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

**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   Date
                         Accreditation Liaison Officer
                         Accreditation Co Chair**

_____   _____

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

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 4, 2005, the president requested an electronic copy of the final report and action letter from the commission.[1] 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.[2]   Unfortunately, because an electronic copy of the action letter was not included in the February 7th email from the commission, the action letter was not posted on the website or placed in the library pursuant to commission guidelines. Consequently, the action letter was unevenly distributed throughout 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]

On May 6, 2005, the college president accepted the academic senate's recommendation that a faculty co-chair assist in the development of the progress report and 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 who should respond to each recommendation.[6]

**References

[1] *Office of the President: Email to ACCJC Requesting Electronic Copies and ACCJC Response*
[2] *Feb. 8, 2005 Collegewide Memo*
[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 and 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 study.[1] 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, and 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 were adopted on September 1, 2005.[2]

The strategic planning process is cyclical in that it will project college planning for the upcoming five years and will be revised and updated every five years, henceforth. The strategic plan is intended to assess both the current status and 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 making decisions about program and course development, enrollment management and coordination and integrating these decisions with the 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; and 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 and objectives, and will 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, and the president's council. 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 that a program is no longer serving the needs of the community and therefore must be discontinued, and/or when a program/discipline should 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. The college began to implement 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 delineate 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, a 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 an open, inclusive budget process which incorporates the program review oversight committee recommendations and reflects the 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 the interviews of several planning firms.[6] This firm is charged with developing a district educational master plan which integrates 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 further development of 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 and the guidelines for funding and selecting education and business partnerships.[9] On July 19, 2005, the board of trustees approved guidelines for ATEP development.

**References

1^1 *Academic Senate Agenda/Minutes: Strategic Planning Process (02-17-2005)*
1^2 *Strategic Planning Process Document*
1^3 *Program Realignment and Program Discontinuance Policies*
1^4 *Implementation of Strategic Planning Process*
1^5 *Memo from Academic Senate President to Faculty on Strategic Planning Process*
1^6 *Memo from District - Educational and Facilities Master Planning Process*
1^7 *Memo from District - Educational and Facilities Master Planning Schedule*
1^8 *Memo from District - ATEP Advisory Committee (06-09-2005)*
1^9 *Board of Trustees Special Meeting Agenda: Board of Trustees ATEP Workshop (06-15-2005)*

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 address the issues surrounding student learning outcomes at the course, program, degree, certificate, and institutional levels. In February of 2005, faculty, staff, and administrators attended a 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 9 faculty members, staff, and administrators to the Chief Instructional Officers Region 8 conference at Rio Hondo College. 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. His long association and familiarity with the college, as well as his established reputation and expertise in the field of student learning outcomes ideally qualify 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 appointed administrators and staff to the committee.[8] The members of the learning outcomes committee overlap with the members on the program review oversight committee and the members of 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, and 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 a college-wide standing committee working under the auspices of the academic senate and,

as such, will channel all formal recommendations and communications 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 committee, respectively. The academic senate will coordinate the work of the learning outcomes committee with that of the instructional council, the student services council, and the president's council.

The committee's initial goal was to review and become familiar with references to student learning outcomes which appear in several key documents: the college mission statement, the accreditation standards, the 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, in the fall of 2005, this document will be reviewed, revised, and adopted by the instructional council, student services council, and the president's council. Discussion regarding core outcomes will help to introduce faculty, administrators, and staff to learning outcomes 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 other entities that address student learning outcomes issues. The current list will be expanded and refined as more college personnel become involved.
- **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, provisions for 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] To ensure full implementation of this plan, the college administration has indicated its total commitment to this effort by approving all of the budgetary requests proposed by the committee.[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 must 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. use for punitive purposes).
- **Survey of current SLO practices**. The committee plans to survey faculty to identify disciplines already engaged in learning outcomes assessment work. The committee is 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 SLO best practices 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 for dissemination will be the college's intranet site and web page for student learning outcomes, as described below.
- **Organizing website**. The committee will identify and forward to a website developer the criteria needed for an SLO website. In addition to providing resource documents, models of best practices, worksheets, and links, the site must also 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 can be queried in order to produce custom reports for all of the 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 the creation of 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, and peer-calibrated-review.

