



2013

Annual Planning Report

Ventura College Office of Institutional Effectiveness

August 1, 2013

Contents

The ten-year Educational Master Plan charts the college’s long-term course. The Strategic Plan is comprised of a limited number of three-year institutional strategic goals derived from the Educational Master Plan. These three-year goals are further divided into strategic objectives, each operationalized through action steps. The Annual Planning Report, prepared by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, with contributions from the College Planning Council, the Student Learning Outcomes Oversight Committee, and the College President, documents the progress made on the Strategic Plan’s action steps from the prior year and the conclusions drawn from the student learning outcomes assessment process.

Section 1: Ventura College Strategic Plan.....	1
VC Objective 1: Continuously assess Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Service Unit Outcomes (SUOs) at the institutional, program, and, for instructional areas, course levels.	1
VC Objective 2: Continuously integrate SLOs, SUOs, Student Success Outcomes, Program Operating Outcomes, and meaningful analysis of data into the program review process.	4
VC Objective 3: Enhance the viability and relevance of CTE programs to support the workforce development plan.	7
VC Objective 4: Increase the transfer/transfer certified rates and certificate/proficiency award completion rates for all students and decrease the gap in transfer rates of Hispanic students (focus of new Title V HIS Transfer Grant).	10
VC Objective 5: Continue to implement the Student Services Re-engineering Plan (focus of Title V HIS Co-operative Grant).	12
VC Objective 6: Increase opportunities for faculty and staff to grow by providing training opportunities to improve teaching effectiveness and enhance service for students (focus of Title V HIS Co-operative Grant).	13
Section 2: SLO Status Report, 2012-2013	15
Section 3: Program Review Report, Fall 2012.....	22
Section 4: Institutional Effectiveness Measures	27

Section 1: Ventura College Strategic Plan

Annual Implementation Plan 2012-2013

VC Objective 1: Continuously assess Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Service Unit Outcomes (SUOs) at the institutional, program, and, for instructional areas, course levels.

Supports:

VC Strategic Goal 1: Continuously improve educational programs and services to meet student, community, and workforce development needs.

VCCCD Board Goal 1: Provide access and student success

VCCCD Board Goal 2: Maintain instructional quality within budgetary limits

#	Action Steps	Responsible Party	Timeline	Progress
1.1	Apply assessment results from prior semester (spring 2012) to improve programs and services and document those improvements	Programs, departments, and services	Fall 2012	Ongoing
1.2	Evaluate closing the loop on prior semester's assessments	Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, TracDat Facilitator, Faculty SLO Facilitators	Fall 2012	Completed
1.3	Complete annual SLO report	Dean of Institutional Effectiveness	July 2012	Completed
1.4	Draft ILSO rubrics	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness, Faculty SLO Facilitators	July 2012	Completed
1.5	Input initial administrative data into TracDat	TracDat Facilitator	July 2012	Completed
1.6	Provide staff and supervisor TracDat training	TracDat Facilitator	August 2012	Completed
1.7	Maintain SLO website	TracDat Facilitator	Continual	Ongoing
1.8	Preview SLO/SUO work to be done in fall with campus at mandatory flex day	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness	August 2012	Completed
1.9	Identify PSLOs, ISLOs, and SUOs to be assessed during fall 2012 semester; create performance indicators and timelines	Programs, departments, and services	August 2012	Completed
1.10	Provide department chairs, coordinators, and Deans TracDat	TracDat Facilitator, Faculty SLO Facilitators	September 2012	Completed
1.11	Provide mapping and embedding training to department chairs and coordinators for SLOs at the institutional, program and course levels	Faculty SLO Facilitators	September 2012	Completed
1.12	Revise SLO/SUO rotational plan	Faculty SLO Facilitator	September 2012	Completed

1.13	Create TracDat help guides for users and put the documents in TracDat for reference	TracDat Facilitator, Faculty SLO Facilitators	September 2012	Initial documents completed; process ongoing
1.14	Create ISUOs for Service (learning environment and accountability)	SLO Committee, SUO Subcommittee	October 2012	Completed
1.15	Create embedded SLO assessment form	Faculty SLO facilitators	October 2012	Completed
1.16	Complete 2012 College Status on SLO Outcomes Implementation for ACCJC	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness	October 2012	Completed
1.17	Approve SLO/SUO rotational plan; send to Academic Senate	SLO Committee	October 2012	Completed
1.18	Provide supplemental training to department chairs and coordinators on embedding of SLOs; review timelines for SLO/SUO assessment completions for fall 2012; establish additional training sessions for faculty on TracDat	Faculty SLO Facilitators; TracDat facilitator	November 2012	Completed
1.19	Conduct small group training sessions for faculty on inputting assessment data into TracDat	TracDat Facilitator, Faculty SLO facilitators	November/ December 2012	In process
1.20	Complete all ISLO, PSLO, CSLO (if embedded), SUO assessments for fall 2012 semester	Programs, departments, services	December 2012	Completed
1.21	Input all completed ISLO, PSLO, CSLO, and SUO assessment data into TracDat	Programs, departments, services	December 2012	Ongoing
1.22	Create ISLO, PSLO, CSLO, SUO timelines for spring 2012	SLO Committee	January 2012	Completed
1.23	Create assessment plans for ISLO, PSLOs, CSLOs and SUOs for spring 2012	Programs, departments, and services	January 2012	Completed
1.24	Review results of ISLOs, PSLOs, CSLOs, and SUOs assessments course and SUO assessments and work with faculty and staff to improve	Department Chairs, SLO Facilitators, Deans, SLO Committee	Spring 2013	Ongoing
1.25	Continue to work with Faculty to refine ISLOs, PSLOs, CSLOs mapping	Faculty SLO facilitators	Spring 2013	Ongoing
1.26	Create and submit five-year rotational plans for all SLO and SUO assessments	Programs, departments, and services; SLO Committee	Spring 2013	Completed
1.27	Apply assessment results from prior semester (fall 2012) to improve programs and services and document those improvements	Programs, departments, and services	Spring 2013	Ongoing
1.28	Conduct SLO annual survey of all faculty and staff	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness	April 2013	Completed

1.29	Conduct SLO Committee self-evaluation	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness	May 2013	Completed
1.30	File annual SLO report	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness	June 2013	In process

VC Objective 2: Continuously integrate SLOs, SUOs, Student Success Outcomes, Program Operating Outcomes, and meaningful analysis of data into the program review process.

Supports:

VC Strategic Goal 1: Continuously improve educational programs and services to meet student, community, and workforce development needs.

VCCCD Board Goal 1: Provide access and student success

VCCCD Board Goal 2: Maintain instructional quality within budgetary limits

#	Action Steps	Responsible Party	Timeline	Progress
2.1	Modify program review template and calendar per suggestions from Program Review Process Subcommittee	VP of Business Services, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness	July 2012	Completed
2.2	Finalize planning parameters, including list of any programs being considered for discontinuance, for use in 2012 program review process; present planning parameters to College Planning Council; email planning parameters document to campus	Executive Team	August 2012	Completed
2.3	Create sample program review for instructional area	VP of Business Services, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, Department Chair for Art	August 2012	Completed
2.4	Complete sample program review for service area	VP of Business Services, LRC Supervisor	August 2012	Completed
2.5	Identify dates for program review meetings at the division level	Deans	August 2012	Completed
2.6	Train department chairs, coordinators, and deans on revised program review document and process	VP of Business Services, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness	August 2012	Completed
2.7	Create links on program review website for faculty and staff to access program review data	VP of Business Services	August 2012	Completed
2.8	Create program review templates for instructional and service	VP of Business Services, LRC Supervisor	August 2012	Completed
2.9	Provide faculty and staff with support in accessing and analyzing data and in completing program review documents	VP of Business Services, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, Deans, LRC Supervisor	September 2012	Completed

2.10	Conduct program review meetings at the program, department, or service level to discuss student learning, create initiatives and close the loop on initiatives from the prior year	Programs, departments, and services	September 2012	Completed
2.11	Complete program review documents	Programs, departments, and services	September - October 2012	Completed
2.12	Conduct initial program review meetings at the division levels to review preliminary initiatives and discuss opportunities for collaboration on initiatives	Programs, departments and services program review facilitators	October 2012	Completed
2.13	Conduct final program review meetings at the division level to present final initiatives in relation to student learning and prioritize final initiatives	Programs, departments and services, program review facilitators	October 2012	Completed
2.14	Prepare final initiatives spreadsheets	Deans	October 2012	Completed
2.15	Present program review summaries to College Planning Council, including status of prior year's initiatives and presentations on program discontinuance	Deans, Faculty (for any programs being considered for discontinuance)	November 2012	Completed
2.16	Hear any program review appeals	College Planning Council	November 2012	N/A
2.17	Forward requests for resources to appropriate committees for further prioritization	VP of Business Services, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness	November 2012	Completed
2.18	Meet, discuss, and prioritize initiatives at the committee level	College Budget Council, Faculty Staffing Priorities, Committee, Classified Staffing Priorities Committee, Technology Committee, Facilities Oversight Group	November 2012	Completed
2.19	Discuss program review process and gather input on revisions for the next cycle	College Planning Council	November 2012	Completed
2.20	Gather input from department chairs and coordinators and from deans on program review process	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness	November 2012	Completed
2.21	Present final prioritized initiatives to College Planning Council	Executive Team	November 2102	Completed
2.22	Notify programs, departments, and services which received funding through the program review process	VP of Business Services, Co-Chairs College Planning Council	December 2012	Completed

2.23	Post all program review documents, including program reviews, presentation data, initiatives spreadsheets on college website	Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, LRC Supervisor	December 2012	Completed
2.24	Conduct Program Review survey to evaluate process	Dean of Institutional Effectiveness	December 2012	Completed
2.25	Complete annual program review report and post to website	Dean of Institutional Effectiveness	January 2013	Completed (need to post)
2.26	Move program review process to TracDat	VP of Business Services, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, TracDat Facilitator	Summer 2013	In process
2.27	Improve process by which faculty access program review data	VP of Business Services, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness	Summer 2013	In process
2.28	Receive additional training from Nuventive (TracDat) personnel	TracDat Facilitator	Summer 2013	Completed

VC Objective 3: Enhance the viability and relevance of CTE programs to support the workforce development plan.

