



**ACCREDITING  
COMMISSION  
for COMMUNITY and  
JUNIOR COLLEGES**

10 COMMERCIAL BOULEVARD  
SUITE 204  
NOVATO, CA 94949  
TELEPHONE: (415) 506-0234  
FAX: (415) 506-0238  
E-MAIL: accjc@accjc.org  
www.accjc.org

Chairperson  
JOSEPH L. RICHEY  
Public Member

Vice Chairperson  
E. JAN KEHOE  
Long Beach City College

President  
BARBARA A. BENO

Vice President  
DEBORAH G. BLUE

Vice President  
GARMAN JACK POND

Associate Vice President  
LILY OWYANG

Business Officer  
BARBARA DUNHAM

ITAS  
TOM LANE

MEMO TO: Mr. Glenn Roquemore  
President  
Irvine Valley College  
5500 Irvine Valley Center  
Irvine, CA 92618

FROM: Barbara A. Beno, President

DATE: December 13, 2005

SUBJECT: Enclosed Report of the Evaluation Team

Previously, the chairperson of the evaluation team sent you a draft report affording you the opportunity to correct errors of fact. We assume you have responded to the team chair. The Commission now has a final version of the report.

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges follows a policy of providing a copy of the final evaluation visit report to the chief executive officer of the visited institution prior to consideration by the Commission. Please examine the enclosed report.

- If you believe that the report contains inaccuracies, you are invited to call them to the attention of the Commission. To do so, a letter stating recommended corrections should be directed to the President and signed by the chief executive officer of the institution. The letter should arrive at the Commission office one week prior to the Commission meeting in order to be included in Commission materials.
- ACCJC policy provides that, if desired, the chief administrator may request an appearance before the Commission to discuss the evaluation report. While the Commission requires that the institution notify the Commission office, in writing, not less than 15 days before the Commission meeting of its intent to attend the meeting, due to holiday schedules the Commission is requesting that the institution respond by Friday, December 16, 2005. This enables the Commission to invite the team chair to attend. The next meeting of the Accrediting Commission will be held on January 11-13, 2006 at the San Francisco Airport Westin Hotel. The enclosure, What To Expect When Attending A Commission Meeting addresses the protocol of such appearances.

Please note that the Commission will not consider the institution as being indifferent if its chief administrator does not choose to appear before the Commission. If the institution does request to be heard at the Commission meeting, the chairperson of the evaluation team will also be asked to be present to explain the reasons for statements in the team report. Both parties will be allowed brief testimony before the Commission deliberates in private.

The enclosed report should be considered confidential and not given general distribution until it has been acted upon by the Accrediting Commission and you have been notified by letter of the action taken.

BAB/tl

Enclosure

cc: Dr. Dennis W. White, Accreditation Liaison Officer (w/o enclosure)

**Progress Visit Report**

**Irvine Valley College  
5500 Irvine Center Drive  
Irvine, California 92618**

**A confidential Report Prepared for the Accrediting Commission  
For Community and Junior Colleges**

**This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited**

**Irvine Valley College  
On  
November 3, 2005**

**Deborah G. Blue, Ph.D., Vice President, Accrediting Commission for Community  
and Junior Colleges, Team Chair  
Mary Halvorson, Vice President, Academic Affairs, Santiago Canyon College,  
Team Member**

## **Introduction and Overview**

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting on January 12-14, 2005, reaffirmed the accreditation of Irvine Valley College, with a requirement that the college complete and submit a Progress Report by October 15, 2005. The Commission indicated the report should focus on Recommendations 1-8, made by the evaluation team that visited the College October 12-14, 2004; and the report would be followed by a progress visit. The Progress Visit to Irvine Valley College was conducted on November 3, 2005. The purpose of the team progress visit was to find evidence for the assertions made in the College's Progress Report and to determine if the College had made improvements in the areas identified by the Commission.

The College president and his staff, the Chancellor and his staff, and college faculty and staff were very timely and accommodating in establishing an interview and meeting schedule conducive to the team conducting its work. The college facilitated the team's work by providing several evidentiary documents electronically, in advance of the visit, and by providing all hard copy documents requested in the team room. The team appreciated the hospitality of the entire college community and was impressed with the college climate that was more relaxed and collegial than the team found during its comprehensive visit in October, 2004. The team commends the College for writing a thorough, candid, and forthright report to the Commission that detailed its progress in meeting the recommendations, and the areas where improvements are still needed.