On August 16, 2005, Drs. Rudmann and Tucker presented a learning outcomes workshop designed to help faculty identify and assess several high priority learning outcomes and design an assessment plan.[14] 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 according to the learning outcomes plan.

**References

2^1 *VETA Conference Brochure*

2^2 *Report from Participating Faculty to Senate Cabinet and Senate Agenda/Minutes*

2^3 *Report from Participating Faculty and SLO Conference Brochure (04-08-2005)*

2^4 *Academic Senate Agenda/Minutes Confirming Dr. Jerry Rudmann and Additional Members for IVC's Student Learning Outcomes Committee (05-05-2005)*

2^5 *Social Science Meeting Minutes – Dr. Jerry Rudmann's SLO Report*

2^6 *Guidance & Counseling Meeting Minutes – Dr. Jerry Rudmann's SLO Report*

2^7 *Communication from President – SLO Implementation Plan*

2^8 *President's Memo on Administrative Appointment to SLO Committee*

2^9 *Meeting Minutes of SLO Committee (Summer 2005)*

2^{10} *College Level Core Outcomes for IVC*

2^{11} *List of Definitions of Terms*

2^{12} *College SLO Implementation Plan*

2^{13} *Communications from the President Confirming SLOC Budget Requests*

2^{14} *Learning Outcomes Workshop Announcement/Agenda (08-16-2005)*

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. The revised process, adopted by the academic senate on November 2, 2004,[1,2,3] 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 to the college president the program review summary and conclusions report for the 2004-2005 academic year.[4] The deans' council and instructional council reviewed the program review summary and conclusions in June of 2005.[5] The revised process further requires that the president submit the program recommendations to the appropriate office(s) for planning purposes.[1, step 12] (The former process required only that the president 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.[6] Under the revised process, the president and the oversight committee will evaluate and assess how effectively the program recommendations have been incorporated into the college planning processes.[1, step 13-14] The first assessment will take place in the fall of 2005.

The revisions to the program review process and 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 modify the program review processes and the strategic planning process as appropriate.

        Additional Planning: The program review process is evaluated annually by the president, the oversight committee, and the academic senate.[7] Presently, the forms and the templates for data collection are under review by the oversight committee.[7] In the fall of 2005, the strategic planning focus groups will begin to incorporate and implement the recommendations derived from the program review process. In compliance with this process, the revisions to the program review process will be reviewed and modified in the spring of 2006.[1, step 14]

**References

    3[1] The Revised Program Review Process (11-02-2004)
    3[2] Academic Senate Agenda/Minutes (11-02-2004)
    3[3] The Former Program Review Process
    3[4] Program Review Summary and Conclusions Report (2004-2005)
    3[5] Instructional Council Meeting Minutes (06-7-2005)

3^6 *President's Submission of Program Review Summary and Conclusions Report*
     to Appropriate offices (09-02-2005)
3^7 *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, including the State government, non-profit research agencies, and 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 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 though scannable hard copy surveys, online surveys, and student response systems or similar electronic devices.

The research team is currently investigating 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, and, as such, they are ideal instruments for collecting assessment data via pre- and post-surveys. The advantage of using these in-house programs is that several instructors are familiar with them. In addition, the team is 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, online rubric generators and rubric scoring software systems 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 establish 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 annual graduate follow-up survey.[1] In order to test the feasibility and acceptability of both the format and validity of the data collected, the college's research office conducted a pilot study via the college's graduate follow-up survey in May 2005.[1] The process, as well as the embedded SLO questions and survey results will be shared with and evaluated by the student learning outcomes committee.

Because of their familiarity with measurement and psychometric concepts, the research team will create training modules designed to train faculty to use assessment strategies and procedures. The researchers anticipate that faculty who identify robust learning outcomes will be interested in learning how to create and use scoring rubrics for assessing student performances and how to conduct cross-rater reliability norming sessions to calibrate the scorers. The research team will provide information on embedded assessment procedures, authentic assessment procedures, and, for objective format assessments, item analysis procedures. The team also will provide guidance regarding qualitative assessment methods, e.g., how to conduct focus groups develop, and analyze and implements 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 core outcome. The SLO committee will also explore strategies to ensure that students understand the importance and relevance of 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.

