Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report

Ventura County Community College District
255 West Stanley Avenue, Suite 150, Ventura, CA 93001

and

Ventura College
4667 Telegraph Road, Ventura, CA 93003

A Confidential Report Prepared
for the
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
Ventura College/Ventura County Community College District

on

November 13-14, 2012

Dr. Gilbert H. Stork, Superintendent/President
San Luis Obispo County Community College District/Cuesta College
Team Chair

Ventura County Community College District
Team Rosters

Ventura College

Dr. Gilbert H. Stork (Chair and Chair of chairs for VCCCD)
Superintendent/President
San Luis Obispo County Community College District/Cuesta College

Ms. Sheri Sterner
Director/Institutional Effectiveness
Orange Coast College

Ms. Georgie Monahan
Faculty/Program Review Coordinator
Orange Coast College

Mr. Trevor Stewart
Director of Business Services
Butte College

Oxnard College

Dr. Jack Daniels (Chair)
President
Los Angeles Southwest College

Dr. Donald Singer
Trustee
San Bernardino Community College District

Moorpark College

Dr. Jackie Fisher, Sr. (Chair)
Superintendent/President
Antelope Valley Community College District/Antelope Valley College

Dr. Edward Karp
Associate Dean of Instructional Research and Planning
Glendale College

Follow-Up Visit Report

DATE: December 3, 2012

TO: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

FROM: Gilbert H. Stork, Ed.D., Team Chair

SUBJECT: Report of Follow-Up Visit Team to Ventura College/Ventura CCC District
November 13-14, 2012

Introduction

A comprehensive visit was conducted at the Ventura County Community College District
(VCCCD) as well as Ventura College, Moorpark College, and Oxnard College on October 11-
14, 2010. At its meeting of January 11-13, 2011, the Commission issued a Warning for Ventura
College and Oxnard College and required them to submit a Follow-Up Report addressing
identified recommendations followed by a visit. Moorpark College was not cited for any
recommendations but was required to address its assessment of the VCCCD's response to the
District recommendations. In January 2012, the Commission imposed Probation on all three
colleges in the VCCCD.

The visiting teams, Chaired by Dr. Gil Stork (Ventura College), Dr. Debbie Travis (Moorpark
College), and Dr. Jack Daniels (Oxnard College) conducted the follow-up site visit to VCCCD
and the three Colleges from October 31-November 1, 2011. The purpose of the team visits was
to verify that the Follow-Up Reports prepared by the VCCCD and the Colleges were accurate
through examination of evidence, to determine if sustained, continuous, and positive
improvements had been made at the institution, and that the institution had resolved the
deficiencies noted by the comprehensive evaluation team and meets the Eligibility Requirements,
Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies.

At its meeting of January 10-12, 2012, the Commission took action to impose Probation on the
three colleges of the district. These actions required VCCCD and Ventura College to submit
Follow-Up Reports addressing identified district and college recommendations followed by a
visit. Moorpark College and Oxnard College were not cited for any college-level
recommendations but were required to address their assessment of the VCCCD's response to the
District recommendations

Three visiting teams were formed for Ventura College, chaired by Dr. Stork; for Oxnard College,
chaired by Dr. Jack Daniels; and for Moorpark College, chaired by Dr. Jackie Fisher, Sr. Dr.
Stork was designated as the chair of the District evaluation. The Moorpark College and Oxnard
College teams conducted their campus visitations during the morning of Tuesday, November 13,

2012. The Moorpark team interviewed the President of Moorpark College, President of the Academic Senate, President and Vice President of the Classified Senate, Interim Executive Vice President, an academic Dean, and Institutional Research Coordinator. Interviews were conducted by the Oxnard College team, including the Oxnard College President, the Executive Vice President, President of the Academic Senate, and the President of the Classified Senate.

The three teams met at the District Office at midday for a team meeting, then conducted interviews with the Chancellor of the Ventura CCC District, members of the Board of Trustees, members of the Ventura CCCD executive staff, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources, and members of the District Council Administrative Services. The three teams also attended a portion of a regular meeting of the Board of Trustees in the evening.

On Wednesday, November 14, 2012, the Ventura team visited the campus of Ventura College to conduct its interviews and validate the contents of the Follow-Up Report. Interviews were held with the President of Ventura College, Vice President of Administrative Services, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, Technology Support Services Supervisor, President of the Academic Senate, President of the Classified Senate, Director of Facilities, Maintenance, and Operations, and representatives from the Budget and Resource Council, Facilities Oversight Group, Technology Committee, Student Learning Outcomes Committee, and the College Planning Council.

The Follow-Up Report and visits were expected to document resolution of the following seven (7) District recommendations, one (1) Commission Concern, and four (4) Ventura College recommendations.

DISTRICT RECOMMENDATIONS

District Recommendation 1:
In order to meet the Standards, the District, in concert with the three Colleges, shall develop clearly defined organizational maps that delineate the primary and secondary responsibilities of each, the College-to-College responsibilities, and that also incorporate the relationship of major District and College committees established to assure the integrity of activities related to such areas as budget, research, planning, and curriculum. (IV.B.3.a-b, IV.B.3.g)

District Recommendation 2:
In order to meet the Standard, the District, in concert with the three Colleges, shall document evidence that a review of District Policies and Procedures that may impede the timely and effective operations of the departments of the Colleges has taken place and that appropriate modifications are made that facilitate the operational effectiveness of the Colleges. A calendar that identifies a timeline for the regular and consistent review of policies shall be developed. (IV.B.1.e)

District Recommendation 3:
In order to increase effectiveness, the Teams recommend that the District conduct a periodic outcomes assessment and analysis of its strategic planning and decision-making processes, leading to sustainable continuous quality improvement in educational effectiveness in support of student learning and district-wide operations. (IV.B.3)

District Recommendation 4:
In order to improve communications, the Teams recommend that the District assess the effectiveness of its formal communications and utilize constituency and community input/feedback data to implement improvements to ensure that open and timely communication regarding expectations of educational excellence, operational planning, and integrity continues and is enhanced at all levels of the organization. (III.A.3, IV.B.3)