The team met with the following groups and/or individuals: President of the college, Vice President of Instruction and Vice President of Student Services, Dean's Council, Student Services Council, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Associated Students, Student Learning Outcomes and Program Review Committees, Four Focus Groups of the Strategic Planning Process, District Chancellor, Board President and five board members, and the District and College researchers. The Saddleback College progress visit team observed the Chancellors Cabinet meeting; however, the meeting conflicted with the Irvine Valley College team's campus meetings, so the Irvine Valley College team was unable to attend the Chancellor's Cabinet meeting.

The team's findings in response to Irvine Valley College's Progress Report, review of College documents, interviews with members of the college community and observations are reported in response to Recommendations 1-8, as required by the Commission.

### **Irvine Valley College's Responses to the Commission Action Letter and the Results of the Progress Visit**

The College reported that the team's report of the comprehensive accreditation evaluation visit on October 12-14, 2004 was posted on the college website on February 8, 2005. The College also reported that the Commission action letter of January 31, 2005 was not widely distributed throughout the college, nor placed in the library, pursuant to Commission policy. Once the College identified the problem in April 2005, all

information including the action letter was distributed throughout the College and placed on the college website. In May, 2005 the college President accepted the Academic Senate's recommendation that a faculty co-chair serve on the oversight committee and assist in the development of the progress report; and the college administration, Academic senate and Classified senate agreed upon a process to respond to the Commission recommendations and who should respond to each recommendation.

***Recommendation 1.*** *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 IB. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7; IIA.1, 2; IIB.1, 3, 4; IIC.2)*

The College reports that the strategic planning process was initially revised by the Academic Senate, and a final document was approved and adopted by all college constituencies on September 1, 2005. The planning process initially involved four focus groups as follows: academic planning; organizational effectiveness; student success/access; and resource and budget planning; however, a fifth focus group has been added for enrollment management. The process is cyclical in that it will be a five-year plan that will be revised every five years.

The College's Progress Report states that the strategic planning process is meant to be inclusive and will integrate budget and resource allocations with the program review process. The College also reported that the Academic Senate developed a program discontinuance policy and a program/discipline realignment policy, both adopted by the college on May 5, 2005. During the fall of 2005, the Academic Senate will introduce a draft of a program development policy for review. The report indicated these policies will be part of the strategic planning process.

Lastly, the college indicates that this strategic planning process will be coordinated with the district educational and facilities master plan. The district engaged a planning firm to work with a district educational and facilities master planning committee. The committee is comprised of representatives of the district and both colleges, and they began meeting on August 12, 2005. The firm is to assist the district and the colleges to integrate the college strategic planning process with the district educational and facilities master plan.

### **Findings and Evidence**

Irvine Valley College produced a document entitled, *Irvine Valley College Strategic Planning Process* (Five Year Strategic Plan). The document describes and identifies the: strategic planning process; members of the strategic planning steering team (SPST); development of mission statement, planning assumptions, goals and objectives; formation of focus groups; role of focus groups; recommendations to the SPST; college-wide review; final SPST review and development of the College strategic plan; and

development of the College strategic plan. A proposed strategic plan model has also been developed and is graphically presented in document form as well.

Interviews and additional documentation provided at the time of the visit revealed there will be five, not four focus groups. The fifth group will focus on enrollment management. At the time of the visit, the focus groups were being formed with appropriate representation. Some focus groups exist, but have yet to meet. There appears to be consensus among all groups that the college strategic plan will integrate various planning processes that will guide resource planning for the college, and the program review process and student learning outcomes initiative will relate closely to each other and influence the strategic plan. College leaders reported confidence that key faculty and staff are in place to bring the focus groups together and provide the leadership necessary to move forward with the implementation and evaluation of the strategic plan and the process identified. All groups reported it was too soon to articulate how the integration of the work of the focus groups and other planning processes such as program review and student learning outcomes would come together. The college researcher is a key member involved in the strategic planning process, program review, and student learning outcomes. Concern was expressed in several meetings that there is no additional research assistance to meet all of the College's research needs and requirements.

