Follow-up Report
in
Support of Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Response to the Recommendations
of the
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

Submitted
by
Ventura College
4667 Telegraph Road
Ventura, CA 93003

Submitted
to
The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges
10 Commercial Boulevard
Novato, CA 94949

October 15, 2011

CERTIFICATION OF THE *FOLLOW-UP REPORT*
October 15, 2012

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

From: Ventura College
4667 Telegraph Road
Ventura, CA 93003

This *Follow-up Report* is submitted per the requirements of the Accrediting Commission of Community and Junior Colleges.

We certify that there was broad participation by the campus community in response to the recommendations and the preparation and review of the report, and we believe that the *Follow-up Report* accurately reflects our response to date to the recommendations made by the Commission and the 2010 Accrediting team.

_____
Dr. Jamillah Moore,
Chancellor, Ventura County Community College District

_____
Dr. Robin Calote
President, Ventura College

_____
Mr. Stephen P. Blum, Esquire
Chair, Board of Trustees, Ventura County Community College District

_____
Mr. Peter Sezzi
Academic Senate President, Ventura College

_____
Mr. Peder Nielsen
Classified Senate President, Ventura College

The Follow-up Report was edited by Kathy Scott, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness.

The following faculty, staff, and administrators from played a leading role in helping the college to address one or more of the accreditation recommendations:

This list will change. It will include members of CPC, Department Chairs, Members of the Academic Senate, Deans, Robin, Ramiro, Dave K., Sue Johnson, , members of Budget Resource Council, members of FOG, members of the Technology Committee, members of SLO committee, Sandy Hajas, Michael Callahan,

Connie Baker
David Bransky
Laura Brower
Michael Callahan
Dr. Robin Calote
Barbara Cogert
Dr. P. Scott Corbett
Will Cowen
Marta de Jesus
Ismael de la Rocha
Tania DeClerck
Beth Doyle
Maureen Eckl
Dr. Maria Teresa Fiumerodo
Jennifer Garcia
Ty Gardner
Dr. Judy Garey
Dr. Karen Gorback
Sandy Hajas
Robbie Haines
Luke Hall
Karen Harrison
Tim Harrison
Bea Herrera
Dr. Gwendolyn Lewis-Huddleston
Becky Hull
Kathryn Jameson Meledy
Meredith Mundell
Sue Johnson
Grant Jones
David Keebler
Raeann Koerner
Dan Kumpf
Dr. Cari Lange
Robert Lawson
Victoria Lugo
Casey Mansfield
Sandra Melton
Dr. James Meznek
Jay Moore
Terry Morris
Jerry Mortensen
Bob Moskowitz
Paula Munoz
David Oliver
Steve Palladino
Patricia Parham
Jennifer Parker
Mark Pauley
Deborah Pollack
Ted Prell
Steve Quon
Ramiro Sanchez
Kathy Scott
Joe Selzler
Peter Sezzi
Rick Shaw
Jeff Stauffer
Elaine Tennen
Jeff Weinstein
Patricia Wendt
Krista Wilbur

October 15, 2012

Dear Commissioners,

This *Follow-up Report* documents the extensive work that has been done by college faculty and staff and district staff to address directly the recommendations made in the 2011 Visiting Team Report. Ventura College and the Ventura County Community College District's actions clearly show our desire and intention to reach excellence in every area noted as needing improvement.

At Ventura College, our faculty and staff have done extraordinary work, and we believe that our campus culture is truly reflective of our mission and our commitment to offer programs and services of the highest quality. Immediately after the team's visit, efforts were underway at Ventura College to begin working on revisions to our student learning outcomes process so that they could be in place for the beginning of the spring 2011 semester. Substantial changes have also been made to our program review and planning processes and to all other areas in which recommendations were made.

Extensive work has also taken place to ensure that district recommendations have been fully addressed.

While both the college and the district are proud of our significant accomplishments over the last few months, we are also aware that this work must be ongoing and are fully committed to continuing our efforts toward reaching a culture of sustainable continuous quality improvement.

Ventura College and the Ventura County Community College District both viewed the recommendations made by the Commission as an opportunity to make significant improvements in several key areas, and we respectfully submit this *Follow-Up Report* as a summary of the work we have accomplished thus far.

