FOCUSED MIDTERM REPORT

OF

IRVINE VALLEY COLLEGE

Presented to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges
October 15, 2007

South Orange County Community College District
Irvine Valley College
5500 Irvine Center Drive
Irvine, California 92618
www.ivc.edu

Board of Trustees
Thomas A. Fuentes, William O. Jay, David B. Lang,
Marcia Milchiker, Nancy Padberg, Donald P. Wagner,
John S. Williams, and Matthew T. Reynard, Student Trustee

Dr. Raghu P. Mathur, Chancellor

Dr. Glenn R. Roquemore, President, Irvine Valley College

TABLE OF CONTENTS

			PAGE
I.	Certification of the Progress Report		3
II.	Statement on Report Preparation		5
III.	Response to Team Recommendations: 2005, 2006, 2007 Commission Action Letters		7
	A.	Response to Recommendation 1	7
	B.	Response to Recommendation 2	16
	C.	Response to Recommendation 3	19
	D.	Response to Recommendation 4	23
	E.	Response to Recommendation 5	27
	F.	Response to Recommendation 6	30
	G.	Response to Recommendation 7	41
	H.	Response to Recommendation 8	46
IV.	Response to Self-identified Issues: 2004 Self Study		60
	A.	Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness	60
	B.	Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services	67
	C.	Standard III: Resources	82
	D.	Standard IV: Leadership and Governance	85

I. CERTIFICATION OF THE PROGRESS REPORT

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

From: **Irvine Valley College, South Orange County Community College District**

This focused midterm report provides the following: (1) the institutional responses to team recommendations cited in the WASC-ACCJC January 31, 2005 action letter, the January 31, 2006 action letter, and the January 31, 2007 action letter; and (2) the institutional responses to self-identified issues based on the planning agenda sections of the 2004 self study. We certify that preparation of this report included opportunities for participation by the campus community and that the progress report accurately reflects the nature of this institution in relation to the issues addressed.

David B. Lang, President, Board of Trustees, SOCCCD — Date: 10/11/07

Dr. Raghu P. Mathur, Chancellor, SOCCCD — Date: 10/11/07

Dr. Glenn R. Roquemore, President, IVC — Date: 10/11/07

Dr. Gwendolyn M. Plano, Vice President of Student Services, Accreditation Liaison Officer, Accreditation Co-Chair — Date: 10-1-07

Wendy Gabriella — 10-11-07

Wendy Gabriella, Academic Senate President Accreditation Co-Chair — **Date**

10/8/07

Davit Khachatryan, Classified Leadership — **Date**

10/11/07

Beep Colclough, Representative, Classified Senate — **Date**

10-4-07

Matthew Wechsler, President, ASIVC — **Date**

II. STATEMENT ON REPORT PREPARATION

On behalf of the South Orange County Community College District, Irvine Valley College submits this focused midterm report to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. This report addresses the team recommendations identified in the commission action letter of January 31, 2005, the team recommendations identified in the commission action letter of January 31, 2006, and the team recommendations identified in the commission action letter of January 31, 2007. In accordance with commission guidelines, the college recognizes that a focused midterm report requires that the college demonstrate significant progress as stated in the January 31, 2007 action letter relative to recommendations 6, 7, and 8. The focused midterm report also addresses the self-identified planning agendas of the 2004 self-study as required by commission policy.

On March 23, 2006, in preparation for the midterm report, the academic senate recommended that the faculty co-chair (and academic senate president) who assisted in the development of the 2005 progress report and the 2006 progress report continue as the faculty co-chair to assist in the preparation of the focused midterm report for 2007.[1] The appointment of the faculty co-chair was approved by the college president on March 24, 2006.[2] The college agreed to continue the practices followed in the production of the 2005 and 2006 progress reports with the continuation of the accreditation oversight committee composed of a Vice President and co-chair, a dean, the president of the student government, the president of the classified senate, three academic senate representatives (in addition to the academic senate president as the co-chair), and the president of the classified leadership council.[1]

Pursuant to commission guidelines, the January 31, 2007 commission action letter and progress visit report were made available to the college community and the public by posting both documents on the Irvine Valley College web site on February 6, 2007.[3] Further, in order to engage the college community in inclusive, informed, and intentional dialogue regarding accreditation, the Office of the President held two college-wide "accreditation dialogue" meetings on February 7, 2007 and 8, 2007, to discuss the January 31, 2007 action letter, the progress visit report, an overview of college progress relative to strategic planning as well as an update on the college's evaluation of institutional effectiveness.[4]

The following procedures were utilized in preparing the focused midterm report: drafts of the report were prepared by the oversight committee and distributed through the shared governance process to all constituent groups, including president's council, instructional council, dean's council, the general assembly of the academic senate (all faculty), the classified senate, the classified leadership council, and the associated student government for review on August 1, 2007.[5] After receiving, reviewing, and incorporating (when appropriate) the input from all aforementioned constituent groups, the oversight committee prepared a preliminary draft of the focused midterm report which was submitted to the board of trustees of the South Orange County Community College

District August 27, 2007.[6] The final draft was submitted to the board on September 24, 2007.[7]

At the August 27, 2007, meeting of the board of trustees, the document, ***"Board of Trustees and Chancellor Response to the November 30, 2006, Progress Visit Report for Irvine Valley College"*** was presented and discussed. This was the first time the document was made available to the college community.

On September 13, 2007, college personnel were directed by the chancellor to integrate the board of trustees and chancellor response within the focused midterm report. There was no opportunity to correct several errors of fact contained in this document.

The academic senate would like to direct the commission's attention to http://socccd.granicaus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view id=2&clip id=46&meta id=13308 to view the board discussion on August 27, 2007 (Item 7.1) and September 24, 2007 (Item 7.2) regarding this matter. Ultimately, the vote of the board of trustees was split, 4 votes in favor of including the board of trustees and chancellor response within the focused midterm report and 3 votes opposed.

The Irvine Valley College academic senate would like to reassure the members of the accrediting commission that the college community agreed upon the process described with the statement on report preparation whereby all drafts of the focused midterm report were reviewed and revised by the accreditation oversight committee throughout the fall of 2006 and the spring of 2007. On August 1, 2007, as documented in the statement on report preparation, a preliminary draft of the report was distributed to the college community for review and revision.

The board of trustees and chancellor response did not go through this same process or a similar one that involved review by all college constituencies.

References: Statement on Report Preparation

[1] *Academic Senate Minutes: Item 13 (3-23-06)*
[2] *Office of the President: Memo Accepting Faculty Co-chair (3-24-06)*
[3] *Office of the President Announcement: Action Letter/Progress Report Visit Findings Available on College Website (2-6-07)*
[4] *Office of the President/Academic Senate Announcement: College-wide Accreditation Dialogue Meetings (2-6/7-07)*
[5] *Announcements: Midterm Drafts Available for Review (1-31-07) (8-1-07)*
[6] *Agenda Meeting of the Board of Trustees: Review Preliminary Draft Focused Midterm Report (Item 7.1) (8-27-07)*
[7] *Agenda Meeting of the Board of Trustees: Review Final Draft Focused Midterm Report*

III. RESPONSES TO TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS: 2005, 2006, and 2007 ACTION LETTERS

A. <u>Recommendation 1.</u> The college develop, implement and evaluate a long range strategic planning process that is cyclical, comprehensive, inclusive, systematic and integrates budget and resource allocations with program review and all institutional planning, which includes educational master planning, human resource planning, physical resource planning, technology resource planning, and fiscal resource planning. (Standards I. B. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7; II. A. 1, 2; II. B. 1, 3, 4; and II. C. 2)

<u>Response</u>: As documented in the 2005 progress report, in February of 2005, the academic senate revised the college strategic planning process and submitted the proposed draft to the college for review and study based on the commission's recommendation in 2005. All constituent groups participated in the revision of the strategic planning process and on September 1, 2005, a final draft of the planning process was adopted by the college. According to the visiting team, at the time of the November 3, 2005, site visit, the college effort towards meeting the recommendation was evident; however, the team noted that much work remained to be done with implementation and evaluation of the planning processes, in order to fully meet the recommendation.

<u>Fall 2005 and Spring 2006: College Strategic Planning Delayed</u>

The implementation of the college strategic plan was delayed for two reasons. First, the college research analyst resigned her position on November 16, 2005, effective January of 2006.[1] Since implementation of the strategic planning model is contingent on the acquisition of research and data collection via internal and external data scans, it was difficult to implement the strategic planning process in the absence of a college research analyst.

The second reason for the delay in implementation of the college strategic planning model was due to the development and execution of the district planning process. In January of 2006, the chancellor developed a district planning process directing the college to establish annualized goals, action plans, and progress/final reports.[2] On January 27, 2006, the IVC college administration developed a process to implement a 17-month planning cycle based on the district planning process.[3]

The academic senate objected to the development of the district planning process and its implementation at the college.[4] Pursuant to Title 5, section 53200 (c) (10) and board policy 2100.1, the senates should be consulted in the discussion of institutional planning and the senate was not informed or included in the development of the district planning process.[4] Thus, the district planning process was not broad based or inclusive. Further, the district goals were not connected to the college mission statement and were not related to student learning and/or connected to program review or an ongoing systematic method of evaluation and improvement. Additionally, the senate viewed the

implementation of the district planning process as problematic because it interfered with the implementation of the college strategic plan.[4] The administration and the faculty could not realistically implement two entirely separate planning processes at the college, the district planning process and the college strategic planning process. On March 24, 2006, the senate requested the college president implement the college strategic plan commensurate with the commission's recommendation.[5]

Also, in March of 2006, the senate requested that the chancellor withdraw the district planning process and allow the college to implement the college strategic planning process.[6, 7] This request was not honored.[8] Therefore, the college administration complied with the timelines set by the district planning process and in May of 2006 submitted college goals, action plans, and progress reports, developed by the administration in Spring of 2006.[9]

On May 26, 2006, at the joint request of the Saddleback College academic senate and the Irvine Valley College academic senate, the chancellor established the district planning process task force in order to examine possible strategies regarding the future integration of district and college planning processes.[10] The district planning process task force met on August 25, 2006, September 8, 2006, and September 21, 2006, and submitted the final recommendations to the chancellor on October 8, 2006.[11] The recommendations of the district planning process task force were accepted by the chancellor on October 30, 2006.[12]

The district planning task force recommendations allow the colleges to implement their strategic planning processes and present the plans to the board of trustees in April/May of 2007.[12] Regarding the district planning process, the task force recommended that the chancellor's cabinet, with representatives from all constituent groups, develop annual district-wide goals in February and April of every year beginning in 2007.[12] According to the recommendation of the task force, the chancellor's cabinet may request an outside facilitator to assist in the development of district-wide goals rather than district goals or operational goals as had been developed in the past.[12] In order to integrate district and college planning, the task force also recommended that the district-wide goals be associated with the college strategic directives and reflected in the planning documents.[12] (Further discussion of the development of the district mission statement and the district-wide goals will be presented in the response to recommendation 8.)

Fall 2006 and Spring 2007: Implementation of the College Strategic Plan

Once the district level planning issues were resolved and the college research position was filled, the college moved forward under the leadership of the president with the implementation of the college strategic plan in the fall of 2006. A strategic planning workshop was held during the fall 2006 flex week. The college president and the academic senate discussed the strategic planning model and the college strategic planning process.[13] On September 28, 2006, the model and the process were modified to incorporate the input of all constituent groups.[14]

The college strategic planning process is broad based and inclusive involving all members of the college community. For example, during September 2006, the college president and the academic senate populated the strategic planning steering team, consisting of the president of the classified senate, the president of the student government, the president of the classified leadership council, the president of the academic senate and a representative from the faculty bargaining agent as well as a representative from the dean's council and all senior college administrators.[15] The planning process involves five focus groups as follows: academic /facilities/educational support/technology; enrollment management; institutional effectiveness; resource and budget; and student success/access.[15] Each of the five focus groups include a representative from the student government (ASIVC), the classified bargaining agent (CSEA), classified management, the classified senate, the administration, and two representatives from the academic senate.[15]

On October 4, 2006, the college held a strategic planning kick off meeting with all members of the five focus groups and the steering team.[16] The meeting was chaired by the president, the college researcher, and the vice chancellor of technology and learning services.[16] The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the implementation of the planning model, the charge of the five focus groups, the development of planning assumptions based on data as well as the development of objectives and planning strategies.[16] The relationship between the implementation of the planning model and resource distribution were also discussed. The vice chancellor of technology and learning services presented an overview of the college's institutional effectiveness and key indicators such as course completion rates, course success rates, and course retention rates.[16]

Strategic Planning and the College Mission Statement

In order to ensure that the college mission statement is an integral component of the institutional planning process and that decision-making is guided by the college mission statement, the strategic planning steering committee met on October 13, 2006, to develop overarching goals for the college based on the college mission statement.[17, 18] Moreover, the committee incorporated the accreditation standards as they relate to strategic planning as well as the statewide strategic planning goals and also established a timeline for the strategic planning process.[19] These goals reflect the purpose of the institution, the intended population, and a strong commitment to providing evidence of and assessing student learning. The mission statement and the IVC goals were distributed to the five focus groups to form the guiding principles of the development of the planning assumptions, objectives, and planning strategies of the five focus groups.[18] Therefore, the IVC goals are integrally related to the college mission statement and institutional planning is driven by the college goals and mission statement. (The relationship will be discussed more fully in the planning agendas relative to standard 1.)

The Strategic Planning Process

The five focus groups met throughout October, November, and December of 2006 to develop objectives, planning assumptions, and strategies based on the external and internal data scans. The college researcher, college president, and the academic senate president initially met with each focus group to explain the process and the specific

charge of each focus group.[20] The college researcher provided each focus group with the college mission statement, the IVC goals, definitions and examples of objectives, planning assumptions, and strategies as well as research gathered from the external and internal data scans. According to the planning model, each focus group utilized six categories of data including, demographics, economy and employment, education trends, social trends, public policies, and technology in this process.

During the January 2007 flex week, two college-wide strategic planning workshops were held for members of the focus groups as well as the college community. On January 2, 2007, the college reviewed the planning assumptions developed by the five focus groups.[21] On January 4, 2007, the college researcher presented a workshop on how to generate objectives and strategies based on the planning assumptions.[22] All five focus groups met on January 25, 2007, February 14, 2007, and on March 1, 2007 to review the objectives and planning strategies.[23] During the aforementioned meetings, considerable dialogue occurred between members of the focus groups and members of the steering team with respect to institutional quality and the reliability of the data concerning the college's programs and services. The nature of strategic planning prompted self reflection and deliberations as to how the college could improve to meet the needs of a diverse student population.

On February 7, 2007 and February 8, 2007, the college held two accreditation dialogue college wide meetings to inform the college community of the 2007 commission action letter and further engage the college community within the strategic planning effort.[24] The meetings were facilitated by the college president and the academic senate president. At the meetings, the 2007 commission action letter was presented as well as the expectations of the commission for the college with respect to the October 2007 focused midterm report.[24] The research and planning analyst provided an update on the strategic planning efforts, including a review of the college goals, the research provided to the strategic planning focus groups, and the development of objectives, planning assumptions, strategies based on the research provided.[24] In order to assist the college community in its understanding of strategic planning, a strategic planning primer for higher education was discussed. The vice chancellor of technology and learning services presented an overview of how to measure institutional effectiveness and the institutional effectiveness measures commonly used throughout the state of California.[24]

Throughout the spring semester of 2007, the strategic planning focus groups and the steering committee worked together to finalize the objectives and strategies for the 2006-2012 college strategic plan.[25] As will be discussed and documented in the budget section below, in April and May of 2007, the final objectives and strategies were analyzed by the resource and budget focus group for fiscal impact. In June and July of 2007, the research analyst prepared a preliminary draft of the strategic plan for review by the steering committee. On July 11, 2007, the steering committee, including the director of fiscal services, reviewed and revised the preliminary draft of the strategic plan based upon the budget analysis.[26] The 2006-2012 college strategic plan was distributed to the college community for review August 1, 2007 through August 24, 2007 and the steering team

reviewed and incorporated revisions, when appropriate, as per the agreed upon process (see reference 14).

The 2006-2012 College Strategic Plan

The college strategic plan includes eleven major objectives and several strategies designed to attain each objective.[27] The objectives include (not in priority order):

- Increasing alternative methods of instruction by offering an online degree and/or certificate in 2008; offering technical training for distance education faculty, providing funding to develop an online distance education orientation;
- Supporting the development of new programs through the request of funding to conduct a community needs assessment;
- Increasing course completion rates in credit basic skills and credit career technology courses as well as increasing the percentage of degree and certificate awards;
- Increasing student success, retention rates, and persistence rates;
- Increasing the number of second language students that enroll in college level English courses;
- Expanding the curriculum offerings for lifelong learning and work force development;
- Increasing enrollment in contract and career technology courses;
- Maintaining and annual marketing and recruiting plan;
- Increasing the enrollment and persistence rates of concurrently enrolled high school students;
- Producing an Institutional Effectiveness Report;
- Developing a preventive maintenance plan.[27]

The strategies (actions) to attain the objectives will be implemented throughout the fall of 2007 and spring of 2008.[28] In January of 2008, the steering team will evaluate the outcomes and begin the development of the 2008-2009 strategies.[28] Additionally, the steering team will review the strategic planning model and make revisions as necessary.

Strategic Planning and the College Budget Development Process

As stated in the 2005 progress report, the college administration and the academic senate agreed to review the college resource and budget allocation process to ensure an open, inclusive process. Although, the 2005 progress report indicated that this review would occur in fall of 2005, it became more relevant with the implementation of the strategic planning model and the work of the resource and budget focus group in spring of 2007.

In spring/summer of 2007, the academic senate, administration, and the strategic planning steering team reviewed a proposed college budget development process.[26] The proposed budget development process is connected to the strategic planning process as follows:

1) All funding proposals will be tied to specific goals, objectives, and strategies/actions approved by the strategic planning process;

2) Every college program/unit will be required to prepare a justification for every key item of their budgets. As part of each request, an assessment of success in terms of meeting the program's strategic planning goals, objectives, and strategies/actions will be included.[29]

The proposed budget development process included the development of a revised strategic planning budget development committee which would combine the functions of the original strategic steering team, the strategic planning resource and budget focus group, and the former college budget committee into one new standing college committee. This new committee will continue to implement the college strategic plan as well as provide budgetary guidance for the college.[29] (page 3)

During the discussion of the college budget development process, in the spring of 2007, the strategic planning steering team integrated the strategic planning objectives and strategies within the budget development process. On April 20, 2007, the strategic planning steering team submitted the objectives and strategies to the resource and budget focus group for review and fiscal recommendations. On May 23, 2007, and June 27, 2007, the strategic planning steering team reviewed the fiscal analysis of the planning objectives and strategies.[30, 31]

Strategic Planning, Budget Development, and Program Review

In accordance with the 2006 revised program review process (which is discussed in the response to recommendation 3), program review recommendations were integrated into the budget development process as well as the strategic planning process in the following manner: the president, the vice president of instruction (or the vice president of student services if the program lies within that division), and the academic senate shall mutually agree upon the program review recommendations which will be forwarded to the appropriate strategic planning focus group for planning consideration and possible implementation commensurate with the budgetary consideration of the college.[32] In accordance with this process, the president, the vice president of instruction, the academic senate president, and the college research analyst met on January 9, 2007, to review the 2004-2005 program review recommendations as well as the 2005-2006 program review recommendations in relation to the strategic planning efforts at the college.[33] On May 23, 2007, the strategic planning steering team reviewed the 2004-2005, 2005-2006, and the 2006-2007 program review recommendations. The program review recommendations fell within four broad categories:

1. Departmental recommendations concerning curriculum development, review of library holdings and media resources, development of student surveys, and creation of new articulation agreements etc.;

2. Recommendations concerning establishing or increasing dedicated classroom space for a specific discipline;

3. Recommendations for additional equipment;

4. Recommendations for additional full-time faculty positions.[34]

Because of the nature of these recommendations, on July 11, 2007, the academic senate in collaboration with the steering team proposed the following revisions to the program review process to better integrate the recommendations within the college budget and planning procedures:

1. The dean or manager, in collaboration with the faculty, will implement the departmental recommendations, program objectives and strategies;

2. All recommendations, program objectives and strategies pertaining to facilities will be directed to the academic and facilities committee (formerly a strategic planning focus group which will be converted to a college standing committee for this purpose, among others);

3. All recommendations, program objectives and strategies pertaining to equipment needs will be directed to the dean or manager to be incorporated into a budget proposal from the school or department, if appropriate, which would then be considered by the strategic planning budget development committee;

4. All recommendations, program objectives and strategies pertaining to additional full-time faculty positions will be directed to the dean for consideration in the development of the deans' annual full-time faculty hiring priority proposal.[35] All recommendations, program objectives and strategies pertaining to additional full-time positions within student services will be directed to the manager for consideration in the college-wide hiring priority process.