Supports:

VC Strategic Goal 1: Continuously improve educational programs and services to meet student, community, and workforce development needs.

VCCCD Board Goal 1: Provide access and student success

VCCCD Board Goal 2: Maintain instructional quality within budgetary limits

#	Action Steps	Responsible Party	Timeline	Progress
3.1	Conduct a comprehensive program review for each CTE Program, including analysis of SLOs, historic data regarding the issuance of degrees and certificates, and qualitative data from Advisory Committees	CTE Dean, Department Chairs	Fall 2013	Done for all CTE Departments & Programs. Repeat in AY 2013-14.
3.2	Explore and possibly obtain local and statewide approval for AS Transfer degree in Nursing Nursing faculty member to attend statewide training meeting	CTE Dean, Department Chairs, Curriculum Committee	Ongoing	Remains in progress @ State & College level. Nursing faculty actively involved in process.
3.3	Participate in CTE Outcomes Project with other colleges to collect statewide and college-specific outcome data on students who complete or leave CTE degree/certificate programs or complete >10 units in past year Provide annual report to CPC and CTE disciplines	CTE Dean, Institutional Researcher, RP Group (funded through Perkins Grant)	Nov. 2013	Done – First Final Report received Nov. 2012. New Outcome Project underway with Final Report due Nov. 2013.
3.4	Install open-entry, competency-based computerized modules in pre-employment skills training into an existing computer lab for integration into existing CTE courses. (Potential modules include: occupation-specific literacy in reading and mathematics, basic electricity theory, time management skills, etc.)	VP for Business Services, CTE Dean	Dec. 2013	Currently purchasing modules for “soft skills” from Kline Educational.

3.5	<p>Enhance the use of CTE advisory committees and other community sources to better ascertain the needs of industry throughout the region.</p> <p>Schedule and hold one (1) Advisory Committee meeting/discipline each semester</p> <p>Post all Advisory Committee minutes on each discipline's website</p>	CTE Dean, Department Chairs	Ongoing	<p>AY 2012-2013 Advisory meetings held for: Business, Nursing, Welding, Automotive, Medical Assistant, Manufacturing, Paramedic, CNA, Drafting, Child Development, & Foster/Kinship Care. Meeting minutes posted or in progress for online posting.</p>
3.6	<p>Explore certificate and degree CTE programs to ascertain if changes are needed in our curriculum and programs to better prepare our students for current and future employment opportunities.</p> <p>Burning Glass software is now in place to collect real-time labor market data to better ascertain if training programs are meeting the current needs of the workforce.</p> <p>Selected staff training to begin in October 2012</p>	CTE Dean, Institutional Research, Department Chairs, Faculty	<p>2012 – 2013</p> <p>Fall 2013</p>	<p>TMC degrees established for Business & Child Development.</p> <p>Consultant hired to develop and produce Labor Market reports.</p>
3.7	Explore the development of new curricula and programs associated with the new Applied Science building/laboratory	CTE Dean, Department Chairs, Faculty	On Hold	Pending further investigation

3.8	Enhance partnerships with feeder secondary schools to strengthen concept of career pathways for incoming freshmen.	CTE Dean, SB-70, CTE Specialist,	October 2012 - June 2013	In progress
	Develop articulation agreements with local feeder schools	CTE Specialist, CTE Transitions	October 2012 – June 2013	Developed 2 new Auto Articulation Agreements with 6 pending
	Conduct career awareness camps to middle school students.	CTE Specialist, SB-70	July 2012 – June 2013	Organized 3 Career Explorations Camps and a Summer Career Institute. Over 400 students total enrolled
	Participate in VUSD’s CTE Advisory Committee.	CTE Specialist, SB-70, CTE Transitions	October 2012 – June 2013	Currently serving on Advisory Board and CTE Steering Committee
	Develop career pathway charts for each CTE discipline.	CTE Specialist, CTE Transitions	October 2013 – July 2013	Counselor will be paid hourly to develop POS and course sequences for each CTE discipline
	Promote CTE programs through marketing and outreach.	CTE Specialist, SB-70	July 2013 – June 2013	CTE Specialist will hire web designer to update careers’ section of the college web page; create CTE videos, brochures, and newsletters.

VC Objective 4: Increase the transfer/transfer certified rates and certificate/proficiency award completion rates for all students and decrease the gap in transfer rates of Hispanic students (focus of new Title V HIS Transfer Grant).

Supports:

VC Strategic Goal 2: Continuously improve educational programs and services in order to enhance opportunities for all students to succeed.

VCCCD Board Goal 1: Provide access and student success

VCCCD Board Goal 2: Maintain instructional quality within budgetary limits

#	Action Steps	Responsible Party	Timeline	Progress
4.1	Provide overview of grant to campus community at mandatory flex day	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness	August 2012	Completed
4.2	Invite and hear presentation from USC on equity issues related to student success	Targeted College Managers, Deans, Faculty, Staff	September 2012	Completed
4.3	Work with Human Resources on hiring for grant positions	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness	Summer 2013	Completed Grant Director, Tutorial Specialist II, Admin Assist, Research Analyst – all hired
4.4	Begin preliminary work to put SI into some of the 20 high impact barrier courses in spring 2012	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness, LRC Supervisor, Tutorial Specialist II	Fall 2012	Ongoing, initial meetings held, lists being created
4.5	Provide overview of grant to Academic Senate	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness	October 2012	Completed
4.6	Provide overview of grant to Department Chairs and Coordinators Council	Dean Institutional Effectiveness	October 2012	Completed
4.7	Establish training for new SI tutors to begin spring 2012	LRC Supervisor, Tutorial Specialist II	November - January 2013	Completed
4.8	Establish training for faculty utilizing SI in spring 2012	LRC Supervisor, Tutorial Specialist II	November - January 2013	Completed
4.9	Develop steering committee for grant	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness	November - December 2013	Completed
4.10	Collaborate with Faculty Professional Development Committee on new strategies for high risk barrier courses	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness, Grant Director	Fall 2012 - Spring 2013	Begun, Spring 2013
4.11	Meet with student services dean and faculty regarding hourly assignments for career and transfer center	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness, Grant Director	November - December 2012	Completed

4.12	Establish workshops for career and transfer centers for spring 2013	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness, Grant Director	November - January 2013	Transfer Center completed 2 workshops Jan. 2013 / Planning for Career Center in progress
4.13	Develop agreement with USC to work on equity issues/student success throughout the course of the grant; work with district on appropriate paperwork	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness, Grant Director	December 2012	To be completed June 2013
4.14	Meet with lead faculty of 20 high risk barrier courses to discuss new instructional strategies	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness, Grant Director, Deans	December 2012 - January 2013	Completed January 2013
4.15	Establish Reading/Writing Center for writing across the curriculum with special emphasis on high risk barrier courses	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness, LRC Supervisor, Department Chair of English	December 2012 - January 2013	Completed
4.16	Begin regularly scheduled meetings with grant steering committee	Grant Director	January 2013	Ongoing
4.17	Work with Math and English Departments on the expansion of accelerated instruction	Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, Dean of Math Science, Grant Director	Spring 2013	Math will begin accelerated course Fall 2013 English is in planning
4.18	Work with Learning Communities Committee to establish pilots for new learning communities in high risk barrier courses	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness, Grant Director	Spring 2013	Faculty discussion begun, to continue Fall 2013
4.19	Begin qualitative research to gather student feedback regarding high risk barrier courses	Grant Director, Research Analyst	Spring 2013	Qualitative Researcher hired
4.20	Pilot transfer and career center workshops	Grant Director, Dean of Student Services	Spring 2013	Planning has begun.

VC Objective 5: Continue to implement the Student Services Re-engineering Plan (focus of Title V HIS Co-operative Grant).

Supports:

VC Strategic Goal 3: Provide students with information and access to diverse and comprehensive support services that lead to their success.

VCCCD Board Goal 1: Provide access and student success

#	Action Steps	Responsible Party	Timeline	Progress
5.1	Design, develop and go live with new online orientation	Student Services Team, Project Director, Activity Director	November 2012 – June 2013	Online orientation script developed / Go live anticipated May 2013
5.2	Develop an intervention process for students on probation/dismissal	Activity Director, Student Services Liaison groups	October 2012 – June 2013	In progress. Completion anticipated end of Fall 2013
5.3	Integrate early alert process into new portal design	Student Services teams, Activity Director, Consultant	October 2012 – April 2013	Completed February 2013
5.4	Continue comprehensive data collection and analysis for all project objectives and quantify outcomes	Institutional Research, Project Director, Activity Director	July 2011-ongoing	Ongoing
5.5	Provide comprehensive customer service training for all student workers	Welcome Center Staff	August 2012-December 2012	Completed December 2012
5.6	Continue to identify and prioritize new online academic support and student services at Ventura and Oxnard Colleges	Online Portal Task Force members	August 2012-June 2012	Go live date anticipated April 2013
5.7	Plan and execute three student focus groups to provide suggestions to the improved student portal	Activity Director	June 2013	Completed February 2013
5.8	Develop transitional plan for elimination of International Student Specialist Position	Dean of Student Services, Registrar	October 2012-December 2012	Transition plan completed by end of Spring 2013
5.9	Reassess outreach plan for matriculation counseling at local high schools	Institutional Research, Dean of Student Services, Counseling staff	July 2011 - October 2012 - May 2013	Completed January 2013

VC Objective 6: Increase opportunities for faculty and staff to grow by providing training opportunities to improve teaching effectiveness and enhance service for students (focus of Title V HIS Co-operative Grant).