This report was compiled by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, the College Planning Council, and the Accreditation Steering Committee. Responses to the district recommendations were prepared by the Chancellor and Vice Chancellors. The consolidated draft report was sent electronically on August 21, 2012 to all college faculty and staff for their input. The report was approved by the Ventura County Community College Board of Trustees at its meeting on October 9, 2012.

_____

Dr. Robin Calote, Ventura College

Contents

Report on College Recommendation #3 1
Report on College Recommendation #4 5
Report on College Recommendation #6 10
Report on College Recommendation #8 13

Report on College Recommendation #3

Recommendation:

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

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

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

Update:

In the fall of 2011, Ventura College piloted a new process that linked program review to the college's new integrated planning model, to the new SLO/SUO assessment processes, to initiatives and requests for resources stemming from SLO/SUO findings and analyses, and to total cost of ownership requirements. Program discontinuance was part of the new program review process. A complete assessment of the program review process also occurred in 2011. Both program discontinuance and the assessment process are explained below.

Program Discontinuance:

In spring 2011, college planning parameters were created by the college's Executive Team and distributed to the college as a planning framework for program review in the early fall. The planning parameters document contained a list of courses and programs that administration was considering discontinuing, pending any compelling arguments that emerged through program review. Programs on the list were encouraged to use the program review process to explain, using data, the significance of the program or courses if they intended to make an argument to maintain them.

At the beginning of the fall semester, the planning parameters were reviewed again by the College Planning Council. Some programs with a degree, certificate, or courses on the proposed discontinuance list spent a considerable amount of time analyzing data and writing their program review report in preparation for the program review presentations.

In a parallel process that occurred during the fall semester, the District Council on Student Learning (DCSL) began discussing the district-wide Administrative Procedure (AP) for program discontinuance. While a brief Board Policy (BP) on program discontinuance had existed for some time, the AP had been in draft form only and had not been approved. During fall 2011, DCSL worked on the document, with input from all three Academic Senates, and in November 2011, the document was approved and forwarded to the board. The new AP allowed the college either to form a recommending group to "examine programs for possible remediation or discontinuance" or to "assign the task to an existing standing committee with majority faculty representation." Ventura College opted to use the CPC, a participatory governance committee co-chaired by the Academic Senate President and the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, to oversee the program discontinuance process.

In October 2011, program review presentations were made to the College Planning Council by the division deans. While the district AP on program discontinuance had not yet been approved, the college followed the direction of the new AP draft. Program Review presentations by the deans included the following areas:

- Process Overview (including the process for prioritizing initiatives at the program/department and division levels)
- Initiatives Not Requiring Additional Resources
- Major Findings, Initiatives, and Requests for Resources
- Program Discontinuance (program and division stand on any programs on the discontinuance list)
- Minority Opinions on Other Resource Requests
- Appeals (a separate meeting was scheduled to hear any appeals)
- Additional Information

Faculty members in programs being considered for discontinuance were provided the opportunity to make their own presentations in support of continuing their programs. Two programs made such presentations, and their backup documentation was included as part of the program review and posted online. Questions and comments on the program review presentations, including those for program discontinuance, were solicited by the co-chairs of the CPC. Executive team members took extensive notes and participated in these discussions. The Academic Senate, whose opinion on possible program discontinuance is to be solicited as part of the AP, opted to defer to the divisions and to support the division's position on program discontinuance.

At the conclusion of the program review presentations, the Executive Team made the final decisions about program discontinuance. For three of the programs discontinued, the Executive Team, in consultation with program faculty, decided to continue offering classes that were needed for transfer (in the case of Architecture), that could be incorporated into other subject disciplines (in the case of Agriculture courses moving to Environmental Sciences), or were needed as requirements for other programs (i.e. Computer Science classes needed for the Engineering program). In all cases, student need was considered, and options for assisting students to complete the affected programs were made available.

In the area of program discontinuance, specifically, the college's open and transparent process for program discontinuance was supported by both the Academic Senate and the union.

