



MOORPARK COLLEGE

FOCUSED MID-TERM REPORT

Presented to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

OCTOBER 2013

**Moorpark College
7075 Campus Road
Moorpark, CA 93021**

Moorpark College Focused Midterm Report October 2013

Table of Contents

Statement on Report Preparation

Response to Team Recommendations and Commission Concerns

College Recommendation: 1

Dissemination of Goals and Achievements to Improve Planning Process; Qualitative Evaluation of Process Review (I.B.2-3, I.B.5-7, II.A.2-3)

College Recommendation: 2

Reaching proficiency in student learning outcomes (SLOs) by fall 2012 and placement of outcomes in class syllabus (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.B4, II.C.2).

College Recommendation: 3

Evaluation of self-placement process for English and mathematics (II.B.3.e)

College Recommendation: 4

Evaluate committee structure, with focus on subcommittee structures and the possible creation of an executive council (IV.A.2-3)

District Recommendation: 1

Organizational Mapping and District/College Committee Relationships (IV.B.3.a-b, IV.B.3.g)

District Recommendation: 2

District Policy and Procedure Review (IV.B.1.e)

District Recommendation: 3

Outcome Assessment, Strategic Planning and Decision-making Processes (IV.B.3)

District Recommendation: 4

Assess Formal Communication, Ensure Open and Timely Communication (III.A.3, IV.B.3)

District Recommendation: 5

Board of Trustees Self-Assessment (IV.B.1.g)

District Recommendation: 6

Establishment of Clear Written Policies and Procedures to Ensure Equitable Decision-making (III.A.3.a, III.A.4.c, IV.B.1.b-c)

District Recommendation: 7

Trustees Policy-making Role and Professional Development (IV.A.3, VI.B.1.e-g)

Commission Concern (Feb. 1, 2012):

Trustee Policy Role and Professional Development, Special Report Required March 15, 2012, and Follow-up Report Required October 15, 2012. (Eligibility Requirement 3; IV.B.1.g, h, i)

Commission Concern (Jan. 31, 2011):

Human Resource Minimum Qualifications, Follow-up Report Required October 2011 (III.A.2)

Response to Self-Identified Planning Agendas

Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services

Standard III: Resources

Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

Appendix A

Education Committee for Accreditation and Planning (EdCAP) Membership 2011-2012

Education Committee for Accreditation and Planning (EdCAP) Membership 2012-2013

District Council for Accreditation and Planning Membership 2011-2012

District Council for Accreditation and Planning Membership 2012-2013

Appendix B

Type of Structure of Groups that Develop Recommendations

Statement on Report Preparation

Preparations for the Moorpark College Focused Midterm Report 2013 began in the semester following the most recent comprehensive accreditation visit in October 2010. The Education Committee on Accreditation and Planning (EdCAP) was responsible for the overall monitoring of the Focused Midterm Report timeline and content gathering. Responses to College Recommendations and Planning Agenda were prepared at the campus by various participants. Responses to District Recommendations and Planning Agendas were prepared by the appropriate District executives and staff, and review by the District Council for Accreditation and Planning (DCAP), a monitoring group comprised of representatives from the full range of constituent groups across the three District Colleges and the District Administrative Center. Members of these committees for the academic years 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 are listed in Appendix A of this report.

The timeline for the development of this report is:

January 2011	Moorpark College accreditation is reaffirmed with the requirement that the College complete a Focused Midterm Report with emphasis on four College Recommendations. The seven District Recommendations are to be addressed by October 15, 2011.
Aug. 2011 – May 2013	EdCAP monitors progress monthly on College Recommendations and Planning Agendas. DCAP monitors progress on District Recommendations and Planning Agendas.
Jan. 2012 – May 2012	College provides input on progress on Recommendations and Planning Agendas.
Aug. 2012 – Jan. 2013	4–5 person workgroups gather evidence and identify additional work needed for Recommendations and Planning Agendas.
Feb. 2012 – March 2013	Initial draft of Focused Midterm Report; incorporate responses for District Recommendations, Commission Concerns, and District Planning Agendas.
March 2013 – April 2013	Initial and subsequent draft reviewed by EdCAP and Campus community. Gathered input, revised draft as needed.
May 2013	Final draft of Focused Midterm Report presented to EdCAP and campus community.
September 2013	VCCCD Board of Trustees first reading of the Focused Midterm Report.
October 2013	VCCCD Board of Trustees approval of the Focused Midterm Report.
October 15, 2013	Focused Midterm Report submitted to ACCJC.

Mary Rees, Academic Senate President

Leanne Colvin, Classified Senate President

Bernard Luskin, Ed.D., Moorpark College Interim President

Jamillah Moore, Ed.D., Chancellor, Ventura County Community College District

Bernardo M. Perez, President, Ventura County Community College District Board of Trustees

Response to Team Recommendations and Commission Concerns

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)

This college has completely satisfied this team recommendation.

To strengthen the process, the College:

- Developed a written review and feedback process as outlined in the *Making Decisions at Moorpark College 2010* document. (CR-1.1)
- Developed and implemented a program plan evaluation summary form, which included analysis of program alignment with institutional goals, quantitative effectiveness measures, and a summary of the program goals for the following year. (CR-1.2, CR-1.9)
- Provided the completed program plan evaluation form to the Programs for review, comments and signature. (CR-1.3, CR-1.4)
- Completed the feedback process and documented the results with the Interim Executive Vice President presenting a summary report of the program review results to the Education Committee on Accreditation and Planning (EdCAP) and Academic Senate. (CR-1.5, CR-1.6, CR-1.9, CR-1.11)
- Progressed as planned by completing the Action Steps for each of the identified Strategic Objectives defined in the College's *2009-2012 Strategic Plan*; reported upon the progress of these Action Steps in the *2011 Institutional Effectiveness Report*.

