

EVALUATION REPORT

MOORPARK COLLEGE

7075 Campus Road
Moorpark, CA 93021-1695

A Confidential Report Prepared for
The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
Moorpark College from October 11 through October 14, 2010

Dr. Deborah Travis, Chair

II. LIST OF TEAM MEMBERS

Moorpark College
Comprehensive Evaluation Visit Team Roster
Monday, October 11-Thursday, October 14, 2010

Dr. Deborah Travis (Chair)
President
Cosumnes River College

Dr. Judith Beachler (Assistant)
Dean of Instruction and Student Learning
Cosumnes River College

Ms. Mandy Davies
Associate Vice President, Student Services
Sierra College

Ms. BK Griesemer
Professor CC Psychology
University of Hawaii Maui College

Dr. Gregory Gray
Chancellor
Riverside Community College District

Ms. Jeanine Hawk
Vice Chancellor, Admin Services
San Jose Evergreen Community College
District

Ms. Bonnie Gratch Lindauer
Librarian, Coordinator of Library
Instructional Services
City College of San Francisco

Dr. Edward Karpp
Dean of Research, Planning and Grants
Glendale Community College

Ms. Melinda Nish
Vice President of Instruction
Orange Coast College

Dr. Thaddeus Wakefield
English Instructor
Santa Rosa Junior College

Dr. Norval Wellsfry
Professor of Accounting and Computer
Information Science
Cosumnes River College

III. SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION REPORT

INSTITUTION: Moorpark College

DATE OF VISIT: October 11-14, 2010

TEAM CHAIR: Deborah Travis, President
Cosumnes River College

An eleven member Accreditation Team visited Moorpark College for the purpose of evaluating the college's request to reaffirm its accreditation. In preparation for the visit, the team chair attended a team chair workshop on August 23, 2010, and the chair and the team assistant attended two pre-visits – one to the Ventura County Community College District office with the team chairs and assistants for Ventura and Oxnard colleges on August 27, 2010 and one to Moorpark College on September 3, 2010. During the two visits, the chair and assistant met with district and college leadership at the district meeting and with the president, and key personnel involved in the self study preparation process, as well as representatives of the Academic and Classified senates at the college meeting. With the exception of one member who joined the Team about a week prior to the site visit, the entire Team received team training provided by staff from the Accrediting Commission on September 8, 2010.

The Team received the College's self study document several weeks prior to the October 2010 visit. The Team prepared for its visit by reviewing the Moorpark College self study report, responses to the previous accreditation team report, the Focused Mid-Term Report, and college publications, such as the Catalog, Schedule of Classes, specific online classes in the College's *Desire2Learn* Course Management System and support services in the College's *MyVCCCD* Portal.

Several members of the Team met with the chancellor, district staff and Board of Trustees members at the district office on Monday and Tuesday mornings, October 11 and 12, 2010. Team members met with these individuals to assess areas such as finance, physical facilities, human resources, technology resources, governance, and Board relations for the operation of the district. Upon arrival to the campus on Monday afternoon on October 11, 2010, the College provided team members a tour of the campus and its Exotic Animals Program facilities and an opportunity to meet key college leaders and staff at an open meeting.

The Team assessed the College's responses to the 2004 recommendations and found that the College has technically and for the most part met the recommendations.

Overall, the Team perceives the College, its faculty, staff and students, to be thriving, creative and very collegial.

2010 Accreditation Evaluation Team Recommendations

District Office Review

During the course of the simultaneous accreditation visits at Moorpark College, Oxnard College and Ventura College, the chancellor, Board of Trustee members and district office personnel were interviewed by team chairs and team members, individually and jointly, for the purpose of identifying any potential recommendations related to the district. In addition, the Lead Team Chair listened to recently taped Board of Trustee meeting sessions and shared a summary of them and their relationship to the accreditation process with the other team chairs. The Team reviewed Board policies, procedures, and documents as it assessed evidence at the College and the District Office regarding district operations and how the district provides support to the colleges.

After carefully reading the self study reports, examining evidence, interviewing personnel at the district office, as well as college personnel and students and discussing the findings in light of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges accreditation standards, the three teams offer the following recommendations to the Ventura County Community College District and its colleges:

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, VI.B.1. e-g)

College Review

After carefully reading the self study report, examining evidence, interviewing college personnel and students and discussing the findings in light of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges accreditation standards, the Team offers the following recommendations to Moorpark College:

College Recommendation: 1

In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the Team recommends that the College strengthen the planning process by incorporating annual, written reports describing progress toward the achievement of institutional goals and disseminate them to college constituencies. It is further recommended that the College go beyond qualitative evaluation of its planning and program review processes by developing and using consistent quantitative effectiveness measures and feedback mechanisms to improve the processes at the program and the institutional level. (I.B.2-3, I.B.5-7, II.A.2-3)

College Recommendation: 2

In order to meet the Commission’s expectation of reaching the proficiency

level regarding student learning outcomes (SLO) development and assessment by fall 2012, the Team recommends that the College develop specific timelines which are disseminated and reviewed, provide written summary reports of SLO assessments and improvements, and assure that assessment results are used for course, program and institutional improvement. Additionally, the College shall ensure that in every class section, students receive a course syllabus that specifies learning outcomes consistent with those in the institution's officially approved course outlines. (II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a-b, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.3, II.A.6, II.B.1, II.B.4, II.C.2).

College Recommendation: 3

In order to validate effectiveness and improve student success, the Team recommends that the College complete an evaluation of its self-placement process for English and mathematics and make modifications as appropriate and necessary. This could include the consideration of using diagnostic instruments and revising placement processes. (II.B.3.e)

College Recommendation: 4

In order to improve effectiveness, the College should evaluate its committee structure as identified in the *Making Decisions at Moorpark College* document with a special focus on subcommittee charges and membership as they relate to the College's mission. This evaluation should give consideration to the creation of an executive council/committee that has constituency representation that advises the President regarding committee recommendations. Based on the evaluation, the College should develop and implement appropriate revisions to its governance structure and document them. (IV.A.2-3)

ACCREDITATION EVALUATION REPORT MOORPARK COLLEGE

October 11-14, 2010

IV. INTRODUCTION

Moorpark College was established in 1965 as the second of three colleges in the Ventura County Community College District (VCCCD). Located on 150 acres of sloping hillside land in the eastern area of Ventura County, Moorpark College primarily serves the communities of Moorpark, Simi Valley, Newbury Park, Oak Park, Santa Rosa Valley, Thousand Oaks, and Westlake Village. The two other colleges in the District are Oxnard College located in the city of Oxnard and Ventura College, located in the city of Ventura.

As the largest college in the District, Moorpark College had an enrollment of 15,379 students in Fall 2010, down 5.6% from 16,237 in Fall 2009. The gender mix of students is almost equally split, with 50.1% males and 49.9% female. Moorpark's student body is young, with 83.2% under the age of 30. More than half of the enrolled students are white, (57.9%), and 18.6% are Hispanic, 9.6% are Asian, 2.4% are African American and 1.1% are Native American; the remaining 10.4% are of various other or unknown ethnicities. Almost two-thirds of Moorpark College students (66.1%) plan to transfer to a four-year college/university.

Of its 338 full-time employees, 13 are managers (with three of the thirteen serving as classified managers), 172 are faculty, 144 classified staff and 9 are classified supervisors. There are 395 adjunct faculty employed at Moorpark College.

In the March 2002 election, the citizens of Ventura County approved the issuance of bonds totaling \$356.3 million for construction and rehabilitation of facilities on the three community college campuses of VCCCD. The funds have provided for the construction of new facilities and building remodeling throughout the district, and have supported, among other buildings completed and planned, the construction of Moorpark College's Academic Center, which was recently completed and its Health Sciences expansion that is currently under construction.

Recent Accreditation History

Moorpark College was last accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges at the Commission's January 12-14, 2005 meeting. The College was asked to prepare a Focused Midterm Report that was due by October 15, 2007. This midterm report was accepted by the Commission at its January 9-11, 2008 meeting. In a letter dated November 2, 2009, the College was informed that the Commission approved a Substantive Change request for approval of 18 associate

degree and 11 certificate programs in which 50% or more of the courses can be completed through a mode of distance or electronic delivery.

The 2010 Accreditation Evaluation Team Visit

An eleven member Team visited Moorpark College for the purpose of evaluating the college's request to reaffirm its accreditation. In preparation for the visit, the team chair attended a team chair workshop on August 23, 2010, and the chair and the team assistant attended two pre-visits – one to the Ventura County Community College District office with the team chairs and assistants for Ventura and Oxnard colleges on August, 27, 2010 and one to Moorpark College on September 3, 2010. During the two visits, the chair and assistant met with district and college leadership at the district meeting and with the president, and key personnel involved in the self study preparation process, as well as representatives of the Academic and Classified senates at the college meeting. With the exception of one member who joined the Team about a week prior to the site visit, the entire Team received team training provided by staff from the Accrediting Commission on September 8, 2010.

The Team received the College's self study document several weeks prior to the October 2010 visit. The Team prepared for its visit by reviewing the Moorpark College self study report, responses to the previous accreditation team report, the Focused Mid-Term Report, and college publications, such as the Catalog, Schedule of Classes, specific online classes in the College's *Desire2Learn* Course Management System and support services in the College's *My VCCCD* Portal.

Team members found the Self Study to be readable and comprehensive in terms of addressing all standards including the Commission's Eligibility Requirements. The Team confirmed that the self study report was compiled through broad participation by the campus community including faculty, staff, students, and administration.

However, there was limited documentation verifying how the standard was met, and there were few examples of the evidence embedded into the report itself to indicate that thorough analysis had been completed in the Self Study. In addition, other than the planning documents, no evidence was made available to the Team prior to the visit. These issues caused a very lengthy and intense review process once the Team arrived on campus.

Several members of the Team met with the Chancellor, district staff and Board of Trustee members at the district office on Monday and Tuesday mornings, October 11 and 12, 2010. Team members met with these individuals to assess areas such as finance, physical facilities, human resources, technology resources, governance, and Board functions and relations for the operation of the district. Upon arrival to the campus on Monday afternoon on October 11, the College provided team members a tour of the campus and its Exotic Animals Program facilities and an opportunity to meet key college leaders and staff at an open meeting.

Throughout the evaluation visit, team members met and interviewed 15 district staff and Board members and held more than 30 on-campus interviews with individuals and groups.

The Team also provided two opportunities for the college community to meet with members of the Team in an open forum. Several team members met with representatives of college shared governance committees and councils. In addition, several class sessions were observed, including evening classes and online classes; online support services were also reviewed. Team members toured the campus grounds, buildings and parking lots to assess safety and security.

The Team reviewed numerous documents that served as evidence in support of the self study report in the team room and on the DVD provided to each member when they arrived for the visit. Documents reviewed by the Team included Board policies and procedures, program review information, procedures, strategic planning information, enrollment information, committee minutes, the faculty handbook and several other documents. The Team also viewed evidence and documentation through the College's online portal, *MyVCCCD*.

The Team acknowledges and supports the importance of the work of the College through its self study process, which created 47 Planning Agendas, which they will pursue and complete over the next few years. This includes two Planning Agendas in Standard I, 14 in Standard II, 10 in Standard III and 21 in Standard IV.

The Team greatly appreciated the enthusiasm and support from college staff throughout the visit. The Team also appreciated the willingness of key staff in the President's Office to assist with team requests for individual meetings and other needs throughout the evaluation process. College staff responded to and met every request for documentation and meetings with individual members and groups of the college community. The Team assessed the College's responses to the 2004 recommendations and found that the College has, for the most part, met the prior recommendations.

The Team was impressed with a number of programs, activities, and services observed during the visit. **In particular, the Team wishes to commend the College for:**

- *Its Student Learning Model as a creative and integrated organizational structure that approaches student needs in a holistic way, supports innovation in developing programs and projects to assist students, particularly in basic skills and degree and transfer achievements, and engages cross-functional dialogue to meet the College's mission.*
- *Its annual program review/planning process that has been in place for more than five years and provides for deliberate and frequent analysis of all programs and integration with resource allocation.*
- *Its Technology Plan that was collegially developed and serves as a model for the district plan.*
- *The innovative work across instruction and student services on the Basic Skills Pilot.*

- *Its beautiful campus facilities and grounds, lovely and well-maintained acreage providing an inspiring learning and work environment for students and staff.*
- *The high level of constituency participation in college decision-making.*
- *Its campus community building activities, such as One Campus One Book, the Year of...., and Multi-Cultural Day.*
- *The dialogue-rich environment and collegial atmosphere throughout Moorpark College.*

Overall, the Team perceives the College, its faculty, staff and students, to be thriving, creative and very collegial.

2010 Accreditation Evaluation Team Recommendations

District Office Review

During the course of the simultaneous accreditation visits at Moorpark College, Oxnard College and Ventura College, the chancellor, Board of Trustee members and district office personnel were interviewed by team chairs and team members, individually and jointly, for the purpose of identifying any potential recommendations related to the district. In addition, the Lead Team Chair listened to recently taped Board of Trustee meeting sessions and shared a summary of them and their relationship to the accreditation process with the other team chairs. The Team reviewed Board policies, procedures, and documents as it assessed evidence at the College and the District Office regarding district operations and how the district provides support to the colleges.

After carefully reading the self study reports, examining evidence, interviewing personnel at the district office, as well as college personnel and students and discussing the findings in light of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges accreditation standards, the three teams offer the following recommendations to the Ventura County Community College District and its colleges:

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, VI.B.1. e-g)

College Review

After carefully reading the self study report, examining evidence, interviewing college personnel and students and discussing the findings in light of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges accreditation standards, the Team offers the following recommendations to Moorpark College:

College Recommendation: 1

In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the Team recommends that the College strengthen the planning process by incorporating annual, written reports describing progress toward the achievement of institutional goals and disseminate them to college constituencies. It is further recommended that the College go beyond qualitative evaluation of its planning and program review processes by developing and using consistent quantitative effectiveness measures and feedback mechanisms to improve the processes at the program and the institutional level. (I.B.2-3, I.B.5-7, II.A.2-3)

College Recommendation: 2

In order to meet the Commission’s expectation of reaching the proficiency

level regarding student learning outcomes (SLO) development and assessment by fall 2012, the Team recommends that the College develop specific timelines which are disseminated and reviewed, provide written summary reports of SLO assessments and improvements, and assure that assessment results are used for course, program and institutional improvement. Additionally, the College shall ensure that in every class section, students receive a course syllabus that specifies learning outcomes consistent with those in the institution's officially approved course outlines. (II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a-b, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.3, II.A.6, II.B.1, II.B.4, II.C.2).