District Recommendation 5:
In order to meet the Standard, the Board of Trustees shall complete an analysis of its self-assessment pursuant to Board Policy 2745 and formally adopt expected outcomes and measures for continuous quality improvement that will be assessed and reported as a component of the immediately succeeding self-assessment. (IV.B.1.g)

District Recommendation 6:
In order to meet the Standards, the Board of Trustees shall establish clearly written policies and corresponding procedures to ensure that decision-making is administered by staff in an equitable and consistent manner across and within the three Colleges. (III.A.3.a, III.A.4.c, IV.B.1.b-c)

District Recommendation 7:
In order to meet the Standards, the Board of Trustees shall assess its actions in relation to its policy making role and implement a program for ongoing Board member professional development to enhance and improve the demonstration of its primary leadership role in

assuring the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services delivered by the District Colleges. (IV.A.3, IV.B.1. e-g)

Commission Concern:
The team report confirmed that board development activities had been provided and all board members were encouraged to attend. At the same time, the team expressed concern about the consistency and long-term sustainability of the Board's demonstration of its primary leadership role and reiterates its recommendation for evidence of ongoing professional development for all Board members. Specifically, the Commission notes a particular board member's disruptive and inappropriate behavior and the entire board's responsibility to address and curtail it. (Eligibility Requirement 3; Standard IV.B.1.g, h, i) The Commission also notes that the continued behavior and non-compliance of the District jeopardizes the accreditation of the VCCCD Colleges.

District/College Responses to the Team Recommendations

General Observations and Comments:
The teams found Ventura College, Moorpark College, Oxnard College, and the Ventura County Community College District had initiated specific actions to respond to the seven recommendations and the Commission concern provided in the College's October 2011 Follow-Up Report. Evidence of such activities reflected considerable effort over the past year focused on resolving the issues and bringing the District, and thus the Colleges, into compliance with the Accreditation Standards. The evidentiary CD provided documentation of such activities (received by the follow-up teams by mail prior to the visit), and direct interviews affirmed the scope and chronology of District and College data gathering, dialogue, and policy development work.

The follow-up teams also assessed the College and District levels of effort and progress in dealing with the multiple concerns cited in the recommendations. Team members noted that much work had been accomplished and a renewed sense of pride and confidence prevailed among the various campuses and District office. The presence of a new Chancellor has created a new dimension at the District leadership team. Specific findings regarding the resolution and/or progress on the recommendations are provided in the following sections of this report.

District Recommendation 1:
In order to meet the Standards, the District, in concert with the three Colleges, shall develop clearly defined organizational maps that delineate the primary and secondary responsibilities of each, the College to College responsibilities, and that also incorporate the relationship of major District and College committees established to assure the integrity of activities related to such areas as budget, research, planning, and curriculum. (IV.B.3.a-b, IV.B.3.g)

Findings and Evidence: The teams reviewed the evidence presented in support of meeting the recommendation. The teams found that the District, in concert with the three Colleges, had developed organizational maps that were clear and delineated primary and secondary

responsibilities of each College. The *Participatory Governance Handbook* clearly outlined the responsibilities and relationship between and among the Colleges and the District. The *Handbook* outlines how College and District employees are involved in the processes and how decisions are made. There is a statement that reflects the mutual working agreement that is being adhered to in the District. Those agreements are reflected in the working practices of District governance, advisory and operational groups.

Additionally, the support of the District, through the Chancellor, is evidenced in the written commitment to the collaborative workings of the District. The *Handbook* also outlines the District Consultative Structure and the General Operating Agreements for District groups. Further, the relationship of College and District groups is also documented. The role and responsibility of the Board of Trustees has been clearly defined in that the Board develops, reviews, and monitors District policies as opposed to functioning in an operational role.

Roles of the District Chancellor, faculty, classified staff, administrators and students are clearly defined in the *Handbook*. The administrative decision-making bodies - Chancellor's Cabinet, District Consultation Council, Administrative Technology Advisory Committee, District Council on Accreditation and Planning, District Council on Human Resources, and the Institutional Research Advisory Committee – have been defined with their charge, membership and meeting timelines.

Governance Recommending Bodies – District Council on Academic Affairs, District Technical Review Workgroup – Instructional, District Technical Review Workgroup – Student Services, District Council on Administrative Services, and the Instructional Technology Advisory Committee – have been equally defined in the same format as the decision-making bodies. The organizational changes in each of these groups reflect the assessment the Colleges and the District conducted of their previous organizational decision-making structures. As a result of the assessment, the Colleges and the District are more structured in their organization and responsibilities.

The functional mapping, as evidenced in the *Handbook's* procedures and identified in its appendices, outline the division of roles and responsibilities of the Board of Trustees, Chancellor, Presidents, Vice-Chancellors and related governance committees. Each major area - budget, research, planning, and curriculum - has been addressed through the establishment of cross committees that assess each of these functional areas. The functional mapping, inclusive of the roles and responsibilities of the organizational entities throughout the Colleges and the District, has been disseminated and vetted among the senates, collective bargaining groups, administration, the Board and the Colleges. Board meeting minutes indicated the discussions and actions as well as evidence provided that reflected College-wide dissemination and dialogue.

Evidence was provided and confirmed through interviews with faculty, staff, and administrators that the organizational functions are being adhered to, and the process includes annual assessment to ensure sustainability of the roles and responsibilities as outlined.

Conclusion: The District, in concert with the three Colleges, completed its functional mapping and has incorporated College-to-College responsibilities and their relationship to the District.

Further, there was evidence of incorporating District and College committees relating to budget, academic (curriculum) and student services, strategic planning and research. The teams concluded that VCCCD has addressed all components of this recommendation, resolved the deficiencies and now meet Standards.