The *Moorpark College Educational Master Plan 2009-2019*, outlines four major challenges to be met by the College in the next decade. They are four broad areas: Student Access, Student Retention and Success, Responsiveness to the Marketplace in Career Training, and the Volatility of the Economic Climate and California Public Funding. Through college-wide dialogue, 15 overarching recommendations emerged in response to the challenges. These recommendations provided the framework for the three-year *2009-2012 Strategic Plan*. Multiple action steps are identified for each Strategic Objective (institutional goals). Action steps are tactical, with an implementation timeline, assigned to a responsible party, and have a method of assessment. Progress is reviewed annually at the Fall Fling Strategic Planning

Retreat and is documented in the *2011 Institutional Effectiveness Report*. The three-year *2013-2016 Strategic Plan* is currently being updated; the college held a campus wide discussion at the Fall Fling Strategic Planning Retreat in October 2013. College goals were reviewed and updated to continue alignment with the District Master Plan, and supporting action steps were identified. Progress on these action steps will continue to be reported in the annual institutional effectiveness reports.

In spring 2008, the Executive Vice President of Student Learning began conducting annual program review meetings with each program. These sessions included interactive dialogue, review of program plan data and a declaration of the program “status”. (CR-1.3, CR-1.4) Over successive years, these program evaluations became more formalized, relying on quantitative data provided by Institutional Research, in addition to qualitative analysis provided by the program. (CR-1.7)

The Program Planning and Evaluation processes for 2012-13 and 2013-14 included consistent quantitative effectiveness measures and included a written feedback process. Programs were provided the program plan evaluation summaries and were given time to review their results with program members before signing and returning the documents. (CR-1.3, 1.4) In following the process outlined in the *Making Decisions at Moorpark College 2012* document, the summary of program plan evaluation results were presented to EdCAP, Academic Senate and Administrative Council. (CR-1.8, CR-1.9, CR-1.11)

In meeting its committee responsibility, EdCAP members also discussed recommended changes to the evaluation process and forwarded recommendations to the Academic Senate for review. (CR-1.10, CR-1.12) The 2014-2015 Program Planning and Evaluation process is currently underway.

Next steps: None

Evidence:

- CR-1.1 *Making Decisions at Moorpark College 2010*
- CR-1.2 Sample of 2013-2014 program plan evaluation form
- CR-1.3 Sample of signed 2012-2013 program plan evaluation form
- CR-1.4 Sample of signed 2013-2014 program plan evaluation form
- CR-1.5 Summary of all 2012-2013 program plan evaluations
- CR-1.6 Summary of all 2013-2014 program plan evaluations
- CR-1.7 Sample program planning document
- CR-1.8 *Making Decisions at Moorpark College 2012*

- CR-1.9 EdCAP minutes 2/28/12, 3/27/12, 10/23/12, 4/23/13
- CR-1.10 EdCAP minutes 11/22/11, 10/23/12, 3/26/13, 4/23/13
- CR-1.11 Letter from President, Dr. Pam Eddinger, regarding 2013-2014 Program Status Report, Academic Senate meeting handout 4/16/13
- CR-1.12 Academic Senate minutes 4/30/13

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).

The college has fulfilled this team recommendation.

Moorpark College's Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation, which was sent to ACCJC on October 15, 2012, reports that the College has reached Proficient Continuous Quality Improvement in the implementation of student learning outcomes. (CR-2.1) Since that time, the College has continued its work towards reaching the level of sustainability with its SLO processes.

To reach proficiency level, the College:

- Provided SLO workshops that assisted faculty in the SLO assessment process (CR-2.2, CR-2.3, CR-2.4)
- Held a 2012 Y' All Come for faculty and staff to share their assessment findings (CR-2.5)
- Prepared comprehensive reports of SLO assessments and improvements (CR-2.6)
- Provided research resources to programs as they developed course, program and institutional SLOs and assessments (CR-2.7)
- Provided training to faculty and staff on how to use SLO assessment results to inform program planning decisions (CR-2.4, CR-2.7)
- Provided technology that allows a strengthened tie between SLO assessment and program planning decisions (CR-2.8)
- Developed and approved a 5-year assessment cycle (CR-2.9)
- Proposed an SLO Assessment Review Committee (CR-2.10)
- Established an SLO Coordinator position and provided release time for these duties (CR-2.11)

Additionally, the College has processes in place to 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. (CR-2.12) Discipline faculty have access to the most current course outlines of record through CurricUNET. (CR-2.13) Each semester,

division deans request that faculty submit each course syllabus to the division office staff for review. (CR-2.14)

The college also communicates Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), General Education Learning Outcomes (GEOs) and Institutional Level Outcomes (ILOs) to students through the College Catalog and the College Website. (CR-2.15) In addition, the College utilizes CurricUNET to manage and maintain all official course outlines, and through this Web-based curriculum database, individuals are able to search each course outline to review its specific course SLOs. (CR-2.13)

Next steps: None

Evidence:

- CR-2.1 Moorpark College's Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation that was sent to ACCJC (October 2012)
- CR-2.2 2011 Fall Flex Presentation: SLOs: Ready? Set? Go!!
- CR-2.3 2012 Fall Flex Presentation: Learning Outcomes – Making Sense of Assessment Results
- CR-2.4 2013 Fall Flex Presentation: Connecting the Dots between SLO Assessment Results and Program Improvement
- CR-2.5 2012 Spring Y'All Come: Summary of Campus-wide Assessment Conversation
- CR-2.6 2010, 2011 and 2012 Comprehensive SLO reports
- CR-2.7 2010, 2011, 2012 Institutional Research Calendar
- CR-2.8 TrackDat screenshot
- CR-2.9 5-Year Assessment Cycle
- CR-2.10 Proposal for Assessment Review Committee
- CR-2.11 EVP email introducing the new SLO Coordinator
- CR-2.12 Sample Course Outline of Record
- CR-2.13 Moorpark College CurricUNET screenshot
- CR-2.14 Sample "Welcome Back" letters from Division Deans
- CR-2.15 Moorpark College Catalog

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)

This college has completely satisfied this team recommendation.

