MID-TERM REPORT

OCTOBER 15, 2013

Submitted
to
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Ventura College
4667 Telegraph Road
Ventura, CA 93003

CERTIFICATION OF INSTITUTIONAL MIDTERM REPORT
October 15, 2013

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

From: Ventura College
4667 Telegraph Road
Ventura, CA 93003

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. Greg Gillespie, President, Ventura College

_____

Dr. Art Sandford, Academic Senate President, Ventura College

_____

Mr. Peder Nielsen, Classified Senate President, Ventura College

Contents

Statement of Report Preparation

This *Midterm Report* describes Ventura 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) and the alignment to the Accreditation Commission Standards.

We certify there has been considerable opportunity for the Board of Trustees, Ventura County Community College District constituents, and Ventura College 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 the Ventura College Office of Institutional Effectiveness and the College Planning Council, and edited by Kathy Scott, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness. The following faculty, staff, and administrators played a role in helping the College to address one or more of the college-specific accreditation recommendations:

Janette Amador	Bill Hendricks	Kelly Neel
Gary Anglin	Bea Herrera	Debbie Newcomb
Lori Annala	Andrea Horigan	Peder Nielsen
David Bransky	Becky Hull	Steve Palladino
Susan Bricker	Grant Jones	Jennifer Parker
Michael Callahan	Mary Jones	Mark Pauley
Robin Calote	David Keebler	Claudia Peter
Marian Carrasco-Nungaray	Henny Kim	Natawni Pringle
Daniel Chavez	Karen Kittrell	Scot Rabe
Albert Chen	Alexander Kolesnik	Miguel Renteria
Barbara Cogert	Dan Kumpf	Linda Resendiz
Jennifer Cook	Cari Lange	Charles Rockwood
Scott Corbett	Gwen Lewis-Huddleston	Malia Rose
Will Cowen	Victoria Lugo	Ramiro Sanchez
Eileen Crump	Rich Magill	Art Sandford
Jeanine Day	Rachel Marchioni	Kathleen Schrader
Mayo de la Rocha	Eric Martinsen	Kathy Scott
Robin Douglas	Lydia Matthews-Morales	Joe Selzler
John Elmer	Trevor Medlen	Peter Sezzi
Amanda Enfield	Sandra Melton	Ben Somoza
Ralph Fernandez	Ned Mircetic	Dorothy Stowers
Richard Forde	Nancy Mitchell	Norbert Tan
Ty Gardner	Jay Moore	Lester Tong
Guadalupe Guillen	Steve Mooshagian	Jaclyn Walker
Robert Haines	Terry Morris	Patricia Wendt
Sandy Hajas	Bob Moskowitz	Jenchi Wu
Tim Harrison	Paula Muñoz	Brent Wilson
William Hart	Martin Navarro	

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.

College Recommendation 1

As noted in 2004, in order to fully meet this Standard the team recommends that the college accelerate its efforts to identify measurable student learning outcomes for every course, instructional program, and student support programs. In conjunction with this effort the college should assess all learning outcomes and incorporate analysis of student learning assessments into course and program improvements. This effort must be accomplished by the year 2012 as a result of broad-based dialogue and administrative, institutional and research support. (I.B.1-7, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a-b, II.A.2.e-f, II.B.4, II.C.2)

Update:

In November 2010 and in response to the preliminary recommendations from the accrediting team, an interim Student Learning Outcome Oversight Group (SLOOG) was developed consisting of faculty, deans, the Academic Senate president, and the Learning Resources Supervisor (C1-01). Additionally, two faculty SLO facilitators were selected and reassigned a portion of their teaching load to work with the faculty on SLO work. Course SLOs had been in existence for several years, and during December 2010, program level SLOs were established (C1-02) and mapped to the courses at which they would be assessed (C1-03). An SLO Toolkit was created and put online to assist faculty and staff with SLO work (C1-04).

Throughout the end of fall 2010 and during the first few weeks of spring 2011, the SLOOG created new SLO and SUO processes and forms, which were approved by the Academic Senate in February 2011 (C1-05, C1-06, and C1-07). The department chairs, department coordinators, and appropriate service supervisors or leads were then trained on the new forms and processes. Assessments using the new forms began during the spring 2011 semester, with a requirement for every course and service to have one SLO or one SUO assessed that semester (C1-08). For instructional areas, rubrics were created by faculty teaching that course and used for measurement purposes. Sample rubrics were posted on the SLO website (C1-09). The elements on the forms included performance expectations (goals), outcomes, findings, initiatives for improvement, and requests, where appropriate, for resources in order to connect the SLO/SUO processes to program review. These elements were reviewed and discussed extensively within departments and programs in relation to assessments that were conducted during the semester. Faculty SLO facilitators worked regularly with faculty across the disciplines. Extensive training sessions were also held during the Department Chair and Coordinators' meetings (C1-10).

A college reorganization relating, in part, to the need to address SLO work, took place in March 2011, after input from campus forums and surveys. An Office of Institutional Effectiveness, with a dean overseeing SLOs, program review, integrated planning, and accreditation, was created in the reorganization (C1-11). This dean served as chair of SLOOG and later began serving as administrative support for the campus SLO Committee.

During this same semester (spring 2011), a program review task force was similarly working to improve the program review process. Several members of the SLOOG served on this task force to ensure the connection of SLOs to program review were present at the outset of the SLO effort. In the SLO assessment forms that were created, questions about initiatives needed to improve student learning were included as were areas to request resources if needed.

At the conclusion of the 2010/2011 academic year, an electronic survey about the new SLO/SUO process was conducted to gather data about participation, successes, and areas in which to improve (C1-12).

The first annual SLO Report, written by the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and the SLO faculty facilitators, with input from the Academic Senate, was created, distributed to the campus electronically, posted online, and included in the *Annual Planning Report* for 2011 (C1-13). It reviewed the work that had been done over the academic year, reported the survey data, and listed areas of success and areas to improve.

On Mandatory Flex Day of the fall 2011 semester, the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and the SLO facilitators addressed the campus on issues pertaining to SLOs and SUOs. SLO work as also conducted during division and department meetings that took place that same day (C1-14).

During this same semester, the SLOOG was replaced by a new SLO/SUO participatory governance committee called the SLO Oversight Committee (SLOOC). The committee is chaired by the lead faculty SLO facilitator, with the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness providing administrative support (C1-15).

During the fall 2011 semester, the college decided to move away from what had been termed "Core Competencies" and instead created ISLOs. At the SLO Committee, numerous models were examined, and extensive discussions took place about what skills the college faculty felt the students should have at the completion of a degree or transfer. SLOOC members also discussed these skills with faculty and staff from their divisions and brought back input, which was further discussed at the SLOOC. After several weeks of discussions, the SLOOC decided to combine ISLOs with GE/SLOs, and a draft of five GE/ISLOs was created (C1-16). The GE/ISLOs were forwarded to the Senate for further discussion. The Senate approved them in March 2012 (C1-17). Work was conducted to include the GE/ISLOs in mapping activities and documents (C1-18).

In spring 2012, course SLOs and service SUOs continued to be assessed. Formal tracking continued to ensure that rubrics for courses were also completed and that faculty and staff were "closing the loop" on initiatives created the prior semester (C1-19).

In spring 2012, the college began reviewing different software programs for SLO management. After evaluation and discussion, the decision was made to go with TracDat as it had the capability of managing SLOs, program review and, ultimately, strategic planning. Additionally, initiatives to improve student learning could be created and tracked to ensure "closing of the loop." The purchase of TracDat was approved by the district Administrative Technology Advisory Committee (ATAC), and was subsequently approved by the Board of Trustees.

Training sessions for department chairs and coordinators took place regularly throughout the 2011/2012 academic year with the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, the SLO faculty facilitators, and the TracDat facilitator in attendance at most regular meetings (C1-20). In spring 2012, training for PSLO and ISLO assessments was provided in anticipation of the assessments for those SLOs that would be done in the fall semester. Pilot assessments by three programs (Child Development, Human Services, and Medical Assisting) were conducted by faculty teaching those courses, and those faculty provided the training to the department chairs at the end of the spring 2012 semester (C1-21).

At the conclusion of the 2011/2012 academic year, the SLO survey was conducted again with greater percentages of respondents saying that they were involved in the SLO/SUO process in their divisions (C1-22). The SLO Annual Report was again written and distributed as was the year's *Annual Planning Report* (C1-23). These processes and reports will continue to be generated on an annual basis.

TracDat was installed during the summer of 2012 and training sessions by the vendor were provided. Over the summer, data were input, and plans for training faculty and staff in the summer/fall were established. A campus TracDat facilitator was appointed to work with faculty and oversee the system.

In fall 2012, SLOOC agreed to add two ISUOs to the existing GE/ISLOs in order to allow the services to map to institutional goals and to support the college mission. The ISUOs were approved by the Classified Senate, and they were also sent to the Academic Senate, which similarly approved them (C1-24). The two approved ISUOs reinforce the role of services to 1) support or facilitate a positive learning environment for students and 2) facilitate institutional accountability with statutes, mandates, local policy and procedures and state or federal laws.

Additionally, a five year rotational plan for all SLO/SUO assessments was created and approved by the SLO Committee (C1-25). The rotational plan called for the five GE/ISLOs to be assessed during specific semesters during which campus-wide discussions would be scheduled to allow faculty across the disciplines to discuss their assessments and collaborate on ways in which to improve student learning in these areas. Programs and departments would be allowed to schedule their own course SLO and PSLO assessments during the five year period allowing for re-assessments when appropriate based on changes in instruction or resources acquired through program review (C1-26).

Also, in fall 2012, PSLOs were assessed by programs (areas with degrees and/or certificates) and ISLOs #1 (Communication) by programs and departments mapping to this ISLO (C1-27). Faculty SLO facilitators worked extensively with program and departments, helping them embed these assessments whenever applicable.

The college submitted its College Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation to ACCJC in October 2012, explaining the reasons for believing that the institution met proficiency per the SLO rubric (C1-28). Prior to its submission, the report was read and revised with input from SLOOC members and the Academic Senate. The report provided the college's performance on SLOs at all levels, and included the following information:

- 98% of college courses have defined CSLOs
- 85% of college courses have ongoing assessment of CSLOs
- 93% of college programs have defined PSLOs
- 93% of college programs have ongoing assessment of PSLOs
- 100% of college support programs have defined SUOs
- 100% of college support programs have ongoing assessment of SUOs

Additionally, 98% of programs or departments that map to ISLO #1 (Communication) have conducted assessments.

Per the directive in the ACCJC 2013 Annual Report, PSLO assessment results have been put on the college's website and made available to students and the public (C1-29).

In spring 2013, faculty and staff continued to work on SLOs and SUOs. Specific tasks for this semester included TracDat "clean up" (review of courses in TracDat to verify that these are the courses currently being offered at least on a rotational basis, review of course SLOs, and verification of all mapping); completion of the five year rotation plans, completion of any PSLO rubrics not previously written; and a program/department meeting with an SLO faculty facilitator (C1-30). As of June 2013, the results of the spring 2013 semester work (C-31) are as follows:

- 98% of the programs or departments have cleaned up TracDat.
- 94% of the programs or departments have met with an SLO Facilitator.
- 90% of the programs or departments have completed a five year rotational plan.
- 96% of the programs have completed their PLSO rubrics.

In place of the annual SLO report, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness coordinated division meetings in order to gather input on the SLO process. Part of the reason for this approach was the need to gather SLO information for our Title V HSI Grant (2012-2017) which has a focus on transfer velocity and institutional effectiveness.

As part of that grant, the college included an objective to have instructional programs associated with identified high-impact barrier courses reach Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement, as explained in WASC's SLO rubric (C1-32). The SLO Executive Committee decided to use the form/tool created to gather this information for all disciplines (beyond the scope of the grant), and so during the spring 2013 semester, each division held a facilitated meeting in which departments/programs identified their status for six specific items using a 1-5 scale (C1-33). A separate form with four items was created for the services (C1-34). From this self-assessment activity, large group discussions were held at the division level, with suggestions for what works being shared as well as ideas for improvement (C1-35). In August 2013, the SLO report provided the year's updates and contained the information from the facilitated division meetings. This was published as part of the 2013 Annual Planning Report (C1-36).

In fall 2013, each program, department, or service will assess CSLOs, PSLOs, or SUOs as required by the five year rotational plan for that area. ISLOs and ISUOs are specifically scheduled in order for the institution to be assessing and discussing them on an institutional

level. For 2013/2014, the college is scheduled to assess ISLO #2, Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning and ISUO #2, Institutional Accountability (C1-37).