District Recommendation 2:

In order to meet the Standards, the District, in concert with the three Colleges, shall document evidence that a review of District Policies and Procedures that may impede the timely and effective operations of the departments of the Colleges has taken place and that appropriate modifications are made that facilitate the operational effectiveness of the Colleges. A calendar that identifies a timeline for the regular and consistent review of policies shall be developed (IV.B.1.e)

Findings and Evidence: The teams reviewed the evidence presented in support of meeting the recommendation. The District, in concert with the three Colleges, has reviewed a number of critical District Policies and Procedures that have an effect on the Colleges' ability to carry out their mission. In March, 2011, the Board implemented a two-year process to review District policies. The Team confirmed the progress that the District had made in reviewing the policies. It was reported and confirmed that the District will be able to complete its two-year cycle of review of existing policies during the winter, 2013.

As of the date of the visit, the Student Service Policy Review Plan was nearly 70% complete as well as the Human Resources policies. The general institutional policies were nearly 50% complete. All constituent groups were found to be involved, as appropriate, in the review of the policies. It was evidenced in the documents that were submitted and affirmed with the interviews conducted at the Colleges and the District that there was widespread discussion and dissemination of the review and resolution relating to policy and procedure refinement.

The Board of Trustees' Policy Committee reviewed these recommended policies and procedures which were then presented for full Board approval during scheduled Board meetings as evidenced in their agendas and meeting minutes. Many of the policies have led to procedures being implemented as referenced in the example of "Business Tools, Forms and Procedures" through the District's *SharePoint* site. The recently implemented *Annual Survey* is being used to gather information on enhancing the flow of information throughout the district and identifying those policies that have been difficult to implement or needed further structure. An example of addressing impediments to operational effectiveness was the Field Trip/Excursion electronic process. This was an impediment identified through faculty and rose to the Administrative Services Council. After a series of discussions and reviews, a new workflow process was implemented that minimized the impediment.

It should be noted that the Board has implemented a *Best Practices Agreement* that guides their actions to be consistent with the policies and procedures of the District. The actions of the Board in relationship to their roles and responsibilities are also noted in the *Participatory Governance Handbook,* district wide communications, as well as through the *Annual Survey.*

Conclusion: The teams found that VCCCD has developed a process to review, assess and modify policies and procedures of the District. There is strong evidence that procedures that impeded operational effectiveness were reviewed as part of the assessment and were refined to ensure efficiency and effectiveness. The District and Colleges have implemented a process that identifies impediments to effectiveness and provides a framework to minimize the impediment. The teams concluded that the process for assessment and improvement is sustainable. The teams concluded that the recommendation has been addressed, the deficiencies resolved, and the Standards met.

District Recommendation 3:
In order to meet the Standards, the Teams recommend that the District conduct a periodic outcomes assessment and analysis of its strategic planning and decision-making processes, leading to a sustainable continuous quality improvement in educational effectiveness in support of student learning and district-wide operations. (IV.B.3)

Findings and Evidence: The teams reviewed the evidence presented in support of meeting the recommendation. The teams found that the District has reviewed its strategic planning and decision-making process. As indicated earlier, the review of policies that address the decision-making process resulted in refinement of policies that reflected the roles and responsibilities of constituent groups and employees. Through the *Participatory Governance Handbook* and its functional map, the delineation of role and responsibilities has been clarified and documented.

Additionally, the teams found that the documents relating to strategic planning and decision-making processes have been disseminated throughout the Colleges and the District. The District, subsequent to assessing its planning processes, revised its integrated planning cycle, and it is being monitored through the Board of Trustees, the District Council on Accreditation and Planning, and the Consultation Council. Each of the district-wide council's review, as stated in the *Handbook*, planning processes and their own decision-making processes. These processes are assessed annually and the outcomes are reported including any adjustments that are to be made.

The integrated planning manual has been created and timelines have been established to monitor improvement. A *District-wide Institutional Effectiveness Report* has been developed and is being monitored by the District Committee for Accreditation and Planning (DCAP). DCAP provided leadership in developing the framework for the *Institutional Effectiveness Report*. The Institutional Research Advisory committee (IRAC) provided technical expertise in identifying and extracting appropriate data sets for the *Institutional Effectiveness Report*. IRAC maintains a data mine and provides appropriate data sets and data trends for the monitoring of continual quality effectiveness in programs and services and district-wide operations. The report focuses on several student success indices that relate to effectiveness of processes to enhance student success. These data are being used to develop interventions to address student success which, in turn, are tied to planning, assessment, and decision-making.

The District-wide *Institutional Effectiveness Report* delineates the outcomes for corresponding annual Board Goals. The first report on Institutional Effectiveness was presented at the 2012 Board Planning Session. The Board assessed the report and made an annual plan toward reaching

9

sustainable continuous quality improvement in its integrated strategic plan. The Board committed to having a report on institutional effectiveness presented, reviewed and discussed annually and institutionalized as part of its assessment processes.

The teams reviewed the District Integrated Planning Model. This model is the overarching framework for District level planning. The plan links each of the Colleges' and services' plans with the District and its services. The process of assessment is conducted over a six-year period. It is clearly stated what will be assessed and the methodology that will be utilized. The annual implementation plan focuses on each of the Board goals and strategic objectives and is assessed annually. The results of the annual assessment are presented to the Board for its review. The assessment includes progress from identified benchmarks relating to student success, operational efficiency and finances. Included in the planning were each College's budget development processes and related linkages back to District-wide planning.

Each of the processes and manuals (e.g., VCCCD *Integrated Planning Manual*) are reviewed and updated annually to document changes and improvements. The refinement of the current VCCCD Integrated Planning Manual was the result of a review of the previous manual and subsequent improvements made to effectuate an improved process with greater clarity. The team confirmed that the District and College planning through its cycle of review and assessment and linkage with Board of Trustees' goals is sustainable. There also appears to be a renewed commitment to ensuring continuous quality improvement throughout the District and its Colleges.

Conclusion: The teams found that there are well-defined processes to review the planning process, and timelines are clear and reasonable. The teams also found that outcomes assessment data and other elements of institutional effectiveness are integrated into both the District and College planning processes. There is a linkage between Recommendation 1 and 3 in that delineation of responsibility is important in addressing the decision-making process at VCCCD. There is indication that the process of assessment-related actions will lead to sustainable continuous quality improvement in effecting student success. The teams conclude that VCCCD has fully addressed this recommendation, resolved deficiencies, and now meets Standards.