The English and Mathematics discipline faculty have each participated in ongoing dialogue regarding assessment and placement into their courses. In addition, each program has completed at least one evaluation of the self-placement process and made modifications based on this evaluation.

English:

The English Department has periodically reviewed the self-placement process. In fall 2007 the department discussed the efficacy of self-placement and improvements to the process. (CR-3.1) Since then, based on numerous discussions and analysis of the online placement process, the English Department made corrections and improvements to the online assessment process to make it more informative and easier to follow for students. Previously, students were able to skip through questions on the online exam. Based on faculty recommendations, the district Information Technology department made adjustments to the online exam so that students cannot skip sections; this change was meant to force students to complete the entire exam, thus taking the assessment more seriously, and therefore, making better decisions about placement. (CR-3.2) The English chair also attended a counselors' meeting in fall 2009 to enlist upon counselor support in encouraging students to take the placement process seriously and not to place themselves beyond their real abilities and preparation.

In November 2011, the English Department held its annual Transitions Workshop meeting with local high school, adult school, and CSU faculty to discuss and compare a variety of topics, including assessment and placement. The participants worked together to align curriculum intersegmentally, and Moorpark College English faculty discussed innovations to ease transition from high school to college composition classes. For example, the Department agreed that students who met specific criteria (specifically, successful completion of the Expository Reading and Writing course in high school) would be allowed to bypass the placement process and enroll directly in English M01A if they choose. (CR-3.3)

Based on department discussions and meetings with faculty from local high schools, adult school, and CSUs about the self-assessment process, in fall 2012 English faculty began creating sample English M01A papers at different grade levels to help inform students about faculty expectations regarding quality of writing at each course level as students make their self-placement decision. The sample papers will be finalized and posted to the website by the end of Fall 2013. (CR-3.4, CR-3.5)

In spring 2013, the English Department also conducted an analysis of self-placement data from fall 2010 and fall 2011. They compared success rates for students who self-placed into English M01A, M02, or M03. Based on their analysis, the English faculty determined that the success and retention rates were satisfactory, which supported that the English self-placement process allowed students to place themselves as well as a standardized exam. (CR-3.6)

Mathematics:

The College created a workgroup that included faculty and staff from the Mathematics Department, Student Success Council, and Matriculation to begin researching common math placement exams. Their goal was to find a placement test that all new students could take to be accurately placed into math courses.

In spring 2011, the workgroup interviewed representatives from four placement test companies and instituted a pilot of *MyMathTest* assessment exam. The Math Department customized the exam and two math faculty piloted the placement exam in their courses. The faculty determined that the pilot was not successful because it did not include enough students to provide sufficient data to extrapolate results across all courses/students. Additionally, faculty evaluated the exam results and found that students who took the pilot exam scored poorly. Based on this evaluation, the Math Department made the following changes: 1) offered students who took the exam an opportunity to remediate, 2) rewrote/refined the assessment exam, and 3) planned to re-pilot the revised exam in sections of Math M09, M01, M04A, M03, and M07 to correlate content with student mastery. (CR-3.7)

In fall 2011, the Math Department piloted the exam in a quarter of the sections (5 per course) for developmental math courses. The goal of this additional assessment exam pilot was to increase the number of students taking the exam (increased data set) and to validate the assessment exam as a predictor of student success. Faculty evaluated the results and determined that the *MyMathTest* was not a good predictor of student success for any given developmental math level. (CR-3.8, CR-3.9, CR-3.10, CR-3.11, CR-3.12)

In spring 2012, based on the issues with the *MyMathTest* exam, the Math Department began researching nationally recognized self-placement tests, but decided to wait for the state to finish its research on assessment before investing in another commercial exam.

In spring 2013, the Math Department decided to revise the original math self-placement exam and implement this improved tool for use beginning summer 2013. The assessment exam was put in place on the website for use beginning March 1, 2013. New and returning students were notified about the assessment exam. The assessment exam was used for new students planning to register for Summer 2013 and/or Fall 2013 classes. The college will collect data over the next year and analyze test results. (CR-3.13, CR-3.14, CR-3.15, CR-3.16)

Next Steps: None. Ongoing assessment.

Evidence:

- CR-3.1 English Department Meeting Minutes
- CR-3.2 Screenshot of the English Placement Exam
- CR-3.3 English Department Transition Meeting Agenda/Minutes
- CR-3.4 Sample English M01A papers
- CR-3.5 English Department Meeting Minutes: 4/25/13
- CR-3.6 English Self-placement Data and Meeting Notes
- CR-3.7 Comparison of Math Placement Exams 2011-2012
- CR-3.8 Mathematic Department Placement Exam Taskforce Meeting Minutes: 9/20/11, 10/28/11
- CR-3.9 Mathematics Department Meeting Minutes: 9/23/11
- CR-3.10 Fall 2011 Placement Exam Pilot Course List
- CR-3.11 Fall 2011 Placement Exam Pilot Timeline
- CR-3.12 Mathematics Department Recommendations on Placement
- CR-3.13 Math Placement Exam Data
- CR-3.14 Matriculation Workgroup Meeting Minutes: 1/15/13, 2/19/13
- CR-3.15 Group emails related to revising the MC Math Placement Exam: January-March, 2013
- CR-3.16 Screenshot of the Math Placement Exam

College Recommendation: 4

In order to improve effectiveness, the College should (1) 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. (2) This evaluation should give consideration to the creation of an executive council/committee that has constituency representation that advises the President regarding committee recommendations. (3) Based on the evaluation, the College should develop and implement appropriate revisions to its governance structure and document them. (IV.A.2-3)

The college has completely satisfied this team recommendation.