All other program review recommendations, objectives and strategies will be forwarded to the appropriate planning committee and/or the strategic planning budget development committee for implementation commensurate with the budgetary considerations of the college.[35]

The 2007 program review process was further revised with regards to the integration of the strategic planning methodology. Programs and services undergoing review in 2007-2008 will develop program objectives, which must be specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time related. Each program and service must develop strategies or actions to attain the objective, specifying~~,~~ what action will be taken, the responsible party, the date of completion, the rationale, as well as the fiscal impact.[35]

College Facilities and Educational Master Planning

At the time of the 2005 progress report, the college and the district were interviewing several firms to prepare an educational master plan. The district selected gkkworks and Maas & Associates to prepare the college facilities and educational master plan. During fall of 2006, the firm conducted interviews with representatives of all constituent groups and conducted extensive reviews of current as well as projected enrollment numbers in the development a five year facilities and educational master plan.[36] Throughout the spring 2007 semester, the college reviewed the facilities and educational master plan and

the five year construction plan for the district and the college.[37] The academic planning, facilities and technology committee will continue to monitor the implementation of the master plan and the district construction plan to develop recommendations for the use of pre-existing facilities as new buildings are constructed and occupied. The college is fortunate to be nearing completion (October of 2007) of a new performing arts center which will create additional classroom space when the departments occupy the new building.[38] Additional science lab space will be created with the completion of a science lab annex. The college has begun construction of the new business and technology innovation center which will create new opportunities for classroom and laboratory space as the new building is occupied leaving the pre-existing classroom and laboratory space for future renovation and occupation.[38] The college recently received notification that state and district funding will now be available to begin construction on a new life sciences building.[38]

With the construction of additional buildings, more classroom and laboratory space will be available to assist the college in implementing the program review recommendations pertaining to additional classroom and lab space.

References: Recommendation 1

1[1] Resignation: Office of Institutional Research (11-16-05)
1[2] District Planning Process (1-06)
1[3] College Process to Implement District Planning Process (1-27-06)
1[4] Academic Senate Minutes (Item 5) (2-16-06)
1[5] Academic Senate Memo to Office of President: Request to Implement College Strategic Planning Process (3-24-06)
1[6] Academic Senate Minutes (Item 5) (3-2-06)
1[7] Academic Senate: Memo to Faculty Regarding District Planning Process (3-10-06)
1[8] Office of Chancellor: Memo to IVC Faculty Regarding District Planning Process (3-11-06)
1[9] Sample: College Goals & Action Plans (2-22--06)
1[10] Office of Chancellor: Memo Establishing District Planning Task Force (5-26-06)
1[11] District Planning Task Force Proposed Recommendations (10-8-06)
1[12] Office of Chancellor: Memo Accepting District Planning Task Force Recommendations (10-30-06)
1[13] Flex Workshop: Implementation of the College Strategic Planning Process (8-28-06)
1[14] College Strategic Planning Process-Final Draft (9-28-06)
1[15] Strategic Planning Focus Group and Steering Team Membership (9-06)
1[16] Strategic Planning Kickoff Meeting (10-4-06)
1[17] Strategic Planning Steering Team Meeting: College Goal Development (10-13-06)
1[18] Strategic Planning Steering Team: Proposed College Goals (10-13-06)
1[19] Strategic Planning Steering Team: Timeline (10-13-06)
1[20] Office of Institutional Research: Memo Regarding Initial Strategic Planning Focus Group Meetings with Office of President, Academic Senate President, and College Researcher (10-13-06)
1[21] January 2007 Flex Workshop: Review Planning Assumptions (1-2-07)

1[22] January 2007 Flex Workshop: Development of Objectives & Planning Strategies (1-4-07)
1[23] Focus Group Meetings: Review Objectives & Planning Strategies (1-25-07), (2-14-07), and (3-1-07)
1[24] Accreditation Dialogue College wide Meetings (2-7-07) (2-8-07)
1[25] Strategic Planning Timeline: Development of Objectives and Strategies (Spring, 2007)
1[26] Strategic Planning Steering Team Retreat (7-11-07)
1[27] 2006-2012 College Strategic Plan
1[28] Strategic Planning Timeline: Implementation of Objectives and Strategies (2007-2008 and 2008-2009)
1[29] Strategic Planning Budget Development Committee: College Resource Allocation Process (7-11-07)
1[30] Strategic Planning Steering Team Meeting: Review Fiscal Recommendations of 2007- 2008 Objectives and Strategies (5-23-07)
1[31] Strategic Planning Steering Team Meeting: Review Fiscal Recommendations of 2007- 2008 Objectives and Strategies (6-27-07)
1[32] Program Review Process: Revised (11-16-07)
1[33] Review: 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 Program Review Recommendations (1-9-07)
1[34] Strategic Planning Steering Team: Review 2004-2007 Program Review Recommendations (5-23-07)
1[35] Irvine Valley College Program Review/Planning Process-Proposed Revisions (7-11-07)
1[36] Irvine Valley College Facilities & Educational Master Plan (Fall 2006)
1[37] College Review: Facilities & Educational Master Plan (Spring 2007)
1[38] SOCCCD Five Year Construction Plan (6-29-06)

B. Recommendation 2: The college implement college-wide dialogue on establishment and assessment of student learning outcomes at the course, program, degree, certificate, and institutional levels. (Standard I. B. 1)

Response: Due to the combined effort of the faculty co-chairs of the learning outcomes committee, the office of the president, and the academic senate, the college has continued to increase the level of engagement, motivation, and ongoing college-wide dialogue regarding the establishment and assessment of student learning outcomes as noted by the evaluating team during the November 3, 2005, site visit.

Student Learning Outcomes: Institutional Commitment

As reported in the 2005 progress report, the learning outcomes committee was formally adopted as a college-wide standing committee which collaborates on a routine basis with the academic senate.[1] The academic senate coordinates the work of the learning outcomes committee with the administrative components of the college such as the instructional council, the student services council, and the president's council.[1] In fall of 2005, the learning outcomes committee forwarded an SLO implementation plan and a draft of proposed institutional/core learning outcomes for the college to the academic senate for review and adoption. On September 29, 2005, the academic senate reviewed, revised, and adopted the SLO implementation plan and the institutional/core learning outcomes for IVC.[2] (Item 10, page 4) In order to facilitate college-wide dialogue regarding student learning outcomes, the committee prepared a definition of terms to provide clarification and standardization of learning outcomes terminology throughout the institution.[2, 3]

The administration and the faculty leadership are committed to making student learning outcomes a visible priority across the institution as documented below. To this end, the college has allocated appropriate resources to implement the student learning outcomes plan.[4] On June 6, 2006, the office of the president approved the budget request for 2006-2007 submitted by the learning outcome committee.[4] The 2006-2007 budget provides reassigned time and a stipend for the faculty co-chairs, clerical support, technological resources, including hardware and software, and the budget provides for the requested conference money.[5] In June of 2007, the office of the president approved the 2007-2008 proposed budget.[5]

College-wide Dialogue: Student Learning Outcomes Flex Week Workshops and Training Sessions 2005-2007

In order to address recommendation 2, student learning outcomes workshops and training sessions have become an ongoing aspect of staff development during the in-service flex week as well as throughout the semester. As reported in the 2005 progress report, at the onset of the fall 2005 semester, the learning outcomes co-chairs conducted a flex week learning outcomes workshop designed to assist faculty in differentiating goals, objectives, and learning outcomes.[6] After a review of the accreditation standards related to learning outcomes, participants generated learning outcomes statements at the course and/or

program level and created a scoring rubric for assessing student progress on robust learning outcomes.[6] In addition, participants formulated a program level learning outcomes assessment plan for the fall semester using embedded, authentic assessment strategies.[6]

The college conducted learning outcomes flex week workshops throughout the fall 2006 semester. On August 25, 2006, and September 15, 2006, the learning outcomes co-chairs facilitated workshops designed as a two part sequence to assist faculty undergoing program review in 2006-2007 to develop course, program, degree, and/or certificate level outcomes and to develop assessment strategies.[7] The workshops introduced faculty to robust level learning outcomes, Bloom's Taxonomy as well as numerous examples of sample learning outcomes.[7] The follow-up workshop on September 15, 2006, assisted faculty in the development of effective assessment strategies.[7] The workshop examined embedded multiple choice methods of assessment as well as development of rubrics for evaluating student learning outcome statements.[7]

The college hosted numerous learning outcomes training sessions throughout the spring of 2006. The learning outcomes co-chairs conducted training sessions with full-time and adjunct faculty in early childhood education and human development to assist faculty in developing a rubric for scoring student portfolios.[8] In February of 2006, IVC hosted an all day workshop on the use of focus groups for gathering evidence of student learning and eight of the fifty attendees were IVC faculty and administrators.[8] In March of 2006, the co-chairs facilitated the region 8 DSP&S workshop on learning outcomes.[8] Also in March of 2006, the co-chairs also facilitated a IVC student services retreat with school of guidance and counseling, including DSP&S and EOPS administrators, faculty, and staff.[8] On September 28, 2006, the co-chairs participated in a workshop on student response systems at Coastline College's Garden Grove Center and on October 4, 5, and 6, 2006, the co-chairs and members of the learning outcomes committee participated the assessment conference in San Diego.[9] In order to enhance administrative support of the development of learning outcomes at the college, on October 17, 2006, the faculty co-chairs hosted a workshop for all college administrators.[9]

Implementation of 2005 Learning Outcomes Planning Agendas

As indicated in the 2005 progress report, the learning outcomes co-chairs developed an extensive website to provide faculty with the necessary resources to assist with the development and assessment of learning outcomes.[10] The website contains a list of resources and links to information regarding the development and assessment of learning outcomes as well as a wealth of examples of learning outcomes for numerous disciplines, and a step by step explanation of how to develop course/program level outcomes.[10] The website has been extremely helpful in facilitating dialogue between faculty, staff, and the administration.

To avoid repetition, the college's continued efforts to implement and assess course, program, degree, certificate, and institutional learning outcomes will be further discussed in the response to recommendation 4 and the response to the 2004 self-study planning agendas in standard II.

References: Recommendation 2

2[1] Academic Senate Minutes: Learning Outcomes Committee-College Standing Committee (9-29-05)
2[2] Academic Senate Minutes: Adoption of the SLO Implementation Plan & Institutional Core Learning Objectives—Item 10 (9-29-05)
2[3] www.vc.edu/asenate/pages/default.aspx
2[4] 2006-2007 Student Learning Outcomes Budget Approval (6-6-06)
2[5] Learning Outcomes Committee Minutes-Budget (6-22-06)
2[6] Learning Outcomes Flex Workshops (8-16-05)
2[7] Learning Outcomes Flex Workshops (8-25-06 and 9-15-06 "One Stop SLO Workshops)
2[8] Student Learning Outcomes Committee Progress Report (5-20-06)
2[9] Student Learning Outcomes Committee Agenda (9-29-06)
2[10] Student Learning Outcomes Website: http.//intranet.ivc.edu/slo

C. Recommendation 3: The college develop and implement cyclical and systematic evaluations and improvements of the program review processes in instructional and student services programs. (Standard II. A. 1, 2; B. 1, 3)

Response: As documented in the 2005 progress report, the program review process was revised on November 2, 2004 in accordance with the commission's recommendation. The program review process was again systematically evaluated and modified in the summer and fall of 2006 with the onset of the strategic planning process and the resignation of the program review co-chairs. On March 29, 2006, the program review chairs resigned after serving in their roles approximately nine years. They maintained that until strategic planning process was implemented, the program review process was perceived, in their opinion, as meaningless by the campus community. [1] The subsequent implementation of the strategic planning process during the fall of 2006 and spring of 2007 resulted in an in-depth institutional evaluation of the purpose, process, and methodology of program review.

Modification of Program Review: Purpose

According to the revised program review process adopted by the college in November 2006, the purpose of program review is an opportunity for self-study, self-renewal, and recognition of the excellence of educational and support programs at the college as well as the opportunity for each program and service to identify the need for improvement.[2] Program review involves self-scrutiny by all college entities to determine how well each program is achieving objectives and advancing the mission, vision, goals, and institutional learning outcomes of the college.[2]

Modification of Program Review: Process

The in-depth institutional evaluation of the program review process resulted in substantial procedural revisions designed to streamline the process and more fully involve the administration as well as the departmental faculty/staff in the review.[2] For example, in the spring prior to the year of the review, the dean or director and the departmental faculty/staff develop program review teams with the membership they recognize as important to the review; the office of research and planning and dean or director assist the departmental faculty/staff in the development and selection of key performance indicators, student surveys questions, and identify the classes and/or offices to be surveyed.[2] In the fall of the review, the office of research and planning assists in administering the student surveys as well as complies the data for analysis by the program review teams.[2]

Other revisions to the process occur in how the program review is conducted. The program review team submits a preliminary draft of the document to the appropriate dean or director at the end of the fall semester of the review.[2] Based upon the dean or director's review, the document may be revised, if appropriate.[2] At the end of the spring semester, the team submits the final document to the office of instruction for review and approval.[2] Upon approval by the office of instruction, the document is submitted to the

office of the president for approval.[2] The modification of the program review process also included integrating the program review recommendations within the budget and resource allocation process as a component of the strategic planning process as documented in the response to recommendation 1. The integration of program review, budget, and the strategic planning processes ensure that the college considers possible funding for and implementation of the program review recommendations.

In accordance with the program review process, all programs are reviewed on a six year cycle.[2] In 2006-2007, the following programs participated in program review:

- Anthropology
- Dance
- Electronics
- Library Services
- Transfer/Career Placement
- Counseling Services
- Art History
- Visual Arts
    - Photography
    - Digital media art
    - Painting, Drawing
    - Gallery
    - 2D/3D Design
- Music
- Geography

The 2006-2007 programs undergoing program review were the remaining programs from the original 2000-2006 cycle, which means that at the conclusion of the spring 2006 semester, every program and service at the college has undergone the first cycle of program review.

On August 31, 2006, the instructional council, president's council, and the academic senate adopted the second six year program review cycle for 2007-2012.[3] The following programs are scheduled for program review in 2007-2008:[3]

- Biology
- Chemistry
- History
- Intercollegiate Athletics
- Mathematics
- Computer Information Management
- Psychology
- Speech
- International Student Center
- Supportive Services

- Financial Aid and Veteran's Program

Modification of Program Review: Methodology

With the revision of the purpose of program review as well as the process, the college agreed to modify the academic and student services templates commensurate with the commission expectations as discussed in the accreditation notes produced by Barbara Beno, Executive Director.[4] The revised templates were implemented by the college in August of 2006.[5] The templates focus the program review on three components: first, describing the status quo and evaluating whether the program meets the needs of the institutional mission/goals; second, measuring program effectiveness through the development and assessment of student learning outcomes; and third, planning for improvement, including program and institutional recommendations.[5] Each section of the program review template will be discussed below.

Mission, Purpose and/or Goals:

The first component of the revised template requires each program or service to identify the mission, purpose or goal of the program; how the mission, purpose or goal of the program relates to the overall mission and/or goals of the institution; and how student needs are met.[5] Each program review packet included the college mission statement for reference.

Program Effectiveness:

The second component of the revised templates requires an analysis of program effectiveness. With the assistance of the office of research and planning, each program under review is provided with indirect learning outcomes assessment data to determine the student population served by the program such as a student profile (age, major, goal, etc. which is gathered from the student surveys referred to above) as well as enrollment data, student retention rates, course completion rates, persistence rates, student success rates, and graduation and transfer rates.[6] As will be fully discussed and documented in the response to self-identified issues associated with standard II, the college felt that student learning outcomes are a substantial component of measuring program effectiveness. Therefore, the templates for instruction as well as student services include the identification of course, program, degree, and certificate learning outcomes as well as assessment methods for each learning outcome, and documentation of the modifications to pedagogy based on the assessment data.[5]

Program Planning, Recommendations, and/or Improvements:

The third component of the template includes specific program recommendations and/or improvements to address student progress, student learning, and efficiency as well as the short term and long term plans to implement the recommendations and/or improvements.[5] The faculty/staff at the program level are further requested to identify institutional changes necessary to implement the program recommendations and/or improvements.[5]

Fall 2007 Revisions to the Program Review Process

In a system of ongoing dialogue, reflection and self-evaluation, as documented in the response to recommendation 1, in July of 2007, the academic senate, in collaboration with the strategic planning steering team developed proposed revisions to the program review process based on the college strategic plan. (See recommendation 1, reference 35)

Additional Planning

In February of 2007, the district purchased a curriculum management system (CurricUNET).[7] An additional component of the CurricUNET system is a program review feature which will greatly assist the college in integrating program review with the strategic planning process and the budget development process. The program review component could be implemented in the fall of 2007 after the curriculum and student learning outcomes components are completed.

References: Recommendation 3

3[1] Resignation: Program Review Co-chairs (3-29-06)
3[2] Program Review Process Revised (11-16-06)
3[3] *2007-2012 Program Review Cycle (8-31-06)*
3[4] Accreditation Expectations: Program Review
3[5] Academic and Student Services Program Review Templates Revised (8-28-06)
3[6] Program Review Data Packet (2006-2007)
3[7] Academic Senate Memo: CurricUNET, Student Learning Outcomes, and Program Review (5-11-07)

D. Recommendation 4: The college develop and implement research to support the establishment and assessment of student learning outcomes at the course, program, degree, certificate, and institutional levels. (Standard II. A. 1. c, 2. e, f, h, i; 3, 6. a; B. 1, 3, 4; C. 1, 2)

Response: As stated in the 2005 progress report, individuals with extensive research expertise assumed primary leadership roles with regards to assisting the college in the development of learning outcomes and implementation of an assessment plan for student learning outcomes at the course, program, degree, certificate, and institutional levels. At the time of the November 3, 2005 team visit, the team found that although the college's progress was still in the planning stage, among the learning outcomes committee members and the researchers, there was a sense that a good "team" is in place which would make every effort to ensure that the college move forward in fully meeting this recommendation.

Research Team

With continued institutional support regarding resources and budget, the research team has continued to work diligently to assist the college in the establishment and assessment of learning outcomes. The college is fortunate to have hired a highly qualified college researcher, Dr. Sibylle Georgianna as discussed in the response to recommendation 1. The college has maintained continuity with the faculty co-chairs of the learning outcomes committee. Drs. Rudmann and Tucker have continued to serve as the learning outcomes co-chairs through 2005-2006, 2006-2007 and 2007-2008. The learning outcomes co-chairs have worked closely with the office of research and planning, the administration, the academic senate, the departmental faculty, and student services units.

