Administrative Council members worked with constituencies at the Colleges and the District Administrative Center to gather input for a first review of the documents at the April 5, 2013 Consultation Council meeting (D1-01). Review of the *Handbook* and related documents is ongoing through scheduled Consultation Council meetings (D1-02), with expected completion in fall 2013.

List of Evidence for District Recommendation 1

D1-01 Consultation Council Meeting Notes and *Participatory Governance Handbook* (4.5.13)

D1-02 Consultation Council Meeting Notes (5.30.13, 6.27.13, 8.30.13)

District Recommendation 2. In order to meet the Standard, the District, in concert with the three Colleges, shall document evidence that a review of District Policies and Procedures that may impede the timely and effective operations of the departments of the Colleges has taken place and that appropriate modifications are made that facilitate the operational effectiveness of the Colleges. A calendar that identifies a timeline for the regular and consistent review of policies shall be developed. (IV.B.1.e)

Conclusion from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report (November 13-14, 2012):

The teams found that VCCCD has developed a process to review, assess and modify policies and procedures of the District. There is strong evidence that procedures that impeded operational effectiveness were reviewed as part of the assessment and were refined to ensure efficiency and effectiveness. The District and Colleges have implemented a process that identifies impediments to effectiveness and provides a framework to minimize the impediment. The teams concluded that the process for assessment and improvement is sustainable. The teams concluded that the recommendation has been addressed, the deficiencies resolved, and the Standards met.

Summary

The Board of Trustees adopted a two-year policy/procedure review cycle calendar in March 2011. The review schedule was implemented and is being vigorously adhered to as evidenced by activities undertaken by the Board's Policy Committee and the subsequent placement of proposed, reviewed, and/or revised policies and administrative procedures on monthly Board agendas for action or information. District governance committees maintain meeting notes documenting policy/administrative procedure review and recommendations and have been requested to post agendas/minutes on the District or College websites.

To address the review and modification of policies and procedures that may impede operational effectiveness, policy/administrative procedure review and recommended changes follow the *VCCCD Governance: Advisory and Recommendation Pathways* as outlined in the *Participatory Governance Handbook* to ensure broad-based constituent input, consistency, and appropriate application across the District and Colleges. Governance committees and District/College constituents serving on governance committees are provided opportunities to review, analyze, and recommend suggestions for modification of policies/procedures under review that may present potential impediments and negatively impact the timely and effective operations of District/College departments. Constituent groups formulate recommendations to the Chancellor through consultation, and members are responsible to serve as a conduit for information and the catalyst for discussion on topics raised by District groups and within constituent groups.

To address extremely time-sensitive policy or administrative procedures critical to District/College operational deadlines but subject to missing Policy Committee or Board Meeting timelines, governance committees can hold special meetings and/or present such time-sensitive recommended policies and administrative procedures to the Chancellor or Chancellor's Cabinet for approval to advance to Policy Committee and the Board of Trustees.

As a result of dialogue by governance groups and constituent feedback, policy and administrative procedure modifications occurred to avoid impeding College operations and ensure consistency across the District/Colleges. For example, an employee-accessible "Business Tools, Forms, and Procedures" SharePoint site was designed to facilitate consistent District-wide application of procedures, and a Field Trip/Excursion electronic workflow process was developed in conjunction with faculty and staff in response to faculty needs.

The process utilized for reviewing and revising Board policies provides opportunities for all constituents to give input and follows the established governance structure and committees before the Board of Trustees acts upon

recommended changes or adoption of policies and administrative procedures. The Board continues to conduct effective Board meetings and more effective implementation of policies and administrative procedures.

Progress on District Recommendation 2 for Improvement and Sustainability

Since the most recent follow-up accreditation team visit in November 2012, all Board policies and administrative procedures have entered the cycle of review. Completion status as of October 2013 is as follows:

Chapters	No. of Board Policies (BPs) and Administrative Procedures (APs) Reviewed	Status
Chapter 1 The District	2 of 2 BPs reviewed No APs required	Review completed
Chapter 2 Board of Trustees	46 of 47 BPs reviewed 23 of 23 APs reviewed	Remaining BP (1) Review in progress
Chapter 3 General Institution	21 of 29 BPs reviewed 18 of 27 APs reviewed	Remaining BPs (8)/APs (9) Review in progress
Chapter 4 Academic Affairs	30 of 32 BPs reviewed 32 of 34 APs reviewed	Remaining BPs (2)/APs (2) Review in progress
Chapter 5 Student Services	10 of 25 BPs reviewed 10 of 26 APs reviewed	Remaining BPs (15)/APs (16) Review in progress
Chapter 6 Business/Fiscal Affairs	22 of 23 BPs reviewed 31 of 31 APs reviewed	Remaining BP (1) under review APs completed
Chapter 7 Human Resources	27 of 30 BPs reviewed 12 of 12 APs reviewed	Remaining BPs (3) under review APs completed

The District continues to monitor the sequence, origination points, and appropriate constituency involvement in the two-year policy/procedure review process to identify systematically criteria and evaluate impacts of same on District/College operational effectiveness (D2-01). The Board of Trustees committed to act in a manner consistent with its policies and administrative procedures by signing a strengthened Best Practices Agreement at its regularly scheduled Board meeting in March 2013 (D2-02).

To achieve continuous quality improvement across the District/Colleges, the “Business Tools, Forms, and Procedures” SharePoint site will be expanded to incorporate additional procedures, forms, and enhancements based on user suggestions (D2-03). This process of regular updates will continue based on user input. The Human Resources Department reviews the electronic toolbox “HR Tools” on an ongoing basis to ensure the toolbox contains necessary and up-to-date materials for employees (D2-04).

In fall 2012, the District Council on Accreditation and Planning (DCAP) designed and implemented an Employee Formal Communications Survey to collect and analyze feedback from employees about ways to improve the flow of information to and from the District through formal channels of the committee and governance structure and to identify any policies or procedures that need clarification or that are difficult to implement in practice. A summary of the survey findings was discussed at District Consultation Council in spring 2013 and provided District-wide through a subsequent Chancellor’s Update, which was distributed to employees, students, and Community Advisory Body members (D2-05). The next annual Employee Formal Communications Survey is scheduled for fall 2013.

List of Evidence for District Recommendation 2

- D2-01 VCCCD Policy/Procedure Tracking Document; Board Policy/Administrative Procedure Two-Year Review Calendar
- D2-02 Board of Trustees Best Practices Agreement (03/2013)
- D2-03 “Business Tools, Forms, and Procedures” SharePoint Site
- D2-04 Human Resources Department “HR Tools”
- D2-05 VCCCD Employee Formal Communications Survey Summary, Chancellor’s Update

District Recommendation 3. In order to increase effectiveness, the Teams recommend that the District conduct a periodic outcomes assessment and analysis of its strategic planning and decision-making processes, leading to sustainable continuous quality improvement in educational effectiveness in support of student learning and district-wide operations. (IV.B.3)

Conclusion from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report (November 13-14, 2012):

The teams found that there are well-defined processes to review the planning process, and timelines are clear and reasonable. The teams also found that outcomes assessment data and other elements of institutional effectiveness are integrated into both the District and College planning processes. There is a linkage between Recommendation 1 and 3 in that delineation of responsibility is important in addressing the decision-making process at VCCCD. There is indication that the process of assessment-related actions will lead to sustainable continuous quality improvement in effecting student success. The teams conclude that VCCCD has fully addressed this recommendation, resolved deficiencies, and now meets Standards.