In the spring of 2012, the college's planning parameters were again published and discussed with the College Planning Council in anticipation of the program review process for 2012. The document explained that programs that awarded fewer than eight degrees, certificates, or proficiency awards in the last four years would be on the possible program discontinuance list. As noted in the planning parameters, this list was distributed again to the college in August 2012, and in fall 2012, the college conducted its second annual program review using the improved process.

Assessment of the Program Review Process:

At the completion of the program review process in fall 2011, input for evaluating the process was gathered from various sources. First, it was discussed extensively at two CPC meetings. Second, an online survey was distributed to all college employees. And third, the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness went to the November 2011 Department Chairs and Coordinator's Council to gather verbal feedback. In January 2012, a Program Review Report was written that included input from these sources. The report also included a summary of the process, the successes, and the areas needed for improvement. The report was distributed to the College Planning Council and discussed at a CPC meeting and was later incorporated into the college's Annual Planning Report that was distributed during the fall 2012 semester.

An appeal from one division was filed during program review in 2011 regarding problems with process in that particular division. The appeal was entered into the record and the concerns were considered as departments in that division were reviewed by the CPC.

The main suggestions that emerged from the CPC discussion, the online survey of the campus and the feedback from the department chairs for improvement of the process were as follows:

- A separate committee for Services needs to be established to review the content of the work required and to discuss the challenges involved in self-supplied data.
- A better timeline needs to be established.
- The process for setting up and holding department and division meetings needs to be reviewed.
- Content/goals for each department and division meeting regarding program review need to be made clearer.
- The process for who votes on various aspects of program review needs to be clearer.
- The collaborative nature of the process needs to be emphasized, and part-time faculty members need to be encouraged to participate.
- The content of program review presentations needs to be reviewed and made consistent.
- Clearer directions on how to access program review data needs to be established.
- District productivity targets need to be reviewed.
- Consistency in prioritization of initiatives needs to be established.
- Terms (i.e. *performance analysis*) need to be clearly defined.

In order to address these issues, two subcommittees of the CPC were established, one for the Services and one to review process for all programs. These committees worked during the spring 2012 semester and progress was reported at the May 2012 CPC meeting and in the college's Annual Planning Report.

The recommendations from the Services subcommittee included increasing collaboration with instructional faculty, being provided more access to the institutional researcher time, and making small revisions to the form to make it more applicable to the services.

Recommendations from the process committee included the use of facilitators at division meetings in order to provide more consistency in prioritizing initiatives and voting, additional program and division meetings in order for the programs within a division to more clearly understand each other's initiatives for collaboration purposes, revision of the timeline, the use of PowerPoint templates for consistency in division presentations, and clearer direction and timelines to programs whose initiatives are funded through the program review process.

The revisions were discussed at the CPC's first meeting of the fall 2012 semester and modifications to the process were implemented prior to the start of the 2012 program review process.

Evidence for Recommendation 3:

1. District Council on Student Learning (DCSL) agendas and minutes, Fall 2011
2. VCCCD Administrative Procedure (AP) 4021 – Program Discontinuance
3. Ventura College Planning Parameters, Fall 2011
4. Program Review Presentation Template, Fall 2011 and Fall 2012
5. Program Review Report, January 2012
6. Ventura College Planning Parameters, Fall 2012
7. College Planning Council Agendas and Minutes for 2011/2012 Academic Year
8. Program Review Process Committee Agendas and Minutes, May 2012
9. Annual Planning Report, Fall 2012

Report on College Recommendation #4

Recommendation:

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

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

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

Update:

As noted in the college's October 2011 follow-up report, a systematic series of steps were taken to address College Recommendation #4. These steps included large-group meetings, campus forums, and online surveys, which collectively, assisted the college to identify gaps in the organizational structure and to gather input for possible solutions. After analyzing the information and meeting with the Executive Vice president, the Vice President of Business Services, and the Deans, the President prepared a draft of a new organizational structure, which was presented to the campus in March 2011. The new structure included the following elements: (1) the combination of all career and technical education programs into one division; (2) the assignment of distance education oversight and faculty professional development to the Dean of Social Science & Humanities (with the resultant renaming of that division to Distance Education, Professional Development, Social Science & Humanities); (3) the assignment of oversight for the Santa Paula program to the Dean of Physical Education/Athletics (with the resultant renaming of that division to Kinesiology, Athletics & Off-Site Programs); and (4) the assignment of oversight for planning, program review, student learning outcomes, institutional research, basic skills, and accreditation to the Dean of Communication & Learning Resources (with the resultant renaming of that division to Institutional Effectiveness, English & Learning Resources). The departments of Communication, ESL, and Foreign Language, which had been part of that division, were reassigned to the Division of Kinesiology, Athletics & Off-Site Programs Division (with the resultant renaming of that division to Communication, Kinesiology, Athletics and Off-Site Programs).