Implementation of the 2005 Learning Outcomes Research Agenda

As projected in the 2005 progress report, the college stated that it would investigate options for efficient learning outcomes data acquisition and analysis using Blackboard and Share Point. To this end, the learning outcomes co-chairs and the college researcher created modules wherein faculty were trained to use assessment strategies and procedures. On January 2, 4, and 5, of 2007, the learning outcomes co-chairs and other faculty trained in this area, facilitated several learning outcomes assessment workshops to assist faculty acquire valid, direct learning outcome data through scannable hard copy surveys, online surveys, rubrics, student response systems, and calibrated peer review.[1]

Learning Outcomes Assessment Workshops

On January 2, 2007, members of the learning outcomes committee and other trained faculty presented a workshop which included the following topics:

- the use of blackboard to gather pre-test and post test learning assessment scores as a means to assess course learning outcomes;

- student response systems (classroom clickers) to engage students, determine comprehension levels, and automatically record learning outcome assessment data during class sessions;

- the development of online scoring rubrics for the assessment of robust learning outcomes;

- the use of calibrated peer review methods used to evaluate written assignments and assess robust student learning outcomes.[2]

On January 4 and 5, 2007, the learning outcomes co-chairs facilitated additional workshops for faculty in disciplines undergoing 2006-2007 program review. The workshops were designed to assist faculty in developing assessment strategies in order to implement learning outcomes assessment in spring of 2007. The research team provided information on embedded assessment procedures, authentic assessment procedures, and, for objective format assessments, item analysis procedures.[1]

Three learning outcomes workshops were conducted during the fall 2007 flex week. Due to substantial faculty interest indicated at the 2006 workshops, the learning outcomes co-chairs purchased state of the art "student response systems" (clickers) to allow faculty to automatically track and assess course level learning outcomes; the August 13, 2007 flex workshop provided training for faculty in the use of the clickers. On August 14, 2007, the learning outcomes co-chairs presented a workshop to assist faculty undergoing program review in 2007-2008 with the development of course/program level learning outcomes. Also, due to faculty interest, on August 15, 2007, the learning outcomes co-chairs presented the calibrated peer review techniques to assist faculty in course level learning outcomes assessment.[3]

Acquisition of Indirect Evidence of Learning Outcomes

As indicated in the 2005 progress report, the learning outcomes research team developed a proposal to facilitate the acquisition of indirect evidence of learning outcomes in order to develop a more comprehensive assessment of student learning via a data-sharing agreement (formally known as a CalPASS MOU agreement) between Irvine Valley College and local transfer institutions.[4]

The college research office provided indirect evidence for learning outcomes to those programs undergoing program review in 2006-2007 and in 2007-2008. Each program was provided with student retention rates, course completion rates, persistence rates, student success rates, and graduation and transfer rates for analysis within their program review. (See recommendation 3, reference 3[6])

Assessment of Learning Outcomes: Software Databases

As will be discussed in the response to standard II, the college has a substantial amount of work to do in assessing learning outcomes as indicated in the 2006-2007 learning outcomes ACCJC annual report. In order to facilitate this effort, the college/district explored several software programs to establish a learning outcomes database to assist the

research team in accumulating and tracking the assessment of learning outcomes. Two software systems are scheduled to be implemented in the fall of 2007. First, as previously mentioned, in February of 2007, the district purchased a curriculum management software system, CurricUNET. (See recommendation 3, reference 3[7].) One component of the software system will allow faculty to record learning outcome assessment data, analyze the results, and record the modifications to instruction based on the assessment data.[5]

The second software system that would assist the research team in tracking learning outcomes assessment data is a system designed specifically for this purpose. On March 9, 2007, the college and the district participated in a presentation regarding the software management system (eLumen) that would allow the research team to store, organize, aggregate, and sort assessment data. On June 25, 2007, the board of trustees authorized the purchased the eLumen software.[6] (Item 5.3) Fortunately, the learning outcomes co-chairs, the research and planning analyst, and the vice chancellor of technology and learning services have extensive expertise in research and technology. Throughout the fall of 2007, these individuals will collaborate to interface the two software systems which will greatly enhance the collection of assessment data. Additionally, the software management systems will facilitate the efforts of the faculty in the development of assessment plans, assessing learning outcomes, analyzing the results, and recording the modifications to instruction based on the assessment data.

Use of Assessment Data

On April 5, 2007, the academic senate reviewed a memorandum of understanding from Modesto Junior College concerning the use of student learning outcomes assessment data.[7] The academic senate endorsed the document and referred it to the learning outcomes committee for modifications to adapt the procedures to Irvine Valley College.[7] This work should be completed by the learning outcomes committee in the fall of 2007. The academic senate endorses the principle that assessment of learning outcomes is not a single action, but an ongoing process which involves gathering the assessment data and using that information to modify and improve teaching and student learning.

Research Assistant

Due to a substantial increase in reports required by the state of California, the college's emphasis on strategic planning based on data and measuring institutional effectiveness, program review, and acquisition of student learning outcomes assessment data, the college hired a research specialist to provide assistance to the research and planning analyst.[8] The research specialist will provide much needed help to the research and planning analyst and will assist the college in meeting its goals with respect to the above projects.

The college, in collaboration with the learning outcomes committee, the curriculum committee, and the academic senate has taken significant action to facilitate the development and implementation of research to support the assessment of student learning outcomes as follows:

1) The implementation of the CurricUNET and eLumen learning outcomes assessment management systems;
2) The implementation of the student response systems (clickers) and the use of scantron software which allow faculty to score embedded learning outcomes assessment questions; and
3) Additional personnel to assist the research analyst.

Although the college stated in the 2005 progress report that indirect evidence of institutional outcomes would be analyzed based on the May 2005 graduate follow-up survey, this project did not occur. Depending on the outcome of the above projects, it may be possible to complete this analysis by 2010 or it may be subsumed in the institutional effectiveness report.

References: Recommendation 4

4[1] January 2007 Student Learning Outcomes Newsletter: Assessment Workshops (1- 2-07, 1-4-07, 1-5-07)
4[2] Assessment Workshops: Blackboard, Rubrics, Clickers, and Calibrated Peer Review (1-2-07, 1-4-07, 1-5-07)
4[3]Learning Outcomes Committee Announcement: Fall 2007 Flex Workshops (6-22-07)
4[4] CalPASS MOU: Indirect Assessment of Learning Outcomes (1-30-07)
4[5] CurricUNET: Course Outline of Record, SLO Assessment Fields (6-27-07)
4[6] Learning Outcomes Co-chairs: Memo eLumen SLO Management System (3-9-07)
Board of Trustee Agenda: Purchase of eLumen Software System (Item 5.3) (6-25-07)
4[7] Academic Senate Minutes: MOU Assessment Data (4-5-07)
4[8] Board of Trustees Agenda: Research Specialist Approved (2-26-07)

E. Recommendation 5: The college assess the high rate of turnover among administrators and other staff, take actions to reduce the number of vacant administrative and classified positions filled on a short term basis, fill the positions that are necessary to ensure the integrity of the college's programs and services. (Eligibility Requirement 5; Standard III. A. 2)

Response: At the time of the November 3, 2005 team visit, the team found that the college had made significant progress in filling vacant administrative positions, with one position being advertised to be filled in January of 2006 (the dean of the school of mathematics, sciences, and technology). Additionally, the 2005 progress visit report stated that the college had made some progress in filling vacant classified positions, however there still remain several vacant classified positions which the college reported would be advertised but the announcements were not yet posted. According to the commission report, the college will need to continue to fill needed vacant positions to fully meet this recommendation. The college's efforts to address the vacant administrative positions and classified positions will be addressed respectively below.

Administrative Positions

In January of 2005, the college hired two permanent deans; one in the school of physical education and athletics and a second in the school of fine arts and the school of humanities and languages. Both deans have continued in their positions from 2005 through the present. In June of 2005, the college hired a permanent dean for the school of guidance and counseling. The dean has continued in that position from 2005 through the present. In December of 2005, based upon an administrative reorganization, the college eliminated the administrative position of dean of advanced technology. The dean of advanced technology was assigned to the dean of the school of mathematics, sciences, and technology, thus filling the one vacant dean position noted by the visiting team in 2005. Thus, the college has attempted to address the commission recommendation by filling vacant administrative positions and reducing the administrative turnover noted in the 2005 progress report.

In November of 2006, the vice president of instruction took administrative leave and then retired in December. An interim vice president of instruction served from November 2006 to June 27, 2007. Pursuant to board policy 4011, the (revised) administrative hiring procedures, a permanent vice president of instruction was approved by the board on July 25, 2007.[1]

On April 23, 2007, the college identified a new administrative dean position, a dean of career technical education and workforce development, based partially on the recommendations of the strategic planning focus groups (documented in the response to recommendation 1 and in the response to self identified issues, Standard I) and based on other factors.[2] (page 6) The current dean of the school of mathematics, sciences, and technology will fill this position and the college will advertise and hire a permanent dean

for the school in 2007-2008.[3] (In June of 2007, an acting dean was appointed to fill the dean of mathematics, sciences, and technology position.[1])

Classified Positions

The November 3, 2005, progress visit report stated that the classified senate expressed the desire to have a more substantive and formal role in the development of the classified hiring priority list. In order to address the concern of the classified senate and recommendation 5, on August 17, 2006, the administration and the classified senate jointly adopted a classified hiring priority list development process which is inclusive and is based on the participation of all constituent groups.[4] The process provides for the development of a classified hiring list within each school or department in collaboration with the administrator or manager. After administrative review, the school/department list is submitted to the appropriate vice president or college president. The vice presidents and college president submit the respective lists to the classified hiring priority task force, which is comprised of two academic senate representatives, one dean, one classified manager, one classified senate member, one classified bargaining unit representative, and one vice president.[4] The task force produces one classified hiring list that is then submitted to the administrative council, president's executive council, and finally to the office of the president.[4] In spring of 2007, based upon implementation of this process, a classified hiring list identifying 21 classified positions was mutually developed and agreed upon by the task force.[5]

Based upon the 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 budgets, the college was able to create and fill the following positions:

- Full-time Parking Coordinator
- Part-Time Administrative Assistant for the Office of Academic Senate
- Full-time Research Specialist
- Full-time Senior Administrative Assistant

In 2007-08, the college has also budgeted funds to hire additional classified positions in the area of Maintenance and Operations.

Based on a historical overview of classified hiring from 2005 to the present, the college hired twelve classified positions in 2005, seven classified positions in 2006, and six classified positions in 2007.[6]

Districtwide Administrative and Classified Staffing Ratios Compared to Other Colleges

On May 21, 2007, the deputy chancellor presented a report to the board of trustees concerning data from the California State Chancellor's Office regarding administrative and classified staffing ratios within the district.[7] According to the report, of the total full-time equivalent employees within the South Orange County Community College District, three percent are administrators. This percentage is within an average range in comparison to nearby community college districts.[7] For example, of the sixteen colleges compared in the report, nine report that they employ three percent administrators (including South Orange); six colleges report they employ two percent administrators,

and only one college reports that it employs four percent administrators.[7] Thus, the district wide percentage for administrative staffing is within the average range.

The report produced by the deputy chancellor included data regarding classified positions within the district. According to the report, of the total full-time equivalent employees within the district, forty-two percent are classified employees.[7] (Classified employees include one percent confidential classified positions, three percent classified managers, and thirty-eight percent other classified positions for the total of forty-two percent).[7] The percentage of classified employees within the district is the third highest in comparison to surrounding community colleges. For example, only two colleges report a higher percentage of classified employees (fifty percent and forty five percent) whereas twelve colleges report a lower percentage from forty-one percent to thirty-four percent.[7]

However, the data presented by the deputy chancellor regarding administrative and classified positions is aggregated data for the district, which includes the district offices, Saddleback College as well as Irvine Valley College. The college needs to conduct a similar analysis of administrative and classified positions based on the number of positions relative to colleges of similar size and composition.

References: Recommendation 5

5[1] Permanent Vice President of Instruction: Board Approval (June, 25, 2000)
5[2] Dean of Career Technical Education and Workforce Development (4-23-07)
5[3] Office of the President: Memo Dean of Career Technical Education and Workforce Development. (7-10-07)
5[4] Classified Hiring Priority List Development Process (8-17-06)
5[5] Classified Hiring Priority List (Spring, 2007)
5[6] IVC Historical Classified Positions (2005-2006)
5[7] Staffing & Expense Comparison: Deputy Chancellor Report to Board (5-21-07)

F. Recommendation 6: The board of trustees cease involvement in college and district operations, delegate all non-policy issues and policy implementation at the district and college level to the chancellor and presidents respectively. (Standards IV B. 1. e, j)

Response: As stated by the visiting team in the November 30, 2006, progress visit report, the trustees' self-assessment relative to addressing this recommendation was more positive than the college's assessment. The board viewed the extent of their continued involvement in micromanaging the college and the district as less frequent; however, the college viewed their involvement as frequent and inappropriate. The college also viewed the chancellor as engaging in micromanagement of the college. The commission concluded that based upon these findings, while the board and the chancellor express no desire to micromanage, they continue to do so in the college's view. According to the November 30, 2006, progress visit report, progress in addressing recommendation 6 was evident; however, continued progress is needed.

As stated in the 2005 and in 2006 progress reports pertaining to this recommendation, the college is limited in authority and/or ability to respond to recommendation 6 as it pertains to the practices of the board of trustees and the management style of the chancellor.

Special Board of Trustee Meetings: March 30, 2007 and April 23, 2007

On March 30, 2007, the board held a special meeting at Irvine Valley College. The agenda item, 2.1, for the meeting listed a 'board forum'.[1] The meeting consisted of an open question and answer format.[1] The March 30th meeting was not videotaped. The accreditation co-chairs were present as well as the college and district administration. The information included herein regarding the March 30, 2007, special board meeting is based on the notes of the accreditation co-chairs and has been reviewed and approved by the accreditation oversight committee. At the meeting, the issue of board and chancellor micromanagement was raised.[2] Several trustees expressed the opinion that they would like to place this issue behind us, and although there are moments where the board has back slid, they are attempting to focus on policy issues without leaving their expertise behind.[2]

Other trustees expressed the opinion that there may be a natural tendency for elected officials to micromanage since they are 'free thinking' officials.[2] According to one trustee, elected bodies need to recognize when it is time to let the college resolve the matter. Other trustees indicated that it is not just the board that is accused of micromanaging, but the administration has played a role as well. According to this trustee, it is better for the board to be involved than be a rubber stamp.[2] One trustee believes that a board should engage in micromanagement when there is a crisis and gave his home phone number, encouraging phone calls in the event there is a problem.[2] Another trustee expressed the opinion that the district and the colleges are not in a precarious situation and the board will not change the way they are doing business. According to this trustee, there is a campaign of scare mongering and he is not afraid to

engage the commission as to the appropriate level of board/chancellor involvement in the daily, routine matters of the college.[2]

Board of Trustee Meeting: April 23, 2007

On April 23, 2007, the board of trustees held a special meeting for "the purpose of discussing accreditation issues and the district's response".[3] The meeting was not video-taped. The accreditation co-chair was present as well as the college and district administration. The information included herein regarding the April 23, 2007, special board meeting is based on the notes of the accreditation co-chair and has been reviewed and approved by the accreditation oversight committee. The meeting was facilitated by the board president and consisted of an open forum format wherein trustees, administrators, faculty, and staff discussed their perceptions.

The Board of Trustees

At the April 23rd meeting, the trustees responded to the issue of board and chancellor micromanagement as follows: The board president felt that, frequently, the board is invited to micromanage. For example, the board was invited to become involved with issue of reassigned time for faculty performing leadership duties. He felt that the issue of reassigned time was not a board matter and should be resolved by the college presidents.[4] He stated that it was the role of the board to create the opportunity for open and honest dialogue wherein there can be different interests competing for scarce resources. Another trustee agreed that the board should not be involved in the issue of reassigned time since it is not a policy issue. He suggested that the board should not be receiving reports on reassigned time as the college presidents and the chancellor should be empowered to make those decisions.[4] He disagreed with the college and the commission's interpretation that the board's rejection of the institutional membership in the American Library Association was an example of micromanagement as reported in the commission's November 30, 2006 progress visit report. Rather, he felt that the board has the obligation to monitor the expenditure of taxpayer dollars and the board must avoid becoming rubber stamp. This trustee also reported that in his perception, the accreditation process needs to be more accountable, that there is a problem with the commission's closed meetings, and there is a lack of involvement with trustees. Other trustees agreed that there should be more trustee involvement within the ACCJC.[4]

Several trustees expressed the concern that the board should not become a rubber stamp. One trustee felt that there was a constant barrage of information telling trustees what to do. She recognized that there is, however, no reason for a lack of civility. Another trustee felt that conflict is quite regular throughout the country and that is important to get things accomplished rather than identify who should get the credit. He also felt that the board has chosen a great district leadership team.[4]

The Chancellor

The Chancellor stated that, in his opinion, disagreement is healthy and should not be interpreted as an attack. He commended all parties for making tremendous progress, commented that the district and the colleges are one, and the responsibility for progress rests with everyone.[4] In response to a comment raised by a member of the IVC academic

senate regarding the politics of power displayed at the meeting when the trustees sit at the dais with the constituent groups sitting below the gaze of the trustees, the chancellor stated that by law the board of trustees has the ultimate authority and that a dialogue as equals was unrealistic.[4]

The chancellor criticized the Saddleback College academic senate president and the Irvine Valley College academic senate president for not following the proper process. For example, the chancellor stated that the Saddleback College senate president should not badger the chancellor regarding reassigned time. He stated that the chancellor's job is to implement board policies and provide oversight. The chancellor admonished the Saddleback College senate president for not working within the process and directed him to work with the college president regarding the issue of reassigned time.[4] The chancellor also criticized the Irvine Valley College academic senate president for calling the board president to receive clarification regarding a senate report to the board pursuant to board policy 6100 (curriculum). (At the April 23rd meeting, the board president publicly stated that the IVC senate president had not contacted him for over two years. He confirmed that the IVC senate president called to get clarification as to the senate report to the board and further suggested that the senate presidents should communicate with him as well as the chancellor.[4]) The chancellor also stated that he thought the IVC senate president and accreditation co-chair had attacked him by making threatening statements about what would be included in the midterm report.[4]

The chancellor stated that he felt that the voice of the trustees was not properly included in the two previous progress reports and that important documentation he provided for the 2005 and 2006 progress reports was included as footnotes and appendices. For example, the 2006 progress report failed to state that the chancellor established the board policy administrative regulation advisory committee. He felt that the college progress reports were biased. He also stated that he felt the senates' two minute report to the board of trustees pursuant to board policy 6100 (curriculum) was inadequate.[4]

<u>District and College Administrators</u>

The district administrators, including the deputy chancellor, the vice chancellor of technology and learning services, and the vice chancellor of human resources, reported positive and collegial interactions with the shared governance groups.[4] The deputy chancellor reported that the district board policy and administrative advisory council has continued to work together in a collegial manner to advance revised board policies and administrative regulations to the board of trustees and to the chancellor. He stated that he felt that there has been significant improvement in the interaction between the colleges and the district and there was a tremendous willingness to cooperate. He also noted that there has been a tremendous positive change with respect to micromanagement.[4]

The vice chancellor for technology and learning services also reported that there was positive reinforcement from all shared governance groups and that all dialogue has been collegial. Further, she stated that the commission standards and procedures involved a process of peer evaluation rather than governmental review and that she thought the accreditation process was valuable.[4]

The IVC college president also reported that interactions with the shared governance groups have been positive and collegial. The college president cited specific examples including implementation of the college strategic planning process, the revision of the classified hiring priority development process, the revision of the program review process, and the continued efforts of the faculty relative to student learning outcomes. The college president particularly noted that he appreciated the assistance and cooperation of the academic senate.[4]

The IVC Academic Senate

All members of the IVC academic senate cabinet were present at the April 23rd meeting and were allowed to participate. The chair of academic affairs noted that the trustee remarks criticizing the accreditation process may not be a good strategy. He also commented on the politics of power evident in the physical set up of the meeting where the trustees were located upon the dais, clearly in a position of power, and all constituent groups were placed below the trustees. In an authentic dialog there is no power over, rather there is mutual agreement, collaboration, and consensus among co-equal partners.[4] The chair of the curriculum committee noted that the point of the meeting was not clear. The meeting consisted of consecutive monologues where the senate presidents were attacked rather than a meaningful dialogue. She also provided clarification as to specific college process utilized in producing the accreditation reports, which included review/revision of all accreditation drafts and documents by the accreditation oversight committee (consisting of the vice president for student services/accreditation co-chair, the senate president/accreditation co-chair, the president of the student government, the president of the classified senate, and a classified manager as well as senate representatives), review/revision by the entire college community, and final review/revision by the college president.[4] She reported that all relevant data is included in the accreditation reports, whether it is perceived as "positive" or "negative".[4]

On April 5, 2007, the academic senate agendized recommendations 6, 7, and 8 for discussion. [5] (Item 8, page 3; Item 8, page 4) At the April 23rd special board meeting, the senate president reported on the April 5, senate deliberations with respect to recommendation 6 as follows: (1) the senate noted that the lack of collegiality and lack of cooperation on the part of college and district administrators in most cases does not appear to stem from willful obstructionism, but instead from a lack of understanding of good management practices; (2) on the other hand, some members of the board of trustees have publicly stated that they believe the taxpayers expect them to micromanage the college; (3) the senators expressed concern for failing to give faculty sufficient notice of the March 30, 2007, special board meeting which was held on a Friday afternoon at 2:00 p.m. when most faculty are not on campus; (4) the senators felt that some trustees gave rude answers to faculty questions (to those able to attend) at the special meeting on March 30, 2007; (5) and the senators expressed concern regarding the board's lack of understanding of the faculty's critical and helpful role in the accreditation process.[5] (Item 8, page 3; Item 8, page 4)

Administrative Regulation 6140 College Speakers

As reported in the 2006 progress report and noted by the visiting team, there was an issue concerning administrative regulation 6140, which required that all college speakers be approved by the board of trustees. In 2006, the board policy and administrative advisory council had proposed revisions to the regulation which required the notification of college speakers be received by the college presidents rather than approved by the board. At that time, the chancellor had taken the proposed revisions under advisement but no action had been taken to address the regulation.