Summary

To align with best practices in institutional planning, the Board of Trustees assessed the District's planning efforts using the ACCJC Rubric on Integrated Planning at its June 2012 Board Strategic Planning Session. Outcomes suggested District practices and processes reflected many essential features of integrated planning, including a 10-year District Master Plan, Board goals and objectives with annual effectiveness reporting, annual Board planning sessions, and dialogue regarding efficacy of the planning process. The improved District-wide integrated planning process incorporated local College planning processes and reporting timelines.

The Board recognized process improvements were needed to reach and maintain the level of "sustainable continuous program improvement." Of particular importance was documentation of the planning process, affirmation of the planning cycle and timeline for creation of the next District Master Plan, and an orderly transition to improved practices from current activities. To that end, a transition plan and District-wide planning model timeline was adopted by the Board in August 2012. A *VCCCD Integrated Planning Manual* guides and documents the planning process.

To assess District/College effectiveness, VCCCD created a District-wide *Institutional Effectiveness Report* that delineates outcomes for corresponding annual Board Goals. The *Institutional Effectiveness Report* provides three years of data for trend analysis and comparisons. The first report was presented at the June 2012 Board Planning Session and will be presented annually and institutionalized as a component of the standard assessment measure.

To assess its decision-making processes, the District, through Consultation Council during the period of February-June 2012, reviewed the *Participatory Governance Handbook* and substantially revised the deliberation and consultation process. The resulting structure, as documented in the *Handbook* under the *VCCCD Governance: Advisory and Recommendation Pathways*, ensures that the deliberation, recommendation, and decision-making process is transparent, appropriate, and functional.

The *Participatory Governance Handbook* review process and development of the *VCCCD Governance: Advisory and Recommendation Pathways* resulted in recommended changes to participatory governance groups, including the creation of a District Council on Accreditation and Planning (DCAP) to develop, monitor, and evaluate District-wide planning and accreditation cycle activities, and a District Council on Academic Affairs (DCAA) to advise the Chancellor regarding instructional program development and related Board policies and administrative procedures. Discussion addressing gaps within existing governance committees further resulted in modifying the District Technical Review Workgroup (DTRW) and District Council on Student Learning (DCSL). The modified groups are now called the District Technical Review Workgroup – Instruction (DTRW-

I) and the District Technical Review Workgroup – Student Services (DTRW-SS), and the Workgroups advise the District Council on Academic Affairs (DCAA) on academic and professional matters. DTRW-I and DTRW-SS focus on instruction and student services in program development and review/suggest revisions to Board policies and administrative procedures in these areas as needed.

The *Participatory Governance Handbook* was communicated District-wide, and constituents were given opportunities to provide input for improvement. The *Participatory Governance Handbook* was presented to the Board of Trustees for information in June 2012, and the Board approved an updated BP 2205 Delineation of System and Board Functions to include the completed *Participatory Governance Handbook* and functional mapping documents.

In fall 2012, the District Council on Accreditation and Planning (DCAP) completed a *VCCCD Operational/Functional Mapping Table* that supplements the Functional Mapping narrative provided in the District-wide *Participatory Governance Handbook*. The supplementary *VCCCD Operational/Functional Mapping Table* provides an “at-a-glance” view of functional mapping between the District and Colleges.

The District and Colleges developed a revised District-wide Integrated Planning Cycle Timeline and District-wide *Institutional Effectiveness Report* that is data-driven to assess District services and ensure periodic outcomes assessment and analysis of its strategic planning and decision-making processes, leading to sustainable, continuous quality improvement in educational effectiveness in support of student learning and District-wide operations. The District has established clearly defined roles of authority and responsibility between the Colleges and District, and it acts as the liaison between the Colleges and Board of Trustees.

Progress on District Recommendation 3 for Improvement and Sustainability

Following Board adoption of the District-wide Integrated Planning Cycle timeline and transition plan, the District and Colleges utilized the *VCCCD Integrated Planning Manual* to guide and document the planning process (D3-01).

Description of the District Planning Process

The District’s six-year *Master Plan* identifies over-arching goals and objectives that serve as the foundation for the *Strategic Plan*, the *Strategic Technology Master Plan*, and the *Facilities Plan* (D3-02). The *Master Plan* may be updated prior to the end of the six-year period if warranted by a major change of conditions.

Research and data analysis provide information for district-wide dialogue that supports the development of the *Master Plan*. Annual and trend data are collected and analyzed in a number of areas, including:

- Demographic data and projections
- Economic projections
- Student access and enrollment data from feeder institutions and receiving institutions
- Student access and success data from the district colleges
- Long-term and short-term analysis of community needs as appropriate to mission
- Other sources of data identified as essential in the planning dialogue

The *Strategic Plan* is comprised of a limited number of high-priority, strategic goals derived from/based on the *Master Plan*. Three-year goals are further divided into objectives, each operationalized through measurable action steps. Each action step includes a timeline for completion, a description of the indicators of success, and the assignment of parties responsible for implementing the action. The Board of Trustees calls for the next

three-year *Strategic Plan* when the term of the *Strategic Plan* expires or when all strategic goals and objectives have been achieved.

The goals and objectives of the six-year *Master Plan* are reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees upon the recommendation of the Chancellor's Consultation Council, which serves as the primary District planning group. Upon receiving the *Master Plan*, Consultation Council (with the assistance of the District Council on Accreditation and Planning (DCAP)): (1) identifies goals and objectives to implement first, which are compiled into the *Strategic Plan*, (2) charges the appropriate District councils and College committees with the task of developing and implementing the action steps to support the *Strategic Plan's* goals and objectives, and (3) calls on these councils and committees to file periodic progress reports with the District Council on Accreditation and Planning (DCAP).

The new *Master Plan* is intended to cover the period from 2013 to 2019. The *Strategic Plan* will be developed during the fall 2013 semester and will span the period of 2013 to 2016. The *Facilities Master Plan* is a rolling five-year plan that currently spans from 2015 to 2019 (D3-03). The *Strategic Technology Master Plan* spans from 2011 to 2014 (D3-04). Subsequent iterations of these plans will be developed when the terms of these plans expire or if there is a major change of internal or external conditions.

Development of the 2013-2019 Master Plan

The development of a new educational Master Plan during spring 2013 was a highly collaborative process, where the hopes and ideas of various stakeholders were synthesized into a coherent narrative that both inspired and directed specific goals and objectives. Below is the framework that was followed to create the 2013-2019 *Ventura County Community College District Master Plan*:

Laying the Foundation: In January 2013, the District Council on Accreditation and Planning (DCAP) proposed a preliminary timeline for the development and adoption of the *Master Plan*. The President of Ventura College (hereafter, "Planner") was asked to lead the District and its three Colleges through the steps needed to produce a document for Board of Trustees review and consideration. Following this appointment, a preliminary methodology for seeking constituent input on key planning issues was developed and a draft implementation calendar was prepared (D3-05).

Identification of Focus Group Participants and Key Discussion Topics: In January 2013, the District Council on Accreditation and Planning (DCAP) presented a preliminary list of questions to be discussed in constituent focus groups. The Chancellor's Consultation Council modified and augmented these preliminary questions, resulting in the following list:

1. In light of increased state and national emphasis on student completion, what might be done in order to create clear pathways to degrees, certificates, and transfers?
2. In light of proposed unit caps and penalties for unsuccessful course attempts, what might be done in order to decrease course withdrawals and failing grades?
3. Is there anything about our relationship with our educational partners that could be improved or that needs to change?
4. In light of rapid technological advancements and increased options available for students on both the state and national level, what do we need to do to remain competitive in the online arena?
5. What should be the relationship of the three Colleges in our District to each other?
6. (Internal Groups): What must we do to retain organizational vitality?
OR
6. (External Groups): What could the District and its three Colleges do to better meet community needs?