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

- College Planning Council: The College Planning Council is a participatory governance committee that monitors college compliance with Accreditation Standard I. As part of the college planning, program review and budget allocation cycle, the College Planning Council reviews the Educational, Facilities, and Technology Master Plans and calls for their revision in accordance with an established cycle; proposes a limited number of three-year strategic goals based on the Educational Master Plan to form the basis for the college's Strategic Plan; establishes the college planning parameters each spring; recommends priority lists for new programs and initiatives that emerge through the annual planning and program review process; responds to administration's recommendations for program growth, reduction and discontinuance; and contributes to the development of the college's Annual Report by documenting the progress made on the Strategic Plan. The Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, English & Learning Resources provides administrative support for this Council.
- Distance Education Committee: The Distance Education Committee, a subcommittee of the Faculty Professional Development Committee, provides a collaborative venue to share and promote effective practices and techniques that contribute to the quality and growth of distance education at Ventura College, including web enhanced on-ground courses, partially-online courses, and fully-online courses. In addition, the Committee is responsible for drafting the college's Distance Education Master Plan and for providing advice to the Administration, the Academic Senate's Curriculum Committee and the Technology Committee about procedures that can help to sustain and managing the distance education infrastructure. The Dean of Distance Education, Professional Development, Social Science and Humanities provides administrative support for the Committee.
- Student Learning Outcomes Committee: The Student Learning Outcomes Committee monitors college compliance with Accreditation Standard IB, IIA, and IIB, and is charged with overseeing the process of developing, assessing, and refining program, course and institutional student learning outcomes (SLOs) and service unit outcomes (SUOs). The committee also provides vision and leadership for outcomes-based assessment; establishes a plan and timeline for the development and assessment of SLOs and SUOs; and monitors and evaluates the process of assessing SLOs for courses, programs, and services. The SLO Committee recommends improvements to the SLO process to the Academic Senate, and documents SLO efforts and results for accreditation. The Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, English & Learning Resources provides administrative support for this Committee.
- Basic Skills Committee: The Basic Skills Committee monitors college compliance with portions of Accreditation Standard IIA, and develops, recommends, coordinates strategies to help Ventura College students successfully acquire the basic skills necessary to succeed in college-level coursework. This includes, but is not limited to: developing and implementing a plan to oversee the state basic skills funding dollars; serving as central forum for campus dialog on the topic of basic skills; seeking out and sharing effective practices developed at Ventura College and elsewhere; assisting in the identification and acquisition of necessary resources to enhance basic skills courses. As a result, in part, to the efforts of the Basic Skills Committee, Ventura College has become the recipient of a Title V grant that will focus, in part, on supporting and expanding the capacity of the college's Reading/Writing Center and supplemental instruction programs and expanding the use of accelerated instruction in math and English. The Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, English &

Learning Resources provides administrative support for this Committee.

- Professional Development Committee: This long-standing college committee is now being provided administrative support by the Dean of Distance Education, Professional Development, Social Sciences & Humanities. The Faculty Professional Development Committee, a subcommittee of the Academic Senate, develops equitable processes for the disbursement of contractually-obligated professional development funds; develops Flex Week activities, and hosts other professional development activities related to academic, professional and pedagogic matters that foster the continued professional growth of the members of the faculty as specialists within their disciplines as well as community college educators. In addition, the Faculty Professional Development Committee monitors compliance with portions of Accreditation Standard IIIA.

