

The image features a background of tall, green grasses with some brown seed heads, slightly out of focus. The text is overlaid on this background. The word "VENTURA" is in white, uppercase, sans-serif font. Below it, "COLLEGE" is in orange, uppercase, sans-serif font. Underneath "COLLEGE" is the tagline "SET YOUR COURSE" in white, uppercase, sans-serif font. At the bottom of the page, the title "ANNUAL PLANNING REPORT" is in white, uppercase, sans-serif font, with "PLANNING" in orange. Below that is "OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS" in orange, uppercase, sans-serif font, and "AUGUST 2012" in white, uppercase, sans-serif font.

VENTURA COLLEGE

SET YOUR COURSE

ANNUAL **PLANNING** REPORT
OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL **EFFECTIVENESS**
AUGUST 2012

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) for all courses and programs.....	1
VC Objective 2: Revise program review process to integrate SLOs and a more meaningful analysis of data.	3
VC Objective 3: Enhance the viability and relevance of CTE Programs to support the workforce development and economic vitality of the community.....	5
VC Objective 4: Implement the Student Services Redesign Plan.....	8
VC Objective 5: Increase opportunities for staff to grow and have training opportunities to enhance service to students	10
VC Objective 6: Explore opportunities for reconfiguring existing or acquiring new space to accommodate growth; reconfigure the VC Santa Paula curriculum	13
Section 2: SLO Status Report, 2011-2012	14
Section 3: Program Review Report, Fall 2011.....	18
Section 4: Ventura College Profile and Institutional Effectiveness Report.....	28

Section 1: Ventura College Strategic Plan

Annual Implementation Plan 2011-2012

1) SLOs/SUOs; 2) Program Review; 3) Workforce Development; 4) Student Services Redesign;
5) Professional Development; 6) Santa Paula site

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

VC Objective 1: Continuously assess Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for all courses and programs.

VCCCD Board Goal 1: Access and Student Success

VC Accreditation Recommendation: As noted in 2004, in order to fully meet this Standard the team recommends that the college accelerate its efforts to identify measurable student learning outcomes for every course, instructional program, and student support programs. In conjunction with this effort the college should assess all learning outcomes and incorporate analysis of student learning assessments into course and program improvements. (Accreditation Standard II.B.1-7, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a-b, II.A.2.e-f, II.B.4, II.C.2)

#	Action Steps	Responsible Party	Timeline	Progress
1.1	Apply SLO assessment results from prior semester to improve programs and document those improvements	Department Chairs, Supervisors, Deans, Faculty	August - December, 2011	Completed
1.2	Assess SLOs at course levels and SUOs at program levels and document assessment process and results	Department Chairs, SLO facilitators, Deans, SLO Committee	August – December, 2011	Completed
1.3	Attend WASC Conference	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness, SLO Facilitator	September, 2011	Completed
1.4	Use SLO assessment results in the revised Program Review process, documenting any need for resources associated with plans for improvements.	Deans, Department Chairs, Supervisors, Program Review Facilitators	October, 2011	Completed
1.5	Review results of SLO course and SUO assessments and work with faculty/staff to improve (to be done after program review)	Department Chairs, SLO facilitators, Deans, SLO Committee	October, 2011- February, 2012	Completed
1.6	Review and select software for SLO/SUO management	VP Business Services, Dean, Institutional Effectiveness, Dean, Math/Science, Supervisor, LRC, SLO Committee	Spring, 2012	Completed
1.7	Review results of SLO course and SUO assessments and work with faculty/staff to improve	Department Chairs, SLO facilitators, Deans, SLO Committee	Spring, 2012	Completed

1.8	Apply SLO assessment results from prior semester to improve programs and document those improvements	Department Chairs, Supervisors, Deans, Faculty	January-May, 2012	Completed
1.9	Review and assess SLO assessment process; modify as necessary	SLO Committee	February, 2012	Completed
1.10	Establish multi-year assessment plan that paces assessment of course, program, and institutional level SLO assessments.	SLO Committee, Academic Senate, SLO Facilitators, Faculty, Staff, Deans	February - July, 2012	Completed
1.11	Formatively assess SLOs at course levels and SUOs at program levels and document assessment process and results	Department Chairs and Coordinators, Faculty, Staff, Deans	February - April, 2012	Completed
1.12	Review and revise institutional level SLOs	SLO Committee, Academic Senate	February - March, 2012	Completed
1.13	Programs are trained on how to align course, program, and institutional level SLOs	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness, SLO Committee	March – May, 2012	Completed
1.14	Develop a model to assess program-level SLOs	SLO Committee, Academic Senate	February – March, 2012	Completed
1.15	Develop a model to assess institutional-level SLOs	SLO Committee, Academic Senate	March– April, 2012	Completed
1.16	Review results of formative SLO course and SUO assessments	Department Chairs, SLO facilitators, Deans, SLO Committee	May - July, 2012	Completed
1.17	Survey faculty and staff on SLO process	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness, SLO Committee	May, 2012	Completed
1.18	File bi-annual SLO report	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness	June, 2012	Completed
1.19	Review SLOs to be loaded into TracDat (SLO software program)	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness, SLO Committee, SLO Facilitator, Department Chairs	June, 2012	Completed
1.20	Load SLO data into TracDat	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness	Summer, 2012	Completed

Annual Implementation Plan 2011-2012

- 1) SLOs/SUOs; **2) Program Review**; 3) Workforce Development; 4) Student Services Redesign;
5) Professional Development; 6) Santa Paula site

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

VC Objective 2: Revise program review process to integrate SLOs and a more meaningful analysis of data.

VCCCD Board Goal 1: Access and Student Success

VC Accreditation Recommendation: In order to fully meet this standard the team recommends that the college must increase its research capacity to serve the programs and fully integrate its research efforts into the program review process. Further Student Learning Outcomes need to become an integral part of the Program Review process, including incorporating the research function, detailed discussions, and appropriate analysis from SLO data research (Accreditation Standard I.B.1, I.B.2., II.B.1, II.B.3.a, II.B.3.c, II.B.4, ER 10 and 19). In order to fully meet this standard the team recommends that the college strengthen the content of its program review process to include a comprehensive and meaningful analysis of data with particular emphasis on student demographics, enrollment, program completion, retention, success, and achievement of student learning outcomes. Improvements to its programs should then be based on these results. (Accreditation Standard I.B.3, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a-b, II.A.2.e, II.C.2.i, II.B.2., II.B.3-4, II.C.2)

