

Accreditation Progress Report

Prepared for the Accrediting Commission
For Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

By

Irvine Valley College
5500 Irvine Center Drive
Irvine, California

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

- I. Certification of the Progress Report**
- II. Statement on Report Preparation**
- III. Responses to the Recommendations of the Commission**
 - A. Response to Recommendation 1**
 - B. Response to Recommendation 2**
 - C. Response to Recommendation 3**
 - D. Response to Recommendation 4**
 - E. Response to Recommendation 5**
 - F. Response to Recommendation 6**
 - G. Response to Recommendation 7**
 - H. Response to Recommendation 8**

I. CERTIFICATION OF THE PROGRESS REPORT

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

From: Irvine Valley College

This progress report provides a summary of institutional responses to recommendations cited in the WASC-ACCJC January 31, 2005 letter in response to the fall 2004 commission visitation. 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.

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

Dr. Dennis W. White **Vice President of Instruction
Accreditation Liaison Officer
Accreditation Co Chair** **Date**

Wendy B. Gabriella **Academic Senate President
Accreditation Co Chair** **Date**

II. STATEMENT ON REPORT PREPARATION

On January 31, 2005, Irvine Valley College was informed by WASC-ACCJC that the commission had reaffirmed the college's accreditation with a requirement that the college complete a progress report by October 15, 2005 addressing eight recommendations. The submission of the progress report will be followed by a visit by commission representatives.

On February 8, 2005, the accreditation evaluation team report was posted on the college website.¹ Inadvertently, the action letter was not posted on the website or placed in the library pursuant to commission guidelines. On February 4, 2005, the president requested an electronic copy of the final report and action letter from the commission.² On February 7, 2005, the commission sent an electronic copy of the fall 2004 team report which was posted on the college website on February 8, 2005.^{1,2} Unfortunately, an electronic copy of the action letter was not included in the February 7, 2005 email from the commission. Therefore, the hard copy of action letter was unevenly distributed within the college community. Additional confusion resulted when it was publicly reported that the college was "fully accredited".³ Once the problems were identified, they were immediately corrected and in April of 2005 all information, including the action letter was distributed throughout the college and placed on the college website.⁴ The college began to address the issues in each of the eight recommendations in February of 2005.

On May 6, 2005, the college president accepted the academic senate's recommendation of a faculty co-chair to assist in the development of the progress report and to serve on the oversight committee.⁵ The college administration, academic senate, and classified senate agreed upon a process to respond to the recommendations and all parties mutually agreed upon the administrators, faculty, and staff with the necessary expertise to respond to each recommendation.⁶

**References:

- 1) Office of the President: Feb. 8, 2005 Collegewide Memo
- 2) Office of the President: Email to ACCJC Requesting Electronic Copies and Jack Pond's Response
- 3) IVC and SC's Joint Letter of Concern to BOT
- 4) IVC Web Site: Action Letter and Evaluation Report Posted
- 5) Office of President: Memo Accepting Senate Recommendation-Faculty Faculty Accreditation Co-Chair
- 6) Office of the President & Vice President for Instruction: Accreditation Progress Report Process and Timeline

III. RESPONSES TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMISSION

- A. **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 I. B. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7; II. A. 1, 2; II. B. 1, 3, 4; and II. C. 2)

Response: On February 17, 2005, the academic senate revised the college strategic planning process and submitted the proposed draft to the college for review and study¹. Throughout March and April of 2005, the strategic planning process was reviewed and revised by the college president and further revised by the academic senate, the instructional council, and president's council. The provisions of the strategic planning process were jointly developed, mutually agreed upon, and the final planning process was adopted by all college constituencies on April 21, 2005.² During the summer of 2005, additional revisions to the strategic planning process were proposed.² These revisions will be considered by all constituent groups in the fall of 2005.

The strategic planning process is cyclical in that it will project college planning for the upcoming five years and the planning process will be revised and updated every five years, henceforth. The strategic plan is intended to assess the current status as well as the future needs of programs, students, and the community consistent with the recommendations of the program review process and the institutional core learning outcomes. The strategic plan provides a systematic framework for decisions about program and course development, enrollment management and coordination and integration of these decisions with budget and facilities planning processes as well as faculty, classified and administrative hiring priorities or human resource planning.

The strategic planning process is designed to be inclusive and systematically integrate budget and resource allocations with recommendations from the program review process. The planning process involves four focus groups as follows: academic planning; organizational effectiveness; student success/access; resource and budget planning.^{2 (pg. 2)} Each focus group will consist of seven members elected by all college constituent groups^{2 (pg. 2)} The focus groups will develop goals, objectives, and implement planning strategies consistent with human resource planning, including the development of administrative and classified hiring priority processes, physical resource planning, technology resource planning, and fiscal resource planning.