Supports:

VC Strategic Goal 4: Continuously enhance institutional operations and effectiveness.

VCCCD Board Goal 2: Maintain instructional quality within budgetary limits.

#	Action Steps	Responsible Party	Timeline	Progress
6.1	Meet with all stakeholders at both VC and OC to establish 3rd annual summer institute draft proposal and develop a Task Force from both campuses	Project Director	October and November 2012	Completed – Third summer institute successfully completed May 30, 2013
6.2	Create Advertisement and application for SITE III	Activity Director, Graphic Artists	November 2012	Completed
6.3	Advertise for participants to attend training	Project Director, Activity Director	November 2012 – April 2013	Completed
6.4	Use the survey completed by VC full-time and part-time faculty and classified staff knowledge, skills and interest for professional development training and participation to develop professional development activities for academic year 2012/2013	Activity Director and Instructional Design Specialist and Professional Development committee	September 2012 and December 2012	Completed trainings offered
6.5	Develop amended curriculum for faculty summer institute	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialists VC and OC	January - April 2013	Completed
6.6	Gather and compile results on reports on all pilot testing projects conducted in Fall 2012	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist, Institutional Researcher	January 2013	Completed
6.7	Coordinate workshops from instructional experts open to all summer institute participants	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialists	September - December 2012, January – April 2013	Completed
6.8	Recruit and select summer institute cohorts at VC, OC, and MC	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist	January - May 2013	Completed
6.9	Organize professional development trainings for 2012-2013 academic year	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist, Professional Development Committee	September 2012 and December 2012	Completed

6.10	Report to greater community of faculty at both VC and OC the results of pilot testing of ideas, and successes and failures if any of one on one and small group DE support	Project Director, Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist	Fall 2013	Due in Fall 2013
6.11	Implement and deliver summer institute II	Project Director, Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist	May 2013	Completed May 30 ,2013
6.12	Identify faculty from summer institute and other trainings to pilot new ideas, identify and capture base line data for research specific to pilot groups	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist, plus faculty involved in pilot testing	May 2013	Completed May 30, 2013
6.13	Organize professional development trainings for 2012-2013 academic year	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist, Task Force, Professional Development Committee	September 2012 - April 2013	Completed
6.14	Create Flex week activities brochure and distribute to all faculty at Ventura College	Activity Director, Professional Development Committee	Develop and distribute by March 2013	Completed
6.15	Identify faculty from summer institute and other trainings to pilot new ideas, identify and capture base line data for research specific to pilot groups	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist, plus faculty involved in pilot testing	Fall 2013	Upcoming

Section 2: SLO Status Report, 2012-2013

In September 2012, the SLO Committee began its work for the semester, reviewing the Annual SLO Report, which is part of the 2012 Annual Planning Report, and commencing its meetings for the year. Ty Gardner, Senior SLO facilitator, served as co-chair of the SLO Committee this academic year.

During the summer, SLO faculty facilitators, Gardner and Debbie Newcomb, met with faculty and staff to help them with the transition to TracDat. TracDat facilitator, Sandy Hajas, worked with service area leads and supervisors to train them on TracDat.

In July 2012, the two faculty SLO facilitators, Gardner and Newcomb, and the Academic Senate President, Peter Sezzi, attended the SLO pre-session of the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges in San Francisco at which they confirmed that the our path towards the development of a rotational plan for all SLO assessments was appropriate and in line with what other colleges were doing.

At the end of the previous academic year (2011-2012), instructional programs were asked to identify one PSLO to assess during the fall 2012 semester. Each program also identified an assessment timeframe, the method of assessment that would be used by the faculty teaching the applicable courses, and the goal. Programs and departments that mapped to ISLO #1 were asked to assess communication skills as well. During the fall, and for some programs/departments, the spring also, these assessments were conducted.

During the fall semester, the SLO Committee identified the following recommendations/goals for the 2012-2013 academic year:

- Expansion, implementation, and improvement of TracDat
- Development of rotational plans (by departments and programs) with embedding
- Formation of committees and development of remaining ISLO rubrics
- Creation of additional connections between SLOs and program review

One of the major projects undertaken in early fall 2012 was the completion of the College Status Report on Student Learning outcomes Implementation, as required by ACCJ3. Numerous weeks were spent writing the report and collecting the required evidence to ensure that we were able to demonstrate how we met the proficiency rating on each of item on WASC's SLO performance rubric. Our quantitative data, which represented our status at the beginning of the fall 2012 semester, was reported as follows:

Total number of active college courses	562	
Number of college courses with defined SLOs	553	98%
Number of college courses with ongoing assessment	480	85%
Total number of college programs	29	
Number of college programs with defined SLOs	27	
Number of college programs with ongoing assessment	27	93%
Total number of student learning and support activities	25	
Number of student learning and support activities with SUOs	25	
Number of student learning and support activities With ongoing assessment	25	100%
Total number of ISLOs defined	5	
Number of ISLOs with ongoing assessment	*5	

*Number was revised after submission of report because it did not reflect the rotational plan.

These results were also included in the Spring 2013 VCCCD Institutional Effectiveness report.

In the final self- assessment section of the report, we noted the institution’s full commitment to ongoing assessments of SLOs at the course, program, service, and institutional levels. We also explained that the college had aligned its various SLOs (course, program, and institution) and connected student learning/ SLOs with our program review process and our allocation of resources. We noted, as well, our commitment to continuous quality improvement and our intention to continue to refine our processes.

Results of the report were discussed with members of the accreditation visiting team at the time of the college’s follow-up visit in November, 2013. The SLO and TracDat facilitators, along with the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, also met with team members, per their request, to discuss the progress that had been made with SLOs since our last visit.

Two Institutional Service Unit Outcomes were also added after discussions at the SLO Committee and among a group of Classified Supervisors working on SUOs and program review. The decision was also made after the dean spoke with a WASC staff member who indicated that these over-arching outcomes for services were appropriate and needed. The two ISUOs that were approved by the SLO Committee, and provided to the Academic Senate as an information item, are as follows:

The Service will support or facilitate a positive learning or service environment for students.

The Service will support or facilitate institutional accountability by monitoring and ensuring compliance with statutory mandates, local policy and procedures, and state or federal law.

During the fall 2012 semester, the SLO Committee worked on the final version of our SLO rotational plan. Initially, committee members felt that a three year plan would be workable, but further discussions – and input from the Academic Senate – indicated that it would be very difficult to conduct all the assessments within a three year period if faculty needed to reassess students to determine

whether changes that had been made as a result of the assessments were helpful in improving student performance. After extensive discussion, the SLO Committee decided that a five year rotational plan would be best. Each year, one ISLO will be assessed by those programs and departments that have courses linked to that ISLO. The semester prior to that particular year, campus forums will be held to develop institutional rubrics for that particular ISLO. Following the assessments, the results and suggestions by faculty will be discussed campus-wide at a forum where institutional initiatives will be developed. Program faculty and staff would then add their course and program SLO assessment dates into their own program or department's five-year rotational plan, embedding assessments wherever possible. A copy of the institution's rotational plan is provided at the end of this report.

SLO facilitators also created SLO embedded worksheets so that faculty members could easily see how one assessment at the course level could connect with a PSLO and an ISLO. SLO facilitators explained also that these worksheets could be used for the collection of information prior to being input into TracDat. These worksheets were distributed to the department chairs at the Department Chair and Coordinator Council Meeting.

In the 2012-2013 academic year, ISLO #1 – Communication – was assessed by programs and departments that mapped to this ISLO. The previous spring semester, ISLO rubrics had been created for written and oral communication. SLO and TracDat facilitators and staff worked with faculty and staff to input results into TracDat.

In fall, ISLO rubrics (first drafts with revisions) for Visual Communication, Quantitative Analysis, and Scientific Analysis were developed by faculty in those disciplines and approved by the SLO committee

During the spring 2013 semester, faculty, and staff were asked to complete the following tasks, and the percentages of those programs/departments that completed the task is also provided:

Work with one of the SLO facilitators	92%
Clean up TracDat for their program/department (information had been input into the program by staff). Clean up meant to review the course and program SLOs and to make any needed adjustments.	96%
Write rubrics for any PSLOs that had not already been done.	96%
Complete their program or department's five year rotational plan	88%

By the end of the spring 2013 semester, this work had been completed by the vast number of instructional programs and departments with significant assistance from the SLO facilitators, all of whom have worked extensively with faculty. Those areas that did not complete the work will do so over the summer or in early fall. The respective deans and SLO facilitators will work with these areas.

In the spring semester, the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and an SLO facilitator met with service areas across campus to ensure that the services understood the work that needed to be done. In the meetings, the five year rotational plan was reviewed, and it was explained that the services could map to the ISLOs (i.e. in the case of the Library), ISUOs, or both – as was appropriate for that service. Samples of prior service assessments were distributed, and the group discussed the types of data being

collected by the services, the findings, and the improvements that had been made. TracDat was also reviewed again, and several areas were looked at as examples. And, finally, connections between SUOs and program review were discussed with samples provided.