- Moorpark College has evaluated and updated its governance structure, and has updated the governance manual accordingly (*Making Decisions at Moorpark College 2012*). Subcommittees no longer exist within the governance structure. (CR-4.1)
- Moorpark College added the Presidents Council to the governance structure, as documented in the *Making Decisions at Moorpark College 2012*. (CR-4.1)
- Moorpark College has developed, implemented, and documented all revisions to the governance structure, as demonstrated through the publishing of *Making Decisions at Moorpark College 2012*. (CR-4.1)

1.Evaluation of Committee Structure

Moorpark College's Decision-Making Structure: Subcommittees no longer exist in the decision-making process. Groups that contribute recommendations to the decision-making processes are organized into four categories based on the group's responsibilities and its source of authority. The groups in all four categories are essential to involving the college community in making decisions and to ensuring the college community is informed about issues of college wide importance. (See Appendix B for "Type of Structure of Groups that Develop Recommendations")

Recommendations developed by governance groups must flow through on-campus processes (outlined in the *Making Decisions at Moorpark College 2012* document), culminating in a formal recommendation to the College President. The College President reviews the process and the recommendations, and either returns the recommendation for further consideration by the governance group or directs implementation of the recommendation. If the College President's decision differs from the formal recommendation, the President's final decision is communicated in writing, and includes the rationale for the final decision. When a recommendation has District wide impact, the College President forwards the recommendation for review by the Chancellor. (CR-4.1)

2. Consider the Creation of an Executive Council/Committee

Moorpark College added the Presidents Council to the governance structure, as documented in the *Making Decisions at Moorpark College 2012*. (CR-4.1) This Council consists of the College President, Executive Vice President, Vice President of Business Services, the Academic Senate President, the Classified Senate President, and the Associated Students President. Members are beginning to meet on a yearly basis to receive comments, concerns, and endorsements regarding the College Standing Committees. The Council is to provide the College President with varied perspectives by which to evaluate recommendations and make final decisions. The first meeting of this Council was held in September 2013. (CR-4.2, CR-4.3)

3. Develop, Implement and Document Appropriate Revisions to Governance Structure

Moorpark College has developed, implemented, and documented all revisions to the governance structure, as demonstrated through the publishing of *Making Decisions at Moorpark College 2012*. (CR-4.1)

Next Steps: None.

Evidence:

- CR-4.1 *Making Decisions at Moorpark College 2012*
- CR-4.2 Presidents Council Agenda 9/11/13
- CR-4.3 Presidents Council Minutes 9/11/13

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)

Conclusion from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report (November 13-14, 2012):
The District, in concert with the three Colleges, completed its functional mapping and has incorporated College-to-College responsibilities and their relationship to the District. Further, there was evidence of incorporating District and College committees relating to budget, academic (curriculum) and student services, strategic planning and research. The teams concluded that VCCCD has addressed all components of this recommendation, resolved the deficiencies and now meet Standards.

Summary

During the period of February through June 2012, the District and Colleges, through the District Consultation Council, completed the work of revising the District-wide *Participatory Governance Handbook* to reflect a clearly defined organizational flow and functional mapping narrative and developed the *VCCCD Governance: Advisory and Recommendation Pathways*, a governance process chart that delineates and illustrates the relationships of major District and College committees. The *Participatory Governance Handbook* and its accompanying *VCCCD Governance: Advisory and Recommendation Pathways* ensure delineation of roles and responsibilities and provide venues within the District/College governance structure to host participatory dialogues.

The *Participatory Governance Handbook* review process and development of the *VCCCD Governance: Advisory and Recommendation Pathways* resulted in recommended changes to participatory governance groups, including the creation of a District Council on Accreditation and Planning (DCAP) to develop, monitor, and evaluate District-wide planning and accreditation cycle activities, and a District Council on Academic Affairs (DCAA) to advise the Chancellor regarding instructional program development and related Board policies and administrative procedures. Discussion addressing gaps within existing governance committees further resulted in modifying the District Technical Review Workgroup (DTRW) and District Council on Student Learning (DCSL). The modified groups are now called the District Technical Review Workgroup – Instruction (DTRW-I) and the District Technical Review Workgroup – Student Services (DTRW-SS), and the Workgroups advise the District Council on Academic Affairs (DCAA) on academic and professional matters. DTRW-I and DTRW-SS focus on instruction and student services in program development and review/suggest revisions to Board policies and administrative procedures in these areas as needed.

The *Participatory Governance Handbook* was communicated District-wide, and constituents were given opportunities to provide input for improvement. The *Participatory Governance*

Handbook was presented to the Board of Trustees for information in June 2012, and the Board approved an updated BP 2205 Delineation of System and Board Functions to include the completed *Participatory Governance Handbook* and functional mapping documents.

In fall 2012, the District Council on Accreditation and Planning (DCAP) completed a *VCCCD Operational/Functional Mapping Table* that supplements the Functional Mapping narrative provided in the District-wide *Participatory Governance Handbook*. The supplementary *VCCCD Operational/Functional Mapping Table* provides an “at-a-glance” view of functional mapping between the District and Colleges.

In the revised *Participatory Governance Handbook*, the District clearly delineates and communicates functions between the District and the individual Colleges and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice. The *Handbook* and its accompanying *VCCCD Governance: Advisory and Recommendation Pathways* serve as the manual of governance and operations within the District and Colleges. By clearly defining and delineating the roles and responsibilities of the District and the Colleges, effective and efficient services and support are provided to the Colleges to achieve the District’s vision and mission.

Progress on District Recommendation 1 for Improvement and Sustainability

The District and Colleges will assess, on an annual basis, the appropriateness of constituent role delineation and responsibilities involved in District-wide governance processes, identifying gaps in governance structures and resources, as well as the overall effectiveness of the process by administering online surveys and holding public forums to gather data for further refinement.