At the request of the office of instruction, the academic senate developed a program discontinuance policy on February 2, 2005. Additionally, the academic senate developed a program/discipline realignment policy on February 22, 2005.³ The policies were reviewed and revised by the college president, the deans council, the instructional council, president's council, and the final policies were adopted by the college on May 5, 2005.³ These policies will be implemented by the strategic planning focus groups when it is determined a program is no longer serving the needs of the community and therefore must be discontinued, and/or when a program/discipline must be realigned within another school or department.

Throughout the spring of 2005, the college drafted and revised the strategic planning process, including the program discontinuance policy and the program/discipline realignment policy. All parties made considerable effort to come together to develop a mutually acceptable cyclic and comprehensive planning process for the benefit of the college. Now, the college must implement the planning process. The college plans to begin implementation of the strategic planning process during the flex week activities at the onset of the fall 2005 semester.^{4,5}

Additional Planning: In the fall of 2005, the academic senate will produce a draft of a program development policy for review and study by the college. The program development policy will define both a process for assessing the need for the development of new programs and the procedures for implementing a new program. This policy will complete the college's programmatic planning process consisting of program review, program/discipline realignment, and program discontinuance.

In addition to the work of the resource and budget planning focus group, in accordance with California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Section 53200 (c)(10), in the fall of 2005, the college administration and the academic senate will undertake a comprehensive review of the college budget/resource allocation process to ensure the budget process is open, inclusive, and incorporates the program review oversight committee recommendations and is consistent with institutional core learning outcomes.

Further, the college strategic planning process will be coordinated with the district educational and facilities master plan. On April 8, 2005, the district invited all constituent groups to participate in interviews of several planning firms and subsequently a firm was selected.⁶ This firm will develop a district educational master plan which will integrate the college strategic plan. The district educational and facilities master planning committee, comprised of representatives from both colleges and the district, will begin meeting on a regular basis on August 12, 2005.⁷ The district has also begun the development of the advanced technology educational park (ATEP) and a district advisory committee, consisting of representatives selected from both colleges and the district, has been formed to ensure that the development of the educational park is coordinated with the two colleges.⁸ On June 16, 2005, the board of trustees held a workshop for the purpose of reviewing the ATEP vision/mission statement as well as the guidelines for funding and the criteria for the selection of education and business partnerships.⁹ On July 19, 2005, the board of trustees approved guidelines for ATEP development.

****References:**

- 1) February 17, 2005 Senate Agenda/Minutes: Strategic Planning Process
- 2) Strategic Planning Process Document
- 3) Program Realignment and Program Discontinuance Policies
- 4) Implementation of Strategic Planning Process
- 5) Senate President: Memo to Faculty-Strategic Planning Process
- 6) District Memo: Educational and Facilities Master Planning Process
- 7) District Memo: Educational and Facilities Master Planning Schedule
- 8) District Memo: ATEP Advisory Committee (6/9/05)
- 9) BOT Special Meeting Agenda: BOT ATEP Workshop (6/15/05)

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 1.B.1)

Response: In response to the commission's recommendation, the college began to educate faculty, staff, and administrators relative to the issues surrounding student learning at comes at the course, program, degree, certificate, and institutional levels. In February of 2005, faculty, staff, and administrators attended the VETA conference on student learning outcomes.¹ On February 17, 2005, faculty members who attended the conference presented a report to the academic senate cabinet.² On April 8, 2005, the college sent 14 faculty members, staff, and administrators to the _____ conference and reports from the conference were given to the academic senate, instructional council, and president's council.³ On May 5, 2005 the academic senate confirmed the appointment of Dr. Jerry Rudmann as chair of the learning outcomes committee.⁴ Dr. Rudmann, a psychology instructor, has formal training in educational measurement, and has presented several learning outcomes workshops on behalf of the statewide Research and Planning Group over the past three years. His long association and familiarity with the college, as well as his established reputation and expertise in the field of student learning outcomes ideally qualifies him to lead the student learning outcomes committee. Dr. Kari Tucker will serve as a co-facilitator of the learning outcomes committee. Dr. Tucker holds a PhD in Social Psychology and has extensive qualifications for conducting research on student learning outcomes. While in her doctorate program, Dr. Tucker minored in quantitative psychology, earning the equivalent of an additional master's degree. For the past three years, Dr. Tucker has been actively participating in the psychology department's learning outcomes work at IVC. In February of 2005, Dr. Rudmann conducted SLO workshops for the school of social and behavioral sciences and the school of guidance and counseling.^{5, 6}

On May 5, 2005, the academic senate nominated and appointed faculty members to serve on the student learning outcomes committee and the college president confirmed the appointments.^{4, 7} The college president and the vice president of instruction also appointed administrators and staff to the committee.⁸ The members of the learning

outcomes committee overlap with the program review oversight committee and the committee on courses in order to ensure that the discourse and understanding of student learning outcomes is universally shared, communicated, and compatible at all levels of the institution. The current committee membership therefore includes full-time faculty representatives from life sciences, mathematics, social sciences, student services, humanities, as well as an academic dean, the academic senate president, and the college researcher.