#	Action Steps	Responsible Party	Timeline	Progress
2.1	Train department chairs, coordinators, supervisors, and deans on new program review process	College Planning Council	August 2011	Completed
2.2	Complete program review documents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and analysis of data • Creation of student success and operating outcomes with performance indicators and methods of assessment • Creation of initiatives that require/do not require resources • Prioritization of initiatives 	Programs and departments	September – October 2011	Completed
2.3	Present program review summaries to College Planning Council, including any presentations on program discontinuance	Deans Faculty (re program discontinuance)	November, 2011	Completed
2.4	Forward requests for resources to appropriate committees for further prioritization	VP of Business Services, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness	November, 2011	Completed
2.5	Present final results of funded initiatives to College Planning Council	Executive Team	December, 2011	Completed
2.6	Post all program reviews, presentation data, and initiatives spreadsheets on college website	Dean of Institutional Effectiveness	December, 2011	Completed

2.7	Evaluate program review process through survey and committee discussions	Dean of Institutional Effectiveness	December, 2011	Completed
2.8	Write annual program review report, review report with CPC, and post to website	Dean of Institutional Effectiveness	January, 2012	Completed
2.9	Evaluate and select software for program review management	VP, Business Services; Dean, Institutional Effectiveness; Dean Math Science	Late Fall 2011/Early Spring 2012	Completed
2.10	Hold meetings for revision of Program Review process.	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness, College Planning Council	May, 2012	Completed
2.11	Create timeline for 2012/13 Program Review based on input from process committee	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness	Summer, 2012	Completed
2.12	Revise program review template based on input from process committee	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness; VP, Business Services	Summer 2012	Completed
2.13	Create link to data to be used in Fall Program Review	VP, Business Services	Summer 2012	Completed

Annual Implementation Plan 2011-2012

- 1) SLOs/SUOs; 2) Program Review; **3) Workforce Development**; 4) Student Services Redesign;
5) Professional Development; 6) Santa Paula site

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

VC Objective 3: Enhance the viability and relevance of CTE Programs to support the workforce development and economic vitality of the community.

VCCCD Board Goal 2: Instructional Quality

#	Action Step	Responsible Party	Timeline	Progress
3.1	Conduct a comprehensive program review for each CTE Program, including analysis of SLOs, historic Date regarding the issuance of degrees and certificates, and qualitative data from Advisory Committees	Assistant CTE Deans, Department Chairs	September - October, 2011	Completed October, 2011
3.2	Obtain both local and statewide approval for new, transfer degrees in Business and in Child Development	Assistant CTE Dean, Department Chairs, Curriculum Committee	October 2011- June 2012	Local approval Fall, 2011; State approval pending. Transfer degrees in Business Administration and in Child Development approved.
3.3	Participate in RP Group statewide CTE Outcomes Pilot Project with 10 other colleges through California to collect outcome data on individuals who completed degrees, certificates or 10 CTE units over the past year	Assistant CTE Deans, Institutional Researcher, RP Group (funded through Perkins Grant)	September 2011- June 2012	First report from RP Group expected by end of September 2012. Preliminary results show 91 students responded to survey.
3.4	Install open-entry, competency-based computerized modules in pre-employment skills	VP for Business Services, Assistant CTE Deans	October 2011 - June 2012 April 2012 Update: New	Pending

	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.)		implementation dates necessitated by restructuring of CTE division: August 2012 - August 2014	
3.5	Provide professional development for CTE instructors to learn how to integrate instruction in leadership skills into any CTE program	Assistant CTE Dean, Co-Chair of South Central Regional Consortium	October 2011 - January 2012	Completed
3.6	Enhance the use of CTE advisory committees and other community sources to better ascertain the needs of industry throughout the region	Assistant CTE Dean/Department Chairs	October 2011 - January 2012	10/17/11 Business Advisory Committee meeting. 1/27/12 Child Development Advisory Committee meeting. SB70 funds being used to schedule fall meetings for Welding, Water Science, manufacturing, automotive, nursing.
3.7	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.	Assistant CTE dean, Department Chairs, Faculty	October 2011 - December 2012	Revised Accounting Certificate/Degree. Approved. AS in Business Administration for Transfer approved. AS in Child Development for transfer approved. SCRC Burning Glass Technology purchased. It will allow us to collect real-time LMI to better ascertain if training programs are meeting the current needs of the labor market.

3.8	Explore the development of new curricula and programs associated with the new Applied Science building/laboratory	Assistant CTE Deans, Department Chairs, Faculty	December 2011 - December 2012	Pending
3.9	Enhance partnerships with feeder secondary schools to strengthen concept of career pathways for incoming freshmen.	Assistant CTE Deans	August 2011- June 2012	Complete but ongoing. Three Articulation Agreements, more than a dozen career awareness camps, participation in VUSD's CTE Advisory Committee, lending library for dual enrollment classes at Fillmore High School.

Annual Implementation Plan 2011-2012

- 1) SLOs/SUOs; 2) Program Review; 3) Workforce Development; **4) Student Services Redesign;**
5) Professional Development; 6) Santa Paula site

VC Strategic Goal 2: Provide students with information and access to diverse and comprehensive support services that lead to their success.

VC Objective 4: Implement the Student Services Redesign Plan.

VCCCD Board Goal 1: Access and Student Success.

#	Action Steps	Responsible Party	Timeline	Progress
4.1	Move Welcome Center and staff into new location and become fully operational	Project Director, Registrar	November 2011	Completed
4.2	Analyze and map flow of information, services, decision points and outcomes for diverse populations of stakeholders	Consultant	Fall 2011	Analysis completed May 2012
4.3	Reactivate and realign reengineering committees	Project Director, Activity Director, Student Services Liaison groups	November 2011	Committees realigned, Meetings continue throughout academic year
4.4	Design, develop and go live with new online orientation	Student Services Team, Project Director, Activity Director	November 2011 - June 2012	Online orientation script developed, go live anticipated Fall 2012
4.5	Analyze and map flow of information, services, decision points and outcomes for diverse populations of stakeholders	Consultant	Fall 2011	Analysis completed May 2012
4.6	Develop an intervention process for students on probation/dismissal	Activity Director, Student Services Liaison groups	November 2011 – June 2012	Completion anticipated Fall 2012
4.7	Design early alert process to be more effective	Student Services Teams, Project Director, Web and Distant Education Task Force	November 2011- November 2012	In process
4.8	Implement early alert process to be more effective	Student Services Teams, Project Director, Web and Distant Education Task Force	November 2011- November 2012	In process