In late spring 2013, the SLO facilitators for fall 2014 and the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness attended the ACCJC Regional Workshop on SLOs, which was held at Pierce College on April 19. They brought examples of work done by the college and engaged with colleagues across the state on strategies for improving SLO work.

In place of the annual SLO survey, departments and programs were asked about the status of their SLO work in facilitated meetings that were held in February/March 2013. This decision was made for two reasons. Firstly, it provided a way to gauge the SLO performance of programs/departments in relation to our new U.S. Education Department Title V HSI grant in the area of transfer. One of the objectives calls for instructional programs, by 2016, to reach Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement (highest level possible) for SLOs as determined by the WASC rubric (and the addition of #7 that is specific to this college). Secondly, it provided an opportunity for faculty to discuss SLOs generally and collaboratively.

Faculty members were asked to rate their programs/departments performance on a scale of 1-5, using the following criteria, which was taken from various areas of the rubric, as well as to make comments.

- Student learning outcomes and authentic assessments are in place for courses, programs, support services, certificates and degrees.
- Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes.
- Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled.
- Student learning outcomes and assessments are ongoing, systematic and used for continuous quality improvement.
- Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive, and robust.
- Learning outcomes are specifically linked to program reviews.
- Rotational plans are in place and being followed.

Per division, the following summarizes the responses that were discussed and provided:

CTE

Ratings varied from 3 – 5 (on the 5 point scale)

- SLO work is ongoing although there is room for improvement (i.e. need more conversations about assessment results)
- Skepticism, in some areas, about the value of SLO work remains
- Some areas noted the need to ensure that SLOs are on the syllabus and that they are discussed with and understood by students
- Some areas noted the need to link SLOs more closely with program review

- Areas (i.e. Nursing) have been required to assess SLOs as part of their individual program accreditation for some time, and their scores in all areas were high

English/Library/LC

Ratings varied from 3 – 5 (on the 5 point scale)

- Continued improvement to the process occurs every semester
- Need to address support services in helping to meet goals/student needs
- Need a dialogue on how SLOs work from one class to the next in the English sequence
- SLOs are on the syllabi, but they need to be discussed more extensively with students
- Genuine dialogue is occurring among faculty members in regards to SLOs – it has been the most valuable outcome of the SLO process
- More connections needed between SLOs and program review

Kinesiology/Communication/Off-Site Programs

Ratings varied from 2 – 5 (on the 5 point scale)

- Ongoing coordination of assessments is continuing
- Student awareness of SLOs could be improved
- SLOs and program review, in some cases, need more coordination
- SLOs are being discussed in department meetings
- Continuing to improve questionnaire for students (off-site programs)
- In one area, students being shown the expectations for excellent, average, and unsatisfactory expectations in relation to SLOs
- Changes are being made based on assessment results

Math/Science

Ratings varied from 2-5

- In most areas, SLOs have been fully integrated into courses and programs and consistently assessed
- More work needs to be done in helping students to understand SLOs
- Program review and SLOs are, for the most part, well linked
- Dialogue is ongoing and robust in most departments

Social Science/Humanities

Ratings mostly varied from 2-5

- SLO work is being done, as required
- Some areas felt that SLO work only has the appearance of being useful
- Faculty in some departments stated that authentic assessment and student learning has always been discussed – without a cumbersome process needed to regulate it
- Too much time spent on forms and tasks rather than student learning

- SLOs discussed in department meetings; some good discussion occurring
- More connection between program review and SLOs needed

Student Services

Ratings varied from 2-5

- Data collection has greatly improved (in some areas, more work needed); most areas utilizing surveys
- Assessments are being completed
- Many SUOs directed at improving outreach or marketing of services to students
- Limited funding is affecting ability, in some areas, to achieve continuous quality improvement of service
- Dialogue continuing and improving
- Some areas linking SUOs to program review; in some areas more connection needed

In reviewing the input from the facilitated meetings, there are several areas that came up in most departments/programs and need to be addressed:

- SLOs need to be discussed and understood more effectively by students
- SLOs and program review need to be more closely aligned (being done already in most of the Math/Science areas)
- The value of SLO work needs to be communicated and discussed more extensively with faculty

In May 2013, the SLO committee again conducted its committee self-evaluation. One hundred percent of respondents felt that the SLO Committee had a clearly documented charge and that committee meetings were conducive to open discussion of relevant issues. Fifty percent strongly agreed and 50% agreed that the business of the committee was accomplished effectively for the year. Most respondents felt that the creation/subsequent completion of five year rotational plans was the committee's greatest accomplishment of the year. For suggestions, respondents felt that the committee's annual goals needed to be established early and revisited during the course of the semester, more training and handouts pertinent to SUOs (vs. instructional areas) needed to occur, and committee members needed to take on additional tasks/acquire a greater sense of involvement.

A new SLO faculty facilitator (Andrea Horigan) was selected for the 2013/2014 academic year. Debbie Newcomb will remain an SLO facilitator. Ty Gardner will continue to work with the committee in a leadership role.

TracDat Administrator, Sandy Hajas, attended the Nuventive TracDat Users Conference, held June 9-12, 2013, in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania where she was able to increase her skill level by attending the more advanced training sessions. The main point of the training was to improve TracDat software skills so that she may actively assist the campus in moving the program review process into TracDat, to improve ability to readily make changes to the SLO process as needed, and to assist in improving report development. An added bonus of the conference was the ability to connect with other colleges using

TracDat and gain their insight into how they are using TracDat to collect data and how they used the software to improve their assessment environment.

In summer 2013, the dean and the SLO facilitators will begin work on an SLO Newsletter, in which we will highlight faculty members who have done an exceptional job with assessments and improvements. It is our hope that through this publication, we can improve the way some faculty members feel about SLOs.

We are also hoping, during mandatory flex day – or at an appropriate time, to bring back what we learned from the SLO WASC Conference at Pierce College. In particular, we were impressed with a faculty member's presentation of the compare/contrast between doing SLO work for regulatory purposes as opposed to learning purposes. It was an exceptional presentation.

At our first meeting of the 2013-2014 academic year, the members of the SLO Committee will establish goals for the coming year.

During Flex Week, 2013, two SLO workshops will be presented: SLOs 101 and How to Write a Rubric. Both will be taught by our faculty SLO facilitators.

Section 3: Program Review Report, Fall 2012

During the fall 2012 semester, changes were implemented to the program review process as a result of suggestions from the Program Review Process Subcommittee. The first involved simplification of the program review form in terms of data (provided in appendices) and the removal of repetition within the form itself. The second involved the addition of a second division meeting. Division faculty and staff had found the previous year that more time was needed for participants to hear summaries of other departments' program review initiatives and associated requests for resources before being in a position to prioritize the requests appropriately at the division level. The additional meeting also provided an opportunity for departments in some divisions to collaborate on joint initiatives. The final major change involved the use of facilitators in the two division meetings. Most divisions made use of trained facilitators to run the meetings to assure consistency and objectivity in the process, and those divisions that did use facilitators found that the meetings were significantly more effective. Additionally, with the meetings being facilitated, division deans were able to participate and collaborate as members of the division.

In early fall 2012, the planning parameters were published again (they had been published originally in spring 2012) to provide a planning framework for programs and services to consider in their program review documents. Programs and services participated in the revised program review process. Faculty and staff generally felt more comfortable with the process during this, our second time/year. The College Planning Council (CPC), which serves as the Program Review Committee, felt that the new Infrastructure Funding Model (Fund 113), which provided funds specifically for integrated planning/program review purposes, made clear to people that program review dollars were set aside for programs and services that requested funds through the appropriate processes. Members also felt positively about the use of facilitators and the extra division meeting. They appreciated that the Director of the Ventura College Foundation was present at the program review presentations in order to coordinate possible funding with program review requests (those that could not be funded), and they recommended that he continue to attend CPC (at least the program review portion) as a non-voting member. The CPC felt that we needed to work on such areas as closing the loop more effectively. Some members felt that we should be moving toward a rotational plan and there was general agreement that we needed to reconcile how the District's AP 4021 on Program Discontinuance works with our local process. Overall, though, CPC members felt very positive about the program review experience from input gathered at the conclusion of the presentations. They felt that the program review process informed people about various areas/needs of the college, allowed people to ask questions about other areas, and generally brought us together as a college to look at our success and challenges.

Suggestions for improvement to the process were solicited using the same assessment processes as were used in 2011: a campus-wide electronic survey, input from the College Planning Council, and input from the Department Chairs and Coordinator's Council. The primary recommendations stemmed from concerns that insufficient time was provided to complete the program review, that program review data needed to be provided in a more user-friendly format, and that improvements needed to be made in

the tracking of created initiatives. Members of the SLO Executive Committee (the two faculty SLO facilitators, the TracDat facilitator, and the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness) believe that connecting program review with TracDat was also important for us to do in the next program review cycle. Additionally, it was noted by several people that SLOs need to be even more clearly at the center of our program review process.

Results of the program review survey can be found at the end of this report, but in most areas there was improvement from the prior year. Importantly, 82 people responded (versus 45 the year before). While we need to work toward a greater response the next time, the rate did go up significantly. Approximately 10% more people reported attending a program review meeting. However, 12% fewer reported reviewing data, which can probably be attributed to providing the data in large appendices as opposed to being included in the program review report text. Greater percentages of people felt that their program was sufficiently represented in the division meeting. Eighty-six percent felt that the process was sufficiently collaborative at the program level and 88% felt so about the division level. In terms of the new processes implemented, 81% agreed or strongly agreed that the use of facilitators in the division meetings was helpful. Seventy-five percent felt that the extra division meeting proved worthwhile.