In February 2012, District Consultation Council and the Chancellor’s Administrative Council discussed and agreed upon a review process and timeline for an annual assessment of the *Participatory Governance Handbook* and accompanying *VCCCD Governance: Advisory and Recommendation Pathways* and *VCCCD Operational/Functional Mapping Table*. During February and March 2013, District Consultation Council members and the Chancellor’s Administrative Council members worked with constituencies at the Colleges and the District Administrative Center to gather input for a first review of the documents at the April 5, 2013 Consultation Council meeting (D1-01). Review of the *Handbook* and related documents is ongoing through scheduled Consultation Council meetings (D1-02), with expected completion in fall 2013.

List of Evidence for District Recommendation 1

D1-01 Consultation Council Meeting Notes and *Participatory Governance Handbook* (4.5.13)

D1-02 Consultation Council Meeting Notes (5.30.13, 6.27.13, 8.30.13)

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)

Conclusion from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report (November 13-14, 2012):
The teams found that VCCCD has developed a process to review, assess and modify policies and procedures of the District. There is strong evidence that procedures that impeded operational effectiveness were reviewed as part of the assessment and were refined to ensure efficiency and effectiveness. The District and Colleges have implemented a process that identifies impediments to effectiveness and provides a framework to minimize the impediment. The teams concluded that the process for assessment and improvement is sustainable. The teams concluded that the recommendation has been addressed, the deficiencies resolved, and the Standards met.

Summary

The Board of Trustees adopted a two-year policy/procedure review cycle calendar in March 2011. The review schedule was implemented and is being vigorously adhered to as evidenced by activities undertaken by the Board's Policy Committee and the subsequent placement of proposed, reviewed, and/or revised policies and administrative procedures on monthly Board agendas for action or information. District governance committees maintain meeting notes documenting policy/administrative procedure review and recommendations and have been requested to post agendas/minutes on the District or College websites.

To address the review and modification of policies and procedures that may impede operational effectiveness, policy/administrative procedure review and recommended changes follow the *VCCCD Governance: Advisory and Recommendation Pathways* as outlined in the *Participatory Governance Handbook* to ensure broad-based constituent input, consistency, and appropriate application across the District and Colleges. Governance committees and District/College constituents serving on governance committees are provided opportunities to review, analyze, and recommend suggestions for modification of policies/procedures under review that may present potential impediments and negatively impact the timely and effective operations of District/College departments. Constituent groups formulate recommendations to the Chancellor through consultation, and members are responsible to serve as a conduit for information and the catalyst for discussion on topics raised by District groups and within constituent groups.

To address extremely time-sensitive policy or administrative procedures critical to District/College operational deadlines but subject to missing Policy Committee or Board Meeting timelines, governance committees can hold special meetings and/or present such time-sensitive recommended policies and administrative procedures to the Chancellor or

Chancellor’s Cabinet for approval to advance to Policy Committee and the Board of Trustees.

As a result of dialogue by governance groups and constituent feedback, policy and administrative procedure modifications occurred to avoid impeding College operations and ensure consistency across the District/Colleges. For example, an employee-accessible “Business Tools, Forms, and Procedures” SharePoint site was designed to facilitate consistent District-wide application of procedures, and a Field Trip/Excursion electronic workflow process was developed in conjunction with faculty and staff in response to faculty needs.

The process utilized for reviewing and revising Board policies provides opportunities for all constituents to give input and follows the established governance structure and committees before the Board of Trustees acts upon recommended changes or adoption of policies and administrative procedures. The Board continues to conduct effective Board meetings and more effective implementation of policies and administrative procedures.

Progress on District Recommendation 2 for Improvement and Sustainability

Since the most recent follow-up accreditation team visit in November 2012, all Board policies and administrative procedures have entered the cycle of review. Completion status as of October 2013 is as follows:

Chapters	No. of Board Policies (BPs) and Administrative Procedures (APs) Reviewed	Status
Chapter 1 The District	2 of 2 BPs reviewed No APs required	Review completed
Chapter 2 Board of Trustees	46 of 47 BPs reviewed 23 of 23 APs reviewed	Remaining BP (1) Review in progress
Chapter 3 General Institution	21 of 29 BPs reviewed 18 of 27 APs reviewed	Remaining BPs (8)/APs (9) Review in progress
Chapter 4 Academic Affairs	30 of 32 BPs reviewed 32 of 34 APs reviewed	Remaining BPs (2)/APs (2) Review in progress
Chapter 5 Student Services	10 of 25 BPs reviewed 10 of 26 APs reviewed	Remaining BPs (15)/APs (16) Review in progress
Chapter 6 Business/Fiscal Affairs	22 of 23 BPs reviewed 31 of 31 APs reviewed	Remaining BP (1) under review APs completed
Chapter 7 Human Resources	27 of 30 BPs reviewed 12 of 12 APs reviewed	Remaining BPs (3) under review APs completed

The District continues to monitor the sequence, origination points, and appropriate constituency involvement in the two-year policy/procedure review process to identify systematically criteria and evaluate impacts of same on District/College operational effectiveness (D2-01). The Board of Trustees committed to act in a manner consistent with

its policies and administrative procedures by signing a strengthened Best Practices Agreement at its regularly scheduled Board meeting in March 2013 (D2-02).

To achieve continuous quality improvement across the District/Colleges, the “Business Tools, Forms, and Procedures” SharePoint site will be expanded to incorporate additional procedures, forms, and enhancements based on user suggestions (D2-03). This process of regular updates will continue based on user input. The Human Resources Department reviews the electronic toolbox “HR Tools” on an ongoing basis to ensure the toolbox contains necessary and up-to-date materials for employees (D2-04).