Evidence for College Recommendation 1:

C1-01   SLOOG Minutes
C1-02   PSLOs
C1-03   PSLO Mapping
C1-04   SLO Toolkit
C1-05   SLO Individual Faculty Form
C1-06   SLO Course Summary Form
C1-07   SUO Form
C1-08   Timeline/Calendar for Spring 2011
C1-09   Sample Rubrics
C1-10   DC Minutes Spring 2011
C1-11   Organizational Chart
C1-12   2011 SLO Survey
C1-13   2011 Annual Planning Report
C1-14   2011 Flex Day SLO Work
C1-15   SLOOC Minutes (Sept. 2011) – first meeting of SLOOC
C1-16   SLOOC Minutes related to ISLOs
C1-17   ISLOs
C1-18   GE/ISLO Mapping
C1-19   SLO/SUO Tracking documents, including "Closing the Loop"
C1-20   DC Minutes 2011/2012
C1-21   Embedded SLO Assessment Pilots – Spring 2012
C1-22   2012 SLO Survey
C1-23   2012 Annual Planning Report
C1-24   ISLOs and ISUOs
C1-25   5 Yr. Rotational Plan for SLOs
C1-26   Sample 5 Yr. Rotational Plan (Medical Assisting)
C1-27   PSLO and ISLO Checklists – Fall 2012
C1-28   SLO Report to ACCJC, Fall 2012
C1-29   PSLO Assessment Results posted to website
C1-30   Email to faculty re: Spring 2013 SLO Work
C1-31   Spring 2013 SLO Checklists
C1-32   Title V Grant Objectives
C1-33   SLO Ratings Form – Spring 2013
C1-34   SUO Ratings Form – Spring 2013
C1-35   SLO Input from facilitated meetings
C1-36   SLO Report
C1-37   5 Year Rotational Plan that includes ISUOs

College Recommendation 2

<u>Recommendation, October 2010:</u>

In order to fully meet this Standard the team recommends that the college must increase its research capacity to serve the programs and fully integrate its research efforts into the program review process. Further, Student Learning Outcomes need to become an integral part of the program review process, including incorporating the research function, detailed discussions, and appropriate analysis from the SLO data research. (I.B.1, I.B.2, II.B.1, II.B.3.a, II.B.3.c, II.B.4, ER 10 and 19).

In its 2011 Follow-Up Report to the Commission, the college provided a lengthy narrative about the work that had been done between November 2010 and October 2011. In its response to the Follow-Up Report and site visit, no further action was indicated as necessary by the Commission. The following update provides a summary of the work completed on this item.

<u>Update:</u>

1. Increased Research Capacity

In March of 2011, an Office of Institutional Effectiveness was established with a dean assigned responsibility for institutional research, integrated planning, program review, and SLOs (C2-01). One of the immediate priorities of this office was the creation of an Institutional Effectiveness Report, which would contain disaggregated data for student goal attainment, graduation rates, transfer rates, licensure certification pass rates, and success rates for distance education students. The completion of this report became a top priority for the Institutional Researcher who met regularly with the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness on the content, format/presentation and organization of the data to ensure that it was thorough as well as easily understandable.

At the college's Mandatory Flex Day in August 2011, portions of the report pertaining to student success and retention were presented to the campus and suggestions for improvement were solicited (C2-02). The campus was also made aware of how completed portions of the report could be accessed online. As additional portions were completed, those sections were added to the college website.

During the spring 2012 semester, the College Planning Council worked on the development of Core Indicators of Effectiveness, which would become an integral part of the Institutional Effectiveness Report. The council looked at various models, created draft documents, revised the documents with input from division representatives, and in May 2012, passed the final version (C2-03). The college's Core Indicators include items pertaining to course completion, success and retention rates, student satisfaction, student engagement as measured by the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), Accountability Reporting for the California Community Colleges (ARCCC report), degrees, certificates, and transfer status,

licensure pass rates, annual FTES, faculty productivity, 75/25 ratio, and achievement of Institutional Student Learning Outcomes. Additionally, a "Scorecard" that provides a summary of the item, outcome selected, and the result was provided for the college to track progress in an easily readable format as part of the Institutional Effectiveness Report (C2-04). (Note: In fall 2013, the Core Indicators will be revised to remove ARCCC and add the state Scorecard. Additionally, we will retitle the college scorecard so that it will not be confused with the state Scorecard.)

In September 2012, the Annual Planning Report /Institutional Effectiveness Report, in its entirety, was completed and put online. The college was notified of its upcoming completion at the August Mandatory Flex Day (C2-05), and a subsequent email with a link to the report was sent by the college President in an update dated September 25, 2012 (C2-06).

For the August 2012 Flex Day campus-wide meeting, the Institutional Researcher also worked with the faculty on the Basic Skills Committee to present a basic skills workshop to the campus community. A report presenting the numbers of basic skills students in courses across the curriculum was presented to the group, after which a panel of successful basic skills students and a panel of faculty who developed strategies for working with basic skills students in courses across the curriculum spoke to the campus. It was an extraordinarily well-received presentation and a very successful collaboration between a campus committee and the Institutional Researcher. A Toolkit providing student focus group suggestions to faculty and faculty-developed strategies was distributed to all attendees and was also posted on the college website under Basic Skills (C2-07).

On the Institutional Effectiveness/Institutional Research website, additional reports have been added, and they are updated on a regular basis. Some of the reports or surveys were created at the request of faculty or specific campus committees (i.e., Basic Skills, Distance Education) some of which were created as a result of the college reorganization that took place in March, 2011. Reports on academic performance (i.e. basic skills, tutoring, accelerated instruction, grades by division, discipline and course), distance education, and supplemental instruction are all easily accessible as are results of student surveys such as those pertaining to assessment, the library, and the Welcome Center. Industry surveys and scans and data pertaining to the college's Santa Paula site are also provided (C2-08).

The Institutional Researcher is also responsible for completing reports relating to the college's two Title V HSI grants. The objectives of the Title V Cooperative Grant (administered in collaboration with Oxnard College 2010-2015), include improving support for learners and increasing active and collaborative learning, both of which are measured by the CCSSE and tie in with the college's Core Indicators of Effectiveness (C2-09). Additional objectives in this grant are designed to reduce the gap between success rates in distance education classes and traditional face-to-face classes and to increase the persistence of first time Hispanic students. The objectives of the individual Title V Transfer Grant (2012-2017) include increases in transfer velocity rates, decreases in the gap between transfer velocity rates between all students and Hispanic students, increased student success rates in identified high-risk barrier courses, decreases in the gap between all students and Hispanic students in the high-risk barrier courses, and movement from proficiency status to continuous quality improvement (as identified on WASC's SLO rubric) for SLO performance (C2-10).

Additional research continues to be conducted in the area of CTE outcomes in a collaborative effort between the college's office of Institutional Research and the state's RP (Research and Planning) Group. In 2011, Ventura College partnered with eleven other colleges throughout the state in a pilot project coordinated by the RP Group. The objectives of the *CTE Employment Outcomes* study were to gather data on employment outcomes for individuals earning CTE degrees or certificates (completers), or those who completed at least twelve units in a specific vocational area but not re-enroll the next year (leavers). Data from the pilot indicated that both completers and leavers were generally satisfied with the training and education received and both groups had wage gains (C2-11).

Ventura College also participated with the RP Group in the 2013 study, which included thirty-five colleges/districts. There was a response rate of 20%; 1,120 students were contacted, 223 responded. The report provides important information the institutional researcher will disaggregate by career area upon receipt of the raw data. However, overall, our numbers are nearly equivalent to those at the state level. Overall, 73% of respondents reported that were employed, 65% of whom were employed in the same or a related field as their studies. Thirty nine percent reported that they had transferred to a four-year institution. In the concluding comments, the report stated that "Respondents overall posted a 28% increase in their hourly wage after completing their studies at Ventura College and the vast majority were satisfied with the education and training they received" (C2-12 and C2-13).

2. Integration of Research into Program Review

In response to recommendations from the accrediting team, in early spring 2011, a Program Review Task Force was created to revise the program review documents and process at the college. One of the main goals was to ensure that data would become more integral to the program review process. The new program review model was built around program student learning outcomes, student success outcomes, and program operating outcomes. The PSLOs were already established for most programs, but student success outcomes and program operating outcomes needed to be created (C2-14).

College planning parameters created by the College's Executive Team (College President, Executive Vice President, and Vice President of Business Services) based on an analysis of data were also required to be addressed by program and departments completing program review (C2-15). Areas with few degrees or certificates were included on a list for possible discontinuance, and program faculty members were asked, in the program review process, to analyze the data and to make an argument, if they chose, for continuation or modification of the program.

The Vice President of Business Services put together an extensive data library for the instructional areas, pulling information from the Banner operational data system regarding demographics; rates of student success, retention, and degree/certificate completion; grade distribution; budget; productivity; and inventory (C2-16). Using the data library (and the categories listed above) individual templates for each program were populated during the summer of 2011 with data specific to that program (C2-17). In fall 2011, the program review documents were presented to the department chairs, and training was provided on how to analyze data (C2-18). A program

review facilitator was also appointed to help faculty in analyzing the data, creating student success outcomes and program operating outcomes based on data, and completing the forms. In addition, the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, the Vice President of Business Services, and two classified supervisors (for service areas) assisted departments, programs, and individual faculty. Requests for resources that were put into program review were required to be based on program review data provided through the data library or SLO data.

For service areas, institutional data were not as readily available, and in many cases, the data needed to be collected in the form of response cards, surveys, and focus groups. Training for services was held (C2-19), and discussions took place about what to collect and how to collect it. Some services requested assistance from the Institutional Researcher and that service was provided.

Data were taken into account in the prioritization of initiatives from program review. After programs prioritized their initiatives, division meetings were held to prioritize division initiatives, and, again, data were used in making those decisions. The requests were then sent to the appropriate committees – Budget Resource Council, Facilities Oversight Group, Technology Committee, and Faculty Staffing Priorities Committee – which also utilized data and rubrics (C2-20) to analyze the requests. Committee recommendations were sent to the College's Executive Committee, which also used to data to provide the final college ranking (C2-21).

In fall 2012, the same program review process was used although improvements and changes were made based on feedback received through a campus-wide electronic survey and input from key campus committees (C2-22 and C2-23). The major changes involved the use of facilitators to lead the discussion regarding prioritization of initiatives in the division meetings, an additional program review meeting at the division level, a revision of the timeline, and a format to ensure consistency in division presentations to the College Planning Council. A subsequent survey and committee input determined that the addition of a facilitator for the division prioritization meetings was a positive change. The other major suggestion for the fall 2012 program review cycle involved a simplification of the program review template. The spring 2012 survey and other campus input indicated that the original form was perceived to be overly long and repetitive, so an attempt was made to simplify it. Some of the repetition present in the form was removed, and instead of populating the program data onto the templates themselves, the data were provided via an online depository from which faculty pulled their own data for analysis (C2-24). Subsequent surveys and input from the Department Chairs and Coordinators Council and from the College Planning Council indicated that instructional faculty were not in favor of this revised form of data delivery, so the process will be changed once again for program review in 2013 (C2-25).

As the college continues to work to improve its program review process for 2013, additional portions of the program review documentation will be transitioned to TracDat, as has been done by other institutions. A program review task force, which includes the Institutional Researcher, the Vice President of Business Services, and the current Academic Senate President, looked at models that have incorporated TracDat (C2-26) and decided on a new format, but the overall process of including and analyzing data will remain the same. The benefits of using TracDat, though, involve the ability to sort data, including initiatives created for purposes of improvement, into specific reports, which will allow for easier monitoring and greater accountability.

In spring/summer 2013, the program review forms were again revised, primarily for simplification and clarity. At the request of faculty, the report was significantly streamlined, and prompts were added to help faculty analyze the data more effectively. Additionally, the data itself have been streamlined to make them easier to read/understand. The new template for instructional programs and services (C2-27 and C2-28) will be utilized in fall 2013 program review cycle.

After each year's program review process, surveys are completed and input gathered both from the College Planning Council, which serves as the Program Review Committee, and the Department Chairs and Coordinator's Council, whose members are primarily responsible for the completion of program review documents in a collaborated effort with faculty and staff in their program or department. The data is compiled into the annual program review report (C2-29). The same process will be followed in fall 2013.

3. Analysis of SLO Data Research

SLO documents that were created in late 2010 were designed to provide faculty with the ability to assess student learning, collaborate with their program faculty and staff, and make improvements where necessary. Additionally, the documents were created with the intention of linking the data to program review. SLO forms required performance targets, findings, initiatives, and requests for resources (where needed) (C2-30 and C2-31). Additionally, instructional programs were required to map relationships between courses, program SLOs, and institutional SLOs (C2-32).

SLO processes were also designed to ensure that dialogue and collaboration occurred. First, departments or programs were required to decide which SLO would be assessed that semester, what the performance indicator would be, what instrument(s) would be used, and what the timeframe would be (i.e., formative or summative). After the assessments had been completed, faculty were required to meet with others teaching the same course to share findings, make and collect suggestions for improvement, and create initiatives that would be part of program review (both with or without needed resources) (C2-33).

In 2012, Ventura College purchased TracDat as a way to manage more effectively all the data that were being generated from the SLOs. Instead of dealing with forms and depositories that were often challenging to use and frequently not up-to-date, TracDat allowed the faculty members to input and retrieve data easily and to sort it in any way needed. Some faculty members are still being trained on its use, but many have already found it to be a vast improvement over the past process.

In fall 2011 and spring 2012, course SLOs were assessed and tracked, with special emphasis on "closing the loop" for initiatives/improvements to student learning that were created from prior assessments (C2-34). In fall 2012 and spring 2013, assessment of program and institutional SLO assessments were conducted, analyses completed, and initiatives to improve student learning created (C2-35 and C2-36). Programs and departments have created five-year rotational plans in which all course, program, and institutional SLOs will be assessed (C2-37).