College Recommendation: 3

In order to validate effectiveness and improve student success, the Team recommends that the College complete an evaluation of its self-placement process for English and mathematics and make modifications as appropriate and necessary. This could include the consideration of using diagnostic instruments and revising placement processes. (II.B.3.e)

College Recommendation: 4

In order to improve effectiveness, the College should evaluate its committee structure as identified in the *Making Decisions at Moorpark College* document with a special focus on subcommittee charges and membership as they relate to the College's mission. This evaluation should give consideration to the creation of an executive council/committee that has constituency representation that advises the President regarding committee recommendations. Based on the evaluation, the College should develop and implement appropriate revisions to its governance structure and document them. (IV.A.2-3)

TEAM EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSES TO THE 2004 RECOMMENDATIONS

College Recommendations

2004 College Recommendation: 1

The College develop, implement, and evaluate a systematic process for formally defining its goals for institutional effectiveness. The process should include an annual review of the College's progress toward those goals and dissemination of such progress to constituencies of the College. This recommendation is a partial repetition of 1997 recommendation #2, which was also a focus of the College's 1999 interim report. (I.B.2-3, I.B.5, I.B.7)

The College has developed and implemented a process for defining goals; goals are called strategic objectives and they are defined in the College's Strategic Plan, which is revised every three years. Goals are reviewed and discussed at the College's annual all-college planning retreat, called the Fall Fling. The College has only recently begun to address the issue of annually reviewing progress toward goals and reporting progress to constituencies. At the 2010 Fall Fling, held on October 1, participants reported on progress toward completion of work items related to the strategic objectives. A summary report has not yet been completed, but the College is working on compiling a report for the current year and plans to develop such a report annually after each Fall Fling. In previous years, some information about strategic objectives was published in the Institutional Effectiveness reports, but these reports are not structured around the strategic objectives, and the reported outcome measures do not directly address all of the strategic objectives. Although the College has begun its annual review and the documentation of its progress toward those goals, reviews have not yet been disseminated. When the College completes the dissemination in Fall 2010 and continues to complete the process each year, it will have thoroughly responded to this recommendation.

2004 College Recommendation: 2

The College implement its institutional planning model as adopted and use an ongoing, systematic process to evaluate it. This recommendation is a partial repetition of 1997 recommendation #2, which was also a focus of the College's 1999 interim report. (I.B)

The College has implemented an integrated planning model that includes an annual program planning/program review that is tied to resource allocation. The annual process has been in place for approximately five years. The program planning model is evaluated annually by Education Committee for Accreditation and Planning (EdCAP), which collects feedback about how well the process works from department chairs, deans, and other constituent groups. EdCAP makes changes to the process in response to feedback. The evaluation process is ongoing. It is systematic to some extent because evaluation is explicitly part of the process, and EdCAP is understood to be responsible for evaluation. However, evaluation is dependent on feedback from individuals and committees rather than consistent measures of process effectiveness. While program-level planning is evaluated by EdCAP, college-level

planning is evaluated by the college president informally and qualitatively. As such, the College has, in effect, addressed this recommendation, but should continue to strengthen its scope and methods of evaluation.

2004 College Recommendation: 3

The College develop a written institution-wide process, with timelines and responsible parties, for the establishment of specific student learning outcomes and criteria for measurement and review. The process should include the identification of student learning outcomes for learning support services, student service areas, courses, programs, general education and certificates and degrees using assessment results systematically to make improvements for student learning. (II)

As documented in *Making Decisions at Moorpark*, the College has developed a systematic and sustainable institution wide process that identifies responsible parties for establishing specific student learning outcomes for courses and programs. Measurement and review of these SLOs has begun, although levels of assessment vary from none to fairly extensive; more assessment is expected to occur as the process continues to mature. Although core competencies have been established in instructional programs, such competencies have not been identified for General Education. General Education outcomes have been drafted and are presently being reviewed. As such, this recommendation has been addressed.

The College is encouraged to establish a timeline that calendars the ongoing milestones for SLO review and assessment and to document a similar process specific to the GE SLOs and their assessment.

2004 College Recommendation: 4

Although, in practice, the College has an inclusive institutional governance process, the Team recommends that the College develop a written policy that clearly specifies appropriate roles for faculty, staff, students, and administrators in institutional governance. (IV.A.2-3)

In Fall 2004, the College published its first edition of *Making Decisions at Moorpark*, a document that is reviewed annually and updated as appropriate to refine Moorpark College's institutional governance process. This document describes the college culture, the type and structure of groups that develop recommendations, timelines and sequences for key college decisions, and college planning and assessment. Roles for faculty, staff, students and administrators in college governance are described in this publication. This recommendation has been addressed.

2004 College Recommendation: 5

The College produce a written comprehensive technology plan and that this plan be integrated with the written institutional plan. (III.C)

The self-study states that the College has completely satisfied this recommendation, based on the work of the Technology Committee for Accreditation and Planning (TechCAP) and the

completion of the *Technology Master Plan* in 2009, which is periodically assessed. The evidence supports this claim, showing that this recommendation has been addressed.

Recently, Information Technology (IT) services have been consolidated at the District level, with some support at the College. Although respondents raised concerns about the timeliness of IT support and the adequacy of training and support on the District's September 2010 Employee Satisfaction Survey, more than 60% are satisfied with the services overall. This has important relevance for Moorpark College, as approximately 50.1% of respondents are employed at Moorpark. District staff confirmed that Moorpark is highly advanced and proactive in terms of its technology.

2004 College Recommendation: 6

Because of reductions in staffing due to budget cuts, the team recommends that the College determine appropriate staffing levels for faculty, classified staff, and management, and work with the District in funding required positions. (III.A.2, IV.B.2)

The College monitors its staffing levels relative to the number of full-time and part-time faculty members and classified staff and the number of managers employed. It has also developed a process for identifying its core courses, services and facilities in order to ensure that its core business is protected. Across the District, there have been layoffs and reorganizations, causing a decline in the number of classified staff and course offerings have been reduced thereby reducing the part-time faculty. During the current period of strained budgets, the College has prioritized personnel needs relative to what is core to student learning in instruction, student services and administrative services as part of its long-term educational master plan and its medium-term strategic planning processes. This recommendation has been addressed.

District Recommendations

The three 2010 teams visiting the colleges of the Ventura County Community College District concur that the district and its colleges have technically addressed the district recommendations of the 2004 Team. However, it is the view of the 2010 teams that the recommendations that were made in 2004 did not go far enough. As such, several new, more specific district recommendations have been made through the 2010 team evaluation processes.

2004 District Recommendation: 1

The Board of Trustees implement a process to regularly evaluate and revise District policies, and implement and participate in an on-going process for professional development and orientation for new board members, which includes a review of board roles and responsibilities. (IV.B.1.e-f)

The District has reviewed its policies in the past two years. These policies have been reviewed and adopted by the District Chancellor's Consultation Council and Board. A new Board Member orientation process has been developed and implemented. Technically, this recommendation has been addressed.

Policies have been reviewed; however, the District would benefit from the adoption of a calendar for continuing review and evaluation. Further, there is some question related to the sufficiency of the policies that actually exist. The District has utilized the Community College League Policy and Procedure Template. There needs to be a more comprehensive review of the existing policies in light of this template and to ensure continuous improvement in organizational effectiveness.

2004 District Recommendation: 2

The District honor its policy on shared governance by implementing operational and evaluative procedures that delineate the roles and responsibilities of the various College/District constituencies that participate in collegial governance. (IV.A.2.a, IV.A.3)

The Board has adopted Policy #2510 that more clearly defines the roles of constituencies in governance. There has also been an effort to more clearly define the role of the District Administrative Center relative to the colleges. Technically, this recommendation has been addressed. These efforts have made improvements in the process, but additional effort will need to be expended to make the systems even more functional and effective.

2004 District Recommendation: 3

The District assumes leadership for a District-wide, collaboratively developed strategic plan that is informed by District research and coordinated with College planning. (IV.B.3)

The District has developed a strategic plan which included the broad spectrum of constituencies. This plan identified themes and further expanded these into a new vision, mission, and values statement for the District. Technically, this recommendation has been addressed.

A Vice Chancellor of Planning and Organizational development was hired. However, the person has left the District and the position was not replaced, due to current budget constraints. Additionally, the District Researcher was laid off. Data needs are now the responsibility of the District Information Technology department. The District will need to carefully evaluate the adequacy of this new system of research information support for the strategic planning process.

2004 District Recommendation: 4

The Chancellor establish and implement a process for open communication with the Colleges by providing information and ensuring staff understanding of board direction and expectations. Further, the District should develop a more effective process for ensuring accountability in achieving standards of educational excellence, fiscal integrity, and operational efficiency within a culture of evidence. (IV.B.3.a-f)

The District has developed a system of Councils at the district level. One key component of this system is the District Chancellor's Consultation Council. The Council system has improved district-wide communication. As such, this recommendation has been addressed.

Nonetheless, the three teams believe that there are still gaps and deficiencies. The District has a pattern of relying on formal structures for communication, but surveys show that there still remains a level of concern about communication across the District, such that additional attention is needed.

2004 District Recommendation: 5

The District develop written personnel procedures that are equitable and consistently administered to ensure fairness in all employment practices. This should include a clearly defined and well-articulated policy for the selection and evaluation of the Presidents of the Colleges. (III.A.3.a, IV.B.1.j)

District governance mechanisms were developed and a new policy related to personnel selection was adopted. Evaluation of staff has been included in relevant labor contracts. The college presidential selection process has been formalized. As such, this recommendation has technically been addressed, given the new procedures that were put into place.

2004 District Recommendation: 6

The District, in cooperation with the Colleges, formulate a district-wide resource allocation model, which will be flexible enough to guide increases or reductions in budget allocations, which will follow the goals for district-wide student learning outcomes, and which will ensure accountability to operate within agreed-upon allocations. (III.D.1.a, III.D.1.c)

In 2007, the District Council on Administrative Services (DCAS), which has participation from all constituency groups across the district, developed a district-wide resource allocation model that was approved and adopted by the Board of Trustees. The model is readily understood and considers issues of accountability, predictability and equity. The model is reviewed annually by DCAS and by the Chancellor's Cabinet and revised as appropriate, with subsequent Board of Trustees approval. This recommendation has been addressed.

2004 District Recommendation: 7

The District develop a funding plan for the unfunded retiree medical liability following the recommendations contained in the actuarial study completed in October 2004. (III.D.1.c)

In November 2004 the Board of Trustees approved a plan to be implemented over a three-year period to begin funding the retiree health benefits liability. Effective July 1, 2007 the District began recording full expenditures as required by GASB 43/45 and setting aside a portion of the appropriate amount in a special fund. This recommendation has been addressed.

EVALUATION OF MOORPARK COLLEGE USING THE ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

1. **Authority**

The Team verified that Moorpark College is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. The College is authorized by the State of California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to operate as an educational institution and to offer programs of study leading to certificates and associate degrees.

2. **Mission**

The Team verified that Moorpark College has a clearly defined mission statement. It is regularly reviewed and revised according to Western Association of Schools and Colleges' Accreditation Commission on Community and Junior Colleges' Standards.

3. **Governing Board**

The Team confirmed that the College operates under the direction of a five member elected Board of Trustees that also includes an elected student representative who serves in an advisory capacity. The trustees serve staggered terms ensuring continuity of this governing body. The non-voting student trustee is elected by the Student Senates of the three colleges.

4. **Chief Executive Officer**

The Team verified that Moorpark College has a president whose full-time responsibility is to provide overall leadership and direction for the College.

5. **Administrative Capacity**

The Team verified that the College has an adequately prepared and experienced administrative staff sufficient in number to support the College's mission and purpose.

6. **Operation Status**

The Team confirmed that Moorpark College is fully operational with students actively pursuing its degree and certificate programs. The campus has modern facilities to support teaching and learning.

7. **Degrees**

The Team verified that Moorpark College offers 57 degrees 34 certificates of achievement, 10 certificates of proficiency and 9 licensing/permit preparation programs, which are consistent with the college mission. The degree and certificate programs are offered in a manner and of rigor consistent with California Community College Approval process standards and California Education Code requirements.

8. Educational Programs

The Team verified that Moorpark College degree programs are congruent with its mission, are based on recognized higher education field(s) of study, are of sufficient content and length, are conducted at levels of quality and rigor appropriate to the degrees offered, and culminate in identified student outcomes.

9. Academic Credit

The Team confirmed that Moorpark College awards academic credits based on generally accepted practices of degree-granting institutions of higher education. The College adheres to the Carnegie Rule and standards set forth in the California Code of Regulations, Title V, Education, Section 55002.5 in granting course credit.

10. Student Learning Achievement

The Team verified that the College has defined student learning outcomes for most programs and courses and that the assessment process has begun.

11. General Education

The Team confirmed that Moorpark College defines and incorporates into all of its degree programs a substantial component of general education designed to ensure breadth of knowledge and promote intellectual inquiry.

12. Academic Freedom

The Team verified that the college faculty and students are free to examine and test knowledge appropriate to their discipline or area of major study as judged by the academic community. The Academic Freedom Policy adopted by the College and the District is made public in the catalog.

13. Faculty

The Team confirmed that Moorpark College has 172 full-time faculty members who are qualified to support the institution's educational programs by meeting the minimum qualifications as approved by the Board of Governors upon the advice of the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges (ASCCC). The duties and responsibilities of Moorpark College faculty are outlined in Board policy, the collective bargaining contract, and in the faculty handbook. The core faculty is sufficient in size and experience to support all of the institution's educational programs. The faculty is responsible for reviewing the curriculum and assessing learning in each class.

14. Student Services

The Team verified that the College provides comprehensive student services. The services are aligned with the mission of the College and meet the needs of the students.

15. Admissions

The Team confirmed that the College adheres to admission policies consistent with its mission.

16. Information and Learning Resources

The Team verified that Moorpark College operates a library and learning resource center that provide students access to electronic and print resources sufficient to its educational purpose, as well as a course management system that supports online instruction.

17. Financial Resources

The Team confirmed that Moorpark College has an adequate funding base, financial reserves, and plans for financial development that are adequate to support its mission and to ensure financial stability.

18. Financial Accountability

The Team verified that the College annually undergoes and makes available an independent external financial audit by a certified public accountant.

19. Institutional Planning and Evaluation

The Team confirmed that Moorpark College has recently completed a Strategic Plan, which informs institutional operation and evaluation.

20. Public Information

The Team verified that the eligibility requirements for public information are contained in the Moorpark College published catalog, website, and an array of other printed materials.

21. Relations with the Accrediting Commission

The Team confirmed that the Moorpark College adheres to the eligibility requirements, standards, and policies of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, describes itself in identical terms to all of its accrediting agencies, communicates any changes in its accreditation status in a timely manner, and agrees to disclose information required by ACCJC to carry out its accrediting responsibilities.

2010 TEAM EVALUATION BY STANDARD

Standard I –Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

General Comments

The Board of Trustees approved the Moorpark College mission statement in 2004, and it was re-affirmed by the Board of Trustees after its annual College review in 2008-09. The mission statement defines the College's broad educational purposes and its intended student population. Programs and services are consistent with the mission statement. The mission statement is reviewed annually. Interviews conducted during the site visit and evidence made available to the Team indicate that constituency groups have a shared understanding of the College's mission and that it is used in planning and decision-making.

