



Accreditation Steering Advisory Group

2017-2018 Academic Year

Meeting Notes

Sept. 6, 2017 ~ 3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Members: ALO: Kim Hoffmans; Faculty Co-Chair: Eric Martinsen

Vice President of Academic Affairs (Accreditation Liaison Officer and Chair), Vice President of Student Affairs, Vice President of Business Services, Dean of Institutional Equity and Effectiveness, Academic Senate Executive Committee members, ASAG Faculty Co-Chair, Basic Skills Advisory Group Co-Chairs, Budget Resource Council Co-Chairs, Classified Senate Executive Board members, College Planning Council Co-Chairs, Curriculum Committee Co-Chairs, Deans of Student Learning, Facilities Oversight Group Co-Chairs, Institutional Researcher, Librarian, SLO Advisory Group Co-Chairs, Student Success Committee Co-Chairs, Professional Development Advisory Group Co-Chairs, Technology Advisory Group Co-Chairs, Distance Education Advisory Group Co-Chairs, Equity Advisory Group Co-Chairs, SSSP Advisory Group Co-Chairs, CE Advisory Group Co-Chairs, ASVC Representative.

Guests: none

Recorder: Sebastian Szczebiot

Notes:

Agenda Item	Summary of Discussion	Action (If Required)	Completion Timeline	Assigned to:
A. Call to Order	K. Hoffmans called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m. Introductions followed.			
B. Public Comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ACCJC Update 2017 – Manual for ISER <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Many updates at ACCJC, link to updated Manual is on Agenda. 2. Follow-up Report ACCJC Reminder Letter <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Reminder letter dated Aug 21st, response due March 15th, 2018 (18 months after visit) ii. Letter does not mention follow up visit to DAC, only follow-up report. 			
C. Approval of Minutes: Mar 1, 2017	K. Hoffmans asked for minutes to be reviewed before next meeting.			

Agenda Item	Summary of Discussion	Action (If Required)	Completion Timeline	Assigned to:
D. Announcements/ Information Items	Welcome back to Fall!			
E. Discussion Items 1. Review Advisory Group Charge, purpose, and membership	. Recommendation to adopt new charge, discussed at March 1 st meeting. Membership to be updated.			
2. Goals and accomplishments	Kim shared that she will be participating on a Fullerton College visit with Chancellor Gillespie – they will use SharePoint. This may serve as a test for a potential solution to Goal 3 from 2016-17. Goals for 2017-18 -GOAL1: Include goal 3 from 2016-17 -GOAL2: Complete writing and submission of follow-up report with evidence by March 15 th (combine with the following: -GOAL3: Coordinate effort by establishing leads for standards well in advance and to accomplish yearly tasks on 7 year cycle -Leads to approach committee members for report out -GOAL (to be added to GOAL 4): Taking Notes – training on minute taking to help facilitate evidence collection SLOs to be standing item on agendas (to discuss at Dept Chair meeting) -Need to continue to get Institutional Set Standard out -The language needs to be simplified -GOAL4: create accreditation tips/FAQs/definition of terms/accreditation items to be regularly included on agendas (method and standardization)			
3. ACCJC Proposed Change to Standard III.A.6	Change in Staff and Leadership – with many new hires, the ACCJC staff are reflecting on past practices and making changes to try and better meet current community college needs.			

Agenda Item	Summary of Discussion	Action (If Required)	Completion Timeline	Assigned to:
	<p>Also, ACCJC has invited members to comment on proposed changes to Standard III.A.6 This is the standard that VC was given a noncompliance for. Philosophically, accreditation is to encourage compliance with standards. But emphasis is on results, and typically is not prescriptive. Many colleges have received non-compliance for this standard.</p> <p>SLOs are not to penalize faculty, but rather focus on continuous quality improvement.</p> <p>This standard may very well go away, but not in time for our follow up. There has been a lot of reflection.</p>			
<p>4. March 15 Follow-up Report due</p> <p>a. Timeline (6-year cycle)</p> <p>b. Review District written draft report</p>	<p>Refer to WASC (ACCJC) Seven-year Cycle Timeline</p> <p>The district wrote a generic draft which will need to be made applicable to Ventura College.</p> <p>Specific Draft Suggestions Include:</p> <p>Grant – include how we trained faculty on SLOs. We should go back to what our Standard III.A.6 said. Phil – first three paragraphs are “filler” Kim – second paragraph is matter of fact. Pamela – Second paragraph second sentence: doesn’t make sense without SUOs – is <i>every</i> staff member involved? Use the ACCJC language that those directly responsible for student learning participated in SLOs...and add SUOs. Paragraph 3...bring in “shared practice” and “collective activity”</p>			