In fall 2012, the District Council on Accreditation and Planning (DCAP) designed and implemented an Employee Formal Communications Survey to collect and analyze feedback from employees about ways to improve the flow of information to and from the District through formal channels of the committee and governance structure and to identify any policies or procedures that need clarification or that are difficult to implement in practice. A summary of the survey findings was discussed at District Consultation Council in spring 2013 and provided District-wide through a subsequent Chancellor’s Update, which was distributed to employees, students, and Community Advisory Body members (D2-05). The next annual Employee Formal Communications Survey is scheduled for fall 2013.

List of Evidence for District Recommendation 2

- D2-01 VCCCD Policy/Procedure Tracking Document; Board Policy/Administrative Procedure
Two-Year Review Calendar
- D2-02 Board of Trustees Best Practices Agreement (03/2013)
- D2-03 “Business Tools, Forms, and Procedures” SharePoint Site
- D2-04 Human Resources Department “HR Tools”
- D2-05 VCCCD Employee Formal Communications Survey Summary, Chancellor’s Update

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)

Conclusion from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report (November 13-14, 2012): *The teams found that there are well-defined processes to review the planning process, and timelines are clear and reasonable. The teams also found that outcomes assessment data and other elements of institutional effectiveness are integrated into both the District and College planning processes. There is a linkage between Recommendation 1 and 3 in that delineation of responsibility is important in addressing the decision-making process at VCCCD. There is indication that the process of assessment-related actions will lead to sustainable continuous quality improvement in effecting student success. The teams conclude that VCCCD has fully addressed this recommendation, resolved deficiencies, and now meets Standards.*

Summary

To align with best practices in institutional planning, the Board of Trustees assessed the District's planning efforts using the ACCJC Rubric on Integrated Planning at its June 2012 Board Strategic Planning Session. Outcomes suggested District practices and processes reflected many essential features of integrated planning, including a 10-year District Master Plan, Board goals and objectives with annual effectiveness reporting, annual Board planning sessions, and dialogue regarding efficacy of the planning process. The improved District-wide integrated planning process incorporated local College planning processes and reporting timelines.

The Board recognized process improvements were needed to reach and maintain the level of "sustainable continuous program improvement." Of particular importance was documentation of the planning process, affirmation of the planning cycle and timeline for creation of the next District Master Plan, and an orderly transition to improved practices from current activities. To that end, a transition plan and District-wide planning model timeline was adopted by the Board in August 2012. A *VCCCD Integrated Planning Manual* guides and documents the planning process.

To assess District/College effectiveness, VCCCD created a District-wide *Institutional Effectiveness Report* that delineates outcomes for corresponding annual Board Goals. The *Institutional Effectiveness Report* provides three years of data for trend analysis and comparisons. The first report was presented at the June 2012 Board Planning Session and will be presented annually and institutionalized as a component of the standard assessment measure.

To assess its decision-making processes, the District, through Consultation Council during the period of February-June 2012, reviewed the *Participatory Governance Handbook* and

substantially revised the deliberation and consultation process. The resulting structure, as documented in the *Handbook* under the *VCCCD Governance: Advisory and Recommendation Pathways*, ensures that the deliberation, recommendation, and decision-making process is transparent, appropriate, and functional.

The *Participatory Governance Handbook* review process and development of the *VCCCD Governance: Advisory and Recommendation Pathways* resulted in recommended changes to participatory governance groups, including the creation of a District Council on Accreditation and Planning (DCAP) to develop, monitor, and evaluate District-wide planning and accreditation cycle activities, and a District Council on Academic Affairs (DCAA) to advise the Chancellor regarding instructional program development and related Board policies and administrative procedures. Discussion addressing gaps within existing governance committees further resulted in modifying the District Technical Review Workgroup (DTRW) and District Council on Student Learning (DCSL). The modified groups are now called the District Technical Review Workgroup – Instruction (DTRW-I) and the District Technical Review Workgroup – Student Services (DTRW-SS), and the Workgroups advise the District Council on Academic Affairs (DCAA) on academic and professional matters. DTRW-I and DTRW-SS focus on instruction and student services in program development and review/suggest revisions to Board policies and administrative procedures in these areas as needed.

The *Participatory Governance Handbook* was communicated District-wide, and constituents were given opportunities to provide input for improvement. The *Participatory Governance Handbook* was presented to the Board of Trustees for information in June 2012, and the Board approved an updated BP 2205 Delineation of System and Board Functions to include the completed *Participatory Governance Handbook* and functional mapping documents.

In fall 2012, the District Council on Accreditation and Planning (DCAP) completed a *VCCCD Operational/Functional Mapping Table* that supplements the Functional Mapping narrative provided in the District-wide *Participatory Governance Handbook*. The supplementary *VCCCD Operational/Functional Mapping Table* provides an “at-a-glance” view of functional mapping between the District and Colleges.

The District and Colleges developed a revised District-wide Integrated Planning Cycle Timeline and District-wide *Institutional Effectiveness Report* that is data-driven to assess District services and ensure 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. The District has established clearly defined roles of authority and responsibility between the Colleges and District, and it acts as the liaison between the Colleges and Board of Trustees.

Progress on District Recommendation 3 for Improvement and Sustainability

Following Board adoption of the District-wide Integrated Planning Cycle timeline and transition plan, the District and Colleges utilized the *VCCCD Integrated Planning Manual* to

guide and document the planning process (D3-01).

Description of the District Planning Process

The District's six-year *Master Plan* identifies over-arching goals and objectives that serve as the foundation for the *Strategic Plan*, the *Strategic Technology Master Plan*, and the *Facilities Plan* (D3-02). The *Master Plan* may be updated prior to the end of the six-year period if warranted by a major change of conditions.