Evidence for College Recommendation 2:

C2-01   Organizational Chart
C2-02   August 2011 Flex Day Agenda
C2-03   Ventura College Core Indicators of Effectiveness
C2-04   Institutional Effectiveness Report
C2-05   August 2012 Flex Day Agenda
C2-06   President's Update dated September 25, 2012
C2-07   Basic Skills Toolkit
C2-08   Institutional Research Website
C2-09   Title V Co-op Grant Objectives
C2-10   Title V Transfer Grant Objectives
C2-11   CTE Employment Outcomes 2012 – RP Group
C2-12   CTE Employment Outcomes Survey 2013, Ventura College – RP Group
C2-13   CTE Employment Outcomes Survey 2013, Statewide Results, CA Community Colleges
            – RP Group
C2-14   2011 Program Review Template
C2-15   2011/2012 Planning Parameters
C2-16   2011 Program Review Data Library
C2-17   2011 Chemistry Program Review (sample)
C2-18   DC Training Minutes
C2-19   Program Review training for services
C2-20   Rubrics for college committees
C2-21   2011 Program Review Initiatives
C2-22   2011 Program Review Survey
C2-23   2011 Program Review Report
C2-24   2012 Program Review Data Library
C2-25   2012 Program Review Survey
C2-26   Emails regarding Long Beach City College Program Review
C2-27   New Program Review Template, Services
C2-28   New Program Review Template, Instruction
C2-29   2012 Program Review Report
C2-30   SLO Individual Form
C2-31   SLO Course Summary Form
C2-32   SLO Mapping Documents
C2-33   Email to department chairs regarding SLO work
C2-34   Fall 2011, Spring 2012, SLO tracking sheets with "Closing the Loop"
C2-35   Fall 2012 checklists for program and institutional SLO assessments
C2-36   2012/2013 PSLO and ISLO TracDat reports
C2-37   5 Year Rotational Plan (template and sample – Medical Assisting)

College Recommendation 3

<u>Recommendation, October 2010:</u>

In order to fully meet this Standard, the team recommends that the college strengthen the content of its program review process to include a comprehensive and meaningful analysis of data with particular emphasis on student demographics, enrollment, program completion, retention, success, and achievement of student learning outcomes. Improvements to its programs should then be based on these results. (I.B.3, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a-b, II.A.2.e, II.C.2.i, II.B.2., II.B.3-4, II.C.2).

<u>Conclusion (from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report from October 31 to November 1, 2011 report):</u>

The team finds that the college has partially met the requirements of Recommendation 3. It noted that major work had been accomplished in the revamping of the program review process, the use of data, establishing the link to total cost of ownership, and that outcomes were being used to determine resource allocation. Work should be continued in the assessment of the program review process and that the policy for program viability/ discontinuance be completed and implemented.

<u>Conclusion (from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report from November 13-14, 2012 report):</u>

The team finds that the College has met this recommendation and would encourage the College to include, in its midterm report, evidence supporting a continuation of the implementation of its enhanced program review process to ensure its sustainability, documentation of its local program viability/discontinuance process, and continuation of its aggressive progress on the assessment of course, program, and institutional student learning outcomes to achieve sustainability status.

<u>Update:</u>

In the fall of 2011, Ventura College piloted a new process that linked program review to the College's new integrated planning model. A comprehensive data library containing enrollment, demographics, productivity, program completion, retention, and success data was developed by the Vice President of Business Services and input into each program review template. Programs also included their own program student learning outcomes data (already established) and created new student success outcomes, and program operating outcomes. Initiatives and requests for resources were required to be generated from data in order to be considered for funding, thereby addressing Total Cost of Ownership issues. The new program review model contained the following elements: program description, performance expectations, operating information, performance assessment, findings, initiatives, and a process assessment (C3-01). A Program Review Handbook was created by the Academic Senate and made available on the College website (C3-02).

Program discontinuance was also part of the new program review process. In spring 2011, the college's Executive Team (College President, Executive Vice President, and Vice President of Business Services), published the Planning Parameters, a planning framework for program review in the early fall 2011 semester (C3-03). The planning parameters document contained a list of courses and programs that administration was considering discontinuing, pending any compelling contrary arguments that emerged through program review. Affected program faculty and/or staff on the list were encouraged to use the program review process and data to explain the significance of the program and/or courses if they intended to make an argument to retain them. Following extensive constituent input through our established college and district participatory governance process, in February 2012, Administrative Procedure 4021 was adopted. This AP established a district-wide procedure for program discontinuance (C3-04). The Academic Senate was involved in the creation of the AP, and the process that was utilized by the college in fall of 2011 reflected what was subsequently put into the procedure.

In fall 2011, program review presentations were made to the College Planning Council (CPC) by the respective deans or Vice President, with input from faculty and staff. Faculty members with programs on the proposed discontinuance list were provided with time to present their arguments for continuation or revision of their program to the CPC. Recommendations for program discontinuance needed to include input from discipline/department faculty, then the division as a whole prior to being presented at the CPC.

A complete assessment of the program review process occurred in 2011. A college-wide electronic survey was conducted (C3-05), and additional input was gathered from both the College Planning Council – which serves as the Program Review Committee – and the Department Chairs and Coordinator's Council. The 2011 Program Review Report, which summarized the process and provided a list of strengths and suggestions for improvement, was written and presented to the College Planning Council (C3-06).

To make the necessary improvements to the process based on input received through the assessment, a Program Review Subcommittee was formed in spring of 2012. The subcommittee, which looked at program reviews for both instructional areas and services, suggested a number of changes, including recommendations to utilize a facilitator in division meetings, to simplify the program review form, to add an additional program review meeting at the division level earlier in the fall semester in order to analyze initiatives more thoroughly and to collaborate where possible, and to have more consistency in program review presentations (C3-07). Additionally a program review rubric from the Academic Senate was included in which programs would analyze their own program in terms of specific elements: enrollment demand, resources, productivity, retention and success rates, participation in SLO work and, for CTE programs, employment outlook (C3-08).

Based on earlier planning parameters originally published in the previous spring semester, in early fall 2012, the planning parameters were again published to provide a planning framework for programs and services to consider in their program review documents that would be created that semester (C3-09). Programs and services participated in the revised program review process that included the use of a facilitator, an additional division meeting, and a rubric for self- assessment. The same process for program discontinuance was used, with faculty from programs on the proposed discontinuance list encouraged to make presentations to the College Planning Council.

Faculty and staff generally felt more comfortable with the process the second time, and the Council felt very positive about the experience from input gathered from the committee at the conclusion of the presentations (C3-10). The fall 2011 program review report, which was included in the 2012 *Annual Planning Report,* summarized the process, the changes, and provided a list of strengths and suggestions for improvement (C3-11).

Suggestions for improvement to the process were solicited using the same assessment processes as were used in 2011: a campus-wide electronic survey, input from the College Planning Council, and input from the Department Chairs and Coordinators Council (C3-12). The primary recommendations in 2012 stemmed from concerns that insufficient time was provided to complete the program review, that program review data needed to be provided in a more user-friendly format, and that improvements needed to be made in the tracking of created initiatives. The input was summarized in the 2012 Program Review Report (C3-13). Members of the SLO Executive Committee believed that connecting program review with TracDat was also important for the college to do in the next cycle of program review.

In spring 2013, an initial program review subcommittee was formed to examine input/ recommendations made from the campus about the 2012 program review process. The initial subcommittee included the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, the Vice President of Business Services, the Institutional Researcher, the Academic Senate President, and the Supervisor of Learning Resources/TracDat Facilitator. Along with examining the recommendations from the assessments, the subcommittee analyzed the feasibility of utilizing TracDat for the student learning outcomes, student success outcomes, and program operating outcomes portions of the program review reports. The committee examined models of other colleges that are using TracDat for program review purposes. The model selected as having the most relevant application for use at Ventura College was the one created by Long Beach City College (LBCC). Its process utilizes TracDat for annual planning purposes (with goals) and contains a separate program review document that summarizes and analyzes planning, performance of goals, and SLO/SUO performance. In February 2013, initial discussions between Ventura College and LBCC took place (C3-15). On March 15, 2013, a video conference took place between members of Ventura College's program review subcommittee and LBCC. A decision was made to bring the LBCC model to a larger group for input. This larger group initially met on April 15, 2013, and included, in addition to those noted earlier, the Registrar, as a representative for the services, and the SLO faculty facilitators.

The full program review subcommittee met during spring 2013 to review again the program review forms for instructional and service areas. Meetings were also held between the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and faculty members in order to gather more faculty input on how, specifically, to revise the form. The VP of Business Services, the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, and the Institutional Researcher also met frequently to improve the data (C3-16). During summer 2013, final revisions to the form were made based on input from these various meetings. In the new documents, the repetition was removed, additional disaggregated data was provided and streamlined, and prompts were added to help faculty to review and analyze the data (C3-17 and C3-18). The documents are now significantly shorter although they contain all the necessary elements that had been in the previous document. Additionally, flowcharts were created to explain the new forms, and a list of what to leave in and leave out of program review was created

to help to answer questions that faculty/staff had about the kinds of resource requests should be made through the program review process (C3-19 and C3-20).

Another change that will go forward for program review in fall 2013 involves responsibility for maintaining the data library. Responsibility for providing program data has now moved from the Vice President of Business Services to the Institutional Researcher, who worked during the late spring and summer on creating data for each individual instructional program that could be accessed through a link on the program review website. Moving this function from the Vice President of Business Services to the Institutional Researcher will help to ensure that the process of providing data will be sustainable.

In spring 2013, the local process for program viability/discontinuation as it relates to the District AP was formalized in documentation written and approved by the Academic Senate (C3-21). This document was presented to the College Planning Council at its meeting in April 2013 (C3-22). This local process, which was utilized in the 2012 program review process, will be followed during program review, which will take place in fall 2013.

In response to the Commission's January 31, 2013 letter to the colleges, Ventura College's revised program review process for fall 2013 will also include a greater focus on student achievement at the program level. While the college has student success outcomes in place for programs, the modification to the process will ensure that additional emphasis and training are put on these program-set standards. Program standards will also reflect institutional standards developed by the College Planning Council and published in the Core Indicators of Effectiveness document in fall 2012 (C3-23).

The extensive progress that has been made on SLO/SUO assessments continues (see Recommendation #1 for percentages of SLOs, SUOs, and assessments, by category). In fall 2012, program and institutional SLO assessments were conducted (C3-24). In the new 2013 program review template that was created, additional emphasis was put on the inclusion of SLO assessment results and identified improvements. Individual programs, departments, and services will also be accountable in their program reviews for SLO assessment compliance (C3-25). TracDat reports of ongoing assessments will be a required attachment, and those not participating in the SLO or SUO effort to a sufficient extent will be considered for possible elimination and will not receive resources. The college understands the need for initiatives and the allocation of resources to be clearly connected with student learning and the analysis of program/department data. Division meetings held in spring 2013 in which departments and programs self-assessed their progress on SLO/SUO performance further reinforced the need for faculty and staff participation in numerous areas/activities associated with SLOs/SUOs (i.e. student awareness of SLOs, ongoing dialogue, and clear links with program review) (C3-26 and C3-27).

The college has made great strides in ensuring that the entire campus community understands that SLOs are now a way of life and must be assessed and analyzed by every program and department along with achievement data. Program and department faculty and staff have completed five year rotational plans and understand clearly that regular and ongoing assessment of SLOs is a responsibility of every department and program (C3-28).

Evidence for College Recommendation 3:

C3-01 2011 Program Review Template
C3-02 Program Review Handbook
C3-03 2011-2012 Planning Parameters
C3-04 AP 4021
C3-05 2011 Program Review Survey
C3-06 2011 Program Review Report
C3-07 Program Review Subcommittee Agenda and Minutes
C3-08 Program Review Rubric for academic and CTE programs
C3-09 2012 Planning Parameters
C3-10 CPC Minutes, Nov. 2012 (at conclusion of program review and +/- list)
C3-11 2012 Annual Planning Report
C3-12 2012 Program Review Report
C3-13 2012 SLO Survey
C3-14 Email regarding LBCC Program Review
C3-15 Email regarding CCC Confer with LBCC
C3-16 Email regarding Program Review meetings
C3-17 New Program Review Template - Services
C3-18 New Program Review Template - Instructional
C3-19 Program Review Flowcharts
C3-20 What To Leave In / What To Leave Out
C3-21 Academic Senate Standard Operating Procedures
C3-22 Email from Academic Senate President regarding local program discontinuance policy
C3-23 Instructions for 2012-2013 Program Review
C3-24 Fall 2012, PSLO and ISLO Checklists
C3-25 Instructions regarding SLO/SUO inclusion in program review
C3-26 SLO Ratings Worksheet
C3-27 SUO Ratings Worksheet
C3-28 5 Yr. Rotational Plan Samples

College Recommendation 4

<u>Recommendation, October 2010:</u>

In order to fully meet this Standard, the team recommends that the college must examine and provide evidence that appropriate leadership is addressing the various initiatives and programs on campus that support student learning. Efforts in online learning technology, basic skills initiatives, and SLOs lack an oversight committee or person responsible to oversee each of these projects and to ensure that they are implemented college wide in a manner that best serves the interests of student learning. (II.A, II.B)

<u>Conclusion (from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report from October 31 to November 1, 2011 report):</u>

The team finds that the college has partially satisfied Recommendation 4. The intense work that the college has accomplished in its reorganization under the leadership of the president should be commended. The college should continue to develop an effective assessment process both formative and summative with broad participation to be able to determine the degree to which this structure meets the intent of the standards cited.