In January 2012, six months after the implementation of the new organizational structure, the college President invited all college employees to participate in an online survey to assess the new structure. Respondents were asked to identify on a five-point Likert scale their degree of satisfaction with way that distance education, professional development, institutional effectiveness, basic skills, professional development, and off-site programs were addressed by the structure. Programs that had changed divisions as a result of the reorganization (Communication, Foreign Languages, CTE) were also asked to rate the degree to which they were satisfied with the new reporting relationship. In addition, respondents were invited to add additional thoughts about the organizational structure through open-ended "comments" sections.

In February 2012, another open college forum, to which all faculty and staff were invited (in addition to student leaders), was devoted to collecting feedback regarding the effectiveness of the new organizational structure. At this forum, the results of the online survey were shared and used as the starting point for small group discussions on the merits of the new system and the additional improvements needed. The results of the focus group discussions were shared in one of the college President's weekly updates, along with a written summary of the results of the online survey.

Since February 2012, the deans and committees have used this feedback to make modifications to their operations. The distance education program has developed a more formal program for certification training for online instructors.

- A software program was identified to facilitate the SLO/SUO documentation and assessment processes for faculty and staff and to allow the institution to more easily track initiatives and close the loop on prior assessments.
- The Basic Skills Committee presented a campus-wide workshop on the mandatory flex day in an effort to make more faculty aware of basic skills students and their needs. The workshop included both student and faculty panels, and each faculty member was provided with a book of resources and strategies for teaching basic skills students across the curriculum.
- The Professional Development Committee held follow-up luncheons for the participants of the 2011 Summer Institute for Teaching Excellence and created new professional development opportunities, such as Lunch and Learn Workshops, open to all faculty.

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

Summative committee self evaluations were conducted at the end of the spring 2012 semester for new or reorganized campus committees. Committee members reviewed and customized the questions prior to the surveys going out, and, as a result, each survey was slightly different. However, in general, the surveys asked committee members about the continued relevance of the committee charge, the establishment of committee goals, the completion of goals, other committee achievements, the timeliness of tasks, the overall environment of the committee, and suggestions for improvement. Some committee-specific questions were also asked (i.e. the College Planning Committee specifically asked about the new program review and program discontinuance processes).

Committee surveys were conducted for the College Planning Council (CPC), the Budget Resource Council (BRC), the Academic Senate, the SLO Committee, the Basic Skills Committee, the Professional Development Committee, and the Distance Education (DE) Committee.

The committee evaluations were used formatively to begin the fall 2012 semester. Each committee reviewed the results of the evaluations and made adjustments, as necessary, so that the committees fully understood their charges, created clear goals, worked to meet those goals, and operated in an environment conducive to open and honest discussion. Committee evaluations will continue to be scheduled at the end of each academic year, with results used, as noted, to begin the following academic year.

In addition, the college has built into its integrated planning process a calendar for the ongoing assessment of the organizational structure. In accordance with this calendar, the College Planning Council will assist the college President in engaging the campus in a review of the organizational every three years, with the next review scheduled for spring 2013.

<u>List of Evidence:</u>

1. Making Decisions at Ventura College, 2012-2013
2. Assessment of Campus Organization, January 5, 2012 (online survey results)
3. President's update #50, January 10, 2012 (regarding online survey of college employees)
4. President's update #52, January 25, 2012 (invitation to open forum regarding organizational structure feedback)
5. President's update #53, January 31, 2012 (reminder regarding open forum regarding organizational structure feedback)
6. President's update #55, February 14, 2012 (summary of feedback regarding open forum focus groups and online survey)
7. Ventura College Integrated Planning Manual, March 2011, page 3 (planning cycle flowchart)
8. Ventura College Organizational Chart, July 2012
9. Ventura College Santa Paula list of Outreach Events, 2011-2012

10. College Planning Council survey results
11. SLO Committee survey results
12. Basic Skills Committee survey results
13. Distance Education committee survey results
14. Professional Development committee survey results

Report on College Recommendation #6

Recommendation:

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

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

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

Update:

The college's Facilities Oversight Group (FOG), which oversees facilities and equipment of a non-computing nature (i.e. vehicles, furniture, lab equipment, kilns, etc.) provides coordination for the periodic revision for the Facilities Master Plan and meets regularly to address the college's cost of ownership needs. As part of the college planning, program review and budget allocation cycle, FOG receives requests for facilities improvements from the College Planning Council and creates an implementation plan to advance these requests. The college's Technology Committee provides coordination for the periodic revision of the campus Technology Plan, which includes a detailed Tech Refresh Plan built around a four-year replacement cycle.