The committee held its first meeting on May 17, 2005 and continued meeting throughout the summer.⁹ The committee identified its mission as follows: *to encourage, serve as a resource, and oversee learning outcomes activities on the campus*. The college president and senate president have agreed that the learning outcomes committee will become college-wide standing committee working under the auspices of the academic senate and, as such, will channel all formal recommendations and communication regarding its work to the academic senate. The college will take formal action on this issue in the fall of 2005. The learning outcomes committee will distribute all meeting agendas and minutes to the chairs of the curriculum committee and the program review oversight committees, respectively. The academic senate will coordinate the work of the learning outcomes committee with the instructional council, the student services counsel, and the president's council.

The committee's initial goal was to review and become familiar with references to student learning outcomes appearing in several key documents: the college mission statement, the accreditation standards, the latest program review procedures for instruction and student services, and recommendations 2 and 4 issued by the visiting 2004 accrediting team.

After reviewing these documents, the committee developed the following proposals which will be reviewed, revised, and adopted by the college in the fall of 2005:

- **Development of institutional level learning outcomes.** After considerable dialogue, the committee forwarded a draft of proposed institutional level learning outcomes to the academic senate for comment, suggested revisions, and adoption.¹⁰ The senate will present and act on this document during the fall of 2005. Additionally, this document will be reviewed, revised, and adopted by the instructional council, student services council, and the president's council in the fall of 2005. Discussion regarding core outcomes will help introduce faculty, administrators, and staff to learning outcome terminology, and will provide a structure for organizing assessment reports.
- **Definition of terms.** Anticipating confusion over the many terms used in learning outcomes work (e.g., learning goals, learning objectives, learning outcomes, robust outcomes, rubrics), the committee developed a list of terms and definitions.¹¹ It is the committee's intention that through a continuing referral and usage process, this terminology will be standardized and institutionalized across the various college committees and entities that address student learning outcomes issues. The current list will continue to grow and undergo refinement as more college personnel become involved in this area.

- **SLO implementation plan for 2005-06.** The committee developed a comprehensive plan for implementing learning outcomes college-wide.¹² The plan includes training strategies for engaging faculty and student services staff in the identification and assessment of student learning outcomes, support personnel (e.g., clerical, technical, and additional research support), a fully developed and interactive college SLO intranet website, as well as anticipated deliverables at the end of the academic year. The workshop co-facilitators (Drs. Rudmann and Tucker) have developed a two-part workshop for faculty and plan to customize the workshop for faculty and staff working in student services.¹² The college administration has indicated its total commitment to this effort by approving all of the budgetary requests proposed by the committee to ensure full implementation of this plan.¹³

Additional Planning: The learning outcomes committee will continue to develop and implement recommendations, resources, strategies, and technology solutions to support an effective and on-going learning outcomes program for the college. Topics on the committee's planning agenda include:

- **Guidelines and safeguards.** Guidelines for gathering, reporting, and using learning outcomes information need to be developed to preclude any misuse of assessment data. It needs to be widely understood, for example, that assessment data shall belong solely to the faculty and staff directly involved with identification of the learning outcome statements for which the data are gathered. Faculty need assurances that safeguards are in place (e.g., aggregation of outcome data across sections of the same course) to protect data from inappropriate interpretation or use (e.g. for punitive purposes).
- **Survey of current SLO practices.** The committee plans to survey faculty to identify disciplines already engaged in learning outcomes assessment work. They are especially interested in finding instances in which SLO practices are part of the department's routine business, are based upon extensive and inclusive dialogue among the department's instructors, have produced program and/or pedagogical improvements, and have resulted in improved student learning outcomes. The survey is currently launched at the committee's SLO intranet site.
- **Best practices.** Once these are identified, the committee will explore ways to acknowledge and communicate to the larger campus community instances of successful and exemplary SLO work taking place within instruction or student services. One avenue will be the college's intranet site and web page for student learning outcomes, as described below.
- **Organizing website.** The committee will identify the criteria needed for a SLO website. These criteria will be given to a website developer. Besides providing resource documents, models of best practices, worksheets, and links, the site must provide for virtual dialogue and document sharing among faculty and staff. The committee foresees development of electronic tools for creating and using scoring rubrics, spreadsheet templates that provide automatic scoring and charting, and a database that could be queried in order to produce custom reports for any or the entire core learning outcomes.

- **Identify strategies to encourage ongoing dialogue.** The committee will examine and evaluate strategies for maintaining the SLO dialogues. For example, discipline specific "SLO circles" could be scheduled during flex week in order to encourage faculty to satisfy a portion of their flex hour obligation while discussing and reviewing their outcome assessment data. Another strategy will be to create discipline-specific groups having password access to the Share Point software on the college's intranet site for student learning outcomes.
- **Efficient Data Gathering.** The committee will identify, evaluate, and facilitate implementation of efficient data-gathering methods. Options to evaluate, for example, include the use of online surveys, scannable hard-copy surveys, Student Response Systems, electronic scoring rubrics, Peer-Calibrated-Review, and so on.