Moorpark College has a well-developed process for annual program review and program planning that is linked to resource allocation. The College also has a process for defining institutional goals and regularly reviewing and updating those goals. This institutional planning process is well developed but the College is still working to assess and document progress toward its goals in a more systematic way.

Standard I.A Mission

Findings and Evidence

Moorpark College's mission statement defines the College's broad educational purposes and the intended student population in general terms ("As a public community college, Moorpark College offers programs and services accessible to the community."). The mission statement's definition of the College's commitment to achieving student learning is implicit rather than explicit. The statement says that "Moorpark College creates learning environments" but it does not directly state that student learning is central to the College mission. Although the mission statement is not explicit in defining the College's commitment to learning, faculty and administrators clearly understand that student learning is central to the College's mission. (I.A)

The Team found that student learning programs and services are aligned with the mission and to the College's purposes, culture, and student population. Evidence presented in the self study shows that the gender and ethnicity distributions for college employees, students, and Ventura County residents are similar, though Hispanics make up a larger proportion of county residents (37% in 2006-2008) and Moorpark service area residents (19% in 2000), and the college employees (11% in 2009). However, the Moorpark service area in 2000, which includes the city of Moorpark, Conejo Valley, Simi Valley and the city of Oak Park, matches the 19% of students enrolled in 2009. (I.A.1)

The College mission statement was approved by the Board of Trustees in 2004 and reaffirmed in 2009. The Team verified that the mission statement is published in the

Moorpark College 2010-2011 Catalog (both print and online PDF versions), on the College website, and in the 2008 and 2010 Institutional Effectiveness Reports (available on the website). The self study indicates that the mission statement is published in the Schedule of Classes, but it is not included in the online Schedule of Classes for Fall 2010 or in the hard copy of the Fall 2010 Schedule of Classes provided to the Team, most likely because they are web-based applications generated from the District's Student Administration System. The college should consider adding the mission statement to the online Schedule of Classes in order to make it more accessible to students, even if it must be in a companion piece to the web-based application of the schedule. (I.A.2)

The mission statement is reviewed annually at the College's fall planning retreat, called the *Fall Fling*. Interviews, as well as meeting agendas and presentation documents, confirmed that the mission statement is reviewed regularly. In 2008-2009, a task force was created to review the mission, vision and values statement, which was reaffirmed and approved by the Board of Trustees on July 14, 2009, with minor changes made to the values statement. The College intends to continue the work of this mission statement review task force as an annual activity, with the next review to be completed this fall. (I.A.3)

The Team found that the mission statement is used in college planning and decision-making. The mission statement is incorporated in the college planning model, as presented in the document *Making Decisions at Moorpark College* (2008-2010). The mission statement is also a part of the annual program planning/review process as well. Each program indicates which part of the college mission it addresses. Additionally, programs develop program purpose statements that reflect the college mission. The Team found that, while the mission statement is not always referenced directly during decision-making, college constituencies are committed to the mission and to student learning. (I.A.4)

Standard I.B Institutional Effectiveness

Findings and Evidence

Interviews and evidence show that the College supports dialogue about student learning. Most dialogue about learning occurs at the department and division levels rather than across disciplines. The faculty Institutional Research Coordinator facilitates the student learning outcomes assessment process and fosters dialogue about student learning in part by attending department meetings. The annual program planning process, which combines program review and program-level planning and resource requests, incorporates the reporting of student learning outcomes at the course and program levels. Dialogue about improving institutional processes is conducted primarily by committees. The EdCAP (Committee on Accreditation and Planning – Education) oversees the program planning/program review processes and approves changes to the document and the process as necessary. (I.B.1)

The College sets goals, called strategic objectives, in its three-year Strategic Plans that respond to the challenges identified in the long-range, 10-year Educational Master Plan. The most recent strategic plan covers 2009 to 2012. This plan includes four general strategic objectives: student access, student retention and success, responsiveness to the marketplace

in career training, and monitoring the volatility of the economic climate and California public funding. Each strategic objective includes a number of action steps that include expected outcomes. Many of the outcomes are stated in terms of whether or not an activity has been conducted; therefore, the degree to which most outcomes are achieved can be determined in a straightforward manner. Other outcomes are quantitative measures. In addition to the strategic objectives and action steps defined in the Strategic Plan, the document, *Making Decisions at Moorpark College*, includes six categories of summative measures for assessing institutional effectiveness. These measures do not define the College's goals but they are presented in the document as institutional assessment measures. Although the College has defined its goals, there is little evidence that institutional members are familiar with the goals. The College has made its plans and strategic objectives available to constituent groups in electronic form, but interviews indicate that the goals are probably not well understood among all employees and students. (I.B.2)

The College has defined and implemented nearly all of the components of an ongoing cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and reevaluation. The cycle includes an annual program review and program planning process based on quantitative and qualitative information. This intensive process is organized by the Institutional Research Coordinator, who is also responsible for the coordination of work on student learning outcomes. The main component of the ongoing cycle that has not yet been fully implemented is the assessment of progress toward goals. The College has only recently begun to address the issue of regularly reviewing progress toward its strategic objectives. At the 2010 *Fall Fling*, held on October 1, 2010, participants reported on progress toward completion of work items related to the strategic objectives. A summary report has not yet been completed, but the College is working on compiling this report for the current year and plans to develop such a report annually after each *Fall Fling*. Some information about strategic objectives is published regularly in the College's Institutional Effectiveness Reports, but these reports are not structured around the strategic objectives and the reported outcome measures do not address all of the strategic objectives. In summary, the College currently does not have a systematic mechanism for reporting progress toward goals, but it is currently compiling such a report. (I.B.3)

Planning at the institutional level is discussed at several college-wide events on a regular basis, including the annual *Fall Fling* retreats. Meeting minutes, distribution lists, and attendance records show that participation in these events is broad-based and inclusive. Planning at the program level occurs annually and is conducted by the appropriate constituencies—faculty, staff, and administrators representing the instructional, student services, and administrative programs. Planning is linked to resource allocation through the resource request process that is part of program planning. The Team found examples of resource allocation leading to program improvements. However, while there are instances of program planning leading to program improvement, the College provides little direct evidence that planning leads to the improvement of institutional effectiveness. An Institutional Effectiveness Report is produced on a regular basis, and this report summarizes institutional measures, but the measures are not tied to planning activities, strategic objectives, or specific resources that were allocated. (I.B.4)

Student achievement measures and general institutional effectiveness measures are communicated to the appropriate constituencies. Student achievement trends, including state-defined accountability measures, are published in the Institutional Effectiveness Report, available on the college website. The *Educational Master Plan* (2009-2019) is also available on the website and includes student achievement measures. The College communicates matters of quality assurance to internal constituencies through responses to reports and through dialogue at the various college meetings where feedback is provided. Community level feedback regarding quality assurance is provided through dialogue when the President and executive staff interact in public meetings, where achievement data, annual reports and other pertinent college information is provided to a variety of external audiences. (I.B.5)

The College's EdCAP committee is responsible for reviewing and modifying the program planning/review process annually. EdCAP evaluates the program review, program planning, and resource allocation components of the annual program planning process. EdCAP solicits feedback about the program planning document, primarily from users and from its own membership which includes department chairs and deans, and makes changes as it sees necessary. For example, a recent proposed change is the addition of a question about curriculum review in the program planning document. Another recent change related to resource allocation is the inclusion of more detail in requests for technology resources. EdCAP does not use documented criteria or direct measures of effectiveness to determine how to improve the program planning process. The evaluation of program review and program planning is systematic to some extent because evaluation is explicitly part of the process and EdCAP is understood to be responsible for evaluation. However, evaluation is dependent on feedback from individuals and committees rather than on objective measures of process effectiveness that are consistent from year to year. While EdCAP reviews program-level planning, the President is responsible for reviewing institutional planning. Evaluation of the process for developing strategic objectives and the Strategic Plan is conducted qualitatively and informally. Because the work of strategic planning is primarily conducted at the *Fall Fling*, the President plans to collect feedback from participants at the 2011 retreat as part of the evaluation of planning, as was done this year and each year in the past. Like the evaluation of program-level planning, the evaluation of institutional planning is not based on consistent measures of effectiveness; however, effectiveness of processes are often based upon qualitative evaluation. The key is to ensure consistency in those qualitative evaluations over time. The College has a structure for evaluating institutional research in its annual program planning process. Institutional research has been evaluated as part of the management program, but the research office did not go through the program review/program planning process in 2009-2010. (I.B.6-7)

Conclusions

The College meets the Standard.

Its mission statement is appropriate, approved by the governing body, and reviewed regularly and revised when necessary. The College should consider strengthening the part of the mission statement that defines its commitment to achieving student learning. The College

should also consider including the mission statement in its online schedule of classes or in a companion publication to it. (I.A.1-2)

The mission statement is reviewed annually. Interviews conducted during the site visit and evidence made available to the Team indicate that constituency groups have a shared understanding of the College's mission and that it is used in planning and decision-making. (I.A.3-4)

Technically, the College meets the requirements of Standard I.B. It defines its goals and it has implemented a well-developed program planning process tied to resource allocation. However, the College is only beginning to implement a mechanism for regularly and systematically documenting its progress toward goal achievement. Additionally, the evaluation of planning at the program and institutional levels, while ongoing, is not well documented, nor are learning assessment results systematically tied to its institutional goals. (I.B.1-2)

While the College is to be commended for its ongoing dialogue regarding planning which includes verbal evaluation, clearly there is a need to create a well-documented, ongoing process of evaluation of these processes which should be published and shared college-wide. (I.B.3-4)

This need, and formal recommendation as noted below, emerged from the Team's assessment of the Standard I.B elements in conjunction with the expected institutional behaviors of ACCJC's planning rubric. Moorpark College manifests "sustainable continuous quality improvement" in its planning processes through its demonstrated priority for improved student learning, robust dialogue, assessment/evaluation participatory discourses, and consistent data use, analysis, and distribution to all college constituencies and decision-making bodies. However, the College appears slightly inconsistent albeit "proficient" in its documentation and thus dissemination of its planning process results, other than through dialogue. The College needs to improve and systematize its mechanisms for documenting its evaluative planning processes and develop and disseminate clear, written reports on how assessment results are linked to specific institutional goals and strategic objectives. (I.B)

However, the College is currently working to address these issues and should be able to resolve them within the current academic year. (I.B)

Recommendations

College Recommendation: 1

In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the Team recommends that the College strengthen the planning process by incorporating annual, written reports describing progress toward the achievement of institutional goals and disseminate them to college constituencies. It is further recommended that the College go beyond qualitative evaluation of its planning and program review processes by developing and using consistent quantitative effectiveness measures and feedback mechanisms to improve the processes at the program and the institutional level. (I.B.2-3, I.B.5-7, II.A.2-3)

Commendation

The Team wishes to commend the College for:

- Its annual program review/planning process that has been in place for more than five years and provides for deliberate and frequent analysis of all programs and integration with resource allocation.

Standard II – Student Learning Programs and Services

General Comments

Moorpark College has made efficient use of limited human and other resources to offer a wide variety of quality education programs. They have made recent and significant progress in expanding distance delivery of courses with corresponding development of quality standards and student support systems. They are at the development level of outcomes and assessment regarding the entire instructional program, but rapidly approaching the proficiency level. (II.A)

Moorpark College offers a comprehensive array of student support services that organizationally are interwoven by a student learning-centered approach designed to promote student success. The structure combines academic and support services under three educational administrators and results in ongoing cross-institutional dialogue about how best to support student access, progress, learning and success. (II.B)

The Library and Learning Support Services are provided in a central location in a relatively new building which opened in 2005. The Library provides a full array of services and collections serving on-site and online students. The Teaching and Learning Center's (TLC) facilities include tutoring services, Math and Writing labs, a Language Lab, and a large student computer lab. The Language Lab serves as a supplemental learning resource available to students in foreign language courses, ESL students and faculty who want to schedule a class in the lab. Students can easily access online resources (e-books and online databases) and services (an online research skills tutorial for the library and online tutoring in study skills, essay writing, and reading comprehension). The facility also supports cultural activities and exhibitions, such as poetry readings and literary receptions. (II.C.)

Standard II.A – Instructional Programs

Findings and Evidence

Moorpark College offers high quality instructional programs in many fields of study, with 57 associate degrees, 34 certificates, 10 proficiency awards and 9 licensing/permit preparations. Moorpark College relies on the Curriculum Committee to ensure that instructional programs and courses meet the college's mission and uphold its integrity. The Curriculum Committee requires proposals to include a statement of need related to the mission. The college has just implemented a five-year curriculum review process where each discipline is slotted into a specific year in the five-year timeline and must assure a comprehensive review of curriculum before or no later than that year. The curriculum process appears to be primarily faculty-driven and organized, with four administrators, one classified staff member, and at least ten voting faculty members representing each academic division serving as the Curriculum Committee. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) are presented as a component of the course

outline of record approved by the Curriculum Committee. Clear procedures exist for program creations but less so for program elimination. (II.A.1)

Through the program planning/review process, research information from the Institutional Effectiveness Report provides demographic needs in the community and student demographics, as well as program level research information, providing faculty with a clear picture of the community they are serving. (II.A.1.a)

The College finds that the most pressing issue in terms of serving students is trying to schedule the courses they need when resources are so scarce due to the State budget crisis. The College has approached this problem by identifying “core” courses. This has been a department-level process where faculty, department chairs, and deans determine what students need most by considering enrollment trends, transfer institution requirements, and the relative merits of breadth from a student perspective, discipline by discipline. The core identification process was first initiated three years ago and continues as the College’s scheduling guideline. (II.A.1.a)

Moorpark College uses a variety of delivery methods. Beginning in 2006, the College identified a strategic direction of providing more courses and services through distance education, based primarily on the forecasted demographic change to an older population in its service area. By Fall 2008, more than 100 courses were offered online, enrolling over 3,500 students, 21% of the College’s student population. In Fall 2009, the College submitted an ACCJC Substantive Change Report that identified the programs in which student may complete 50% or more of their course requirements using an online delivery mode. This rapid growth was matched by considerable faculty and staff dialogue about the appropriate support mechanisms for online students, which resulted in the adoption of a new course management system that could adequately support the growing number of courses and students. Several committee support structures and a forum for review were created to assure the quality of distance education course offerings. The College acknowledges that the student success rate in online courses is only 58%, which is about 10% less than on-ground classes. However, this online course success rate is similar to that of other California community colleges. (II.A.1.b)