Agenda Item	Summary of Discussion	Action (If Required)	Completion Timeline	Assigned to:
5. Next Steps	Volunteers to lead response: Lynn, Debbie and Eric!			
6. Meeting Takeaways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We have goals - Elected Co chair - Need to know Institutional Set Standards 			
F. Action Items				
1.	Draft to be prepared for October 4 th meeting.			
G. Adjournment	K. Hoffmans adjourned the meeting at 4:55 p.m.			
Next Meeting Date:	October 4, 2017 @ 3:00 pm, MCW-312			

WASC (ACCJC) SEVEN-YEAR CYCLE

Note: Current year is shaded

Yearly Cycle	Ventura College	Timeline	Details
Site visit Year	AY 2016/17		Fall before Visit: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Announce visit on Web and newspapers b) Forward Completed self-study and evidence to visiting team c) Write addendum to self-study to ensure up-to-date info d) Prepare evidence room hotel/on campus e) Coordinate schedule with team lead Spring following Visit: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> f) Review/Debrief for Site Visit g) Review recommendation from ACCJC Commission h) Begin write initial draft of any follow up report
Year One	Fall 2017/ Spring 2018	August- Sept (a & b) Oct (b, c, & d) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Input from constituency groups Nov.- Dec (d) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First & Second readings January (d) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Second readings February (e & f) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VCCCD Board of Trustee approval March 9 Submit Follow-up Report to ACCJC	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Taskforce to follow-up on Commission recommendations b) Write draft of any follow-up report c) Gather evidence for follow-up report d) Forward draft to Academic Senate, Classified Sensate, Associated Students & review by campus community e) Post necessary documents on Web f) Forward completed report to Board of Trustees before submission to ACCJC g) March 15 Follow-up report due to ACCJC
Year Two	Fall 2018/ Spring 2019		Progress Report & Refinement of Action Plan <ol style="list-style-type: none"> h) <u>Early Fall</u>-Collect college input on action plan progress i) <u>Late Fall</u>- Write initial draft of any follow up report j) <u>Early Spring</u>- Review and revise draft #1; write draft #2 k) <u>Late Spring</u>- Review and revise draft #2; forward to campus community and constituents to review

Year Three (Midterm Report)			<p>Midterm Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Complete Draft b) Forward draft to Academic Senate, Classified Sensate, Associated Students & review by campus community <p>VCCCD Board reviews draft of Midterm report</p>
Year Four (Gap analysis)	Fall 2019/ Spring 2020		<p>Midterm Report-Due to ACCJC October</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Board approval of Midterm Report b) Report and supporting documentation to ACCJC <p>Progress Report and Preparation for Self-study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <u>Early Fall</u>-Training/review of Accreditation Standards b) <u>Early Spring</u>- Data gathering c) <u>Middle Spring</u>-Gap Analysis of MC Progress for each Standard d) <u>Late Spring</u>- Report on each Standard and Identify strategies to close gaps
Year Five (Communication, Continue Assessment, Complete Self-Study Outline)	Fall 2020/ Spring 2021		<p>Progress Report & Refinement of Action Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <u>Early Fall</u>-Communicate timeline, Gap Analysis, and general information to campus community (Prof. Development Week presentation, Fall Retreat Presentation, and Campus Forum) b) <u>Early Fall</u>-Forward identified Accreditation Gaps to VP as Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) and Academic Senate, Classified Senate and Associated Students c) <u>Mid Fall</u>-Confirm and recruit additional Workgroup member d) <u>Fall/Spring</u>- Workgroups continue to meet routinely over the Fall semester responded to focused Standard questions and gather evidence e) <u>Early Spring</u>-Workgroups report progress and findings to ASAG f) <u>Early to Mid-Spring</u>-Review in ASAG Tables for Evaluating ACCJC Standards g) <u>Late Spring</u>-Forward Standards I-V including DE Tables for Evaluating ACCJC Standards to ALO h) <u>Late Spring</u> – Begin Outline of self-study i) <u>Summer</u> – Write initial draft of self-study