District Recommendation 4:
In order to improve communications, the Teams recommend that the District assess the effectiveness of its formal communications and utilize constituency and community input/feedback data to implement improvements to ensure that open and timely communication regarding expectations of educational excellence, operational planning, and integrity continues and is enhanced at all levels of the organization. (III.A.3, IV.B.3)

Findings and Evidence: The 2011 visiting team found that the District had addressed most of the recommendation, but recommended that the District "incorporate regular assessments of formal communications such as committee self-appraisal and employee surveys, to ensure improved communications and fully address" the Standards. The Colleges confirm that the District, through the Consultation Council, has taken steps to improve the effectiveness of its formal communications. The College reports also made a claim that the process of reviewing

and revising of the District *Participatory Governance Handbook* provided evidence to validate better communication has occurred between the Colleges and District office.

After conducting interviews with College employees, the teams were able to confirm that formal communications are being assessed through committee self-appraisal surveys and through an employee survey conducted in September 2012. Employees at all of the Colleges believe that communication has improved and that there is more communication brought back from District committees to College constituent groups. Examples of communication leading to improvements include the simplification of the District field trip approval form and the District response to a 2011 change in parking permit procedures initiated by the District that had negative effects on registration and student flow at District Colleges. In both cases, feedback from the Colleges was taken seriously by the District and addressed through process improvements.

After conducting additional interviews with College employees and District Office staff, the teams were able to confirm that communication regarding human resources processes and issues has improved significantly. The implementation of *HR Tools*, which provides electronic access to forms and procedures, was noted in previous Follow-Up Reports and is perceived as a good example of improved communication. Employees stated to the team that the District's Human Resources staff attended Administrative Council meetings once a month to seek resolutions to open issues. Also, employees stated that communication between the Colleges and District staff is much better as evidenced from results of surveys administered recently. Employees stated that the priority registration system for students was improved after staff listening to College staff recommendations to reduce the number of students attempting to register for classes in person. In addition, the District is implementing *HR Talk*, a "talk show" designed to address human resources questions.

Conclusion: The teams found that communication between College employees and District staff members have improved significantly. The team determined that the VCCCD, in conjunction with the Colleges, now meets Standard III.A.3 and Standard IV.B.3. In their response to District Recommendation 4, the teams believe that the District and Colleges have met this recommendation and resolved the deficiencies.

District Recommendation 5:
In order to meet the Standard, the Board of Trustees shall complete an analysis of its self assessment pursuant to Board Policy 2745 and formally adopt expected outcomes and measures for continuous quality improvement that will be addressed and reported as a component of the immediately succeeding self-assessment. (IV.B.1.g)

Findings and Evidence: The Colleges' Follow-Up Reports indicate the Board of Trustees implemented strategies to improve its communication with both internal and external stakeholders after reviewing results of a self-assessment survey. Also, the reports stated that the Board of Trustees has agreed to establish an ongoing self-evaluation process to improve their ability to communicate more effectively with both stakeholder groups.

11

The 2011 evaluation visiting team found that the Board had addressed most of this recommendation, but that the continuous improvement component of the recommendation could not be assessed until the annual Board self-evaluation session in June 2012. The Board self-evaluation survey was conducted in May 2012. The survey was completed by the Board members and by members of the District Consultation Council.

At the June 26, 2012 Board of Trustees strategic planning session, the results of the survey were presented, and a summative self-evaluation was conducted. The results showed several discrepancies between Board members' perceptions of the Board's performance and Consultation Council members' perceptions. The Consultation Council members were generally more negative about issues such as Trustee involvement in operational matters, the Board acting as a coherent unit, and the Board adhering to its policy-making role. In interviews with Board members, the team found that the discrepancies in perceptions were surprising and taken very seriously. Interviews and meeting minutes confirm that the evaluation based on the revised self-assessment and the Board's revised procedures for dealing with inappropriate behavior have resulted in improvements. This was further evidenced by the Board of Trustees taking action to respond to inappropriate comments by two Board members during recent meetings. College and District employees are hopeful that these responses signal a long-term change in how the Board operates. In interviews, employees expressed their perception that Board self-monitoring has improved, and that the entire Board now realizes that it is its responsibility to monitor itself and respond quickly to inappropriate behavior.

Conclusion: After interviewing College employees, District staff, and individual Board members, the team concluded that the Board has implemented a professional development process to improve individual member's skills. This professional development process is dependent on an on-going self-evaluation to identify inefficiencies involving performance of Board members. The teams conclude that the District has met this recommendation.

District Recommendation 6:
In order to meet the Standards, the Board of Trustees shall establish clearly written policies and corresponding procedures to ensure that decision-making is administered by staff in an equitable and consistent manner across and within the three Colleges. (III.A.3.a, III.A.4.c, IV.B.1.b-c)

Findings and Evidence: The Colleges' Follow-Up reports indicate that the District implemented a three-pronged strategy to ensure all policies and administrative procedures are administered District-wide in an equitable and consistent manner. The team interviewed employees at the Colleges and District office to assess that equitable application of policies and procedures are being performed. The team was able to affirm the process for equitable input from Colleges was occurring. The various College employees stated that communication is better now due to the revision of the *Participatory Governance Handbook* and the corresponding clarifications to decision-making structures.

Communications between the District and the Colleges have improved, and there are many examples of the District using College feedback to make improvements. Two examples of

improved processes are the often-cited simplification of the field trip approval process and the improved electronic access to forms and processes through *Human Resources Tools* and *Business Tools* shared sites.

Through interviews with employees at the Colleges and the District Office, the team was able to confirm that policies for recommending hiring of academic leadership are being revised to increase inclusion of College personnel on screening committees. These policies will broaden the membership of the hiring committees as requested by the College. In the Human Resources area, these changes in policies and operations processes are approaching the implementation and/or review stages, and direct impact on day-to-day operations is anticipated. The fact that the changes are underway affords a greater sense of empowerment. The College employees that were interviewed by the teams were not aware of any examples of procedures that are being applied inequitably or inconsistently across Colleges.