Subsequently, the district sought legal advice concerning the regulation and the payment of travel expenditures and honoraria that may be associated with college speakers. In November of 2006, it was determined by district's legal counsel that such payments would need board approval. Therefore, on January 4, 2007, the administrative regulation was revised to include prior board approval for speakers receiving payment for travel expenditures and honoraria upon recommendation of the college president and the chancellor.[6]

College Study Abroad Program

During the November 30, 2006 team visit, the student government leadership requested to meet with the team to express concerns about board meetings and actions of the board. The student government leaders were concerned about the board's involvement in operations rather than policy and cited as an example the problems relative to the study abroad program. Throughout 2005-2006, during the board approval process of study abroad courses, trustees expressed concerns about the content of the courses, the location of the courses (on February 28, 2005, the board did not approve travel to Spain because one trustee noted that Spain has "abandoned our fighting men and women, [by] withdrawing their support" of the United States troops in Iraq, other trustees voted against the course due to the expense).[7]

On November 20, 2006, the board requested a report on the study abroad programs within the district.[8] (Item 40) According to the report, the district had a long history of providing high-quality, study abroad programs.[9] (page 1) A 10 year study indicated that 92 programs have been offered with travel to 23 different countries serving nearly 2,000 students.[9] (page 1) The report goes on to state that:

> [I]t is interesting to note that in the face of both local and national discussions on expanding study abroad opportunities, there has recently been a significant reduction in the number of programs offered by our colleges. In the previous five years, we have averaged approximately 12 programs a year. During the most recent year, 2005-2006, ending with the summer of 2006, we have offered two programs."[9] (page 1)

The board set a $50 million liability insurance as the desired level for study abroad programs.[9] (page 3) The insurance requirement narrowed the available providers and

increased the costs of the program by as much as 50%.[8] (page 3) Most colleges nationwide require $1-3 million in liability insurance.[9] (page 3)

On December 11, 2006, the board of trustees reduced the liability insurance for study abroad programs from $50 million to $5-10 million per program.[10] (Item 24) Consequently, the number of study abroad programs offered is increasing. At the regular board meeting on April 23, 2007, the board approved a study abroad program to Guanajuato, Mexico and on May 21, 2007, the board approved two study abroad programs one to Paris, France and a second program in Greece.[11]

At the April 23, 2007, special meeting of the board of trustees, the student trustee reported that the students' concerns regarding the study abroad programs had been adequately addressed.[4]

Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC)

During the November 30, 2006 team visit, the student government leadership also raised concerns about the timely offering of courses needed to transfer to four-year institutions. After review of the IGETC course offerings, it was determined that courses needed to transfer are offered on a regular basis in order to meet the needs of IVC students. There are two areas that need to be addressed "critical thinking/composition" and "oral communication" where IVC only offers one course in each of the IGETC areas, although other courses fulfill CSU general education breadth requirements in these categories. Other colleges have more choices within each IGETC category. This situation will be addressed by the college general education committee and the curriculum committee in 2007-2008.

Actions of the Chancellor/Board of Trustees

As stated by the visiting team in the November 30, 2006, progress visit report, while the board and the chancellor express no desire to micromanage, they continue to do so in the college's view, even though improvement is evident. Two recent examples of micromanagement are as follows (1) the goals set by the chancellor for the college president; and (2) the chancellor's recent procedures regarding classified hiring. Each situation will be discussed respectively below.

Chancellor's Goals for College President 2006-2007

Following a practice established by then IVC President Mathur (need to reference Goals and Action Plans Book), the college president distributed his goals set by the chancellor to the college community and called for assistance in meeting them successfully. On February 15, 2007, the academic senate reviewed the goals set by the chancellor. The college president would be evaluated, in part, based on the accomplishment of these goals for the evaluation period from November 1, 2006 through November 1, 2007.[12] The goals set by the chancellor are as follows:

1. Increase student enrollment by 333 full-time equivalent students (FTES)

during the academic year through strategies such as development and offering of 4-6 new academic and/or career programs, 4-6 online degree programs, and continued marketing and outreach efforts.

2. Continue to operate the college within the allocated budget and maintain a contingency. Review all existing expenditures and prioritize by eliminating less desirable and least effective programs and services.

3. Ensure that the total cost of reassigned time and stipends does not exceed 2.4% of the total budget during 2007-2008.

4. Ensure implementation of district goals through its integration with the college goals.

5. Ensure implementation of accreditation recommendations.

6. Provide leadership in ensuring institutional effectiveness of IVC.[13]

According to the chancellor, the above goals represent just one portion of the overall evaluation criteria for the college president.[12] (Item 12, page 4) The discussion of the academic senate focused on how the evaluation criteria cited above were clear examples of micromanagement.[12] (Item 12, page 4) The first goal, to create 4-6 academic and/or career programs contradicts, the "new program development policy" adopted by the college on April 12, 2006.[12] (Item 12, page 4),[14] In addition, the development of even four new programs in one academic year at IVC would be unprecedented. Further, with respect to the portion of goal number one concerning the development of 4-6 online degree programs, this contradicts the recommendations of the district distance education advisory council recommendations (see response to self identified issues, standard II, reference numbers 19-20). As agreed upon by the chancellor and the advisory council, the district identified fourteen recommendations to be implemented over a three year time span. The chancellor's goal relative to the development of 4-6 online degree programs in the academic year of 2007-2008 runs in direct opposition to the recommendations of the advisory council formed by the chancellor on May 17, 2006. This places the College President in the difficult situation of being required, for a successful evaluation, to establish programs that fall within the purview of several college processes, budget considerations, research, and the Delegation of Authority to the Academic Senate (BP 2100.1).

The academic senate also noted that goal number three requiring the college president to ensure that the total cost of reassigned time and stipends does not exceed 2.4% of the college budget does not "create an environment which ensures greater administrative stability and empowerment at the college" as the college president is precluded from granting reassigned time and/or stipends to faculty to complete reports such as this one or granting reassigned time as he deems appropriate to conduct the business of the college.[12] (Item 12, page 4)

Goal number four requiring the implementation of the district goals through the integration of the college goals, directly contradicts the recommendations of the district planning process advisory council, formed by the chancellor on May 26, 2006 (see response to recommendation 1, references 10-12). The recommendations of the district planning advisory council were adopted by the chancellor on October 30, 2006 (see response to recommendation 1, reference 12).

With respect to goal number five, implementation of accreditation recommendations, the academic senate expressed concern as recommendations 6, 7, and 8 from the 2006 progress report pertain to the chancellor and the board of trustees. The college president is powerless to "implement" the aforementioned recommendations.[12] (Item 12, page 5)

It is the concern of the academic senate that the chancellor is micromanaging the college via the evaluation criteria set by the chancellor for the college president. The chancellor's goals for the college president are in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the advisory councils established by the chancellor. Further, the chancellor's goals for the college president run in direct opposition and obviate the work of the college strategic planning process, also agreed to by the chancellor.

Classified Hiring

On April 10, 2007, the vice chancellor of human resources issued a memorandum concerning classified hiring procedures for the college.[15] According to the memorandum, effective immediately, all proposed new classified positions must be discussed with the chancellor before submitting any paperwork to the department of human resources.[15] "If the chancellor approves the creation of a new position, he will forward the paperwork to human resources".[15] "Unless the chancellor approves the position, human resources will not act on any requests to add positions to the board agenda".[15] According to the memorandum from human resources:

> In the past, occasionally, individuals have submitted paperwork directly to human resources authorizing the creation of new positions. This can no longer occur, and any such paperwork, if submitted, will be returned to your offices for routing through the Chancellor's office. Only new positions approved by the Chancellor transmitted from his office will be placed on the board agenda.[15]

Board of Trustees and Chancellor Response to Recommendation 6

At the August board of trustees meeting, the chancellor and the board of trustees provided a copy of their response to recommendation 6. On September 12, a final draft of the chancellor and board response was provided to the college with the directive that the document be included in its entirety. The chancellor and board response is included below.

> Chancellor'/Board of Trustees' Response: There are some areas that the district administration and the board of trustees would like to clarify in order to put our

progress in perspective. While board involvement in day to day operations is sometimes a source of friction in most organizations with an elected board, SOCCCD trustees have made concerted efforts to respond to the team's recommendations, as noted below.

- The board adopted a resolution "Implementation of Accreditation Recommendations by the District and Board of Trustees" on March 27, 2006 and "Strategies for Enhancement of Effectiveness of Board Agendas and Meetings" on January 16, 2007. [16-17]
- The board has publicly stated its opposition to micromanagement. [16]
- In the course of monthly board meetings, trustees do point out to each other when they perceive members may be engaging in micromanagement.
- In direct response to input from faculty, staff and students, changes were made to the administrative regulation regarding speaker approval (January 4, 2007) and the trustees adopted changes to study abroad programs (December 11, 2006). [18-19]
- At the April 24, 2006 meeting the board discussed the issue of trustee professional development and its importance in effective governance which eventually was reflected in board policy BP109, Board Education, adopted on August 27th, 2007. [20]

It should be acknowledged that, on occasion, board members are "invited" to micromanage by some faculty who, at the same time, have also expressed concerns about board micromanagement. The board rightly tries to resist these invitations. But the fact that these employees complain about micromanagement at other times should not be lost in the discussion. Rather than contacting board members directly, these faculty members should work with the administration to resolve issues of concern. If administration is not first given an opportunity to address issues, it remains a challenge for the board to cease involvement in college operations. The chancellor continues to work with faculty to refer these issues to him instead of inviting board micromanagement, and he works with the college presidents to address issues of concern as appropriate.

In addition, it should be noted that at times, charges of "micromanagement" are brought by some faculty when they merely disagree with policy decisions or actions and points of view of the chancellor and the board. For example, the progress report mentions the denial of approval for membership in the American Library Association. Memberships are subject to board approval for two reasons. First, they involve an expenditure of public funds. This is a matter within the discretion of the board. Elected trustees have a right and an obligation to raise issues of spending, whether independently or at the urging of taxpayers, faculty and staff. Second, the elected board members are responsible to the community as to what private organization the colleges will support with their membership.

It is beyond question that the community's representatives can, and should, be satisfied that the mission, goals and agenda of any organization to which the colleges belong are consistent with community values. While any member of the

district community may disagree with the board's decision as to that consistency, the decision legally resides with the board. The Commission's criticism and evident conclusion to the contrary is inherently inappropriate.

Trustees represent students on behalf of their elected constituency. The board of trustees, as a publicly elected and independent body, must consider many factors in its decisions. It is important to understand that when items are presented to the board, it may approve, or not approve, or seek additional information as needed. It is fundamentally inappropriate for faculty and staff to expect that any given board of trustees must always approve all faculty and staff recommendations without question.

Under the Education Code, the trustees have the right to take action on policy, financial and other items that, at times, may be contrary to the recommendation of the administration or the wishes of faculty.

References: Recommendation 6

6[1] Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees (3-30-07)
6[2] Special Meeting Notes (3-30-07)
6[3] Notice & Agenda for Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees (4-23-07)
Chancellor's Memo: Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees (4-2-07)
6[4] Special Meeting Notes (4-23-07)
6[5] Academic Senate Minutes: Item 8, Recommendations 6, 7, 8 (4-5-07)
6[6] Administrative Regulation 6140 (College Speakers) (1-4-07)
6[7] The Chronicle of Higher Education: Community College District Cancels Program In Spain (3-18-05); Inside Higher Ed: Cost and Safety, or Politics (3-7-05)
6[8] Board of Trustees Meeting Agenda: Board Report on Study Abroad Programs (11-20-06)
6[9] Board Report: Study Abroad Programs (11-9-06)
6[10] Board of Trustee Meeting Agenda: Reduction in Liability Insurance (12-11-06)
6[11] Board of Trustee Meeting Agendas: Approval of Study Abroad Programs (4-23-07; 5-21-07)
6[12] Academic Senate Minutes: Chancellor's Goals for College President (2-15-07)
6[13] President's Goals for Annual Evaluation Period 11-1-06 through 11-1-07
6[14] New Program Approval Policy (4-12-06)
6[15] Procedure for Adding New Positions to Board Agenda (5-10-07)
6[16] South Orange County Community College District Resolution 06-06 Implementation of Accreditation Recommendations by the District and Board of Trustees
6[17] South Orange County Community College District Strategies for Enhancement of Effectiveness of Board Agendas and Meetings Adopted by the Board of Trustees 1-16-07
6[18] Administrative Regulation 6140 South Orange County Community College District Instruction College Speakers
6[19] South Orange County Community College District Agenda Item Subject: SOCCCD: Study Abroad Program, Liability Insurance Level

6[20] South Orange County Community College District Agenda Item Subject: Board Member Professional Development

G. Recommendation 7: The board of trustees, district leadership and college leadership, publish, adhere to, regularly evaluate, and continuously improve the respective leadership roles and scopes of authority of college and district constituent groups and governance committees in meaningful, collegial decision making processes. (Standard IV. A. 1, 2, 3, 5)

Response: As stated in the November 30, 2006, progress visit report, there continues to be some disagreement among college governance leaders, and the chancellor and board of trustees regarding roles and authority. There continues to be blaming of responsibility for their failure to be in agreement, and a lack of understanding between them. The commission commended the college leadership, district leadership and board of trustees for the actions they did take to define leadership roles and scopes of authority and found that, in spite of continued strained relationships between the college and the chancellor and the board, the chancellor, district leadership, and board of trustees are making progress in addressing recommendation 7.

Board Policies Delineating Roles and Scopes of Authority

As documented in the 2006 progress report, district leadership and college leadership developed board policies delineating the roles and scopes of authority of the constituent groups and the board. At that time, the policies had not yet been approved by the board. Subsequently, the policies were approved by the board as discussed below.

Board Policy 102: Functions of the Governing Board

On August 27, 2007, the board adopted board policy 102 (Functions of the Governing Board) delineating the role and function of the board of trustees.[1] (When drafting this report it was discovered that the policy was not brought forward for board approval at the time it was drafted.) Board policy 102 mirrors the California Education Code (E.C.) section 70902 (a) and establishes the functions of the board as follows:

> (1) The district and colleges shall be under the authority and control of the board;
> (2) The board shall exercise those powers expressly granted or implied;
> (3) The board shall establish policies for: academic and facilities planning, instructional and educational programs, academic standards/probation/dismissal/readmission/graduation, recruitment and employment of the chancellor,
> (4) To the extent authorized by law, the board shall determine and control the district's operational and capital outlay budgets, manage and control district property,
> (5) The board shall establish procedures to: ensure effective participation of faculty, staff, and administrators, regulate student conduct, and establish student fees, receive gifts;
> (6) The board shall provide auxiliary services, determine the

district's calendar, hold and convey property for the district, and participate in the consultation process established by the board of governors.[1]

Board Policy 2100.2 Role and Scope of Authority of the Academic Senates

On September 25, 2006, the board approved board policy 2100.2 delineating the role and scope of the academic senate.[2] Board policy 2100.2 mirrors the California Education Code and California Code of Regulations (C.C.R) as follows:

> (1) The academic senates assume primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards (E.C. 70901 (b)(1)(E), 5 C.C.R. section 51023);
> (2) The board and the academic senates shall develop and agree upon jointly hiring criteria, policies, and procedures (E.C. section 87360);
> (3) The board and the academic senates shall develop and agree upon jointly the process for determining minimum qualifications for an administrator whose administrative assignment has expired or terminated (E.C. section 87458);
> (4) The board and the academic senate shall develop and agree upon jointly, the process to determine whether a faculty member possesses qualifications equivalent to the minimum qualifications determined by the California board of governors (E.C. 87359).[2]

Board Policy 4056 Classified Employees Participation in Decision Making

On December 11, 2006, the board approved board policy 4056 delineating the role of classified employees' participation in decisions making.[3] This policy also mirrors the California Education Code and California Code of Regulations as follows:

> (1) The board and the classified staff shall jointly develop district policies and procedures that the board reasonably determines (in consultation with the classified senates) will have a significant effect on classified staff (E.C. 70902, 5 C.C.R.51023.5);
> (2) Appointments to college or district committees to implement this policy shall be made in consultation with the bargaining unit and/or the classified senates;
> (3) In implementing this policy, the board shall not dominate or interfere with any employee organization or intrude on matters within scope of the bargaining unit.[3]

District Governance Committees

According to the November 30, 2006, progress visit report, the team heard some sentiments expressed among college staff that there are too many district led governance committees that take time away from the college. In particular, it was felt that the chancellor's coordinating council could be more effective if the colleges were able to take the lead with their K-12 feeder schools. The vice chancellor of technology and learning services, who is the chair of the committee, has reduced the number of the meetings and has shifted the direction of the committee to be more data driven.

Continued Disagreement: Roles and Authority

The November 30, 2006, progress visit report stated that there continues to be disagreement concerning roles and authority. To avoid repetition, this issue will be discussed in recommendation 8 below.

Board of Trustees and Chancellor Response to Recommendation 7

At the August board of trustees meeting, the chancellor and the board of trustees provided a copy of their response to recommendation 7. On September 12, a final draft of the chancellor and board response was provided to the college with the directive that the document be included in its entirety. The chancellor and board response is included below.

> District/Board of Trustees Response: There are many instances of good progress in response to this recommendation, including the following:
>
> - Administrative Regulation 107 was adopted on April 16, 2006, which allows constituent group participation in the decision–making processes; and two Technical Assistance visits were conducted on February 13, 2006 and April 24, 2006 to assist the board, administration, faculty and staff in responding to governance recommendations.
> - The Board Policy and Administration Regulation Advisory Council was created by Chancellor Mathur in January 2006 which has improved collegial decision-making.
> - Board Policy 2100.2: Role and Scope of Authority of the Academic Senates was adopted on September 25, 2006 and subsequently, since the progress report visit was made, Board Policy 4056: Classified Employees Participation in Decision Making was adopted on December 11, 2006. [4-5]
> - A presentation by Deputy Chancellor Poertner to the Board on May 21, 2007 revealed that SOCCCD, compared to other California community college districts, is in the high range of ratios of classified staff to support instructional programs (Source: State Chancellor's Office Management Information System). [6]
> - Overall faculty release time is up from 2% to 2.4% of the college's instructional budget. Academic senate officers release time is up 50% in 2006-07 over the 2005-06 academic year.
>
> The November 2006 progress visit report mentions negative feedback regarding an amendment to the March 26, 2006 resolution titled "Implementation of Accreditation Recommendations by the District and Board of Trustees." The statement, as amended reads, "Whereas, the Board and District are committed to clarifying the respective leadership roles and scopes of authority of College and District constituent groups and governance committees in meaningful, collegial decision making processes, thereby avoiding macromanagement by constituent groups."

This was an important distinction to the board, which was in direct response to the academic senates' initial description of their roles and responsibilities as reviewed during the Technical Assistance visits. The academic senates had a broader view of their role, until corrected by facilitator Dr. Diane Woodruff, now the interim Chancellor of the California Community Colleges System.[7-8] Also, no evidence appears to have been sought by the visiting team to explain the amendment to the resolution.

The board's concern about macromanagement is reinforced in the college's Midterm Report in August 2007 in which the academic senate's concerns are mentioned regarding the chancellor's goals for the college president. There seems to be a lack of understanding that it is the chancellor's responsibility to set goals and communicate the criteria for evaluation of college presidents. While the academic senate may see this as micromanagement, it is not unusual in any work setting for a supervisor to set goals for an employee.

Some IVC employees expressed that there are too many district led governance committees that take time away from the college. While no one likes more meetings than are necessary, there are defined purposes to district committees, many of which were formed in direct response to address college issues and needs. Good communication and shared governance take an investment of time and collaboration. It has repeatedly proven of value to the colleges and the district to meet together to identify, coordinate and resolve shared issues, and exchange information and strategies. There are many projects being led by the district that require the involvement of the colleges to guide district services, and expenditures, in the most effective way to serve students. At this time, the district is pursuing internet-based meeting technologies and many staff already attend meetings via teleconference and web-cam.

It was mentioned that the chancellor's coordinating council could be more effective if the colleges were able to take the lead with their feeder K-12 schools, rather than the district. The council provides a different type of opportunity for the district and colleges to meet with representatives of unified school districts, regional occupational programs, and four year colleges to better serve students as they transfer from high school to college. It helps to establish communication and build relationships between all educational entities. Many students attend IVC and Saddleback College from outside the obvious feeder schools. Also, because students can and do take classes at both colleges, it only makes sense to make all schools in the geographic region aware of the resources available. The council complements the colleges' efforts which continue to nurture special relationships with their feeder K-12 schools.

Some perceptions were presented in the progress reports without evidence or opportunity for other points of view. The visiting teams for Saddleback College and Irvine Valley College who met with the board refused, despite a request from the board president, to provide context for some of the statements made. Instead,

the board was forced to respond to vague questions in a public meeting with the press in attendance. We believe this to be an unfair part of the process employed by the visiting teams.