<p>Year Six (Assess & Write)</p>	<p>Fall 2021/ Spring 2022</p>		<p>Progress Report & Refinement of Action Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <u>Early Fall</u>-Finish writing initial draft of self-study b) <u>Late Fall</u>-ASAG Review and revise draft #1; write draft #2 c) <u>Early Spring</u>- Review and revise draft #2; forward to campus community and constituents to review; Prepare evidence on web d) <u>Late Spring</u>-Revise based upon campus feedback; forward back to campus for final review; Districtwide community forum for accreditation input. e) <u>Summer</u>-Forward completed self-study to VCCCD Board; continue to collect and confirm evidence has been obtained to self-study
<p>Year Seven</p>	<p>Fall 2022/ Spring 2023</p>		<p>Fall before Visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Announce visit on Web and newspapers b) Forward Completed self-study and evidence to visiting team c) Write addendum to self-study to ensure up-to-date info d) Prepare evidence room hotel/on campus e) Coordinate schedule with team lead <p>Spring following Visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Review/Debrief for Site Visit j) Review recommendation from ACCJC Commission

August 21, 2017

Mr. David Keebler, Interim President
Ventura College
4667 Telegraph Road
Ventura, CA 93003

Dear Interim President Keebler:

This is a friendly reminder that Ventura College is scheduled to submit a Follow-Up Report by **March 15, 2018**.

The institution's follow-up report includes analysis and supporting evidence that documents it has addressed and resolved the recommendations to meet the standards identified in the Commission's action letter, and now meets the standards.

Ventura College will send the institutional Report with evidence in PDF on a USB Flash Drive to the Commission office. The Commission publication, *Guidelines for Preparing Institutional Reports to the Commission*, which is found on our website, explains the presentation of the report. Within those guidelines, Ventura College is free to organize the report in ways which are useful to the institution in its ongoing efforts of continuous improvement.

On behalf of the Commission, thank you for the tremendous commitment you and your staff have made toward improving student learning and academic quality in our region. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you need any assistance. I look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,



Stephanie Droker, Ed.D.
Vice President

cc: Dr. Kimberly Hoffmans, Accreditation Liaison Officer

Enclosures

Protocol for Creating/Submitting Evidence Electronically to ACCJC

When submitting institutional reports, the college will provide evidence that supports its narrative. When large documents are used as evidence, hyperlinks in the report will point to those sections of the document that are specifically related to the statements made by the institution. Institutions should carefully select relevant evidence to support the elements of narrative stated in the report. The ACCJC *Manual for Institutional Self Evaluation*, the *Guide to Evaluating-and Improving Institutions*, and *Guidelines for Preparing Institutional Reports to the Commission* provide guidance about selection and presentation of evidence associated with the ERs, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies, and areas of institutional practice. The best evidence is that which is meaningful to an institution's constituents and used in planning, operations, decision-making, assessments and improvement practices.

Evidence must accompany the college report and is submitted in PDF on a clearly labeled USB Flash drive. A requirement of evidence submitted on Flash drive is to use the shortest file names and folder structures possible. Please use the following methodology:

1. Folder names should not be more than four characters in length
2. File names must not be more than 27 characters in length
3. Avoid complex or redundant sub folder structures
4. Develop standardized abbreviations for file naming conventions

A separate folder should be created for each section of the report. When a document is referenced as evidence in two sections of the report, please use a hyperlink within the report that will automatically take the reader to the evidence document in the folder where the evidenced is referenced for the first time in order to eliminate redundancy. This simple rule should apply to all sections of the report that reference any single evidentiary document found on the Flash drive.

Invitation for Member Comments on Proposed Change of Standards

During the June 2017 session of the ACCJC Commission, the Board of Directors voted to approve as a First Read a new policy that allows the Commission to review and propose changes to individual ACCJC Standards without waiting for the comprehensive review of all Standards that happens on a ten-year cycle. This proposed policy has been posted for public comment. In view of strong Commission and member support for this policy, it is anticipated that it will be approved at the next Commission session in January. A current application of this policy is addressed here:

During several previous sessions, the Commission has addressed its concerns about Standard III.A.6. Commissioners have noted ambiguities and related difficulties for both institutions and peer review teams in knowing how to demonstrate compliance with the Standard. At the initiation of the Executive Committee, and with the concurrence of the Commissioners, the attached "Proposal re Standards III.A.6 and II.A.2" is being posted here as a First Read. Comments from constituents are invited. Following this period for comments, and subsequent to the approval of the policy noted above, the Commission will take action on this Proposal at its January 2018 session. In anticipation of its approval, staff will prepare guidance on how the change will be implemented in subsequent reviews.

You are invited to read the proposal and to evaluate the reasons being put forth in support of the proposed changes. Please address any comments to my attention at rwinn@accjc.org

Thank you for your engagement in this important process.