Research and data analysis provide information for district-wide dialogue that supports the development of the *Master Plan*. Annual and trend data are collected and analyzed in a number of areas, including:

- Demographic data and projections
- Economic projections
- Student access and enrollment data from feeder institutions and receiving institutions
- Student access and success data from the district colleges
- Long-term and short-term analysis of community needs as appropriate to mission
- Other sources of data identified as essential in the planning dialogue

The *Strategic Plan* is comprised of a limited number of high-priority, strategic goals derived from/based on the *Master Plan*. Three-year goals are further divided into objectives, each operationalized through measurable action steps. Each action step includes a timeline for completion, a description of the indicators of success, and the assignment of parties responsible for implementing the action. The Board of Trustees calls for the next three-year *Strategic Plan* when the term of the *Strategic Plan* expires or when all strategic goals and objectives have been achieved.

The goals and objectives of the six-year *Master Plan* are reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees upon the recommendation of the Chancellor's Consultation Council, which serves as the primary District planning group. Upon receiving the *Master Plan*, Consultation Council (with the assistance of the District Council on Accreditation and Planning (DCAP)): (1) identifies goals and objectives to implement first, which are compiled into the *Strategic Plan*, (2) charges the appropriate District councils and College committees with the task of developing and implementing the action steps to support the *Strategic Plan*'s goals and objectives, and (3) calls on these councils and committees to file periodic progress reports with the District Council on Accreditation and Planning (DCAP).

The new *Master Plan* is intended to cover the period from 2013 to 2019. The *Strategic Plan* will be developed during the Fall 2013 semester and will span the period of 2013 to 2016. The *Facilities Master Plan* is a rolling five-year plan that currently spans from 2015 to 2019 (D3-03). The *Strategic Technology Master Plan* spans from 2011 to 2014 (D3-04). Subsequent iterations of these plans will be developed when the terms of these plans expire or if there is a major change of internal or external conditions.

Development of the 2013-2019 Master Plan

The development of a new educational Master Plan during spring 2013 was a highly collaborative process, where the hopes and ideas of various stakeholders were synthesized into a coherent narrative that both inspired and directed specific goals and objectives. Below is the framework that was followed to create the 2013-2019 *Ventura County Community College District Master Plan*:

Laying the Foundation: In January 2013, the District Council on Accreditation and Planning (DCAP) proposed a preliminary timeline for the development and adoption of the *Master Plan*. The President of Ventura College (hereafter, “Planner”) was asked to lead the District and its three Colleges through the steps needed to produce a document for Board of Trustees review and consideration. Following this appointment, a preliminary methodology for seeking constituent input on key planning issues was developed and a draft implementation calendar was prepared (D3-05).

Identification of Focus Group Participants and Key Discussion Topics: In January 2013, the District Council on Accreditation and Planning (DCAP) presented a preliminary list of questions to be discussed in constituent focus groups. The Chancellor’s Consultation Council modified and augmented these preliminary questions, resulting in the following list:

1. In light of increased state and national emphasis on student completion, what might be done in order to create clear pathways to degrees, certificates, and transfers?
2. In light of proposed unit caps and penalties for unsuccessful course attempts, what might be done in order to decrease course withdrawals and failing grades?
3. Is there anything about our relationship with our educational partners that could be improved or that needs to change?
4. In light of rapid technological advancements and increased options available for students on both the state and national level, what do we need to do to remain competitive in the online arena?
5. What should be the relationship of the three Colleges in our District to each other?
6. (Internal Groups): What must we do to retain organizational vitality?
OR
6. (External Groups): What could the District and its three Colleges do to better meet community needs?

Consultation Council also agreed to a minimum set of constituent groups to participate in focus group discussions. These groups included the Academic, Classified, and Student Senates; the College Administrative or Deans’ Councils; the District’s Community Advisory Board (as augmented by additional community representatives); and representatives from the College Foundation Boards.

Environmental Scan: Concurrently with the development of the focus group questions, the District’s institutional researchers were asked to compile an extensive scan of the external and internal environment, focusing on the variables that might impact district planning decisions. Where possible, county data was compared to state data.

External data included:

1. County demographics
2. Socioeconomic trends
3. Unemployment rates
4. Employment by sector
5. K-12 student demographics
6. High school graduation numbers and test scores
7. High school dropout rates
8. College-going rates

Internal data included:

1. Enrollment trends
2. Student demographics
3. Faculty and staff demographics
4. Student goals and majors
5. English, math and reading placements
6. BOG waiver statistics
7. Trends in numbers served by categorical programs
8. ARCC data
9. Degrees and certificates awarded
10. Numbers of transfers
11. Employment rate of CTE student cohorts
12. Number of students taking online courses
13. Number of students above a 90-unit threshold
14. Number of students who have tried and failed courses 3 or more times; courses attempted that fall into this category
15. Number of students who are on financial aid
16. Number of students who have been on financial aid for 12 or more semesters

Focus Groups: Thirteen individuals were identified by the Chancellor, College Presidents, and Academic Senate Presidents to serve as facilitators of the focus groups. In February 2013, the Planner met with the identified facilitators to orient them to their task, to clarify the planning discussion questions that would be raised, to pilot a methodology for the focus groups, and to agree upon a methodology for documenting the results of the focus group discussions. Focus group discussions were held during the months of February and March 2013.

Forum: In April 2013, a large-group dialogue on the planning issues was held. At this meeting, the members of Consultation Council were joined by the 13 facilitators and by the members of the committees responsible for planning at the three Colleges. After reviewing the data prepared by the District's institutional researchers and hearing the synthesized results of College and District focus group discussions, the Forum format was used to enable the 80+ participants to further discuss the planning issues at greater length. The results of this large-group dialogue were synthesized by the Planner and used as the basis for the development of a proposed list of goals and objectives to serve as the foundation for the *Master Plan*.

Review and Revision: In May 2013, the first draft of the proposed *Master Plan* was shared with College and District constituent groups. District Consultation Council received feedback and made modifications to the draft. The draft report was also reviewed and discussed by the Board of Trustees in June 2013 as part of their annual Planning Session. Work continued on a second draft of the *Master Plan* during July 2013, and the revised document was shared with College and District constituent groups when school resumed in August 2013.