<u>Conclusion (from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report from November 13-14, 2012 report):</u>

The team found that the College has met this recommendation and would encourage it to include, in its midterm report, evidence of conducting a follow-up evaluation that is broad-based, representative of the entire campus, to assess the effectiveness of the administrative reorganization structure.

<u>Update:</u>

In June 2011, the college implemented a new organizational structure after engaging in a series of steps to gather college input. These steps included large-group meetings, campus forums, and online surveys to identify gaps in the organizational structure and to develop possible solutions.

The new structure included the following elements: (1) the combination of all career and technical education programs into one division; (2) the assignment of distance education oversight and professional development to the Dean of Social Science & Humanities (with the resultant renaming of that division to Distance Education, Professional Development, Social Science & Humanities); (3) the assignment of oversight for the Santa Paula program and the departments of Communication, English as a Second Language, and Foreign Language to the Dean of Physical Education/Athletics (with the resultant renaming of that division to Communication, Kinesiology, Athletics & Off-Site Programs); and (4) the assignment of oversight for planning, program review, student learning outcomes, institutional research, basic skills, and accreditation to the Dean of Communication & Learning Resources (with the resultant renaming of that division to Institutional Effectiveness, English & Learning Resources) (C4-01).

In addition to organizational structure changes, several new campus committees were formed to support efforts in institutional effectiveness, online learning technology, basic skills initiatives, professional development, and student learning outcomes. The committees included the following:

- College Planning Council
- Distance Education Committee
- Basic Skills Committee
- Professional Development Committee
- Student Learning Outcomes Committee

The charge and membership of each committee can be found in the college's *Making Decisions* document, which is updated on a regular basis on made available on the college website (C4-02).

In January 2012, six months after the implementation of the new organizational structure, the College President invited all College employees to participate in an online survey to assess the new structure (C4-03). Respondents were asked to identify on a five-point Likert scale their degree of satisfaction with the way that distance education, professional development, institutional effectiveness, basic skills, and off-site programs were addressed by the structure. Programs that had changed divisions as a result of the reorganization (Communication, Foreign Languages, and English as a Second Language) were also asked to rate the degree to which they were satisfied with the new reporting relationship. In addition, respondents were invited to add additional thoughts about the organizational structure through open-ended "comments" sections. The satisfaction for the reorganization with Distance Education was 82.2%, Professional Development 75.9%, Institutional Effectiveness 80.5%, Basic Skills 75.8%, Off-site Programs 73.6%, CTE 84.7%, and movements of departments 60% (an area to be further considered) (C4-04).

In February 2012, another College Open Forum, to which all faculty and staff were invited (as well as student leaders), was devoted to collecting feedback regarding the effectiveness of the new organizational structure (C4-05 and C4-06). At this forum, the results of the online survey were shared and used as the starting point for small group discussions about the merits of the new system and the additional improvements needed. The results of the focus group discussions were shared in one of the College President's weekly *Updates*, along with a written summary of the results of the online survey (C4-07).

The deans and committees used this feedback to make modifications to their operations.

- The distance education program developed a more formal program of training for online instructors.

- A software program (TracDat) was identified to facilitate the SLO/SUO documentation and assessment processes and to allow the institution to more easily track initiatives and close the loop on prior assessments.

- The Basic Skills Committee presented a campus-wide workshop on the Mandatory Flex Day in an effort to make more faculty members aware of basic skills students and their

needs. The workshop included both student and faculty panels, and each faculty member was provided with a *Toolkit* of resources and strategies for teaching basic skills students across the curriculum.

- The Professional Development Committee held follow-up luncheons for the participants of the 2011 Summer Institute for Teaching Excellence (SITE) and created new professional development opportunities, such as "Lunch and Learn" workshops, open to all faculty.

- Outreach efforts were expanded for the Santa Paula site. New outreach activities included "Registration Days" events, ESL Registration Week, application and financial aid workshops, orientation meetings for new students, and participation in Higher Education Day and Parent College Night at local high schools.

Summative committee self-evaluations were conducted at the end of the spring 2012 semester for new or reorganized campus committees, including the College Planning Council (CPC) (C4-08), the Budget Resource Council (BRC) (C4-09), the Academic Senate (C4-10), the Classified Senate (C4-11), the Curriculum Committee (C4-12), the SLO Committee (C4-13), the Basic Skills Committee (C4-14), the Professional Development Committee (C4-15), and the Distance Education (DE) Committee (C4-16). The surveys asked committee members about the continued relevance of the committee charge, the establishment of committee goals, the completion of goals, other committee achievements, the timeliness of tasks, the overall environment of the committee, and suggestions for improvement. Some committee-specific questions were also asked (i.e. the College Planning Committee specifically asked about the new program review and program discontinuance processes). Each committee reviewed the results of the evaluations and made adjustments, as necessary, to ensure that college committees continue to improve the way their members understand their charges, create clear goals, work to meet those goals, and operate in an environment conducive to open and honest discussion.

Committees used their self-assessment survey data and self-determined goals to determine the direction of the respective committee for the 2012/2013 academic year. Examples of activities created from this input included the following:

- The College Planning Council (under a Program Review Subcommittee) revised the program review process (C4-17), and the CPC utilized the new process for its 2012/2013 program review (C4-18). Members created and approved a 2012/2013 strategic plan, aligning it to Board Goals (C4-19). They engaged in facilitated meetings to develop strategies to improve performance on the CCSSE (on the Core Indicators of Effectiveness) and to provide input for district planning.

- The Distance Education Committee has been working on strategies to reduce the gap between success rates in distance ed and traditional classes including the creation of a fully online training program for faculty to learn the new Desire2Learn platform, the enhancement of student orientations for online learning scheduled at registration times and again at the beginning of the semester, the creation of a training center, the revamping of the Faculty Resource Center with new equipment, group training sessions on such topics as effective online discussions to enhance instruction, and the enhancement of the DE website (C4-20).

- The Basic Skills Committee has continued to work closely with the Institutional Researcher to ensure that requests for data by members of the Math, English, and ESL Departments for program review and other purposes are addressed and that reports are made available to these departments and analyzed by the committee (C4-21). The committee continues to focus on ensuring that all members of the campus community are aware of the numbers and the needs of basic skills students throughout the campus. Further, committee members collaborate each year on the best use of local BSI funds.

- The Professional Development Committee continues its work to ensure that it is responsive to the faculty as a whole and that it offers a large number of professional development opportunities throughout the semester on a large variety of topics. Committee members continue to improve the website and to advertise professional development in a number of creative ways. They also continue, through their work with the Title V co-op grant, to prepare for and offer the Summer Institute for Teaching Excellence (SITE) each summer to participants from all three colleges in the district (C4-22).

- The SLO Committee's goals focused on the continued implementation and improvement of TracDat, the development of five-year rotational plans by each program, department, and service, the formation of ISLO committees to create ISLO rubrics to be used by the campus for those not already completed, and the creation of additional connections between SLOs and program review (C4-23).

In spring 2013, and on schedule with the integrated planning calendar that calls for a revisit of the organizational structure every three years, the campus engaged in such a review. In February, 2013, an electronic survey was distributed to all college employees by the Institutional Researcher. Numerous reminders and emails about the importance of the survey were sent out, and as a result, 149 responses were received, a far higher rate than had been received previously. The survey results documented that, in general, the college faculty and staff are more than satisfied with the reorganization. The percentages of respondents who felt either satisfied or very satisfied were 82.2% for Distance Education, 75.9% for Professional Development, 80.5% for Institutional Effectiveness, 85.8% for Basic Skills, 73.6% for Off-Site Programs, 84.7% for CTE, and 60.0% for movement of departments (C4-24).

To supplement the survey data and to ensure that more campus voices were heard, a series of questions about the reorganization were asked in special division meetings established for the purpose of reviewing the organizational structure and gathering SLO status information (C4-25). The meetings were run by facilitators, not deans (and in most cases the deans stepped out of the room) in order to gather the most honest feedback possible. Facilitators clearly explained that the discussion would be focused on the structure, not on specific managers. The purpose of the discussion was to analyze the merits of the new structure from the point of view of that division, to determine whether mistakes were made, and if so, to learn from the mistakes for the future. The major themes, per area, were as follows:

Distance Education
- The area is managed more efficiently under the new structure

- More training is available for both faculty and students
- Additional technical assistance is needed
- The breadth of responsibility is large enough to warrant a separate structure

Professional Development
- The Professional Development Committee is working well
- SITE program is effective
- Workshops are ongoing and well publicized
- A wider range of professional development activities are now being offered
- Title V co-op grant reassigned time for a faculty member has proven very effective
- More divisions need to be involved
- More management support of classified attendance at professional development activities is needed

Institutional Effectiveness
- College Planning Council meetings are effective
- The SLO Committee works well
- SLO facilitators are helpful and effective
- SLO work is time consuming
- More attention needed for services (service unit outcomes)
- Additional research assistance is needed
- A great deal of responsibility for one dean

Basic Skills
- The Basic Skills Committee is working well, and the new structure works
- Concern exists about how to fund needed activities when grant finishes

CTE
- Outreach is effective
- Having all of CTE under one dean is helpful, but it is a great deal of responsibility/work for one dean

Off-Site programs
- Excellent staff and faculty in Santa Paula
- Limited administrative coverage in Santa Paula
- Some programs/departments were not logically placed within the division (C4-26).

A summary of the electronic and division responses was distributed to the campus by the College President in an email update (C4-27). A summary was also provided to the College Planning Council and to the Administrative Council at their April 2013 meetings (C4-28). Copies were also provided to chairs of the new committees that were established as a result of the reorganization for their use in modifying services and activities for the coming year.

The College will continue to review the organizational structure every three years, with the next review scheduled for spring 2016.

Evidence for College Recommendation 4:

C4-01   Ventura College Organizational Chart, July 2012
C4-02   Making Decisions at Ventura College, 2012-2013
C4-03   President's Update #50, January 10, 2102 (regarding online survey of College employees)
C4-04   Assessment of Campus Organization (online survey results)
C4-05   President's Update #52, January 25, 2012 (invitation to open forum regarding organizational structure feedback)
C4-06   President's Update #53, January 31, 2012 (reminder regarding open forum regarding organizational structure feedback)
C4-07   President's Update #55, February 14, 2012 (summary of feedback regarding open forum focus groups and online survey)
C4-08   College Planning Council survey results
C4-09   Budget Resource Council survey results
C4-10   Academic Senate survey results
C4-11   Classified Senate survey results
C4-12   Curriculum Committee survey results
C4-13   SLO Committee survey results
C4-14   Basic Skills Committee survey results
C4-15   Professional Development committee survey results
C4-16   Distance Education committee survey results
C4-17   2012 Program Review Subcommittee Minutes
C4-18   2012 Program Review Template
C4-19   2012-2013 Ventura College Strategic Plan
C4-20   DE Committee Report to CPC, January 30, 2013
C4-21   Spring 2013 List of BSI Research Projects
C4-22   SITE 2012 and 2013 brochure
C4-23   SLOOC Minutes, November 2012
C4-24   Results of electronic survey regarding reorganization, February 2013
C4-25   Division input on 2010 College Reorganization – results
C4-26   Input from facilitated division meetings on organizational structure
C4-27   President's Update regarding organizational structure, April 2013
C4-28   CPC Minutes, April 2013

College Recommendation 5

<u>Recommendation, October 2010:</u>

In order to fully meet this Standard by fall 2012, the team recommends that the college must negotiate with its local bargaining unit that a component of the faculty evaluation process includes the faculty member's effectiveness in producing learning outcomes. (III.A.1.c)

<u>Update:</u>

Ventura College is part of a three-college district and thus cannot independently negotiate the faculty evaluation process with the bargaining unit that represents the faculty of multiple institutions. Negotiations for the agreement expiring on June 30, 2103 commenced during the spring 2013 semester. Article 12 (Evaluation) was a proposed bargaining topic in the initial proposals for both the District and AFT Local 1828 (C5-01, C5-02).

While the college administration waited for negotiations to be completed, the Deans were oriented to the manner in which they could work within the language of the existing collective bargaining agreement to ensure that faculty evaluations included an assessment of effectiveness in producing learning outcomes. Specifically, the College President informed the Deans that she would be looking for documented references to student learning outcomes on the fall 2012 evaluations and for all subsequent evaluations (C5-03), and she provided the Deans with examples of the range of behaviors that might be observed that would document the degree to which faculty members have been involved in assessing student learning and using that assessment to improve instruction (C5-04). Numerous items in the current evaluation form can be used to ensure participation in the student learning outcomes process. Using this strategy, the Deans and the President were able to address the accreditation standard while waiting for the formal contract negotiations to conclude.