Richard Winn, President
ACCJC

Proposal Regarding Standard III.A.6

The evaluation of faculty, academic administrators, and other personnel directly responsible for student learning includes, as a component of that evaluation, consideration of how these employees use the results of the assessment of learning outcomes to improve teaching and learning. – ACCJC Standard III.A.6

PART 1: In light of the following concerns, the ACCJC Commission proposes the removal of Standard III.A.6 and an expanded focus of Standard II.A.2, based on the following considerations:

- By placing Standard III.A.6 under the heading of Standard III.A “Human Resources,” it conflates a student learning focus with a personnel performance expectation.
- The Standard is susceptible to the inference that student learning is largely the result of an individual faculty member’s efforts rather than of a collective and collaborative effort among program faculty.
- It has been found to be difficult to propose a metric or action that could be used consistently by teams to determine compliance with the Standard.
- The “unit of measure” for establishing compliance is typically based on the self-reported actions of single individuals, which is a granular evaluation focus for a review team and difficult for a team to substantiate. There are instances in which review teams have requested access to confidential performance review files in fulfilling what they saw as their obligation under the evaluation of this Standard.
- As presently understood, this Standard is often seen as an intrusion into the domain of collective bargaining since faculty performance reviews are a negotiated aspect of a union contract.
- Standard III.A.5 already focuses on the value of performance evaluations while not singling out this area of academic engagement as a criterion.
- It is ambiguous as to who is covered by the phrase, “other personnel directly involved.” This leaves institutions to make sometimes inconsistent delineations of whom to include in this category – which teams may then second-guess during their review, expecting other groups to have been included.
- In preparing their ISER, institutions have reported widely varying practices in how they apply the aspect of the Standard that requires “consideration of how these employees use the results of the assessment of learning outcomes to improve teaching and learning” in conducting personnel evaluations. This leaves teams – and, ultimately, the Commission – in an uncertain position as to how to determine compliance in a consistent manner over time.

PART 2: An important goal of these proposed revisions is to refocus the evaluative spotlight from the individual toward a shared practice. Teams should not be expected to make judgments about if, or how well, individual faculty members are performing their work. If individuals are not appropriately engaged in the use of student data, that should be a departmental concern. Since the improvement of program-level student learning outcomes is largely a collective activity among groups of faculty, evaluation teams can focus on the institution's collaborative conversations in which appropriate faculty groups review assessment results and make shared decisions about improving the curriculum or pedagogy. These are common and standard practices in higher education. Peer evaluators can inquire as to whether program review practices include the relevant stakeholders rather than checking the files of individual faculty, counselors, or librarians. Note that Standards I.B.1 to I.B.6 place the responsibility for assessment and use of learning outcomes at the institutional and collective levels rather than at the individual level.

The Commission's desire to see assessment outcomes employed to improve learning could be addressed by more precisely emphasizing group expectations with this proposed expansion of Standard II.A.2:

Redline Version:

Standard II.A.2. Faculty, including full time, part time, and adjunct faculty, regularly engage in ensuring that the content and methods of instruction meet generally accepted academic and professional standards and expectations. In exercising collective ownership over the design and improvement of the learning experience, ~~Faculty and others responsible act to~~conduct systematic and inclusive program review, using student achievement data, in order to continuously improve instructional courses and, programs ~~and directly related services through systematic evaluation to assure~~thereby ensuring program currency, improving teaching and learning strategies, and promoting student success.

Edited Version:

Standard II.A.2. Faculty, including full time, part time, and adjunct faculty, regularly engage in ensuring that the content and methods of instruction meet generally accepted academic and professional standards and expectations. In exercising collective ownership over the design and improvement of the learning experience, faculty conduct systematic and inclusive program review, using student achievement data, in order to continuously improve instructional courses and programs, thereby ensuring program currency, improving teaching and learning strategies, and promoting student success.

District Recommendation 1 (Compliance)

In order to meet the Standard, the teams recommend the District include use of the results of assessment of learning outcomes to improve teaching and learning as a formal component of the evaluation processes for faculty, academic administrators and other personnel directly responsible for student learning.

(III.A.6)

District response:

The assessment of SLOs is an ongoing process. SLOs are assessed at the course level, program level, and institutional level. Faculty members collaborate on the design and implementation of SLO assessment instruments and rubrics and assess student performance relative to SLOs for each course offered in their programs on a rotational basis, such that all courses are assessed within a five-year period. The assessment data are entered into TracDat, which is the VCCCD approved SLO assessment software. Reports are generated and the results are used to create initiatives to improve student success in the courses and programs that are submitted to the Program Review Committee. Once the initiatives are implemented, faculty members reassess the SLOs to see if the initiatives brought a higher level of student attainment.

