Standard I – Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

The institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes achievement of student learning and to communicating the mission internally and externally. The institution uses analyses of quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation to verify and improve the effectiveness by which the mission is accomplished.

Standard IA: Mission

The institution has a statement of mission that defines the institution's broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning.

IA-1. The institution establishes student learning programs and services aligned with its purposes, its character, and its student population.

Description

The character and purposes of the College are defined in Board Policy 1200, District Vision, Values, Mission, and Goals (Item I-1). The College's vision statement expresses commitment to the educational, economic, and environmental advancement of its service communities.

Vision

Victor Valley Community College District uplifts the diverse communities we teach and serve by promoting educational excellence, enhancing local prosperity, and ensuring environmental leadership.

In pursuing this vision, the College is guided by the six core values.

Values

As a student-centered learning organization, we will uphold the following core values:

- Excellence – providing superior service and educational learning opportunities.

- Integrity – guiding the College's actions with an internally consistent framework of principles.

- Accessibility – facilitating access to the College's programs from other locations.

- Diversity – valuing different points of view and contributions of all.

- Collaboration – encouraging recursive interaction of knowledge experience and mutual learning of people who are working together toward a common creative goal.

- Innovation- providing creative approaches to learning problem solving and growth

The District vision and values shape the fivefold mission of Victor Valley Community College.

Mission

The mission of Victor Valley Community College is to:

- Cultivate intellectual growth, social responsibility, environmental stewardship, cultural enrichment, and economic development.

- Create exceptional and accessible lifelong learning opportunities that afford students within our expanding communities the attainment of knowledge and skills necessary for success in the global economy.

- Embrace difference in our communities by integrating their wealth of multicultural knowledge and wisdom into a cohesive and resourceful learning environment for all.

- Inspire innovative teaching and service with imaginative uses of collaboration and technology, fostering vibrant programs that are measurably effective in addressing student learning and community needs.

- Empower each student to learn by modeling academic integrity, democratic citizenship, and meaningful contribution to society.

The College has established five goals that are integral to the mission statement and ensure the establishment of student learning programs and services that are aligned with its purpose, its character, and its student population.

Goals

The goals of Victor Valley Community College are to:

- create sustainability and environmental stewardship for our colleagues, our students, and our community.

- become an agile learning organization consistent with the needs of students and the communities that the College serves.

- offer educational programs that lead to meaningful and measurable student learning and success through seamless transfer opportunities to Colleges, universities, and careers.

- increase the number of students served through recruitment, persistence, and retention strategies.

- provide affordable and attractive options for members of the community seeking a post secondary education, which includes an environment in which diversity thrives.

- develop and deliver enriching courses for community members and businesses seeking additional training and development.

The College serves annually more than 10,000 full-time equivalent students drawn primarily from the local area, but increasingly as well from across the nation and around the world. A wide variety of racial, cultural, linguistic, socioeconomic, and national-origin backgrounds are represented in the College's student population. The Annual Report, 2009 documents that changing regional demographics are reflected in ongoing growth in the percentage of African-American and Hispanic students and a gradual decline in the percentage of white non-Hispanic students (Item I-2).

Board Policy 1200, District Vision, Values, Mission, and Goals provides direction for planning processes that govern the establishment of student learning programs and services, thereby assuring that these programs and services are aligned with its purpose, its character, and its student population (Item I-1). Accordingly, the College offers a variety of courses and educational programs, including adult/continuing education, community service, Associate degree, transfer, certificate, and career-technical. Each year, more than 1500 students complete Associate degree programs and certificate programs across a wide variety of career-technical areas. The College is the community's primary source of career training for vital public servants such as firefighters, police, nurses and emergency responders who protect, serve, and care for area families, local industries, and public agencies. According to the 2008-2010 College Catalog: Programs of Study, the College also supports the ideal of economic and environmental sustainability through training programs for careers in green industries such as solar energy, hybrid car maintenance, geographic information systems (GIS), wastewater management, and other green industries (College Catalog; Item I-3).

The College responds to and meets the diverse needs of its changing student population in many ways. Classes are offered at several off-campus attendance centers within the local area. In addition, distance education classes are available for students seeking alternatives to conventional face-to-face classes (Online classes website; Item I-4). Web-based student services (*e.g.*, counseling, admission, registration, and fee payment) have been implemented for the purpose of facilitating and expanding student access to learning opportunities (Admissions and Records website; Item I-5). In addition, more than 2400 of the College's students are served by one or more of the following support programs: Extended Opportunity Programs and Services, Cooperative Agencies Resources for Education, Disabled Students Programs and Services, and CalWORKs (Annual Report 2009; Item I-2).

IA-2. The mission statement is approved by the Governing Board and published.

Description

The College mission statement was initially developed during two August 2007 workshops when the Board of Trustees redefined the College's vision, values, and mission in light of the

Educational Master Plan completed in March 2007. College Council, the College-wide governance body, reviewed the Board of Trustee's draft document, and representatives were instructed to disseminate the draft and collect comments from their respective constituencies to share with College Council. The draft documents were made available to the local community and stories were published in the local newspaper to alert members of the College District as to the direction and progress of the new mission, vision and goals for the College. Input was solicited and comments were incorporated. The District Board of Trustees adopted the final draft of the current College vision, values, mission, and goals as Board Policy 1200 on October 9, 2007 (VVC Progress Report; Item I-30; Board of Trustees Agendas and Minutes Archive; Item I-31)

The College vision, values, mission, and goals are available to the community, the District workforce, and the student population from a number of sources. They are published on the President's Office webpage in Board Policy 1200 (Item I-1), in the College Catalog (Item I-3), and in the Annual Report 2009 (Item I-2).