## **Conclusions**

The College has made progress towards the development of a long range strategic planning model and process that is designed to be cyclical, comprehensive, inclusive, and systematic and integrates budget and resource allocations with institutional planning. However, at the time of the visit, the strategic planning process was in the initial stages of development. Meetings are taking place to identify the details of implementing the plan. To date, the College effort towards meeting the recommendation is evident; however, much work remains to be done with implementation and evaluation of their planning processes, in order to fully meet this recommendation.

***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 IB.1)*

The College reports that several faculty members have attended workshops to assist in their efforts to lead the development of student learning outcomes at Irvine Valley College. The College formed a Learning Outcomes Committee, and two faculty members serve as co-facilitators. Institutional-level student learning outcomes (SLOs) have been developed, with college-wide approval anticipated in fall 2005. An SLO implementation plan for 2005-2006 was developed to include a plan for college-wide learning outcomes, training strategies, development of an interactive college SLO intranet website, and identified deliverables at the end of the academic year. Additionally, the College President has committed to support this effort by approving all of the budgetary requests proposed by the committee.

On August 16, 2005, the co-facilitators of the SLO committee presented a learning outcomes workshop to help faculty identify and assess key learning outcomes and design an assessment plan. Participants in this workshop volunteered to become peer mentors to assist other faculty. Irvine Valley College reports that SLOs will be implemented both in Instruction and in Student Services.

### **Findings/Evidence**

The College has developed a document, *Student Learning Outcomes Implementation Plan* that was reviewed and submitted by the Learning Outcome Committee. It includes an Instruction Plan for 2005-06, a Student Services Plan for 2005-06, and details of responsibilities of the facilitator and co-facilitators, definitions of terms, and a College Level Outcomes Summary that is the fourth draft of the document, *Ten Core Outcomes for Irvine Valley College*. The Learning Outcomes Committee provided the team a SLO Implementation Status Report on the day of the visit. The report identified disciplines and the courses for which SLOs have been or are under development and the status of development of an assessment plan. While some faculty are not embracing the work on SLOs, there is strong leadership and administrative support for those who are.

The leaders of the Learning Outcomes Committee are respected by all with whom the team conducted interviews. There is a sense that this committee is now in a "full proactive mode." At the time of the visit, the momentum was building, and the Committee reported a desire to increase awareness of the need to develop or recognize already established learning outcomes. At the time of the visit, the team found evidence that a cycle of training workshops and a system of peer mentoring is taking place. Spring 2006 flex workshops are planned to focus on "measuring success" and the hope is that student learning outcomes will be viewed as a "benefit of the course" both for the teacher as well as for students.

The Committee chairs have received funding necessary for training and materials to implement student learning outcomes. They expressed concern for the development and implementation of the research component necessary for the assessment of SLOs stating there is only one research analyst at the College.

### **Conclusions**

The College is demonstrating early progress in developing a plan for implementation of SLOs at the institutional and course level, and their flex workshops on establishing and assessing SLOs. The Learning Outcomes Committee has developed a concept of peer mentoring and it is planning content for an SLO intranet web site with resources and criteria to develop SLOs. The proposed institutional-level learning outcomes have been reviewed as proposed and revised in four draft documents with anticipated approval by the end of spring 2006. The leadership of the facilitator and co-facilitator is appreciated by the faculty, and continued dialogue is taking place to ensure the success of the implementation plan.

The membership of the Student Learning Outcome Committee overlaps with the members of the Program Review Oversight Committee and the members of the Committee on Courses. In the College's view, this will help to ensure collaboration and compatibility of processes.

The College has begun to make progress in meeting the recommendation; however, it does not yet fully meet it. The College is encouraged to continue the level of engagement and motivation demonstrated at the time of the visit to complete the work necessary in the establishment and assessment of SLOs at the course, program, degree, certificate, and institutional level to fully meet this recommendation.

***Recommendation 3.*** *The college develop and implement cyclical and systematic evaluations and improvements of the program review processes in instructional and student services programs. (Standards IIA.1, 2; B. 1, 3, 4; C. 2)*

In the Progress Report, the college asserts that the Program Review Oversight Committee revised the program review process; the Academic Senate adopted the process on November 2, 2004; the Committee submitted the program review summary and conclusions report for 2004-2005 to the President in May 2005; and the Deans' Council and Instructional Council reviewed the summary and conclusions in June 2005. The first assessment of how effectively the program recommendations were incorporated into the College planning processes will be conducted in fall 2005. The College plans to evaluate the program review process annually.