In spring 2013, the local process for program viability/discontinuation as it relates to the District AP was made clear in documentation written and approved by the Academic Senate. This local process, which was utilized in the 2012 program review process, will be followed during the next program review process, which will take place in fall 2013.

Also in spring 2013, an initial, small program review subcommittee was formed to examine input/recommendations made from the campus about the 2012 program review process. This subcommittee included the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, the Vice President of Business Services, the Institutional Researcher, and the Supervisor of Learning Resources/TracDat Facilitator. Along with examining the recommendations from the assessments, the subcommittee analyzed the feasibility of utilizing TracDat for the student learning outcomes, student success outcomes, and program operating outcomes portions of the program review reports. The committee examined models of other colleges that are using TracDat for program review purposes. The model selected as the leading contender for our own process was the one created by Long Beach City College (LBCC). Its process utilizes TracDat for annual planning purposes (with goals) and contains a separate program review document that summarizes and analyzes planning, performance of goals, and SLO/SUO performance. LBCC has a three-year rotation for program review, but every year, programs/departments report on the status of their goals, update their goals, and request resources as they relate to goals and student learning. In February 2013, initial discussions between Ventura College and LBCC took place. On March 15, 2013, the video conference took place between members of the program review subcommittee and LBC3.

A decision was made to bring the LBCC model to a larger group for input. This meeting took place on April 15, 2013. Attendees included Ramiro Sanchez (EVP), David Keebler (VP of Business Services), Peter Sezzi (Academic Senate President), Dan Kumpf (Dean, Math/Science), Michael Callahan (Institutional Researcher), Sandy Hajas (LRC Supervisor), Susan Bricker (Registrar), Ty Gardner (SLO

Faculty Facilitator), Andrea Horigan (incoming SLO Faculty Facilitator), Kathy Scott (Dean, IE). The group thought that LBCC's process was an effective one and supported us going forward with it. However, the group felt that the change needed to be made slowly so that faculty and staff would not feel overwhelmed. The group did support the use of TracDat to capture information pertaining to all types of outcomes, including student success and operating goals (the ones that are used specifically for program review) and supported beginning the transition this fall for the items we could feasible handle. Additionally, it was decided that the Institutional Researcher would take over the task of providing data to the individual programs/departments. We agreed that a smaller group would meet to work on revisions to the form for fall.

This smaller group met on May 6, 2013 and began going over the form in detail. Attendees included Susan Bricker, Sandy Hajas, Art Sanford (incoming Academic Senate President), Debbie Newcomb (SLO Faculty Facilitator), David Keebler, and Kathy Scott. The discussion focused on ways to make the program review process and document simpler and more meaningful for faculty. The idea of programs/departments creating goals was also discussed extensively. The group also discussed the need for the deans and vice presidents to create their own plans, which will provide additional direction to the programs, departments, and services within that division. The group scheduled a full day to sit down and work through every page of the form. That meeting will take place on June 3.

Our goal for the summer of 2013 is to revise the form, create sample program review documents for an instructional and a service program, and to create the data packets for the instructional programs. The group also wants to incorporate the establishment of three annual goals that will help transition the process into TracDat and a possible program review rotational plan. Early in fall 2013, we will begin training the department chairs, coordinators, supervisors, and service leads on the changes in the document. We believe that our continued work toward improving our program review process will help us evaluate our programs, departments, and services even more effectively.

2012 Program Review Survey Responses

Please check the one that applies to you:

Part-Time Faculty	28.0%
Full-time Faculty	40.2%
Department Chair	3.7%
Classified Employee	14.6%
Classified Supervisor	4.9%
Manager	8.5%

Did you work with your program faculty/staff to collaborate on any of the following during the program review process?

89.0%	Attend a meeting to discuss program review
68.3%	Review data
31.7%	Collected data (services only)
56.1%	Developed initiatives using data
65.9%	Created or revised program SLOs, student success outcomes, or operating outcomes
57.3%	Created initiatives
57.3%	Ranked initiatives

Was your program sufficiently represented in the division meeting and division ranking process?

Yes	73.2%
No	3.7%
Don't know	23.2%

Was the process sufficiently collaborative at each of the following levels?

Program Level:

Yes	85.7%
No	14.3%

Division Level:

Yes	87.8%
No	12.2%

Instructional Programs: What is the most effective way for data to be provided for interpretation/analysis?

32.4%	Data should be in the appendices only
59.2%	Data should be embedded into the program review document
8.5%	Other

Service Programs: Was your program able to obtain sufficient data?

Yes	86.0%
No	14.0%

Did the changes that were implemented prior to this year's program review process improve the process that are listed below improve the process from last year?

Use of facilitators in division meetings:

Strongly Disagree	7.6%
Disagree	11.4%

Agree	51.9%
Strongly Agree	29.1%

Additional division meetings:

Strongly Disagree	9.2%
Disagree	15.8%
Agree	52.6%
Strongly Agree	22.4%

Note: The list of individual comments can be found on the Program Review website.

Section 4: Institutional Effectiveness Measures

A. Core Indicators of Effectiveness

Introduction

Ventura College's Core Indicators of Effectiveness, developed by the College Planning Council and approved in May 2012, are broad measures that act as important gauges of the college's overall effectiveness as an institution of higher education. The measures were self-selected by the institution and data associated with them will be tracked over time to ascertain the college's performance related to each indicator. These metrics should not be viewed as the sole measures for evaluating the success or failure of Ventura College since some students attend the institution for reasons other than the obtainment of degrees or certificates or for transfer to four-year schools.

VC's Core Indicators of Effectiveness are publicly shared within the context of celebrating accomplishments and identifying areas needing improvement and are not used to evaluate the effectiveness of discrete courses, faculty or students. The measures are intended as an overall portrait of the institutional effectiveness of Ventura College and are not presented in ranked order of importance.

Indicators of Effectiveness

The college has established the following **thirteen** Core Indicators of Effectiveness.

1. Course Completion Rate

Using VC's **2008–2009** course completion rate as a **baseline, maintain or increase** the annual course completion rate in future years.

The Course Completion Rate is the percentage of students who do not withdraw (receive W's) from class and who receive a grade notation of A, B, C, P, D, F, NP, RD, or I*.
(The Course Completion Rate was formerly known as the Retention Rate)

2. Course Success Rate

Using VC's **2008–2009** course success rate as a **baseline, maintain or increase** the annual course success rate in future years.

The Course Success Rate is the percentage of students who receive a passing/satisfactory grade notation of A, B, IB, C, IC, or P.

3. Student Retention Rates

Using VC's **fall 2008** student retention rates as **baselines, maintain or increase** the fall-to-fall retention rates of **all first-time** students (whose primary college was VC) and first-time students by **ethnicity**.

The Student Retention Rate is the percentage of first-time fall students who receive a grade of A, B, C, P, D, F, NP, I*, or W in the succeeding spring and fall terms. (Formerly known as Persistence Rate)

4. Student Satisfaction

In **2013–2014**, establish target student satisfaction goals based on the spring 2009 district-wide Survey of Student Perceptions.

5. Student Engagement

Score **at or above the mean** in each of the **five** CCSSE Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice:

- a. Active and Collaborative Learning
- b. Student Effort
- c. Academic Challenge
- d. Student-Faculty Interaction
- e. Support for Learners

The CCSSE (Community College Survey of Student Engagement) is conducted by The University of Texas, Austin and is administered at Ventura College in the spring of even-numbered years.

6. Student Progress and Achievement and Pre-Collegiate Improvement

Score **at or above** the college's **peer-group** mean in each of the **six** College Level Indicators set forth in the ARCC (Accountability Reporting for the California Community Colleges):

- a. Student Progress and Achievement Rate
- b. Percent of Students Who Achieved at Least 30 Units
- c. Persistence Rate
- d. Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Credit Vocational Skills Courses
- e. Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Credit Basic Skills Courses
- f. Improvement Rate for ESL Courses
- g. Improvement Rate for Credit Basic Skills Courses

7. Degrees and Certificates Awarded

With **2008–2009** as the **baseline** year, **maintain or increase** the college's annual awards of Associate Degrees and Certificates.

8. Transfers

a. **Transfers to Four-Year Institutions:**

With **2008 – 2009** as the **baseline** year, **maintain or increase** the annual numbers of VC students transferring to a California public (CSU or UC), independent, or out-of-state university.

b. **Transfer Velocity:**

With **2005 – 2006** as the **baseline** year, **maintain or increase** the percentage of VC students who transfer **within four years** to a public or independent four-year institution within the US.

The CCC Chancellor's Office – Transfer Velocity Project tracks cohorts of first-time college students for six years to determine if they show "behavioral intent to transfer" (i.e., they accumulated a minimum of 12 earned units and they attempted a transfer-level Math or English course).

c. **Transfer Certified:**

Using **2009 – 2010** as the **baseline** year, **maintain or increase** the number of students who are CSU–GE or IGETC certified.

9. Licensure Pass Rates

With **2008 – 2009** as the **baseline** year, **maintain or increase** licensure pass rates in the following technical or vocational programs:

- a. Registered Nursing
- b. Certified Nursing Assistant
- c. Paramedic
- d. Emergency Medical Technician (EMT)

10. Annual FTES

Maintain the college's state-wide standing as a mid-sized college by meeting the minimum required FTES (Full-time Equivalent Student) to secure a mid-size college designation.