In regard to student learning outcomes (SLOs), the college has shown significant progress in developing and assessing outcomes since the last accreditation self study in 2004. Initiating course SLO development in 2003, almost all courses now have SLOs on the official course outlines of record. Most programs and majors have SLOs, as well. There is ongoing dialogue as to what constitutes a program, which provides for review and subsequent changing of the SLOs. General education (GE) outcomes have been drafted and are now being discussed, with the expectation that they will be finalized in 2010-11 and assessment will begin. Institutional SLOs (called ISLOs) have yet to be developed, but work on institutional core competencies has been completed, serving as a foundation for ISLOs. (II.A.1.c)

The College hopes to reach the sustainability level of outcomes and assessment by Fall 2012, however it is the Team’s view that it is more likely that the College will reach the proficiency level overall, with sustainability at the course level. At least two assessment and

improvement loops are planned to occur for programs by Fall 2012, but there is no explicit timeline. Furthermore, the fact that the program level discussions are occurring now would suggest that the first assessment may not begin until 2011-12. (II.A.1.c, II.A.2.b)

Moorpark College ensures quality and improvement in instructional programs and courses via its curriculum approval process, faculty member performance evaluations, and the assessment of student learning outcomes. The program planning/review process is annual and assures faculty member review of course and program relevancy, currency, and effectiveness. (II.A.2)

The College follows defined procedures when developing new courses and programs. The process is detailed in the *Making Decisions at Moorpark College* document and begins at the department/discipline level. Each step is clearly delineated and efficiency has been greatly enhanced with the implementation of *CurricuNet* at the college level and with *BoardDocs* at the district level. Furthermore, the College has taken steps to assure that all disciplines will be in compliance with regular curriculum updates through the implementation of a new five-year curriculum review cycle. (II.A.2.a)

Faculty members conduct an annual program review/plan which includes a review of SLOs and assessment of those outcomes. During this process, faculty may indicate areas for improvement in courses and/or programs which are documented in the program plan itself. Plans are reviewed by the Institutional Research Coordinator and vice presidents in the spring of each year and they are tied to resource allocation. (II.A.2.a)

Moorpark College primarily relies on faculty expertise to identify competency levels and measureable SLOs at the course, program and general education level. Faculty members are actively engaged in outcomes assessment, the primary evidence being program plans from the annual review process. Course syllabi randomly selected on the site visit, showed clearly stated student learning outcomes and objectives; all course outlines of record with the approved SLOs are accessible through *CurricuNet*, and many were randomly reviewed. There is no summary report that confirms the level to which course SLOs have been completed. (II.A.2.b)

A Team review of the program plans showed evidence of program SLOs. Yet, there is a current campus dialogue considering the question: "What is a program?" This may require changes in the program SLOs, as the college continues to discuss and refine how it defines a program more clearly. Program assessment was initiated in 2009-10 but is not complete. (II.A.2.b)

There are five core competencies established to address what knowledge a Moorpark program completer should possess, but there are no institutional student learning outcomes for these yet. (II.A.2.b)

The Curriculum Committee is the primary means by which the College ensures high-quality instruction. As discussed above, there is a well-documented curriculum process, established guidelines for committee membership, and recent technological developments that have

improved the efficiency of the entire approval cycle. Curriculum review that includes articulation to transfer institutions works to assure appropriate breadth, depth, and rigor. Additionally, there are three subcommittees of the Curriculum Committee that assist in quality review, including technical compliance, general education, and honors. (II.A.2.c)

Moorpark College uses delivery modes and teaching methodologies that reflect the diverse needs and learning styles of its students, including traditional lecture, learning communities, and distance delivery modes. (II.A.2.c)

A visit to a Rhetoric course provided an experience of being in a large lecture hall filled with over a hundred students, actively engaged in the lecture as evidenced by their rapt attention. Even from the last row in the hall, the lecturer's voice and delivery were clear and understandable; the delivery mode and teaching methodology were effective and engaging. Ideas were presented clearly, to keep a wide variety, and large number of students able to comment thoughtfully on the ideas presented. (II.A.2.c)

An English-Philosophy Learning Community (ENGL M01B & PHIL M01) course presented a variety of delivery modes and pedagogical strategies. These included a student-led approach contrasted with a teacher-led discussion that followed the student group. Students were engaged with both techniques, and there was a high level of student participation and discussion. (II.A.2.c)

A visit to the Child Development Center revealed wonderfully varied teaching strategies and methods that incorporate the full spectrum of learning styles and brain development activities. These methods allow student observation, reflection and data analysis in a variety of areas and methods. A quite thorough exploration of meeting learners' different learning abilities was shown through Child Development courses, particularly its courses that focus on special education and special needs. (II.A.2.c)

The Alternative Delivery Subcommittee of the Education Committee for Accreditation and Planning (EdCAP) has written and is revising best practice guidelines for distance education course delivery. Compliance with these guidelines is a requirement for curriculum approval. Additionally, the College offers training to help faculty members utilize the course management software and to address pedagogical issues. There is a Distance Education Program Plan that has identified improvement of student success and retention as goals and strategies have been employed and new faculty training sessions have been offered, such as the Fall 2010 "Coffee-Break" series for faculty to illustrate best practices in online teaching. (II.A.2.c)

Moorpark College fosters faculty development to support diverse learning needs with faculty professional development activities. In particular, first year tenure track faculty members attend a *New Faculty Orientation* which is a series of presentations during their first year of employment, providing a venue for pedagogy and teaching methodologies' discussions. (II.A.2.c)

The College's curriculum and program review processes are the primary means to evaluate programs and courses. Curriculum review is now a five-year staggered process and is supported by the use of *CurricuNet*. Program review is a dynamic annual process that is well-understood by department faculty members. A new modification to the program plan/review process is being implemented to explicitly include curriculum review status. (II.A.2.e)

The College is engaged in ongoing, systematic evaluation and integrated planning to assure currency and measure achievement of its stated student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. It is abundantly clear from the *Making Decisions at Moorpark College* document that the College requires annual program planning for all its programs, and the process is linked to resource allocations. Advisory committee input, Projections of Environment Scans, and department comments all reflect that decisions are integrated through these various participatory groups. Data is made readily available for analysis in ongoing, systemic evaluation and integrated planning of programs. Evidence reviewed shows that this process is working extremely well. (II.A.2.f)

Moorpark College does not use departmental examinations but does have some departments that have elected to use common exams and/or common exam questions as part of their SLO assessment plans. There are some career technical programs, such as Nursing, that prepare students for external licensure examinations. (II.A.2.g)

As outlined in the College Catalog, credit is awarded based on student completion of course requirements, including learning outcomes listed on the Course Outline of Record. As previously mentioned, nearly all courses and most programs have identified SLOs. Upon completion of required courses, degrees and certificates are awarded. (II.A.2.h-i)

All degree programs require a general education component which is identified in the College Catalog. The Catalog also contains a philosophy statement which outlines the rationale for general education as a requirement of Moorpark degrees. This philosophy statement also includes ten statements of outcomes students are expected to achieve via General Education requirement completion. The Curriculum Committee has established a General Education Subcommittee which reviews and recommends courses for GE approval to the full Committee. There is some evidence to support that GE has comprehensive learning outcomes for students through the core competencies General Education rubric and through program outcomes in the areas of humanities and fine arts, the natural and social sciences, language and rationality, and, ethnic and women's studies. However, the College has not yet determined whether these core competencies are the same as General Education SLOs. This is a discussion in progress. (II.A.3)

As outlined in the college catalog, all Associate in Arts and Associate in Science degree programs require focused study in one area of inquiry. (II.A.4)

Career Technical Education (CTE) course objectives are developed by faculty in the discipline with assistance of program advisory committees. The College measures the

effectiveness of the CTE programs by analyzing graduates' success in passing external licensure examinations. In areas without external licensure, industry standards are incorporated into the curriculum via advisory committees and documented on the Course Outlines of Record. Some programs are externally accredited, which further provide evidence of maintaining applicable standards. (II.A.5)

Moorpark College communicates information to current and prospective students through the College Catalog, Class Schedule and course syllabi. Degrees, certificate programs, and transfer policies are clearly and accurately described in the Catalog. Faculty members are encouraged to include student learning outcomes on their syllabi, however this is not required and, according to the Coordinator of Institutional Research, not all syllabi list them. Course Outlines of Record and Program Plans are available on the website, so students technically have access to SLOs, but there is no assurance that students receive them. (II.A.6)

The College informs students about degree and transfer requirements in the College Catalog. Transfer-of-credit is assured through the articulation process and is primarily the purview of the articulation officer who is responsible to update the Catalog annually. Articulation agreements are maintained and students may obtain transfer information to the UC and CSU through the *ASSIST* website. The college also helps students with transfer information at its Career/Transfer Center staffed by a full-time counselor. (II.A.6.a)

The College has eliminated only one program in recent history and does not have a formal program discontinuance process. At this point in time, program elimination would be triggered within the program planning/review process. The College states that catalog rights would allow a student with continuous enrollment to complete an eliminated program. A student who interrupts his/her enrollment status in an eliminated program consults a counselor to see if alternative means of completion can be provided by the department faculty. The College is working in concert with the District to develop a consistent program discontinuance policy and administrative procedures. This process was initiated over a year ago but has not been completed, nor is there a timeline for completion. (II.A.6.b)

Overall, Moorpark College represents itself accurately and consistently through its media products and the College Catalog. The website available to the public is relatively easy to navigate and is up-to-date with only some minor revisions needed, such as updating addresses, the total number of California community colleges, the most recent organizational chart, and the like. (II.A. 6.c)

All members of the public have access to the College Catalog, the Class Schedule, Academic Calendar, and other items. The District provides a portal, *MyVCCCD*, which provides students, staff and faculty with an additional means of communication. Additionally, the Office of Institutional Research has a website, which allows anyone to obtain student success and access information specific to the College. (II.A.6.c)

Moorpark College uses the VCCCD Board Policy on Academic Freedom (BP 4030) which is available to the public on the District's website. Academic Freedom is also assured and defined in the Collective Bargaining Agreement negotiated with the local AFT union and

appears in the College Catalog. Furthermore, the Academic Senate adopted a commitment to Academic Freedom which is printed in the Faculty Handbook, which is widely available. (II.A.7)

Whereas the Academic Freedom policy is highly available, there has been continuing discussion and need of clarification between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline. The College intends to use venues of faculty professional development to more widely disseminate the difference between personal conviction and professionally accepted views, but the plan still needs to be solidified to be more specific as to who is responsible, how and when they will do this. (II.A.7.a)

The District has a Board policy addressing student academic honesty (BP 5500). This policy is available on the District's website and in the College Catalog and it includes a Student Code of Conduct. It governs student academic honesty and the consequences of violating the policy. Instructors are encouraged to include the policy in syllabi. Additionally, the College has established a Behavior Intervention Team (BIT) to assist with counseling and intervention when student conduct is deemed to necessitate such actions. (II.A.7.b)

The District also has an Employee Code of Ethics (BP 7205) that was adopted June 16, 2010. It is not in the current Faculty Handbook, which has not been updated since 2008. The Faculty Handbook does, however, contain a statement of ethics developed by the Academic Senate. (II.A.7.c)

Moorpark College does not offer any instruction in foreign locations. (II.A.8)

Standard II.B – Student Support Services

Findings and Evidence

Moorpark College employs a student learning centered approach and clusters student support services by functionality under three deans. This unique structure ensures that the College's administrative staff maintains shared awareness and understanding from both the academic and student affairs perspectives. Semi-monthly meetings of the Student Services Council provide added cohesion between and among support programs. A recent pilot project completed by the Basic Skills Committee provides an example of the collaboration and integration of student learning that is fostered by the College's organizational model. The project brought a decentralized group of faculty from the classroom, learning center, and student services together with educational administrators to increase student success in gate-keeping courses (i.e., first in sequence required for degree and transfer). The project resulted in marked increases in success rates. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) have been developed and refined by each of the program units and assessments have been written. As evidenced in the most recently submitted program plans for 2010, many programs have begun to deploy their evaluation tools and use the results to make service improvements. (II.B)

The College has a strong outreach program that conducts frequent presentations at fourteen feeder high schools in the primary service area, as well as at college fairs and community events. The College applies a team approach, using an outreach specialist, student ambassadors, and counselors as appropriate for each venue. Although the majority of students use the online statewide application *CCCApply*, paper applications are also available in both English and Spanish for students less comfortable with technology. (II.B)

Although it does not offer any classes off site, Moorpark College has recently experienced significant growth in its Distance Education program with enrollments tripling over the past three years. The College's Education Committee for Accreditation and Planning (EdCAP) established an Alternative Delivery Ad Hoc Committee to plan, monitor and assess alternative instruction and services. The committee has representation from instruction, student services, technology and administrative services. The committee reviews enrollment, success and persistence data and establishes annual goals by which to secure measurable improvements. A student portal (*myVCCCD*) was launched in 2009 and provides students a primary access point for online information and services. An online orientation is offered to new students to complement the on-ground modality. The Writing Center has established an on-line tutoring service, providing students with an opportunity to log in weekly for assistance. The College is encouraged to continue to evaluate, modify, and expand upon the services it provides for its distance education students. (II.B.1)

Moorpark College publishes a College Catalog that is reviewed and updated annually to reflect changes in offerings, policy and practice. The catalog is available in hardcopy, on computer disk, and on the College's website. It contains general institutional information, admission, fee, graduation and transfer requirements, and describes the major policies affecting students such as academic honesty and nondiscrimination. The College's Grievance Officer maintains detailed records of student complaints and grievances. (II.B.2)

The College has multiple strategies for researching and identifying the learning support needs of its students. The Research Office publishes an annual Institutional Effectiveness Report which provides historical perspective and trend analysis on a variety of key data, such as student demographics, student success and persistence rates, program completion, and transfer rates. Additionally, the College uses two primary survey instruments to research and identify the learning needs of its student population: the nationally developed Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE); and a locally developed Student Perception Survey that is administered through the District Office. A side-by-side comparison of the 2003 and 2009 Student Perception Surveys was completed in June 2009 and provides an assessment of changing student perceptions and satisfaction with services. As indicated in the Self Study planning agendas, program staff have identified the need to develop additional assessment measurements at the programmatic or service level to measure the effectiveness of programs such as those designed to encourage personal and civic responsibility, enhance understanding of diversity, as well as in counseling where there is a desire to secure feedback specifically from students who have recently sought counseling assistance. (II.B.3, II.B.3.a)

Over the past three years, college staff has developed and built *myNav*, a student development tool which was launched in Fall 2010. *MyNav* is designed to encourage student self-advocacy in an outcome-based, on-line delivery format that is accessed through the web. It defines stages of student engagement as students move through the College and identifies key outcomes a student needs to be successful. The College plans to track student access and utilization of *myNav* and promote resources to students based on their specific phase of development. (II.B.3 a)