The work of FOG and the Technology Committee to address the total cost of ownership is supported through the following measures:

- The college has set aside 2% of its annual budget for preventative maintenance, which helps to delay major costly breakdowns to facilities and equipment.
- In addition to allocating funds for the technology refresh plan, money has also been set aside for periodic software renewals/upgrades to meet the performance goals of the various programs and services.
- Inventory lists of the equipment in each program have been extracted from Banner. Due to some Banner errors, the lists for the 2011 program review process were not completely correct. Under the 2012 college program review process, programs were required to reconcile the items on the Banner inventory list with the equipment that actually exists, and to identify equipment that is at end-of-life status. This contributed to the development and maintenance of a more accurate

inventory list that includes the description, number of items, cost, date of purchase, expected life, and annual preventative maintenance cost of each item. Using the reconciled inventory list (which divisions are required to maintain and update each year), programs now have the ability through the program review process to create initiatives and request appropriate resources to meet their operating and student performance goals.

Each year after programs have presented their program reviews to the College Planning Council, a compiled list of prioritized requests for facilities improvements, based on program findings, is given to FOG. Software and technology prioritized requests, based on program review findings, are given to the Technology Committee. Other equipment requests, based on program review findings, are given to the Budget Resource Council. These groups assign the committee rating of *required, high*, *medium*, *low* or *not ranked* to each request based on the overall needs of the college, taking into consideration new technologies, if appropriate, and the ways in which resources can be leveraged. The committees' ratings are then forwarded to the Executive Team for the final college ranking. The lists of initiatives, with all rankings, are then shared with the College Planning Council and the college administration for inclusion in the Strategic Plan. Divisions are notified about funded requests and have until the next program review cycle (approximately 12 months) to submit purchase orders.

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

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

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

The District Council on Administrative Services is the venue that is used to evaluated and reassess the Budget Allocation Model, as well as the new Infrastructure Funding Model. This evaluation, which involves the feedback from constituent representatives, is conducted each year prior to the development of the budget.

List of Evidence:

1. College budget (showing 2% preventative maintenance line item)
2. Technology Strategic Plan (for Technology Refresh Plan)
3. Program Review Initiatives Spreadsheets
4. College equipment inventory list
5. Program Review Handbook
6. Infrastructure Funding Model

Report on College Recommendation #8

Recommendation:

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

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

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

Update:

As described in response to recommendation #4, the college implemented a new organizational structure in July 2011. As noted by the 2011 follow-up accreditation team, this structure was scheduled to be evaluated during the spring 2012 semester. In January 2012, six months after the implementation of the new organizational structure, the college President invited all college employees to participate in an online survey to assess the new structure. Respondents were asked to identify on a five-point Likert scale their degree of satisfaction with way that distance education, professional development, institutional effectiveness, basic skills, and off-site programs were addressed by the structure. Programs that had changed divisions as a result of the reorganization (Communication, Foreign Languages, CTE) were also asked to rate the degree to which they were satisfied with the new reporting relationship. In addition, respondents were invited to add additional thoughts about the organizational structure through open-ended "comments" sections.

In February 2012, another open college forum, to which all faculty and staff were invited (in addition to student leaders), was devoted to collecting feedback regarding the effectiveness of the new organizational structure. At this forum, the results of the online survey were shared and used as the starting point for small group discussions on the merits of the new system and the additional improvements needed. The results of the focus group discussions were shared in one of the college President's weekly updates, along with a written summary of the results of the online survey.

Since February 2012, the deans and committees have used this feedback to make modifications to their operations.

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

- A software program was identified to facilitate the SLO/SUO documentation and assessment processes for faculty and staff and to allow the institution to more easily track initiatives and close the loop on prior assessments.
- The Basic Skills Committee presented a campus-wide workshop on the mandatory flex day in an effort to make more faculty aware of basic skills students and their needs. The workshop included both student and faculty panels, and each faculty member was provided with a book of resources and strategies for teaching basic skills students across the curriculum.
- The Professional Development Committee held follow-up luncheons for the participants of the 2011 Summer Institute for Teaching Excellence and created new professional development opportunities, such as Lunch and Learn Workshops, open to all faculty.
- Outreach efforts were expanded for the Santa Paula site. New outreach activities included "Registration Days" events, ESL Registration Week, application and financial aid workshops, orientation meetings for new students, and participation in Higher Education Day and Parent College Night at local high schools.