While there was an opportunity for faculty and staff to share their feedback with the visiting teams in a confidential manner, that information was not shared in an open and meaningful way with the board. The lack of two-way communication seems antithetical to the process of establishing an institutional dialog with a focus on students.

It is of concern that there were no trustees on the visiting team, to add a balance and perspective to the points of view. A trustee representative could have made sure that the visiting team was reminded that it is not unusual for the faculty to have different points of view than board members' views which may be more reflective of the community and the region they serve.

References: Recommendation 7

7[1] See Statement on Report Preparation, Reference 7: Agenda of the Board of Trustees, Item 5.2 Approved: BP 102 Functions of the Governing Board (8-27-07)
7[2] BP 2100.2 Role & Scope of the Academic Senates (9-25-06)
7[3] BP 4056 Classified Employees Participation in Decision Making (12-11-06)
7[4]Board Policy 2100.2 South Orange County Community College District Administration Role and Scope of Authority of the Academic Senates
7[5] Board Policy 4056 South Orange County Community College District Personnel Classified Employees Participation in Decision Making
7[6] Cost of Employee Benefits and Staffing Comparison Deputy Chancellor Gary Poertner Board of Trustees Meeting May 21, 2007
7[7] Summary of Academic Senate Roles and Responsibilities
7[8] Summary of Academic Senate Roles and Responsibilities

H. **<u>Recommendation 8:</u> The board of trustees, chancellor, presidents, administrators, managers, faculty senates and unions, classified senates and unions, and students take measures to bring all constituent groups together to enable the campus to work toward:**
A. Developing positive and in-depth dialogue on essential issues (e.g., evaluation, planning and research, student learning outcomes, decision making roles and responsibilities, etc.) that will ultimately lead to strengthening student learning and success at the college. (Standards I. A. 3., I. B. 1);
B. Creating an environment which ensures greater administrative stability and empowerment at the college (Standards IV. A. 1, IV. A. 2, A. 2. a., A. 2. b., A. 3, A. 5, IV. B. 1, IV. B. 2, and IV. B. 3); and
C. Enhancing the college and district communication structure so that it is clear to everyone who the responsible party is for making decisions and how those decisions are or will be made. (Standards IV. A. 1, IV. A. 2, A. 2. a, A. 2. b, A. 3, A. 5, IV. B. 1, IV. B. 2, and IV. B. 3)

<u>Response:</u> This response will address the issues raised by the team in the November 30, 2006 progress visit report within the response to recommendation 8, sections A, B, and C, above.

<u>A. Developing Positive and In-Depth Dialogue on Essential Issues</u>

<u>The Integration of District Planning with College Strategic Planning</u>
The integration of the district planning process with the college strategic planning process provides evidence that the college and the district are working together to develop a positive and in-depth dialogue on essential issues such as planning. As documented in the response to recommendation 1, the chancellor established the district planning process task force and the recommendations of the task force were accepted by the chancellor on October 30, 2006 (see recommendation 1, reference 12). The recommendations of the district planning task force allowed the college to develop and implement a college strategic planning process, which is documented in the response to recommendation 1.

Relative to the integration of the district planning process with the college strategic planning process, the task force recommended two special planning meetings of the chancellor's cabinet to address district planning issues. In accordance with the task force recommendations, the chancellor's cabinet met on February 27, 2007, to develop a preliminary draft of the SOCCCD mission/vision statement and district-wide goals.[1] The chancellor's cabinet was agreed upon as the body to conduct the district planning sessions because it consists of representatives from all shared governance groups at both colleges, the college presidents, and the senior district administrators. In order to ensure that the district planning process was broad based and inclusive, all interested parties were invited to attend the planning session.[1] In addition, to ensure participation,

reflection, and exchange by as many members of the district and college community as possible, prior to the planning session, all governance groups, advisory councils, and the chancellor's coordinating council were invited to submit proposed district-wide goals, mission and vision statements for review at the chancellor's cabinet special planning meetings.[2]

On behalf of the college, the IVC strategic planning steering committee and the academic senate jointly submitted proposed district-wide goals for review at the meeting.[3]

The February 27th planning session was well attended by the representatives of all the governance groups as well as additional faculty, staff, and administrators from both colleges.[4] The vice chancellor of technology and learning services facilitated the meeting, wherein participants reviewed the district mission/vision statement as well as examples from other multi-college districts.[4] All goals submitted by the governance groups and administrators were complied into a proposed draft of district-wide goals for discussion.[5] The vice chancellor's expertise and extensive background in research and planning greatly facilitated the discussion and review of all goals submitted by the governance groups. After clarification of the scope and breath of district-wide goals, certain goals were eliminated because they were operational goals, administrative goals, or were more appropriate as college goals.[5]

At the conclusion of the first planning session, all participants agreed upon a preliminary draft of a district mission statement, district vision statement, and proposed draft of seventeen district-wide goals to be reviewed by all members of the district/college community and revised at the second planning session accordingly.[6] As per the task force recommendations, on March 22, 2007,[7] (Item 5, page 2) and April 5, 2007,[8] (see recommendation 6, reference 5, Item 6), the academic senate reviewed the proposed mission/vision statements and the proposed goals developed at the February 27, 2007 planning session. On April 11, 2007, the president's council also reviewed the information from the February 27th planning session and, on behalf of the college, the college president submitted proposed revisions.[9]

As per the agreed upon recommendations, a second special planning meeting of the chancellor's cabinet occurred on April 18, 2007.[10] On April 11, 2007, in a written memorandum, the chancellor notified and invited all members of the district and college community of the meeting and sent the proposed drafts of the February 27th meeting to the entire district for review.[10] The second planning meeting was also well attended and productive. The participants reviewed the revisions suggested by the governance groups and district/college community.[11] At the April 18th special planning meeting a final proposed draft of the district mission and vision statements as well as eleven proposed district-wide goals were agreed upon.[12] The proposed drafts were submitted to the board on May 21, 2007, however the items were tabled at that meeting.[13] (See Recommendation 6, Reference 11) On June 25, 2007, the board approved the district mission statement, the district vision statement and the district-wide goals.[14] (page 3)

Planning, Research, and Student Learning Outcomes

As documented in the response to recommendations 1, 2, 3, and 4, the college has continued to implement the strategic plan, the student learning outcomes implementation plan, program review, and to evaluate and measure institutional effectiveness with considerable assistance and guidance from the college research analyst. The college is fortunate to have such a skilled expert in this position. As documented in recommendation 4, because the college is committed to regular evaluation and improvement of programs and services and due to the increasing workload, the college hired a second research position as well as a student aide to assist in the aforementioned projects. The college research analyst routinely collaborates with the vice chancellor of technology and learning services at the district. Fortunately, this individual has substantial expertise in the area of research and planning and has supported the college's efforts. For example, as previously mentioned, the vice chancellor attended the October 4, 2006 strategic planning kick off meeting at the college to present an overview of institutional effectiveness and key indicators and the vice chancellor assisted in the institutional effectiveness report for the college-wide accreditation dialogues held on February 6 and February 7, 2007. The college community responded positively to the information presented at the college-wide meetings.[15]

As documented in the response to recommendations 2 and 4, the college is committed to developing and assessing student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional level. The student learning outcomes co-chairs have extensive backgrounds in research and assessment and have contributed greatly to the college's progress in this area. As stated in the response to recommendation 4, the vice chancellor of technology and learning services has also assisted the college in the evaluation and purchase of two software programs to allow the college to better develop and track the assessment of student learning outcomes.

Since the 2006 progress report, the college and the district are routinely working together in the areas of planning and research to strengthen student learning and success at the college.

Decision Making Roles and Responsibilities

The clarification of decision making roles and responsibilities was addressed in the response to recommendation 7 and will be further discussed in the response to recommendation 8, section C below.

B. Creating an Environment Which Ensures Greater Administrative Stability and Empowerment at the College

Administrative Staffing Ratios

As previously discussed in the response to recommendation 5, the deputy chancellor presented information to the board of trustees on May 21, 2007, regarding districtwide administrative staffing ratios as compared to other colleges (see response to recommendation 5, reference 7.) According to this data, the districtwide administrative staffing ratios are within a normal range in comparison to other colleges. However, since the research conducted by the deputy chancellor concerns aggregated data concerning administrative staffing ratios, the college must conduct similar research to determine if the administrative staffing at the college is sufficient to ensure greater administrative stability.

Also, as indicated in the response to recommendation 5, reference 2, 2007, the college (with district and board approval) identified on April 23, 2007, a new administrative dean position, a dean of career technical education and workforce development. This new administrative position could decrease the workload of the current deans and may contribute to greater administrative stability as individual workloads decrease.

Administrative Workload

A second area that remains to be examined pertains to administrative workload. As reported in the 2005 progress report, the current administrative structure at the college is a result of the July 1997 reorganization by the board of trustees. On June 19, 1998, the commission requested an additional progress report concerning the administrative reorganization of the college by the board. In 1998, the commission stated "[T]he report from the district does not indicate a coherent planning process for the reorganization of the district colleges, nor has any objective evaluation of the consequences of that reorganization been developed."[16] The commission goes on to state "[T]he commission remains very concerned that the district does not effectively link planning to decision making, thereby continuing the practice of *ad hoc* decisions at the board level."[16] The May 21, 2007, report produced by the deputy chancellor is an attempt to address the longstanding concerns of the commission and the college.

As reported in the 2005 progress report, on April 20, 2005, the vice president of instruction conducted a re-evaluation of the duties and compensation of the academic chairs, who provide administrative assistance to the deans.[17] In 2005, the compensation rate for academic chairs was increased slightly commensurate with the expected duties.[17] However, the issue of adequate compensation for the academic chairs remains unresolved at this time. In the 2005 progress report, it was suggested that the current mode of compensation for academic chairs may need to shift from a stipend to reassigned time. The issue of adequate compensation for the academic chairs and their assistance in reducing the administrative workload could be addressed within the 2007 faculty contract negotiations.

Administrative Empowerment at the College

Recommendation 8. B. requests that the college address administrative empowerment at the college.

From the administrative perspective

As documented in the 2005 progress report (see recommendation 5, reference 6), on May 23, 2005, the district began offering administrators three year contracts, after the successful completion of the initial contract. Moreover, at the same board meeting, administrators were given a notable salary adjustment. These actions provided a needed sense of security. That being said, administrators have an inherent vulnerability, because they are not protected by tenure and cannot retire with benefits until they have completed ten years with the district.

From the faculty perspective

Based on the continued micromanagement of the college, as documented in the response to recommendation 6, the college administrators are not empowered to make decisions in the best interest of the college and this issue needs to be addressed in the future.

From the classified perspective

Administrative instability directly impacts classified staff. In some instances, administrative vacancies can cause an imbalance in workload, because sometimes classified staff are relied upon for administrative duties; and depending on the circumstance, they may help train new administrators when the changes occur. This dependency can lead to potential conflict and confusion about roles and responsibilities.

November 30, 2006 Progress Visit Report

The November 30, 2006 progress visit report states that the classified staff reported that, although they are pleased with the increased involvement they have in district and college governance, "they described one unit of the college in which in their view a hostile work environment still exists". This information was brought to the attention of the college president by the visiting team. The college president did investigate the concerns of the classified staff and, subsequently, the individual supervisor resigned his position.

The November 30, 2006 progress visit report also states that "the team observed a high degree of stress and anxiety among college administrators, and learned that in the current academic year, two college administrators have been placed on administrative leave". The campus police chief and deputy chief were placed on paid administrative leave pending an investigation of alleged misconduct. At the conclusion of the investigation, the chief retired and the deputy chief resigned. In addition, the vice president of instruction went on administrative leave and then retired. Both instances involved personnel matters for which details were not disclosed to the college community. This caused some level of anxiousness among all college employees.

C. Enhancing the College and District Communication Structure

The college has collaborated with the district in enhancing the communication structure as follows:

Board Policy and Administrative Regulation Advisory Council

As stated in the 2006 progress visit report, the team observed a sense of pride regarding the achievements of the board policy and administrative regulation advisory council. From the college's perspective, due to the expertise and leadership of the deputy chancellor, this council has continued to operate in a collegial manner since the visit of the accrediting commission in 2006. The evidence of the dedicated efforts of this council are found in the board approval of numerous new/revised board policies and the approval of the chancellor of many new/revised administrative regulations.[18] This level of communication and collaboration is unprecedented in the district within the last decade and the deputy chancellor must be recognized for his skill in working with all constituent groups in a collegial and collaborative manner.

The deputy chancellor has assisted all members of the council (and the colleges as well as the district) in understanding the communication structure as to who the responsible party is for making decisions relative to board policies and administrative regulations and how those decisions will be made. As reported in the 2006 progress report, on April 24, 2006, the board approved board policy 107 and in June of 2006, the chancellor approved administrative regulation 107. Board policy 107 and the companion regulation 107 clearly define the roles of all constituent groups, communication structure, and the role of the board in the final approval of board policies as well as the role of the chancellor in the final approval of administrative regulations. The clear delineation of the responsible parties for making the ultimate decision relative to board policies and administrative regulations has enhanced the communication structure within the district. Most importantly, based on the work of the deputy chancellor and this council, the board, the district, and the college have been successful in complying with the board policy 107 and the administrative regulation 107. With regards to the functioning of this advisory council, there has been a direct correlation between what is written on paper and the implementation of the policy and regulation.

ACCJC Function Map

As stated in the 2006 progress visit report, the team met with several new college and district executive administrators, who were hired after the October 2005 progress report team visit. As noted by the visiting team, the college leaders expressed optimism for their continued efforts to make progress as a team. One of the newest district executive administrators, who has greatly enhanced the communication structure within the district, is the vice chancellor of technology and learning services. For example, on April 23, 2007, district and college leaders met to discuss the South Orange County Community College function map with respect to the accreditation standards.[19] The participants reviewed each component of all accreditation standards and agreed upon which party has primary responsibility (P), secondary responsibility (S), and which components required shared responsibility (SH).[20] Primary responsibility indicates leadership and oversight of

a given function, secondary responsibility indicates support of a given function which may include input and liaisons to assist with successful integration, and shared responsibility indicates that the district and the college are equally responsible for the leadership and oversight of a given function. All parties reached agreement as to which entity, the college or district, has primary responsibility, secondary responsibility, or the responsibility is shared. This was a valuable exercise which assisted all parties in understanding who the responsible party is for making decisions and how those decisions are or will be made.

Strategies for Effective Board Meetings

Upon the recommendation of the chancellor, January 16, 2007, the board adopted strategies for enhancement of effectiveness board agendas and meetings.[21] During the deliberations concerning this topic, numerous issues were raised regarding communication with the board, which items must be board approved, which items will be sent to the board for information as well as jointly submitting similar college items to the board. These discussions helped to clarify the role of the board.

The strategies adopted by the board include the following: starting the public session of the meetings in a timely manner; submitting requests for board reports in writing to the chancellor prior to the board meeting; encouraging board members to refrain from pulling items from the consent calendar absent a compelling reason; encouraging all shared governance groups to submit written reports; authorizing the chancellor to approve individual business contracts up to a maximum of $100,000 dollars; encouraging trustees to contact the chancellor with questions prior to the board meeting; and in consultation with legal counsel, decreasing the number of board agenda items as well as the volume of exhibits.[21]

The strategies for effective board meetings have been implemented. The meetings have been ending at a more reasonable hour due to the decrease in amount of items sent to the board and the meetings are running more efficiently.

November 30, 2006, Progress Visit Report: Significant Progress at the College

In the November 30, 2006, progress visit report, the team concluded that:
The college has made significant progress in addressing recommendation 8. The faculty view their working relationships with college administration as progressing in a positive direction.

From the administrative perspective

The administration views their working relationship with the faculty and classified staff as very collegial and productive. The renewed trust and cooperation among all governance groups is particularly evident in the strategic planning process which was adopted and initiated in 2006. This planning process demonstrates the in-depth, focused and a very constructive dialogue that has emerged over these past two years. Because of the nature of the relationship between administration, faculty and staff, there has been a significant increase in the breadth and quality of work produced by the college community as a whole. Importantly, the chancellor has formally recognized the

collegiality and the productiveness of the institution by presenting the president of the college with the *Administrator of the Year* award.

From the perspective of the academic senate:
Based on the April 5, 2007, discussion of the academic senate, the senate agreed that, while the college climate has improved and some relations with district personnel are excellent, there are still instances of lack of collegiality and lack of cooperation with certain district administrators.[22] (see recommendation 6, reference 5, Item 8) At the April 23, 2007, special meeting of the board of trustees, the senate president reported that the relationship between the senate and the college president as well as the vice presidents has continued to improve, citing evidence of the successful implementation of the strategic plan, the continued efforts to develop and assess student learning outcomes, the revision of the program review process and the integration of program review with the college budget process.[23] (see recommendation 6, reference 4)

The college administration and faculty leadership remain committed to keeping the lines of communication open. The college president and the vice president of instruction continue to meet weekly or bimonthly with the classified senate president and the academic senate president. In addition, the administration and the senate president regularly communicate via email and cell phone in between the biweekly face to face meetings. The vice president of instruction continues to attend the meetings of the academic senate and, there has been at least one dean in attendance at every senate meeting for 2006-2007. The academic senate continues to attend all meetings of the instructional (administrative) council to ensure adequate communication between the faculty and the administration.

During flex week of fall 2007, the college president recognized the academic senate president with the *Administrative Award of Excellence*. In presenting the award, the president spoke of the academic senate president's dedication and expertise with regard to the accreditation midterm report and the strategic plan and commended her for her efforts to bridge differences and bring the campus community together. The public acknowledgement was met with campus wide excitement and endorsement.

From the perspective of the classified staff
The classified unit has appreciated more inclusion and representation within the strategic planning process and other important decision making bodies within the college and district. New classified positions are being created and advertised within an inclusive collegial process.

Staff development funding allowed several members appropriate training for their areas that otherwise would have been denied. This crucial training allows a stronger service to our students as well as a feeling of value within the individual and a stronger sense of the college community. The full and half day staff development events truly enhance the sense of the college community while providing a different perspective of our careers.

In the November 30, 2006, progress visit report, the team concluded that:

There have also been district efforts to find ways to bring all groups together, however, communications between faculty leaders and the chancellor, and the board minutes reveal ongoing disagreements and power struggles. While some progress has been made in addressing recommendation 8, there continues to be much work to be done by the board of trustees, the chancellor and members of the college community to improve the climate of the district as a whole.

From the perspective of the administration

The administration has noticed improved relationships with the chancellor, the board of trustees and all governance groups. To encourage this progress, the college administration is highlighting the efforts of each governance group in building the campus community. The strategic planning process is an excellent example of a living document that interconnects all sectors of the college. By explaining the success of this mechanism to the chancellor and the board of trustees, the respective duties and responsibilities of each governance group is better understood and appreciated. They are realizing that we have a hard working faculty and classified staff that remains focused on open dialog, quality, high standards, and continued improvement.

From the perspective of the academic senate

Based on the April 5, 2007, discussion of the academic senate, the senate agrees with the commission and the college administration that communications between faculty leaders and the chancellor reveal ongoing disagreements and power struggles.[22]

At the May 3, 2007, meeting of the academic senate, it was reported that at the April 23, 2007, special meeting of the board of trustees to address the accreditation recommendations, the comments were very positive and full of praise for faculty-administrative collegiality at the college as well as with some district administrators. Three were two exceptions.[24] First, two board members called into question the procedures of the accrediting commission relative to closed meetings as well as trustee involvement on the commission.[24] Second, the chancellor publicly criticized both senate presidents for raising the issue of compensation for senate officer and criticized the senate presidents for engaging in discussions with individual board members.[24] The senate expressed disappointment that in a meeting to address "fixing a bad environment, the chancellor would choose to go on the offensive".[24] The academic senate noted that some members of the board of trustees continue to display what appears to be an unfairly biased and negative view of the faculty, which is not helpful to improving the climate.[22]

At the April 23, 2007, special meeting of the board of trustees, the senate president reported that relations with the deputy chancellor and the vice chancellor of technology and learning services have been excellent, citing examples of the continued progress of the district board policy and administrative regulation advisory council and the integration of the district planning process with the college strategic planning process as well as the collaboration between the college and the district relative to developing an institutional effectiveness report, and the district support of the college distance education efforts.[23]

From the perspective of the classified senate

The classified senate feels that their relationship with the chancellor and the board of trustees has certainly improved. There seems to be an effort to communicate better with classified employees and an increasing effort to invite their input. The classified senate would be less than candid if they did not report a sense that the best behavior seems to be in place during times of increased exposure. This does not lessen the importance of better communications but is still a factor when discussing the issue of trust.