4.9	Analyze and map flow of information, services, decision points and outcomes for diverse populations of stakeholders	Consultant	Fall 2011	Analysis completed May 2012
4.10	Hold an in-service for all student workers in all student services programs for the purpose of cross training	Activity Director, Student Services Liaison groups	December, 2011	Completed 12/2011
4.11	Analyze student worker training program	Consultant	May 2012	Pending
4.12	Continue comprehensive data collection and analysis for all project objectives and quantify outcomes	Institutional Research, Project Director, Activity Director	July 2011 – ongoing	Pending
4.13	Continue to identify and prioritize new online academic support and student services at Ventura College and Oxnard College	Student Services Teams, Project Director, Activity Director, Consultant services, District Wide Web and Distant Ed Task Force	July 2011- June 2012	Pending
4.14	Continue to enhance and evaluate Welcome Center	Activity Director, Student Outreach Specialist, Student Services Specialist	June 2011- June 2012	Completed June 2012
4.15	Analyze and map flow of information, services, decision points and outcomes for diverse populations of stakeholders	Consultant	June 2012	Analysis completed May 2012
4.16	Continue comprehensive data collection for all project objectives and quantify outcomes	Institutional Research, Project Director, Activity Director	July 2011 – June 2012	Pending
4.17	Design, develop, pilot, evaluate and revise, soft roll-out, evaluate and revise, “go live” with prioritized online services at Ventura College and Oxnard College	Student Services Teams, Project Director, Activity Director, Consultant services, District Wide Web and Distant Ed Task Force	July 2011 – June 2012	Completed June 2012
4.18	Revise Web portal hierarchy, information and services to align with identified flows as needed	Consultant Activity Director	July 2012 – June 2013	Pending
4.19	Analyze and map flow of information, services, decision points and outcomes for diverse populations of stakeholders	Consultant	July 2012	Pending
4.20	Plan and execute 3 student focus groups to provide suggestions to the improved	Activity Director	June 2013	First focus group in Feb. 2012
4.21	Analyze and map flow of information, services, decision points and outcomes for diverse populations of stakeholders	Consultant	June 2013	In process

Annual Implementation Plan 2011-2012

1) SLOs/SUOs; 2) Program Review; 3) Workforce Development; 4) Student Services Redesign;

5) Professional Development; 6) Santa Paula site

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

VC Objective 5: Increase opportunities for staff to grow and have training opportunities to enhance service to students.

VCCCD Board Goal 2: Maintain Instructional Quality.

#	Action Steps	Responsible Party	Timeline	Progress
5.1	Meet with all stakeholders at both VC and OC to establish 2nd annual Summer Institute draft proposal and develop a Task Force from both campuses	Project Director	January 2012	Completed
5.2	Create Advertisement and application for SITE II	Activity Director/Graphic Artists	January 2012	Completed
5.3	Advertise for participants to attend training	Project Director, Activity Director	January through May 2012	Completed
5.4	Survey VC and OC full-time and part-time faculty knowledge, skills and interest for professional development training and participation	Activity Director and Instructional Design Specialist and Professional Development	April 2012	Completed
5.5	Develop amended curriculum for faculty summer institute	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialists VC and OC	May 2012	Completed
5.6	Gather and compile results on reports on all pilot testing projects conducted in fall 2011	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist	January 2012	Completed
5.7	Coordinate workshops from instructional experts open to all summer institute participants	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialists	January - April 2012	Completed
5.8	Recruit and select Summer institute cohorts at VC and OC	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist	January - May 2012	Completed and expanded to add Moorpark College

				recruits as well
5.9	Organize professional development trainings for 2011-2012 academic year	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist, Task Force	Fall 2011 and Spring 2012	Completed
5.10	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, Task Force	Spring 2012	Completed
5.11	Implement and deliver summer institute II	Project Director, Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist	May 2012	Completed
5.12	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 2012	Completed
5.13	Organize professional development trainings for 2012-2013 academic year	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist, Task Force, Professional Development Committee	February - April 2012	Completed
5.14	Create Flex week activities brochure and distribute to all faculty at Ventura College	Activity Director, Professional Development Committee	June 2012	Completed
5.15	Hold ongoing professional development trainings throughout Spring semester	Activity Director, Professional Development Committee, Instructional Designer	Beginning January 2012 and ongoing through April 2012	Completed
5.16	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	May 2012	Completed

		faculty involved in pilot testing		
--	--	--------------------------------------	--	--

Annual Implementation Plan 2011-2012

- 1) SLOs/SUOs; 2) Program Review; 3) Workforce Development; 4) Student Services Redesign;
5) Professional Development; **6) Santa Paula site**

VC Strategic Goal 5: Implement the Ventura College Santa Paula Site educational plan.

VC Objective 6: Explore opportunities for reconfiguring existing or acquiring new space to accommodate growth; reconfigure the VC Santa Paula curriculum.

VCCCD Board Goal 1: Access and Student Success.

#	Action Steps	Responsible Party	Timeline	Progress
6.1	Work with department potential rotation of fast-track general education courses	Dean, Off-Campus Programs	August – March 2012	In Process. Timeline revised
6.2	Pilot newly-revised English as a Second Language (ESL) curriculum	Dean, English and ESL faculty	August – December 2011	Completed
6.3	Assess current levels of service in the areas of counseling, A&R, and financial aid	Dean, Off-Campus Programs; Dean of Student Services	October – December 2011	Completed
6.4	Survey Santa Paula, Piru, and Fillmore communities for CTE Needs	Dean, Off-Campus Programs; Assistant Dean, Career & Technical Education	February - March 2012	Committee recommends rescheduling and to be completed in conjunction with Camarillo, Ventura and Oxnard survey in 2012-2013
6.5	Survey students and employees about student services and new facilities.	Dean, Off-Campus programs	April – May 2012	Completed
6.6	Revisit CTE curriculum; modify curriculum and prepare for curriculum approval.	Assistant Dean, Career & Technical Education	April – May 2012	Committee recommends rescheduling to work with a revised CTE plan
6.7	Identify one-time dollars (general fund, categorical, or grant) to support the acquisition of needed machine “trainers” and packaged software.	May 2012	Vice President, Business Services; Assistant Dean, Career & Technical Education	Committee recommends rescheduling to work with a revised CTE plan

Section 2: SLO Status Report, 2011-2012

In fall 2011, the interim SLO Oversight Group (SLOOG) was replaced by a new SLO participatory governance committee (the SLO Committee). At the first meeting in September 2011, a faculty co-chair was elected to serve with the administrative co-chair/Dean of Institutional Effectiveness. At this transition meeting, the history of the SLO/SUO process and the work of SLOOG was reviewed by the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and the two faculty SLO facilitators. The college's strategic plan was also discussed briefly as its first item pertained to SLOs. The need for software to manage the SLO process was also discussed.

In fall, course and service program assessments were conducted at a summative level, repeating processes that had been established in prior semesters.

Early in the fall semester, the co-chairs of the new SLO Committee attended the "WASC Retreat on Academic Essentials," September 21-22, in Northern California. Information from the conference was shared with the SLO Committee, and the document entitled "Percentage of Employers who Want Colleges to place more emphasis on Essential Learning Outcomes" was discussed extensively in relation to the Institutional SLOs such as communication and critical thinking.