IA-3. *Using the institution's governance and decision-making processes, the institution reviews its mission statement on a regular basis and revises it as necessary.*

Description

There has been no revision of the College mission statement since its adoption in October 2007. However, according to established policy, the Board of Trustees is expected to review the mission statement on an annual basis (Board Policy 3250, Item I-20) – in the past, this was to occur during its annual retreat. Most recently, College Council appointed a subcommittee in June 2010 (College Council Minutes; Item I-6) to review Board Policy 1200, District Vision, Values, Mission, and Goals (Item I-1). As a result of that review, a new administrative procedure has been drafted detailing the process for review of District vision, values, mission, and goals (Item I-41).

IA-4. *The institution's mission is central to institutional planning and decision making.*

Description

The District mission statement that was adopted by the Board of Trustees as Board Policy 1200 in October of 2007 includes six District goals that focus on sustainability, agility in serving student and community needs, successful transfer and career transition, increasing the number of students served, campus diversity, and community service education (Item I-1). These six goals reflect the commitment to economic development, student learning, diversity, educational excellence, and citizenship that are central themes of the District's mission statement. The College's program review and budget planning process incorporates these goals as guides for long range planning on the discipline, department, unit, and division level (Program review

website; Item I-21). Moreover, the goals of the mission statement were the basis for six District priorities that have been established to guide all institutionalized processes of evaluation, planning, budget development, and decision making (Administrative Procedure 1202; Item I-7):

- Incorporate the principles and practices of sustainability in all its applications across programs and service areas of the College.

- Reflect the socio-cultural diversity of the communities served.

- Enhance strategies for student recruitment, retention, persistence, and success towards educational goals.

- Infuse the educational experience of all students with innovation, creativity, and effective integration of new instructional technologies.

- Improve the basic skills of students, defined to include all the fundamental tools for learning—pre-collegiate through transfer.

- Develop and deliver instructional programs that meet the needs of the communities served, including those relevant to the following career pathways: Allied Health/Emergency Services; Transportation/Distribution/Logistics; Aviation; Environmental.

The most recent update of the Educational Master Plan for the College (Item I-25) was completed in March 2007. The plan described the direction of the District for the next ten years and was based on the mission, vision, and goals adopted by the Board of Trustees in 2003. Also included were twenty planning imperatives that were based on six strategic goals. The mission and goals established most recently by the Board of Trustees (Item 1200) are different; however, the general vision for the College remains consistent.

Evaluation, Standard IA

Standard IA-1: The mission statement clearly expresses the values and purposes that the College's programs and services are intended to embody and fulfill. This document   affirms the College's commitment to the achievement of student learning through its emphasis on educational excellence, intellectual growth, knowledge and skill achievement, effective teaching and service, and demonstrated student success. Moreover, the mission statement affirms the College's commitment to establish and deliver programs that are directly relevant to the educational and economic needs of students and the community.

Standard IA-2: The Board of Trustees formally approved the mission statement in October 2007, and it is published in the College catalog and website.

Standards IA-3: There has been no formal review or revision of the mission statement subsequent to its adoption, However, the College Council adopted in November 2010 an administrative procedure that defines a new process for the collaborative annual review of the College's statement of its vision, values, mission, and goals. It is necessary for AP 1200 to be implemented promptly in order to guarantee that the mission statement accurately represents

District values and clearly defines goals that are realistic, measurable, and directly relevant to the evolving educational needs of the College's student population.

Standard IA-4: The College's annual cycle of program review, planning and budget development is linked to the goals of its mission statement. Individual unit plans must indicate which College-wide strategic goal is being addressed through any major initiatives or innovations proposed by the program/department. Evaluations and plans reported in unit program reviews are the basis for the respective division planning priorities and budgets for the coming year (Program review division summaries; Item I-26) While the 2003 mission statement was central to the District's March 2007 Educational Master Plan, there has been no revision of the master plan since the October 2007 adoption of a new mission statement.

Summary of Opportunities for Improvement, Standard IA

The College's current mission statement was adopted by the Board of Trustees on October 9. 2007. In accordance with recently adopted AP 1200, it is appropriate at this time to initiate a formal and collaborative review of the College's vision, mission, values, goals, and priorities. The College's Educational Master Plan was based on the mission statement of 2003 and was not updated following the adoption of a new mission statement in 2007.

Planning Agenda, Standard IA

Commencing Spring 2011, the Superintendent/President will implement Administrative Procedure 1200, Annual Mission Statement Review, by recommending that the Board of Trustees undertake a formal review and revision, if needed, of its vision, mission, goals, and priorities in order to ensure that institutional identity and operational direction support current student and community needs (Standards IA3), and in order to reinforce the central role of the mission statement in institutional planning and decision making (Standard IA4).