Summative committee self evaluations were conducted at the end of the spring 2012 semester for new or reorganized campus committees. Committee members reviewed and customized the questions prior to the surveys going out, and, as a result, each survey was slightly different. However, in general, the surveys asked committee members about the continued relevance of the committee charge, the establishment of committee goals, the completion of goals, other committee achievements, the timeliness of tasks, the overall environment of the committee, and suggestions for improvement. Some committee-specific questions were also asked (i.e. the College Planning Committee specifically asked about the new program review and program discontinuance processes).

Committee surveys were conducted for the College Planning Council (CPC), the Budget Resource Council (BRC), the Academic Senate, the SLO Committee, the Basic Skills Committee, the Professional Development Committee, and the Distance Education (DE) Committee.

The committee evaluations were used formatively to begin the fall 2012 semester. Each committee reviewed the results of the evaluations and made adjustments, as necessary, so that the committees fully understood their charges, created clear goals, worked to meet those goals, and operated in an environment conducive to open and honest discussion. Committee evaluations will continue to be scheduled at the end of each academic year, with results used, as noted, to begin the following academic year.

In addition, the college has built into its integrated planning process a calendar for the ongoing assessment of the organizational structure. In accordance with this calendar, the College Planning Council will assist the college President in engaging the campus in a review of the organizational every three years, with the next review scheduled for spring 2013.

There are two opportunities within the new program review process to allow for assessment. First, faculty and staff completing the program review documents will have the opportunity to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the process itself each time program review is conducted. This feedback is

used by the College Planning Council to clarify and modify the planning and program review forms, to identify processes that are unclear so that better written instructions and training instructions can be provided, and to further improve the process itself for future planning/program review cycles.

In accordance with its planning cycle, an Annual Planning Report, prepared by the College Planning Council, the Student Learning Outcomes Oversight Committee and the college President is distributed each fall semester, and data that document progress made toward college goals is discussed both by the College Planning Council and at the open college forums.

At Ventura College, the data set to measure institutional effectiveness (identified as the Core Indicators) was discussed throughout most of the spring 2012 semester at the College Planning Council. Input was gathered from the divisions via the division representatives about what should be included in the Core Indicators, and the document list of data elements was revised numerous times based on this input and subsequent committee discussions. The final version of the Core Indicators list was approved at the May 9, 2012 meeting of the CPC.

The data accumulated to document the college's status relative to the Core Indicators was added as a new chapter to Ventura College's Annual Planning Report (which also continues to document the progress made toward the Strategic Plan's action steps from the prior year and conclusions drawn from assessing the student learning outcomes process).

Also during the spring 2012 semester, the District Council on Accreditation and Planning defined a data set common to all three colleges in the district to measure institutional effectiveness relative to the Board of Trustee's planning goals. These data were then prepared as an additional report for each college and across the district as a whole for the periods of 2008 through 2012 to assist in integrated district-wide planning.

<u>List of Evidence:</u>

1. Assessment of Campus Organization, January 5, 2012 (online survey results)
2. President's update #50, January 10, 2012 (regarding online survey of college employees)
3. President's update #52, January 25, 2012 (invitation to open forum regarding organizational structure feedback)
4. President's update #53, January 31, 2012 (reminder regarding open forum regarding organizational structure feedback)
5. President's update #55, February 14, 2012 (summary of feedback regarding open forum focus groups and online survey)
6. College Planning Council survey results
7. SLO Committee survey results
8. Basic Skills Committee survey results
9. Distance Education committee survey results
10. Professional Development committee survey results
11. Program Review template showing feedback component
12. College Planning Council Agendas and Minutes, Spring 2012

13. Core Indicators of Institutional Effectiveness, May 2012
14. Annual Planning Report, Fall 2012
15. Institutional Effectiveness: Moorpark, Oxnard and Ventura Colleges, June 2012