With a well-established process for assessing courses and service programs, we placed a greater emphasis on "closing the loop" (the reporting back on improvements made as a result of prior assessments) in this academic year. SLO facilitators and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness reviewed completed work to determine if the "closing the loop" section was completed. Initially, this part of the process was somewhat confusing, but as faculty and staff continued to work on their SLOs/SUOs, this area of accountability became much clearer. It also became increasingly clear to us that a software program to manage this accountability function would be highly advantageous.

During the fall 2011 semester, the committee began looking at samples of Institutional SLOs from other colleges as we began the process of looking to revise our own. There was general agreement at the college that the Institutional SLOs developed several years prior were overly detailed and some would be difficult to assess. In the SLO Committee, a great deal of discussion took place about the skills we want students to have when they leave our college.

At virtually every meeting during the 2011/2012 year, the topic of Institutional SLOs was discussed. In looking at models from other colleges, the SLO Committee decided to combine the Institutional SLOs with GE SLOs. The SLO faculty facilitators and the administrative co-chair of the SLO Committee, with input from the SLO Committee, created a draft of new Institutional/GE SLOs, which was presented to the SLO Committee. Committee members revised them, made numerous changes, and took them to their respective divisions for input. A great deal of discussion at the SLO Committee and the divisions took place, particularly in regard to GE/ISLO #5 -- Personal/Community Awareness and Academic/Career Responsibilities. One department felt that it related only to vocational areas or could not easily be assessed; the committee, overall, disagreed, believing that all programs and departments, minimally, have some responsibility in helping our students learn to self-manage their academic goals through the use of study skills and time management techniques. On February 14, 2012, the new Institutional/GE SLOs were approved by the SLO Committee, with the one concern noted, and forwarded to the Academic Senate for their approval. The Academic Senate approved them in March 2012.

Early in the spring semester, the college began reviewing different software programs for SLO management. Representatives from eLeumen and TracDat both made presentations to the college after being invited to do so. After evaluation and discussion, the decision was made to go with TracDat as it had the capability of managing SLOs at all levels as well as managing program review and strategic planning. The Dean of Institutional Effectiveness presented the TracDat proposal to the district Administrative Technology Advisory Committee (ATAC), and it was approved by that body for use at Ventura and Moorpark Colleges. The purchase was subsequently approved by the board.

In early summer 2012, TracDat was installed and initial training sessions were held with the SLO faculty facilitators, the Learning Resources Supervisor (who took the primary role for system implementation at the college), the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, the Vice President of Business Services, and the clerical staff who would be in a support function. During the remainder of the summer, the system was set up and SLOs for all programs (service and instructional) and departments were input. Plans were established for faculty and staff training during the late summer/early fall 2013.

In the spring 2012 semester, three programs (Child Development, Human Services, and Medical Assisting) undertook pilots of institutional and program-level SLO assessments in preparation for work that would be done in fall 2013. Forms for these assessments were created. In May 2012, the faculty members who did the pilots presented their assessments, findings, and rubrics to the Department Chair and Coordinators' Council as models for the work that would be done in fall 2012. The Department Chair of Psychology also presented his department's mapping as a model for other areas. These pilots were also shared with the SLO Committee.

In this academic year, a great deal of discussion also took place about rotational plans. At the SLO Committee, various drafts were presented. The committee determined, at the end of the spring semester, that a rotational plan would be used and that it was important for each program or department to create its own plan based on parameters/guidance provided by the committee. ISLO/GE assessments would be planned and scheduled so that institutional discussions could take place about the findings and the plans for improvement. Programs and departments, though, would be able to schedule their course and program-level SLOs as worked best for them, taking embedding into consideration wherever possible.

In late spring, 2012, the faculty facilitators of the SLO committee attended the Academic Senate for Community Colleges SLO Pre-session and shared that information with the SLO Committee in fall 2012.

On a related topic, in the spring 2012 semester, the college applied for a Title V individual grant from the U.S. Department of Education. The emphasis in the grant was on increasing the transfer velocity for all students, particularly our Hispanic students, through improved institutional effectiveness. Improvement strategies such as professional development and increased student support services to increase success rates for 20 high-risk courses across the disciplines were included as part of the proposal. Also included were plans for continuous quality improvement of student learning outcomes processes. Collaboration with USC's School of Urban Education and the Equity Scorecard was included in the grant in an effort to increase the college's awareness and attention to issues of student equity and to further the college's use of data to make decisions. In June 2012, the college was awarded this \$2.9M grant. Plans are underway for implementation beginning in October 2012.

In summer 2012, course and service program assessments were conducted at a formative level, repeating processes that had been established in prior semesters.

Plans were fully developed (based on prior pilots) for all instructional programs to conduct institutional and program-level SLOs in fall 2012. During the summer of 2012, the SLO facilitators and Dean of Institutional Effectiveness continued to work to refine the process so that it would be ready for faculty and staff when they returned in the fall.

At the end of the spring 2012 semester, an electronic survey regarding the SLO/SUO process was distributed to all faculty, staff, and administrators with the following results:

- 95.5% of respondents indicated that they were involved in the SLO/SUO process in their divisions.
- 31.8% responded that they were more comfortable with the process than they had been previously; we are hopeful that with the implementation of TracDat in fall 2012 that our response will be higher next year. The process, thus far, has been largely paper driven, which has caused a fair amount of frustration.
- 50% responded that they had worked with the faculty facilitator on the process.
28.6 responded that they had worked with faculty facilitators on the forms and the mapping process.
- 52.6% of respondents reported that their department had discussed student learning. This is an area in which we need to continue working.
51% responded that their department made changes that affected student learning.
31.6% responded that their SLO/SUO process was revised to make improvements.

In terms of improving our processes, some respondents made comments pertaining to the amount of time required and the difficulty of the forms (both of which we hope will be alleviated greatly by the implementation of TracDat). Some did not understand when the forms were due. Some respondents still had some skepticism about the ability of SLOs, generally, to improve student learning. And some respondents felt that the process still needed to be more inclusive, that the process needed to be clearer, and that more assistance and guidance was needed.

Numerous positive comments were also made on the survey. Some of these comments included how the information gained did help student learning, how the process made faculty members re-evaluate teaching and the evaluation process, and how it stimulated discussion between faculty members about teaching effectiveness.

At the end of the spring 2012 semester, the SLO Committee evaluated its effectiveness as a committee on an electronic survey. 100% of respondents felt that the committee had a clearly documented charge. 40% strongly agreed and 60% agreed that the business of the SLO Committee was accomplished effectively during the year. 100% of respondents felt that committee meetings were conducive to open discussion of relevant issues.