Standard IB: Improving Institutional Effectiveness

The institution demonstrates a conscious effort to produce and support student learning, measures that learning, assesses how well learning is occurring, and makes changes to improve student learning. The institution also organizes its key processes and allocates its resources to effectively support student learning. The institution demonstrates its effectiveness by providing 1) evidence of the achievement of student learning outcomes and 2) evidence of institution and program performance. The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.

IB-1. The institution maintains an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes.

Description

Dialogue regarding improvement is integral to the organizational, governance, and evaluation structures and processes of the District, as defined by Administrative Procedure 1201, Shared Governance Structure and Responsibilities (Item I-10). College Council and College-wide committees serve as collegial forums for dialogue about improvement of College operations. Processes that impact instruction are central to the activities and functions of the Academic Senate and its committees. Finally, dialogue regarding institutional improvement occurs across the College within disciplines, divisions, and service units in conjunction with the program review process. Guiding these discussions, in part, are standards of quality established by the Academic Senate and adopted by the Board of Trustees as Board Policy 4000, Standards of Educational Excellence (Item I-11), and Administrative Procedure 4000, Sustaining Standards of Educational Excellence (Item I-12).

College Council serves as the representative College-wide planning body and is comprised of representatives from each of the five major College constituencies: faculty, classified staff, students, classified management, and educational administrators. The College Council meets twice monthly (agenda and minutes; Item I-6) in order to review and evaluate operational matters impacting the College, to receive reports from representatives of the shared governance committees, and to assure policies, procedures, and other important matters are recommended to the Superintendent/President only after thorough and collegial consideration and review. Likewise, it functions as the steering committee for the accredition self study.

Nine standing College-wide committees were established in November 2007 with the approval of College Council (agenda and minutes; Item I-6). They are as follows:

- Finance/Budget and Planning

- Diversity

- Environmental Health and Safety

- Facilities

- Institutional Effectiveness

- Staff Development

- Student Services

- Sustainability

- Technology

The membership of each committee includes representation from all five College constituencies, and each committee reports its discussions, activities, and recommendations to the College Council, and to representative groups and other College-wide committees as appropriate. Agendas for each monthly meeting of the Academic Senate include reports from faculty who are also chairs or members of each College-wide committee (College-wide committees; Item I-12).

The charge of each College-wide committee requires review, evaluation, and recommendations for the improvement of designated institutional processes (Administrative Procedure 1201; Item I-8). For example, the Diversity Committee suggests strategies to encourage people of diverse backgrounds to participate at the College, the Environmental Health and Safety Committee makes recommendations to ensure preparedness, and the Finance and Budget Committee designs and ensures the short- and long-term fiscal planning for the College and monitors plan implementation and resource allocation and assessment. Dialogue about continuous institutional improvement is a special responsibility of the College-wide Institutional Effectiveness Committee, which reports performance measures of institutional effectiveness, assesses planning and improvement processes, and reports progress on the assessment of student learning at the course, program, and College levels (Annual Report 2009; Item I-2).

Two special activities of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee involve data-informed reflection and conversation about the improvement of student learning and institutional processes. This committee is responsible for the annual review and analysis of District performance data published by the California Community College Chancellor's Office as Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC; Item I-15). In addition to creating improvement goals for each ARCC performance indicator, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, in consultation with the Academic Senate, prepares the District's formal analysis of and response to the data. As a result of that collaboration, long-standing data integrity issues were identified and addressed, thereby ensuring the validity and reliability of data submissions to the state.

A second function of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee is to oversee the Annual Report (Item I-2), a comprehensive assessment of institutional effectiveness as measured by the factors of student success, student access, responsible financial management, and organizational and instructional excellence. The Annual Report, 2009 includes detailed recommendations for District improvement that are based directly on Institutional Effectiveness Committee analysis and discussion of performance data from across the District.

Pursuant to Board Policy 4035 (Academic Consultation), the Academic Senate has primary responsibility for considering and recommending improvements in designated academic and professional matters that relate directly to instruction and student learning (Board Policy 4035; Item I-16). Among these areas are the following: curriculum, degree and certificate requirements, grading policies, educational program development, and standards or policies regarding student preparation and success. Dialogue regarding the improvement of student learning occurs through the activities of the standing Academic Senate Committees whose chairs or representatives report at each monthly Senate meeting. Those committees in which the improvement of student learning is most directly addressed are the following: Curriculum, Program Review, Graduation Requirements, and Online Program. In addition, the faculty Student Learning Outcomes Facilitator, who is responsible for directing learning assessment in instructional and learning support programs, provides an informational report at each meeting of the Academic Senate.

Significant products of Academic Senate dialogue regarding the improvement of learning include the approval in April 2008 of General Education Student Learning Outcomes (Item I-17), as recommended by the Graduation Requirements Committee. Moreover, in November of 2008 the Academic Senate approved Student Learning Outcomes Assessment FAQs (Item I-18), a general statement of assessment philosophy and implementation recommended by the Faculty Learning Assessment Committee. In May 2009, the Academic Senate approved Administrative Procedure 4000, Sustaining Standards of Educational Excellence (Item I-10), a formal affirmation of faculty responsibility for assessment as a strategy for improving student learning and instructional practice. A final example is the Online Student Readiness Survey (Item I-19) approved in June 2009 on the recommendation of the Online Program Committee and subsequently published on the College Online Class website. (Item I-32) This survey assists potential distance education students in assessing their preparation to succeed in online classes.