**References

4^1 *2005 Graduation Follow-Up Survey*

> **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 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]

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 schools;
consequently, five administrative positions and the position of dean of instructional
programs was eliminated so that five deans became responsible for the work formerly
performed by eleven individuals. Academic chair positions were created and the faculty
serving as academic chairs were given a stipend to perform their duties; however, 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 Technology was not successful; however, the college has re-
advertised this position and plans to fill it on a permanent basis in January of 2006.[3]

On April 20, 2005, the vice president of instruction conducted an administrative retreat
for the instructional deans.[4] One of the topics addressed at the retreat was a re-evaluation
of the duties and compensation for the academic chairs. At the retreat, the compensation
rate for the academic chairs was increased slightly 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 those in 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] The salary increase should enable the college to attract and retain competent administrators and 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 meeting, the administrators and managers presented a justification for the classified positions.[8] The justifications were reviewed and ranked in priority order[9] and a final list of classified hiring priorities was developed.[7]

       Additional Planning: To ensure the integrity of the programs and services, the college will engage in further dialogue concerning the college administrative and classified organizational structure. 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 for each of the ten schools must be systematically evaluated and adjusted as appropriate. The compensation for the academic chairs must be adjusted so that the compensation is consistent with the expected duties. This adjustment may require a shift from the current stipend mode of compensation to reassigned time. In addition, the workload of the senior administrative positions must 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

5[1] *ACCJC Report (06-19-1998)*
5[2] *Administrative Hiring Chart*
5[3] *Job Announcement for Dean of Math, Science, and Engineering*
5[4] *Administrative Retreat Announcement/Agenda (04-20-2005)*
5[5] *Proposed and Approved Chair Compensation Charts (04-20-2005)*
5[6] *Board Minutes - Approval Administrative Contracts (05-23-2005)*
5[7] *Leadership Retreat - Classified Hiring Priorities (03-24-2005)*
5[8] *Leadership Retreat - Classified Hiring Priorities Justification (03-24-2005)*
5[9] *Leadership Retreat - Classified Hiring Priorities Ranking (03-24-2005)*

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: The college is limited in its authority and/or ability to respond to this recommendation since it specifically focuses on the practices of the board of trustees. Given this limited authority, the college's response to recommendation 6 primarily documents what has occurred at the district level. Secondarily, this response delineates how the college has addressed the concerns raised by the commission.

The District

In February of 2005, the chancellor distributed a document entitled "Accreditation Goals."[1]   According to the chancellor, "[t]he board of trustees will address this goal."[1] This document was agendized for discussion by the trustees on February 28, 2005 and each successive monthly agenda thereafter; however, very little discussion of this issue actually occurred.[2] On May 16, 2005, the Chancellor recommended that the trustees devote at least one hour at each regular board meeting to discuss the commission recommendations, or in the alternative, he recommended that the board schedule a monthly workshop to address the commission concerns.[2] However, the board did not accept either recommendation.[3]

In a memorandum dated May 16, 2005, the chancellor notified the trustees that he was concerned about the board's lack of discussion regarding the issues raised by the commission.[2] The chancellor states that board meetings are "bogged down by routine questions and answers" that should have been resolved prior to the meetings.[2] Further, the chancellor states that some trustees "appear to be playing to television cameras to gain support from the public."[2] According to the chancellor, board meetings are viewed as "being negative and contentious" and the board is perceived as divided.[2] The chancellor further states that there is a perception of "dissension among board members at meetings, [the] pursuance of personal agendas, [and] [the] punishment of staff who do not necessarily agree with a board member's opinion."[2] According to the chancellor, "as one staff member put it, [this] does not project a positive, polished, or professional image of the district."[2]

Although the May 16, 2005 memorandum from the chancellor to the trustees also includes an article from the *Chronicle of Higher Education* entitled "How to Keep Trustees from Being Micromanagers,"[2] the recommendations in this article have not been publicly discussed by the board or implemented at this time.