The college's SLO/SUO 2011/2012 performance, as reported in the 2012 ACCJC Annual Report, was as follows:

Course Level Outcomes	
% of courses with defined SLOs	95%
% of courses with on-going assessment	90%

Program Level Outcomes	
% of programs with defined PLOs	95%
% of programs with on-going assessment	30%
Service Unit Outcomes	
% of student learning support activities with defined SLOs	95%
% of student learning support activities with on-going assessment	95%
Institutional Level Outcomes	
Institutional SLOs are defined	Yes
% of institutional outcomes with on-going assessment	55%

In the fall 2012 semester, the institution will be focusing on program and institutional SLOs, at which time the percentages in those areas will increase significantly.

Section 3: Program Review Report, Fall 2011

During the fall 2011 semester, the college piloted a new program review process that addressed our need for integrated planning: linking the allocation of resources with institutional research and the creation of initiatives designed to increase student success and improve student/campus services. In the new process, all programs were provided with budget information, and instructional areas were also provided with student demographic, student success, and productivity data. Service areas utilized student data collected by their respective program(s).

The process was also designed to work in conjunction with the newly created process for assessing student learning outcomes (SLOs) and service unit outcomes (SUOs), which rely on data collection, assessment, and the subsequent creation of initiatives.

The new program review template contained the following elements:

- **Program Description:** student learning outcomes, estimated student costs, criteria for admission, college mission, college student learning outcomes, program degrees and/or certificates, history/significant program events, professional qualities (if appropriate), organizational structure, and instructors and staff
- **Performance Expectations:** student learning outcomes, student success outcomes (program-level SLOs), program operating outcomes, mapping of courses to course-level student learning outcomes, and primary and secondary assessment methods
- **Operating Information:** institutional data (e.g., enrollment with three year trends, budgets, scheduling, facilities and equipment usage), program data (e.g., course-level SLO measures and processes), non-instructional performance measures/benchmarks, and program review process documentation (e.g. minutes, decisions, findings)
- **Performance Assessment:** performance indicators, operating information (e.g., equipment inventory including per unit and total costs as well as years of life and annual cost) and analysis/assessment for program-level student learning outcomes, student success goals, and operating goals
- **Findings:** critical analysis of a program's overall performance assessments
- **Initiatives** (with links to findings): benefits to program, requests for resources, and other possible funding sources (e.g. grants)
- **Process Review Process Assessment:** to be completed after the completion of the first iteration of the program review process

During the summer of 2011 and early part of the fall 2011 semester, program reviews forms were populated with program description information, data to assess performance expectations, operating information, and program-level SLOs or SUOs that had been previously written by faculty and staff. More detailed information for the instructional programs (i.e., specific course data) was made available to faculty and staff in appendices that could be accessed online.

Program faculty and staff were responsible for the following:

- 1) Creating student success goals (instructional areas only)
- 2) Creating operating goals

- 3) Creating performance indicators for existing program-level SLOs and newly created operating goals
- 4) Creating performance indicators for student success goals (instructional areas)
- 5) Analyzing budget, facilities and equipment usage, and operating information, which for instructional areas includes enrollment, student success, student retention, student persistence, and scheduling.
- 6) Reviewing findings and initiatives from SLO program summaries completed in spring 2011 for possible inclusion in program review; adding any additional findings and initiatives.

During the second week of the fall semester, training on the new forms and process was provided to both the Department Chairs/Coordinators Council and the College Planning Council by the Vice President of Business Services and the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness. Samples from an instructional area (Chemistry) and a service area (Learning Center) were provided, as were instructions for completing both types of program reviews. A timeline was also provided. Facilitators were made available to faculty and staff to help them work collaboratively and complete the document. At the Department Chair/Coordinators Council, members signed up to meet with a facilitator at a time convenient for their programs.

As this was our first time with the new process, there was some delay in getting the populated forms to the various programs, and in some cases, data needed to be corrected or, in the case of service areas, self-supplied or created. As a result, the deadline for completing the program review forms was extended, and these delays did cause a hardship for some of the programs to finish in the required time.

In the subsequent weeks, meetings were held by each program to review and analyze the program review data that was provided to them, to create initiatives for improvement based on the data, and to prioritize the initiatives, some needing resources and some not. These meetings were also attended by the designated facilitator.

Programs that were being considered for discontinuance had been notified as early as at the end of the prior semester (spring 2011). In some cases, those programs spent a considerable amount of time analyzing their data and writing their program review report in preparation for the program review presentations at which they would have the opportunity to present their program to the College Planning Council.

The week after the program reviews were due, deans of each division called division meetings for the purpose of prioritizing the initiatives within the division. These meetings took different forms, but the programs within each division prioritized their division's initiatives with a ranking of required (for safety purposes), high (critical need), medium (important need), or low (documented need) within each of the following categories: faculty, staff, facilities, equipment, and equipment/computer. At the direction of the College Planning Council, each program was given one (1) vote in this process so that smaller programs would have sufficient influence. However, the goal was for the division faculty and staff to look at the division as a whole and to make collaborative decisions based on the greatest needs of the division.

After the division meetings, the division deans each wrote a program review summary report to present to the College Planning Council during the week of program review presentations. The summaries explained the division's process, the major findings and initiatives, any requested resources for the major initiatives, the division's position on any programs identified for discontinuance, minority opinions, and notification of possible appeals. The deans also completed an initiatives spreadsheet identifying all of their division's initiatives and the ranking determined by division members at the division meeting.

During the week of October 24, 2011, the Campus Resource Council heard presentations from the deans of all instructional and service divisions. Department chairs and supervisors were encouraged to add additional comments. In the case of programs identified for program discontinuance, faculty members were provided the opportunity to present arguments for continuing the program, and several did so. After each division presentation, questions and comments were solicited from the College Planning Council members. One faculty member presented a minority report regarding process that had occurred in a particular division. The minority report was heard and accepted into the record.

Following the presentations, the initiatives spreadsheets were provided to the appropriate campus committee for further ranking. These committees included the Facilities Oversight Group (FOG), Faculty Staffing Priorities Committee, Classified Staffing Priorities Committee, Budget Resource Council (BRC), and Technology Committee.

Committee rankings were then forwarded to the Executive Team, which consists of the College President, the Executive Vice President, and the Vice President of Business Services, for the college ranking.

At the College Planning Council meeting held on December 7, 2011, the college rankings were presented by the Vice President of Business Services. Those with a ranking of high were funded, pending final, more formal assessment of the actual cost and the ability to house equipment. Faculty staffing priority initiatives were addressed by President Calote in an email to the campus.