Conclusion

Discussions and deliberations at the college level concerning strategic planning, student learning outcomes, and program review as well as many other projects are progressing at a reasonable pace with the cooperation and collaboration of the college administration, the faculty, and the classified staff.[25] Collaboration between the college and the district is increasing because of the expertise and leadership of the deputy chancellor and the vice chancellor of technology and learning services. These two district administrators have worked with the college governance groups and college leadership to develop and implement board policies and administrative regulations, integrate the district planning process with the college strategic planning process, facilitate the MIS reporting system, develop the new student information system, and secure appropriate technology to implement and assess student learning outcomes as well as college distance education initiatives. Through their combined efforts, there is now a solid working relationship between the college constituencies and some district administrators.

Board of Trustees and Chancellor Response to Recommendation 8

At the August board of trustees meeting, the chancellor and the board of trustees provided a copy of their response to recommendation 8. On September 12, a final draft of the chancellor and board response was provided to the college with the directive that the document be included in its entirety. The chancellor and board response is included below.

> District/Board of Trustees Response: Improvements in the institutional climate at the district and college levels have been observed. The chancellor has initiated meetings with college employees. Avenues of communication between constituent groups and the district administration include monthly chancellor's cabinet and docket meetings. The district administration collaborates with the college shared governance groups.
>
> The November 2006 accreditation visiting team report overstated alleged instances of behavior by individual trustees, such as publicly criticizing employees. The report fails to put that criticism in context. Trustees respond at public board meetings--to take the examples discussed by the visiting team--only when there have been long-standing problems that go unaddressed or to respond to false, misleading, or erroneous misstatements made by employees to the public. This is well within the proper role of the trustees. They owe the public an honest

presentation of the facts and they cannot address employee behavior problems in secret without facing the micromanagement charge.

The report also neglects to mention negative, disrespectful and unprofessional faculty behavior off camera. At the March, 2006 board meeting, faculty leadership left during the chancellor's comments, and during many meetings faculty leadership talk out loud to each other when trustees and the chancellor are speaking on board agenda items. In addition, faculty leaders routinely talk out loud to each other during the chancellor's docket and cabinet meetings when other committee members are speaking. In the past, some faculty leaders have filed complaints with the State Chancellor's Office and have gone to the media, instead of working with the chancellor and the board of trustees with the intention to seek resolution of issues in positive, constructive and professional ways.

There are many examples of efforts by the board and chancellor to reinforce a positive environment, some of which are listed below:

- At most board meetings, the board presents formal resolutions to recognize students, faculty, staff and community members as reported in the attached board highlights.[26]
- At almost every board meeting, individual trustees and the chancellor give oral reports and mention the accomplishments of faculty and staff, and thank them for their hard work.
- An electronic board meeting update, sent to all employees the day after board meetings, displays photos and text about such recognitions.[26]
- Since July 23, 2007, board meetings are available for viewing on demand on the district website (http://socccd.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2). Employees and the public can view board meetings in their entirety, or easily go to discussion of a specific agenda item. The full agendas and minutes are also readily available.
- Trustees regularly attend college events to demonstrate their support.
- Board discussion forums, open to all employees, were held to get input from constituent groups on March 30, 2007 and September 11, 2007.
- A public meeting, facilitated by the board president, was held on April 23, 2007 during which progress on accreditation teams' recommendations was the sole topic of discussion between the board and all constituent groups.
- The chancellor initiated manager and administrator of the year awards in 2006, which involved soliciting nominations from all employees. Annual recognition continues for outstanding faculty members and classified staff.
- Faculty presentations are being included in board meetings, most recently on the topics of distance education (March 26, 2007) and curriculum development (April 23, 2007). More are planned in the coming months. These presentations were well received by the board.
- The chancellor's opening session during flex-week each semester provides employee recognition opportunities and features well-known speakers, entertainment and refreshments for all faculty and staff.

There was broad participation in establishing the 2007-08 district wide mission, vision and goals through a series of meetings which were well attended by all constituent groups. Two work sessions (February 27, 2007 and April 18, 2007) were dedicated to discussion and clarification that the district wide goals were to serve as a broad planning framework for the colleges and district services. Together we developed a vision, mission and goals (which received board approval on June 25, 2007) that were broad in nature and complement college planning efforts.

The college's Midterm Report in August 2007 continues to refer to the 2005-06 planning process while also acknowledging the positive progress made with the 2007-08 process. The Report states that the mission statement and goals developed in 2005-06 were not related to student learning and were interfering with the implementation of the college's strategic plan. Months of valuable time from the college's planning were lost because faculty leadership instead spent time in meetings complaining about the process. They refused to accept the chancellor's invitation to work collegially so that the district goals could be better integrated within those being established individually by the colleges. The final result is that, with the input from faculty, staff, administrators, the chancellor's cabinet, and the chancellor's executive council, the process was revised and positively resulted in the adopted, inclusive approach for 2007-08.

The chancellor is perceived to engage in micromanagement and inappropriate involvement in day-to-day operations of the colleges. Further, faculty members at IVC suggested that the chancellor should "cease taking punitive measures against administrators and faculty who express contrary views to his." The chancellor has not taken any punitive measures against administrators and faculty. The lack of examples to support this statement should demonstrate the chancellor's point that it is not happening. The board of trustees expects from the chancellor that, overall, the district is managed well in all aspects, including financial matters and in the area of faculty and staff accountability. It should be acknowledged that the chancellor, college presidents and district executives work collaboratively and as a team to provide leadership within the district.

In the college's Midterm Report in August 2007 the academic senate president is attributed to have said at a special board meeting that the lack of collegiality and cooperation on the part of college and district administrators does not appear to stem from willful obstructionism, but instead from a lack of understanding of good management practices. This reiteration in the Report of one person's opinion, who has had no administrative-management experience or administrative leadership training, is questionable.

The IVC accreditation visiting team "observed a high degree of stress and anxiety among college administrators, and learned that in the current academic year, two college administrators have been placed on administrative leave." These two

issues are not connected. The visiting team made no inquiries about the circumstances of the leaves which were long-term personnel matters that the district and college administration were compelled to address. Reporting perceptions, rather than facts and evidence, perpetuates the negative environment that the team is making an effort to illuminate and does not allow for a well-rounded, balanced and comprehensive view of the college.

Although there is an inclusive review process, the college Self-Study and Progress Reports are authored primarily by an academic senate-appointed faculty member, who is leading the charge in airing criticisms and gripes about past decisions in a judgmental fashion. Unfortunately some of this negativity has been echoed in the visiting team reports. Is it the purpose of the Accrediting Commission and its Standards to allow airing of perceived faults, to rebuke and to hold accountable the trustees and district administration? Publicly elected trustees delegate responsibility to the chancellor, and one of their roles together is to hold faculty, administrators and staff accountable. The use of the accreditation process to reverse this role leads to confusion and lack of collegiality. It is our understanding that the accreditation process is designed to strengthen dialog in a positive and professional educational environment and improve processes to enhance student learning and success.

The board of trustees and district administration remain committed to making progress in the areas detailed by the visiting teams. It is in everyone's best interest to work collaboratively, based on mutual trust and respect, to fulfill our vision to create an environment of excellence that best serves our students and the community.

References: Recommendation 8

8[1] Chancellor's Memo: February 27, 2007 District-wide Planning Session (2-20-07)
8[2] Vice Chancellor Memo: Soliciting Governance Group Input (1-4-07)
8[3] IVC Strategic Planning Steering Team & Academic Senate Proposed District-wide Goals (2-20-07)
8[4] District-wide Planning Work Session Agenda (2-27-07)
8[5] Review of All Proposed District-wide Goals (2-27-07)
8[6] Revised District-wide Goals (3-7-07)
8[7] Academic Senate Agenda: Review District-wide Goals (3-22-07)
8[8] See Recommendation 6, Reference 5, Item 6 (4-5-07)
8[9] President's Council Agenda: Review District-wide Goals (4-11-7)
College President Memo: IVC's Proposed Revisions to District-Wide Goals (4-12-07)
8[10] Chancellor Memo: Announcing April 18th Planning Meeting (4-11-07)
8[11] Suggested Revisions: Mission/Vision Statements/District-wide Goals (4-18-07)
8[12] Final Draft: Proposed Mission/Vision Statements/District-wide Goals (4-23-07)

8[13] See Recommendation 6, Reference 11 (5-21-07)
8[14] Board Meeting Highlights (6-25-07)
8[15] Academic Senate Memo: College-wide Accreditation Dialogue Meetings (2-9-07)
8[16] ACCJC Action Letter and Evaluation Report (6-19-98)
8[17] Proposed and Approved Chair Compensation (4-20-05)
8[18] List of Approved Board Policies and Administrative Regulations (7-07)
8[19] Memo: District Function Map Meeting (4-27-07)
8[20] SOCCCD Function Map (5-17-07)
8[21] Strategies for Enhancement of Effectiveness of Board Agendas and Meetings (1-16-07)
8[22] See Recommendation 6, Reference 5, Item 8 (Academic Senate Minutes) (4-5-07)
8[23] See Recommendation 6, Reference 4, (Special Board Meeting Notes 4-23-07)
8[24] Academic Senate Minutes, Item D (5-3-07)
8[25] 2006-2007 Accomplishments
8[26] Board Meeting Highlights May 21, 2007

IV. RESPONSES TO SELF-IDENTIFIED ISSUES: 2004 SELF STUDY

The following section of the focused midterm report describes the college's response to the planning agendas based on the 2004 self study as well as identifying timelines for completion and identifying the responsible parties as required by commission policy. Each planning agenda is correlated with the corresponding accreditation standard. With the increased focus on college-wide dialogue and institutional integrity, the college found that not all planning agendas included in the 2004 self study were relevant and given the results of the strategic planning process. In some cases, the college collegially decided that some planning agendas would not be completed or would be modified. This section of the report will address the progress on the 2004 self study planning agendas as well as the 2004 self study planning agendas which have been modified and provide an explanation for the modifications.

Additionally, based on the college's progress relative to the extensive recommendations in the 2005 and 2006 progress reports, additional planning agendas were added as the college has refocused its commitment to strategic planning, institutional effectiveness, evaluation, and improvement. Additional planning agendas are correlated with the corresponding accreditation standard.

A. STANDARD I: INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND EFFECTIVENESS

1. 2004 Self-Study Planning Agendas: IVC will revise the college mission statement to reflect the specific student populations served by the college; the revised mission statement will be presented to the board for review; student learning programs and services will be presented to the board annually; the college will highlight the mission statement in its council and governance meetings by including the statement in its documents and by setting up a regular review process. (Standard I. A. 1, 2, 3, 4)

Progress Status: As documented in the 2004 self study, the college mission statement was reviewed and revised on February 24, 2004. The mission statement was reviewed again in spring of 2006 and adopted by the president's council on May 24, 2006.[1] As part of the 2006 review, the mission statement identifies the intended student populations served by the college in the following statements: "The College serves students seeking to transfer, enhance career skills, obtain a degree or certificate, or improve basic skills. The College also provides student support services, community education, opportunities for lifelong learning, cultural experiences, and activities promoting economic partnerships with the community. The central purpose of these programs is the education of students to think critically and act responsibly within the global community."[2]

The college mission statement was reviewed and approved by the board on July 23, 2007.[3]

Although the 2004 self study planning agenda cited above states that "student learning programs and services" would be submitted to the board annually, it is not clear what the college intended by this statement. However, pursuant to board policy 6100, curriculum is regularly submitted to the board for approval after a rigorous internal college review and approval process.[4] The policy stipulates that curriculum which has not been revised in a timely manner pursuant to the internal college review cycle as well as within the specified time limits as prescribed by the articulation agreements will not be offered by the college.[4] Additionally, as documented in the 2005 progress report, the college has adopted policies and procedures for program discontinuance and program/course realignment.(see 2005 progress report, page 4, reference 3) As stated in the 2005 progress report, in the fall of 2005, the college was reviewing a new program development policy which was adopted on April 12, 2006.[5] Combined with the revised program review process (discussed in the response to recommendation 3), the program discontinuance policy, the program/course realignment policy, and the new program development policy, the college's programmatic review process has been completed and all modifications that require board approval are forwarded as appropriate.

The college has highlighted the mission statement in council and governance meetings in the following manner: As documented in the response to recommendation 1, with the implementation of the college strategic planning process in the fall of 2006, the mission statement was reviewed again on October 13, 2006 by the strategic planning steering team in order to develop the college goals. The college mission statement provided the framework for the development of the college goals and formed the basis for the entire strategic planning process. For example, based on the aforementioned portions of the mission statement which identifies the intended student population, the strategic planning steering team developed the corresponding college goal "[T]o focus college processes on the central purpose of providing programs and services which educates students to think critically, prepare for career choices and academic pursuits, and act responsibly within a global community."[6]

The nexus between the mission statement and college goals subsequently influenced the development of the objectives, planning assumptions, and planning strategies. For example, the college mission statement further states that "[A]s an educational institution within the South Orange County Community College District, the college provides a board range of programs courses. Student learning outcomes and student success are the measure of quality for all offerings".[6] A corresponding planning assumption developed by the student success/access strategic planning focus group provides "[S]tudent learning outcomes and quantifiable measures of success for programs and students will become increasingly vital. Demonstration of this success will be a requirement for the state and will be a valuable marketing and recruiting tool for the college."[6] By using the college mission statement as the foundation of the strategic planning process, the mission statement has become a more integral component of the college community influencing all segments of the college.

On September 13, 2007, the college developed and adopted a regular systematic process for reviewing the mission statement and the college goals on an annual basis. According to the review process the strategic planning budget development committee will be the responsible party for disseminating the college mission statement and college goals to all constituent groups as well as the five strategic planning committees for annual review and revision in the spring of each academic year in order to facilitate planning for the next year.[7]

2. <u>2004 Self-Study Planning Agendas:</u> Ensure the institution is aware of the goals and objectives of the college and work collaboratively toward achieving the college goals; use the results of the program review recommendations (the student survey in particular) to improve student opportunities for learning. (Standard I. B. 1, 2, 4)

<u>Progress Status:</u> The broad-based and inclusive nature of the strategic planning process which is based on the college goals has created the opportunity for the college community to become more aware of the goals of the college. As documented in the response to recommendation 1, during the January 2007, flex week, two college-wide workshops were held on January 2, 2007, and January 4, 2007, to address the planning process and the development of the college goals(see recommendation 1, reference #21). Also, as documented in the statement on report preparation, two college-wide meetings were held on February 7, 2007, and February 8, 2007, to discuss the strategic planning process and the college goals (see statement on report preparation, reference #5). The college goals are featured on the college website.[8] Thus, the college is making every reasonable effort to ensure broad participation in the development and awareness of the college goals.

<u>Time to Completion and Responsible Parties</u>

Regarding the 2004 planning agenda which states that the institution will work together collaboratively to achieve the college goals: Since the college developed a strategic plan in spring of 2007, there has not been sufficient opportunity for the institution to assess whether the goals have been achieved or to what extent. This assessment will become on on-going component of the planning process and will begin in the spring of 2008 and/or fall of 2009. The responsible parties for ensuring that this assessment is completed on a regular basis will be the office of the president in consultation with the office of research and planning.

Although the 2004 self study planning agenda stated that the college would use the program review recommendations as the method for identifying priorities for improvement, the program review recommendations became one component of the overall college strategic planning process as documented in the response to recommendation 1. Therefore, the program review recommendations were used to identify programmatic priorities for improvement within the overall strategic planning process.

3. **<u>Additional Planning Agendas In Progress:</u> The institution provides evidence that the planning process is broad-based offers opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness; the institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies. (Standard I. B. 4, 5)**

<u>Progress Status:</u> Although the 2004 self study did not identify planning agendas for standard I. B. 4 and 5, other than streamlining the committee structure, which falls short of addressing the components of this standard, the college began addressing the specific aspects of this standard with the implementation of a broad based strategic planning model that created the opportunity for input by the appropriate constituencies as documented in the response to recommendation 1. The college is presently addressing the allocation of necessary resources that leads to institutional effectiveness in the following manner:

At the October 4, 2006, strategic planning kick off meeting, the vice chancellor of technology and learning services presented an overview of institutional effectiveness concepts and measures.[9] The vice chancellor reviewed the definitions of institutional effectiveness as well as the relationship with accrediting commission standards and presented the accountability reporting for the community colleges pursuant to state performance reporting requirements, specifically assembly bill 1417.[10]
As part of the ongoing dialogue regarding institutional effectiveness, on October 12, 2006, the academic senate reviewed and discussed the list of required as well as optional performance indicators.[11]

The strategic planning process specifically included an institutional effectiveness focus group in order to begin the assessment process regarding the achievement of the college goals and the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing, systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, and implementation. On October 20, 2006, the research and planning analyst provided the college with the institutional effectiveness quantitative data for this process.[12] The data included evidence of student learning from 2000-2006 as follows:

- the total and percentage of overall headcount of students on academic probation;
- overall course completion rates by academic school;
- course completion rates in math and English transfer courses;
- course completion rates in math and English basic skills courses;
- cumulative GPA of full-time students;
- persistence rates;
- number of degrees and certificates awarded;
- number of annual transfers to the UC and CSU's;
- Number of students with transfer goal and number who transferred.[13]

The data also included quantitative evidence of student outreach, technology data as well as student success rates, retention rates, and fill rates from spring 2000-2006 for the college and by each academic school.[12]

On February 7, 2007, and February 8, 2007, during the college-wide accreditation dialogues, the research/planning analyst and the vice chancellor of technology and learning services presented the relationship between institutional effectiveness and strategic planning.[13] During the development of the strategic plan, institutional effectiveness measures serve as the baseline data for determining the status quo. Once the baseline data has been identified, the institutional effectiveness measures assist the college in assessing progress toward achievement of the stated goals as well as identify areas that may need improvement. Baseline college level data was presented in the following areas:

- annual successful course completion Rates for credit basic skills courses from 2003 through 2006;[13], page 9
- basic skills improvement rates from 2001 through 2006;[13], page 9
- course completion rates in English basic skills courses from fall 2001 through fall 2005;[13], page 10
- course completion rates in English level transfer courses from fall 2001 through fall 2005;[13], page 11
- course completion rates in Math basic skills courses from fall 2001 through fall 2005;[13], page 12
- course completion rates in Math transfer level courses from fall 2001 through fall 2005;[13], page 13
- full-time equivalent students (FTES) in basic skills, vocational, and non-vocational courses from 2002 through 2006;[13], page 14
- full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF—15 lecture hour equivalent as 1 FTEF) in basic skills, vocational, and non-vocational courses from 2002 through 2006;[13], page 15

The institutional effectiveness strategic planning focus group identified the production of an annual report on institutional effectiveness as a planning assumption and objective.[14] The focus group identified the college president, the academic senate, and the office of research and planning as the responsible parties to determine the key indicators to be included in the annual report.[14] To this end, on February 15, 2007, the academic senate cabinet, the college president, and the research/planning analyst agreed upon the institutional effectiveness measures to be included in the annual report for October 2007.[15], [16]

4. **<u>Additional Planning Agendas In Progress:</u> The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts; the institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning services. (Standard I. B. 6, 7)**

<u>Progress Status:</u> Although the 2004 self study did not identify any planning agendas in response to standard I. B. 6 and 7, subsequently, the college has more fully addressed the components of this standard. In July/August of 2007, at the conclusion of the first phase of the implementation of the strategic plan, the college systematically reviewed all parts of the cycle, including institutional research efforts. First, this review resulted in major revisions to the college governance committee structure.[17] The numerous college governance committees were consolidated within the five strategic planning focus groups as follows: academic, facilities, and technology planning committee; institutional effectiveness committee; student success/access committee; strategic planning budget development committee; and the enrollment management committee. The primary charge of each of the five college committees is to implement the college strategic planning strategies.[17] The strategic planning budget development committee will review all budgetary considerations within the parameters of the strategic planning strategies. Each committee will report to the strategic planning budget development committee as to the progress in meeting the strategic planning strategies. Consequently, strategic planning is an integrated and ongoing process at the college.

Second, in the spring of 2008, the strategic planning budget development committee will review and assess the college progress relative to meeting the strategic planning strategies for 2007-2008. Based upon the review, modifications will be incorporated within the college strategic plan. Pursuant to the adopted strategic planning process, a report summarizing the college's efforts in meeting the strategic planning strategies will be produced each year beginning in 2007-2008. Therefore, in 2010, the time of the next accreditation self study, the college will have three years of strategic planning data to provide to the commission.