Consultation Council also agreed to a minimum set of constituent groups to participate in focus group discussions. These groups included the Academic, Classified, and Student Senates; the College Administrative or Deans' Councils; the District's Community Advisory Board (as augmented by additional community representatives); and representatives from the College Foundation Boards.

Environmental Scan: Concurrently with the development of the focus group questions, the District's institutional researchers were asked to compile an extensive scan of the external and internal environment, focusing on the variables that might impact district planning decisions. Where possible, county data was compared to state data.

External data included:

1. County demographics
2. Socioeconomic trends
3. Unemployment rates
4. Employment by sector
5. K-12 student demographics
6. High school graduation numbers and test scores
7. High school dropout rates
8. College-going rates

Internal data included:

1. Enrollment trends
2. Student demographics
3. Faculty and staff demographics
4. Student goals and majors
5. English, math and reading placements
6. BOG waiver statistics
7. Trends in numbers served by categorical programs
8. ARCC data
9. Degrees and certificates awarded
10. Numbers of transfers
11. Employment rate of CTE student cohorts
12. Number of students taking online courses
13. Number of students above a 90-unit threshold
14. Number of students who have tried and failed courses 3 or more times; courses attempted that fall into this category
15. Number of students who are on financial aid
16. Number of students who have been on financial aid for 12 or more semesters

Focus Groups: Thirteen individuals were identified by the Chancellor, College Presidents, and Academic Senate Presidents to serve as facilitators of the focus groups. In February 2013, the Planner met with the identified facilitators to orient them to their task, to clarify the planning discussion questions that would be raised, to pilot a methodology for the focus groups, and to agree upon a methodology for documenting the results of the focus group discussions. Focus group discussions were held during the months of February and March 2013.

Forum: In April 2013, a large-group dialogue on the planning issues was held. At this meeting, the members of Consultation Council were joined by the 13 facilitators and by the members of the committees responsible for planning at the three Colleges. After reviewing the data prepared by the District's institutional researchers and hearing the synthesized results of College and District focus group discussions, the Forum format was used to enable the 80+ participants to further discuss the planning issues at greater length. The results of this large-

group dialogue were synthesized by the Planner and used as the basis for the development of a proposed list of goals and objectives to serve as the foundation for the *Master Plan*.

Review and Revision: In May 2013, the first draft of the proposed *Master Plan* was shared with College and District constituent groups. District Consultation Council received feedback and made modifications to the draft. The draft report was also reviewed and discussed by the Board of Trustees in June 2013 as part of their annual Planning Session. Work continued on a second draft of the *Master Plan* during July 2013, and the revised document was shared with College and District constituent groups when school resumed in August 2013.

Adoption: Consultation Council finalized the draft of the *Master Plan* in September 2013. The *Master Plan* was presented to the Board of Trustees in September 2013 for discussion and in October 2013 for adoption (D3-06 and D3-07).

List of Evidence for District Recommendation 3

- D3-01 *VCCCD Integrated Planning Manual*
- D3-02 *District Master Plan*
- D3-03 *Facilities Master Plan*
- D3-04 *Strategic Technology Master Plan*
- D3-05 District Master Plan Timeline/Calendar
- D3-06 Consultation Council Agenda/Notes (9.27.13)
- D3-07 Board of Trustees Meetings (9.10.13, 10.8.13)

District Recommendation 4. In order to improve communications, the Teams recommend that the District assess the effectiveness of its formal communications and utilize constituency and community input/feedback data to implement improvements to ensure that open and timely communication regarding expectations of educational excellence, operational planning, and integrity continues and is enhanced at all levels of the organization. (III.A.3, IV.B.3)

Conclusion from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report (November 13-14, 2012):

The teams found that communication between College employees and District staff members have improved significantly. The team determined that the VCCCD, in conjunction with the Colleges, now meets Standard III.A.3 and Standard IV.B.3. In their response to District Recommendation 4, the teams believe that the District and Colleges have met this recommendation and resolved the deficiencies.

Summary

Internal

The District, through Consultation Council, improved effectiveness of its formal communications as evidenced by a thorough review and revision of the District-wide *Participatory Governance Handbook*. In creating and adhering to an appropriate governance process chart, *VCCCD Governance: Advisory and Recommendation Pathways*, for formal consultation and dialogue, the District ensured that venues for constituent feedback are available, well-defined, and understood. The *Handbook* will be thoroughly assessed through Consultation Council at least once every three years to ensure ongoing effectiveness and demonstrate sustainable continuous quality improvement.

In March 2012, VCCCD implemented an annual governance committees' self-appraisal survey process to ensure assessment and improve formal communications within governance committee structures. Findings were discussed by committee members, and areas of potential improvement identified. In addition, formal governance committee/council activities occurring District-wide were communicated through the Chancellor's Update, posted on the District website, and distributed to employees, students, and Citizens Advisory Body members.

To improve communication between Chancellor's Cabinet and governance committees, actions taken in Chancellor's Cabinet regarding policies and procedures were recorded in Chancellor's Cabinet meeting notes, and the Chair/Co-Chairs of the appropriate governance committees were notified of actions taken in Chancellor's Cabinet. In addition, the Director of Administrative Relations attended various governance committee meetings as a guest to assist in maintaining consistent communication regarding review of policies and administrative procedures.

External

To further utilize community input in strategic planning, the District surveyed an expanded Citizens Advisory Body to obtain feedback for consideration at the Board's June 2012 Strategic Planning Session. The survey obtained opinions regarding the District/Colleges' breadth of functions and perceived challenges to better inform the Board of Trustees in planning and deliberations. Significant findings reflected the need for the District to increase communication with community constituents regarding programs, services, and budget information. In addition, findings indicated that community members identified the budget, alternative revenue resources, accreditation, partnerships, and college readiness as challenges currently facing VCCCD. Trustees commented that the findings confirmed the importance of obtaining community input, and the Board agreed to increase the number of meetings with the Citizens Advisory Body to improve communication and ensure in-depth community participation in planning related to community needs.

The District is committed to continuous assessment of the effectiveness of its formal communication and utilized its constituency and community input/feedback data as a means to plan for continuous improvement. At the same time, the District and Colleges are demonstrating to the community that it and the three Colleges value open and timely communication with their constituents regarding expectation of educational excellence, operational planning, and integrity. High expectations are to be the norm at all levels of the organization.

Progress on District Recommendation 4 for Improvement and Sustainability

In March 2013, annual governance committees' self-appraisal surveys were distributed to governance committees (i.e., District Consultation Council, Administrative Technology Advisory Committee (ATAC); District Council on Accreditation and Planning (DCAP); District Council on Human Resources (DCHR); Institutional Research Advisory Committee (IRAC); District Council on Academic Affairs (DCAA); District Technical Review Workgroup-Instructional (DTRW-I); District Technical Review Workgroup-Student Services (DTRW-SS); District Council on Administrative Services (DCAS); and Instructional Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)) to ensure assessment and improve formal communications within governance committee structures (D4-01).