All documents—program reviews (including presentations made by programs identified for discontinuance and appeals), summary reports, initiatives spreadsheets, rubrics, and minutes College Planning Council meetings--were put on the college website. The campus community was made aware that these documents were available for viewing online.

The new process was a significant improvement over our prior program review processes. It was transparent and collaborative, and it represented the first time our college had clearly linked requests for resources with data and initiatives generated from data. Deans made the division presentations but individual faculty members were given the opportunity to make presentations to the entire College Planning Council regarding programs that had been identified for discontinuance. That opportunity had not been provided in previous program review presentations. After all division presentations, comments and questions regarding the programs were solicited and encouraged. From this new process, the College Planning Council learned a great deal about the campus as a whole. In giving this committee the opportunity to hear about all divisions at the college, it provided the opportunity for the Council members to hear about the successes of other divisions and to consider the needs and challenges of the institution as a whole.

At the conclusion of the process, College Planning Council members were asked to gather feedback on the process from their divisions and to present that information to the council at the last meeting of the semester. The Dean of Institutional Effectiveness also attended the Department Chair/Coordinator's Council for additional input. And, finally, a campus-wide survey was sent to all faculty, staff, and administrators for their input. From this input, the following lists of successes and areas for improvement were compiled:

Successes:

- The college Vice President of Business Services did an exemplary job in compiling institutional data for the instructional programs.

- College staff did an excellent job of populating the program review forms with information and data so that these programs could spend their time analyzing data rather than merely inputting information.
- Training sessions for department chairs and College Planning Council members were helpful for introducing the process and providing opportunities for people to ask questions and receive appropriate clarification.
- Facilitators were helpful in guiding the programs through the new process this first time. Instructional areas were strongly encouraged to utilize a facilitator because of the extensive data that needed to be analyzed. The majority of instructional programs met with one of these facilitators.
- For the vast majority of programs, faculty and/or staff worked collaboratively in a positive manner. One department chair characterized the discussion as “healthy.”
- The Academic Senate President was involved in numerous aspects of the program review process, including working with faculty, helping people to understand the importance of the process, and making programs identified for discontinuance aware of the opportunity for presenting their case to the College Planning Council.
- A number of department chairs and faculty voiced their appreciation for being given program specific data. Many learned things about their program they had not known before, and many were grateful for the ability they now had to be involved in data-driven decision making.
- The new process (for instructional areas) provided a comparative opportunity for programs to observe and analyze how well their students were progressing, contrasted to total numbers of students campus wide.
- The new process (for instructional areas) provided the opportunity for faculty to analyze each set of data.
- Program reviews were completed on time, per the schedule that had been created.
- All programs submitted a program review. The only exceptions were those programs that had been identified for discontinuance and chose not to submit a program review.
- Several programs that were identified for discontinuance submitted program reviews and other documentation in support of continuing their programs. The program review process, for the first time, allowed any program being considered for discontinuance to make their presentation and case for program continuance or program modification to the appropriate college committee (the College Planning Council).

- The entire College Planning Council heard summaries of each division's major findings, initiatives, and requests for resources. In doing so, CPC members became much more educated about the college as a whole. The College's Executive Team (the president, EVP, and VP) are members of the CPC, and similarly were there to hear these presentations and to ask questions to help in their decision-making process and to gain information for future planning.
- College Planning Council members as well as program department chairs, coordinators, or program members in attendance were encouraged to provide feedback and to ask/answer questions during any of the program review presentations.
- The new program review process was successful in combining institutional research data and student learning outcomes as well as in connecting requests for resources with initiatives derived from data.
- The new process worked smoothly in terms of initiatives moving from departments to divisions to appropriate committees to the Executive Team and back to the College Planning Council. Before the end of the fall semester, programs that had been granted resources for various initiatives (i.e., equipment, facilities, computer, other) based on Executive Team rankings had been funded.
- Data analysis and data-driven decision making increased significantly throughout the institution.
- Program reviews, division summaries, and spreadsheets of initiatives were posted on the college website for viewing by any interested person. The campus community was made aware in a campus-wide email from the college president that the documents were available for review online.

Areas for improvement:

- There was some confusion during the initial kick-off meeting about facilitator involvement and how to sign up for a facilitator. This confusion led, in some cases, to numerous phone calls in order to clarify.
- The timeline was problematic. Firstly, it did not provide sufficient time for some programs to review and analyze the data adequately. It did not provide sufficient time for programs to schedule additional meetings for the purposes of creating initiatives/strategies. And it did not provide sufficient time for programs to read the program reviews of other programs in the division. A suggestion was made to hold separate meetings to review the documents and to rank the initiatives.
- The service areas received their program review templates late, which made it difficult for them to complete their work in a timely manner.
- In some cases, the data provided to the program was incorrect or incomplete and had to be revised, which added further delays into a process with limited time.

- Additional data, which was in the appendices, was difficult or confusing for some faculty members to access. Specific instructions, in writing, should be provided in the future about how to access the documents.
- It was difficult for us to be piloting a new program discontinuance process at the same time we were piloting a new process for program review.
- In general, instructional programs would like to see additional disaggregated data, by course.
- District productivity targets need to be re-examined. In some cases, there was a perception of a lack of fairness.
- Some of the data in the program review form was repetitive. In the future, when a faculty or staff member changes a piece of information, that change should occur throughout the document – if the repetition is necessary for clarity or explanation.
- We need to understand who are students, in some programs are. We make assumptions that may not be accurate. We need to identify the goals of the students in our programs.
- We need to ensure that students update their goal in a manner we can track, so that our data is accurate.
- We need to find a way to determine if students who attend the college met their goal.
- The program review process was particularly difficult for programs, such as Child Development and ESL, with only one full-time faculty member, or programs, such as Sign Language, with no full-time faculty member. In these programs, there was far less collaboration due to the inability of most part-time faculty to attend program review meetings.
- The program review document was perceived to be excessively long and intimidating by some faculty members. The length was perceived to be problematic in programs that had numerous subcategories, such as Art and Foreign Language.
- There was some inconsistency in the prioritization of initiatives at the various levels. At the program level, each initiative was rated by a specific number (i.e., 1, 2, 3) in order of importance. At the division level, these initiatives were categorized into R (required), H (high), M (medium), and L (low). It was difficult for division members to navigate between these two systems and come up with the initiatives in the appropriate categories.
- In one division, there was a concern about a lack of collaboration. This concern became the source of a minority report presented to the College Planning Council. On the positive side, though, this program was allowed to present this concern publicly, the document was attached to that area's program review, and the committee voted to include the minority report in the record.