<u>Evidence for College Recommendation 5:</u>

C5-01   Ventura County Community College District's Initial Proposal to AFT Local 1828, January 2013
C5-02   AFT 1828 Initial Proposal, January 15, 2013
C5-03   Memos from President to Deans, November 15, 2012
C5-04   Student Learning Outcomes as Addressed Through Faculty Evaluation Process

College Recommendation 6

Recommendation, October 2010:

As noted in 2004, in order to fully meet this Standard, the team recommends that the college must develop a funding plan for new and modernized facilities based on the concept of Total Cost of Ownership. The plan must address the necessary staffing and other support costs to operate these facilities. (III.B.2.a)

Conclusion (from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report from October 31 to November 1, 2011 report):

The team finds that the college has partially satisfied Recommendation 6. With the exception of the program review revisions to include the equipment inventory that, in turn, better informs the facilities/equipment prioritization process, most other strategies have either been recently implemented or are planned to be implemented at a later date. The college should aggressively activate its implementation plan as well as a strategy for assessing these actions to better ensure its optimal allocation of resources.

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

Even though the Infrastructure Funding Model is new for fiscal year 2012-13, the model should be evaluated throughout the planning process to make sure it is meeting the requirements of the Total Cost of Ownership. The team determined that the College has fully met this recommendation.

Update:

The Total Cost of Ownership is now addressed through a modification to the District Budget Allocation Model, and through the work of three College committees: the Budget Resource Council (BRC), the Facilities Oversight Group (FOG), and the Technology Committee.

Following many months of discussion, in February 2012, the District Council of Administrative Services (DCAS) proposed a modification to the general Budget Allocation Model (C6-01) and the establishment of an Infrastructure Funding Model (C6-02). This new model was adopted by the Board of Trustees on March 13, 2012. Under the model, lottery proceeds, interest income, and other specific revenue categories are segregated from the general Budget Allocation Model. This designated Fund (Fund 113) is a recurring revenue stream designed to provide foundational funding to the College as a base resource. Existing college resources as described above will continue to be allocated to augment this new Infrastructure Funding Model. Under the adopted model, specific expenditure categories are now established for:

- Scheduled maintenance and capital furniture (including classroom, faculty and administration)
- Library materials and databases
- Instructional and non-instructional equipment
- Technology refresh (hardware and software)
- Other (restricted to one-time and not on-going expenditures, such as new program/process start-up costs, staff innovation, and program-specific accreditation)

A transition plan, described in the documentary evidence provided, was used as a vehicle to move the funds from the general Budget Allocation Model to the Infrastructure Funding Model over a period of years beginning with FY13.

DCAS is the venue that is used to evaluate and reassess the Budget Allocation Model, as well as the new Infrastructure Funding Model. This evaluation, which involves the feedback from constituent representatives, is conducted each year prior to the development of the budget.

During the last three years, the state has not funded scheduled maintenance, instructional equipment or library materials. Consequently, Ventura College has transferred its general fund year-end balances to provide funds for scheduled/deferred maintenance (Fund 419), computer technology refresh and non-computing equipment (Fund 445). In total, the college has expended over $3.6 million for these needs. These non-recurring dedicated funds are in addition to the new recurring infrastructure funds.

The college has protected the existing positions in technologies, maintenance and operations when, due to very significant budget reductions, has had to reduce the number of classified and manager positions.

The Budget Resource Council (BRC) receives recommendations from both the Facilities Oversight Group (FOG) and the Technology Committee, and then analyzes the budget requirements of the prioritized requests and develops a plan to address these budget requirements.

FOG, which oversees facilities and equipment of a non-computing nature (i.e. vehicles, furniture, lab equipment, kilns, etc.), provides coordination for the periodic revision for the college's Facilities Master Plan and meets regularly to address the college's cost of ownership needs. As part of the college planning, program review and budget allocation cycle, FOG receives requests for facilities improvements from the College Planning Council (CPC) and creates an implementation plan to advance these requests (C6-03).

The College's Technology Committee provides coordination for the periodic revision of the campus Technology Plan, which includes a detailed Technology Refresh Plan built around a four-year replacement cycle (C6-04).

A thorough physical assessment of the college's furniture and equipment inventory was completed in July 2013, with every room or space on the campus included. An expected life table was established, which will provide key information for program review and other purposes. The inventory list is now in a sustainable database and can be sorted by department, room, type of equipment, or tag number. Photographs of all equipment have been taken and are part of the database. Using the reconciled inventory list, which divisions are required to maintain and update

each year, programs now have the ability through the program review process to create initiatives and request appropriate resources to meet their operating and student performance goals (C6-05). Additionally, the BRC adopted in March 2012 an Inventory Rubric to be applied during the inventory of all of the fixed assets owned by the institution (C6-06).

Each year after programs have presented their program reviews to the CPC, a compiled list of prioritized requests for facilities improvements, based on program findings, is given to FOG. Software and technology prioritized requests, based on program review findings, are given to the Technology Committee. Other equipment requests, based on program review findings, are given to the BRC. These groups assign the committee rating of *required, high*, *medium*, *low* or *not ranked* to each request based on the overall needs of the college, taking into consideration new technologies, if appropriate, and the ways in which resources can be leveraged. The committees' ratings are then forwarded to the College Executive Team for the final college ranking. The lists of initiatives (C6-07) with all rankings are then shared with the CPC and the college administration for implementation. Divisions are notified about funded requests and have until the next program review cycle (approximately twelve months) to complete purchase orders.

Total Cost of Ownership is also being addressed with state officials in relation to capital outlay. In March 2013, college and district officials met with one of the state's Facilities Planning and Utilization Specialists to review the state's assessment of the campus, which includes facilities, the 2013-2014 space inventory, the college's five year capital plan, and the institution's future growth eligibility (C6-08). The facilities assessment, which the state official explained as containing "everything," identified $93,875,742 in Total Cost to Repair, $289,523,783 in Cost to Replace (building structures only), and 32.42% for Facilities Condition Index. While these numbers are significant, the State's Facility Planning and Utilization Specialist said that Ventura College's status in this regard is "better than most." Nonetheless, the numbers for Cost to Repair indicate the need for the state to fund scheduled maintenance again.

In this same meeting, college officials were provided with a copy of the official space inventory for the institution. Ventura College's total room assigned square footage is 434,599, and the outside gross square footage is 620,516, for an efficiency rate of 70%, which the state Facilities Specialist similarly noted is "better than average."

In the meeting with state, district, and college officials, future building needs were also discussed. The college's Administration Building is seriously outdated, as is the Campus Center building. While the campus no longer has the same need for a cafeteria-based Campus Center as was initially conceived several decades ago, there remains a need to consolidate some student services (i.e., Financial Aid, CalWorks, DSPS, and EOPS), which are currently housed in very old and separate buildings, into a more permanent and modern facility that could also house administrative staff on the top floor. In the coming months, the college administration and FOG will consider putting together an Initial Project Proposal (IPP) and, if approved in concept by the State Chancellor's office, will put together the Final Project Proposal (FPP) for such a building.

In this same meeting, the college administration and the state's Facilities Planning and Utilization Specialist also discussed Fusion, the state's Planning Module software, a real-time database that allows the college to "see" the details of all of the institution's facilities. Access to Fusion will be provided to those individuals responsible for facilities oversight so that changes or updates to campus facilities will continue to be carefully tracked. The college will utilize the Fusion Planning

Module for scenario planning prior to the creation of an IPP or an FPP for the proposed revision to the Campus Center building.

Our Facilities Master Plan, which is a rolling five-year plan, will be revised to meet the needs of our changing campus. We will ensure that we continue to address the Total Cost of Ownership needs identified through program review as well as to identify building projects in the areas of growth, modernization, or safety that may be needed in future years.

Evidence for College Recommendation 6:

C6-01   Budget Allocation Model
C6-02   Infrastructure Funding Model
C6-03   Facilities Improvements List
C6-04   Technology Strategic Plan (for Technology Refresh Plan)
C6-05   College Equipment Inventory List
C6-06   Inventory Control Rubric
C6-07   Program Review Initiatives Spreadsheets
C6-08   Ventura College Capital Outlay Meeting (Presentation PowerPoint)

College Recommendation 7

In order to fully meet this Standard the team recommends that the president of Ventura College, in combination with the executive leadership, needs to develop a more comprehensive system of campus communication that promotes a climate of open dialogue, broader involvement in an understanding of college planning processes, and increased access to information and institutional outcomes. (IV.A.1)

Update:

The campus communication system is multi-faceted. Campus-wide communication techniques include the following:

- The College President sends a written weekly update to the entire campus. These updates cover a number of topics, including status reports on accreditation, planning, and program review; reminders of procedures for updating the classification of course tiers and for holding department chair elections; announcements of personnel changes; solicitations for participation in forums and/or to provide input on issues of campus-wide concern; lists of professional development opportunities and upcoming events (C7-01).

- The College President hosts a monthly open forum to share information, to prompt group discussion, and to solicit opinions on a number of issues, including input on revisions to the college mission statement and the college organizational structure; presentations on new campus programs and demonstrations of new technologies or other institutional innovations; question and answer questions about budget (C7-02).

- A formal committee structure promotes dialogue and governance involvement on issues of concern. Committees address and promote dialogue about planning, program review, student learning outcomes, budget procedures, facilities, professional development, basic skills, distance education, curriculum, learning communities, safety and technology. Operational committees, such as the Department Chair and Coordinators Council and the Administrative Council, promote dialogue about the implementation and improvement of college procedures.

- The College Planning Council (CPC) serves as a key committee for promoting dialogue and discussion on a variety of topics, including significant changes that are taking place in the areas of financial aid, enrollment priorities, and repeatability as well as potential changes that may result from the most recent state budget (C7-03). The College President is an active member of this committee, bringing issues forward and encouraging dialogue. Also on this committee are the other members of the Executive Team (the Executive Vice President and the Vice President of Business Services), deans, supervisors, the Academic Senate Executive Committee, other faculty, and classified staff.   CPC is a well-attended

meeting, and members are provided the opportunity to interact and discuss important issues with people from across the campus. Two facilitated meetings occurred in the College Planning Council during spring 2013, one to discuss challenges and ideas in regards to issues at the state level and to gather ideas for district/ college planning, and the other to gather ideas about how to improve the college's performance in the area of student engagement. Both of these meetings were seen as very positive in terms of promoting dialogue and gathering ideas for future planning (C7-04).

- Department and division meetings promote dialogue about department and division plans, the prioritization of staffing and equipment needs, and the development and assessment of student learning outcomes. Facilitated division meetings in spring 2013 provided division members the opportunity to reflect and give input on both the college's SLO performance and our organizational structure.

- Recent efforts to facilitate meetings across the campus as a way to promote dialogue prompted the College President and to institute a program to train campus leaders in utilizing facilitation techniques to enhance broader participation and group engagement in campus meetings. The first group being trained includes managers, the current as well as incoming Academic Senate presidents, other faculty, classified staff, and the Director of the College's Foundation (C7-05). In fall 2013, a second group of college employees will receive the training. It is the college's intention to make a significant effort to include more facilitated discussion into major campus committees.

As described extensively in the response to College Recommendation 3, the college's planning and program review process was revised to ensure broader participation and discussion at the department and division levels and facilitated prioritization of needs at the division level. Data and analysis-intensive department-level program reviews are posted on the college web page for ease of campus and public access.

An Annual Planning Report, which explains progress made toward institutional effectiveness measures and summarizes the results of program review and the progress made toward the development and assessment of student learning outcomes, is distributed each fall. Also distributed each fall is a published Integrated Planning Manual, describing the steps involved in planning and the integration of the college's master plan and strategic plan (C7-06 and C7-07).

Evidence for College Recommendation 7:

C7-01   Email updates by College President to campus (#1 through #114)
C7-02   Emails pertaining to Campus Forums
C7-03   CPC Minutes, 2011-2013
C7-04   CPC Input from facilitated meetings, springe 2013
C7-05   Emails regarding facilitation training, spring 2013
C7-06   2011 Annual Planning Report
C7-07   2012 Annual Planning Report

College Recommendation 8

<u>**Recommendation, October 2010:**</u>

As noted in 2004, in order to fully meet this Standard, the team recommends that the college President must develop an ongoing systematic and comprehensive system to assess the effectiveness of the college's organizational structure, campus planning processes, and community in a timely manner. (IV.B.2.a-b, IV.B.2.c)

<u>**Conclusion (from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report from October 31 to November 1, 2011 report):**</u>

The team finds that the college has partially satisfied Recommendation 8 having restructured the use of personnel and resources to address the issues cited in this recommendation. The evaluation of the reorganization plan should be completed as outlined in the Follow-up Report and the results implemented. Attention should be given to the college institutional effectiveness goals being aligned with the District's goals.

<u>**Conclusion (from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report from November 13-14, 2012 report):**</u>

The team finds that the College has satisfied this recommendation and would encourage Ventura College, along with its two sister Colleges and the District, to continue to assess how well the alignment of District and College goals is being maintained.