Dialogue on improvement occurs across the institution within the context of program review pursuant to established board policy (Item I-23) and administrative procedures (Item I-7). Program review for Student Support Services Areas documents dialogue about each unit's relevance to student needs, linkage to student learning, and productivity in achieving identified learning outcomes (P.R.A.I.S.E. documents; Item I-27). Program review for campus support departments documents dialogue within departments about the relevance of services to campus needs and the evaluation and improvement of business processes and work systems (P.R.A.I.S.E. documents; Item I-27). Instructional program reviews call for the analysis of student achievement data and reporting of learning assessments, including plans for improvement (P.R.A.I.S.E. documents; Item I-27). Finally, program review division summaries report strengths and weaknesses of component departments and include detailed division-level plans for the improvement of identified deficiencies (Program review division summaries; Item I-26).

> *IB-2. The institution sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purposes. The institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. The institutional members understand these goals and work collaboratively toward their achievement.*

Description

The College vision, values, and mission are widely known and operative throughout the College. Results of the Campus Climate Survey – Fall 2010 show that 76% of respondents agreed with the statement, "I know the mission, vision, and values of VVC and how I contribute to them as a workforce member" (Item I-41). Six District goals are based on the College's mission statement and focus on sustainability, agility in serving student and community needs, successful transfer and career transition, increasing the number of students served, campus diversity, and community service education (Item I-1).

These six goals were developed with community and campus involvement in order to ensure their alignment with community needs. (Item I-31) They were adopted by the Board of Trustees in October 2007 (Item I-32) and are intended to determine the overall direction of the District. In order to facilitate progress on District goals the Superintendent/President in consultation with the campus community identified six priorities to ensure the alignment of District resources with administrative planning, institution-wide evaluation, and ongoing improvement. These priorities for planning, evaluation, and improvement incorporate the following themes: sustainability applications, diversity, enrollment and student success, educational innovation and technology, basic skills, and new program development (Item I-7)

A broad-based understanding of the District's goals and priorities is made possible through the implementation of nine standing College-wide committees that are charged to collaborate on the achievement of institutional goals (Administrative Procedure 1201; Item I-8). Priority one, the incorporation of principles and practices of sustainability in all its applications across programs,is included in the charge of the sustainability committee. The Diversity Committee addresses the second priority by creating, implementing, and monitoring a plan to enhance and celebrate diversity on campus. The Student Sservices Committee is charged with the third priority through support for recruitment, marketing, and improved opportunities for student success. The Staff Development Committee and the Technology Committee address the fourth priority by supporting the improvement of teaching and learning and monitoring the adequacy of campus technological resources.

Dialogue regarding the proposals and plans developed through these committees occurs at College Council before recommendations are made to the Superintendent/President. In addition, feedback from the college community is passed through the committees to College Council, thereby ensuring that participative governance activities are coordinated with the overall direction of the institution (Administrative Procedure 1201; Item I-8).

The annual program review cycle for instructional disciplines and departments and for student and campus support areas links unit planning explicitly with the goals of the District. Program reviews for campus support, student support, and instructional areas describe major initiatives and innovations, key activities, and requested resources for the next two to three years. These initiatives and innovations must be measurable and directly related to the six District goals, thereby ensuring that planning across departments and programs is consistent with the overall direction of the District, as defined by the Board of Trustees (P.R.A.I.S.E. documents; Item I-27).

In addition to goals defined internally through College planning processes, improvement goals are developed annually in response to comparative student achievement data published as the California Community College Chancellor's Office's Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC; Item I-15). The College's ARCC 2010 report demonstrates ongoing improvement over the past three years on the indicators of student progress and achievement, percentage of students who have earned at least thirty units, persistence, basic skills course completion, and basic skills course improvement. However, the College performed below the average of its peer group on all six ARCC indicators for 2010 (Item I-33), and preliminary data for 2011 show a decline in the College's performance on all six ARCC indicators. The College improvement goals for 2012, as presented to the Academic Senate by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, are to match the ARCC-defined 2012 peer averages on all ARCC indicators: student progress and achievement, completion of 30 units or more, persistence, vocational course completion, basic skills course completion, and basic skills and ESL course improvement.

> *IB-3. The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.*

Description

The cycle of evaluation and improvement at the College incorporates three levels of analysis to assess institutional effectiveness:

- Program level evaluation and analysis: Unit program reviews (Item I-27) incorporate quantitative data on student achievement, enrollment patterns, and overall program-level outcomes; division summaries (Item I-26) provide a qualitative analysis of individual program reviews by relevant administrators to derive division-level priorities for the coming year.

- Assessment of student learning: Learning assessment reports are incorporated into annual program reviews and findings are reported to the Academic Senate for review and for development of educational improvement priorities (Item I-27). Institution-level evaluation, analysis, and planning: The College's Annual Report (Item I-2)

communicates overall institutional progress on effectiveness. Through institutional planning and budget development processes, annual priorities are identified and targeted for resource allocation.