At the invitation of the Irvine Valley College administration and the academic senate, on August 5, 2005, the board president and the chancellor participated in a meeting which addressed the issues raised by the commission in recommendation 6 and 7.[3] Because the commission raised similar concerns between the board and Saddleback College, the Saddleback College academic senate president and the Saddleback College accreditation

chair also attended this meeting.[3] At the meeting, the board president stated that "he feels that the board has a role in addressing district policy, not to run the two colleges…and that the board is trying to address the micromanagement problem…by conducting workshops and hiring outside consultants in order to change the manner in which [the board currently] operate."[3, page 2]   Since, as the board president states "this has been happening behind the scenes,"[3, page 2] there is little documentation regarding these efforts. He also stated that he has been meeting weekly with the chancellor to discuss the issues raised regarding recommendation 6.[3, page 2]

In an August 16, 2005 memorandum, the chancellor states that he "believes there has been a concerted effort recently to improve the climate in the district and [that] board president Lang has been instrumental in this endeavor."[4]   As evidence of the concerted effort, the chancellor provides numerous excerpts from board minutes that document instances where the board referred various items to the chancellor for final disposition.[5]

The College

The college administration reports that they have noticed a decrease in board interference with college operations. For example, there has been a modification in administrative and faculty hiring practices. The former practice of conducting second level interviews with the college president and chancellor has been modified to allow the college president and vice presidents to make the final selection in consultation with the chair of the hiring committee.   [The administrative hiring policy is governed by board policy 4011.[6] Although there has been a change in the practice regarding second level interview procedures, there has been no change in the policy.[6] The faculty hiring policy was governed by board policy 4011.1 and 4011.2.[7] As with the administrative hiring policy, although there has been a change in practice regarding second level interview procedures, there has been no change in that policy. Additional discussion regarding the faculty hiring policy will be provided in the response to recommendation 7.]

The college looks forward to continued dialogue with the board of trustees regarding this issue. In this regard, the chancellor states that a workshop with the board will occur in September of 2005.[3]

**References

> 6[1] *Chancellor's Accreditation Goals Document*
> 6[2] *Chancellor's Memo to Board of Trustees and Article from Chronicle of Higher Education (05-16-2005)*
> 6[3] *Meeting Minutes of Recommendations 6 and 7 Task Force (08-05-2005)*
> 6[4] *Chancellor's Memo on Follow-Up to Accreditation Progress Report Meeting (08-16-2005)*
> 6[5] *Chancellor's Excerpts from Board Minutes*
> 6[6] *Administrative Hiring Policy (BP 4011)*

6^7 *Faculty Hiring Policy (BP 4011.1 & BP 4011.2)*

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: The lack of understanding regarding the roles and scopes of authority between the board of trustees, district leadership, and college leadership has been a long standing issue in the district.[1] The concerns noted in this recommendation are directly related to the issues raised by the commission in recommendation 6 and contribute to the "climate plagued with hostility, cynicism, and despair" noted in recommendation 8.

While the parties have not defined, published, adhered to or regularly evaluated their respective roles and scopes of authority as recommended by the commission, some initial efforts have been made in this regard. For example, in order to define the leadership roles and scopes of authority of college and district constituent groups and governance committees, the chancellor requested the participation of the academic senates in technical assistance with the community college league of California and the state academic senate.[1] The senate presidents agreed to participate.[2] The Irvine Valley College academic senate has requested from the board and the chancellor clarification regarding the specific purpose/goals of seeking technical assistance. The IVC academic senate has also requested that the board, the chancellor and the senates mutually agree upon the parties that will conduct the technical assistance process.[3]

The lack of understanding regarding the authority and relationship between the board of trustees/chancellor and the academic senates resulted in three years of litigation which was recently resolved in an appellate court decision regarding the development of faculty hiring procedures, a decision which came down in favor of the academic senates.[4] At issue in the case, and directly relevant to the concerns raised by the commission in recommendation 7, was whether representatives of the board and the academic senates must jointly develop and mutually agree upon hiring procedures, policies, and criteria for new faculty pursuant to Education Code Section 87360 (b) and (c).[4, page 1]

On June 8, 2005, the State Court of Appeals for the state of California, 4th District, Division Three, found that "[T]he bottom line is that the Legislature granted the Senates a role equal to the District's in developing and adopting faculty hiring policies."[4, page 6] Further, the appellate court states "[A]greed upon jointly means what it says - joint agreement - not merely the opportunity to recommend or to participate in the process."[4, page 5] [The district petitioned the appellate court for rehearing on this matter, which was unanimously denied by the appellate court on July 8, 2005.[5] The district then petitioned the California Supreme Court for review, which was also denied on August 30, 2005.[6]] In a press release regarding the appellate court decision, the board president and the chancellor state that they view this decision as a "dangerous precedent taking authority

away from elected governing boards and placing that authority in the hands of unelected academic senates."[7]