References: Standard I

1[1] President's Council Minutes: Review, Revision, & Adoption of the College Mission Statement (5 or 6-06)
1[2] Revised College Mission and Vision Statement (5 or 6-06)
1[3] College Mission Statement: Board Approval (July 23,2007)
1[4] Board Policy 6100: Curriculum Approval
1[5] New Program Development Policy (4-12-06)
1[6] College Goals: Nexus with the Mission Statement (1-2-07)
1[7] College Process: Review/Revision of the College Mission Statement (9-13-07)
1[8] www.ivc.edu/offices
1[9] Vice Chancellor of Technology & Learning Services: Overview of Institutional Effectiveness (10-4-06)
1[10] Vice Chancellor of Technology & Learning Services: Accountability Reporting (10-4-06)
1[11] Academic Senate Minutes Item 17:Review Institutional Effectiveness (10-26-06)
1[12] Institutional Effectiveness Data: IVC 2000-2006 (10-20-06)
1[13] Institutional Effectiveness at IVC (2-7/8-07)
1[14] Institutional Effectiveness Focus Group Planning Assumption (2-14-07)
1[15] Academic Senate Memo: Institutional Effectiveness Key Indicators (2-9-07)
1[16] Office of Research/Planning, Office of President: Institutional Effectiveness Key Indicators (2-15-07)
1[17] College Strategic Planning and Governance Committees (8-30-07)

B. STANDARD II: STUDENT LEARNING PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

1. 2004 Self Study Planning Agendas: Each school will identify student learning goals/competencies (i.e. outcomes) for courses, programs, degrees, and certificates; the college, which is in the initial stages of developing research methodologies to assess student learning outcomes, will continue this effort; the college will incorporate the definition of specific and measurable student learning outcomes in the curriculum development process at the course and program levels; the college will develop a process to assess the achievement of learning outcomes/competencies for programs in order to award certificates, degrees, and majors; the college will improve the dissemination of data available to delineate the achievement of learning outcomes (Standard II. A. 1. a, c; 2. a, b, f, h, i) (Note: All 2004 self study planning agendas related to the development and assessment of student learning outcomes will be addressed in the discussion below and are addressed in the college responses to recommendations 2, 3, and 4.)

Progress Status: The college addressed the 2004 self study planning agendas related to the development of a process for the identification and assessment of student learning outcomes in the following manner: First, as previously mentioned in the response to recommendation 3, the program review templates for instruction and student support services were modified to include the development and assessment of course and program/certificate learning outcomes. (Although the former program review process described in the 2004 self study did include a learning outcomes component, the revisions to the 2006 templates focus on the identification of assessment plans and modifications to pedagogy based on analysis of the assessment data.) Second, within the curriculum development process, the college modified the course outline of record templates to include course learning outcomes. The revisions to the program review process and the curriculum process will be addressed respectively below.

Modification of Program Review: Student Learning Outcomes and Analysis of Assessment Data to Implement Changes to Pedagogy to Improve Student Learning

The college recognizes a nexus between the evaluation of the effectiveness of a program and the development and assessment of learning outcomes. A program should be focused on student learning, and the assessment of course, program, degree, and/or certificate learning outcomes is a fundamental component of reviewing the effectiveness of a program. Consequently, in February and March of 2006, the learning outcomes committee, the academic senate, and the instructional council agreed to modify the program review process to focus on student learning outcomes and the assessment of student learning through indirect as well as direct assessment methodologies.[1, 2, 3]

In August of 2006, as a fundamental component of program review, the college adopted a four column matrix to assist faculty in developing and assessing learning outcomes.[4, page 6] The first column of the matrix directs faculty to identify course and/or program level

student learning outcomes for key courses.[4, page 6] The second column of the matrix assists faculty in identifying assessment methodologies for each outcome as well as the date of assessment completion.[4, page 6] The third column includes the assessment results, main findings, date, and author(s).[4, page 6] The fourth column assists faculty in documenting how instruction and student support services will be modified based upon the assessment results.[4, page 6]

In 2006-2007, the following programs undergoing review developed learning outcomes and assessment plans at the course and/or program level.[5]

- Anthropology
- Dance
- Electronics
- *Library Services
- *Transfer/Career Placement
- *Counseling Services
- Art History
- Visual Arts
    - Photography
    - Digital media art
    - Painting, Drawing
    - Gallery
    - 2D/3D design
- Music
- Geography

(*Library services, transfer/career placement, and counseling services student learning outcomes matrixes are discussed separately below within the analysis of student support services, see reference number 38.)

Based on the 2007-2012 program review cycle adopted by the college (see recommendation 3, reference 3, the following programs within instruction as well as student services will be developing and assessing learning outcomes at the course and/or program/certificate level in 2007-2008:

- Biology
- Chemistry
- History
- Intercollegiate Athletics
- Mathematics*
- Computer Information Management
- Psychology*
- Speech
- International Student Center
- Supportive Services

- Financial Aid and Veteran's Program

*The faculty in the departments of mathematics and psychology have been leaders at the college in establishing and assessing learning outcomes as well as modifying instruction based on the assessment results.[6]

The learning outcomes co-chairs began meeting with members of the aforementioned programs in March of 2007 in order to assist the faculty in the development and assessment of learning outcomes.[7]

Modification of the Course Outlines of Record: Student Learning Outcomes

In February and March of 2007, the learning outcomes committee and the curriculum committee, in collaboration with the academic senate, discussed the incorporation of course learning outcomes within the development of curriculum and the course outlines of record.[8] (page 10, 12), [9],[10] On February 15, 2007, the academic senate unanimously approved a motion to modify the IVC course outline of record template to include learning outcomes.[10] (Item 18)

On March 2, 2007, in a joint meeting with the learning outcomes co-chairs, the chair of the curriculum committee, the academic senate president and vice president, the officers agreed upon a strategy to implement the decision to include learning outcomes in the course outlines of record.[11] As instructional programs undergo curriculum review in 2007-2008, the course outline of record template will be expanded to include learning outcomes as well as learning objectives in accordance with the direction of the academic senate and the results of the 2007 curriculum review by the office of research and planning.[11] In order to assure the development of high quality and meaningful learning outcomes, the model suggested by the learning outcomes co-chairs was reviewed by the academic senate.[12], [13]

Commensurate with the aforementioned decisions, in June of 2007, the development of course learning outcomes and assessment plans were formally incorporated into the curriculum review process through the implementation of the software management system, curricUNET. [14]

In order to ascertain the current status of learning outcomes development within the curriculum, in March of 2007, the research analyst, in collaboration with the learning outcomes co-chairs, the chair of the curriculum committee, and the academic senate president, systematically reviewed the learning objectives of the course outlines of record for all active courses. In addition, in preparation for the 2006-2007 student learning outcomes annual report required by the accrediting commission, the college engaged in an extensive review to ascertain the status of the development of learning outcomes and assessment plans as well as how many programs and services have assessed learning outcomes, analyzed the data, and modified instruction/practices based on the assessment data within instruction as well as student services. The results for instruction and student services will be discussed respectively below.

Instruction

Based on the review of 492 active courses, 95.0% have identified course level learning outcomes.[15] (page two, table 1) However, with respect to the number of instructional programs which have identified an assessment plan substantially decreases to 12.2%. The number of programs which have assessed learning outcomes also decreases to 3.3% and the number of programs that have analyzed assessment data and modified instruction decreases to 2.7%.[15] (The break down for specific programs that contain course level learning outcomes, assessment plans, data analysis, and modifications is contained in table 2, reference 15, pages 3-4.)[15]

Within instruction, the number of programs which have identified learning outcomes is 21.1 %, the identification of assessment plans is 14.0%, and the number of programs which have assessed, analyzed, and modified the program decreases to 3.5%.[15] (The break down for specific programs that contain program level learning outcomes, assessment plans, data analysis, and modifications is contained in table 2, reference 15, pages 3-4.)[15]

The number of certificate programs which have identified learning outcomes is 24.10%. No certificate program has identified an assessment plan, assessed learning outcomes, analyzed or modified the certificate.[15]

Student Services

The percentage of student services units which have identified learning outcomes is 100%. 92.3% have an assessment plan, however only 15.4 have assessed the learning outcomes and analyzed the data. 7.7% of student services units have modified practices as a result of the assessment data.[15]

Clearly, the college must focus on assessing learning outcomes, analyzing the assessment data and modifying instruction/practices based on the data.

Time to Completion and Responsible Parties

As documented above, the college must focus on the assessment of student learning outcomes. The adoption of the curricUNET and eLumen software may greatly facilitate this process.

In order to increase assessment of course/program learning outcomes, in the fall of 2007, the college agreed upon the following targets:

1) The college will increase the number of departments that assess course, program, and certificate student learning outcomes by 30% by 2010;

2) The college will increase the number of departments that analyze course, program, and certificate learning outcome data by 30% by 2010; and

3) And, the college will increase the number of departments that have modified pedagogy based on course, program, and/or certificate learning outcomes by 30% by 2010.

The responsible parties for ensuring implementation of the college-wide learning outcomes assessment plans will be the vice president of instruction, the vice president of student services, and the academic senate.

2. **2004 Self-Study Planning Agendas: IVC will continue to work toward expanding distance education through the development of online curriculum; the college will also attempt to reestablish the telecourse and live interactive modes of instruction based on available funding; IVC will implement a two-year program plan developed in spring 2003 to address breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing and time for completion for all programs; Irvine Valley College will implement the new two-year program plan developed in the spring 2003 across the curriculum, so that all courses in a state-approved program will be offered once in two years…all stand alone courses will be offered once every year. (Standard II. A. 1. b; A. 2. c, d)**

Progress Status: The college progress relative to expanding the distance education curriculum and the development of a two-year program plan to address breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, and time for completion for all programs will be discussed respectively below.

Distance Education: Institutional Context and Commitment

The delivery of courses through electronic means is consistent with the college role and mission. The college mission statement, in pertinent part, provides:

> To best serve the needs of the diverse population and workforce, the college delivers its curriculum in a variety of traditional and distance learning methods. In this era of rapid change, the college commits itself to being at the forefront of instructional and administrative technologies while providing exemplary services to ensure student success. (See recommendation 1, references 17 and 18.)

Further, the delivery of courses through electronic means is consistent with the districtwide goals. The first districtwide goal is to:

> Promote and support enrollment growth to meet student demand through new programs, distance education, workforce development, and alternative instructional delivery modes. (See recommendation 8, reference 12)

In accordance with the college mission statement, the districtwide goal, and 2004 self-study planning agenda relative to distance education, the college, in collaboration with the vice chancellor of technology and learning services, explored distance education options during the summer and fall of 2006. On May 17, 2006, the chancellor formed the

district distance education advisory council, with representation from all constituent groups, to examine the status of distance education at the colleges and clarify the role of the district in providing support to the colleges in this endeavor.[16] The council met on May 25, 2006, June 8, 2006, June 22, 2006, September 1, 2006, September 19, 2006, and October 9, 2006.[17] The council examined baseline information regarding distance education course offerings at the colleges; a review of the state system office information on distance education; members of the colleges and the district conducted a site visit to Rio Salado College; the council conducted an extensive review of distance education best practices; the vice chancellor interviewed administrators and faculty from Foothill College, San Diego Community College District, and San Joaquin Delta College; and the council reviewed the distance education practices at numerous colleges and universities recognized as leaders in this area.[17]

Commensurate with the commission guidelines as defined in the ACCJC distance learning manual of 2006, the distance education advisory council established fourteen recommendations to be implemented in three phases over a three year time span from 2006-2009.[17] (page 2-3) In phase 1 (2006-2007), the vice chancellor will work with the college to establish mechanisms to coordinate distance education curriculum, training, support, and infrastructure to assist students and faculty.

In January and February of 2007, the office of the president and the academic senate agreed to reconstitute the college information technology committee as the college technology and distance education committee.[18] (Item 13), [19] In conjunction with the district distance education advisory council, the college committee established a comprehensive distance education policy in compliance with state regulations, best practices, and accreditation standards as defined in the commission distance learning manual of August, 2006.[19], [20] (page 6)

Distance Education Curriculum and Instruction

According to state regulations (which are compatible with commission standards) distance education is a means instruction in which the instructor and student are separated by distance and interact through the assistance of communication technology. (Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Section 55205) Additionally, distance education includes any regularly scheduled course work that replaces otherwise scheduled class ("face") time. The same standards of course quality as are applied to traditional classroom courses shall be applied to distance education and all approved distance education courses shall include regular effective contact between instructor and students. (Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Sections 55207, 55211) Pursuant to state regulations each proposed or existing course, if delivered by distance education, shall be separately reviewed and approved according the certified course approval process. (Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Section 55213)

In order to meet state regulations and commission standards, the college committee revised the distance education curriculum approval forms and the distance education curriculum approval process (the revised forms and revised separate approval process

were incorporated within the implementation of the curricUNET software management system) as follows:

- All distance education courses are separately reviewed and approved by the curriculum committee to ensure the course results in learning outcomes appropriate to the rigor and breadth of the course credit awarded. For example, all distance education courses require faculty to describe activities the students will perform to achieve the stated learning outcomes as provided in the course outline of record.[20] (pages 20-21) (However, the college must establish a regulatory body which has the expertise to review, evaluate, and recommend approval to the curriculum committee of distance education courses.)

- Any course with a distance education component which replaces in class instruction, even if it is less than 100% (synchronous or asynchronous interaction between faculty and students and among students), must state the percentage of distance instruction and classroom instruction and must submit the distance education course proposal form for separate approval.[20] (page 20)

- The separate approval process for courses offered as 100% distance education and/or portions of courses delivered through electronic means ensures that all courses, despite the mode of instruction, are evaluated according to the same principles of academic quality and integrity as the traditional course. Course proposals must include a description of each of the methods of evaluation for each learning objective/outcome as required for the approval of a traditional course.[20] (pages 21-22)

- Distance education course proposals are evaluated according to how the instructor will ensure regular and effective contact between faculty and students as well as student to student contact as required by California regulations, and the type of technology used and whether the technology is appropriate to the nature and objective of the course; [20] (page 20-21)

- The institution ensures that all materials used in distance education courses and programs are current by requiring faculty to complete a "distance education addendum curriculum form" where all instructional resources are specified. The distance education instructional resources are proposed by the faculty author and evaluated by the faculty department chair, school dean, faculty task force chair, the library coordinator, the chair of the technology committee, the faculty chair of the curriculum committee and the vice president of instruction.[20] (page 23)

- The institution ensures that faculty have the responsibility for and exercise oversight of electronically-delivered courses and programs as the faculty are directly responsible for authoring distance education course proposals as required for a traditional course. The curriculum committee, which consists of faculty representative from each school, are responsible for the course approval just as it is responsible for approving a traditional course, although as noted above, the

college must establish a regulatory body which has the expertise to make an informed recommendation.

- At this time, the college does not offer any fully electronic degree or certificate programs. The degree and certificate programs that are partially delivered through electronic means is coherent and complete and results in learning outcomes comparable to the traditional means of instruction as demonstrated in the separate course approval process described above.

Commitment to Support

The institution demonstrates a commitment to ongoing program support, both financial and technical to enable students to complete a degree/certificate. Although the college does not offer any fully online degree or certificate programs at this time, discussions did take place in this regard within the district distance education task force and this became a component of the task force recommendations.

According to the college committee report, there is technical support personnel in all required areas.[20] (page 9) There has been fiscal support for hardware and software technology renewal through the district allocation of basic aid monies. The report notes, however, that there is much work to be completed relative to instructional design, web design, development of audio and video resources, course material development, and faculty training.[20] (page 10)

The college committee has established a distance education webpage to provide support and information for students enrolled in distance education classes.[20] (page 11) Students are also given information as to whether they have the background, knowledge, and technical skills needed to successfully use the technology involved in distance education coursework.[20] (pages 25-31)

Distance Education Expansion

Distance Education course offerings have increased steadily for the past four years. The total number of sections offered annually increased from 79 in 2002-2003 to 137 in 2005-2006. In 2004-2005, at the time of the self-study planning agenda, the college offered 118 distance education courses. In 2005-2006, the college offered 137 distance education courses.[20] (pages 32-33)

Additional Planning

In order to further expand distance education at the college, additional deliberation and institutional commitment will be necessary as follows:

- The college committee has given consideration relative to the technical skill and needs of faculty teaching distance education by establishing a faculty technical skills certification for instructors. However, the college must establish regulatory body to ensure compliance with the policies and procedures. [20] (page 7)

- The college must ensure ongoing fiscal and technological support for the expansion of distance education course offerings as well as for the development of fully online degrees and/or certificates.

Based on college budget constraints and the distance education policy, the reestablishment of telecourse and live interactive modes of instruction is not feasible at this time and will be reexamined in 2008-2009?

Breadth, Depth, Rigor, Sequencing, and Time for Completion for all Programs
Although the 2004 self study planning agendas noted above stated that the college would implement the two-year plan designed in spring of 2003, the college has not formally taken action to address this issue. The faculty in collaboration with the school chairs and deans routinely review course offerings during the production of the fall, spring, and summer schedules to ensure proper sequencing of courses and time for completion of all programs.

The breadth, depth, and rigor of all courses offered by the college are monitored by the academic senate in consultation with the curriculum committee pursuant to board policy 6100 adopted in May of 2006.[21] Board policy 6100 states that courses of instruction and educational programs shall be written by faculty teaching in instruction and educational programs. All curriculum and educational programs are reviewed and approved by the academic senate and forwarded to the board of trustees for approval. If required, all curriculum and educational programs are subsequently forwarded to the California Community College Chancellor's Office for final approval.[21]

3. 2004 Self Study Planning Agendas: The college will define comprehensive general education learning outcomes; the college will consider the possibility of including a computer literacy requirement as part of the graduation requirements. (Standard II. A. 3. a, b, c)

Progress Status: As previously stated in the response to recommendation 2, in the fall of 2005, the college adopted institutional (general education) learning outcomes.[22] As part of the ongoing process of institutional self reflection, in spring of 2007, the instructional council, the academic senate, the learning outcomes committee, and the general education committee reviewed and revised the institutional learning outcomes.[23, 24, 25, 26, 27] The revised institutional learning outcomes are as follows:

• Communicate effectively when speaking, writing, and presenting to a variety of audiences and with a variety of purposes.
• Engage in critical and creative thinking to solve problems, explore alternatives, and make decisions. • Develop comprehensive, rational arguments for ethical positions and describe the implications for the individual and the larger society. • Apply mathematical approaches and computational techniques to solve problems, to manipulate and interpret data, and to disseminate the data, methodology, analysis, and results. • Apply the fundamentals of scientific inquiry to real-life and hypothetical situations. • Use a variety of media, including computer resources, to access, organize, evaluate, synthesize, cite, and communicate that information.
• Demonstrate and observe sensitive and respectful treatment of diverse groups and perspectives. • Demonstrate an awareness of historical and contemporary global issues and events.
• Make use of a variety of critical methods to analyze, interpret, and evaluate works of literary, visual, and performing art. • Identify and recognize opportunities to participate in the creative arts as an artist, performer or observer • Recognize the historic and cultural role of the creative arts in forming human experience.
• Identify and recognize opportunities to address civic and environmental needs. • Promote physical and mental well-being; self-management; maturity; and ethical decision-making. [27]

The adoption of the revised institutional learning outcomes ensure that practices in academic and instructional support programs are intentionally aligned and establish student learning as a focus addressed collaboratively across disciplines, departments, and services.

Based upon the college wide review regarding the status of learning outcomes discussed in section B. 1 above, within instruction, the percentage of general education courses that have mapped their courses to the institutional learning outcomes are as follows:

- communication 26%
- critical thinking 26%
- global awareness 17%
- aesthetic awareness 15%
- personal, professional, civic responsibility 14%[15]

Within student services, the percentage of service units that have mapped the learning outcomes to the institutional learning outcomes are as follows:

- communication 87%
- critical thinking 26%
- global awareness 17%
- aesthetic awareness 15%
- personal, professional, civic responsibility 14%[15]

With the implementation of the curricUNET software, the above percentages should increase by 2010 as every course undergoing curriculum review through 2007-2010 will map course level learning outcomes to the institutional learning outcomes as a component of the curriculum review process.[14]

The institutional learning outcomes are widely publicized and are available on the college website, the academic senate website, the college catalog for 2007-2008 (page 7), the strategic plan (page 13), and the faculty manual (page 11).[28]

In the fall of 2007, the college general education committee will consider including an informational competency requirement as part of an overall review of the college general education package.