Drs. Rudman and Tucker presented a learning outcomes workshop for faculty on August 16, 2005.¹⁴ The workshop was designed to help faculty identify and assess several high priority learning outcomes and design an assessment plan. Participants designed several robust learning outcome statements and a scoring rubric to assess the outcomes. Participants in this workshop volunteered to become peer-mentors to assist other faculty in establishing learning outcomes as per the aforementioned learning outcomes plan.

****References:**

- 1) VETA Conference Brochure
- 2) Miriam's Report to Senate Cabinet; Senate Agenda & Minutes
- 3) April 8, 2005 SLO Conference Brochure/Traci's Report
- 4) May 5, 2005 Senate Agenda/Minutes Confirming Jerry and committee members
- 5) Social Science Meeting Minutes—Jerry's SLO Report
- 6) Guidance & Counseling Meeting Minutes—Jerry's SLO Report
- 7) Office of the President Memo Confirming Jerry and SLO Committee
- 8) Office of the President Memo Administrative Appt to SLO Committee
- 9) Minutes of Summer 2005 SLO Committee
- 10) Institutional Learning Outcomes Document
- 11) List of Definition of Terms Document
- 12) College-wide Comprehensive SLO Plan Document
- 13) Office of the President Memo Confirming Budget Requests
- 14) August 16, 2005 Learning Outcomes Workshop Announcement/Agenda

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. (Standards II. A.1.2; B. 1, 3,)**

Response: In accordance with the commission's recommendation, the program review oversight committee revised the program review process and it was adopted by the academic senate on November 2, 2004.^{1,2,3} The revised process requires the program review oversight committee to prepare an annual report (program review summary and conclusions report) containing all of the information submitted by the programs under review in the current cycle.^{1, Step 11} In May of 2005, the oversight committee submitted the program review summary and conclusions report for the 2004-2005 academic year to the college president.⁴ The deans council and instructional council reviewed the program review summary and conclusions in June of 2005.^{5,6} The revised process further requires the president to submit the program recommendations to the appropriate office(s) for planning purposes.^{1, step 12} (The former process only required the president to review the results of the program recommendations.³) Pursuant to the revised process, in June of 2005, the president submitted the 2004-2005 program recommendations to the appropriate offices.⁷ Under the revised process, the president and the oversight committee will evaluate and assess how effectively the program recommendations have been incorporated in the college planning processes.^{1, step 13-14} This assessment will take place in the fall of 2005.

The revisions to the program review process in conjunction with the implementation of strategic planning provide the college with an opportunity to assess and implement the recommendations derived from the review of each program. Based upon this assessment, the president, the academic senate, and the program review oversight committee can make modifications in the program review processes and the strategic planning process as appropriate.

Additional Planning: The program review process is systematically evaluated annually by the president, the oversight committee, and the academic senate to determine how it may be improved.⁸ Presently, the forms and the templates for data collection are under review by the oversight committee.⁸ In the fall of 2005, the strategic planning focus groups will begin to incorporate and implement the recommendations based upon the program review process. In compliance with this process, the aforementioned revisions to the program review process will be reviewed and modified in the spring of 2006.^{1, step 14}

****References:**

- 1) The Revised Program Review Process (11/2/04)
- 2) Academic Senate Agenda/Minutes (11/2/04)
- 3) The former Program Review Process
- 4) Program Review Summary & Conclusions Report (2004-2005)
- 5) Deans Council Minutes (6 /6 /05)
- 6) Instructional Council Minutes (6/7/05)

- 7) President's Submission to appropriate offices (6/05)
- 8) Program Review Annual Progress Report 2004-2005

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. (Standards II.A.1.c,2.e,f,h,I;A.3,6.a;B.1,3,4; and C.1,2).

Response: Research Support. Individuals with extensive research expertise have taken primary leadership roles on the learning outcomes committee. The research team is coordinated by Dr. Neena Verma, IVC's college researcher. Dr. Verma holds a PhD in Sociology and has been actively involved in SLO training at various levels and venues. Over the past five years, she has conducted hands-on research in a variety of organizational settings, such as the State government, non-profit research agencies, as well as in higher education. Some of her early research work dealt with developing measurable performance outcomes for homelessness assistance programs that were funded by the State – an exercise that is conceptually similar to that of developing measurable student learning outcomes. Dr. Jerry Rudmann is the research team's second member. Dr. Rudmann, also the learning outcomes committee chair, holds a Masters in experimental psychology and a PhD in educational research. As the college's former matriculation researcher, Dr. Rudmann has an intimate understanding of the college's research database, as well as the college's overall research capacity and limitations. He has five years of additional experience performing institutional research in his current capacity as research director at a nearby community college. He is also currently Vice President (southern region) of the statewide Research and Planning Group. Dr. Kari Tucker, the learning outcomes co-facilitator will be the third member of the research team. Dr. Scott Simpson, director of research and planning, SOCCCD, will provide additional research expertise to the college's student learning outcomes committee once active work in the actual development of assessment tools, data processing and compiling, and analysis are initiated.