- The process of voting on initiatives in division meetings was not clear. While the CPC had decided that each program would get one vote, we did not take into account how that would work in programs that have both faculty and classified staff. Further, the question of whether classified staff should be voting on faculty initiatives (and vice versa) was not addressed sufficiently. While some people supported the idea of having one vote per program as a way for the smaller programs to have a voice, others felt that such a process disadvantaged the larger programs unfairly.
- Having faculty and staff initiatives ranked in a “mixed” manner was problematic for some areas because it could devalue or ignore some initiatives in the final rankings.
- Some part-time faculty felt that their opinions were not valued sufficiently.
- We need more part-time faculty participation.
- There was some inconsistency in the way the initiatives spreadsheets were collected by the deans’ offices and distributed to faculty and staff. That process needs to be made clearer in the future.
- We need to clearly define terms such as “findings,” “performance analysis,” etc.
- Some programs felt that program review presentations should have included all initiatives, not just those ranked high; some people felt that the program review presentations were too long and should be condensed further.
- Some classified staff felt that they did not have sufficient input into the process of establishing outcomes.
- The process currently does not include qualitative data.
- Some felt that they could summarize the data but not analyze it, so additional training will be required.
- We need to be sure that faculty and staff members are aware –and know how to find – the Program Review System Handbook. Many were not aware this time.
- In the future, we should re-look at our program list. Some of the programs could probably be combined, and we need to put particular emphasis on Title 5 language that defines educational programs: *an organized sequence of courses leading to a defined objective, a degree, a certificate, a diploma, a license, or transfer to another institution of higher education*. Reports from other areas that do not offer a degree or a certificate (i.e., English or Math) might be referred to as “departmental” reviews.
- Many of the service areas did not have sufficient data for incorporation into the program review process because, in most cases, it is data collected by the program, not the college.

A survey was sent to all faculty, staff, and managers at the end of the fall semester. The results of the survey

are provided below. The survey, including all comments, is available on the college website under “Program Review.”

Survey questions and summarized responses follow:

1) What is your position with the college?

- 51.5% Full-time faculty
- 17.8% Part-time faculty
- 13.3% Classified staff
- 11.1% Department chairs
- 4.4% Managers
- 2.2% Classified Supervisors

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

- Reviewed data 80.0%
- Attended a meeting to discuss program review 77.8%
- Created or revised program-level SLOs, student success outcomes, or operating outcomes 71.1%
- Created initiatives 66.7%
- Ranked initiatives 62.2%
- Developed initiatives using data 57.8%
- Collected data (services only) 26.7%

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

- Yes 66.7%
- No 13.3%
- Don't know 20.0%

4) Was the process sufficiently collaborative?

- Program Level
 - Yes 73.3%
 - No 26.7%
- Division Level
 - Yes 65.8%
 - No 34.2%

5) Instructional Programs: Was your program provided with sufficient data?

- Yes 55.6%
- No 44.4%

- 6) Service Programs: Was your program able to obtain sufficient data?
- Yes 63.2%
 - No 36.8%

- 7) Do you agree that you have been adequately prepared for next year's program review process as a result of the training and data assistance you received during this year's process?

Outcomes development:

- Strongly agree 13.3%
- Agree 64.4%
- Disagree 17.8%
- Strongly disagree 4.4%

Data analysis:

- Strongly agree 11.6%
- Agree 58.1%
- Disagree 20.9%
- Strongly disagree 9.3%

- 8) What worked well for this year's program review process?

Summarized responses:

- Sample program reviews provided a good model
- Overall professionalism and team effort was encouraged and nurtured; leadership was first rate
- Department meetings were open and instructive; chair was collaborative
- Collaboration with instructors in the program
- Facilitator was very helpful
- Division meeting worked well
- Overall collaborative approach

- 9) Explain what did not work well with this year's program review process?

Summarized responses:

- Data collection software is needed
- Time constraints
- Ranking of initiatives at division meeting was ineffective and disorganized
- Lack of collaboration at the program level
- More information was needed to make sound decisions about rankings
- Program plans were not connected with college planning

Next Steps:

- 1) Implement new program review software
- 2) Create timeline for next program review cycle
- 3) Form subgroup from service area to revise program review template for services
- 4) Form subgroup to review and revise program review based on input from faculty and staff
- 5) Manage and provide data needed by instructional programs more efficiently

Clarify program and division processes, including voting and collaboration

Section 4: Ventura College Profile and Institutional Effectiveness Report

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 **2012–2013**, 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 2009–2010 and 2010–2011	Met Goal
2	Course Success Rate	Exceeded baseline rate in 2009–2010 and 2010–2011	Met Goal
3a	Retention Rate – All	Exceeded baseline rate in 2009–2010 and 2010–2011	Met Goal
3b	Retention Rates – Ethnicity	Blacks and Native Americans were below their benchmarks	Goal Not Met
4	Student Satisfaction	Target goals to be established in 2012–2013	----
5a	Active Learning	CCSSE – 2010: Below peer group mean by 4.2 points	Goal Not Met
5b	Student Effort	CCSSE – 2010: Below peer group mean by 3.6 points	Goal Not Met
5c	Academic Challenge	CCSSE – 2010: Below peer group mean by 2.5 points	Goal Not Met
5d	Student-Faculty	CCSSE – 2010: Below peer group mean by 2.8 points	Goal Not Met
5e	Support for Learners	CCSSE – 2010: Below peer group mean by 0.4 point	Goal Not Met
6a	Student Progress	ARCC – 2012: Below peer group mean by 3.3 percent points	Goal Not Met
6b	% Students with 30 Units	ARCC – 2012: Below peer group mean by 2.1 percent points	Goal Not Met
6c	Persistence Rate	ARCC – 2012: Above peer group mean by 0.8 percent point	Met Goal
6d	Completion – Vocational	ARCC – 2012: Below peer group mean by 2.0 percent points	Goal Not Met
6e	Completion – Basic Skills	ARCC – 2012: Above peer group mean by 6.1 percent points	Met Goal
6f	Improvement – Basic Skills	ARCC – 2012: Above peer group mean by 7.1 percent points	Met Goal
6g	Improvement – ESL	ARCC – 2012: Below peer group mean by 38.7 percent points	Goal Not Met
7	Degrees and Certificates	Exceeded baseline rate in 2009–2010 and 2010–2011	Met Goal
8a	Transfer to 4-Year Schools	Exceeded baseline rate in 2010–2011	Met Goal
8b	Transfer Velocity	Currently in baseline year	----
8c	Transfer Certified	Exceeded baseline rate in 2009–2010 and 2010–2011	Met Goal
9a	Registered Nursing	Exceeded baseline rate in 2009–2010 and 2010–2011	Met Goal
9b	Certified Nurse Assistant	Exceeded baseline rate in 2009–2010 and 2010–2011	Met Goal
9c	Paramedic	Exceeded baseline rate in 2009–2010 and 2010–2011	Met Goal
9d	EMT	Below baseline rate in 2009–2010 and 2010–2011	Goal Not Met
10	Annual FTES	2010 – 2011 FTES of 10,704 exceeds mid-size threshold	Met Goal
11	Faculty Productivity	Productivity exceeded goal in 2008–09, 2009–10, & 2010–11	Met Goal
12	75/25 Ratio	FT-FTEF has increased each term from fall 2008 to fall 2011	Met Goal
13	Institutional SLO's	Baseline standards to be established in 2012–2013	----