Conclusion: The teams were able to confirm that the Colleges receive equitable participation from the District Office regarding input on policies and procedures, which may affect their decision making process. College personnel cited examples of procedures that are implemented consistently and equitably across Colleges, such as the granting of early tenure. The teams conclude that the District Office has met this recommendation.

District Recommendation 7:
In order to meet the Standards, the Board of Trustees shall assess its actions in relation to its policy making role and implement a program for ongoing Board member professional development to enhance and improve the demonstration of its primary leadership role in assuring the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services delivered by the District Colleges. (IV.A.3, IV.B.1. e-g)

Findings and Evidence: The teams noted a significant amount of work by the Board of Trustees in addressing this recommendation. The Board revised Board Policy/Administrative Procedure 2740 – Trustee Professional Development and Best Practices Agreement which was signed on March 13, 2012. In addition, the Board developed a Professional Development 2012/2013 Calendar of activities. In the spring 2012, the Board began assessing the effectiveness of its external professional development activities. In fall 2012, the Board integrated the evaluation of its internal professional development activities as part of its monthly Board meeting assessments. The Board has participated as a whole or in smaller numbers in thirteen activities since November 11, 2012. There remain an additional six professional development activities that are scheduled for the spring semester.

The Board members have demonstrated a commitment to professional development in order to enhance their performance. The Board has also taken action in February 2012 to ensure that it reviews its member's own ethical behavior and has procedures in place to advise, warn, sanction, and censure members regarding their conduct.

The teams also confirmed through interviews and documentation that the Board demonstrates its interest in self-monitoring by using monthly surveys as a means to regularly assess and improve

their performance. The Board has also solicited feedback from the members of the Consultation Council to help the Board continue to improve its performance as a policymaking body.

Conclusion: The efforts by the Board of Trustees to take responsibility for policing its own actions and implementing a continuous quality improvement professional development plan and calendar are commendable. The increased degree to which all members of the Board participate in these activities is also to be noted. The teams conclude that the District has met this recommendation, resolved deficiencies, and now meets Standards.

<u>**Commission Concern (July 2, 2012 Action Letter):**</u>
The team report confirmed that board development activities had been provided and all board members were encouraged to attend. At the same time, the team expressed concern about the consistency and long-term sustainability of the Board's demonstration of its primary leadership role and reiterates its recommendation for evidence of ongoing professional development for all Board members. Specifically, the Commission notes a particular board member's disruptive and inappropriate behavior and the entire board's responsibility to address and curtail it. (Eligibility Requirement 3; Standard IV.B.1.g, h, i) The Commission also notes that the continued behavior and non-compliance of the District jeopardizes the accreditation of the VCCCD Colleges.

Findings and Evidence: The teams met with College employees, District Office staff, and individual members of the Board of Trustees to verify whether the Board has resolved the issues contained in the Commission Concern released in its action letter of February 1, 2012. In preparation for a special visit in April 2012, the Board was required to submit a Special Report by March 15, 2012 addressing the issues stated in the Commission Concern.

It was noted by the visiting team in April 2012 that the Board took this action seriously and began an intense self-evaluation. The team found the VCCCD had initiated specific actions in response to the Commission Concern provided in the Commission's action letter of February 1, 2012. Evidence of such activities reflected considerable effort over the months of February, March, and April which focused on resolving the issues and bringing the District into compliance with the Accreditation Standards.

February 6, 2012	The Chancellor held an emergency meeting with the Board Chair to plan for a study session and a special meeting of the Board of Trustees.
February 14, 2012	The Board held a study session to publicly review and discuss the Commission's action letter, dated February 2, 2012. It was noted that Board development and the need to demonstrate the Board's consistent leadership role were matters for immediate attention.
February 15, 2012	The Board ad hoc committee met to determine the documents needed for the meeting of the full Board on February 22.

February 22, 2012   The Board held a Special Board Meeting to formally acknowledge and accept the Commission Concern letter, provide Board professional development to ensure Board members clearly understood their roles and responsibilities pertaining to District leadership, and review Board policies and procedures to ensure consistent and sustainable Board member commitment to its leadership role. The Board also incorporated a presentation on the role of the Academic Senate and faculty in the accreditation process, presented by the three Academic Senate Presidents.

Board members adopted ground rules for all future Board and standing committee meetings, they reviewed Eligibility Requirement 3, and Accreditation Standards IV.B.1.g-i. They also reviewed and discussed all board policies related to the Standards in question and determined BP 2715 Board Ethics, BP 2740 Trustee Professional Development, and BP 2745 Board Self-Evaluation needed further strengthening to comply with the Commission Concern.

The entire Board committed to attending the CCLC Trustee Conference on May 4-6, 2012 in San Diego. They also committed to attend one additional conference/workshop by January 2013 as well as schedule professional development activities for Board meetings at least once per quarter.

March 7, 2012   The Board Policy Committee met to review and discuss Board policies and procedures for consistency and alignment with effective trusteeship. It was agreed that the Board needed to significantly clarify and strengthen BP 2715 Board Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice, BP 2430 Delegation of Authority to Chancellor, BP 2740 Trustee Professional Development, and BP 2745 Board Self-Evaluation in response to the Commission's Concern.

March 13, 2012   During this regular meeting of the Board of Trustees, the Board adopted changes to or reaffirmed the following Board policies:
- BP 2200 Board Duties and Responsibilities
- BP 2210 Officer
- BP 2215 Board Chair
- BP 2215 Role of the Board Chair
- BP 2430 Delegation of Authority to CEO
- BP 2434 Chancellor's Relationship with the Board
- BP 2710 Conflict of Interest
- BP 2712 Conflict of Interest Code-Form 700: Statement of Economic Interest
- BP 2715 Board Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice
- BP2720 Board Member Communication
- BP 2740 Trustee Professional Development
- BP 2745 Board Self-Evaluation

The Board also adopted a Board Professional Development Plan, approved a request to ACCJC to provide technical assistance to VCCCD, and approved the Special Report to ACCJC to address the Commission Concern.