Findings were shared with members of the above-referenced committees in spring 2013. Members identified areas of potential improvement, if any, based on self-appraisal findings as follows (D4-02):

- District Consultation Council agreed review and discussion regarding its role would take place as part of the Participatory Governance Handbook review.
- ATAC discussion of findings resulted in committee agreement to maintain the current meeting schedule and post draft meeting notes to the District website to provide needed information in advance of approved minutes. ATAC members also requested more frequent updates on recommendations presented to Cabinet.
- DCAP discussion results will be provided in fall 2013 when the committee resumes meeting.
- DCHR discussion results will be provided in fall 2013 when the committee resumes meeting.
- IRAC members reviewed the self-appraisal findings and determined the committee was functioning as needed.
- DCAA members recommended additional discussion take place at Consultation Council regarding the charge of DCAA.
- DTRW-I and DTRW-SS workgroups discussed process and coordination between DTRW-I, DTRW-SS, and DCAA. Workgroup members agreed to post draft meeting notes on the District Committee website to provide needed information in advance of approved minutes. In addition, the workgroup members agreed to change the monthly meeting dates to accommodate submission deadlines for Policy Committee review and Board review.
- DCAS findings resulted in group discussion regarding planning and budget and the committee's role as it relates to the funding allocation model.
- ITAC findings resulted in members reviewing the committee structure and forwarding recommended changes to Consultation Council.

In fall 2012, the District Council on Accreditation and Planning (DCAP) initiated a survey of all employees related to constituency satisfaction with formal communications as a means to gauge effectiveness and provide opportunity for improvement. A summary of the survey findings was discussed at District Consultation Council in spring 2013 and provided District-wide through a subsequent Chancellor's Update, which was distributed to employees, students, and Community Advisory Body members (D4-03). The next annual Employee Formal Communications Survey is scheduled for fall 2013.

The Board values the importance of obtaining community input and increased the number of meetings with the Citizens Advisory Body to improve communication and ensure in-depth community participation in planning related to community needs. Four Citizens Advisory Body meetings have been held since fall 2012. The October 2012 meeting focused on the Board's Goals and Objectives, the District budget, and accreditation. The January 2013 meeting focused on economic development. The District's Division of Economic Development provided an overview of current economic development activities, achievements, and future plans. Trustees and community members discussed opportunities for vital community needs and identified gaps in service delivery. Groups were assigned topics for discussion and reported findings in the areas of emerging sectors in the county, potential partnerships, outreach possibilities, and methods to address any gaps in training and workforce development. The April 2013 Citizens Advisory Body meeting focused on development of the District *Master Plan*. Additional Ventura County community leaders were invited to attend the April 2013 Citizens Advisory Body meeting as a means to obtain additional community input for the District *Master Plan*. The September 2013 Citizens Advisory Body meeting provided members an opportunity to review and discuss the most recent version of the District Master Plan that included Citizen Advisory Body members' ideas and input (D4-04).

Citizens Advisory Body meeting assessment findings indicate members desire and appreciate interactive meetings. As a result, all Citizen Advisory Body meetings include opportunities for discussion between Citizen Advisory Body members, presenters, facilitators, and the Board of Trustees (D4-05).

List of Evidence for District Recommendation 4

D4-01 District Committee Self-Appraisal Electronic Distribution Communications

D4-02 Participatory Governance Committees Self-Appraisal Findings and Governance Committee Meeting Notes Reflecting Discussion

D4-03 VCCCD Employee Formal Communications Survey Summary, Chancellor's Update

D4-04 Citizens Advisory Body Meeting Agendas/Minutes

D4-05 Citizens Advisory Body Assessment Findings

District Recommendation 5. In order to meet the Standard, the Board of Trustees shall complete an analysis of its self-assessment pursuant to Board Policy 2745 and formally adopt expected outcomes and measures for continuous quality improvement that will be assessed and reported as a component of the immediately succeeding self-assessment. (IV.B.1.g)

Conclusion from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report (November 13-14, 2012):

After interviewing College employees, District staff, and individual Board members, the team concluded that the Board has implemented a professional development process to improve individual member's skills. This professional development process is dependent on an on-going self-evaluation to identify inefficiencies involving performance of Board members. The teams conclude that the District has met this recommendation.

Summary

The Board's annual self-evaluation process to assess Board performance is clearly defined in Board Policy/Administrative Procedure 2745 Board Self-Evaluation. The Board of Trustees improved the self-assessment instrument and implemented the self-evaluation process to complete the Board self-evaluation in advance of its June 2012 Board Planning Session in accordance with Board Policy 2745.

The full Board completed an analysis of its self-assessment and formally adopted outcomes and measures of Board performance. The assessment of those outcomes was an integral part of the annual evaluation. An external constituent assessment of the Board in the form of a survey to the District Consultation Council was established per Board Policy/Administrative Policy 2745 as part of the Board's annual self-assessment process. The results of the external assessment by District Consultation Council were discussed as part of the Board self-evaluation at the June 2012 Board Planning Session. The Board also accepted the survey results from the District Consultation Council and incorporated the findings into the Board's goal setting and performance enhancement activities.

In adopting the Board's Performance Goals, conducting the continuous self-assessment activities, and reviewing and improving the self-assessment instrument, the Board demonstrated a heightened vigilance toward self-reflection and continuous quality improvement. The assessment is focused upon Board performance as related to the Board's leadership and policy-making roles.

Progress on Recommendation 5 for Improvement and Sustainability

Per Policy 2745 Board Self-Evaluation, the Board's self-evaluation process is conducted annually (D5-01). The Board's 2013 self-assessment process included the following activities:

- At the April 2013 Planning, Accreditation, Board Communications, and Student Success Committee (PACSS), PACSS reviewed existing self-evaluation survey instruments (i.e., Board's self-evaluation, Board evaluation survey provided to District Consultation Council for feedback, and the Board's monthly meeting assessment) (D5-02).
- In May 2013, the Board implemented its annual ongoing self-evaluation process per Board Policy/Administrative Procedure 2745. The Board of Trustees received the 2013 self-evaluation survey in electronic format for completion from the Chancellor's Office, and District Consultation Council members were provided an opportunity to complete the Board Evaluation survey electronically through the Chancellor's Office. The Board Survey was designed to gather feedback regarding Board Performance Goals, general evaluation, and individual Trustee reflective perspective. Participants were asked to indicate opinions using a rating scale of "agree," "partial agreement,"

“disagree,” or “don’t know.” An option to provide comments was provided (D5-03).

- The annual summative Board self-evaluation was conducted at the Board’s June 2013 Board Strategic Planning Session. Purpose and expected outcomes included evaluating Board performance; identifying and discussing areas for strengthening Board performance; incorporating identified areas in need of improvement into existing Board Performance Goals; and adopting updated Board Performance Goals. The Board’s self-evaluation process also included discussion of significant findings from a summary of the Board’s Monthly Meeting Assessments and a discussion of the results of the Board’s Annual Self-Evaluation and Consultation Council Evaluation of the Board (D5-04).
- Following Board discussion in June 2013, Trustees assessed the Board’s progress in achieving performance goals and considered significant findings in the review and update of Board Performance Goals. The Board made recommendations for improvement and renewed the Board’s commitment to maintain strengthened Board performance. At a subsequent Board meeting in September 2013, the Board adopted its updated Board Performance Goals (D5-05).
- Following the Board’s 2013 self-evaluation process, Board members completed a meeting assessment to ensure continuous quality improvement and effectiveness. Findings were provided for Trustee discussion (D5-06).

List of Evidence for District Recommendation 5

- D5-01 VCCCD Board Policy/Administrative Procedure 2745 Board Self-Evaluation
- D5-02 PACSS Meeting Notes, Existing Board Self-Evaluation Instruments
- D5-03 Board Self-Evaluation, Consultation Council Board Evaluation Survey
- D5-04 Board Planning Session Agenda/Minutes, Board Self-Evaluation Findings, Consultation Council Findings, Summary of Board’s Monthly Meeting Assessments
- D5-05 Board Meeting Minutes, Board Performance Goals
- D5-06 Board Annual Planning Session Assessment Findings

District Recommendation 6. In order to meet the Standards, the Board of Trustees shall establish clearly written policies and corresponding procedures to ensure that decision-making is administered by staff in an equitable and consistent manner across and within the three Colleges. (III.A.3.a, III.A.4.c, IV.B.1.b-c)

Conclusion from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report (November 13-14, 2012):

The teams were able to confirm that the Colleges receive equitable participation from the District Office regarding input on policies and procedures, which may affect their decision making process. College personnel cited examples of procedures that are implemented consistently and equitably across Colleges, such as the granting of early tenure. The teams conclude that the District Office has met this recommendation.