Research Agenda

Several strategies will be developed to provide research in support of student learning outcomes. First, the research team will seek ways to help faculty and student services staff gather assessment data using the least obtrusive, most efficient methods available. In this sense, the researchers will play an important supporting role for helping academic departments and student service units acquire valid direct learning outcome data through scannable hard copy surveys, online surveys, and student response systems or similar electronic devices.

The research team is currently investigating several different programs and options for easy and efficient data gathering and analysis. For instance the college's IT Department makes available Blackboard and Share Point. Both of these software programs have the option for launching customized surveys with the capability of gathering and tabulating survey results. These would be ideal for collecting assessment data via pre- and post-

surveys. The advantage of using these in-house programs is that several instructors are already familiar with these programs and have been using them for pedagogical and other purposes. In addition, the team is also evaluating a new surveying product, Class Climate, which is currently being piloted at several institutions across the nation.

Because the learning outcomes committee will stress the importance of identifying "robust" learning outcomes, outcomes most appropriately assessed through custom-designed scoring rubrics, an online rubric generator and rubric scoring software system will also be evaluated.

The research team also plans to oversee and facilitate acquisition of indirect learning outcomes evidence needed to develop a more comprehensive assessment of student learning. For example, the researchers will try to facilitate a data-sharing agreement (more formally known as a CalPASS MOU agreement) between Irvine Valley College and its local transfer institutions. Data-sharing information will provide feedback, organized by major, on how well IVC's transfer students are performing in upper division coursework. Course and grade data on former IVC students now attending CSU Fullerton would provide extremely interesting and useful SLO feedback to IVC's instructors and student services staff.

The college research office will provide other forms of indirect evidence of learning normally collected and reported by IR offices. This information will be available to instructional departments and student service units. These measures will include course retention and success rates, course success rates in degree level courses for students previously completing the discipline's basic skills course(s), transfer rates, and students' self-perceptions of their learning progress.

Indirect evidence of institutional level core outcomes measures will also be gathered and evaluated through the annually implemented graduate follow-up survey. In order to test the feasibility and acceptability of both the format as well as the kind of data collected, the college's research office conducted a pilot study via the college's graduate follow-up survey in May 2005. The process, as well as the embedded SLO questions and survey results will be shared with the student learning outcomes committee for further evaluation.

Because of their familiarity with measurement and psychometric concepts, the research team will create training modules designed to help faculty become proficient in using various assessment strategies and procedures. The researchers anticipate that faculty who identify robust learning outcomes will be interested in learning to create and use scoring rubrics for assessing student performances, and how to conduct cross-rater reliability sessions to calibrate the scorers. The research team will provide information on embedded assessment, authentic assessment, and, for objective format assessment, item analysis procedures. The team also will provide guidance qualitative assessment methods, e.g., how to conduct focus groups and surveys of transfer students.

Finally, the learning outcomes research team will take primary responsibility for assessing and reporting on the college's overall progress regarding the ten institutional level (core) learning outcomes. One strategy for accomplishing this task will be to develop a student learning outcomes database. We anticipate that many academic disciplines and student service units will have course, program, and unit level learning outcomes in mind for their students and that these learning outcomes will simultaneously contribute to the college's institutional level outcomes. Our SLO database will permit us to create reports sorted by any core outcome. Other strategies to explore include ways to motivate students to try their best on any institutional level assessments by providing, for example, special recognition to graduating students who have demonstrated a certain level of proficiency on IVC's ten core outcomes.

In summary, an experienced, talented research team has come forward to support and facilitate the college's student learning outcomes activities. This team will provide strong support to faculty and staff as they identify and assess student learning outcomes.

- 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, and 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: Many of the issues associated with the high turnover rate among administrators and classified personnel at the college are associated with the reorganization of the district and the two colleges by the board of trustees in July of 1997. On June 19, 1998, the commission requested an additional progress report concerning the administrative organization of the college. At that time, 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.”¹ The report further states: “[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. Two examples are the reorganization of the two colleges and the administrative appointment policy.”¹ The college has struggled with the implementation of the administrative reorganization imposed by the board of trustees since July of 1997.

A significant consequence of the administrative reorganization was a tremendous increase in workload for all administrators. Prior to 1997, ten faculty chairs and a dean of instructional programs conducted the middle level management of the college. As a result of the reorganization, the ten academic schools, formerly led by ten faculty chairs, were condensed into five administrative positions and the dean of instructional programs position was eliminated. This, of course, means that the five deans are responsible for the work formerly performed by eleven individuals. Academic chair positions were created

on an ad hoc basis to assist the five deans. The faculty serving as academic chairs were given a small stipend to perform their duties and as a result, most of the work fell on the deans and their classified support staff.