<u>Update:</u>

As described in the response to College Recommendation 4, Ventura College implemented a new organizational structure in July 2011 (C8-01). This structure was evaluated during the spring 2012 semester. In January 2012, six months after the implementation of the new organizational structure, the College President invited all College employees to participate in an online survey to assess the new structure (C8-02). In February 2012, a College Open Forum was devoted to collecting feedback regarding the effectiveness of the new organizational structure (C8-03). At this forum, the results of the online survey were shared and used as the starting point for small group discussions on the merits of the new system and the additional improvements needed. The results of the focus group discussions were shared in one of the College President's weekly *Updates*, along with a written summary of the results of the online survey (C8-04). Since February 2012, the deans and committees have used this feedback to make modifications to their operations, as described more fully in the response to College Recommendation 4. In addition, the college has built into its integrated planning process a calendar for the ongoing assessment of the organizational structure (C8-05). In accordance with this calendar, the College Planning Council (CPC) will assist the College President in engaging the campus in a review of the organization structure every three years. The most recent review took place, in accordance with the established schedule, during the spring 2013 semester. Documentation in support of efforts

to assess the organizational structure and the college planning process are found in the response to College Recommendation 4 in this report.

The development of a data set to quantify the College's Core Indicators of Institutional Effectiveness was discussed throughout most of the spring 2012 semester at both the Academic Senate and the CPC. Input was gathered from division representatives about what should be included in the Core Indicators and the document list of data elements was revised numerous times based on this input and subsequent Academic Senate and CPC discussions (C8-06). The final version of the Core Indicators list was approved at the May 9, 2012 meeting of the CPC (C8-07).

The work that was done at Ventura College to identify the data elements by which to measure institutional effectiveness was used later during the spring 2012 semester to document and support progress made at both the College and District level toward the Board of Trustee's planning goals. Ventura College's Core Indicators, along with documents submitted by the institutional researchers at Moorpark College, Oxnard College, Ventura College, and the District Administrative Center, assisted in the development of a data set common to all three Colleges in the District (C8-08). At the conclusion of this development process, the data elements in the district-wide report (which align with the Board's goals) replicated many of the data elements in Ventura College's Core Indicators, thus ensuring the necessary alignment of the College institutional effectiveness goals with the District goals.

During spring 2013 in preparation for development of the new VCCCD Master Plan, a number of facilitated meetings took place, both at the campuses and at the district level. The first of these meetings at Ventura College took place with the College Planning Council (CPC) (C8-09). An initial review of the district Mission Statement was conducted, and from there, committee members divided into small groups. They first engaged in a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) exercise, looking at a number of significant issues (e.g., Financial Aid changes) at the state level that the college must now address in a meaningful way. Groups reported their responses out to the larger group, and a large-group discussion took place. Groups then met again, this time to respond to specific questions:

- 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?
- 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?
- Is there anything about our relationship with our educational partners that could be improved or that needs to change?
- 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?
- What should be the relationship of the three colleges in our district to each other?
- What must we do to retain organizational vitality?

The same facilitated process and questions were used to gather input from the Academic Senate, the Administrative Council, the Classified Senate, Student Services, and the College Foundation. An open forum was held for students, hosted by the Associated Student Body (ASB). At the district level, a Community Advisory Board, augmented by additional citizen representatives,

was asked for their responses to the same questions. Responses from each group were compiled and forwarded to the District Committee on Planning (DCAP) and Consultation Council (C8-10).

On April 15, 2013, a facilitated Master Planning meeting was held at Oxnard College with members from all three colleges and the district office (C8-11). Input from the Board of Trustees was gathered at the Board Meeting on June 25, 2013 (C8-12). In late June 2013, a draft of the new VCCCD Master Plan (2013-2019) was created based on the input gathered (C8-13). In August, 2013, the document will be shared again with Consultation Council and with college and district constituent groups, prior to being brought back to the Board of Trustees in September for review and subsequent approval in October.

Evidence for College Recommendation 8:

C8-01   Ventura College Organizational Chart, July 2012
C8-02   Assessment of Campus Organization (online survey results)
C8-03   President's Updates #52, January 25, 2012 (invitation to open forum)
C8-04   President's Updates #55, February 14, 2012 (summary of feedback regarding organizational structure feedback)
C8-05   Ventura College Planning Cycle Flowchart (from 2013 Integrated Planning Manual)
C8-06   CPC and Academic Senate Minutes, Spring 2013
C8-07   Ventura College Core Indicators of Effectiveness
C8-08   VCCCD and Ventura College Shared Effectiveness Measures (p. 12 of Ventura College Institutional Effectiveness Report)
C8-09   CPC Minutes, February 2013
C8-10   DCAP Summary of Planning Responses from college district and community focus groups
C8-11   Email regarding District Master Planning Meeting on April 15, 2013
C8-12   VCCCD Board of Trustees Agenda June 25, 2013
C8-13   Draft of new VCCCD Educational Master Plan 2013-2019

District Recommendation 1

<u>**District Recommendation 1:**</u>

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

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 polices 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

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

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.

<u>External</u>

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).

<u>List of Evidence for District Recommendation 4:</u>

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

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

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 polices 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.

<u>List of Evidence for District Recommendation 6:</u>

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

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

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 1V.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

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.

Response to Self-Identified Issues in the 2010 Self Study Planning Agenda

Self-Identified Issue:	Responsible Party:	Timeline:	Progress:
The Program Review Committee will discuss alternative ways to strengthen the link between the college mission statement and decision making as it relates to classified personnel decisions (I.A.1.4).	College Planning Council	Fall 2012 and ongoing	Initiatives for classified personnel are included in the program review process. These initiatives are prioritized by the department and division and then forwarded to the Classified Staffing Priorities Committee for further prioritization and input. Among the criteria used by the departments, divisions, committees (including Classified Staffing Priorities Comm.), and college is the new mission statement, particularly the need to hire classified staff that support quality instruction, student services, completion, workforce preparation, and basic skills. Program review processes are evaluated and improved on an annual basis.
A feedback loop will be created to show the college community what actions have been taken as a result of program review (1.A.1.4)	Office of Institutional Effectiveness	Fall 2012 and ongoing	Beginning in fall 2012, program review documents require programs to "close the loop" and report status on prior year's initiatives (those requiring funding and those not requiring funding).
Department Chairs will be charged with working with their faculty colleagues to finalize student learning outcomes on the course level (I.B.1).	SLO Oversight Committee	Fall 2011 – Spring 2012, then revisit annually	Course-level SLOs/SUOs were completed in fall 2010 and assessed in spring 2011. Program-level SLOs/SUOs were developed in fall 2010 and re-evaluated in spring 2012. An opportunity to revise again was provided in fall 2012 with the implementation of TracDat. .
The Office of Institutional Research will work with the Program Review Committee to develop and distribute an online survey that will solicit faculty and	Office of Institutional Effectiveness	Beginning Spring 2012, then ongoing	Completed spring 2012 and 2013. Program review process modified based on results. Survey scheduled

staff suggestions for improving the program review process. This survey will be distributed after each program review cycle and the results of the survey will be shared with the Program Review Committee as their first order of business each year (I.B.6).			for follow-up distribution in spring 2014 and each spring thereafter. Input on the process was also solicited from the Department Chairs and Coordinators and members of the College Planning Council at meetings of these respective committees.
The Executive Vice President, Institutional Researcher, and Administrative Council will develop a calendar of open forum sessions to enable the Deans, Department Chairs, faculty, and staff to review and discuss the implications of the collected data in a more structured manner (I.B.7).	President and Office of Institutional Effectiveness	Beginning fall 2011 and each fall thereafter	Institutional Effectiveness report distributed fall 2011 and fall 2012. Report scheduled for distribution again in fall 2013 and each fall thereafter. Data was discussed in open college forums and at College Planning Council in fall 2011 and fall 2012, and will continue to be reviewed in the same manner each fall.
Department Chairs will be charged with working with their faculty colleagues to finalize student learning outcomes on the program level (II.A.1.c).	SLO Oversight Committee	Spring 2012 and each fall thereafter	Program-level SLOs/SUOs were developed in fall 2010 and re-evaluated spring 2012. An opportunity to modify again took place in fall 2012 with the implementation of TracDat. Opportunities for further revision occur each fall.
The minutes of the occupational advisory committees will be posted on each respective departmental web page (II.A.2.b).	Dean and Department Chairs, CTE	Fall 2012, then ongoing	The division has posted all the Advisory Meeting minutes for each discipline for the 2012-2013 academic year. The division will continue to post minutes within four weeks of advisory committee meetings, which are scheduled on an annual or semi-annual basis.
Institutional research will be conducted to identify the degree to which the five unit credit load in the English composition classes is academically justified (II.A.2.c; II.A.3).	Institutional Researcher	Ongoing	On August 31, 2010, an analysis of the CSU Northridge – Writing Proficiency Exam (Spring 2006 – Spring 2008) was submitted to the President and Executive Vice President for their review. The English Department is continuing to evaluate the five unit ENGL V01A course because of inconsistencies with ADT

			degrees, which call for four units of transfer-level English.
Ventura College faculty and administrators will collaborate with their counterparts at Oxnard College and Moorpark College to examine the number of general education units required to obtain an associate degree (II.A.2.c; II.A.3, II.A.2.d).	District Task Force	2011-2012 academic year and ongoing	During the 2011-12 academic year, a District Task Force, comprised of the Executive Vice Presidents, the Academic Senate Presidents, and the Faculty Curriculum Committee Chairs fully addressed this issue. In addition, College faculty has completed 12 ADT (CSU transfer degree patterns) to ensure that students can transfer to the CSU system smoothly and without taking unnecessary units.
Faculty who have not been found through the evaluation process to have made a successful transition to the online teaching mode will be returned to the more conventional face-to-face classroom. Online classes will be taught, with rare exception, by those who have been able to demonstrate an ability to make effective use of this new instructional platform (II.A.2.d).	Executive Vice President and Instructional Deans	Fall 2011 and ongoing	Effective fall 2011, online faculty have been evaluated with the goal of reaching the student success and retention rates of like courses delivered in face-to-face formats. Faculty demonstrating negative retention and success and poor student evaluations in the online format are being considered for return to on-ground classes and/or for increased training for online class delivery.
		Fall 2012 and ongoing	A formal training program for those wishing to teach in an online format was implemented in fall 2012, and those wishing to teach online have been required to demonstrate proficiency in the course management system and knowledge of best online teaching practices.
Additional research will be conducted to determine the variables impacting the retention rates of online students (II.A.2.d).	Executive Vice President; Institutional Researcher	Spring 2012 and ongoing	One component of the Title V Cooperative Grant focuses on improving Success and Retention rates in Distance Education classes. As of fall 2011, the gap in success rates between online and

		Fall 2012	traditional classes has been narrowed to 7 percentage points compared to a three-year fall average of 11 percentage points.

At the November 2012 Department Chairs & Coordinators meeting, data from a regional distance education consortium on trends in DE to improve student success was reviewed and discussed. Ideas to implement in the 2013 Summer Institute DE component were shared. |
All faculty will continue to be encouraged to file copies of their syllabi with their respective department chairs and division deans. Those faculty who are found to have inadvertently left student learning outcomes off their syllabi will be advised of the accreditation standard requirement to do so by their department chairs (II.A.6).	Deans; Department Chairs	Ongoing	Ongoing institutional practice. In addition, the Faculty Handbook addresses the requirement to list SLOs on the syllabus, and Deans assess the use of a syllabus as a vehicle to distribute information about SLOs as part of the faculty evaluation process.
The Executive Vice President in conjunction with discipline faculty and deans of impacted programs will develop a method for systematically notifying and advising students in programs that have been (or may be) moved to another college in the district of the options available to them to complete their degree or certificate (II.A.6.b).	Executive Vice President	Fall 2011, and ongoing	For discontinued programs, discipline faculty, working in conjunction with the EVP and the respective dean (and where appropriate student services faculty), are counseling students and, where appropriate, providing petitions of variance and/or assistance with transfer to other institutions.
Maintenance of the accuracy and timeliness of the assigned portion of the college website will become a narrative element that will be addressed in the administrative portion of the annual evaluation for deans and other college administrators (II.A.6.c).	Executive Vice President	Ongoing	Annual evaluation contains a component of accuracy and timeliness of assigned the website. Website training is provided to divisional administrative staff with approval by the area dean.
The Academic Senate will review the adopted *Statement on Professional Ethics* with the intention of augmenting the locally adopted version of this document to reflect their professional commitment to distinguishing between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline (II.A.7.a).	Academic Senate	Fall 2012	Completed. During the fall 2012 semester the VC Academic Senate reviewed its previously adopted *AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics* and reaffirmed our commitment thereto on Oct 4, 2012.