Summary

The District administered a three-pronged strategy to ensure Board-established policies and administrative procedures are administered District-wide in an equitable and consistent manner:

1. Board policies and administrative procedures are reviewed on a two-year cycle with constituent input to ensure clarity and appropriateness in field implementation.
2. The Functional Mapping narrative in the *Participatory Governance Handbook* makes explicit the delineation of functions between the District and Colleges and clarifies where District/College sites have discretionary decision-making over operations and where uniformity in practice is mandated.
3. Formal communication channels are utilized to ensure Board policies and procedures are communicated to District-wide constituents.

The Board of Trustees adopted a two-year policy/procedure review cycle calendar in March 2011. The review schedule was implemented and is being vigorously adhered to as evidenced by activities undertaken by the Board's Policy Committee and the subsequent placement of proposed, reviewed, and/or revised policies and administrative procedures on monthly Board agendas for action or information. District governance committees maintain meeting notes documenting policy/administrative procedure review and recommendations and have been requested to post agendas/minutes on the District or College websites.

To address policies and procedures that may impede operational effectiveness or result in less than uniform practice concerns, policy/procedure review and recommended changes follow the implemented *VCCCD Governance: Advisory and Recommendation Pathways* outlined in the *Participatory Governance Handbook* to ensure transparent and broad-based constituent input, consistency, and appropriate application across the District and Colleges. The Functional Mapping narrative in the *Participatory Governance Handbook* explains the delineation of functions between the District and Colleges and clarifies where District/College sites have discretionary decision-making over operations and where uniformity in practice is mandated.

Governance committees and District/College constituents serving on governance committees are provided opportunities to review, analyze, and recommend suggestions for modification of policies/procedures under review that may present potential impediments or uniform application concerns in District/College departments. Committee members understand that they attend meetings to represent constituent groups at a College or the District Administrative Center and serve as a conduit for information and catalyst for discussion on topics raised by District groups and within the constituent groups.

As a result of dialogue by governance groups and constituent feedback, policy and administrative procedure modifications were implemented to avoid impeding College operations and ensure consistency across the

District/Colleges. For example, an employee-accessible “Business Tools, Forms, and Procedures” SharePoint site was designed to facilitate consistent District-wide application of procedures, and a Field Trip/Excursion electronic workflow process was developed in conjunction with faculty and staff in response to faculty needs.

To improve communication between Chancellor’s Cabinet and governance committees, actions taken in Chancellor’s Cabinet regarding policies and procedures were recorded in Chancellor’s Cabinet meeting notes, and the Chair/Co-Chairs of the appropriate governance committees were notified of actions taken in Chancellor’s Cabinet. In addition, the Director of Administrative Relations attended various government committee meetings as a guest to assist in maintaining consistent communication regarding review of policies and administrative procedures.

All Board policies and administrative procedures are monitored and tracked using a “Policy/Procedure Review Master Tracking Document,” and all active Board policies and procedures are available to District/College constituents and the public electronically via the District website. Constituents are provided District contact information on the District website for questions or requests related to policy and administrative procedures.

The District has consistently addressed the delineation of roles and responsibilities of the Chancellor and Board of Trustees as stated in Board Policy 2434. The Board delegates fully the responsibility and authority to the Chancellor to implement and administer Board policies without Board interference and holds the Chancellor accountable for the leadership and operation of the District and the Colleges. The Board continues to be cognizant and diligent in its responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.

Progress on Recommendation 6 for Improvement and Sustainability

Since the most recent follow-up accreditation team visit in November 2012, all Board policies and administrative procedures have entered the cycle of review. Completion status as of October 2013 is as follows:

Chapters	No. of Board Policies (BPs) and Administrative Procedures (APs) Reviewed	Status
Chapter 1 The District	2 of 2 BPs reviewed No APs required	Review completed
Chapter 2 Board of Trustees	46 of 47 BPs reviewed 23 of 23 APs reviewed	Remaining BP (1) Review in progress
Chapter 3 General Institution	21 of 29 BPs reviewed 18 of 27 APs reviewed	Remaining BPs (8)/APs (9) Review in progress
Chapter 4 Academic Affairs	30 of 32 BPs reviewed 32 of 34 APs reviewed	Remaining BPs (2)/APs (2) Review in progress
Chapter 5 Student Services	10 of 25 BPs reviewed 10 of 26 APs reviewed	Remaining BPs (15)/APs (16) Review in progress
Chapter 6 Business/Fiscal Affairs	22 of 23 BPs reviewed 31 of 31 APs reviewed	Remaining BP (1) under review APs completed
Chapter 7 Human Resources	27 of 30 BPs reviewed 12 of 12 APs reviewed	Remaining BPs (3) under review APs completed

The District continues to monitor the sequence, origination points, and appropriate constituency involvement in the two-year policy/procedure review process to identify systematically criteria and evaluate impacts of same on District/College operational effectiveness (D6-01). The Board of Trustees committed to act in a manner

consistent with its policies and administrative procedures by signing a strengthened Best Practices Agreement at its regularly scheduled Board meeting in March 2013 (D6-02).

To achieve continuous quality improvement across the District/Colleges, the “Business Tools, Forms, and Procedures” SharePoint site will be expanded to incorporate additional procedures, forms, and enhancements based on user suggestions (D6-03). The Human Resources Department reviews the electronic toolbox “HR Tools” on an ongoing basis to ensure the toolbox contains necessary and up-to-date materials for employees (D6-04).

In February 2012, District Consultation Council and Chancellor’s Administrative Council agreed upon a review process and timeline for an annual assessment of the *Participatory Governance Handbook* and accompanying *VCCCD Governance: Advisory and Recommendation Pathways* and *VCCCD Operational/Functional Mapping Table*. During February and March 2013, District Consultation Council members and the Chancellor’s Administrative Council members worked with constituencies at the Colleges and the District Administrative Center to gather input for a first review of the documents at the April 5, 2013 Consultation Council meeting (D6-05). Review of the *Handbook* and related documents is ongoing through scheduled Consultation Council meetings (D6-06), with expected completion in fall 2013.

In fall 2012, the District Council on Accreditation and Planning (DCAP) designed and implemented an Employee Formal Communications Survey to collect and analyze feedback from employees about ways to improve the flow of information to and from the District through formal channels of the committee and governance structure and to identify any policies or procedures that need clarification or that are difficult to implement in practice. A summary of the survey findings was discussed at District Consultation Council in spring 2013 and provided District-wide through a subsequent Chancellor’s Update, which was distributed to employees, students, and Community Advisory Body members (D6-07). The next annual Employee Formal Communications Survey is scheduled for fall 2013.