Moorpark College offers students a variety of opportunities for leadership and personal development. The Associated Students Board of Directors consists of ten positions filled through a general election process. Additionally, the Board of Directors has recognized twenty-eight active clubs representing a broad diversity of interests and perspectives. Students are appointed to formal seats at each of the shared governance committees at the College, although student participation goals have been hard to achieve. The Associated Students Board of Directors provides administrative oversight for approximately \$100,000 in annual revenues generated by student I.D. card sales and bookstore contributions. Approximately \$2 million has accrued in a restricted account from the collection of student center fees over the past ten years and awaits allocation. (II.B.3.b)

Master Degree-prepared faculty provide general counseling services and specialized services such as the Accessibility Coordination Center and Education Support Services (ACCESS), Arts, Athletics, Career/Transfer, Educational Opportunities Programs and Services (EOPS). There are also specialized counselors for the Nursing and for the Sciences programs, specifically. Counselors are evaluated according to the terms of the faculty contract which incorporates student survey results. The College provides a variety of training opportunities for counselors including weekly departmental meetings, academic information sessions, and counselor conferences sponsored by the major four-year universities in the region. In addition to the data received on the Student Perception Survey regarding counseling, the College is working to utilize functionality available through the *myVCCD* portal to specifically secure feedback from students who have received counseling assistance. (II.B.3.c)

The percentage of ethnically diverse students at Moorpark College exceeds that of its service area, although the College still enrolls a high number of Caucasian students compared to many other community colleges in California. The College does not actively recruit international students, however approximately 100 students from other countries enroll each semester. The College prides itself on a number of programs and practices that support and enhance diversity, the largest of which is *Multicultural Day*, held each spring semester. The *One Campus, One Book* project weaves diversity discussions both in and out of the classroom as do the *Theme of the Year* projects that have included science and religion, the environment, democracy, service and the economy. Although the effectiveness of these efforts is not evaluated by the Student Perception Survey, the College plans to solicit feedback from students at the time of their participation. (II.B.3.d)

The College employs a self-placement process for students attempting to enroll in English and mathematics courses that are below college level. College research has shown that lower student success and retention data in Mathematics for self-placed students as compared to

mandatorily placed students has identified the need for the College to review and modify its processes. The Matriculation Committee, Basic Skills Committee and the math department faculty are aware of the research findings and are working to recommend appropriate changes. (II.B.3.e)

The district's Instructional Technology division administers back-up protocols for electronic storage of student data. Permanent paper records are stored in a fireproof vault and destroyed in accordance with California Education Code Title 5 regulations. The institution adheres to its policy governing the release of student records and other information which is contained in the Moorpark College Catalog and other appropriate publications. (II.B.3.f)

The College has established a goal of achieving Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement in its implementation of student learning outcomes through the annual program planning process by 2012, although the Team's evaluation suggests that the College will reach proficiency by then. Each student support service has developed one or more (SLOs) in addition to identifying assessment measures. As evidenced in the most recently submitted program plans, many programs have begun to deploy evaluation tools and use the results to make service improvements. (II.B.4)

Standard II.C – Library and Learning Support Services

Findings and Evidence

The services and resources of the Library, the Teaching & Learning Center (TLC) and student computer lab are heavily used and well regarded by faculty and students, as evidenced by productivity/usage and survey data that indicates increasing use in all. Examples include Math Lab sign-ins: from 4,151 in 2007-08 to 8,725 the following year; and the total number of tutoring sessions increasing from 7,659 to 9,177 in this same time period. (II.C)

Until recently, both the Library and the TLC have had only two full-time faculty (plus classified, an administrator and student staff), which makes it noteworthy that they have accomplished many of their program goals to serve increasing numbers of students, to offer high quality services, and to serve the broader campus community on committees and as part of innovative projects. The Library's documented need for an additional librarian was noted on the previous Self Study and repeated on each annual program plan/review since then; a full-time librarian was hired in Fall 2010 to finally address this long-term planning goal. (II.C)

Evidence cited in the Self Study and findings from Team interviews document the adequacy of materials, collections and equipment to support student learning. At very busy times, student space in the TLC becomes impacted, but because of the open architecture, accommodations can be made to seat more students waiting for tutoring or other services. There is extensive faculty expertise used in the selection of software and service development for the TLC. Both the Math Lab and the Writing Center have advisory committees that meet once a month to discuss resources and services that directly affect

student learning. Faculty members from many academic departments populate these advisory committees. The TLC also documents the on-going need for maintaining, upgrading when appropriate and maximizing the use of learning technologies, such as the *PLATO* software and other online accessible learning software and equipment. (IIC.1a-b)

The Library staff has had a stable budget to purchase print and online resources/materials and through the curriculum review process gets direct input regarding library resources for new and revised courses. A librarian is consistently a member of the Curriculum Committee to evaluate the library's ability to provide adequate support for courses. Library faculty members also solicit recommendations from faculty for purchases and involve them in targeted collection analysis decisions that involve withdrawing older materials. As stated on a Moorpark Self Study "Planning Agenda," to supplement their collections and enhance student access to information, librarians are currently in the process of developing policies and procedures to offer reciprocal borrowing between the three Ventura District college libraries to expand the availability of materials to students. (II.C.1.a)

Through the Division Core Competencies, the faculty and staff of the Library and the TLC have collaboratively developed program purposes and measurable program SLOs. TLC staff have also developed course SLOs for their credit COLL courses, which are published on the web site. To ensure that students develop skills and outcomes, instruction is provided in a variety of ways and formats to accommodate on-site and online students. Library faculty offer one-to-one assistance at the Reference/Information service desk or by appointment to assist students with course and library assignments. Instruction is also provided in group sessions requested by course instructors. The third instructional delivery medium is through an online tutorial called *Searchpath*, developed in Spring 2008. TLC faculty and staff also offer workshops, one-to-one by appointment and drop-in tutoring, online tutoring, and online accessible learning software like the *PLATO* system for Mathematics. Math Center faculty and tutors assist students at all levels, with a special focus on student needs in basic skills courses. Student tutors are well trained and consistently receive high ratings by students and faculty alike. Increasingly, there is more integration of these learning resources and services in Math, English, Nursing and other classes, largely because of the advisory committees and the fine outreach that TLC faculty do across-the-curriculum. Moreover, Math Department faculty members hold office hours in the TLC, thus strengthening the connection between the classroom and learning resources. (II.C.1.b-c)

Access to the resources, collections and services provided by the Library and TLC are adequate, although not equal in terms of the various service area hours. Saturday hours have been eliminated due to budget cuts, but the Moorpark Self Study points out that Saturday course offerings have decreased for the same reason. Despite this, student satisfaction data from Fall 2008 affirm that the Library hours are adequate. (IIC.1.c)

Interviews with LLR faculty demonstrate dedication to student learning; faculty members often make arrangements to teach workshops or an online tutorial occasionally on Saturdays or after normal hours. Access is enhanced, especially for distance learning students, by the provision of telephone and online services, 24/7 access to information resources such as the electronic books and reference/periodical databases, and web pages describing new materials,

services, resources, policies and procedures. Movie tutorials are also available from links on the Library website for some courses. TLC and Library staff members actively promote their services, regularly targeting and assisting faculty teaching online courses. (IIC.1.c)

The program plans/reviews short- and long-term planning agendas identify ways to increase access to library collections by cataloging the backlog of print and non-print materials and electronic books. The only service that is lacking an online presence is the reference information service, although discussions are underway about options for providing an online presence. TLC staff members are investigating the possible expansion of online learning opportunities, particularly for more Math courses and as refresher/review opportunities for newly enrolled students before classes begin. (IIC.1.c)

The College and District seem to provide adequate maintenance and security for the Library and Learning Resource Center (LLRC). As explained in the Self Study, security is provided by the District Police on a daily basis. The Maintenance and Operation Department handles building maintenance, and the computer and related technologies are maintained by the College Information Technology staff. IT support appears to be adequate, although more staff training on the content management software could be provided so that Library and TLC staff could revise and add their own web pages. Library collections are processed with embedded security strips and protected by the 3M security gate system. The only concern expressed in the 2009-10 Library program plan/review identifies a security and safety problem with the LLR building. The issue relates to library staff needing to secure the building when classroom instruction sometimes extends beyond service hours. The open architecture of the building does not allow for opening/closing just one section of the building. (II.C.1.d)

The College does not rely on external contract services to support instructional programs, and the cooperative agreements with library networks and professional associations are formal and reviewed regularly for relevance and effectiveness. These cooperative agreements are subscription or membership-based and provide cataloging records for library materials and discounted yearly subscriptions to online databases. The District acquires and maintains necessary licensing agreements with the online course management system and software used for courses and in the TLC such as *PLATO* and others. (II.C.1.e)

The Library and TLC staff members have evaluated their services to assure adequacy in meeting identified student needs and have begun to accumulate evidence related to program and student learning outcomes. Overall, there are consistently high and positive assessment findings for the quality of their services and resources. In general, the measurable SLOs stated in Program Plan's Assessment of Program Effectiveness document seem effective in terms of the measurement technique utilized. However in the 2009-10 Library Program Plan, one measurement method does not really address the desired SLO, as performance on a standardized test may not adequately reveal how well students can actually apply specific research skills to classroom assignments. The 2009-10 Program Plans documented assessment findings from 2008-09 show positive findings and practical applications for program improvement. Library student satisfaction surveys, exit surveys in the Math and

Writing centers and other evaluation tools are used to assess the adequacy of services and staff use the findings to provide improvements where needed. (II.C.2)

Another evaluation venue comes from the Writing and Math centers Advisory Committees, which have provided suggestions for program/service expansion and improvement based on course instructors' observations of their students' performance. The record of assessment and application of assessment findings to program improvement and student learning in the TLC shows an emerging culture of evidence. (II.C.2)

Conclusions

The College meets the Standard.

Moorpark College has a comprehensive instructional program that meets its mission by identifying students' needs and utilizing modes of instruction that are appropriate to those needs and has faculty members who are highly engaged in the processes of creating courses and programs, completing annual program review/plans, and developing/assessing student learning outcomes. The College assures quality in all of its educational courses and programs through well-established procedures to design, identify, approve, deliver and evaluate its courses and programs. (II.A.1)

Moorpark College has done a thorough job completing nearly all student learning outcomes at the course level, yet substantial work remains. The College needs to complete all program SLOs and create a clear plan to complete cycles of assessment for degree, certificate, general education and institutional SLOs. The five core competencies serving as Institutional Student Learning Outcomes should be reviewed and identified as such, or revised to do so. The College has no timeline for the completion of its work by 2012, nor are the SLOs at the course level consistently documented on course syllabi. (II.A.2)

It is quite evident that Moorpark College has high quality instruction and appropriate breadth, depth and rigor in its courses and programs, and uses delivery modes and teaching methodologies that reflect the diverse needs and learning styles of its students. The College evaluates courses and programs through an ongoing program review/planning process that takes into consideration currency, relevance, student success on learning outcomes, and future needs, and has embraced an attitude of ongoing, systematic evaluation and integrated planning of its programs. However, as indicated in the Team's review in Standard I, there is work to be done at the institutional level, specifically related to written documentation of progress in achieving institutional goals. (II.A.2)

Moorpark College requires general education components as part of degree requirements and has done a very good job of creating and disseminating a general education philosophy with outcomes to students. The College's General Education Subcommittee is a strong working body that assures faculty review of all general education considerations. Furthermore, Moorpark College is using student learning outcomes to guide analysis and decisions made on general education curriculum. Degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry, and CTE programs demonstrate technical competencies that meet employment standards. (II.A.3-5)

Moorpark College represents itself and its programs accurately and widely disseminates this information. However, students do not have ready access to SLOs as they are not consistently included on syllabi or published in the Catalog or Class Schedule. The District is currently developing a program discontinuance process for all three colleges. The College meets the standards of establishing and communicating policies of academic freedom, student conduct and employee ethics. (II.A.6-7)

Moorpark College has a dedicated team of staff focused on and passionate about student learning. Its decentralized administrative oversight of student services has been modified to improve coordination and collaboration. Attention is given to ensure ease of student access to support services, including but not limited to way-finding signage, hours of operation, functional adjacencies, and front counter presentation. As evidenced in the maturation of their program plans, the service units have worked hard to improve their student learning outcomes, assessment measures, and assessment and evaluation processes. (II.B.1, II.B.4)

College research has shown that lower student success and retention data in mathematics for self-placed students as compared to mandatorily placed students has identified the need for the college to review and modify its processes. And while SLOs have been developed and refined by each of the student support program units and assessments have been written, many but not all programs have begun to deploy their evaluation tools and use the results to make service improvements. (II.B.3-4)

The College has a high quality and variety of Library and Learning Resource services developed, offered, assessed and continually refined by the LLRC to benefit student learning and success. These learning support operations work like a “well-oiled machine,” due to leadership, commitment, and staff enthusiasm for helping students to succeed. Library services, materials and resources are well-developed and customized to serve students’ curricular needs. Access is being further expanded by the acquisition and promotion of more online resources and services. Once the Library staff implements online reference information service and completes the reciprocal borrowing arrangements with the other two District colleges, access will be even more improved for both on-site and distance learning students. The LLRC physical facility is very attractive, functional and heavily used. Sufficient space for students using TLC services could become an issue should services expand and/or more students use services during peak periods. (II.C.1)

Evaluation of services and resources to assess SLOs is well on track and as long as appropriate assessment methods and instruments are aligned with specific SLOs, the findings should be useful for service improvements. More could be accomplished by enhancing existing collaboration between Library and TLC faculty. For example, consulting between librarians and TLC faculty about how and what they are doing to teach students proper citation format using MLA and APA would likely enhance student learning. With the recent addition of the third, full-time librarian, expansion and more comprehensive integration of information competency skills may be realized through enhanced outreach to course instructors requiring research-based assignments. (II.C.1-2)

Recommendations

College Recommendation: 1

See Standard I.

College Recommendation: 2

In order to meet the Commission's expectation of reaching the proficiency level regarding student learning outcomes and assessment by fall 2012, the Team recommends that the College develop specific timelines which are disseminated and reviewed, provide written summary reports of SLO assessments and improvements, and assure that assessment results are used for course, program and institutional improvement. Additionally, the College shall ensure that in every class section, students receive a course syllabus that specifies learning outcomes consistent with those in the institution's officially approved course outline.

(II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a-b, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, IIA.3, II.A.6, IIB.1, IIB4, II.C.2).

College Recommendation: 3

In order to validate effectiveness and improve student success, the Team recommends that the College complete an evaluation of its self-placement process for English and mathematics and make modifications as appropriate and necessary. This could include the consideration of using diagnostic instruments and revising placement processes. (II.B.3.e)

Commendations

The Team wishes to commend the College for:

- Its Student Learning Model as a creative and integrated organizational structure that approaches student needs in a holistic way, supports innovation in developing programs and projects to assist students, particularly in basic skills and degree and transfer achievements, and engages cross-functional dialogue to meet the College's mission.
- The innovative work across instruction and student services on the Basic Skills Pilot.