The above levels of analyses are designed to support evaluation, communication, and discussion of the College's progress on its goals, and facilitate decisions about improvement and the investment of College resources. As is detailed in Administrative Procedure 3250 (Institutional Planning Systems; Item I-37) and Administrative Procedure 1202 (Implementing Institutional Effectiveness; Item I-7), the College's integrated planning and effectiveness systems incorporate the analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data—including but not limited to the following:

- Enrollment trends and projections

- Retention, persistence, and success rates

- Job market demand

- Course transferability

- Cost effectiveness

- Availability of resources (including budget history)

- Other measures as deemed relevant by program stakeholders

- Student learning outcomes (SLO) assessments

- Program relevance and process management

- Service utilization, participation, and productivity

Review of these data should inform decisions about what to improve, how to improve, and through what strategies improvements can best be achieved. In turn, decisions about where to invest College resources in the coming year are facilitated—thereby aligning and integrating evaluation and planning efforts with budget allocations. Monitoring progress of those strategic decisions on the College mission is achieved through the Annual Report of Institutional Effectiveness. This report details progress made on improvement in meeting the District's goals and priorities (Item I-2). The report is organized around four institutional effectiveness outcomes that are derived from and incorporate core themes in the District goals and priorities. Carefully defined indicators for each institutional effectiveness outcome have been developed, and performance data are collected, analyzed, and published for the purpose of systematically assessing District effectiveness and progress on improving effectiveness.

- The institutional effectiveness outcome of student success: District goals 3, 4, 6; priorities 3, 5. Indicators: retention, persistence, successful course completion, program completion, General Education course success, transfer rates, workforce placement.

- The institutional effectiveness outcome of student access: District goals 2, 4 through 6; priorities 2 through 6. Indicators: enrollment growth, representativeness of the student population, special program and matriculation participation, scheduling alternatives.

- The institutional effectiveness outcome of resource stewardship: District goals 1 and 2; priorities 1, 5, 6. Indicators: sources of revenue, mandate compliance, allocation of financial resources.

- The institutional effectiveness outcome of program and service excellence: District goals 1 through 6; priorities 1 through 6. Indicators: program quality improvement, program efficiency and effectiveness, campus environment.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and the institutional effectiveness committee plan to present revised and updated versions of the Annual Report each year to the Board of Trustees, the District workforce, and the community (Item I-2).

The College has formally adopted a definition of student learning outcomes (Administrative Procedure 4000; Item I-10), and student learning outcomes have been developed for all credit courses and certificate programs, as well as for General Education (Administrative Procedure 4025; Item I-34). General education student learning outcomes correspond directly to the criteria by which courses qualify for inclusion in the general education curriculum. The College has acknowledged that the assessment of student learning is a primary responsibility of all faculty (Administrative Procedure 4000; Item I-10). Accordingly, the Academic Senate approved a definition of assessment and its purposes, and has endorsed the use of course-embedded methods to assess the achievement of student learning outcomes (SLO FAQs; Item I-18). During the 2007-2008 academic year, eight assessment teams, supported by Title V–HSI grant funds, received assessment training and designed assessment projects. Reports submitted for three of these projects documented the implementation and completion of assessment plans during the year. Since March 2008 a member of the faculty has received 20% reassigned time to serve as Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Coordinator and assist in the development of students learning outcomes and assessment. In November of 2008, the Academic Senate recommended that learning assessment within each discipline and student support area be documented through an assessment report form that was incorporated into the program review templates for instructional disciplines and student support services (P.R.A.I.S.E. document; Item I-27). While recognizing ongoing assessment activities are a familiar component of accepted instructional practice, the Academic Senate recommended that documentation of these activities be reported for each course, program, and service at least once every two years (SLO FAQs; Item I-18)

Program review for instructional and student support areas included assessment reporting for the first time during the 2009-2010 cycle. Five of the twenty-six program reviews submitted by instructional departments or discipline included results of learning assessments. Two of the five disciplines reporting assessment results also demonstrated the use of these results for the improvement of instructional practice and student learning. Program reviews for another 10 departments or disciplines stated that assessments were underway or described plans for future assessment activities. Twelve program reviews stated that learning assessment was not being

practiced or did not address the subject (P.R.A.I.S.E. documents; Item I-27); Program Review Division Summaries were completed by two of three instructional divisions, The Health Sciences/Public Safety/Industrial Technology division summary (Item I-26) reported that assessments have been completed or initiated in the eleven departments of this division. The Institutional Effectiveness division summary reported service level outcomes for the Office of Institutional Research (Item I-26).

The Annual Report 2009 includes an initial comprehensive assessment report based on data provided by the SLO and Assessment Coordinator at the end of the Fall 2009 semester.   Faculty reported that assessments have been completed for 11% of courses. Student learning outcomes for general education are to be assessed in the courses that meet the requirements for inclusion in the general education curriculum. Faculty reported that assessments were completed in 22% of all general education courses, including courses that cover five of the College's seven general education learning outcomes (Annual Report 2009; Item I-2).

> *IB-4. The institution provides evidence that the planning process is broad-based, offers opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.*

Description

As documented in the annual P.R.A.I.S.E. (Program Review, Allocation, and Institutional Strategies for Excellence) Reports (Item I-27), the College has implemented an annual cycle of program review and planning for several years, with participation primarily in instructional programs. The process as detailed in Administrative Procedure 1202 (Item I-7) requires the participation of all instructional, campus support, and student support departments, and includes the components of evaluation, discussion, planning, and resource allocation. Results of the Campus Climate Survey 2010 show that 49% of respondents disagreed with the statement, "Employee recommendations are considered in the development of institutional evaluation, planning, and improvement" (Item I-43). In addition, 45% of respondents indicated "No Opinion/Don't Know" for the item, "Planning documents are regularly reviewed for continuous quality improvement," and 41% responded in the same way to the item, "P.R.A.I.S.E. Reports are consistently compiled and reviewed at the division level to ensure effective annual strategic planning" (Item I-43).