Since the original reorganization and the subsequent resignations and retirements, the college has taken steps to fill vacant administrative positions. The School of Fine Arts, Physical Education and Athletics has been separated, thus reducing the workload for the respective deans. In January of 2005 a permanent dean was hired for the School of Physical Education and Athletics.² Also, in January of 2005, the college hired a permanent dean for the School of Fine Arts and the School of Humanities and Languages.² In June of 2005, the college hired a permanent dean for the School of Guidance and Counseling.² The hiring process for the permanent dean of the School of Mathematics, Sciences, and Technologies (Check name of School) was not successful, however, the college expects to readvertise and fill this position on a permanent basis in January of 2006.³ Thus, the only remaining vacant administrative position is the Dean of the School of Mathematics, Sciences, and Technologies.

On April 21, 2005, the vice president of instruction conducted an administrative retreat for the instructional deans.⁴ One of the topics addressed at the retreat included a re-evaluation of the duties and compensation for the academic chairs. The compensation rate for the academic chairs was slightly increased commensurate with the expected duties.⁵ Additionally, the number of academic chairs per school/department was re-evaluated and readjusted depending on the workload.⁵ This preliminary re-evaluation of the workload of the academic chairs and additional compensation may assist in decreasing the workload of the administrative positions and decrease the high turnover rate of administrative and classified staff.

On May 23, 2005, the board of trustees granted a salary increase for all district and college administrators.⁶ Significantly, the board also adjusted the length of the administrative contracts.⁶ (Incorporate revised contract language here and compare with the current circumstances.) The salary increase and the increase in the length of the administrative contracts should enable the college to attract and retain competent administrators and serve to decrease the high rate of administrative turnover.

On March 24, 2005, the senior administrators met to address the classified hiring priorities.⁷ During the retreat, the administrators and managers presented a justification for the classified positions.⁸ The justifications were reviewed and ranked in priority order⁹ and a final list of classified hiring priorities was developed.⁷

Additional Planning: The college will engage in further dialogue concerning the college administrative and classified organizational structure to ensure the integrity of the programs and services. This opportunity will occur in the fall of 2005 within the strategic planning process as part of the planning agenda for the 'academic planning and organizational effectiveness focus groups' as documented in recommendation 1. The administrative workload needs to be systematically evaluated for each of the ten schools and adjusted as appropriate. The compensation of the academic chairs needs to be

adjusted to be commensurate with the expected duties. This may require a shift from the current stipend mode of compensation to reassigned time. In addition, the workload of the senior administrative positions needs to be assessed, re-evaluated, and adjusted as appropriate. Further, the college administrators must be empowered to make decisions in the best interest of the college.

****References:**

- 1) June 19, 1998 ACCJC Report
- 2) Administrative Hiring Chart
- 3) Memo from Glenn: Dean of Math Hiring Process
- 4) April 21, 2005 Administrative Retreat Announcement/Agenda
- 5) Chair Compensation Chart (April 21, 2005)
- 6) May 23, 2005 Board Minutes: Approval Administrative Contracts
- 7) March 24, 2005 Leadership Retreat: Classified Hiring Priorities
- 8) March 24, 2005 Leadership Retreat: Classified Hiring Priorities Justification
- 9) March 24, 2005 Leadership Retreat: Classified Hiring Priorities Ranking

- 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: This task force (Board President, Chancellor, IVC & SC College Presidents and Vice Presidents, IVC & SC Senate Presidents and Senate Representatives, and IVC & SC Accreditation Chairs) met on August 5, 2005. The response to this recommendation is currently being drafted and it will be available as soon as possible.

- G. 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 IV. A. 1, 2, 3, 5)**

Response: This task force (Board President, Chancellor, IVC & SC College Presidents and Vice Presidents, IVC & SC Senate Presidents and Senate Representatives, and IVC & SC Accreditation Chairs) met on August 5, 2005. The response to this recommendation is currently being drafted and it will be available as soon as possible.

H. 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.

Response: This recommendation has been the most challenging for all constituent groups. The hostility, cynicism, despair, and fear identified by the commission are long standing issues that have been perpetual in nature. There has been progress at the college as well as within the district. However, there is disagreement as to how to resolve such systemic issues. The progress report oversight committee agreed to respond to this recommendation by including the views of the constituent groups and the action taken from each perspective to address the commission's concerns.

College Progress: The Academic Senate

The college administration and the academic senate have made a concerted effort to work together in a collaborative and collegial manner in order to reduce the hostility, cynicism, despair, and fear that permeates the college climate. The college administration accepted the academic senate recommendation for a faculty co-chair to assist in drafting this progress report and the parties mutually agreed upon the progress report process and timelines as documented in the statement on report preparation. Since the faculty accreditation co-chair is also the academic senate president, the senate has played an integral role in the development of the accreditation progress report.