Standard III – Resources

General Comments

Generally, Moorpark has sufficient resources to provide a quality education. The self study and evidence is clear on that point. All institutions would like to have more, and Moorpark College is no different, however, the college personnel are proud of the resources they do have and the processes by which they are allocated at the College. Although there are budget constraints, the College has procedures for assessing, planning for, acquiring, conserving and evaluating resources of all types. Measure S, a bond measure that provides for upgrading older facilities and building new facilities, is a testament to the College's planning capacity. The Moorpark Campus is exceptionally attractive and well maintained, with many new facilities funded through Bond Measure S in 2002. The Measure S bond dollars are maximized through use of additional state and local resources set aside by the College. The College has identified over \$13 million in project requests; however, there is currently no funding from the state for any scheduled maintenance projects. The majority of the buildings are located on a scenic plateau at the top of the campus and lovely grounds transition to additional parking and athletic facilities at the base. The large fountain at the top of the campus provides a space for peaceful reflection and is a focal point on the upper campus grounds. The footprint for the campus allows for large, landscaped swathes of green between buildings that lend themselves to student and staff activities. The construction that has occurred or is underway is consistent with educational and facilities master planning efforts. A full tour of the campus was conducted and a number of buildings were entered and viewed for ongoing upkeep and cleanliness.

The College has shown considerable innovation through the extensive technology resources that support on-campus needs of all staff, both administratively and instructionally, as well as distance education.

Moorpark College is part of the Ventura County Community College District, and its financial resources are primarily tied to the financial well-being of the district. Financial planning is done at both the district and college levels. Integration of planning at the institutional level, which includes capital planning, design, construction and technology, is handled by the District Office because these functions are considered to be central district services. Integration of planning at the college level is well developed. The College completed its revised strategic plan for 2009-2012 in January 2010 and the budget process ties resource allocation requests and decisions to the strategic plan through the program review process. Currently, requests for new or revised positions are incorporated in the program plans.

District financial planning activities take into consideration long-range financial obligations as evidenced by its commitment to fund its post-retirement benefit funding liability (GASB-45), and its liabilities for load banking.

The College uses the program review process as a foundation for budget development. The College provides constituent groups with the opportunity to participate in the development of institutional plans and budgets through representation on the EdCAP and Fiscal Planning committees. There is a strong commitment to maintaining a transparent budget process and to engaging the entire college community in planning and budgeting although only about 47.7% of faculty and staff surveyed in Fall 2009 agreed that there is “an openness and transparency in the college development process.”

The district uses the Banner integrated administrative IT system, which provides dependable and timely information. The annual budget document provides detailed information on the finances of the district and colleges and the calculations from the District’s budget allocation model.

The Banner finance system provides appropriate financial information and additional queries are available through the College’s Business Services Office, Coordinator of Institutional Research and through the District IT function. All managers and division staff are trained to use the Banner finance system.

The District Committee on Administrative Services (DCAS) reviews the budgeting process and financial information at the district and college levels, including allocations based on the District’s Budget Allocation Model. Changes in policies and management procedures are discussed at DCAS meetings, including the percent of carryover the colleges may budget. Since the hiring of the college business officer in 2009, many processes at the local level have been reviewed.

Standard III.A – Human Resources

Findings and Evidence

The Ventura County Community College District (VCCCD) has policies and procedures in place that allow Moorpark College to hire qualified personnel to support student learning. The College relies on these District policies and procedures to manage its personnel practices. A review of current job postings, job descriptions, and hiring committee packets provides evidence that the institution identifies position duties and ensures positions are related to the mission and goals of the College. Criteria for selection of new faculty include knowledge of subject matter and effective teaching skills. Team interviews with faculty members and with the District Vice Chancellor of Human Resources reveal that faculty members play a significant role in the selection of new faculty. The Human Resources Department verifies the official copies of college/university transcripts and obtains verification through a third-party agency that such degrees were conferred. Applicants holding degrees from non-U.S. institutions must provide an evaluation of their transcripts by an agency recognized by the National Association of Credential Evaluation Services. The District is presently nearing completion of an audit of the minimum qualifications (MQs) of all full- and part-time faculty members. (III.A.1, III.A.1.a)

The Human Resources Department places applicants for classified positions on eligibility lists following the successful completion of an application process that includes a competitive screening process. The District measures the success of the hiring practices in fact that since July 2007, with few exceptions all 61 of full-time, tenure track hires have gone on to be tenures, while of 126 classified employees only five have been released during the probationary period. (III.A.1.a)

Evidence indicates that probationary faculty, tenured faculty, part-time faculty, and classified personnel are evaluated on the regular schedule for their category of employment. A random review of personnel files was undertaken by Team members as verification of this practice. Full-time faculty members are evaluated in accordance with tenure and promotion processes. Evaluation forms for staff and faculty vary, but evaluation methods focus on performance effectiveness and encourage improvement. Adherence to course outlines of record (CORs) and evidence of course preparation are also evaluated during the faculty evaluation process. Administrators are evaluated using an evaluation format that includes a complete feedback component. (III.A.1.b)

Formal and timely follow-up of evaluations are mandated by union contracts. The effectiveness of faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving SLOs is not a component of the evaluation process; however, faculty utilize SLOs as the basis for evaluating effectiveness of course content and the general assessment of student learning in their courses even though individual student evaluation must be grade based. (III.A.1.c)

Professional ethics for all personnel are defined in Board Policy 7205, which is titled Employee Code of Ethics. (III.A.1.d)

Due to the budget situation in California, the College appears to be operating with a minimally sufficient number of full- and part- faculty, staff, and administrators to support its mission and purpose. The College “has undertaken a two-part strategy over the past five years to ensure that, (1) the College is always cognizant of its human resources needs through review and planning, and (2) that the academic and administrative service areas identify and protect core services so as to mitigate severe impact on operations during economic down-cycles which necessitate staff reductions” (III.A.2, p. 154). Although as is natural in times of budget constraints, there was initial reluctance to go through human resource review and planning, the College held internal discussions and “made a commitment to faculty prioritization processes regardless of funding availability”. This decision provides for important dialogue and subsequent documentation regarding needs for new employees and resource allocation. The second prong of the strategy was “to mitigate the negative effects of severe budget reductions on institutional effectiveness and mission” by “the identification of core services (III.A.2).

With the elimination of administrative and classified positions and reduction of adjunct faculty in FY 2009 and 2010, it was the conversations on what is “core” that helped guide decisions. The College remains committed to being mindful of its mission priorities and its human resource needs in order to respond to the growth cycles as well as budget declines.

Human Resource planning is tied to institutional planning through the program review process. Over the past six years, the integrated process of review, planning, and human resource allocation has matured and is used to help match personnel to core programs and services. College personnel, although tempered by the present circumstance, express confidence that Moorpark will be able to sustain its programs and services. (III.A.2, III.A.6)

The District's human resource function is developed in compliance with the California Education Code and Title V requirements, District's Personnel Commission rules, collective bargaining agreements and court decisions. Changes in any one of these spurs change in the District's human resources policies, Such changes are updated in the *HR Tools*, which is available online to supervisors and managers. However, these changes are not normally communicated to supervisors and managers, nor are effected personnel normally consulted before or even after a change is made. This lack of communication is of concern to administrative, classified, and faculty personnel in VCCCD. The *District Employee Satisfaction Survey* report dated September 2010, where the Moorpark College response rate was 51.0% of all respondents, reports 25.7% either strongly disagree or disagree with the statement: "HR staff appropriately communicates HR-related information to VCCCD employees." In the college break out of the *Fall 2009 Employee Survey* report, only 34.5% of employees somewhat agree or strongly agree with the statement: " There is adequate communication between the College and District." (III.A.3)

While the *HR Tools* is presently available only to supervisory staff, work is now underway to customize its content for availability by employee category (i.e., full-time tenured faculty, tenure track faculty, etc.), which is evidence that efforts are being made to improve communication. (III.A.3)

However, the communication processes rely on the formal structures that were put into place in response to a prior recommendation. A system of district-wide councils has been created, but in practice, the processes they support do not address the day-to-day operational communications that require more informal processes. Survey results show that there still remains a level of concern about communication across the District, such that additional attention is needed. (III.A.3)

Supervisors and managers are trained to apply human resources polices in a fair and consistent manner and are evaluated, in part, on equitable treatment of employees. When grievances arise they are handled in accordance to procedures spelled out in collective bargaining agreements and in the District's Personnel Commission rules. However, in recent years, issues regarding early tenure approvals came up. A practice to conduct an "early tenure" at year three, rather than at "year four" under the normal tenure process was inequitably administered across the District, such that one college's faculty were approved for early tenure, while faculty at the other two colleges were not afforded the opportunity for early review. This caused great concern about the issue of fairness in employment practices. (III.A.3a, III.A.4.c)

A review of the Board policies online validated that many human resources policies have been recently developed or updated, some as recently as 2010, suggesting that effective

District personnel policies and procedures are in place. Personnel records are maintained in secure locations and confidentiality of personnel records is maintained. There is a plan to purchase image scanning technology and create an electronic redundancy to the current paper personnel file system. (III.A.3.b)

Although following the passage of Proposition 209, the District discontinued its EEOC plan and therefore the model that many employees were familiar with, it has since drafted a new plan based on the Model Equal Employment Opportunity Plan provided by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. Although the plan is still in draft form, the portions that stress cultural and diversity sensitivity are in place. Currently all screening committees involved in hiring processes include review by a Screening Committee Facilitator who assesses the diversity of the committee to ensure a professional, legal, consistent and equitable screening process. The District tracks gender and race/ethnicity data of current employees for MIS reporting. (III.A.4.a-b)

Evidence indicates that Moorpark has extensive staff development opportunities for all categories of employees. Evidence also shows that the staff development activities provided within the College or District are evaluated. Surveys of employees and questions on evaluations provide feedback regarding professional development that faculty and staff are interested in pursuing. The long standing *New Faculty Orientation* program is due to be reviewed and up-dated in a joint effort between the Office of Student Learning and the Faculty Development Committee. (III.A.5)

Moorpark College does integrate human resource planning with its institutional planning as evidenced by its commitment to faculty prioritization processes regardless of the current budget constraints to hire. This decision continues important dialogue and subsequent documentation regarding needs for new employees and resource allocation as part of the College's overall institutional planning. (III.A.6)

Standard III.B – Physical Resources

Findings and Evidence

The College has a computerized work order system for maintenance; however, the program is cumbersome to use. A new work order program, Track It will be in place by January 2011. This system is web-based and will be available on the College's Intranet. It will allow real-time tracking of work orders. (II.B.1)

Program review of maintenance programs does occur, utilizing the College's program review template. However, reviews are not conducted and staffing levels were not identified related to industry or system benchmarks. Nor are comparative industry standards for building and grounds workloads compared to campus levels available. (II.B.1)

The 2002 General Obligation Bond Measure S provided \$104 million dollars to the capital construction program on the Moorpark College campus. Other funds for campus renovations and new buildings included local funding and other state funding sources. Unfortunately, the

employee satisfaction survey conducted this year does not address perceptions about facilities and grounds. (III.B, III.B.1, III.B.1.a)

The college safety committee meets periodically and reviews a variety of safety issues including workers compensation, emergency preparedness, ergonomics, American Disabilities Association (ADA), and other related issues. The committee also reviews accident and injury incidents on campus. The new construction on campus has led to the upgrading of facilities for ADA compliance. Wheelchair ramps and parking spaces for persons with disabilities have been added to make the campus more user-friendly to students, faculty, and guests. However, because the campus is situated on a steep incline, there remain limited options on campus that are easily accessible to all. The Self Study outlines progress made in ADA compliance during the recent renovations and new building development (Academic Center). (III.B.1.b)

The District is a member of the Statewide Association of Community Colleges Joint Powers Authority (SWACC) that provides the district with property and liability insurance. SWACC, through Keenan and Associates, provides annual physical surveys, and these reports highlight areas of remediation when necessary along with prescribing corrective actions. Blue-light emergency phones have been installed throughout all permanent parking lots, however there are a number of temporary lots that do not have emergency phones or lights. Cameras were also installed as part of the \$1.8 million locally funded project focused on safety and emergency preparedness. The District operates a seven-day-a-week police department, but hours have been reduced due to budgetary reductions from a 24/7 schedule to a 21/5 weekday schedule, and a 17/2 weekend schedule. Traffic and parking have been identified as the largest safety concern on campus, which is being addressed through the parking and circulation projects as identified in the Facilities Master Plan. The campus is spread out over 150 acres and presents an additional challenge for public safety. (III.B.1.b)

As part of the campus facilities planning process, the College utilizes total cost of ownership models when considering new facilities and equipment. The Facilities Master Plan (FMP) of 2002 serves as the foundation for subsequent Facilities Master plans; the most recent update to the FMP was the 2005-2015 plan. The longer term Educational Master Plan is revised every ten years, while the Strategic Plan, based on program plans completed each year by all college programs, is revised every three years. To ensure that facilities are supportive of educational goals, the FMP is updated on a subsequent cycle (2005 is most recent and 2011 is planned). Annual updates are provided for the five-year construction plan submitted to the State Chancellor. Deferred maintenance and the resulting master plan for facilities became the basis for the new capital construction program. The FMP supports the long-term institutional goals of the College as reported in the Self Study. Moorpark College's FacilitiesCAP meets to discuss long-range planning and prioritization of future projects. (III.B.2, III.B.2.a)

Standard III.C Technology Resources

Findings and Evidence

The College's opening statement in Standard III.C of the Self Study is "Technology infrastructure and support at Moorpark College is designed to meet the needs of teaching and learning, college-wide communications, research, and information management systems for operations" (III.C.1, p. 175). The remainder of the Self Study discussion and other evidence that was reviewed supports this statement.