The planning cycles for the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 fiscal years included an improvement to the P.R.A.I.S.E. process in terms of enabling budget augmentation requests for instructional supply funds. The Academic Senate Allocations Committee, functioning as a subcommittee of the finance and budget committee rated and prioritized requests, for the allocation of instructional supply funds (prioritization worksheets; Item I-38). The process was not repeated for the following two fiscal years because there were no available funds to allocate for instructional supplies. However, the Fiscal/Budget and Planning Committee is charged with the responsibility to review unit plans and priorities in order to ensure financial support (Administrative Procedure 1201; Item I-8) and, as part of the annual planning cycle, reviews

program review reports for budget impact and recommended priorities for funding (Administrative Procedure 1202; Item I-7).

Pursuant to Administrative Procedure 1202, (Item I-7 planning for the 2010-2011 fiscal year included for the first time a prioritized summary at the division level of all requests made in the P.R.A.I.S.E. reports completed within the division (Item I-26). Deans of the following divisions fulfilled this requirement: Office of Institutional Effectiveness; Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences; Health Science, Public Safety, and Industrial Technology (Item I-26).

In 2010, the College established a basic model for program management based on the criteria of demand, relevance, costs, and benefits to ensure administrators were on the same page in their thinking about the relative status of programs they manage (decision flowchart; Item I-40). In consultation with the instructional division deans, the President/Superintendent targeted seven (7) instructional programs for intensive evaluations in accordance with Administrative Procedure 4020 (Process for Program Discontinuance; Item I-39). At this writing that intensive evaluation process has been withdrawn. However, program improvement efforts continue in career technical education programs as mandated by Federal statute, following procedures developed during this cycle of planning for those funds (program improvement proposal template; Item 42). Dialogue among discipline faculty and management has produced improvement proposals for four of these seven programs (Item I-44).

IB-5. The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.

Description

As documented in the annual P.R.A.I.S.E. (Program Review, Allocation, and Institutional Strategies for Excellence) Reports—an essential component of program review—campus constituents examine success rates, retention rates, enrollment trends and projections, course transferability, availability of resources and utilization of resources, effective process management, program impact based on student learning outcome assessment or based on meeting demand and maintaining relevance, goals and budget justification (P.R.A.I.S.E. documents; Item I-21).

The Annual Report is prepared by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and documents the assessment of institutional performance on the factors of student success, student access, resource management, and program and service excellence. This information is published in detailed form for the District workforce and in summary form for the public (Annual Report 2009; Item I-2).

> **IB-6.** *The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts.*

Description

The annual program review cycle is the College's central planning and resource allocation procedure. The Academic Senate has engaged in an ongoing discussion and refinement of program review processes. P.R.A.I.S.E., a major revision of program review adopted in June 2006, restructured program review as an annual process integrating program performance data with planning and budget development. The Academic Senate added student learning outcomes planning and assessment forms to the program review template in November 2007 and approved revised versions of the assessment report forms in November 2008 (P.R.A.I.S.E. documents; Item I-21). In 2009, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee supplemented the program review process with a template to be used by each instructional, support, and service division to summarize divisional strengths, weaknesses, initiatives, budget impact, and instructional priorities (division summaries; Item I-26).

A number of changes have been made by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee in the Annual Report of Institutional Effectiveness for 2010. The publication timeline has been changed to allow for data collection during the summer and early fall, data analysis and dialogue during the late fall, and publication of the updated Annual Report no later than March 31st of each year (timeline; Item I-28) In addition, data on the following indicators be will be added and/or refined for the next evaluation cycle: student learning outcomes assessment, student support participation/service utilization, curriculum and program currency, and placement into the workforce (Institutional Effectiveness Committee agendas and minutes; Item I-14).

Campus Climate Survey 2010 evaluated several aspects of the planning and resource allocation processes. Findings indicate improvements are needed in terms of establishing clear and consistent processes (Campus Climate 2010; Item I-43).

> **IB-7.** *The institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services.*

Description

At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 program review cycle, the Academic Senate initiated an evaluation of program review through a survey tool distributed to members of the faculty as indicated in their minutes (Items I-24, I-26). No other formal procedure has been proposed to evaluate program review. However, additional discussion of the program review process takes place during meetings of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, which is charged with

evaluating and recommending improvements to program review of all College programs (Administrative Procedure 1201; Item I-8); see committee minutes (Item I-14).

Publication of data and analysis evaluating institutional effectiveness in the Annual Report 2009 was accompanied by a survey tool to be used by individuals who reviewed the report to submit comments and assessments of this resource. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee uses Annual Report feedback to assess and refine the College's use of institution level data and analysis for evaluation and improvement (Item I-2). To date, no one has formally submitted any feedback regarding the Annual Report, and 34% of respondents to Campus Climate Survey 2010 indicated "No Opinion/Don't Know" to the item, "Quality performance measures are used to evaluate VVC's institutional effectiveness via the Annual Report." Committee members, however, have commenced their own review and are refining the report for its 2010 edition (Item I-14).