List of Evidence for District Recommendation 6

- D6-01 VCCCD Policy/Procedure Tracking Document; Board Policy/Administrative Procedure Two-Year Review Calendar
- D6-02 Board of Trustees Best Practices Agreement (03/2013)
- D6-03 “Business Tools, Forms, and Procedures” SharePoint Site
- D6-04 Human Resources Department “HR Tools”
- D6-05 Consultation Council Agenda/Notes and *Participatory Governance Handbook* (4.5.13)
- D6-06 Consultation Council Agendas/Notes (5.30.13, 6.27.13, 8.30.13)
- D6-07 VCCCD Employee Formal Communications Survey Summary, Chancellor’s Update

District Recommendation 7. In order to meet the Standards, the Board of Trustees shall assess its actions in relation to its policy making role and implement a program for ongoing Board member professional development to enhance and improve the demonstration of its primary leadership role in assuring the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services delivered by the District Colleges. (IV.A.3, IV.B.1. e-g)

Conclusion from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report (November 13-14, 2012):

The efforts by the Board of Trustees to take responsibility for policing its own actions and implementing a continuous quality improvement professional development plan and calendar is commendable. The team was able to verify that all members of the Board of Trustees participates in all professional development activities to assure that they will carry out their duties and roles as policymakers. The teams conclude that the District has met this recommendation, resolved deficiencies, and now meets Standards.

Summary

The Board of Trustees committed to ongoing professional development as evidenced by Board Policy/Administrative Procedure 2740 Trustee Professional Development and the Board's March 2012 Best Practices Agreement. To demonstrate its commitment and accomplish this goal, the Board developed and adopted a "Professional Development 2012/2013 Calendar" of activities and began assessing the effectiveness of its external professional development activities to ensure that the full Board is in concordance on the content and value of its development experience. In fall 2012, to further the Board's professional growth related to Board roles and responsibilities, the Board integrated the evaluation of its internal professional development activities as part of its monthly Board meeting assessments.

During the period of November 2011 through October 2012, the Board participated in numerous professional development activities, including a visit by the President of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), several Community College League of California Conferences, and Parliamentary Procedure Training. Presentations included the Role of Faculty in Accreditation Processes; Role of Academic Senates/Areas of Authority and Responsibility; External Leadership Role; Fiscal Affairs; Legal Affairs; Legislative Matters; Human Resources; Student Trustee Role; Program Discontinuance Process; and Enrollment Priorities.

A majority of Board professional development activities are based on "Board and CEO Roles: Different Jobs, Different Tasks," provided by the Community College League of California. Activities provided on the District premises are attended by the full Board, with the exception of excused absences. Off-site activities requiring travel are attended by a minimum of one or two Board members on behalf of the full Board. Board members attending off-site activities provided verbal reports to the full Board during a regularly-scheduled Board meeting to communicate the value of the professional development experience.

Board professional development activities demonstrate the Trustees' commitment to ongoing professional development to enhance and improve the performance of their primary leadership role in assuring the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services delivered by the District and Colleges. Furthermore, the Board of Trustees took action to ensure that it reviews its members' ethical behavior and has procedures in place to advise, warn, sanction, and censure members regarding their conduct.

Progress on Recommendation 7 for Improvement and Sustainability

Since the most recent follow-up accreditation team visit in November 2012, two or more Board members have participated in the following professional development activities:

Date	Professional Development Activity
11/15/12	Community College League of California Annual Conference
01/12/13	Effective Board/Committee Meetings: Governance Issues and the Open Meetings Act, Ventura County Office of Education
01/22/13	Technical Assistance Visit (AB 1725) by Scott Lay (CCLC) and Michelle Pilati (Academic Senate for California Community Colleges)
01/25/13	CCLC Effective Trustee Conference
01/27/13	CCLC Legislative Conference
04/05/13	Board Communications Workshop
04/09/13	Board Role in Strategic Planning
05/03/13	Community College League of California, Trustees Annual Conference
05/14/13	Emergency Preparedness
07/09/13	2013 State of the Region Report, Ventura Civic Alliance
08/13/13	State Community College Budget Overview by Scott Lay, Community College League of California
09/03/13	California Workforce Association
10/01/13	Association of Community College Trustee Leadership Congress 2013

In summer 2013, the Board, through its annual planning session, evaluated a summary of its professional development activity assessments to ensure continued growth related to roles and responsibilities, governance, effective policy and decision-making, organizational effectiveness, and ethics. A 2013-14 annual calendar of professional activities was established by the Board of Trustees at the Board's Strategic Planning Session in June 2013 and adopted in July 2013 (D7-01).

List of Evidence for District Recommendation 7

D7-01 Board 2013-14 Professional Development Calendar

Commission Concern (February 1, 2012). The team report confirmed that board development activities had been provided and all board members were encouraged to attend. At the same time, the team expressed concern about the consistency and long-term sustainability of the Board's demonstration of its primary leadership role and reiterates its recommendation for evidence of ongoing professional development for all Board members. Specifically, the Commission notes a particular board member's disruptive and inappropriate behavior and the entire board's responsibility to address and curtail it. (Eligibility Requirement 3; Standard IV.B.1.g, h, i) The Commission also notes that the continued behavior and non-compliance of the District jeopardizes the accreditation of the VCCCD Colleges.

Conclusion from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report (November 13-14, 2012):

The teams acknowledged the systematic work that the Board of Trustees and Chancellor have made in addressing the Commission Concern. The Board has recognized and taken seriously that it must take control of its actions and maintain its focus on the "The Big Three" i.e., accreditation, budget, and new leadership. Through interviews with College employees and reviewing the evidentiary documents, the teams were able to confirm that Board members understand their roles and responsibilities as policy-making and professional development.

Board members made statements that were confirmed through interviews, that their role has improved greatly, representing a noticeable change in the Board's attitudes. Employees are hopeful about the sustainability of this change, but during some employee interviews, concern was expressed about the sustainability of the Board's behavior.

At this point, even though it has only been nine months, the Board of Trustees has resolved the Commission Concern. It will be extremely important that this area of Board leadership and behavior be reviewed in the Mid-term report in 2013 for further evidence of sustainability.

Eligibility Requirement 3: *In order to meet this requirement, the Board needs to demonstrate a consistent and sustainable ability to effectively function as a Board in carrying out its responsibility for the quality, integrity, and financial stability of the District and for ensuring that the District's mission is being carried out. The individual members of the Board must demonstrate their ability to operate impartially on all matters relative to District business to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the District. The Board has demonstrated exceptional progress in addressing this Requirement, but the Mid-term report in 2013 will need to show evidence of the sustainability of the Board's efforts to be fully compliant with this Eligibility Requirement.*

Standard 1V.B.1.g: *The Board reviewed BP 2745 and modified its self-evaluation instrument following the comprehensive visit in November 2011. The follow-up team reported in its November 2012 report that the Board had developed objectives and eleven measurable activities for the 2011-2012 academic year, and an evaluation and analysis of achievement of these outcomes would occur at a Board session in May/June 2012. The Board completed this cycle and conducted an assessment of this process. The Board has met compliance with this Standard.*

Standard 1V.B.1.h: *The Board took serious action to revise and strengthen BP 2715 to more clearly identify expected behavior displayed by each member of the Board of Trustees. It further added language that identified various forms of sanction that could be administered in the event of a violation of this Board policy. The Board should be commended for taking this action. The Board has demonstrated enforcement of these policies to correct the behavior of at least two Board members. Reports from interviews indicate that the Board behavior has definitely improved during the period of time the new policies have been in force. To meet compliance with this Standard, the Board will need to provide evidence for the Mid-term report that the changes are sustainable.*

Standard IV.B.1.i: *The Board has demonstrated that it has a desire to be informed and involved in the accreditation process. The evidence of its study session with ACCJC staff in November 2011, its special Board meeting in February 2012, the District Council on Accreditation and Planning was established in March 2012, attending accreditation sessions for Trustees at the November 2012 Community College League of California annual conference, and a technical assistance visit from ACCJC in January 2013 indicate the Board's sincere efforts to be knowledgeable and conversant on accreditation matters. The Board has met compliance with this standard.*