The College has extensive technology resources that support on-campus needs of all staff as well as distance education. Until recently, Information Technology (IT) was managed at the College, but responsibility is now centralized at the District Office under an Associate Vice Chancellor of Information Technology. On a day-to-day basis, IT services are now provided to the College through an IT manager shared by all three colleges, a classified supervisor at the College, and a small number of technicians who support daily operations at the College. When a new technological resource, such as Desire2Learn, is introduced across the District, extensive training is provided. The Instructional Technologist at Moorpark College among others provides an on-going, wide-ranging of technology training and support to faculty. (III.C.1)

The consolidation of services at the District and the roll out of Desire2Learn has not been seamless or without issues. The Ventura County Community College District Employee Satisfaction Survey report (September 2010) indicates concern about the timeliness of IT support and the adequacy of training and support. Overall, however, more than 60% of respondents are satisfied with the services. This figure has important implications for Moorpark College, as 51% of all survey respondents are employed there. (III.C.1)

The College has an actively involved Technical Committee for Accreditation and Planning (TechCAP), which proves to be an extremely valuable asset. As a standing committee of the College with participatory membership, TechCAP monitors and evaluates college technology planning through the College's annual program plan process. Short-term needs are identified and prioritized in the annual Program Plans, while longer term planning is periodically updated in the Technology Master Plan. The Technology Resource Allocation Committee (TRAC), which is a sub-committee of TechCAP, reviews all program reviews and plans for technology requests and then consolidates and prioritizes them and sends them back through TechCAP for final review and approval. These committees with their cross-section of members from campus constituent groups, assure that the College systematically assesses the effective use of technology resources and sets plans for improvement. The College integrates technology planning into institutional planning at all levels, from its *Educational Master Plan*, the *Strategic Plan*, the *Technology Plan* and the annual program plans. In addition, Moorpark College's Technology Plan has been viewed as a district-wide model and serves as a prototype for development of the District's plan. (III.C.1.c-d, III.C.2)

Standard III.D – Financial Resources

Findings and Evidence

There is a fairly new, but well-defined, district budget allocation model that provides a comprehensive and relatively stable level of funding to the College. The model addresses the differences in programs and services delivered at each college through a variety of components, such as the classroom schedule and productivity. District operating costs are taken off the top and college carryovers are limited to 1% by Board Policy. DCAS serves as the District budget and finance committee and reviews allocation recommendations that are forwarded to the Chancellor's Cabinet for consideration. The Moorpark College budget is 36% of the Unrestricted General Fund, 44.3% of the Total District Budget, and generates 44% of the FTES. (III.D)

The district has historically maintained a five percent reserve, and the 2010-2011 Adopted Budget also provides for a Revenue Shortfall Contingency of \$5 million and unallocated reserves of \$9.5 million. The college Vice President of Business Services has responsibility for the management of the College's general fund and categorical budgets and grants. The financials of the Foundation are audited by an outside auditing firm. This audit is reviewed by the Board of Trustees Audit, and by the Budget and Foundation Relations committees and is reviewed annually by the Board in its November meeting. The Cafeteria and Bookstore are monitored at the college level by the Vice President. The College has made effective use of its grants and seems to have been successful in developing instructional and student services grants of almost \$1million that support the mission and goals of the College. The college Vice President of Business Services and the office of the Vice Chancellor review contractual agreements. Policies and procedures regarding contracts are developed and implemented in compliance with the appropriate state codes. (III.D, III.D.1.c)

District financial planning activities take into consideration long-range financial obligations as evidenced by its current commitment to fund its post-retirement benefit funding liability and its liabilities for load banking. The District was required to fully implement GASB 45 beginning in 2002 through 2008 and has currently funded \$9.2 million of its \$174 million liability. The Board of Trustees is considering placing the funded portion of this liability into an irrevocable trust. Current funding represents about 80% of the annual requirement and expects to fund at 100% in 2011-2012. (III.D.1.c)

The College completed a strategic master plan in 2009 to guide and inform financial planning. The College uses the program review documents to integrate financial planning with other planning activities. There is a general commitment on the part of the college president and the FiscalCAP to move forward with tying future budget development to the strategic master plan. This practice has already begun for the prioritization of new faculty and classified positions. The Fiscal Planning Committee operates under the process contained within the Making Decisions at Moorpark planning process guidebook. It was institutionalized only two years ago but appears committed to planning and linking planning

with budgeting, though it is unclear how this effort rolls up to the strategic planning level. (III.D.1.a, III.D.1.d)

The College has developed a process for budget development and there is the beginning of a process for financial planning. The Self Study acknowledges that 48.7% of respondents to the Fall 2009 Employee Survey did not feel that there was openness and transparency in the college budget development process. There is a need to make the budget development process more transparent to the whole college community and to add a budget development timeline to the Making Decisions at Moorpark. (III.D.1.d)

The annual audit report and annual budget reports are posted on-line. Financial records are accessible and reflect the annual allocation of funds to the various departments and programs. The Banner finance system provides appropriate financial information throughout the institution. All managers and division staff are trained to use the Banner finance system. (III.D.2.a-b)

The district provides adequate cash without the use of TRANS and has adequate reserves to maintain fiscal stability. The budget was built in keeping with the District's prudent policy of no deficit spending. (III.D.2.c)

The District's Director of Fiscal Services provides financial oversight and support services to college program managers responsible for externally funded programs, contracts and grants. Effective oversight of financial aid, contractual relationships, auxiliary organization and the Foundation is exercised by the District. However, findings were identified in the June 30, 2009 annual financial audit report, which represent significant deficiencies and/or instances of noncompliance including questioned costs that are required to be reported by OMB Circular A-133 relative to federal funds. These deficiencies were not related to financial activity at Moorpark College. The district has policies and procedures to maintain the integrity of the institution in its contractual agreements. (III.D.2.d-f)

During meetings of the DCAS and at regular meetings of other standing committees and councils, the financial management processes of the district are regularly reviewed at the end of each planning cycle for possible future improvements. (III.D.2.g)

While the College has a strong program review process with well-developed resource components, there is a void in terms of a connection back into this process from financial resources through assessment. The development of an institutional financial assessment methodology and process will be compatible with the Educational Master Plan planning objective and provide important feedback into the subsequent year planning and budget process. During this period of limited resources, the effectiveness of resource allocation is more important than ever before, and programs need this data to reflect on the level of impact made by prior resource allocations. (III.D.3)

Conclusions

The College meets the Standard.

Moorpark College employs qualified personnel to support student learning programs and services and there is a general commitment to diversity of faculty staff and students. In addition, human resource planning is well integrated with institutional planning. Staffing priorities established through dialogue align with the college's mission and purpose. The evaluation process for faculty includes discussions of student achievement of learning outcomes. (III.A)

However, there are two Human Resource (HR) issues of concern, validated through interviews and the results of employee surveys. Although formal communication is in place, ongoing informal communication between the District and College needs to improve, as does support from the District in terms of personnel processes. When HR practices, policies and procedures are changed there is a communication gap between the District Office and the College, such that mistakes are made and time is lost. In addition, the recent issue of inequitable application of the early tenure process at one college and not the other two left faculty across the district frustrated and concerned about the equitable administration of HR practices. (III.A.3)

Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning and the process is collaborative and inclusive. The District Office of Capital Planning, Design and Construction works cooperatively with the College to implement Measure S projects on an ongoing basis. There is a Board of Trustees' Subcommittee on Construction, which acts as the approval body for the selection of architects for campus projects. Since the Board of Trustees is a policy board, this selection process may be out of character and charge and should be reviewed. (III.B)

The Facilities Master Plan (FMP) of 2002 serves as the foundation for subsequent Facilities Master Plans. As part of the campus facilities planning process, the College utilizes total cost of ownership models when considering new facilities and equipment. The College will be updating the Facilities Master Plan in 2011 and the need for additional resources should be considered through future bond planning and other resource generation mechanisms. Custodial staffing is extremely limited, given the new buildings under development on campus, but some of this new space is simply replacing temporary facilities that currently exist. When all new building is fully operational on campus, additional human resources will need to be identified in order to maintain current level of maintenance and facilities operations. (III.B.1-2)

Sustainability and environmental efficiency are not major topics of discussion or program implementation. The District does not currently participate in Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification, nor has it developed a LEED-like standard for implementation. Given the footprint of the campus and the challenging fiscal environment, energy efficiency should be high on the College's list of facilities goals, with the campus being very well-suited to large-scale solar installations. (III.B.2)

The College in conjunction with the District Office has ensured the adequacy of technology resources in support of instruction, student support services and student learning. Technology

resources are adequate for the College's present requirements and there is extensive planning in order to meet future needs. (III.C)

The VCCCD has progressed towards sound fiscal management and has developed a district-wide resource allocation model and funding plan for the unfunded retiree medical liability. The management of college finances appears to be in order and there is no evidence of concern in this area except that communication must be improved as part of the budget development and monitoring process. The college president is committed to planning and to the integration of planning and budget. However, the processes could be improved through the cross-fertilization of recommendations and outcomes across committee structures as it relates to resources allocation. (IV.D)

Integration of planning at the college level is well developed. The College completed its revised strategic plan for 2009-2012 in January 2010 and the budget process ties resource allocation requests and decisions to the strategic plan through the program review process. Currently, requests for new or revised positions are incorporated in the program plans. (IV.D.1)

College financial planning is also comprehensive, although there is recognition by the Team that the college needs to develop a method to assess the effectiveness of its resource allocations. The Vice President for Business Services is currently developing a tool called a "Balanced Scorecard", which has been in use at both the University of California and California State University systems as a resource planning and management tool. The College's financial resources are sufficient to maintain existing levels of service, but future growth and improvements may be limited due to the State's limited enrollment growth funding which is the primary basis for new fiscal resources. A multi-year financial projection by the District was not available. (IV.D.1-2)

The long-term financial stability of the College and the district is tied to their ability to generate growth in FTES and the new funding model does allow for state-funded growth to be available to the colleges as they earn a comparable share. The College's ability to attract external funding to support programs and services could be more aggressive during this difficult fiscal period. (IV.D)

Recommendations

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: 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)

Commendations

The Team wishes to commend the College for:

- Its Technology Plan that was collegially developed and serves as a model for the district plan
- Its beautiful campus facilities and grounds, lovely and well-maintained acreage providing an inspiring learning and work environment for students and staff.

STANDARD IV – Leadership and Governance

General Comments

As noted in Moorpark College's Self Study and validated through on-site team observations, interviews, and evidence review, the College recognizes the importance of effective leadership in the achievement of its student learning mission and in the continuous improvement of college effectiveness. The College is committed to constituency consultation and responsive leadership in both its everyday functions and its unprecedented higher education management challenges due to State budget circumstances and uncertainties.

Moorpark College's governance structures, extensive dialogue venues, and decision-making paths provide a solid foundation for the College's identification, exploration, and affirmation of values, strategic objectives, and organizational improvement opportunities. Institutional efforts and conditions that demonstrate Moorpark College's inclusive approach to and focus on the contributions of broad-based leadership include:

- The periodic review, revision, and affirmation of Moorpark College's mission and values statements;
- The development, dissemination, and college-wide use of *Making Decisions at Moorpark College*;
- The distribution and use of the *VCCCD Participatory Governance Handbook* in district-level consultation and decision-making processes;
- The composition, clearly-defined roles, and participant engagement of the College's four organizational councils, three senates, and six standing committees; and
- The inclusive development processes and integration of the College's Educational Master Plan (long-range), Strategic Plan (mid-range), and Action Plans (annual) to support collective goal setting, collegial assessment, and organizational learning and improvement.

As chief executive officer of Moorpark College, the President has created a collegial and innovative learning environment. She has the responsibility for the quality of the institution and provides effective leadership in all areas of college activities including developing and implementing its mission and vision; strategic planning and resource allocations; maintaining fiscal viability, and selecting, overseeing, and evaluating organizational personnel. A critical component of her inclusive supervision is the responsibility for institutional effectiveness by oversight of goals and objectives, by administering all planning process for continued growth and improvement, and by assuring that the integrity of college processes and practices are maintained. The President is an effective ambassador for Moorpark College, maintaining active and supportive relationships with community organizations and members of the general public.

Standard IVA – Decision-Making and Processes

Findings and Evidence

Moorpark College has established an environment that facilitates empowerment, innovation and institutional excellence. The document *Making Decisions at Moorpark College* (2008-2010) discusses the culture for establishing this environment. The document outlines the philosophy for decision-making, which includes a culture of collegiality, a culture of dialogue, a culture of inclusiveness, a culture of evidence, innovation and student learning. This structure is based on the overall goal of serving students by effectively integrating instruction and student services. The document also outlines the roles of the various stakeholders (faculty, staff, students and administrators) in making decisions. These groups reflect Moorpark's commitment to continuous quality improvement and excellence. Input for decision-making is also noted in the Self Study from a variety of campus-wide venues, including but not limited to *Fall Flings*, *Y'All Come* sessions and *Town Hall* meetings. Without question, Moorpark has established a culture of dialogue that is very organic. Informal discussions continue to provide a wide range of conversation about significant issues to the College. However, documentation in many areas is somewhat limited. (IV.A)

Making Decisions at Moorpark College is reviewed annually and updated. The document is reviewed by the Academic Senate, Dean's Council, Vice President's Council, and submitted to the entire college community for feedback and input. Several refinements to the document (and therefore the overall planning process) have resulted from this annual review. For example, the current consultation process with the Academic Senate is an outgrowth of this process, as well as the standing committee structure for the Academic Senate. As such, Moorpark's process for institutional evaluation is continually being reviewed, refined and improved. The entire college community has an opportunity to participate. (IV.A.1)

Moorpark reviews the decision-making process with respect to the roles and scope of authority of each of the stakeholders at the College. These groups include governance groups (the Academic Senate and the standing college committees, organization groups, Administrative Council, Dean's Council, Student Services Council, Vice President's Council, as well as advisory committees, such as campus environment, learning communities, the Program for Accelerated College Education (PACE), and safety and wellness). These committees bring further ideas and initiatives from their constituencies and are framed in an appropriate manner for review, deliberation and action. The stakeholders (faculty, staff, administration, and students) have a clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in college processes, planning and budget. The interview with the student government president particularly revealed a great deal of student participation in the campus governance structure. The students elect ten members of a student Board of Directors as well as the student president. Most directors participate in college committees. The six Academic Senate standing committees provide the student representatives with an equal vote, and all committees facilitate student input. On a district-wide basis, one student is elected to the VCCCD Board of Trustees, but has no voting privilege. (IV.A.2.a)

The four council groups (Administrative, Deans, Student Services and Vice Presidents) provide input and recommendations based upon the strategic plan as well as the policies of the District. Of particular note is the reliance upon faculty, through the Academic Senate (and its Curriculum Committee, which includes faculty and academic administrative membership), to provide input for student learning programs and services. These recommendations describe the individual groups' roles in academic governance as well as the planning and budget process. When disputes arise between Academic Senate recommendations and the president's decision, a written rationale for the decision is presented to all constituencies. (IV.A.2.b)

Written procedures on governance do specify appropriate roles for all stakeholders. Questions dealing with student's educational programs and services are specified in responsibilities belonging to the academic faculty and staff. These governance structures and reporting hierarchies are outlined in the *VCCCD Participatory Governance Handbook* and in *Making Decisions at Moorpark College*. The campus community, therefore, participates in this environment and works collaboratively for institutional improvement. An example of such collaboration resulting in improvement is a recent program review indicating the need to enhance instructional technology support. As a result of this planning initiative, an IT professional was hired. (IV.A.2)

Communication at the College appears to be generally clear, understood, current, and widely available through the college portal and through *McShare*, the College's file sharing server for Moorpark College employees. *McShare* allows employee communication and sharing of important documents not only on-campus but from remote locations, as well. The Self Study references the employee survey conducted by the District Office in the fall of 2009. The college-level results of the survey show that employees are basically satisfied with their job, role at the College, and their ability to work collaboratively. (IV.A.3)