This case sets precedent in the State of California by clarifying the role of the academic senates and establishing that the senates are not merely advisory bodies to the board of trustees: the senates have "other rights and responsibilities…which are specifically provided in statute."[4, page 4] Further, this case firmly clarifies the role of the senates as joint partners with the board of trustees in the joint development of and mutual agreement upon faculty hiring procedures.[4, page 6] Finally, this case gives the uncodified portions of the statute, referred to as AB 1725, the full weight of the law as binding case precedent.[4, page 6] Despite the ruling of the California Court of Appeals and the California Supreme Court, these matters are still disputed by the board president and the chancellor.[7] However, 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.[8]

The college looks forward to further efforts in defining, publishing, adhering to, and regularly evaluating the roles and scopes of authorities of all parties as recommended by the commission.

**References

7[1] *Recommendation 6 and 7 Task Force Meeting Minutes (08-05-2005)*
7[2] *Memo from IVC and Saddleback College Academic Senates (08-22-2005)*
7[3] *Memo from IVC Academic Senate Seeking Clarification (09-02-2005)*
7[4] *Appellate Court Decision (06-08-2005)*
7[5] *District Petition for Rehearing Appellate Court - Denied (07-08- 2005)*
7[6] *District Petition for Review California Supreme Court – Denied (08-30-2005)*
7[7] *Irvine World News Article - (09-01-2005)*
7[8] *Chancellor's Communication on Faculty Hiring Policy (08-11- 2005)*

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. Although there has been progress at the college as well as within the district, disagreement exists as to how to resolve these systemic issues.   To address the commission's concerns, the progress report oversight committee agreed to respond to this recommendation by including the views of and actions taken by each of the constituent groups.

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 as documented in recommendations 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 on and mutually developed a proposal for an alternative calendar.[1] The proposal has not yet been endorsed by the entire college community or by 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 from the general fund for faculty and staff professional development activities for the academic year 2005-2006. The academic affairs committee developed guidelines for the distribution of the funds.[2,3]   The president's commitment to funding professional development activities is important since the college has not received staff development funds since the State eliminated funding in 2003. 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 continues.

College Progress: Student Services

On February 11, 2005, the student services staff held an off-campus retreat. One of the principal items discussed was recommendation 8.[4] In both small groups and later in full forum, counselors, managers, administrators, and classified employees examined the commission's characterization of the campus climate. This facilitated discussion was cathartic for many, because the safe environment allowed them 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 that all are welcome to express their concerns.

College Progress: Instruction

On April 20, 2005, the instructional deans participated in an off-campus retreat. One of the principle items discussed was recommendation 8.[5] 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 future retreats. A follow-up retreat will be held on November 1, 2005.

College Progress: Classified Staff

On June 3, 2005, classified staff devoted part of its staff development day to recommendation 8.[6]   Using a workshop format, approximately 70 staff members identified more than 20 "morale boosters" that would foster a supportive campus climate.[7] 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 14 items have been addressed. For example, an intranet site has been developed for the classified senate, the life fitness center has been made available to faculty and staff, and a board policy waiving tuition for staff is being developed. The administration has stated that it will honor vacation requests, flexible work schedules, and that they encourage staff participation in college-wide governance. Additionally, a campus map of staff lounge areas will be distributed. Safety/catastrophe training will occur in fall 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.[8] Staff listed expressions of each attribute and then collectively discussed ways to institutionalize these expressions. At the close of the workshop, staff referenced the past and how it contributed to their feelings of "hostility, cynicism, despair, and fear" but repeatedly expressed their desire to move forward and let the past be past and voiced a willingness to trust again in order to help build a better college for our students. To this end, it is recognized that employees need to be heard; that the staff work for the district and for students; that leadership is not solely identified by an individual's title; that campus involvement fosters a sense of community; that conflicted relationships are repaired one person at a time; and that employee satisfaction is linked to enrollment. Further, the classified staff supports a classified hiring process that includes collaboration between the classified senate, the administration, the classified management, and the faculty.