Summary

Board Acknowledgement of Commission Concern and Commitment to Reach Compliance

As evidenced by the Board's March 2012 Commission Concern Special Report, the Trustees acknowledged the Commission's Concern regarding Board governance and implemented a systematic approach in responding to the Commission Concern. Actions included:

- Conducted a Special Board meeting to determine a course of action to address the Commission's February 2012 action letter;
- Accepted "Ground Rules" for all Board and Board committee meetings as defined by the ACCJC;
- Reviewed California Community College League "Board and CEO Roles: Different Jobs, Different Tasks" and implemented professional development activities to delineate Board roles within a scope of best practices;
- Discussed the Association of Community College Trustees "Role of a Trustee" and the California School Board Association's "Professional Governance Standards";
- Reviewed policies and administrative procedures related to Board roles and responsibilities (i.e., BP 2200 Board Duties and Responsibilities; BP 2430 Delegation of Authority to CEO; BP 2434 Chancellor's Relationship with the Board; BP 2715 Board Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice; AP 2715-A Code of Ethics; AP 2715-B Standards of Practice; BP/AP 2720 Board Member Communication; BP/AP 2740 Trustee Professional Development; BP/AP 2745 Board Self-Evaluation) and further strengthened and aligned policies to accreditation standards;
- Committed to adhere to Board policies and procedures and hold all Board members accountable to provisions contained within Board policies and procedures;
- Committed to participate in Board professional development activities at least once per quarter; and
- Executed a Board of Trustees Best Practices Agreement in March 2012 under Board Policy 2715 Board Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice.

Board's Role and Board Member Mutual Responsibility to Monitor for Compliance

In complying with Standard IV.B.1.h., the Board took significant action following the March 2012 Commission Concern Special Report and the April 2012 accreditation team visit. In response to the Commission's Concern regarding a particular Trustee's role violations and the Board's lack of addressing and curtailing the Trustee's behavior, Board members improved policies and procedures to govern the actions of the entire Board to function effectively. One specific Board action taken in June 2012 was to strengthen Board Policy 2715 Board Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice and Administrative Procedure 2715-A Board Code of Ethics by including an opportunity for constituents to make verbal complaints in addition to written complaints.

Evidence of improved Board behavior was demonstrated when Board Policy 2715 Board Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice and Administrative Procedure 2715-A Board Code of Ethics were invoked by the Board on two occasions in 2012 to address an alleged violation of the Board of Trustees Best Practices Agreement and an inappropriate comment made by a Trustee. The Board Chair addressed the alleged violations by taking action in accordance with BP 2715/AP 2715-A Board Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice. Upon findings of sufficient cause, resolution was reached in both situations following discussion with the parties involved.

One Trustee's role and presence on the Oxnard College campus was clarified when the Trustee submitted a letter for the record describing his job responsibilities with the Ventura County Human Services Department and confirmed no direct business was conducted with Oxnard College personnel as a result of his assigned work space in the Oxnard College environment.

Board Self-Assessment and Continuous Improvement

To demonstrate compliance with Standard IV.B.1.g, the Board's annual self-evaluation process to assess Board performance is clearly defined in Board Policy/Administrative Procedure 2745 Board Self-Evaluation. The Board of Trustees improved the self-assessment instrument and implemented the self-evaluation process to complete the Board self-evaluation in advance of its June 2012 Board Planning Session in accordance with Board Policy 2745.

The full Board completed an analysis of its self-assessment and formally adopted outcomes and measures of Board performance. The assessment of those outcomes was an integral part of the annual evaluation. An external constituent assessment of the Board in the form of a survey to the District Consultation Council was established per Board Policy/Administrative Policy 2745 as part of the Board's annual self-assessment process. The results of the external assessment by District Consultation Council were discussed as part of the Board self-evaluation at the June 2012 Board Planning Session. The Board also accepted the survey results from the District Consultation Council and incorporated the findings into the Board's goal setting and performance enhancement activities.

In adopting the Board's Performance Goals, conducting the continuous self-assessment activities, and reviewing and improving the self-assessment instrument, the Board demonstrated a heightened vigilance toward self-reflection and continuous quality improvement. The assessment was focused upon Board performance as related to the Board's leadership and policy-making roles.

Professional Development Focus on Accreditation: Eligibility Requirement 3 and Accreditation Standard IV

To demonstrate compliance with Standard IV.B.1.i, the Board of Trustees committed to ongoing professional development as evidenced by Board Policy/Administrative Procedure 2740 Trustee Professional Development and the Board's March 2012 Best Practices Agreement. To demonstrate its commitment and actions to sustain efforts to be fully engaged with all aspects of the accreditation process, the Board adopted a "Professional Development 2012/2013 Calendar" of activities that included professional development activities in the area of accreditation.

During the period of November 2011 through October 2012, the Board participated in numerous professional development activities involving the accreditation process, including a visit by the President of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), two Community College League of California Conferences, a Special Board Meeting, and an Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Committee and Chancellor Visit with

the ACCJC President. Presentations included the Role of Faculty in Accreditation Processes and the Role of Academic Senates/Areas of Authority and Responsibility.

Professional development activities related to the accreditation process provided on the District premises were attended by the full Board, with the exception of excused absences. Off-site activities requiring travel were attended by a minimum of one or two Board members on behalf of the full Board. Board members attending off-site activities provided verbal reports to the full Board during a regularly-scheduled Board meeting to communicate the value of the professional development experience.

In August 2012, the Board formally established the Planning, Accreditation, and Communication (PAC) Committee. PAC ensures District and College planning is comprehensive and meets organizational and community needs, as well as Accrediting Commission Standards. The committee also reviews, tracks District practices and activities for alignment with Accrediting Commission Standards, and receives reports on College progress toward meeting Accrediting Commission Standards. PAC ensures the Board is informed regarding all accreditation matters within the District, and that Board communication is ongoing, timely, transparent, and meets organizational and community needs.

To maintain successful application of policies and procedures, ensure the Board continues to fulfill its primary leadership role, and to meet Eligibility Requirement 3 Accreditation Commission Standard IV, the Board held a special September 2012 Workshop to develop additional strategies to sustain stronger formal communication; maintain accountability; and enhance the working relationships between Trustees and between the Chancellor and Trustees. In addition, Trustees supported adhering to their conflict of interest policy and the duty to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the institution.

Progress on Commission Concern for Improvement and Sustainability

The Board of Trustees continues to demonstrate its commitment to consistency and long-term sustainability as evidenced by actions related to its primary policy-making leadership role, accountability, self-assessment, ongoing professional development activities, and accreditation. Outcomes are intended to ensure the quality, integrity, stability, and mission of the District.

Board's Responsibility to Monitor for Compliance

In complying with Standard IV.B.1.h., the Board again took action to improve policy and procedure to govern the actions of the entire Board to function effectively. A specific action taken by the Board on March 12, 2013 was to further strengthen Board Policy 2715 Board Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice and Administrative Procedure 2715-A Board Code of Ethics by including statements of clarity that addressed Trustees' responsibility to advocate, defend, and represent the District and Colleges equally, exercise authority only as a Policy Board, and fully support Board actions as a unit once taken. Under Board Policy 2715 Board Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice, the Board also executed a strengthened Board of Trustees Best Practices Agreement (CC2012-01).

On April 5, 2013, the Board held a special Board Workshop that focused on strengthening Board communications. Trustees reviewed Accreditation Standard IV as related to formal communications, reviewed the Board's progress on meeting Board Performance Goals, and discussed a summary of communication protocols prepared by the Director of Administrative Relations. Areas of discussion included communication between the Board and Chancellor; crisis communications; Board meeting communications; communication with community members; and communication with employees and students (CC2012-02).