There are, however, issues related to the committee processes at the College. Although the participatory governance standing committees have structures and charges, subcommittees have evolved which exist without defined structures and charges. Subcommittee recommendations go to their respective parent Standing Committee and then to the President for a decision. Overall communication would be better served at the College by defining committee and subcommittee charges and membership, as well as reviewing both on an ongoing basis to ensure they are effectively aligned to the mission and strategic goals of the College. Moreover, the creation of a participatory "Executive Council" to the President would ensure higher level review and consultation regarding committee recommendations to avoid changes that might be counterproductive to the work of other committees. (IV.A.2-3)

Some results of the District's employee survey conducted in September 2010 suggest that there may be some frustration on the part of some members of the college community about communication with the District Office. For example, of the ten items listed under the Board governance criteria, eight were found to be less than acceptable (with a 25% or higher disapproval rate). Comments include: "It would be nice if the actions of the senior members of the District and the College and the Board of Trustees match their words." Another comment: "Need communication not just information," and, finally, "The alienation by the

DAC (District Administrative Center) and the campuses is heart breaking and counter-productive.” Clearly, there are communication issues between the District and the College that need to be addressed. (IV.A.3)

Moorpark College demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationship with external agencies. Evidence includes documents submitted to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. Included among these documents were mid-term reports, fiscal reports, annual reports and a substantive change report. The institution’s communication with the public is also included in the documents reviewed and appears to be accurate and effective. Materials verified include advertisements, press releases and items posted on the college website. (IV.A.4)

Moorpark College has integrated program planning/review and resource allocation processes. The processes are described in *Making Decisions at Moorpark College*. The processes this document describes are updated and refined annually, as is the document itself. The last update was August 2009, and it is due for its annual update later this fall. The college President assumes responsibility for the structure of governance and the responsiveness for planning and college-wide dialogue. In addition, the President’s Office administers an annual committee-effectiveness survey. The results of the 2008-2009 survey showed that 47% of the 67 respondents had a positive perception of the committees and 70% found the committees to be helpful/friendly. Results of the various college decisions are communicated effectively to the college community via the website, the *McShare* file sharing and archive system, and by other updates and distribution of information to the college community. (IV.A.5)

Standard IV.B – Board and Administrative Organization

Findings and Evidence

In response to a prior recommendation, the Board of Trustees has evaluated and revised its current policies and procedures through the work of its active Policy Committee. Policies have been reviewed and adopted first by the District Chancellor’s Consultation Council and then the Board. Board agendas and minutes are also reviewed by the Chancellor’s Consultation Council, ensuring that constituency groups are informed. Recently, the District has begun using *BoardDocs* (third-party software) to document agendas, minutes and Board Policies, all of which are published on the District website, thus creating a system to assist with regular review of policies and procedures. A Board Policy that describes the process for selecting and evaluating the Chancellor does exist. (IV.B.1)

The *BoardDocs* software stores a record of the policies, dates they were adopted and accompanying procedures as documentation for all Board approved policies and procedures. A review of these policies has shown that the breadth of policies is somewhat limited. As such, existing policies and procedures generally guide student programs and services, but they do not do so in a comprehensive manner. Because of this, policy guidance for effective college operation is spotty, causing impediments to timely and effective operations at the departmental level. (IV.B.1)

The Board acts as an independent policy-making body and acts as a whole when action is taken. Although Board members are elected by district, they generally act as a single unit when taking action. However, there is some indication that individual Board members tend to act in a somewhat parochial manner in relation to their elected area, although this tendency has decreased in recent years. (IV.B.1.a)

Board Policies and Procedures are consistent with the Moorpark College mission statement. However, Team interviews found that there a large number of district and college staff members with concerns about Board action that is sometimes counter to approved policies. There is also a large number of staff with the perception that Board Members do not adhere to their policy-making role. The District's Employee Survey corroborates this concern, whereby employees identified a Board difficulty in reaching consensus on some issues because of a bias toward their "represented college." (IV.B.1.a)

The Board has ultimate decision making authority for educational quality, legal matters and financial integrity and has charged the Chancellor to ensure that college presidents have primary authority for institutional quality, for provision of effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting, and developing employees and for assessment of the effectiveness of their colleges through the Policy on the delegation of authority to the Chancellor (BP 2430). (IV.B.1.b-c)

In response to a prior recommendation, District governance mechanisms were developed and a new policy related to personnel selection was adopted. The District developed written personnel procedures for equitable and consistent administration in order to ensure fairness in employment practice. The evaluation of staff has been included in relevant labor contracts. Yet, there remains a continuing concern related to employee understanding of human resource processes that has led to Board action that impacts the colleges. Tenure decisions (i.e., the granting of early tenure) have been inconsistently applied across the District, suggestion that there is still work to be done to ensure that decision-making is administered in an equitable and consistent manner across the District. (IV.B.1.b-c)

The Board has a set of Policies that specify its duties and responsibilities. These policies are available online through the District Web site in *BoardDocs*. As noted above, the District does review its policies and procedures. In response to prior accreditation recommendations, all policies have been reviewed in the past two years. However there is no timeline to ensure a regular policy review on an ongoing basis moving forward. (IV.B.1.d-e)

In response to a prior recommendation, a new Board member orientation was created and implemented, as was a recommended process for the development of the Board. Although board development activities are available, some Board members do not actively participate in ongoing professional development. With an ever evolving economic, social and political environment, as well as changing federal and state regulations and requirements governing college operation, professional development is critical to the effectiveness of community college boards. (IV.B.1.f)

Board members do participate in a self-evaluation process, and although these self-evaluations are published, there does not appear to be any consistent and deliberate follow-up to the results. It appears that the evaluation process has little impact on Board behavior. (IV.B.1.g)

The Board has a code of ethics with a clear process for dealing with violations. An administrative procedure to implement this policy has not yet been adopted, however it is currently under development. (IV.B.1.h)

The Board has been fully informed of the Accreditation process and has reviewed the Colleges' self-studies. The Board selects the Chancellor and evaluates him on a regular basis. In fact, the Chancellor's evaluation was an agenda item for the Board during the period of the team visit. This evaluation includes a goal-setting process. The Chancellor selects the college presidents in consultation with the Board. (IV.B.1.i-j)

The President has organized and staffed the College's administrative structure. A number of college level councils have been established to discuss policies, processes and planning. The President also monitors the College's participatory governance structure. The College has a culture of open dialogue as part of its participatory governance. In recent years, the administrative structure has been somewhat compressed because of financial limitations; however, the structure that currently exists seems to function adequately at the present time. (IV.B.2.a)

There is a clear path for deliberations and recommendations which is outlined in the College's governance document, *Making Decisions at Moorpark College* (2008-2010). However there is no high level participatory governance committee that reviews the various recommendations set forward through the shared governance process, prior to presidential review and decision. The College's governance structure tends to flow to the Vice-Presidents who then forward recommendations to the President. The College has a highly functioning process for collegial dialogue and all constituencies are represented in the process. The College has an extensive program planning/review process that results in annual planning documents. The College also makes extensive use of informal planning processes for broad-based inputs including the *Fall Fling*, *Y'All Come* sessions and *Town Hall* meetings. In general, these activities are widely attended by constituent groups. The College makes extensive use of research information and the Coordinator of Institutional Research reports directly to the President. (IV.B.2)

The *Participatory Governance Handbook* describes the District governance process. The Self Study indicates that roles of the District Office are clearly defined. However in actuality, the process is somewhat less clear. The District does not have a clearly written delineation of responsibilities for the colleges, for the district, and for those that are shared. Although the Self Study includes a narrative of functional responsibility, it does not include a district "functional map" that provides a clear description of the distribution of responsibility between the colleges and the District, nor is there a description of an evaluation of the effectiveness of processes that exist. (IV.B.3.a-b, IV.B.3.g)

Recently the District has been transitioning and centralizing certain responsibilities from the colleges to the District Office. Yet, this transition is in development with no clear descriptions of goals or direction. Further, on the District's Fall 2009 Employee Survey, a significant proportion of college staff (40%) does not feel that the District provides effective services, and 38% believe communication is inadequate. (IV.B.3.a)

In the past, the evaluation of District services was not conducted directly but rather was based on the evaluation of individual managers. However, with the implementation of the September 2010 survey, there is now an explicitly clear evaluation and analysis of the quality and effectiveness of district services to the College. Continued administration of this survey should provide for ongoing review over time. Noteworthy is the fact that the District developed a revised resource allocation model in 2007-08. This model is reviewed annually for effectiveness and appears to be well-accepted within the District as functioning adequately. The District also has an effective expenditure control system in place. District financial statements are audited on an annual basis and reviewed by the Board's Audit, Budget, and Foundation Committee. District reserves continue to be adequate. (IV.B.3.b-d)

The President is delegated full responsibility to operate the College. In turn, the College utilizes its committee structure to provide feedback to the District on the policy front. For example, the Self Study identified an area in curriculum that needed additional administrative oversight at the district level. The Board is currently in the process of approving a policy to expand administrative oversight for recommendations related to curriculum, which will be documented through the Board Policy on program and curriculum development (BP 4020) and its related procedures. (IV.B.3.e)

In response to a prior recommendation, the District and the colleges have developed a process of formal communication that works effectively to an extent. This process relies extensively on the utilization of district-wide councils and electronic communication. However, there have been issues of direct communication between Board members and College staff that has bypassed the college and district organizational structures. A new Board Policy has been adopted that is directed at this issue by requiring the utilization of established communication channels. The effectiveness of this policy has not yet been evaluated. The District and College should assess it via surveys or other methods. (IV.B.3.f)

There remains a significant concern within the College related to the effectiveness of this more formal communication process, because it does not address the day-to-day operational communications that require more informal processes. The Self Study has identified the need to develop an independent evaluation mechanism for communication processes. It should be developed and implemented as soon as feasible. (IV.B.3.g)

In response to a prior recommendation, the district has developed a strategic plan that was informed by research and provided the big-picture direction for college level planning. The strategic plan development process included the broad spectrum of constituencies. It has identified themes and further expanded these into a new vision, mission, and values statement for the District. (IV.B.3)

A Vice Chancellor of Planning and Organizational development was hired, as was a District Researcher. Given current budget constraints, these two positions are now vacant, with the responsibility for district level data needs falling to the District's Information Technology department. The District will need to carefully evaluate the adequacy of this new system of research information support for the strategic planning process. Given the lack of resources now directed to strategic planning at the district level, it will be important to ensure that implementation of the plan continues and that results are assessed to ensure continuous quality improvement, both in educational effectiveness to support student learning and in effective district-wide operations, both of which must support the College so it can effectively meet its mission. (IV.B.3)

Conclusions

The College meets the Standard in 4.A, *Decision-Making Roles and Processes*, but does not meet the Standard in 4.B, *Board and Administrative Organization*.

The College has established an enviable culture of dialogue and discussion. The decision-making processes appear to be consistent with the goal of establishing an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. There is wide opportunity for decision-making throughout the institution and most employees are familiar with the processes outlined in *Making Decisions at Moorpark College*. (IV.A)

At the college committee level, subcommittees to standing committees exist without defined structures and charges. When recommendations are made by a subcommittee, they do go to the respective parent standing committee and then to the President for a decision, but there is no higher level constituency review that serves to advise the President from a broader perspective. (IV.A.2-3)

Moorpark College is a part of a multi-college district and there appears to be some difficulties and challenges related to communication and perhaps governance at the district-level. (IV.A)

The Board has reviewed and revised its current policies and regulations over the past few years, and has developed a process for their open review by all constituencies and the public in general, which are easily accessible on the District's web site. Although Board Policies and their accompanying procedures do exist, the breadth of both is somewhat limited, such that comprehensive direction is lacking. The District has utilized the Community College League of California (CCLC) *Policy and Procedures Template*, but there needs to be a more comprehensive review of existing policies in light of this template to ensure continuous improvement in organizational effectiveness. In addition, development of a calendar for policy review on a cyclical basis will ensure their effectiveness in facilitating efficiency in college operations. (IV.B.1)

Although the Board does act as an independent policy-making body that acts as a whole, there is staff concern that there remain some examples of the Board involvement in

operational decisions that are generally delegated to district and college executive leadership, even though this has greatly improved since the previous team visit. (IV.B.1)

The District has developed new procedures to ensure equitable and consistent administration of employment practices. This has provided for the formalization of many HR processes, including staff evaluation and college presidential selection. However, there remain perceived inequities, such as when an early tenure decision was inconsistently applied across the three colleges. (IV.B.1.b-c)

The Board has approved a Policy that provide an orientation for new Board members, but ongoing professional development for all members has resulted in very limited participation. With an ever evolving economic, social and political environment and changing governmental mandates and compliances, ongoing professional development is critical for effective policy making by the Board. (IV.B.1.e-f)

Board members participate in a self-evaluation process, and although these self-evaluations are published, there does not appear to be any consistent and deliberate follow-up to the results. It appears that this evaluation process has little impact on Board behavior. (IV.B.1.g)

At the College level there is a clear path for deliberations and recommendations, as outlined in the governance document, *Making Decisions at Moorpark College* (2008-10). Likewise, district governance is guided by a document, which is called *Participatory Governance Handbook*. However, the district governance processes are somewhat less clear. There is no clearly written delineation of responsibilities for the colleges, the district and those that are shared, which exacerbates communication. This has also led to frustration about service provision by the District Office in supporting institutional effectiveness across the organization. (IV.B.3)

The District has created a process of formal communication through the creation of district-wide councils and the use of electronic communication, both of which work effectively, as far as they go. However, the day-to-day operational communications are not timely, which causes confusion, lags in the dissemination of important information and perceptions that communication is not open. Some of the District communications require the readers to access the web portal. However the District does not always advise the colleges when changes are made. The District is relying on "pull" technology rather than using "push" technology to ensure the distribution of information. (IV.B.3)

The district has developed a strategic plan that was informed by research and sets the direction for college level strategic planning. The process has effectively led to a new vision, mission and values statement for the District. In order to ensure institutional effectiveness across the District, it is important that the plan is systematically evaluated and revised, as appropriate, on an ongoing basis to support the colleges in meeting the changing needs of students over time. (IV.B.3)

Recommendations

College Recommendation: 4

In order to improve effectiveness, the College should evaluate its committee structure as identified in the *Making Decisions at Moorpark College* document with a special focus on subcommittee charges and membership as they relate to the College's mission. This evaluation should give consideration to the creation of an executive council/committee that has constituency representation that advises the President regarding committee recommendations. Based on the evaluation, the College should develop and implement appropriate revisions to its governance structure and document them. (IV.A.2-3)

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

See Standard III.

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

See Standard III.

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, VI.B.1. e-g)

Commendations

The Team wishes to commend the College for:

- Its high level of constituency participation in college decision-making
- Its campus community building activities, such as *One Campus One Book*, the *Year of.....*, and *Multi-Cultural Day*
- The dialogue-rich environment and collegial atmosphere throughout Moorpark College