The team acknowledged that the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor had mobilized efforts to seriously address the concerns voiced by the Commission. The ethics policy was greatly strengthened by adding language which more clearly outlined sanctions that would be imposed in the event of continued inappropriate conduct displayed by a member of the Board of Trustees.

However, the Commission Concern focused on two major areas: (1) the ability of the Board of Trustees to sustain its laudable efforts in professional development and leadership, and (2) the curtailing of the "disruptive and inappropriate behavior" of one of the members of the Board of Trustees. The teams determined that the Board has addressed the structural part of addressing the Commission Concern with its training and policy development.

The teams reviewed evidence that the Board has taken significant action since its March 15, 2012 Commission Concern Special Report and the April 16, 2012 visit by the Accrediting Commission evaluating team. In response to the Commission's Concern regarding a particular Trustee's role violations and the Board's lack of addressing and curtailing the Trustee's behavior, Board members recognized the need to actively utilize its improved policies and procedures to govern the actions of the entire Board to function effectively. One specific action taken by the Board of Trustees on June 19, 2012 to strengthen Board Policy 2715 Board Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice and Administrative Procedure 2715-A Board Code of Ethics was to include an opportunity for constituents to make verbal complaints in addition to written complaints as stated in the original Board Policy 2715.

Evidence of improved Board behavior was demonstrated when Board Policy 2715 Board Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice and Administrative Procedure 2715-A Board Code of Ethics were invoked by the Board on August 9, 2012 as a result of a verbal statement made by the Board Vice Chair at the July 10 Board Meeting regarding his perception of the April 16, 2012 Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report of Commission Concern and July 2, 2012 Accrediting Commission's Action Letter to VCCCD and its Colleges. The Board Chair immediately addressed the Vice Chair's verbal statement which violated the March 13, 2012 Board of Trustees Best Practices Agreement and took action on the matter in accordance with BP 2715/AP 2715-A Board Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice as follows:

- Alleged violation was addressed initially and immediately by the Board Chair.

- Upon a finding of sufficient cause, the Board Chair and the Interim Chancellor met with the Vice Chair to discuss the alleged violation and to seek resolution.

- Upon reaching resolution, the Board Chair provided during public Open Session on August 9, 2012 a verbal statement on behalf of the Board regarding the Trustee's

misconduct.

- In response, the Board Vice Chair provided a verbal statement of clarification and apology related to his verbal statement made at the July 10, 2012 Board meeting and expressed full commitment in support of the Board.

Board Policy 2715 Board Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice and Administrative Procedure 2715-A Board Code of Ethics were invoked on one other occasion following an inappropriate remark made by a Trustee in March 2012. Upon findings of sufficient cause, the Board Chair met with the Trustee to discuss the alleged misconduct and reached resolution. As a result, the Trustee issued an apology to the affected individuals, and the matter was deemed as resolved.

To clarify one Trustee's role and presence on the Oxnard College campus, the Trustee submitted a letter dated September 18, 2012 for the record, describing his job responsibilities with the Ventura County Human Services Department and attesting to the fact that he conducts no direct business with Oxnard College personnel as a result of the proximity of his assigned work space to the College environment. Furthermore, in an interview with the Chancellor, the teams became aware of plans to terminate the contract with the County for the use of the Oxnard College office space. This will allow the District to consider more appropriate uses of the District property to reduce costs, which will also alleviate the above-mentioned concern.

The teams participated in separate interview sessions involving each of the five current members of the Board of Trustees. Board members stated that they are developing a Communication Protocol Policy. A major component of the proposed Communication Protocol Policy will require Board members to direct issues to the Chancellor. The Chancellor will be responsible for resolving issues that are delivered to Board members.

Conclusion: The teams acknowledged the systematic work that the Board of Trustees and Chancellor have made in addressing the Commission Concern. The Board has recognized, and taken seriously, that it must take control of its actions and maintain its focus on the "The Big Three" i.e., accreditation, budget, and new leadership. Through interviews with College employees and reviewing the evidentiary documents, the teams were able to confirm that Board members understand their roles and responsibilities as policy-making and professional development.

Board members made statements that were confirmed through interviews, that their role has improved greatly, representing a noticeable change in the Board's attitudes. Employees are hopeful about the sustainability of this change, but during some employee interviews, concern was expressed about the sustainability of the Board's behavior.

At this point, even though it has only been nine months, the Board of Trustees has resolved the Commission Concern. It will be extremely important that this area of Board leadership and behavior be reviewed in the Mid-term report in 2013 for further evidence of sustainability.

Eligibility Requirement 3 In order to meet this requirement, the Board needs to demonstrate a consistent and sustainable ability to effectively function as a Board in carrying out its

responsibility for the quality, integrity, and financial stability of the District and for ensuring that the District's mission is being carried out. The individual members of the Board must demonstrate their ability to operate impartially on all matters relative to District business to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the District. The Board has demonstrated exceptional progress in addressing this Requirement, but the Mid-term report in 2013 will need to show evidence of the sustainability of the Board's efforts to be fully compliant with this Eligibility Requirement.

Standard 1V.B.1.g: The Board reviewed BP 2745 and modified its self-evaluation instrument following the comprehensive visit in November 2011. The follow-up team reported in its November 2012 report that the Board had developed objectives and eleven measurable activities for the 2011-2012 academic year, and an evaluation and analysis of achievement of these outcomes would occur at a Board session in May/June 2012. The Board completed this cycle and conducted an assessment of this process. The Board has met compliance with this Standard.

Standard 1V.B.1.h: The Board took serious action to revise and strengthen BP 2715 to more clearly identify expected behavior displayed by each member of the Board of Trustees. It further added language that identified various forms of sanction that could be administered in the event of a violation of this Board policy. The Board should be commended for taking this action. The Board has demonstrated enforcement of these policies to correct the behavior of at least two Board members. Reports from interviews indicate that the Board behavior has definitely improved during the period of time the new policies have been in force. To meet compliance with this Standard, the Board will need to provide evidence for the Mid-term report that the changes are sustainable.