The revised faculty *Statement on Professional Ethics* will be included in the faculty handbook published for the fall 2011 semester, and will also be posted on the Academic Senate website (II.A.7.a).	President (for Handbook); Academic Senate (for website)	2012	Completed. The Senate's reaffirmation of the *AAUP Statement* is posted online under on the VC Senate Resolution's webpage as Senate Resolution 2012-2.
Based on the student survey results, the college will continue to seek new ways to encourage students to make use of existing programs and services (II.B.1).	Dean of Students; Title V Grant Directors and Design Teams	Spring 2011 and ongoing	Funds from a Title V grant have been used to map and redesign the web-based student information portal and the college web page. Grant funds have also been used to develop and implement a "Welcome Center" to guide new students to programs and services. New program brochures have been created.
During the fall 2010 semester, the impact on enrollment of the movement away from a printed schedule will be assessed (II.B.2).	Executive Vice President	Fall 2010	Analysis of enrollment trends shows that the elimination of the printed schedule did not negatively impact enrollment. Instead, enrollment continued to increase until state budgetary considerations and the need to cut back on unfunded enrollment made it necessary to reduce the number of sections offered.
The college will conduct a survey of student satisfaction with services provided at the East Campus (II.B.3.a).	Institutional Researcher	Fall 2011, and ongoing	East Campus staff has conducted three student satisfaction surveys. Fall 2011: Services and facilities. Spring 2012: Services Fall 2012: Facilities Spring 2013: Learning Resources
A list of clubs in need of faculty or staff sponsors will be generated by student government each spring semester, and college employees will be asked to indicate their willingness to serve in this capacity at the beginning of each fall semester, when they are typically asked to sign up for committee work (II.B.3.b).	Student Activities Specialist	Fall 2012	As of fall 2012, there is no need for a list of clubs that are in need of an advisor as the students have been successfully able to seek out advisors on their own. In the event that an advisor vacancy should take place, the Student Activities Specialist will meet with students from the club to create a list of possible advisor options. This practice has proven to be the most effective for

			helping to build student leadership skills.
The Student Activities Specialist will provide a formal orientation to the purpose and goals of the committees where students are invited to participate. The elected or appointed chair of the committee will also be asked to mentor the student appointee during the first few meetings of each respective committee (II.B.3.b).	Student Activities Specialist	Fall 2012 , Fall 2013, then ongoing	In fall 2012, the Associated Students of VC held a retreat for the Executive Board members. The Student Activities Specialist provided a formal orientation to the purpose and goals of participatory governance committees. The "Making Decisions at Ventura College" document was reviewed, and the Student Activities Specialist facilitated a discussion regarding the student government's roles and responsibilities. During the fall 2013 semester, chairs of the college and district committees will be asked to mentor those students who are new to participatory governance.
Beginning with the fall 2011 semester, the Arts & Lectures Committee will assume responsibility for planning activities that will address the allowed priorities of the diversity funds (II.B.3.d).	Arts & Lectures Committee	Fall 2011	Not completed. Instead, the Arts & Lectures Committee was disbanded. Discussion continues about the implementation of a Diversity Activities and Events Committee. Diversity events are held with support from faculty, deans, and student services. With the Title V transfer grant, the college has entered into a collaboration with USC's Center for Urban Education and the Equity Scorecard, which will begin in fall 2013. Diversity issues will be included with this initiative.
The English assessment instrument will be validated against college curriculum every five years, with the next validation scheduled for fall 2012 (II.B.3.e).	English Department; Institutional Researcher	2012/2013	The validation was completed in Fall 2012 for all composition courses and in Spring 2013 for all reading courses.
The Math assessment instrument will be validated against college curriculum every five years, with the next validation scheduled for fall 2015 (II.B.3.e).	Math Department; Institutional Researcher	Fall 2015	The Math Department is on track to complete the validation in 2015.
Student services programs will continue to meet on a standing basis to discuss	Dean, Student Services;	Ongoing	Members of the Student Services Division continue

student performance relative to student learning outcomes and to make adjustments to programs and services in order to improve student success (II.B.4).	Department Chairs and Directors, Student Services		to follow the college timeline for the assessment of service unit outcomes. Modifications to student service programs are made based on data and discussions.
[Within Learning Resources] On an annual basis, student learning outcomes will continue to be re-evaluated and revised, based on assessment results (II.C.1.a).	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness & Learning Resources; Department Chairs and Supervisor, Learning Resources	Ongoing	Members of the Learning Resources Division continue to follow the college timeline for the assessment of service unit outcomes. Modifications to student service programs are made based on these assessments and on initiatives created through the program review process.
Pre- and post-testing of students participating in library orientations will move away from paper-based assessment. The librarians will pilot the use of clicker technology and/or online surveys in order to provide more immediate results (II.C.1.a).	Librarians	Ongoing	Pre and post tests are used periodically for SLO assessment purposes (last utilized in spring 2012). Since librarians do not use PowerPoint, they are rethinking the use of clicker technology. An online survey was developed in its place.
The librarians will develop an online orientation to meet the needs of distance education students, East Campus students, and others who are unable to attend an onsite library orientation (II.C.1.c).	Librarians	Ongoing	Online tutorials are being developed. Videos are being developed for online catalog and database searches. Online orientations are being developed in conjunction with the Title V co-op grant. All new orientation materials are scheduled to be completed at the end of the 2013/2014 academic year.
The Library's online reference service and automation software will be expanded by incorporating Web 2.0 technologies. In addition, the Library's website will be expanded to provide digital reserves and subject area research paths (II.C.1.c).	Librarians	Spring 2012 and ongoing	A mock-up of the new website has been developed. An online question/reference form is available to students via the library website. The online reference service is anticipated to be fully launched in fall 2013.
Improved remote user authorization with be implemented to allow students to use electronic databases more effectively from offsite locations (II.C.1.c).	Supervisor, Learning Resources	Spring, 2011	Completed. EZ Proxy was implemented.
The Library and Learning Resources staff	Supervisor,	Ongoing	The LRC Supervisor and

will continue to cooperate with the district Information Technology Department and the college Technology Committee to evaluate and respond to the security threats to the college's electronic resources (II.C.1.d).	Learning Resources		librarians are active members on the district library team and the Campus Technology Committee.
The feasibility of establishing reciprocal library privileges among the three college libraries in the district will be explored (II.C.1.e).	Assistant Vice Chancellor, Technology; Dean, Institutional Effectiveness; Supervisor, Learning Resources; Librarians	Spring 2012	Completed. All three colleges in the district now have a common database in a shared library automation system. Reciprocal library privileges, called universal borrowing, were established with the installation of the new Voyager automation system.
The current paper-based library survey will be replaced with an online Library survey (II.C.2).	Institutional Researcher	Spring 2011	Completed. The library staff started using an online survey in spring 2011.
Representatives of the Academic Senates for the three colleges in the district and the Human Resources Department will review the equivalency process no later than spring 2011 and will make revisions as necessary to ensure the procedure's effectiveness in maintaining minimum qualifications for contract and hourly faculty (III.A.1).	Academic Senate President and Senate Appointees	Spring 2011	Completed. Procedure has been established and implemented.
Faculty will continue to be supported in a series of ongoing activities to utilize student learning outcome development and assessment as a means to improve instruction (III.A.1.c).	Student Learning Outcomes Oversight Committee; College Faculty	Ongoing	Calendar of activities has been established at the institution level. Collaborative effort to improve instruction continues within departments and programs based on assessments, initiatives, and reassessments. Required reports have been filed to document progress in the development, revision, and achievement of student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels.
Faculty will continue to have adherence to course outlines as a component of their evaluation (III.A.1.c).	District Negotiations Team; Faculty Collective Bargaining Representatives	Ongoing	Completed. Classroom faculty members have as a component in their evaluations an assessment of whether the content of their lessons are consistent with the course outline of record.
The faculty *Statement on Professional Ethics* and the management *Statement of*	President's Office	Fall 2012	Completed.

Ethics will be posted on the college website. The faculty *Statement on Professional Ethics* will also be included in the 2010-11 faculty handbook (III.A.1.d).			
The district-wide code of ethics will be adopted after additional feedback and modifications from employee groups (III.A.1.d).	District Chancellor's Office	Spring 2010	Completed. AP 7205 was adopted in June 2010.
The college will continue to reorganize when necessary to adapt to the changing needs of the institution (III.A.2).	President	Ongoing	Modifications have been made to the structure in response to accrediting team recommendations and to changing institutional needs. Minor modifications continue each year.
The Human Resources Department will develop and implement the equal employment opportunity plan based on the model plan provided by the state Chancellor's Office (III.A.4.b).	Vice Chancellor, Human Resources	Spring 2011	Completed. Adopted board policy 3420 and administrative procedure 3420 ensure equal opportunity in employment.
During the fall 2010 semester, a design team of faculty, classified and management staff will be formed to restructure the college's professional development program, resulting in one integrated system that will be more closely aligned with the college and district goals and priorities (III.A.5.a).	Dean, Distance Education, Professional Development, Social Sciences & Humanities	Fall 2012	Completed. The faculty and classified staff have formed one professional development committee to address college- and district-wide goals, while still maintaining separate subcommittees to address the unique training needs of each employee group.
The newly-reorganized Professional Development Committee will investigate the resources and support available through the California Community College Council for Staff and Organizational Development (III.A.5.a).	Professional Development Committee	Fall 2012 Ongoing	The Professional Development Committee reviewed the most recent student success plan from the state, which includes professional development. The Committee also reviewed the state's Distance Education plan. The college continues to monitor developments from the California Community College Council for Staff and Organizational Development to see when and how funds will be distributed to the colleges.
During any district or college program reviews, planning activities, and/or changes to goals and priorities, the college will assess the associated professional development needs of management, faculty and staff.	College Planning Council	Ongoing	Completed. The revised program review process calls for departments and programs to identify professional development needs as linked to college

			plans and program initiatives.
The new Professional Development Committee will systematically evaluate its activities in order to efficiently gather, study and then act upon data relative to the ongoing development needs of faculty, management and staff (III.A.5.b).	Professional Development Committee	Ongoing	Program review indicated a need to collect more data to determine faculty needs. Surveys of faculty and staff and attendance records at events, evaluations of events, and requests for repeats of events or more training in specific subject areas will continue to be the Committee's primary resource for collecting data on training needs.
The college administration will identify alternative locations to house the East Campus prior to the expiration of the current lease in 2011 (III.B.1).	Dean, Communication, Kinesiology, Athletics & Off-Site Programs	Spring 2011	Completed. A suitable alternative location was identified. The building was remodeled and the newly-renamed "Ventura College, Santa Paula Site" was officially opened during the Fall 2011 semester.
Classroom furniture will be placed on a calendar for systematic replacement. Each year, a specified number of older classrooms will be upgraded with new desks, new whiteboards, and other needed repairs (III.B.1.a).	Vice President, Business Services	Ongoing	A physical inventory was conducted and will be utilized in the fall 2013 program review cycle. An inventory report by room will be distributed to the stakeholders, who will then enter three additional fields: the number of years the existing asset has prior to being replace; the number of expected years for a new asset; and an estimated replacement cost. An annual replacement cost report will then be generated showing the end-of-life assets and the associated replacement costs.
Working with the Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services, the college's Vice President of Business Services and the Campus Resource Council will design and implement a total cost of ownership model to assist with decision making relative to equipment purchases and new facilities (III.B.2.a).	Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services; Vice President, Business Services; Campus Resource Council	Fall 2011	Completed. A district-wide total cost of ownership funding model has been developed, adopted, and implemented.
The Ventura College strategic technology plan will be revised and updated during the fall 2010 semester (III.C.1; III.C.1.c).	Assistant Vice Chancellor, Technology;	Fall 2010 and ongoing	The technology plan was most recently revised in 2012.

	Technology Support Services Supervisor; College Technology Committee		
The mission and the composition of the College Technology Committee will be revisited during the fall 2010 semester, with the recommended changes implemented during the spring 2011 semester (III.C.1; III.C.1.c).	College Technology Committee	Fall 2010 and ongoing	Completed. Each spring college committees evaluate their accomplishments, composition, and relevance of their purpose. There is an opportunity to revise mission and composition of the College Technology Committee each year.
The district portal provides many opportunities for professional growth in the area of technology, however more training and more publicity is needed to inform employees of what is available. The college administration will work with IT to develop higher profile training materials (III.C.1.a).	Assistant Vice Chancellor, Technology; Professional Development Committee; College President	Ongoing	Regular announcements are made through the portal of training opportunities. In addition, the College President updates the campus weeks of training opportunities available through the portal and of workshop training opportunities in technology. Currently the commercial training website Lynda.com is available for all employees through the portal.
Training of faculty on the new Desire-2-Learn learning management system will continue (III.C.1.b).	Distance Educational Committee; Instructional Technologist; Instructional Design Specialist	Ongoing	A formal training program has been developed for online instructors. This is supplemented with one-on-one training and support for the instructors.
The training available to faculty and staff will be made more public through flex activities and other campus wide announcements (III.C.1.b).	Professional Development Committee; Distance Educational Committee; Instructional Technologist; Instructional Design Specialist; College President	Ongoing	Flex week technology training activities have been scheduled each fall. In addition, a grant-funded summer institute for faculty has focused on technology training. The College President reinforces publicity efforts made by the Professional Development Committee and the Distance Education Committee through a weekly campus update.
Information Technology will offer additional help desk support for all online faculty and students during non-traditional hours (III.C.1.b).	Instructional Technologist	Ongoing	Adjustments in staff schedules are made in order to provide additional support for students during