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS MEASURES

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. Campuswide 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 Scorecard for the Core Indicators of Effectiveness 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 Scorecard for 2011–2012 indicates that in 15 of the 29 areas, effectiveness goals were met. For Course Completion Rate, Course Success Rate, and overall Retention Rate, the college met the goals, but Retention Rates for two student groups, Blacks and Native Americans, were below their respective baseline. A Student Satisfaction Survey will be developed at the district level in the 2012–2013 academic year; benchmarks for Ventura College will be established by the CPC. For the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) indicators, the college did not meet any of the five benchmarks; however, efforts are already underway to address these results. In regards to the Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC) indicators, three of seven goals were met. The figures for ESL Improvement were incorrect due to coding issues and it will require corrected data in order to be properly evaluated. In the area of Degrees and Certificates, the goal was met.

Areas in which the college did not meet its baseline goals will be discussed at the first CPC meeting of the fall 2012 semester and in initial meetings of the Academic Senate. As noted above, efforts to address some of the areas have already started. The college's USDE Title V–HSI Co-operative grant (2010–2015) has a large professional development component through which activities to improve active learning in the classroom have been developed – e.g., the Summer Institute for Teaching Excellence (SITE) which was held in summer 2011 and summer 2012. Additionally, in 2012, the college was awarded a new individual Title V–HSI grant (2012–2017) in the area of transfer through improved institutional effectiveness. This grant also has a professional development component which will focus on activities related to assisting faculty “to teach across the curriculum,” particularly in the area of high-risk transfer courses. The grant will also provide funding for improving academic support services, such as Supplemental Instruction and the Reading/Writing Center, which will be expanded to include transfer-level courses. Also, the institution's research capacity will be improved through the collection, analysis, and utilization of qualitative data to complement our existing quantitative data. Improving the Student Learning Outcomes process is another area that will be addressed under the grant.

The evaluator for the new Title V–HSI grant is USC's Center for Urban Education and the Equity Scorecard. Meetings with USC will begin in August. The initial focus will be on making better use of the college's disaggregated institutional data and enhancing professional development capacity. At the college's mandatory flex day meeting in August 2012, a basic skills workshop entitled “What Works: A Framework for Student Success” will be presented to faculty, staff, and administrators from across the campus. The workshop will include a student panel, a faculty panel, and a presentation of data, both qualitative and quantitative. The five areas from the CCSSE report will be highlighted at the workshop, plus suggestions/assignments previously gathered by faculty to address basic skills issues have been organized into a Toolkit, which will be distributed to faculty and staff and placed on the college's website.

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS MEASURES

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%**. In 2009 – 2010, the completion rate was **84.4%**, which **exceeded** the baseline by **1.0** percentage point. The 2010 – 2011 course completion rate of **85.0%** also **exceeded** the baseline (by **1.6** percentage points).

Tables A-1 and **A-2**, below, 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%**. In 2009 – 2010, the success rate was **67.4%**, which **exceeded** the baseline by **0.7** percentage point. The 2010 – 2011 success rate of **69.0%** also **exceeded** the baseline (by **2.3** 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				
Year 4	2012 – 2013				

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		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	2008 – 2009		2009 – 2010		2010 – 2011		2011 – 2012		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%				
Completed	64,253	83.4%	65,989	84.4%	65,562	85.0%				
Successful	51,345	66.7%	52,617	67.4%	52,972	69.0%				

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 Native American were the only ethnic groups whose **fall 2010** cohorts did **not meet/exceed** their respective baseline retention rate (fall 2010 rates are highlighted in **pink**).

Ventura College Fall to Fall Retention Rates									
Category	Baseline			Fall 2009 Cohort			Fall 2010 Cohort		
	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Retain Rate	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Retain Rate	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Retain Rate
Asian / PI	176	110	62.5%	147	88	59.9%	134	85	63.4%
Black	98	56	57.1%	87	37	42.5%	84	47	56.0%
Hispanic	1,330	744	55.9%	1,330	723	54.4%	1,210	676	55.9%
Nat Amer	30	15	50.0%	43	17	39.5%	34	16	47.1%
White	1,014	508	50.1%	960	540	56.3%	693	396	57.1%
Other	214	113	52.8%	134	70	52.2%	57	34	59.6%
Unknown	33	16	48.5%	52	30	57.7%	12	9	75.0%
Totals	2,895	1,562	54.0%	2,753	1,505	54.7%	2,224	1,263	56.8%

4. Student Satisfaction

In **2012 – 2013**, 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:

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

The most recent administration of the CCSSE at Ventura College was in **spring 2010**. 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 Ventura College in spring 2010 are as follows:

Benchmarks	VC Score	Mean	Difference
a. Active and Collaborative Learning	46.8	50	- 3.2
b. Student Effort	46.4	50	- 3.6
c. Academic Challenge	47.5	50	- 2.5
d. Student-Faculty Interaction	47.2	50	- 2.8
e. Support for Learners	49.6	50	- 1.4

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 both 2009 – 2010 and 2010 – 2011.

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				

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 2010–2011.

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				

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**) will be published in fall 2012.

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**.

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 **2010 – 2011** 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) 2009 – 2010	(c) 2010 – 2011	Difference (c) – (a)
a. Registered Nursing	92%	93%	96%	+ 4
b. Certified Nursing Assistant	94%	97%	96%	+ 2
c. Paramedic	100%	100%	100%	0
d. Emergency Medical Technician	84%	82%	82%	- 2

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 **2010 – 2011** Ventura College's FTES of **10,704** **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.

Over each of the past three years, the college has **exceeded** its VCCCD Productivity Goals.

Ventura College College Productivity					
Fiscal Year	WSCH	Ventura College FTEF	Productivity	VCCCD Goal	Difference VC – VCCCD
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.

Over each of the past three years, the college has **continued** to make progress toward the **75 / 25** ratio.

Ventura College Full-Time / Part-Time Ratio				
Term	Full-Time FTEF	Part-time FTEF	Total FTEF	Full-Time / Part-Time Ratio
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.

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS MEASURES

D. Student Satisfaction Survey

In **spring 2013**, 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 **2012 – 2013**, 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.

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS MEASURES

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.

District Effectiveness Measures	VC Core Indicators of Effectiveness
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