### **Findings/Evidence**

The College has a program review process in place and a six-year program review cycle that is being implemented in Instruction and Student Services. The Program Review Cycle as revised in May, 2005 indicates that all programs will have undergone review at the end of the 2006-2007 academic year. Implementation of program review and the reports summarizing the results of program review are part of the responsibility of the Program Review Oversight Committee. There is a process of evaluation built into the program review process to ensure future needs and plans are not dismissed. The College plans to integrate the program review process with the new Strategic Planning Process.

Administrators, faculty and staff feel great strides have been made in the program review process. The program review annual report is sent to the President for review and signature, and it is reviewed by the Deans' Council and Instructional Council. The President submits any program recommendations to the appropriate staff for follow through and planning. When the program review process integrates with the college strategic plan, there is a sense that recommendations arising from the program review process will not be lost or forgotten.

## Conclusions

The College is making progress with implementation of program review; and more demonstrable progress with implementation will be made if the program review cycle continues to be implemented as outlined. When the team visited in October 2004, the College had postponed implementation while it reviewed the program review process and cycle for revision. When the team visited the College for the progress visit, the implementation of program review had resumed. The College is encouraged to continue its program review implementation and evaluation, as scheduled, to ensure that this partially met recommendation will be fully met as scheduled for 2006-2007.

***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. (Standards IIA.1.c, 2.e, f, h, i; 3, 6. a; B.1, 3, 4; C.1, 2)*

The College's report of progress made to date is primarily in the planning stage of how research will support student learning outcomes. The College reports it formed a research team composed of the College Researcher, the Learning Outcomes Committee Facilitator and Co-facilitator, and the District Director of Research and Planning. This research team will assist faculty to evaluate both direct and indirect data related to student learning outcomes and to develop assessment tools within their programs and courses that will help measure the effectiveness of student learning. They will have primary responsibility for assessing and reporting on the college's overall progress related to the identified ten, institutional core learning outcomes. The College further asserts that the research team will provide the necessary support to assess student learning across all programs and the College's identified ten institutional core learning outcomes.

## Findings/Evidence

At the time of the visit, the team found that among the Student Learning Outcome Committee members and the researchers, there is a sense that they have a good "team" which will make every effort to assist in the establishment and assessment of student learning outcomes. However, both groups have grave concerns that one District and one IVC research staff member will not have adequate time to fill this need. There was a sense that additional research staff would need to be added to fully meet this recommendation.

Some of the College's programs have begun to develop assessment plans, and the Psychology Program has begun implementation that includes gathering some data. As a college, the development and implementation of assessment of student learning outcomes is still in the planning stage.



## Conclusions

The research team is in place that will provide the commitment and support to ensure the successful implementation of assessment and research activities for evaluation of student learning outcomes. The College's progress to date, however, is primarily in planning, with a group of courses in the disciplines of Early Childhood Education, Mathematics, and Writing, beginning to develop assessment plans for implementation. To fully meet this recommendation, the college needs to continue its momentum and work as planned, toward full development of Student Learning Outcomes.

***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, and fill the positions that are necessary to ensure the integrity of the College's programs and services. (Eligibility Requirement 5; Standard IIIA.2)*

The College reports that a permanent dean was hired in January, 2005 for the School of Physical Education and Athletics, a school separated from the School of Fine Arts through reorganization. Also in January 2005, a permanent dean was hired for the School of Fine Arts, and the School of Humanities and Languages. In June of 2005, a permanent dean was hired for the School of Guidance and Counseling; and a second recruitment is in process to hire a permanent dean of the School of Mathematics, Sciences, and Technology. On April 20, 2005 the Vice President of Instruction conducted an administrative retreat for the Instructional Deans to re-evaluate the duties and compensation for Academic Chairs. In March 2005, administrators and managers developed and ranked a list of classified hiring priorities. In May 2005 the Board of Trustees approved salary increases for all district and college administrators. The College asserts that it will engage in further dialogue concerning college and classified organization structure, administrative workload, and compensation for Academic Chairs. The College concludes their report of progress in response to Recommendation 5 as follows, "...the college administrators must be empowered to make decisions in the best interest of the college."