Effective spring 2013, one Trustee, whose presence on the Oxnard College campus was required due to job responsibilities with the Ventura County Human Services Department, moved off campus when County offices relocated.

Board Self-Assessment

To demonstrate ongoing compliance with Standard IV.B.1.g, the Board conducts its self-evaluation process annually per Policy 2745 Board Self-Evaluation (CC2012-03). The Board's 2013 self-assessment process included the following activities:

- At the April 2013 Planning, Accreditation, Board Communications, and Student Success Committee (PACSS) meeting, PACSS reviewed existing self-evaluation survey instruments (i.e., Board's self-evaluation, Board evaluation survey provided to District Consultation Council for feedback, and the Board's monthly meeting assessment) (CC2012-04).
- In May 2013, the Board implemented its annual ongoing self-evaluation process per Board Policy/Administrative Procedure 2745. The Board of Trustees received the 2013 self-evaluation survey in electronic format for completion from the Chancellor's Office, and District Consultation Council members were provided an opportunity to complete the Board Evaluation survey electronically through the Chancellor's Office. The Board Survey was designed to gather feedback regarding Board Performance Goals, general evaluation, and individual Trustee reflective perspective. Participants were asked to indicate opinions using a rating scale of "agree," "partial agreement," "disagree," or "don't know." An option to provide comments was provided (CC2012-05).
- The annual summative Board self-evaluation was conducted at the Board's June 2013 Board Strategic Planning Session. Purpose and expected outcomes included evaluating Board performance; identifying and discussing areas for strengthening Board performance; incorporating identified areas in need of improvement into existing Board Performance Goals; and adopting updated Board Performance Goals. The Board's self-evaluation process also included discussion of significant findings from a summary of the Board's Monthly Meeting Assessments and a discussion of the results of the Board's Annual Self-Evaluation and Consultation Council Evaluation of the Board (CC2012-06).
- Following Board discussion in June 2013, Trustees assessed the Board's progress in achieving performance goals and considered significant findings in the review and update of Board Performance Goals. The Board made recommendations for improvement and renewed the Board's commitment to continue to strengthen Board performance. At a subsequent Board meeting in September 2013, the Board adopted its updated Board Performance Goals (CC2012-07).
- Following the Board's 2013 self-evaluation process, Board members completed a meeting assessment to ensure continuous quality improvement and effectiveness. Findings were provided for Trustee discussion (CC2012-08).

Professional Development Focus on Accreditation: Eligibility Requirement 3 and Accreditation Standard IV

To demonstrate ongoing compliance with Standard IV.B.1.i, the Board of Trustees remains committed to ongoing professional development as evidenced by Board Policy/Administrative Procedure 2740 Trustee Professional Development and the Board's March 2013 Best Practices Agreement (CC2012-09). Since the

most recent follow-up accreditation team visit in November 2012, two or more Board members have participated in the following professional development activities that included the area of accreditation:

Date	Professional Development Activity
11/15/12	Community College League of California Annual Conference
01/12/13	Effective Board/Committee Meetings: Governance Issues and the Open Meetings Act, Ventura County Office of Education
01/22/13	Technical Assistance Visit (AB 1725) by Scott Lay (CCLC) and Michelle Pilati (Academic Senate for California Community Colleges)
01/25/13	CCLC Effective Trustee Conference
04/05/13	Board Communications Workshop
04/09/13	Board Role in Strategic Planning
05/03/13	Community College League of California, Trustees Annual Conference
07/09/13	2013 State of the Region Report, Ventura Civic Alliance
08/13/13	State Community College Budget Overview by Scott Lay, Community College League of California
09/03/13	California Workforce Association
10/01/13	Association of Community College Trustee Leadership Congress 2013

In summer 2013, the Board, through its annual planning session, evaluated a summary of its professional development activity assessments to ensure continued growth related to roles and responsibilities, governance, effective policy and decision-making, organizational effectiveness, and ethics. A 2013-14 annual calendar of professional activities was developed by the Board of Trustees at the Board’s Strategic Planning Session in June 2013 and adopted in July 2013 to demonstrate its ongoing commitment to sustain efforts to be fully engaged with all aspects of the accreditation process (CC2012-10).

In March 2013, the Board modified the Planning, Accreditation, and Communication (PAC) Committee to include “Student Success” (PACSS). PACSS continues to meet monthly or as needed to ensure that District and College planning is comprehensive and meets organizational and community needs, as well as Accrediting Commission Standards. The committee also reviews, tracks District practices and activities for alignment with Accrediting Commission Standards, and receives reports on college progress toward meeting Accrediting Commission Standards. PACSS ensures the Board is informed regarding all accreditation matters within the District, and that Board communication is ongoing, timely, transparent, and meets organizational and community needs (CC2012-11).

List of Evidence for Commission Concern (February 1, 2012)

- CC2012-01 Board Policy 2715 Board Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice, Board Best Practices Agreement
- CC2012-02 Special Board Workshop Agenda/Meeting Minutes (04.05.13)
- CC2012-03 VCCCD Board Policy/Administrative Procedure 2745 Board Self-Evaluation
- CC2012-04 PACSS Meeting Notes, Existing Board Self-Evaluation Instruments
- CC2012-05 Board Self-Evaluation, Consultation Council Board Evaluation Survey
- CC2012-06 Board Planning Session Agenda/Minutes, Board Self-Evaluation Findings, Consultation Council Findings, Summary of Board’s Monthly Meeting Assessments
- CC2012-07 Board Meeting Minutes, Board Performance Goals
- CC2012-08 Board Annual Planning Session Assessment Findings
- CC2012-09 Board Policy/Administrative Procedure 2740 Trustee Professional Development, Board’s March 2013 Best Practices Agreement

CC2012-10 Board 2013-14 Professional Development Calendar

CC2012-11 Board Meeting Minutes (03.12.2013)

Commission Concern (January 31, 2011): The Commission noted that a recent HR audit revealed a lack of minimum qualifications and/or equivalencies for a total of 110 full- and part-time faculty district-wide. The District reported it is currently engaged in the formal review and verification of degrees for all new hires and for those who lack an equivalency review at each of the Colleges. The Commission requires the results of that review be included in the October 2011 Follow-Up Report from all three Colleges. (Standard III.A.2)

Conclusion from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report (10/31/11-11/1/11):

The team finds District and Colleges have adequately responded to the Commission Concern and have fully addressed the human resources issue regarding the lack of minimum qualifications of specific instructors. The team recommends the District continues its vigilance and rigor in its faculty hiring practices and encourages the implementation of the technology-based system for recording and monitoring HR qualifications currently under consideration.

Summary

To identify any potential deficiencies in the area of minimum qualifications and/or equivalencies for full-time and part-time faculty, the District Human Resources Department conducted a thorough and systematic audit of faculty personnel files and a multi-tiered follow-up process with affected faculty members. The District and Colleges ultimately affirmed the minimum qualifications for nearly 100 instructors. A full remediation of personnel files occurred and now includes appropriate academic transcripts and/or approved equivalencies for all teaching faculty.

Progress on Commission Concern for Improvement and Sustainability

This work has been completed, and an additional response was not requested in the Commission's most recent action letter dated February 11, 2013. All faculty hires are reviewed by the Director of Employment Services/Personnel Commission prior to being hired to ensure they meet minimum qualifications or have been granted an equivalency in the discipline. In addition, the Human Resources Department implemented a system by which a faculty member's discipline is cross-checked with the discipline of the course at the time of assignment to ensure faculty are teaching in the discipline for which they were hired and deemed qualified.