As part of the annual program review process at each college, every instructional and student service program is required to assess and evaluate its student learning outcomes. All faculty and staff are expected to participate in course and program Student Learning Outcome (SLO) assessment as required by their department assessment cycle. The results of this assessment, along with changes made to improve their programs are documented in TracDat mentioned above.

Further, as part of the colleges' integrated planning process, program plans require departments to document their SLO assessment and changes that their program made to improve course or program effectiveness. SLO assessment data is also tied to resource requests to ensure they are data driven. The program planning process is one method by which programs, and the faculty and staff within them, evaluated in terms of how results of SLO assessment are being used to improve teaching and learning. During program review, programs discuss their assessment results and course program improvements with the college's Chief Instructional Officer, Chief Business Officer and Academic Senate President.

Student learning outcomes are linked to the course outlines of record in CurricUNET, as well as syllabi. Within the faculty evaluation process, syllabi are reviewed by division deans to ensure that faculty members are consistently informing students of the SLOs and that the course content and evaluation measures are consistent with the official course objectives and SLOs.

Within the District, faculty evaluation is a collective bargaining issue, and the process and criteria for evaluation are outlined in the Agreement between the Ventura County Community College District (hereafter VCCCD) Moorpark, Oxnard, Ventura and Ventura County Federation of College Teachers AFT Local 1828, AFL-CIO (hereafter AFT) July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2016 .

According to the current agreement cited above, faculty are required to participate in the assessment of learning outcomes and use results to improve teaching and learning, as discussed in Accreditation Standard II, Student Learning Programs and Support Services. This participation is reflected in the Administrator and Peer Evaluation Form for Contract Tenured Faculty that must be completed by each member of the evaluation committee. *See Appendix D, Form A2, Administrator and Peer Evaluation Form for Contract Tenured Faculty attached hereto and incorporated by reference.*

Within the components of the above referenced *Administrator and Peer Evaluation Form for Contract Tenured Faculty*, each faculty member being evaluated is required to provide their evaluation committees with materials demonstrating course preparation and adherence to course outlines. The evaluation committees consider these materials as one of the evaluation components, along with the student evaluations of teaching effectiveness and direct observation both in and out of the classroom. Through the Faculty Handbooks, faculty members have been advised of the requirement to list student learning outcomes (SLOs) on their course syllabi. The faculty evaluation process also requires the peer evaluators to assess the degree to which the person being evaluated uses effective teaching techniques, engages students in the lesson observed, and measures student performance in fair and valid ways.

The faculty members at each of the three colleges within the District are aware that participation in assessment of SLOs is required and must be listed on all course syllabi. Syllabi review is a required component in the faculty evaluation process. Discussions of and concerning the assessment of student learning outcomes (SLOs) and the use of results are a part of the department and division meetings. These are appropriate occasions in which to discuss how the SLO assessment can provide the tools to improve teaching and learning. These discussions provide an effective opportunity to support individual faculty as well as administrative and student services staff in their efforts to improve student learning and success.

Currently, there is no formal component for SLO assessment in the Administrator and Peer Evaluation of Contract Tenured Faculty, but future collective bargaining efforts with AFT and the Service Employees International Union Local 99 (hereafter SEIU), the collective bargaining agent for classified personnel, may result in making SLO assessment data a formal component of the evaluation processes for faculty and other personnel directly responsible for student learning within the District. Until then, deans and department chairs do routinely discuss participation in the course and program SLO process with all faculty and work to ensure faculty use the results of the assessment of learning outcomes to improve teaching and learning.

Analysis and Evaluation:

Student learning is the result of the collective and collaborative efforts among a program's faculty rather than an individual faculty member. In the case of VCCCD, the assessment of SLOs is an ongoing process. SLOs are assessed at the course level, program level, and institutional level. Faculty members within a department or program collaborate on the design and implementation of SLO assessment instruments and rubrics and assess student performance relative to SLOs for each course offered in their programs.

While not a formal, [separate](#) component of the current evaluation of Contract Tenured Faculty and other personnel directly responsible for student learning, all faculty and classified staff are expected to participate in their course and program SLO assessment as required by their department assessment cycle. The end result is that faculty members and classified personnel recognize the value and importance of SLO assessment in improving teaching and learning and creating a culture of student success throughout the District.

DRAFT