			peak times at the start of the semester, and during mid-terms and finals.
Information Technology will complete the investigation of methods for delivering technology training to students and will design or acquire and implement such a system (III.C.1.b).	Instructional Technologist	Spring 2013	Online orientation training and self-assessment for students is currently being implemented with the portal redesign.
The effectiveness of the district reorganization and consolidation of technology services will be evaluated during the spring 2011 semester (III.C.1.d)	District Technology Services Department	Ongoing	Periodic surveys are conducted regarding the effectiveness of college and district-wide services, including Information Technology.
Focus groups will be conducted by the members of the Campus Resource Council to determine why employees may perceive there is a lack of transparency in the budget development process, and based on the results of these focus groups, corrective measures will be taken (III.D.1.d).	Budget and Resource Council	Ongoing	The college's budget and the development process have been praised for their transparency by the Academic Senate President. To support the accuracy of this improved perception, focus groups will be conducted during the 2013/2014 academic year. Over the past two years, budget updates and opportunities for questions/input have been part of most campus forums. This practice will continue.
The college will maintain continued participation in the district's allocation model to ensure preservation and eventual expansion of the college's funding base (III.D.2.a).	Vice President, Business Services; Academic Senate President	Ongoing	The Vice President, Business Services and the Academic Senate President serve on the District Council on Administrative Services, which revisits the allocation model each year.
The Campus Resource Council will continue to monitor the proportionality of the college budget, and will use this research as the basis for recommendations for any adjustments needed to preserve institutional integrity as the budget either increases or decreases in the years ahead (III.D.3).	Budget and Resource Council	Ongoing	The Budget and Resource Council receives reports from the Vice President, Business Services that enable its members to monitor the proportionality of the college budget.
A multi-year calendar will be developed for the implementation of the strategies identified in the college educational master plan. Appropriate administrators or governance groups will be charged with carrying forward the identified strategies (IV.A.1).	College Planning Council	Ongoing	The objectives that support the college goals have been prioritized and each year, as part of developing and monitoring the strategic plan, the College Planning Council notes the objectives that have been completed and identifies unaddressed

			objectives to add to the strategic plan. Action steps and timelines are then identified for each objective.
The effectiveness of the *Making Decisions at Ventura College* document will be assessed. Based on this assessment, modifications will be made to improve the document (IV.A.1).	College President	Annually	Each year the College President asks the Committee Chairs and Senate Presidents for feedback on the accuracy and functionality of the *Making Decisions* document. Based on this feedback, minor modifications to the document are made as needed.
The appointed or elected chairs of all committees will be trained to post the minutes of their meetings on the web (IV.A.3).	Technology Support Services Supervisor	Fall 2012 and ongoing	Ongoing training is provided for updating websites using the OmniUpdate system. Committee minutes are being made available on a single designated page of the college website with links to those committees.
Follow-up research will be conducted to gain a better understanding of how governance representatives might communicate important information more effectively with constituent groups and what vehicles, beyond the ability to participate on college and district committees, might be perceived as positive opportunities to engage in institutional governance (IV.A.3).	College President, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Administrative Council	Ongoing	Discussions are ongoing within various college committees about continued improvement of communication and participation by all constituency groups. Facilitated sessions for each constituency group took place in spring 2013 for use in development of the new district educational master plan.
The college will continue to administer the committee evaluation survey at the end of each spring semester (IV.A.5).	College President; Committee Chairs	Ongoing	Each spring the College President charges the Committee Chairs with gathering survey information from their respective memberships. Model surveys are provided for guidance. Surveys are used to improve committee performance the next academic year.
The Chancellor will provide more staff information to Trustees regarding the broader district needs and implications of staff recommendations in order to diminish fractional or narrowly focused	Chancellor	Ongoing	The Chancellor provides the Board of Trustees a weekly report that addresses district and college matters. The Chancellor's *Update*,

decision-making (IV.B.1.a).			distributed to employees/students, is now provided to the Board of Trustees and includes governance committee meeting summaries.
The employees will be surveyed again to assess the degree to which the implementation of Board Policy 2434 has diminished the perception that the Board can occasionally stray from its policy role into operational matters (IV.B.1.b).	Director of Administrative Relations	Fall 2012	An annual formal communications survey was developed and implemented in fall 2012 through the District Council on Accreditation and Planning.
The Board will designate a review cycle to ensure that all policies and procedures continued to be revised in a timely manner (IV.B.1.e).	Director of Administrative Relations	March 2011 and ongoing	Implemented and ongoing. A two-year policy/procedure review cycle was adopted by the Board of Trustees in March 2011. All Board Policies and Administrative Procedures have entered the cycle of review.
Board education will continue in the form of orientations, training sessions, and conference attendance (IV.B.1.f).	Chancellor	Ongoing	The Board of Trustees has established an annual calendar of professional development activities, conference attendance opportunities, and training sessions.
[Regarding Board self-evaluation] The survey of the Board will be distributed in July 2010, in accordance with established procedure. The data will be compiled in August 2010, and an agendized discussion of the findings will take place in September 2010 (IV.B.1.g).	Chancellor and Director of Administrative Relations	July and August 2010 and ongoing	Each year the Board conducts a self-evaluation and holds an agendized discussion of the findings.
The Board's self-evaluation procedure will be revisited with a goal of identifying ways to incorporate a broader range of feedback for assessment purposes (IV.B.1.g).	Chancellor and Board Chair	April 2012	Completed. The procedure was revisited and as a result, feedback from the members of Consultation Council was incorporated into the self-evaluation.
An administrative procedure will be developed to support the implementation of Board Policy 2715 (IV.B.1.h).	Chancellor	January – June 2012	Implemented and ongoing. An administrative procedure to support Board Policy 2715 (Board Ethics) was developed and adopted.
The adjustments made to the organizational structure in 2009-10 will be formally assessed during the 2010-11 academic year, and minor changes will be made as necessary to improve functionality (IV.B.2.a).	College President	Ongoing	The organizational structure has been modified in response to accrediting team recommendations. The modified structure was assessed in December 2011 and the results were shared in February 2012.
Refinements will continue to be made to	Vice Chancellor,	Ongoing	The budget allocation

the planning, program review and budget allocation model to increase the ability of the model to more quickly adjust to circumstances of rapidly declining fiscal resources (IV.B.2.b).	Business Services; Vice President, Business Services; Dean, Institutional Effectiveness; Academic Senate President		model is revisited each year by the District Council on Administrative Services. The planning and program review model is revisited each year by the College Planning Council.
Focus groups will be conducted with representatives of the faculty and staff to gain a better understanding of what additional leadership activities would be helpful in the arena of planning and assessing institutional effectiveness (IV.B.2.b).	College President, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness	Spring 2013 and ongoing	Facilitated meetings led by trained faculty, staff, and administrative leaders were held with constituent groups in spring 2013 to determine each group's priorities for college planning in conjunction with district planning. In spring 2013, a qualitative researcher was hired to conduct focus groups of students and faculty/staff to determine ways to improve completion, transfer, and overall institutional effectiveness.
By fall 2010, a Community Advisory Board will be developed as a vehicle to involve community partners and local leaders in college planning and decision making (IV.B.2.e).	Chancellor; Board of Trustees	Spring 2012	Completed. A Community Advisory Board has been formed and is now holding scheduled meetings.
The Board will communicate its expectations of educational excellence and integrity by adopting more and strengthened policies in the following areas: associate degree and certificate credit requirements; credit hour limits for associate degrees and career certificates; discontinuance of programs and courses for which have not been regularly offered (IV.B.3.a).	Chancellor	2011-2012 academic year	Completed. The identified expectations were communicated through the Board's planning agenda. Steps were taken by the college constituent groups to adhere to these expectations.
The Board will develop a policy and procedural mechanism to review tenure recommendations where disagreements exist between college administration and tenure committees (IV.B.3.a).	Chancellor; Cabinet	Cannot be implemented	Article 11.1.E of the collective bargaining agreement identifies the steps involved in resolving disagreements about tenure recommendations. There can be no formal separate policy or procedural mechanism outside of the steps identified in the collective bargaining agreement.
In order to enhance the effective operation of the colleges, the district Human Resources Division will review its HR Toolbox for strengthened and	Vice Chancellor, Human Resources	Ongoing	The Human Resources Department reviews the electronic toolbox (HR Tools) on an ongoing basis

consistent user-friendly guidelines in approaching standard employment activities, such as hiring, employee classification, and evaluation (IV.B.3.a).			to ensure the toolbox contains necessary and up-to-date materials. Since August 2010, approximately 68% of the documents in HR Tools were updated or are new.
Human Resources will establish and keep reasonable timelines for basic, ongoing, and repetitive functions, such as recruitment and testing, evaluation, and termination (IV.B.3.a).	Vice Chancellor, Human Resources	Spring 2011 and ongoing	The Director of Employment Services/Personnel Commission approves recruitment and examination schedules for all classified selection processes to ensure eligibility lists are produced within an approximate five to six week time frame.

The Director of Employment Services/Personnel Commission facilitates the hiring process for academic management positions which includes reviewing and approving committee activity calendars as proposed by the committees to ensure adherence to the administrative procedure.

The Director of Employment Services/Personnel Commission develops a schedule each fall semester to assist college management with planning as it relates to the hiring of full-time faculty for the upcoming academic year.

Employee evaluation schedules are determined by collective bargaining agreement provisions, Personnel Commission rules, and other District procedures. For example, evaluation procedures for faculty are described in the AFT contract in Article 11 for full-time, tenure-track instructors and in Article 12 for all other faculty |

| | | | members; Personnel Commission Rule 192 requires classified employees to be evaluated after the end of each fiscal year.

To ensure that the colleges stay current with their evaluations, the Human Resources department periodically provides information to college administrators regarding employee evaluations that are required or overdue. For example, each Spring District administrators are sent information regarding the evaluation process for managers; the colleges received an evaluations due report for classified employees in October 2012. |
|---|---|---|---|
| By spring 2011, a data driven program review system for assessing all district services, DTRW, and DCSL will be implemented (IV.B.3.b). | Chancellor; Vice Chancellors | Fall 2013 | A program review model for district services will be implemented in 2013. District councils are assessed each year through surveys of their membership. |
| The Board will adopt strengthened academic and program standards through collegial consultation with the Academic Senates informed by local administrative perspectives (IV.B.3.e) | Chancellor; Academic Senate Presidents | Completed | Recommendations to the Board now contain a space for comment from appropriate campus administrators, presidents and academic senate presidents as appropriate. Additionally, Board agendas also indicate dates of when Participatory Governance groups reviewed a given item before being placed on a Board agenda for action or information. |
| Recommendations from the three independent colleges pertaining to faculty academic and professional matters will contain comment from appropriate campus administrators and presidents regarding the adequacy of proposals (IV.B.3.e) | Chancellor; College Presidents; Academic Senate Presidents | 2010-2011 academic year | Completed. Recommendations to the Board now contain a space for comment from appropriate campus administrators and presidents. |
| Administrative oversight of faculty proposals within DCSL and DTRW will | Chancellor; College Presidents; | Ongoing | Completed. Proposals from the District Technical |

be strengthened by assessing them for overall effectiveness in meeting student needs. Academic matters taken to the Board for action will contain the primary recommendation of the Academic Senate and the college President or her designee, such as the Executive Vice President of Student Learning (IV.B.3.e)	Academic Senate Presidents		Workgroups for instruction and student services now are routed through the new District Council on Academic Affairs (DCAA), which in turn makes recommendations to Chancellor's Cabinet. If the membership of Chancellor's Cabinet is in disagreement, feedback is given to DCAA and the Board of Trustees is informed of the reasons for the disagreement.
The BoardDocs system will be fully implemented by the end of the fall 2010 semester (IV.B.3.f).	Director of Administrative Relations	Fall 2010	Completed. The BoardDocs system has been fully implemented. An assessment of its effectiveness will be conducted in spring 2013.
The Office of Administrative Relations will conduct a publications audit, develop an annual report to the community or other signature publication, and create a district-wide newsletter (IV.B.3.f).	Office of Administrative Relations	Ongoing	Following completion of a publications audit, the annual publication was eliminated due to cost and an online, annual digital magazine, *MOtiVate*, is under development through Marketing and Public Relations. A news/announcement channel was established following implementation of the employee/student portal, and an updated district-wide news channel will be launched with the implementation of the redesigned district/college websites in fall 2013.
An online style guide will be developed for employee access and use (IV.B.3.f).	Director of Administrative Relations	Will not be implemented	Following the integration of marketing, all district-wide marketing materials are designed and formatted for appropriate style through Marketing and Public Relations, eliminating the need for an online style guide.
The Board will adopt Board Policy 7205 (Employee Code of Ethics) (IV.B.3.f).	Board of Trustees	Fall 2009	Completed. The Board has adopted Board Policy 7205.
The Office of Administrative Relations will assess approaches to providing technical support necessary to maintain technological communications (IV.B.3.f).	Director of Administrative Relations	Fall 2012 and ongoing	Technology tools were implemented to streamline communications, including the Intranet portal for employees/students

			allowing for posting of news/events/announcements and regularly-scheduled OmniUpdate software training offered through Information Technology to support portal and website activities. Findings of a fall 2012 website survey indicate the existing websites/portals are adequate but in need of updating, particularly in the area of navigation. District/college websites and portals are currently under redesign for implementation by fall 2013.
District governance bodies covered by the Brown Act will post meeting agendas and minutes on the district website for public access (IV.B.3.f).	Director of Administrative Relations	Ongoing	Governance committees covered by the Brown Act have been instructed to post their agendas and minutes on the district or college websites.
By spring 2011, a data driven program review system for assessing all district services will be implemented (IV.B.3.g).	Director of Administrative Relations	Fall 2013	A program review model for district services will be implemented in 2013. District councils are assessed each year through surveys of their membership.