The college administration and the academic senate collegially developed and mutually agreed upon the strategic planning process, the program/discipline realignment policy, and the program discontinuance policy as documented in recommendation 1. The college administration accepted the academic senate recommendation regarding the faculty chair of the student learning outcomes committee and provided the requested funding to accomplish this important endeavor as documented in recommendation 2 and 4. The parties have mutually agreed upon the revisions to the program review process and the administration is implementing the program review recommendations as documented in recommendation 3. Additionally, the vice president of instruction and the academic senate collaborated and mutually developed a proposal for an alternative calendar.¹ The proposal has not yet been endorsed by the entire college community or the district. However, the parties look forward to continued discussion in 2005-2006. The vice president of instruction regularly attends the academic senate meetings. In this capacity, the vice president has assisted in enhancing collegial communication between the academic senate and the administration.

In support of staff development activities, the college president allocated fiscal resources for faculty and staff professional development activities for the academic year 2005-2006 from general fund. The academic affairs committee developed guidelines for the distribution of the funds.^{2,3} The college has not received staff development funds since the State eliminated funding in 2003 and the lack of such funds has been of considerable concern to the college community.

In summary, the college has taken steps to respond to recommendation 8 and these efforts have enhanced the collegial atmosphere. However, the college community is well aware that the improved level of collegiality could erode quickly if micromanagement by the board of trustees and district administration resumes.

College Progress: Student Services

On February 11, 2005, the student services staff held an off-campus retreat and one of the principal items discussed was recommendation 8.⁴ Counselors, managers, administrators, and classified employees examined the commission's characterization of the campus climate in both small groups and later in full forum. This facilitated discussion was cathartic for many, because each had the opportunity in a safe environment to express their feelings.

The president of the college was invited to attend the latter part of the retreat and was present for the group discussion of recommendation 8. Collectively, ways to create a more supportive campus environment were identified. The analogy of a marriage gone awry because of an affair was used, and employees stated that just as some marriages weather the storm and become stronger because of it, so can Irvine Valley College. They acknowledged that it will take time to rebuild trust, but they were confident it could happen. The president affirmed that he would do all that he could to rebuild that trust. He reassured the participants that he has an "open door policy" and all are welcome to express their concerns.

College Progress: Instruction

On April 21, 2005, the instructional deans participated in an off campus retreat to deal with several issues of importance to the college. One of the principal items reviewed during the course of this meeting were elements related to recommendation 8.⁵ As a part of this process the academic senate president was invited to participate in the review of stipend assignments to ensure fairness as related to faculty assignments. The retreat allowed for honest explorations of the difficulties facing the college and district.

The president of the college was invited to attend the post-retreat dinner and the parties discussed the concerns raised during the retreat. At the conclusion of the day's events the general consensus was that the retreat was worthwhile and additional events of this nature should be held periodically. The college president and vice president of instruction concurred with this assessment and agreed to conduct such retreats periodically during the course of the year. A follow up retreat will be held on November 1, 2005.

The board approved a change in the hiring process that permitted the vice presidents to serve on the second level interviews of both faculty and administrative positions. This revision gave the college greater control in the selection of those individuals believed most capable of serving the college.⁶ Operating under the revised process, the college president accepted the committees' recommendations for the dean of the school of humanities and languages and the school of fine arts, as well as for the dean of the school of health sciences, physical education and athletics. These administrators commenced their duties on January 2, 2005.⁷ The dean of the school of guidance and counseling hiring process concluded in June of 2005, and the college looks forward to the conclusion of the hiring process for the dean of the school of mathematics, sciences, and technologies in January of 2006. The college anticipates that all administrative positions will be filled in January of 2006. This will greatly enhance administrative stability, a perceived necessary element in order to ensure integrity of college programs and services. It is also anticipated that filling of these administrative positions will assist the college in reducing the some of the underlying elements related to recommendation 8.

College Progress: Classified Staff

On June 3, 2005, classified staff devoted part of its staff development day to recommendation 8.⁸ Using a workshop format, approximately 70 staff members identified more than 20 "morale boosters" that would foster a supportive campus climate.⁹ This list was discussed and prioritized by tabulating the degree to which staff believed the item would assist in creating a supportive working environment. The president met with his executive staff to review the list and the top fourteen items have been implemented or will be implemented in the fall of 2005.

Additionally, the staff focused on "hostility, cynicism, despair and fear" by looking at the manifestations of the opposite characteristics on campus. Therefore, examples of friendliness, optimism, hope and trust were discussed.¹⁰ Staff listed expressions of each attribute and then collectively discussed ways to institutionalize them. At the close of the workshop, staff repeatedly mentioned their desire to move forward and let the past be past.