11. Faculty Productivity (Aggregate WSCH / FTEF)

Meet the college's productivity goal as measured by achieving the Aggregate WSCH / FTEF quotient (Aggregate Weekly Student Contact Hours *divided by* FTEF) established by the VCCCD.

12. 75/25 Ratio (Full-Time / Part-Time Faculty Ratio)

Continue to **make progress** on a yearly (*or fall term*) basis toward the state-mandated requirement that 75% or more of Full-Time Equivalent Faculty be full-time.

13. Institutional Student Learning Outcomes

In **2012–2013**, establish baseline standards for Institutional (General Education) Student Learning Outcomes and then **meet or exceed** the baseline standards in future years.

Ventura College has established **thirteen** Core Indicators of Effectiveness. However, since several of these Core Indicators are sub-divided into two or more effectiveness measures, there are actually a total of **29** standards of effectiveness. The **Scorecard** below provides an overview of the results of evaluations of the **29** indicators. For **15** of the measures, the effectiveness goals were met; for **11** of the measures, the goals were not met; the remaining **three** measures cannot be evaluated until next year. The college's plan for addressing Core Indicators – for which goals were not met – is presented on the next page.

Ventura College Core Indicators of Effectiveness			
◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ Scorecard ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆			
Effectiveness Indicator		Outcome	Result
No.	Abbreviated Title		
1	Course Completion Rate	Exceeded baseline rate in 2009–10, 2010–11, and 2011–12	Met Standard
2	Course Success Rate	Exceeded baseline rate in 2009–10, 2010–11, and 2011–12	Met Standard
3a	Retention Rate – All	Exceeded baseline rate in 2009–10, 2010–11, and 2011–12	Met Standard
3b	Retention Rates – Ethnicity	2011–12: Blacks and Unknown were below their benchmarks	Not Met
4	Student Satisfaction	Target goals to be established in 2013–2014	----
5a	Active Learning	CCSSE – 2010: Below peer group mean by 3.2 points	Not Met
5b	Student Effort	CCSSE – 2010: Below peer group mean by 3.6 points	Not Met
5c	Academic Challenge	CCSSE – 2010: Below peer group mean by 2.5 points	Not Met
5d	Student-Faculty	CCSSE – 2010: Below peer group mean by 2.8 points	Not Met
5e	Support for Learners	CCSSE – 2010: Below peer group mean by 1.4 point	Not Met
6a	Student Progress	ARCC – 2012: Below peer group mean by 3.3 percent points	Not Met
6b	% Students with 30 Units	ARCC – 2012: Below peer group mean by 2.1 percent points	Not Met
6c	Persistence Rate	ARCC – 2012: Above peer group mean by 0.8 percent point	Met Standard
6d	Completion – Vocational	ARCC – 2012: Below peer group mean by 2.0 percent points	Not Met

6e	Completion – Basic Skills	ARCC – 2012: Above peer group mean by 6.1 percent points	Met Standard
6f	Improvement – Basic Skills	ARCC – 2012: Above peer group mean by 7.1 percent points	Met Standard
6g	Improvement – ESL	ARCC – 2012: Below peer group mean by 38.7 percent points	Not Met
7	Degrees and Certificates	Exceeded baseline rate in 2009–10, 2010–11, and 2011–12	Met Standard
8a	Transfer to 4-Year Schools	Exceeded baseline rate in 2010–11 and 2011–12	Met Standard
8b	Transfer Velocity	Currently in baseline year	----
8c	Transfer Certified	Exceeded baseline rate in 2010–11 and 2011–12	Met Standard
9a	Registered Nursing	Exceeded baseline rate in 2009–10, 2010–11, and 2011–12	Met Standard
9b	Certified Nurse Assistant	Exceeded baseline rate in 2009–10, 2010–11, and 2011–12	Met Standard
9c	Paramedic	Exceeded baseline rate in 2009–10, 2010–11, and 2011–12	Met Standard
9d	EMT	Below baseline rate in 2009–10, 2010–11, and 2011–12	Not Met
10	Annual FTES	2011 – 2012 FTES of 10,414 exceeds mid-size threshold	Met Standard
11	Faculty Productivity	In 2012 – 2013, the college did not meet its productivity goal	Not Met
12	75/25 Ratio	Compared to previous terms, FT-FTEF decreased in fall 2012	Not Met
13	Institutional SLO's	Baseline standards to be established in 2013–2014	----

B. Overall Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness

In spring 2012, the College Planning Council (CPC), a participatory governance committee, developed the VC Core Indicators of Effectiveness. Using Effectiveness Indicators from several colleges as models, the CPC analyzed and discussed the various effectiveness measures before deciding on the particular metrics that were most applicable to Ventura College. The college Institutional Research Officer provided expertise regarding data sources, and baselines for each indicator were discussed extensively during CPC meetings throughout most of the spring 2012 semester. Campus-wide input on the Core Indicators and associated benchmarks was obtained by CPC members who took various drafts of the document to their respective divisions for discussion. The Academic Senate President, as co-chair of the CPC, shared draft documents with Senate members and kept them fully aware of all CPC proceedings.

The Core Indicators of Effectiveness, which contain 29 elements, were approved by the College Planning Council in May 2012, and they represent the key components of the Institutional Effectiveness Report. Data related to the Core indicators will be tracked by the Office of Research and Evaluation to determine the degree to which the college is meeting its effectiveness goals.

A Scoreboard (previously “Scorecard” but changed to avoid confusion with the state’s new Scorecard) was developed by the Institutional Researcher in order for the college to easily see whether or not goals were being met in each of the 29 areas.

The Scoreboard for 2012/2013 indicates that the college met 13 of the 29 effectiveness indicators (three have not yet been measured). For Course Completion, Course Success, and Retention Rate, we met the goals and improved in each area from the prior year. In looking at the disaggregated data by ethnicity for retention rates, Hispanic students, which make up 53% of our student population, increased as did the rates for Asian and Native American students. The retention rate for Black students, however, decreased from the prior year and continues to be an area in which the institution needs to focus. A Student Satisfaction Survey, which was scheduled to be developed during the 2012/2013 academic year, will

instead be developed during the 2013/2014 academic year. Benchmarks for Ventura College will be developed by the College Planning Council.

For the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) indicators, the college did not meet any of the five benchmarks this year. However, for three of the five benchmarks – Active Learning, Student Effort, and Academic Challenge – the rates were higher than for the previous year. Data from the survey show that, among full-time students, our rates exceeded the goal in every category; however, among part-time students, we did not meet the goal in any of the five categories. Student Engagement was discussed at the College Planning Council in 2012/2013, and one meeting was dedicated entirely to the topic, with input gathered through facilitated discussions. However, additional efforts will need to be made to increase the rates of student engagement among our part-time students. For the first time this fall (2013), the college will participate in the SENSE survey, which is also associated with the Center for Community College Student Engagement (CCSSE).

The ARCC goals will be replaced in fall 2013 by benchmarks generated from the new state Scorecard. Scorecard data for 2012 indicates that the college performed above the state average in three of the five categories: Completion of 30 units, Completion, and Career Technical Education.

The goal for Degree and Certificate Completion was met. In the area of Transfer, the college has met its goals for Transfer to Four-Year Institutions and Transfer Certified. Licensure Pass Rate goals were met in Registered Nursing, Certified Nurse Assistant, and Paramedic; the goal for Emergency Medical Technician was not met. VC's Annual FTES goal for 2011–2012 was met, i.e., FTES exceeded the minimum number required for maintaining a medium-size college designation.

The goals associated with Faculty Productivity and the 75/25 Ratio were not met. As was the trend state-wide, the college experienced enrollment challenges. Additionally, mitigating factors at the state level, such as changes in repeatability and academic progress, further affected enrollment negatively. At the college level, we moved away from offering extra-large classes, opting instead to offer additional sections (for which we hired more part-time faculty), which was another factor that contributed to the decrease in Faculty Productivity and the 75/25 Ratio. In order to improve our performance in this area and to help us work more effectively when changes are made at the state level, the college created an Enrollment Management Committee in spring 2013. During the 2013/2014 academic year, the committee will create enrollment targets and work with the academic deans to ensure that targets are met.

The Core Indicators of Effectiveness will continue to be addressed by significant college committees and other groups during the 2013/2014 academic year. In addition to being discussed extensively at the College Planning Council and the Basic Skills Committee, they will be addressed by the faculty and staff working on our two Title V HSI Grants. The USDE Title V-HSI Co-operative grant (2010-2015) has a large professional development component and continues to offer the Summer Institute for Teaching Excellence (SITE) each year. The grant also has a Distance Education focus, and increased faculty training has helped to raise our student success numbers in distance education classes. The new Title V-HSI grant (2012-2017) focuses on increasing student transfer. As part of the grant, the college has entered into a collaboration with USC's Center for Urban Education (CUE) and the Equity Scorecard. CUE's kick-off event is scheduled for August 15, 2013 at the college's Performing Arts Center, where Dr. Estela Bensimon of USC will present an overview of the work that will be conducted at VC next year. It is our intention that this collaboration helps faculty, staff, and administrators to understand the importance of equity, of creating a welcoming environment for all students, and of being "change agents," regardless of the discipline or service area in which they work. Also, under this grant, the college was able to hire its

first qualitative research analyst. This fall (2013), we will begin conducting focus groups and other qualitative studies to gather additional important data about our students.

C. Evaluations of Individual Effectiveness Measures

1. Course Completion Rate

Using VC's **2008–2009** course completion rate as a **baseline, maintain or increase** the annual course completion rate in future years.