Standard 1V.B.1.i: The Board has demonstrated that it has a desire to be informed and involved in the accreditation process. The evidence of its study session with ACCJC staff in November 2011, its special Board meeting in February 2012, the District Council on Accreditation and Planning was established in March 2012, attending accreditation sessions for Trustees at the November 2012 Community College League of California annual conference, and a technical assistance visit from ACCJC in January 2013 indicate the Board's sincere efforts to be knowledgeable and conversant on accreditation matters. The Board has met compliance with this standard.

VENTURA COLLEGE RECOMMENDATIONS

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

College Recommendation 4:
In order to fully meet this Standard, the team recommends that the College must examine and provide evidence that appropriate leadership is addressing the various initiatives and programs on campus that support student learning. Efforts in online learning technology, basic skills initiatives, and SLOS lack an oversight committee or person responsible to oversee each of these projects and to ensure that they are implemented College wide in a manner that best serves the interests of student learning. (II.A, II.B)

College Recommendation 6:
As noted in 2004, in order to fully meet this Standard, the team recommends that the College must develop a funding plan for new and modernized facilities based on the concept of Total Cost of Ownership. The plan must address the necessary staffing and other support costs to operate these facilities. (III.B.2.a)

College Recommendation 8:
As noted in 2004, in order to fully meet this Standard, the team recommends that the College President must develop an ongoing systematic and comprehensive system to assess the effectiveness of the College's organizational structure, campus planning processes, and institutional effectiveness and to convey the results of such assessments to the College community in a timely manner. (IV.B.2.a-b, IV.B.2.c)

College Responses to the Team Recommendations

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

Findings and Evidence: Since the College's last follow-up visit, the team found evidence of a sustained program review process that continues to use enhanced data and leads to determining resource allocation and recognizing total cost of ownership. During interviews with College faculty, staff, and management, the team found these processes are collaborative, transparent, and widely understood. The participatory governance processes continue to be enhanced and are

most apparent in the successful summary reporting of program reviews to the College Planning Council. These reports lead to resource allocation decisions that are better understood in addressing College-wide needs.

Evidence was found that total cost of ownership has been successfully interwoven into the resource allocation process at both the College and District levels. During interviews with the District Council on Administrative Services (DCAS), the council members validated that College program reviews are used in determining what resource requests receive allocated funds and TCO is addressed in allocation, where applicable. In addition, the College implemented software, TracDat, to assist them in their integrated program review, SLO and planning efforts.

The team also found evidence that the College annually evaluates the program review process and makes improvements to their process on the basis of the evaluation. The College is currently addressing sustainability by maintaining program review as an annual requirement that is leading to institutionalization and sustainability. Survey comments in the evaluation indicated concerns from faculty about this required time commitment that has yet to be addressed. The efficacy of the process will be addressed more fully in the next evaluation.

The District has established a program viability/discontinuance process, as evidenced in Administrative Procedure 4021 – Program Discontinuance adopted on February 14, 2012. Although the College has implemented this procedure locally, the process could only be explained verbally to the team, since no written documentation explaining the details of how the College is executing this process was found.

The College has made considerable progress on the development and assessment of student learning outcomes (SLOs) at the course, program and institutional level. The College submitted its *College Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation* this fall which indicated: 98% of college courses with defined SLOs, 85% of College courses with ongoing assessment of SLOs, 93% of college programs with defined SLOs, 93% of college programs with ongoing assessment of SLOs, and 100% of student learning and support activities with defined SLOs and ongoing assessment of SLOs. The College has focused on building institutionalized and sustainable processes linked to program review and resource allocation. For institutional SLOs, the College has developed a five-year assessment calendar where each core ISLOs is assessed annually encouraging analysis and dialogue campus-wide. This calendar is in its first year of implementation.

Conclusion: The team finds that the College has met this recommendation and would encourage the College to include, in its midterm report, evidence supporting a continuation of the implementation of its enhanced program review process to ensure its sustainability, documentation of its local program viability/discontinuance process, and continuation of its aggressive progress on the assessment of course, program, and institutional student learning outcomes to achieve *sustainability* status.

College Recommendation 4

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

Findings and Evidence: At the College's last follow-up visit in October 2011, it had fully implemented a reorganization to address this recommendation. The follow-up team recommended the College needed to develop an effective assessment process, both formative and summative, with broad participation to evaluate its effectiveness. During campus interviews and reviewing evidence, the November 2012 follow-up team found that the College continues to operate under the administrative reorganization with a participatory governance committee structure supporting it. Constituents from all employee groups who were interviewed emphasized to the team that the new leadership and oversight structure is effective, productive and collaborative.

The College implemented two ways of evaluating this new structure six months following the reorganization. The first was through an all-employee online survey. The second was through a College-wide forum where the survey results were shared and used as a starting point for small group discussions to determine where improvements were needed. The team reviewed the survey results provided as evidence and discovered a low response rate from the campus community and no documented formal analysis of the results. In fall 2011, the College had approximately 613 employees (as listed on the State of California Community College Chancellor's Office data mart). The survey results indicated 32 employees responded to the survey, or only about 5% of the total employee population. Five of the areas undergoing reorganization were included in the survey. Three of the five areas evaluated had a large number of responses as "No Opinion".

- Distance education - 47% satisfied; 13% unsatisfied; 41% no opinion
- Professional development – 58% satisfied; 23% unsatisfied; 19% no opinion
- Institutional effectiveness – 61% satisfied; 23% unsatisfied; 16% no opinion
- Basic skills – 36% satisfied; 13% unsatisfied; 50% no opinion
- Off-site programs – 55% satisfied; 13% unsatisfied; 32% no opinion
- Movement of programs (academic re-shifting) – 17% satisfied; 10% unsatisfied; 7% no opinion; 67% not applicable

While the College used these results as a starting point for further discussion, no analysis of the generalization of results to the entire campus or of the high percent of no opinion/not applicable was found. The discussion results were distributed campus-wide. Improvements for the committee or administrative area were identified and implemented. After this initial evaluation, the College provided further evidence that each of the committees supporting the reorganization conducted a self-evaluation. Based on the self-evaluation process, adjustments were made, as necessary.