Evaluation, Standard IB

Standard IB-1: Multiple opportunities for dialogue about the improvement of student learning and institutional processes are available as a result of the defined responsibilities and functions of College Council, shared governance committees, and the Academic Senate. Accordingly, the agendas and minutes of the Academic Senate, the College Council, and the College-wide committees demonstrate ongoing, self-reflective, and collegial dialogue occurs across the College. In addition, dialogue occurs within committees that report to the Academic Senate and in instructional departments and service units across the campus, as documented by program review. The scope of these opportunities for dialogue is reflected in the fact that 50% of respondents to the Campus Climate Survey 2010 indicated agreement with the statement, "Opportunities exist for me to provide recommendations regarding the College's institutional effectiveness" (Item I-41). However, the College's participative governance structure is not fully operative, since not all College-wide committees meet, report, or document their activities with sufficient regularity (Item I-12). Accordingly, 41% of respondents to the Campus Climate survey rated the College as deficient on survey item, "Shared governance committees that keep the campus community informed" (Item I-41). Finally, the program review process is designed to facilitate and document conversations about improvement, but compliance varies widely from year to year across the institution and for this reason program review provides uneven evidence for improvement dialogue within disciplines, departments, and service units.

Standard IB-2: The Board of Trustees adopted a new statement of District mission, vision, and goals, and new priorities were developed and adopted in 2007. Although the District goals and priorities were developed collaboratively and are consistent with the College mission, they are formulated in a way that makes it difficult to directly measure and evaluate progress toward their achievement. As a result the comprehensive evaluation of institutional effectiveness published in Annual Report, 2009 was not based directly on the College's goals and priorities, but on four themes derived from these goals and priorities: success, access, stewardship, excellence. Moreover, the College's current Educational Master Plan was based on an older statement of mission, vision, and goals adopted in 2003 and on 2004 data regarding conditions both external and internal to the District. While the 2003 and 2007 missions are largely congruent, the Educational Master Plan should be updated to reflect current environmental conditions, planning assumptions, and imperatives, as well as the current College goals and

priorities. Revision of the Educational Master Plan should follow a substantive and collaborative review and revision of the College mission statement, in accordance with Administrative Procedure 1200. ARCC reports are presented annually to the Academic Senate and to the Board of Trustees. Improvement goals are discussed by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, and were reported to the Academic Senate for the first time in 2010. Although performance has improved, the ARCC 2010 report demonstrated that the College performed below the peer average on each of the six indicators and the preliminary ARCC 2011 data show a decline in College performance on all six indicators. Inaccuracies in the data reported for one indicator have undermined faculty confidence in the value of ARCC, but dialogue with the Academic Senate leadership has helped to resolve the problem and improve the reliability of future reports. Other than this issue, there has been insufficient discussion of ARCC reports outside of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, and the College has not yet assigned responsibility for developing and implementing performance improvement plans for ARCC indicators

Standard IB-3: Program review (P.R.A.I.S.E.) which is the heart of the College's evaluation and planning process, is implemented annually, incorporates both qualitative and quantitative data, and is linked to procedures for resource allocation. Compliance with the program review process improved in 2009-2010 over 2008-2009; however, participation rates were remarkably uneven across the institution, and reports were varied in content and completeness. For the 2009-2010 cycle, program reviews were completed by 60% of student service departments, 58% of instructional disciplines, and 29% of campus support departments. Only 25% of divisions completed division summaries. It should be noted that 100% of programs submitted developmental budget worksheets for 2010-2011—hence, most of those budgets were not accompanied by documentation of completed program review and planning components.

The participation rate among managers of non-instructional units was particularly poor, despite specialized training sessions that were held in 2009-2010. Strategies for improving participation and communication should be developed prior to the initiation of the 2010-2011 program review cycle. The management team has not yet demonstrated commitment to the College's annual program review and budget planning cycle (its procedures and uses) or the ability to communicate the value program review to the work units they supervise. Improved engagement on the part of managers will increase participation and improve the integrity of the process, thereby resulting in quality planning documents that reflect campus-wide strategic priorities for the coming year.

With the exception of the reassigned time and training opportunities provided to the faculty Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Facilitator, the College has allocated few resources to support the development of learning outcomes and assessment. Furthermore, there has been no administrative effort to reach agreement with College constituencies on an institutional plan for implementing learning assessment. Although assessment activities are underway in certain departments and disciplines, there is insufficient documentation across instructional programs of the practice of learning outcome assessment, dialogue about its results, and use of the results for the improvement of learning and instruction. As a result there is little evidence that the definitions and procedures developed to guide learning assessment have resulted in any substantial implementation of the practice of assessment.

In order for the College to make progress in this area, formal and ongoing demonstrations of support for learning assessment are required from College leadership, effective assessment reporting procedures must be designed, a broader respect for assessment among members of the faculty must be developed, and effective structures must be created for dialogue leading to improvement in learning and instructional practice.

The results of the Academic Senate's first evaluation survey for program review demonstrate consistent and strong doubt among members of the faculty that program review is effective in addressing campus needs and improvement, is linked to budgeting and planning, or has positive outcomes. In addition, survey responses expressed doubts about the reliability of the program review data provided to departments and about the willingness of administrators to read and make effective use of program review reports. There are few examples of improvement in institutional effectiveness that can be attributed to the last three program review cycles. Rather than making use of the established evaluation and planning cycle for the purpose of program improvement, in 2010 the College initiated an independent program management process for this purpose.