The Course Completion Rate is the percentage of students who do not withdraw (receive W's) from class and who receive a grade notation of A, B, C, P, D, F, NP, RD, or I*.

The baseline course completion rate (2008 – 2009) is **83.4%**. Over the last four years, completion rates have consistently exceeded the baseline. In 2011 – 2012, the completion rate was **85.7%**, which **exceeded** the baseline by **2.3** percentage points. The 2012 – 2013 completion rate was also **85.7%**, **exceeding** the baseline by **2.3** percentage points.

Tables A-1/A-2 provide course completion rates and the data that were used to compute the rates.

2. Course Success Rate

Using VC's **2008–2009** course success rate as a **baseline, maintain or increase** the annual course success rate in future years.

The Course Success Rate is the percentage of students who receive a passing/satisfactory grade notation of A, B, IB, C, IC, or P.

The baseline course success rate (2008 – 2009) is **66.7%**. Over the last four years, success rates have consistently exceeded the baseline. In 2011 – 2012, the success rate was **69.7%**, which **exceeded** the baseline by **3.0** percentage points. The 2012 – 2013 success rate of **70.5%** **exceeded** the baseline by **3.8** percentage points.

Tables A-1 and **A-2** provide course success rates and the data that were used to compute the rates.

Table A-1. Course Completion and Course Success Rates

Ventura College Course Completion and Course Success Rates					
Category	Academic Year	Course Completion		Course Success	
		Completion Rate	Change from Baseline Rate	Success Rate	Change from Baseline Rate
Baseline	2008 – 2009	83.4%	----	66.7%	----
Year 1	2009 – 2010	84.4%	+ 1.0	67.4%	+ 0.7
Year 2	2010 – 2011	85.0%	+ 1.6	69.0%	+ 2.3
Year 3	2011 – 2012	85.7%	+ 2.3	69.7%	+ 3.0
Year 4	2012 – 2013	85.7%	+ 2.3	70.5%	+ 3.8

Table A-2. Data for Computing Course Completion and Course Success Rates

Ventura College Data for Computing Course Completion and Course Success Rates										
Category	Baseline 2008 – 2009		Year 1 2009 – 2010		Year 2 2010 – 2011		Year 3 2011 – 2012		Year 4 2012 – 2013	
	Count	Rate	Count	Rate	Count	Rate	Count	Rate	Count	Rate
Enrolled	77,003	100.0%	78,118	100.0%	76,776	100.0%	76,062	100.0%	72,057	100.0%
Completed	64,253	83.4%	65,989	84.4%	65,562	85.0%	65,177	85.7%	61,738	85.7%
Successful	51,345	66.7%	52,617	67.4%	52,972	69.0%	53,048	69.7%	50,775	70.5%

3. Student Retention Rates

Using VC's **fall 2008** student retention rates as **baselines, maintain or increase** the fall-to-fall retention rates of **all first-time** students (whose primary college was VC) and **first-time** students by **ethnicity**.

The Student Retention Rate is the percentage of first-time fall students who receive a grade of A, B, C, P, D, F, NP, I*, or W in the succeeding spring and fall terms. (Formerly known as Persistence Rate)

All Students

The baseline rate for **all** first-time students (whose primary college was VC) is **54.0%**. The baseline was **exceeded** by both the fall 2009 and fall 2010 cohorts.

Ethnicity

African American (Black) and Unknown were the only ethnic groups whose **fall 2011** cohorts did **not meet/exceed** their respective baseline retention rate (these fall 2011 rates are highlighted in **pink**).

Ventura College Fall to Fall Retention Rates									
Category	Baseline			Fall 2010 Cohort			Fall 2011 Cohort		
	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Retain Rate	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Retain Rate	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Retain Rate
Asian / PI	176	110	62.5%	134	85	63.4%	92	73	79.3%
Black	98	56	57.1%	84	47	56.0%	78	35	44.9%
Hispanic	1,330	744	55.9%	1,210	676	55.9%	1,476	874	59.2%
Nat Amer	30	15	50.0%	34	16	47.1%	7	4	57.1%
White	1,014	508	50.1%	693	396	57.1%	654	370	56.6%
Other	214	113	52.8%	57	34	59.6%	88	48	54.5%
Unknown	33	16	48.5%	12	9	75.0%	16	7	43.8%
Totals	2,895	1,562	54.0%	2,224	1,263	56.8%	2,411	1,411	58.5%

4. Student Satisfaction

In **2013 – 2014**, establish target student satisfaction goals. (See Section D – Student Satisfaction Survey)

5. Student Engagement

Score **at or above** the **mean** in each of the **five** CCSSE Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice:

- Active and Collaborative Learning
- Student Effort
- Academic Challenge
- Student-Faculty Interaction
- Support for Learners

The most recent administration of the CCSSE at Ventura College was in **spring 2013**. CCSSE has normalized the Benchmark scores so that the mean for the entire CCSSE Cohort (all of the responding institutions) is **50** for each of the Benchmarks. Scores for VC in **spring 2010** and **spring 2013** are shown below. All of VC's scores are below the mean. However, in three of the Benchmarks, the college has improved its score in spring 2013 as compared to spring 2010 (Improved Diff.s are highlighted in green).

Benchmarks	Spring 2010			Spring 2013			Spring 2014		
	VC	Mean	Diff.	VC	Mean	Diff.	VC	Mean	Diff.
a. Active and Collaborative Learning	46.8	50	-3.2	48.3	50	-1.7			
b. Student Effort	46.4	50	-3.6	47.0	50	-3.0			
c. Academic Challenge	47.5	50	-2.5	49.7	50	-0.3			
d. Student-Faculty Interaction	47.2	50	-2.8	46.8	50	-3.2			
e. Support for Learners	49.6	50	-1.4	46.2	50	-3.8			

All of VC's Benchmark scores are **below** the CCSSE mean score of **50**.

CCSSE items (questions) which comprise each Benchmark are listed below.

a. Active and Collaborative Learning

- In your experiences at this college during the current year, how often have you done each of the following? (Never; Sometimes; Often; Very often)
 - Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions
 - Made a class presentation
 - Worked with other students on projects during class
 - Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments
 - Tutored or taught other students (paid or voluntary)
 - Participated in a community-based project as a part of a regular course
 - Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (students, family members, etc.)

b. Student Effort

- In your experiences at this college during the current year, how often have you done each of the following? (Never; Sometimes; Often; Very often)
 - Prepared two or more drafts of a paper before turning it in
 - Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas of information from various sources
 - Came to class without completing readings or assignments
- During the current school year, about how much reading and writing have you done at this college? (None; Between 1 and 4; Between 5 and 10; Between 11 and 20; more than 20)
 - Number of books read on your own (not assigned) for personal enjoyment or academic enrichment
- About how many hours do you spend in a typical 7-day week doing each of the following? (None; 1 – 5 hours; 6 – 10 hours; 11 – 20 hours; 21 – 30 hours; More than 30 hours)
 - Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, rehearsing, doing homework, or other activities related to your program)
- How often do you use the following services? (Rarely/Never; Sometimes; Often)
 - Peer or other tutoring
 - Skills labs (writing, math, etc.)
 - Computer lab

c. Academic Challenge

- In your experiences at this college during the current year, how often have you done each of the following? (Never; Sometimes; Often; Very often)
 - Worked harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor's standards or expectations
- During the current school year, how much has your coursework at this college emphasized the following mental activities? (Very Little; Some; Quite a bit; Very much)
 - Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory
 - Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences in new ways
 - Making judgments about the value or soundness of information, arguments, or methods
 - Apply theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations
 - Using information you have read or heard to perform a new skill
- During the current school year, about how much reading and writing have you done at this college? (None; Between 1 and 4; Between 5 and 10; Between 11 and 20; more than 20)
 - Number of assigned textbooks, manuals, books, or book-length packs of course readings
 - Number of written papers or reports of any length
- Mark the box that best represents the extent to which your examinations during the current school year have challenged you to do your best work at this college (Extremely easy. to Extremely challenging)
- How much does this college emphasize each of the following? (Very Little; Some; Quite a bit; Very much)
 - Encouraging you to spend significant amounts of time studying

d. Student-Faculty Interaction

- In your experiences at this college during the current year, how often have you done each of the following? (Never; Sometimes; Often; Very often)
 - Used email to communicate with an instructor
 - Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor
 - Talked about career plans with an instructor or advisor
 - Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with instructors outside of class
 - Received prompt feedback (written or oral) from instructors on your performance
 - Worked with instructors on activities other than coursework

e. Support for Learners

- How much does this college emphasize each of the following? (Very Little; Some; Quite a bit; Very much)
 - Providing the support you need to succeed at this college
 - Encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds
 - Helping you cope with your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)
 - Providing the support you need to thrive socially
 - Providing the financial support you need to afford your education
- How often do you use the following services? (Rarely/Never; Sometimes; Often)
 - Frequency: Academic advising/planning
 - Frequency: Career counseling

6. Student Progress and Achievement and Pre-Collegiate Improvement

Score **at or above** the college's **peer-group** mean in each of the **six** College Level Indicators set forth in the ARCC (Accountability Reporting for the California Community Colleges):

- a. Student Progress and Achievement Rate
Percentage of first-time students who showed intent to complete and who achieved any of the following outcomes within 6 years: Transferred to a four-year college; or earned an AA/AS; or earned a certificate (18 units or more); or achieved “Transfer Directed” status; or achieved “Transfer prepared” status.
- b. Percent of Students Who Achieved at Least 30 Units
Percentage of first-time students who showed intent to complete and who earned at least 30 units while in the California Community College System.
- c. Persistence Rate
Percentage of first-time students with a minimum of six units earned in a fall term and who returned and enrolled in the subsequent fall term anywhere in the system.
- d. Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Credit Vocational Skills Courses
- e. Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Credit Basic Skills Courses
- f. Improvement Rate for ESL Courses
- g. Improvement Rate for Credit Basic Skills Courses

Ventura College **exceeded** peer group means in **three** of the **seven** AARC College Level Indicators. In the table below, Indicators with a positive difference are highlighted in **blue**; negative differences are in **pink**.