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. The district and the board of trustees could reduce the cynicism and despair by participating in fair and equitable bargaining with the classified employees. 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 in April of 2005, the board of trustees unanimously approved the master agreement.[9,10] 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 faculty 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 management rule presented a major obstacle in attracting faculty participation in shared governance as they were precluded from accepting reassigned time if they elected to teach overload, a difficulty noted in the accreditation report. The faculty association will be negotiating a memorandum of understanding with the district to address the inequity between stipend compensation and reassigned time.[11]

Even though the number of replacement positions exceeded the requirement set by the state chancellor's office, the district authorized the hiring of eleven faculty replacement positions to fill all of the 2004 vacancies created by faculty retirements at the college.[12] 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 8.[13] These efforts were met with mixed results as some were well attended and others not. On September 8, 2005, the chancellor submitted the South Orange County Communication Strategies.[14]

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.

Concluding Comments

From the faculty and staff perspective, the most significant issue relative to the climate of despair that continues to plague the college is 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.[15,16] (The California League of Women Voters mailed 318 ballots to all full-time faculty within the district. 246 faculty participated in the vote (77% of the faculty responded). 230 votes (93.5%) expressed no confidence in the leadership of the chancellor; 15 votes (6%) expressed confidence in the leadership of the chancellor; one ballot was unmarked, and counted as an abstention.[15] The vote was conducted by and certified by the California League of Women Voters.[15]) It is the view of the faculty that by renewing the chancellor's contract, the board majority has continued to dismiss the voice of the faculty thereby causing dismay, concern, and further despair.[17,18,19,20]

Despite repeated efforts by the faculty association, IVC and SC academic senates, the classified senate, and CSEA to convey their concerns to the board president and other members of the board, the trustees voted 4-2-1 to renew the contract and granted the chancellor a substantial retroactive increase in salary as well as a substantial salary increase.[22] These actions outraged dissenting board members and faculty.[19,20] Approximately 75 faculty members attended the June 21, 2005 board meeting. Almost all faculty who attended the meeting were there to protest, to voice their opposition to the board's actions regarding the chancellor's contract.[17]

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

8^1 *Senate Agenda & Minutes Approving Alternative Calendar (05-05-2005)*
8^2 *President's Communication on Availability of Staff Development Fund*
8^3 *Academic Affairs Guidelines-Distribution of Staff Development Funds*
8^4 *Student Services Retreat Announcement (02-11-2005)*
8^5 *Deans Retreat Announcement/Agenda (04-20-2005)*
8^6 *Classified Staff Development Day Announcement (06-03-2005)*
8^7 *Classified Staff-Morale Boosters (06-03-2005)*
8^8 *Classified Staff-Retreat Outcomes (06-03-2005)*
8^9 *Faculty Association Contract Ratification (April 2005)*
8^{10} *Board Minutes—Approval Faculty Contract (April 2005)*
8^{11} *Faculty Association Minutes - MOU Stipends/Reassigned Time*
8^{12} *President's Communication on Faculty Hiring for Eleven Positions*
8^{13} *Chancellor's Brown Bag Luncheon Announcements*
8^{14} *Chancellor's Communication Strategies (09-08-2005)*
8^{15} *District wide Faculty Vote of No Confidence Memo and California League of Women Voters Certification (05-17-2004)*
8^{16} *Basis for District wide Faculty Vote of No Confidence (April 2004)*
8^{17} *United Governance Groups Memo to Faculty - Board Meeting (06-21-2005)*
8^{18} *District Faculty/Classified Memo to Board President (June, 2005)*
8^{19} *Irvine World News Article - Chancellor's Contract (06-23-2005)*
8^{20} *Faculty Association Board Report (06-21-2005)*

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
Revised 8-21-05:   Accreditation Progress Report Oversight Committee
                       (Incorporated Faculty Revisions/Edits)
Revised 8-23-05:   Office of the President and Accreditation Oversight Committee
Revised 9-1-05:   Office of the President and Accreditation Oversight Committee
Revised 9-8-05:   Office of the President and Accreditation Oversight Committee
                       (Incorporated Faculty, Staff Revisions/Edits)

Revised 9-12-05:   Office of the President and Accreditation Oversight Committee
                        (Incorporated Faculty, Staff Revisions/Edits)
Revised 9-13-05:   Office of the President and Accreditation Oversight Committee
                        (Incorporated Faculty, Staff Revisions/Edits)