## Findings/Evidence

The Vice President of Instruction and Vice President of Student Services feel confident in the progress of filling administrative dean positions. At the time of the visit, all but one instructional dean was in place. The VP of Instruction states he is hopeful that having long term and consistent leadership at the academic division level will bring positive continuity to the faculty and staff and to the many processes of instruction. The Deans expressed concern for the need to equally fill key classified positions.

A large number of classified staff attended the meeting scheduled with the Classified Senate. The team shared with the staff a Classified Hiring Priorities list for 2005-2006 provided by the college that noted it was submitted for review at an Administrative Council Retreat on March 24, 2005. Deans were expected to work with their Schools to

determine hiring needs and draft written proposals to make presentations in support of the positions requested. The Classified Senate reported that they were unaware of the list, and did not know which positions were existing positions and which ones were new positions, because CSEA has a role in positions that are new in the SOCC District.

The classified staff indicated they desired re-institution of developing the classified hiring priorities as it was done in the past. They described that process as one which included the development of a formula by the Classified Senate and a formal standing governance body represented by all constituent groups, rather than only administrators. They reported that the prioritization process that now only includes Deans was implemented a couple of years ago, and since that time, their involvement is only informal, dependent upon how each Dean involves them. The Classified Senate desires a more formal role in the process.

There was a notable emotional tone in the support staff members' comments. They reported concerns that their contract negotiations were not progressing and it was impacting their feelings of whether their efforts as employees were valued by the district, given that faculty and college administrators had received raises, and the faculty contract had been settled.

## **Conclusions**

The College has made significant progress in filling vacant administrative positions, with one position still being advertised to be filled in January 2006. It is anticipated that a new Board approved administrative salary schedule will not only attract qualified candidates, but increase the potential for less turnover of key administrative positions. The College has made some progress in filling vacant classified positions, however there still remain several vacant classified positions, which the College reports will be advertised; however, those announcements were not yet posted. The College will need to continue to fill needed vacant positions to fully meet this recommendation.

***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 IVB, I.e, j)*

The College reports that the Chancellor has placed the Commission's District recommendations on the board agenda each month commencing with the meeting of February 28, 2005; however there has been "...very little discussion of this issue..." ( p.17, Progress Report). On August 5, 2005, the Irvine Valley College administration and Academic Senate convened a meeting with the Board President, Chancellor, Saddleback College Academic Senate president and accreditation chair to discuss Recommendations 6 and 7. The College reports that they have noticed less Board interference in college operations; however, the Board's administrative hiring policy has not been changed (Board Policy 4011). There has been a change in practice regarding second level interview procedures. The former practice of conducting second level interviews with the college President and Chancellor has been modified, and the

President and Vice Presidents make the final selections in consultation with hiring committee chairs.

### **Findings/Evidence**

At the time of the visit, the President, Deans and Academic Senate reported to the team that they have been allowed more autonomy at the College, and the Board has made efforts not to involve itself in the operational aspects of the college. The IVC Academic Senate scheduled an All-Senate meeting during the visit, at which time they openly expressed their views. It was the perception of some that the Board President was becoming the de-facto Chancellor of the District, citing an example that the Chancellor referred faculty to the Board President to discuss matters of bargaining and negotiations. This perception was shared with the Chancellor during the visit. Faculty expressed gratitude for the forum conducted by the Board at IVC, providing an opportunity for them to engage in dialogue with the college community; however, faculty also felt the forum was viewed by some as an event that showed what they considered to be some examples of a dysfunctional District. Overall, the faculty view expressed to the team is that the College is moving forward, and they are working well with the administration at the College. Faculty reported they value the President and Vice Presidents' efforts to do the right thing. They view the culture of the district as one of "in-breeding" and would like to see fresh new visionary leadership in the District.