The team recognizes that the collective outcome of the survey, forums, and committee self-evaluations followed the spirit of the follow-up team's recommendation. The team felt that the evaluation needed better focus and analysis on the effectiveness of the administrative side of the reorganization as well as better attention to the campus-wide participation in the evaluation.

Conclusion: The team found that the College has met this recommendation and would encourage it to include, in its midterm report, evidence of conducting a follow-up evaluation that is broad-based, representative of the entire campus, to assess the effectiveness of the administrative reorganization structure.

College Recommendation 6
As noted in 2004, in order to fully meet this Standard, the team recommends that the College must develop a funding plan for new and modernized facilities based on the concept of Total Cost of Ownership. The plan must address the necessary staffing and other support costs to operate these facilities. (III.B.2.a)

Findings and Evidence: The Ventura College Follow-Up Report dated October 15, 2012 provides an update on College Recommendation 6. The Total Cost of Ownership is now addressed through the District Budget Allocation Model. The entire site visit team met with the District Council on Administrative Services on November 13, 2012. The Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services described the new allocation model and how it was implemented for the 2012-13 fiscal year. The new Infrastructure Funding Model provides funding for instructional equipment, library materials, technology, and scheduled maintenance. Funds are allocated to the College based on a funding rate. This new funding model will provide additional funds each year until it is fully phased in over a several year period.

A significant feature of the Total Cost of Ownership model is the staffing to make sure facilities operate properly. The College update did not describe staffing as it relates to the concept of Total Cost of Ownership. Several interviews were conducted at the College on November 14, 2012 to discuss the Total Cost of Ownership concept and specifically how staffing plays a role in this process.

The Vice President of Business Services indicated that there has not been a reduction in personnel in the maintenance and operations area. A review of the organization charts for the last three years validates this comment. The College reduced classified positions on the campus but none in maintenance and operations. Staffing levels have been benchmarked through program review for this area. It was noted that square feet maintained per employee was higher than average but comparable to other colleges.

The Technology Support Services Supervisor noted that one College-level position had been eliminated in the technology area over the last three years. This leaves four campus employees that receive support from the District office as well as other Colleges when called to complete large projects. Efficiencies in delivering technology to computers across campus have eliminated the need to visit every computer during an update. The College is extending the life of personal computers by adding more Random-Access Memory (RAM) and new solid state drives. All of these changes are positive approaches to reducing the Total Cost of Ownership as it relates to technology.

Additional meetings were held with members of the Budget and Resource Council, the Facilities Oversight Group, and the Technology Committee. These conversations confirmed the work the College has done to meet the standard.

Conclusion: Even though the Infrastructure Funding Model is new for fiscal year 2012-13, the model should be evaluated throughout the planning process to make sure it is meeting the requirements of the Total Cost of Ownership. The team determined that the College has fully met this recommendation.

College Recommendation 8
As noted in 2004, in order to fully meet this Standard, the team recommends that the College President must develop an ongoing systematic and comprehensive system to assess the effectiveness of the College's organizational structure, campus planning processes, and institutional effectiveness and to convey the results of such assessments to the College community in a timely manner. (IV.B.2.a-b, IV.B.2.c)

Findings and Evidence: The College initiated a new organizational structure in July 2011 to address integrated planning, increased research capacity, and other identified needs. The College's reorganization addressed the areas outlined in Recommendation 4, but the evaluation of the process had not occurred at the time of the last team visit in November 2011. In January 2012, six months after the implementation of the new organizational structure, the College President invited all College employees to participate in an online survey to assess the new structure. In February 2012, a College Open Forum was devoted to collecting feedback regarding the effectiveness of the new organizational structure. At this forum, the results of the online survey were shared and used as the starting point for small group discussions on the merits of the new system and the additional improvements needed. A review of the evidence by team members and interviews conducted confirmed that the results of the focus group discussions were shared in one of the College President's weekly *Updates*, along with a written summary of the results of the online survey. Since February 2012, it was further confirmed that the deans and committees have used this feedback to make modifications to their operations.

In addition, the College has built into its integrated planning process a calendar for the ongoing assessment of the organizational structure. In accordance with this calendar, the College Planning Council (CPC) will assist the College President in engaging the campus in a review of the organization structure every three years, with the next review scheduled for spring 2013. Documentation in support of efforts to assess the organizational structure and the College planning process was found in the response to College Recommendation 4 in this report.

By means of interviews and a review of committee minutes and other evidence, it was confirmed that the development of a data set to quantify the College's Core Indicators of Institutional Effectiveness was discussed throughout most of the spring 2012 semester at both the Academic Senate and the CPC. Input was gathered from division representatives about what should be included in the Core Indicators and the document list of data elements was revised numerous times based on this input and subsequent Academic Senate and CPC discussions. The final version of the Core Indicators list was approved at the May 9, 2012 meeting of the CPC.

The work that was done at Ventura College to identify the data elements by which to measure institutional effectiveness was used later during the spring 2012 semester to document and support progress made at both the College and District levels toward the Board of Trustee's planning goals. Documents reviewed demonstrated that the Ventura College's Core Indicators, along with documents submitted by the institutional researchers at Moorpark College, Oxnard College, and the District Administrative Center assisted in the development of a data set common to all three Colleges in the District. The data elements in the district-wide report, which align with the Board's goals, replicate the data elements in Ventura College's Core Indicators, thus ensuring the necessary alignment of the College institutional effectiveness goals with the District goals.

Conclusion: The team finds that the College has satisfied this recommendation and would encourage Ventura College, along with its two sister Colleges and the District, to continue to assess how well the alignment of District and College goals is being maintained.