Standard IB-4: The College's planning process is broad-based and offers opportunities for participation across the institution. Faculty evaluations in 2010 of program review demonstrated little confidence in the value of this process for addressing campus needs and improvement. Moreover, examples of improvement in effectiveness produced by program review are not available.

Standard IB-5: The publication of Annual Report 2009 (March, 2010) was a major step toward improving District use of institution-level data and analysis to assess and improve effectiveness. This resource, however, failed to receive the intended level of utilization across the institution. As a result, development of Annual Report: 2010 has been suspended pending a radical revision and simplification of its content and organization.

Standard IB-6: The Academic Senate has repeatedly refined program review for instructional departments over the last three years. Notable improvements include the integration of program evaluation with budget development and learning assessment reporting. Major changes in the Annual Report of Institutional Effectiveness are planned for 2010.

Standard IB-7: One procedure for assessing the College's evaluation mechanism, the Academic Senate's evaluation survey for program review, was first implemented in June 2010. The Academic Senate has not formally integrated the evaluation procedure into the established program review process and has taken no action on faculty recommendations for the improvement of program review. Similar evaluation procedures do not exist for non-instructional program reviews. No responses were received via the evaluation survey posted for Annual Report: 2009.

Summary of Opportunities for Improvement, Standard IB

Substantial internal and external changes that occurred subsequent to the adoption of the current Educational Master Plan require the development of a new Master Plan that is consistent with economic conditions within the District, state funding projections, College organization and

leadership, and the reviewed and revised statement of the College's mission, vision, values, and goals to be completed by the Board of Trustees in January 2011. There is insufficient documentation of student learning outcomes assessment for program, courses, and general education or of dialogue and planning for the improvement of learning.

Planning Agenda, Standard IB

No later than September 2011, the Superintendent/President will initiate a process by which the campus community will review and update the District Educational Master Plan in order to ensure that institutional planning and decision making are directly responsive to current community needs and guided by current College goals and priorities (Standard IB-2).

By June 2011, the Academic Senate will develop recommendations regarding College acquisition of software for assessment data management and approve a procedure for systematic learning assessment documentation across the institution to be integrated into the College's existing program review and planning procedures (Standard IB-3).

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness, in consultation with the Academic Senate and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, will develop by November 2011 a program review training procedure for chairs, managers, and student support staff in order to improve understanding and use of data, as well as standardize and improve follow-through and communication for program improvement (Standard IB-3)..

Evidence in Support of Standard I

Item I-1.   Board Policy 1200, District Vision, Values, Mission, and Goals

Item I-2.   Annual Report, 2009

Item I-3.   2010-2011 College Catalog, Programs of Study

Item I-4.   Online Classes @ VVC

Item I-5.   Admissions and Records

Item I-6.   College Council Agenda and Minutes

Item I-7.   Administrative Procedure 1202, Implementing Institutional Effectiveness

Item I-8.   Administrative Procedure 1201, Shared Governance Structure and Responsibilities

Item I-9.   Board Policy 4000, Standards of Educational Excellence

Item I-10.   Administrative Procedure 4000, Sustaining Standards of Educational Excellence

Item I-11.   College Council Schedule of Meetings

Item I-12.   College-wide Committees

Item I-13.   Academic Senate Agenda

Item I-14.   Institutional Effectiveness Committee Agenda and Minutes

Item I-15.   Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges, VVC 2009 (ARCC)

Item I-16.   Board Policy 4035, Academic Collegial Consultation

Item I-17.   Administrative Procedure 4025, General Education Student Learning Outcomes

Item I-18.   Student Learning Outcomes Assessment FAQs

Item I-19.   Online Classes @ VVC, Student Readiness Survey

Item I-20.   Board Policy 3250, Institutional Planning

Item I-21.   Program Review Home, P.R.A.I.S.E. Documents

Item I-22.   Educational Master Plan, March 2007

Item I-23.   Board Policy 1202, Institutional Effectiveness

Item I-24.   Academic Senate Minutes

Item I-25.   Academic Senate Approved Documents

Item I-26.   Program Review Division Summaries

Item I-27.   P.R.A.I.S.E. Documents

Item I-28.   Timeline for Annual Report

Item I-29.   Linkages between Institutional Effectiveness and District Goals and Priorities

Item I-30.   VVC Progress Report, October 15, 2007

Item I-31.   Board of Trustees Agenda and Minutes Archives

Item I-32.   ARCC Summary and Targets

Item I-33.   Administrative Procedure 4025, AA/AS Criteria

Item I-34.   Victor Valley College's CurricUNET

Item I-35.   Academic Senate Program Review Evaluation

Item I-36.   Administrative Procedure 3250, Institutional Planning Systems

Item I-37.   Prioritization of Budget Augmentation Requests (planning years 2007-2008
                  and 2009-2010)

Item I-38.   Administrative Procedure 4020, Process for Program Discontinuance

Item I-39.   Program Management Flowchart

Item I-40.   Administrative Procedure 1200, Review of District Vision, Values, Mission
                  and Goals

Item I-41.   Program Improvement Proposal Form and Sample

Item I-42.   Campus Climate Survey 2010