Ventura College ARCC College Level Indicators			
College Level indicator	Ventura College	Peer Group	Difference
a. Student Progress and Achievement Rate 6 year rate: First-time students in 2005–2006 were tracked through 2010–2011	56.4%	59.7%	- 3.3
b. Percent of Students Who Earned 30+ Units 6 year rate: First-time students in 2005–2006 were tracked through 2010–2011	71.2%	73.3%	- 2.1
c. Persistence Rate (Retention Rate) First-time students in Fall 2009 were tracked through Fall 2010	70.0%	69.2%	+ 0.8
d. Annual Success Rate for Vocational Courses AY: 2010 – 2011	71.3%	73.3%	- 2.0
e. Annual Success Rate for Basic Skills Courses AY: 2010 – 2011	69.9%	63.8%	+ 6.1
f. ESL Improvement Rate * 3 year rate: ESL students in 2008 – 2009 were tracked through 2010 – 2011	10.1%	48.8%	- 38.7 *
g. Basic Skills Improvement Rate 3 year rate: Basic skills students in 2008–2009 were tracked through 2010–2011	59.9%	52.8%	+ 7.1

* Note – VC’s ESL Improvement Rate of 10.1% is significantly understated due to incorrect and inconsistent coding of pertinent MIS Data Elements. As the necessary coding corrections have now been made, new ESL cohorts will begin to reflect the college’s true ESL Improvement Rates.

7. Degrees and Certificates Awarded

With **2008 – 2009** as the **baseline** year, **maintain or increase** the college's annual awards of Associate Degrees and Certificates.

The baseline of **1,178** degrees and certificates was **exceeded** in each of the **three** years.

Ventura College Degrees and Certificates					
Category	Academic Year	Associates Degrees	Certificates	Transfer Certification	Total
Baseline	2008 – 2009	1,096	82	---	1,178
Year 1	2009 – 2010	972	101	155	1,228
Year 2	2010 – 2011	990	94	345	1,429
Year 3	2011 – 2012	1,088	132	444	1,664

8. Transfers

a. Transfers to Four-Year Institutions:

With **2008 – 2009** as the **baseline** year, **maintain or increase** the annual numbers of VC students transferring to a California public (CSU or UC), independent, or out-of-state university.

The baseline of **595** transfers was **exceeded** in both 2010–2011 and 2011–2012.

Ventura College Transfers					
Category	Academic Year	CSU Transfers	UC Transfers	Out-of-State & In-State Private	Total
Baseline	2008 – 2009	492	103	351	595
Year 1	2009 – 2010	444	134	380	578
Year 2	2010 – 2011	587	145	Not Available	732
Year 3	2011 – 2012	625	121	Not Available	746

b. Transfer Velocity:

With **2005 – 2006** as the **baseline** year, **maintain or increase** the percentage of VC students who transfer **within four years** to a public or independent four-year institution within the US.

The CCC Chancellor's Office – Transfer Velocity Project tracks cohorts of first-time college students for six years to determine if they show "behavioral intent to transfer" (i.e., they accumulated a minimum of 12 earned units and they attempted a transfer-level Math or English course).

The four-year transfer rate for the **2005 – 2006** cohort (the baseline rate) is **29%**. The transfer rate for the next cohort (**2006 – 2007**) has **not** been published as of **June 12, 2013**.

c. Transfer Certified:

Using **2009 – 2010** as the **baseline** year, **maintain or increase** the number of students who are CSU–GE or IGETC certified.

In 2009 – 2010, the baseline year, VC awarded **155** “transfer certificates.” In 2010 – 2011, the number of “transfer certificate” awards **increased** to **345**. In 2011 – 2012, the number of “transfer certificate” awards was **444**.

9. Licensure Pass Rates

With **2008 – 2009** as the **baseline** year, **maintain or increase** licensure pass rates in the following technical or vocational programs:

- a. Registered Nursing
- b. Certified Nursing Assistant (CNA) – Average of Written and Skill Tests
- c. Paramedic
- d. Emergency Medical Technician (EMT)

Other than Emergency Medical Technician (EMT), the **2011 – 2012** licensure pass rates for all Health Sciences Programs **met or exceeded** their baseline rates.

Ventura College Licensure Pass Rates				
Health Science Programs	(a) Baseline 2008 – 2009	(b) 2010 – 2011	(c) 2011 – 2012	Difference (c) – (a)
a. Registered Nursing	92%	96%	96%	+ 4
b. Certified Nursing Assistant	94%	96%	96%	+ 2
c. Paramedic	100%	100%	100%	0
d. Emergency Medical Technician	84%	82%	83%	- 1

10. Annual FTES

Maintain the college’s state-wide standing as a mid-sized college by meeting the minimum required FTES (Full-time Equivalent Student) to secure a mid-size college designation.

In **2011 – 2012** Ventura College’s FTES of **10,414** **exceeded** the state’s mid-size college threshold.

11. Faculty Productivity (Aggregate WSCH / FTEF)

Meet the college’s productivity goal as measured by achieving the Aggregate WSCH / FTEF quotient (Aggregate Weekly Student Contact Hours *divided by* FTEF) established by the VCCCD.

In 2012 – 2013, the college did **not meet** its VCCCD Productivity Goals.

Ventura College College Productivity					
Fiscal Year	Ventura College			VCCCD Goal	Difference VC – VCCCD
	WSCH	FTEF	Productivity		
2012 – 2013	299,339	571	524	541	- 17
2011 – 2012	289,116	526	550	543	+ 7
2010 – 2011	300,777	528	570	549	+ 21
2009 – 2010	302,015	531	569	551	+ 18

12. 75/25 Ratio (Full-Time / Part-Time Faculty Ratio)

Continue to **make progress** on a yearly (**or fall term**) basis toward the state-mandated requirement that 75% or more of Full-Time Equivalent Faculty be full-time.

Progress toward the **75 / 25** ratio was not sustained in fall 2012.

Ventura College Full-Time / Part-Time Ratio				
Term	Full-Time FTEF	Part-time FTEF	Total FTEF	Full-Time / Part-Time Ratio
Fall 2012	130.20	132.59	262.79	49.55 / 50.45
Fall 2011	135.28	123.18	258.46	52.34 / 47.66
Fall 2010	132.01	121.48	253.49	52.08 / 47.92
Fall 2009	138.28	135.00	273.28	50.60 / 49.40

13. Institutional Student Learning Outcomes

In **2012–2013**, establish baseline standards for Institutional (General Education) Student Learning Outcomes and then **meet or exceed** the baseline standards in future years.

D. Student Satisfaction Survey

In **spring 2014**, the VCCCD Institutional Research Committee (IRAC) plans to administer a district-wide **Student Satisfaction Survey** that will encompass all three district colleges and will cover student learning and student services areas. The survey will be based on the district-wide **Survey of Student Perceptions** which was last administered in spring 2009.

In **2013 – 2014**, the Ventura College Campus Planning Council (CPC) will establish target goals related to items appearing on the district-wide student satisfaction survey. The major areas/topics of the survey relate to students:

- Satisfaction with Instruction
- Satisfaction with Student Services
- Perception of College Learning Environment
- Perception of Campus Climate
- Perception of Major Barriers to Achieving Educational Goals

A few of the items comprising the Instructional area of the survey are:

- Overall Quality of Instruction
- Fairness in Grading
- Technology Used in Instruction

Results of the survey will be presented in this section of the report.

E. District Institutional Effectiveness Report

Background

In early spring 2012, the District Committee for Accreditation and Planning (DCAP) began developing a common set of measurements to assess the institutional effectiveness of the three district colleges. After reviewing the effectiveness measures used at each college, DCAP established ten overall district-wide

metrics. These standards relate to student achievement and goal attainment, as well as productivity rates and Student Learning Outcomes/Service Unit Outcomes.

A subcommittee of the district Institutional Research Advisory Committee (IRAC) was charged with collecting and analyzing the data and then preparing a written report for DCAP’s review. The subcommittee, which included the college researchers, completed the final version of the report in June 2012. The report is entitled “Institutional Effectiveness – Moorpark, Oxnard and Ventura Colleges.”

Shared Effectiveness Measures

Most of the district institutional effectiveness indicators are similar to those adopted by Ventura College. The table below links the district effectiveness metrics to the Ventura College Core Indicators.

<u>District Effectiveness Measures</u>	<u>VC Core Indicators of Effectiveness</u>
VCCCD Course Completion Rates	1. Course Completion Rate
VCCCD Course Success Rates	2. Course Success Rate
VCCCD First-Time Student Retention Rates	3. Student Retention Rates
Degrees and Certificates Awarded	7. Degrees and Certificates Awarded
Students Transferring to Four-Year Institutions	8a. Transfers to Four-Year Institutions
Three-Year Degree, Certificate, Transfer Outcomes	-----
Three-Year Degree, Certificate, Transfer Outcomes by College	-----
Licensure and Certification Pass Rates	9. Licensure Pass Rates
Productivity Rates	11. Faculty Productivity (WSCH / FTEF)
Student Learning Outcomes/Service Unit Outcomes	13. Institutional Student Learning Outcomes