The combined visiting teams met with six members of the Board, including the Student Trustee. This meeting preceded a meeting with the Chancellor. The Student Trustee praised the Board's acceptance and support of his role. Board members reported on their progress since the comprehensive visit, which included the Board forums held at IVC and Saddleback College that allowed them to hear their constituencies and engage in dialogue. The Board reported there were two board retreats, one conducted by the Director of Education Services of the Community College League of California, about which positive comments were made; a second special board session was conducted by a consultant, identified by the Chancellor, who has conducted workshops for the Association of Governing Boards for over ten years. The second activity was intended to clarify the role of board members and the Chancellor and suggest how the board could guide and support the Chancellor in his efforts to accomplish district and board goals without micromanaging. Board members reported mixed reactions about the session, some feeling insulted by the consultant's comments. Board members informed the team they are taking the accreditation recommendations seriously, stopping the micromanagement, and admitted they still have a way to go. They reported they do not call administrators and give direction, yet in the same meeting a board member commented that the Board should micromanage when there is a crisis. The Board President meets weekly with the Chancellor to discuss the role of the Board in College and District operations, specifically, as it relates to this recommendation. The Chancellor also provided the team with a document of *Accreditation Comments*, in which each of the recommendations made by the comprehensive visiting team in October 2004 has a response from the Chancellor to report the district's response and progress, or intended progress.

## Conclusions

This recommendation has not been met. There is a general feeling at IVC that progress is being made in response to this recommendation, primarily due to a perception that the new Board President is open to discussion and better understands the role of the Board in governance of the institution. However, the team heard conflicting sentiments expressed by Board members, regarding their micro-management of day to day college and district administrative operations. It is evident there remains much work to do for the Board to become more focused on policy, and less attentive to the operational details of managing the colleges and the district. While the board expressed a desire to meet this recommendation, there was no evidence that the Board has had any discussion of the accreditation recommendations at Board meetings, in spite of the fact that it has been a standing agenda item at Board meetings since February 28, 2005. Little demonstrable progress has been made to meet this recommendation.

***Recommendation 7.*** *The Board of Trustees, District leadership and College leadership define, 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. (Standards IVA.1, 2, 3, 5)*

The College describes the lack of understanding regarding the roles and scopes of authority between the Board of Trustees, District leadership and College leadership as a long standing issue in the district, and reports some initial limited efforts of progress. The College provided an update on the litigation recently resolved in an appellate court decision regarding the development of faculty hiring procedures, in favor of the academic senates. The College reports that the District is complying with the Appellate Court decision, and representatives of the Board and the Senates are meeting to mutually revise the faculty hiring policy. The College acknowledges more work will need to be done to fully meet the team's recommendation.

## Findings/Evidence

All groups with whom the team met expressed progress had been made in relation to this recommendation. The Academic Senate reported and the team found evidence that the Senate has been asking for technical assistance since early 2000 on various issues, but they need district mutual agreement to proceed. Mutual agreement has been reached to request technical assistance; however, from which organizations this assistance will come has not been determined. The Academic Senate would be willing to participate in technical assistance provided by the Statewide Academic Senate and the Community College League of California, or the American Association of University Professors. The Academic Senate is requesting mutually agreed upon outcomes before the meeting or workshop takes place. Some expressed confidence that the new Board President may have a better understanding of the role of board of Trustees for community colleges. Some faculty feel the new Board President may have some positive influence on decreasing the real or perceived micro-management of the Board. In some faculty's view,

the relationships with the district have not improved. There are vocal non-supporters of the Chancellor and others who privately express their support.

The Classified Senate's participation in the team visit was equally as strong in presence as the faculty, with standing room only in the meeting room. Their sentiment was one of strong involvement in governance, better than it was a few years ago, including their participation in Chancellor's Cabinet. They also indicated that their roles are not always clear. The Classified Senate forms committees, and while they are involved in the President's Council, they view the meetings as primarily informational, and see the Academic Senate as more involved than they are. Classified staff reported that negotiations are affecting their morale.

The President and Vice Presidents and other college administrators believe the Chancellor and the Board have been attempting to increase the decision-making ability of the colleges over the last two years. There is a sense that the Board has made progress in the recognition of their policy role versus the college's operational role.

IVC has several governance committees and councils that are contributing to improved relationships and collegial college governance. The Chancellor convenes monthly cabinet meetings with representation from all consultation groups intended to provide updates on District business and discuss issues of interest; and monthly Docket meetings with representation from all consultation groups intended to review Board agenda items and discuss issues of interest. There are other district governance councils on which both colleges have representation as well. There are mixed views, however, regarding the contribution these district level governance meetings to improved relationships among the College, the District, and the Chancellor. There was participation in the meetings during this visit, compared to a lack of participation a year ago; however, there is still the presence of tension.