4. **<u>2004 Self Study Planning Agendas:</u> Irvine Valley College will include the academic dishonesty policy in publications; IVC will restructure the degree and certificate evaluation process so students are notified in a more timely manner about their status and can make informed decisions on how to proceed with transfer or graduation; the academic freedom statement will be included in the next publication of the catalog; the college will develop ways to provide additional services for its online students; the school of guidance and counseling will complete program review in 2005-2006. (Standard II. A. 7. b) (Standard II. B. 1. 2; B. 2. d; B. 3. a, c)**

<u>Response:</u> The academic honesty/dishonesty policy is contained in administrative regulation 5401 and is part of the regulation entitled student conduct.[29] (pages 4-6) The regulations were revised in April and September of 2006 by the district board policy and administrative regulations advisory council which contains representatives from all constituent groups as well as district and college administrators and directors. Relevant excerpts pertaining to student conduct generally and forms of academic dishonesty (falsification, plagiarism, cheating) and the corresponding disciplinary action (verbal reprimand, written reprimand, suspension, expulsion) were published in the 2006-2007 catalog on pages 28-30.[30] All administrative regulations, including AR 5401 are published on the district website as well as on the college website.

The academic freedom statement referred to in the above 2004 planning agenda is contained in board policy 6120.[31] Board policy 6120 was included in the 2007-2008 catalog on page 71.[32] All board policies are published on the district website as well.

The 2004 planning agendas related to the degree/certificate evaluation process and the additional services for online students are being addressed in a district-wide project to revise all student information systems (SIS).[33] The student tracking system which would include the degree/certificate evaluation process is scheduled to be revised and updated in 2008-2009.[33] The additional services such as online matriculation and assessment processes as well as an online orientation for all students is being addressed as a

component of the registration process in 2007-2008.[33] The responsible parties for the SIS project are the vice chancellor of education and technology services in collaboration with district informational technology staff.

In order to evaluate the counseling program, the school of guidance and counseling participated in program review in 2006-2007 (rather than in 2005-2006 as indicated in the 2004 planning agenda).[34] According to the results of the program review, student development and success are supported through orientations, academic, personal and career counseling as well as numerous workshops (study skills, transfer, career, and resume writing), classroom presentations, individual counseling, drop-in counseling as well as online and telephone counseling appointments, probation workshops, and transfer application reviews. The counselors also assist in high school outreach efforts such as high school counselor's breakfast, high school college workshops, high school senior day, college nights at local high schools, welcome day, campus tours, and host open house events for the community.[34]

5. **2004 Self Study Planning Agendas: IVC will develop tools and procedures to evaluate whether student support services contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes; the school of library services will: invite faculty to earn in-service credit by attending bibliographic workshops geared toward their subject disciplines after approval by the academic senate, suggest library workshops as part of in-service staff development, encourage faculty to use the library workshops as extra-credit for "at risk" students, advertise the library courses and the monthly workshops on the IVC website and through the college television station channel 33; IVC will expand online database contractual obligations to include remote student access via student user name and ID, liaison with disabled student services to ensure that specific resource materials and equipment are section 508 compliant, work with the academic senate to create an acceptable formula for including library faculty in the list of new hires; the college will assign specific student assistants to patrol the library floors and bookshelves on a regular basis, post appropriate signage regarding checkout and return policies for library materials, notify patrons that defacing or stealing library property warrants disciplinary action. (Standard II. B. 4; C. 1. b, c, d; C. 2)**

Response: The planning agendas pertaining to student support services and student learning outcomes as well as the library services planning agendas will be addressed respectively below.

Student Support Services: Student Learning Outcomes

Library services, the transfer/career center, and counseling services identified student learning outcomes and assessment methodologies as a component of their program review.[35] Other support services such as financial aid, student discipline, outreach & community relations, the office of the vice president for student services, student affairs,

and the child development center identified student learning outcomes for each of their respective areas, identified assessment methodologies, assessed the learning outcomes, and modified services based on the assessment results.[36]

Library Services: 2004 Planning Agendas

The school of library services prepared a summary to address all aforementioned planning agendas.[37] The progress with respect to each planning agenda will be summarized below.

Flex Week Workshops 2004-2007 and Workshops for Faculty/Students

The school of library services invited faculty to earn flex (or in-service) credit by attending numerous bibliographic workshops in August of 2004,[38] in August of 2005,[39], in January of 2005,[40] in January of 2006[41] and in January of 2007.[42]

Throughout 2004-2007, the school of library services offered numerous workshops to enhance the library skills of all students, including those students "at risk".[43]

Library Services Advertisements

In order to address the 2004 self-study planning agenda concerning library services advertisements, the school prepared a summary of their efforts relative to advertisements and enrollment in the library 10 course.[44] The school has placed an advertisement in every schedule of classes between the years of 2004 through 2007.[45] The library 10 course addresses traditional and online resources, including but not limited to, Lexis-Nexis, Proquest, Grove Art, Grove Music, Gale Literary Index, and Access Science.[45] In addition, from 2005-2007, the school of library has advertised the library 10 course on the college television station, channel 33.[46]

Expansion of Online Database Access for Students, Faculty, and Staff

The school of library service has expanded the off-site access to online databases.[47] IVC students, faculty, and staff can access numerous databases from off-campus locations via student/faculty/staff user name and identification.[47]

Section 508 Compliance

Federal and State statutes in California as well as the California Community College guidelines for library information competency require all course materials to be accessible to disabled students. All new and revised course outlines of record are reviewed for section 508 compliance via college interaction with disabled student services and the technical review committee.[48]

Full-time Faculty Hiring Formula: Library Services

On December 11, 2003, the academic senate and the school of library services agreed upon a formula to include the library faculty within the priority list for full-time faculty hiring.[49] The formula is based on unduplicated headcount for the college minus the unduplicated headcount of students in supportive services divided by 1000.[49] In October of 2006, a full-time instructor in the school of library sciences was the second position on

the full-time faculty hiring priority list.[49] However, due to extenuating circumstances, including a decline in full-time equivalent students, there were no full-time faculty hired in 2006-2007.

Student Assistants: Library Services

The library technician managing the circulation desk regularly assigns four student assistants to patrol the library in order to alert staff to problematic situations such as exit alarms, defacing of library materials, locating lost personal items, and other library issues.[50] In addition, the student assistants re-shelve all books and periodicals and check shelves for misfiled resources.[50]

Appropriate Signage: Library Services

Library services has posted appropriate signage informing patrons of library policies.[51] In addition, all patrons are informed of the college lost or damaged materials policies.[51]

References: Standard II

2[1] Learning Outcomes Committee Report to Academic Senate (2-16-06)
2[2] Learning Outcomes Committee Minutes: Connecting Learning Outcomes/Assessment with Program Review (3-24-06)
2[3] Academic Senate Minutes, Item 14: Connecting Learning Outcomes/Assessment with Program Review (3-23-06)
2[4] Academic/Student Services Program Review Templates: Modified to Focus on Learning Outcomes/Assessment (8-28-06)
2[5] 2006-2007 Program Review Student Learning Outcomes Matrixes (4-2-07)
2[6] Department of Mathematics and Psychology: Modification of Instruction Based on Assessment Results
2[7] Learning Outcomes Meeting with Department of Physical Sciences (3-2-07)
2[8] Modification of Course Outlines of Record To Include Student Learning Outcomes (Spring 2007)
2[9] Curriculum Committee Minutes: Modification of Course Outlines of Record and Learning Outcomes (2-13-07)
2[10] Academic Senate Minutes: Modification of Course Outlines of Record and Learning Outcomes (2-15-07)
2[11] Student Learning Outcomes: Joint Meeting Agenda (3-2-07)
2[12] Student Learning Outcomes-Transforming Course Learning Objectives into Student Learning Outcomes (2-22-07)
2[13] Academic Senate Minutes: Learning Objectives & Learning Outcomes (3-22-07)
2[14] CurricUNET: Course Outline of Record Revised Learning Outcomes—See Recommendation 4, Reference number 5 (9-2-07)
2[15] 2006-2007 Annual Student Learning Outcomes Report (8-6-07)
2[16] Memorandum: Office of Chancellor—District Distance Education Advisory Council (5-17-06)
2[17] District Distance Education Advisory Council Recommendations (11-15-06)
2[18] Academic Senate Minutes: College Technology and Distance Education Committee (1-18-07)

2[19] College Technology and Distance Education Committee: Reformulated (2-1-07)
2[20] College Technology & Distance Education Committee Report (6-07)
2[21] Board Policy 6100 Curriculum Review (5-22-06)
2[22] College Level Outcomes Summary (9-29-05)
2[23] Instructional Council Minutes: Review & Approval of Institutional Learning Outcomes (1-16-07) (4-3-07); President's Council Agenda: Review & Approval of Institutional Learning Outcomes (4-11-07)
2[24]Academic Senate Agenda: Review Institutional Learning Outcomes (2-15-07)
Academic Senate Minutes: Review of Revised Institutional Learning Outcomes (3-22-07)
Academic Senate Minutes: Review of Revised Institutional Learning Outcomes (4-5-07)
2[25]Learning Outcomes Committee Minutes: Revised Institutional Learning Outcomes (1-19-07) (2-9-07
2[26] General Education Committee Minutes: Adoption of Revised GE Learning Outcomes (5-2-07)
2[27] 2007 Institutional Learning Outcomes (5-3-07)
2[28] Institutional Learning Outcomes: www.ivc.edu; www.ivc.edu/asenate; College Catalo 2007-2008, page 7; Strategic Plan 2006-2012, page 13; Faculty Manual 2007-2008, page 11.
2[29] Student Conduct/Academic Dishonesty Regulations: Administrative Regulation 5401 (9-14-06)
2[30] Catalog: Student Conduct/Academic Dishonesty Regulations (2006-2007)
2[31] Academic Freedom: Board Policy 6120 (10-24-05)
2[32] Catalog: Academic Freedom (2007-2008)
2[33] Student Information Systems Project Timeline and Agenda (2-1-07)
2[34] School of Guidance and Counseling: Program Review (2006-2007)
2[35] Library Services, Transfer/Career Center, Counseling Services: Student Learning Outcomes-4 Column matrixes (2006-2007)
2[36] Support Services Student Learning Outcomes 4 Column Matrixes
2[37] Library Services: Planning Agendas--Summary of Progress (2007)
2[38-42] Library Services: Flex Week Workshops (2004-2007)
2[43] Library Services: Workshops for At Risk Students (2004-2007)
2[44] Library Services: Advertisements (2004-2007)
2[45] Library Services: Class Schedule Advertisements (2004-2007)
2[46] Library Services: Advertisements—Channel 33 (2005-2007)
2[47] Library Services: Expansion of Online Databases (2004-2007)
2[48] Library Services: Section 508 Compliance (2004-2007)
2[49] Library Services: Full-Time Faculty Hiring Formula (12-11-2003)
2[50] Library Services: Student Assistants (2004-2007)
2[51] Library Services: Appropriate Signage (2004-2007)

C. STANDARD III: RESOURCES

1. 2004 Self-Study Planning Agenda: The college will recommend that the district and faculty association include effectiveness in producing learning outcomes in the contractually negotiated evaluation criteria. (Standard III. A. 1. c)

Progress Status: The south orange county community college academic employee master agreement (faculty contract) is a part of the collective bargaining process mandated by California government code. By statute, the college does not participate in the collective bargaining process as this is the responsibility of the district and the bargaining agent of the faculty. The academic employee master agreement expired in June of 2007. Based upon the statutorily defined process, it is not clear as to how the contract negotiations will proceed at this time and what specific provisions will be negotiated.

2. 2004 Self-Study Planning Agendas: Advanced Technology (AT) will: create short monthly web newsletters describing innovative ideas on campus and will encourage members of the information technology committee to attend meetings and share information with their related constituencies; the college will complete installation of the VoIP telephone system; the college will strive to budget ongoing funds to address the technology needs of the campus. (Standard III. C. 1)

Progress Status: As documented in the response to standard II, planning agenda number 2, in January/February of 2007, the college agreed to reformulate the college information technology committee as the college technology and distance education committee. The committee membership includes administrators, classified staff, and a faculty representative from each of the ten schools. The meetings were well attended throughout the spring semester of 2007. Monthly web newsletters and information about innovative ideas and technology related projects have been shared via this revised committee.

Technology services remains the department which supports all technology needs of the campus. As of 2007, IVC has completed the installation of a VoIP telephone system. Additions and modifications of phones/extensions are being handled internally by college staff.

In the last 3 years, funds to support ongoing technology needs at the college have been funded through the district resource allocation model. Currently, there is not a budget line item in the college general fund to support annual technology projects and initiatives. However, through the integration of strategic planning and the budget process, the college would like to establish technology as a separate line item within the college budget. (See recommendation 1, reference 24.)

3. **<u>2004 Self-Study Planning Agendas:</u> IVC will: continue the computer refresh program with available funding; prioritize requests for media, equipment, and software commensurate with available funding; offer computer training workshops for students who do not want a complete course; IVC will take advantage of state and California Multiple Award Schedule contracts and work with Saddleback College to achieve economy of scale in the purchase of hardware and software (Standard III. C. 1. a. b. c)**

<u>Progress Status:</u> As stated above, since there is no line item within the college general fund to support technology renewal, the computer refresh program has proceeded commensurate with available district funding and requests are prioritized according to a process and criteria established by the deans council. The renewal consists of computers, media equipment for classrooms, software, printers, and much more.

Unfortunately, due to limited funding and staff, the college has not been able to offer computer workshops for students.

Since 2001, IVC has used the "California multiple award schedule" (CMAS) contract as a mechanism for purchasing technology hardware and software.[1]

4. **<u>2004 Planning Agenda:</u> IVC will continue to solidify a core network foundation in order to support the growth of distance education. Network architecture and design are important in this process; IVC will also continue to work with district information technology and Saddleback to enhance course management tools affecting learning outcomes. (Standard III. C. 1. d)**

<u>Progress Status:</u> The college's progress regarding establishment of a core network foundation to support the growth of distance education course offerings is discussed in the response to self-identified issues, Standard II. Additionally, the college has coordinated its efforts with district information technology and Saddleback College through the office of the vice chancellor of technology and learning services relative to course management tools which affect the acquisition student learning outcomes assessment data as discussed in the response to recommendation 4 and in the response to self-identified issues, Standard II.

5. **<u>2004 Planning Agendas:</u> IVC will work toward a goal of no audit exceptions. (Standard III. D. 1. e)**

<u>Progress Status:</u> Independent audits over the past three years for all sectors of the college, including Financial Aid, Admissions and Records, and Supportive Services have been exemplary. There have been very few recommendations for corrective action, and all such recommendations have been addressed and resolved satisfactorily.

6. **<u>2004 Planning Agenda:</u> IVC will develop a process for regularly evaluating its financial management processes and use the results of the evaluation to improve financial management systems. (Standard III. D. 1. k)**

<u>Progress Status:</u> The proposed budget development process previously discussed in the response to recommendation 1 and the implementation of the strategic planning process, address this 2004 planning agenda.

<u>References: Standard III</u>

3[1] http://www.pd.dgs.ca.gov/cmas/default.htm

D. STANDARD IV: GOVERNANCE AND LEADERSHIP

1. 2004 Self-Study Planning Agendas: It is recommended that the board requirement of a percentage cap on fiscal resources available to support faculty governance activities be reexamined; it is recommended that the board requirement superimposed on the college administration restricting instructional overload assignments for those faculty receiving reassigned time for serving on approved committees be reexamined; the administration, working closely with the academic senate and other constituent bodies of the college, will work to implement the new committee structure. (Standard IV. A. 1, IV. A. 2. b)

Progress Status: Faculty who perform extra duties for the college in addition to their normal teaching load (such as student learning outcomes coordinators, senate officers, director of the honors program, and academic chairs etc.) are compensated through two mechanisms, a stipend or reassigned time. As reported in the 2004 self-study, page IV-8, there is a problem with the how the college can allocate stipends and reassigned time. From 2004 through 2007, the board, via the chancellor, continued to enforce a limit: the total amount of stipends and reassigned time for the college cannot exceed a certain percentage of the total college budget. This requirement is contained in a 1998 document entitled *College Guidelines for Release Time and/or* Stipends.[1] As documented in the response to recommendation 6, as part of the college president's goals for 2007-2008, the chancellor set an overall 2.4% limit of the college budget which can be allocated for stipends and/or reassigned time.[2]

The board/chancellor limit on stipends/reassigned time has many detrimental effects on the functioning of the college. First, the college president's authority to conduct business is restricted as he is not at liberty to grant a stipend or reassigned time which may exceed the 2.4% limit even if the college budget could support the expenditure. Second, there is and has been a long standing dispute as to how the 2.4% limit is calculated. Presently, this issue is under discussion but remains unresolved. Third, the college and the district must meet federal and state reporting requirements, including reports to the accreditation commission (including the new student learning outcomes report), a human resource development report, a flexible calendar report, an institutional effectiveness report, a strategic planning report, and numerous other reporting functions. The federal and state reporting requirements are in addition to the ACCJC requirements for program review and student learning outcomes development and assessment. All of the reports as well as the commission standards require faculty involvement. Presently, the senior college administration does not have the ability to adequately compensate faculty to participate in completing the necessary work.

As reported in the 2004 self-study (page IV-7-8), there was an unwritten "management rule" superimposed on the college by the chancellor, that faculty members who accepted reassigned time for governance positions (such as the academic senate or director of the

honors program) were precluded from overload teaching assignments. This "management rule" has subsequently been rescinded and is no longer enforced.

The revisions to the college committee structure were discussed in standard I. and reference number 17, standard I.

2. **<u>2004 Self-Study Planning Agendas:</u> Commencing with the 2004 fall semester, IVC will reestablish the program review process using the revised accreditation standards; the college president will present accreditation accomplishments at college wide meetings; it is recommended that the board consider developing self-evaluation processes which are included in board polices and regulations; the board will develop a timeline for the annual evaluation of the chancellor and college president; IVC will develop a strategic planning process which incorporates the college budget process; (Standard IV. A. 4, IV. B. 1. f, IV. B. 1. j, IV. B. 2. a)**

<u>Progress Status:</u> As documented in the response to recommendation 3 and in the response to self-identified issues in standard II, the college resumed the program review cycle in 2004 through the present. Also, as documented in the aforementioned sections of this report, the program review process and templates have been reevaluated and revised in August of 2006 and again in August of 2007.

As documented in the response to recommendation 1, the college president, did conduct several college wide meetings during flex week of 2006, and 2007, as well as throughout the spring of 2007 highlighting the college efforts relative to accreditation, strategic planning, and institutional effectiveness.

Upon the recommendation of the district board policy and administrative regulation advisory council, the board adopted BP 172 regarding self-evaluation of the board as documented in the response to recommendation 7.[3] According to provision 4 of the board policy, the self evaluation of the board would occur during the same time period as the evaluation of the chancellor.[3] According to a separate process, the college presidents are evaluated regularly during November of each year.

As documented in the response to recommendation 1 and in the response to self-identified issues in standard I, the college developed a strategic plan wherein the college budget process is integrated within the planning process.

3. 2004 Self-Study Planning Agendas: The district will review the list of participants in docket meetings and will take corrective action, if necessary, to maintain effective methods of communication; (Standard IV. B. 3. f)

Progress Status: As indicated in the 2004 self-study (page IV-53), until fall 2002, the presidents of the academic senates, classified senates, and the presidents of the faculty and classified bargaining units participated in the district meeting to assemble the agendas for the board of trustees (docket meetings). At that time, the governance units were removed from attending docket meetings. In summer of 2005, the presidents of all of the aforementioned constituent groups were invited to attend docket meetings. This has greatly improved communication between the board of trustees, the district, and the colleges.

However, items which were included on the board agenda at the docket meeting were subsequently pulled from the agenda without consultation or communication with the constituent groups. For example, the senates' reports per board policy 6100 were pulled from the February 2007 board meeting without any consultation with the senates. In another circumstance an item was included on the board agenda after the docket meeting without consultation or communication with the constituent groups (the agreement between Camelot and the district regarding the development of the advanced technology and education park was added after the docket meeting). The academic senate, classified senate, and the bargaining units are hopeful that this does not become a routine practice as it undermines the purpose of including the constituent groups in the docket meetings and results in confusion at meetings of the board of trustees.

Time to Completion and Responsible Parties

The academic senate, classified senate, and bargaining unit representatives will work with the chancellor and college president to develop a process whereby modifications to the board agendas will be regularly communicated to the constituent groups prior to the meeting of the board of trustees. This process will be in place by 2010.

References: Standard IV

4[1] 1998 Document-College Cap on Stipends/Reassigned Time (1998)
4[2] Chancellor's Goals for College President (11-2006-11-2007)
4[3] Board Policy 172 Board Self Evaluation (8-27- 07)