District Progress

Reduction of hostility, cynicism, despair, and fear within the district is far more difficult to describe and/or document and may best be characterized as mixed. The classified staff is currently engaged in contract negotiations with the district. After three years of contentious negotiations, the contract with the faculty association (the exclusive bargaining agency for the faculty) was positively resolved. In April of 2005, 93.5 % of the district faculty ratified the academic employee master agreement and on _____, the board of trustees unanimously approved the master agreement.^{11, 12} Of particular significance to the college is the contractual provision which allows the college president to approve stipends and/or reassigned time for faculty willing to accept shared governance positions and extra-contractual assignments. Additionally, the contract no longer allows the district to enforce a long standing “management rule” which precluded faculty from accepting reassigned time if they elected to undertake overload assignments. This was a major obstacle in attracting faculty to participate in shared governance as they were precluded from accepting reassigned time if they elected to teach overload, a difficulty noted in the accreditation report. Acceptance of these provisions by district administration and the board of trustees are intended to improve college climate. The faculty association will be negotiating a memorandum of understanding with the district to address the inequity between stipend compensation and reassigned time.¹³

The district authorized the hiring of eleven faculty replacement positions to fill the number of 2004 faculty retirements at the college even though the number of replacement positions exceeded the requirement set by the state chancellor’s office.¹⁴ The faculty hiring processes concluded in June of 2005.

During the spring of 2005, the chancellor initiated numerous of “brown bag luncheons” in response to recommendation 8¹⁵. These efforts were met with mixed results as some were well attended and others not were not.

From the faculty’s perspective, district leadership and the board have taken several small steps to address recommendation 8, however, these actions are not perceived as significant efforts to address the commission’s concerns regarding the hostility, cynicism, and fear that plague the college.

In January of 2005, when the board moved their meeting location into the new health sciences building at saddleback college, the board president requested that faculty and classified leadership be seated at the table as participants in board meetings rather than be seated in the audience as was originally planned. Additionally, microphones were installed for the faculty and classified leadership rather than requiring the leadership to address the board at the podium as members of the audience.

Concluding Comments

From the faculty and staff perspective, the most significant issue relative to the climate of despair that continues to plague the college was the renewal of the chancellor’s contract on June 21, 2005. On May 17, 2004, 93.5% of the district faculty voted no confidence in the chancellor.^{16, 17} By renewing the chancellor’s contract, it is the view of the faculty

that the board majority has continued to dismiss the voice of the faculty causing dismay, concern, and further despair.^{18, 19, 20, 21} Despite repeated efforts by the faculty association, IVC and SC academic senates, classified senate, and CSEA to communicate with the board president and other members of the board of trustees, the trustees voted 4-2-1 to renew the contract and granted the chancellor a substantial retroactive increase in salary. These actions outraged dissenting board members and faculty.²² Approximately seventy-five faculty members attended the June 21, 2005 board meeting.¹⁸ Almost all faculty who attended the meeting were there to protest and voice their opposition to the board's actions regarding the chancellor's contract.¹⁸

The consequences of the chancellor's contract renewal are not fully apparent at the time of the preparation of this document. The commission should be able to appreciate the level of contention that exists within the district as result of this action.

**References

- 1) Senate Agenda/Minutes—Approving Alternative Calendar (5/5/05)
- 2) President's Memo-Staff Development Funds Available
- 3) Academic Affairs Guidelines-Distribution of Staff Development Funds
- 4) Student Services Retreat Announcement (2/11/05)
- 5) Deans Retreat Announcement/Agenda (4/21/05)
- 6) Faculty and Administrative Hiring Policies
- 7) January Board Minutes-Approval Deans
- 8) Classified Staff Development Day Announcement (6/3/05)
- 9) Classified Staff-Morale Boosters (6/3/05)
- 10) Classified Staff-Friendliness, Optimism, Hope, & Trust (6/3/05)
- 11) Faculty Association Contract Ratification ()
- 12) Board Minutes—Approval Faculty Contract (5/23/05)
- 13) Faculty Association Minutes—MOU Stipends/Reassigned Time
- 14) President's Memo—Faculty Hiring—Eleven Positions
- 15) Brown Bag Luncheons-Announcements
- 16) Districtwide Faculty Vote of No Confidence (5-17-04)
- 17) Basis for Districtwide Faculty Vote of No Confidence (4/04)
- 18) United Governance Groups Memo to Faculty—6/21/05 Board Meeting
- 19) District Faculty/Classified Memo to Board President (6/05)
- 20) Orange County Register Article—Chancellor's Contract
- 21) Irvine World News Article—Chancellor's Contract
- 22) Faculty Association Board Report (6/21/05)

Revised 7-5-05: Accreditation Progress Report Oversight Committee
Revised 7-8-05: Vice President of Instruction
Revised 7-8-05: Vice President Student Services
Revised 7-11-05: Office of the President
Revised 7-12-05: Accreditation Progress Report Oversight Committee
Revised 7-26-05: Accreditation Progress Report Oversight Committee
Revised 8-2-05: Accreditation Progress Report Oversight Committee
Revised 8-9-05: Accreditation Progress Report Oversight Committee