Students report to the team they are very happy with the faculty and services IVC provides. They feel they have participation on Presidents Council and other appropriate committees of the College, that they can get information when they need it, and nothing is "hidden" from them. Students informed the team they were unaware of any "climate" issues but knew there was something between the faculty not liking the Chancellor, but reported it did not affect them.

## **Conclusions**

This recommendation has not been met. The Chancellor, the Board and all college constituent groups are making some initial progress in meeting this recommendation, but there is much work to be done. The mutual agreement between the Colleges and District to seek technical assistance to address collegial governance issues will assist with making progress towards meeting the recommendation.

***Recommendation 8.*** *The Board of Trustees, chancellor, presidents, administrators, managers, faculty senates and unions, classified senates and unions, and students come together and take measures to reduce the hostility, cynicism, despair, and fear that continue to plague the college. (Standard IVA.1, 2, 2a, 2b, 3, 5)*

The College describes this recommendation as the most challenging for all constituent groups, and one that represents long-standing issues that have been perpetual in nature. The College asserts there has been progress, yet disagreement exists on how to resolve these “systemic issues.”

The Chancellor hosts “brown bag luncheons” which are open to all staff, and are sometimes well attended. The faculty describe district leadership as taking small steps to address this recommendation, but feel nothing significant has been accomplished.

The classified and administrative staff at IVC held retreats to discuss the negative climate of the college and develop strategies to turn that around. Constituent groups describe progress in more positive relationships among college faculty, staff, and administration, and express a willingness to continue activities that will bring them together for the good of the students. Some groups report a desire to move forward and let the past be past. The report describes a sense that continued dysfunction continues in the relationship among the Board, the Chancellor and the Academic Senate.

In April, 2005 the academic employee master agreement was ratified by the faculty and approved by the Board. There is now a contractual provision that allows the President rather than the Chancellor to approve stipends and/or reassigned time. Also, approval of reassigned time is not related to a faculty member accepting an overload assignment. This is described as a positive outcome of negotiations that will attract more faculty to participate in key shared governance roles.

### **Findings/Evidence**

The President, Vice Presidents, Deans and Academic Senate reported that the climate at the College and the relationships between their respective constituencies have improved. The Classified Senate reported improvements in some areas of governance, and areas where improvements are needed, such as classified staffing prioritization. It was also evident that bargaining issues were affecting classified staff morale and feelings of trust. The team found evidence that the senates participate on the Chancellor’s Cabinet; however, they reported it has little impact on Board actions. The Academic Senate leadership views the College climate as improving, but the existence of a continued negative climate between the College and the District still persists.

At the time of the visit, a sense of re-building of trust on the IVC campus was evident. A document was developed in response to Recommendation 8 that described the positive contrasts of hostility (friendliness), cynicism (optimism), despair (hope) and trust (fear), and surveyed members of the college community for the types of morale boosters that might help people feel more connected to the College.

Unlike one year ago during the team visit when faculty displayed strained relationships among themselves when the team attempted to meet with them, during this visit the faculty invited all faculty to attend the Academic Senate meeting with the visiting team. They shared differing points of view and demonstrated professionalism and civility in their interactions with one another. Some members of the college community believed that only a small group of long time faculty continued to complain about the district administration and the Board, and most faculty and staff were “just doing their work”, and. The Academic Senate was still divided in their view of the relationship between the College and the District. Some expressed confidence in the District administration and the Board, but the majority in attendance was very vocal that the Board continued to interfere with the faculty role as it relates to governance. That group expressed a concern that administrators who were too friendly or working too well with faculty would be at risk of losing their jobs.

Concern was also expressed for the workload of the Deans due to lack of classified staff support, and unidentified, clear roles and responsibilities of department chairs without agreement as to compensation for the work.

### **Conclusions**

This recommendation has not been met. College constituent groups are making an effort to find ways to improve the climate at IVC. There is a feeling among some that it is time to move forward regardless of Board actions they may not agree with. There is a commitment to students and a sense of pride in the educational services provided at IVC. The team found evidence that the College is striving to make progress in meeting this recommendation; however, there continues to be much work to be done by the College, the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor and the District as a whole.