Adoption: Consultation Council finalized the draft of the *Master Plan* in September 2013. The *Master Plan* was presented to the Board of Trustees in September 2013 for discussion and in October 2013 for adoption (D3-06 and D3-07).

List of Evidence for District Recommendation 3

D3-01 *VCCCD Integrated Planning Manual*

D3-02 *District Master Plan*

D3-03 *Facilities Master Plan*

D3-04 *Strategic Technology Master Plan*

D3-05 District Master Plan Timeline/Calendar

D3-06 Consultation Council Agenda/Notes (9.27.13)

D3-07 Board of Trustees Meetings (9.10.13, 10.8.13)

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)

Conclusion from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report (November 13-14, 2012):

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

Summary

Internal

The District, through Consultation Council, improved effectiveness of its formal communications as evidenced by a thorough review and revision of the District-wide *Participatory Governance Handbook*. In creating and adhering to an appropriate governance process chart, *VCCCD Governance: Advisory and Recommendation Pathways*, for formal consultation and dialogue, the District ensured that venues for constituent feedback are available, well-defined, and understood. The *Handbook* will be thoroughly assessed through Consultation Council at least once every three years to ensure ongoing effectiveness and demonstrate sustainable continuous quality improvement.

In March 2012, VCCCD implemented an annual governance committees' self-appraisal survey process to ensure assessment and improve formal communications within governance committee structures. Findings were discussed by committee members, and areas of potential improvement identified. In addition, formal governance committee/council activities occurring District-wide were communicated through the Chancellor's Update, posted on the District website, and distributed to employees, students, and Citizens Advisory Body members.

To improve communication between Chancellor's Cabinet and governance committees, actions taken in Chancellor's Cabinet regarding policies and procedures were recorded in Chancellor's Cabinet meeting notes, and the Chair/Co-Chairs of the appropriate governance committees were notified of actions taken in Chancellor's Cabinet. In addition, the Director of Administrative Relations attended various governance committee meetings as a guest to assist in maintaining consistent communication regarding review of policies and administrative procedures.

External

To further utilize community input in strategic planning, the District surveyed an expanded Citizens Advisory Body to obtain feedback for consideration at the Board's June 2012 Strategic Planning Session. The survey obtained opinions regarding the District/Colleges' breadth of functions and perceived challenges to better inform the Board of Trustees in planning and deliberations. Significant findings reflected the need for the District to increase communication with community constituents regarding programs, services, and budget information. In addition, findings indicated that community members identified the budget, alternative revenue resources, accreditation, partnerships, and college readiness as challenges currently facing VCCCD. Trustees commented that the findings confirmed the importance of obtaining community input, and the Board agreed to increase the number of meetings with the Citizens Advisory Body to improve communication and ensure in-depth community participation in planning related to community needs.

The District is committed to continuous assessment of the effectiveness of its formal communication and utilized its constituency and community input/feedback data as a means to plan for continuous improvement. At the same time, the District and Colleges are demonstrating to the community that it and the three Colleges value open and timely communication with their constituents regarding expectation of educational excellence, operational planning, and integrity. High expectations are to be the norm at all levels of the organization.

Progress on District Recommendation 4 for Improvement and Sustainability

In March 2013, annual governance committees' self-appraisal surveys were distributed to governance committees (i.e., District Consultation Council, Administrative Technology Advisory Committee (ATAC); District Council on Accreditation and Planning (DCAP); District Council on Human Resources (DCHR); Institutional Research Advisory Committee (IRAC); District Council on Academic Affairs (DCAA); District Technical Review Workgroup-Instructional (DTRW-I); District Technical Review Workgroup-Student Services (DTRW-SS); District Council on Administrative Services (DCAS); and Instructional Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)) to ensure assessment and improve formal communications within governance committee structures (D4-01).

Findings were shared with members of the above-referenced committees in spring 2013. Members identified areas of potential improvement, if any, based on self-appraisal findings as follows (D4-02):

- District Consultation Council agreed review and discussion regarding its role would take place as part of the Participatory Governance Handbook review.
- ATAC discussion of findings resulted in committee agreement to maintain the current meeting schedule and post draft meeting notes to the District website to provide needed information in advance of approved minutes. ATAC members also requested more frequent updates on recommendations presented to Cabinet.

- DCAP discussion results will be provided in fall 2013 when the committee resumes meeting.
- DCHR discussion results will be provided in fall 2013 when the committee resumes meeting.
- IRAC members reviewed the self-appraisal findings and determined the committee was functioning as needed.
- DCAA members recommended additional discussion take place at Consultation Council regarding the charge of DCAA.
- DTRW-I and DTRW-SS workgroups discussed process and coordination between DTRW-I, DTRW-SS, and DCAA. Workgroup members agreed to post draft meeting notes on the District Committee website to provide needed information in advance of approved minutes. In addition, the workgroup members agreed to change the monthly meeting dates to accommodate submission deadlines for Policy Committee review and Board review.
- DCAS findings resulted in group discussion regarding planning and budget and the committee's role as it relates to the funding allocation model.
- ITAC findings resulted in members reviewing the committee structure and forwarding recommended changes to Consultation Council.

In fall 2012, the District Council on Accreditation and Planning (DCAP) initiated a survey of all employees related to constituency satisfaction with formal communications as a means to gauge effectiveness and provide opportunity for improvement. A summary of the survey findings was discussed at District Consultation Council in spring 2013 and provided District-wide through a subsequent Chancellor's Update, which was distributed to employees, students, and Community Advisory Body members (D4-03). The next annual Employee Formal Communications Survey is scheduled for fall 2013.

The Board values the importance of obtaining community input and increased the number of meetings with the Citizens Advisory Body to improve communication and ensure in-depth community participation in planning related to community needs. Four Citizens Advisory Body meetings have been held since fall 2012. The October 2012 meeting focused on the Board's Goals and Objectives, the District budget, and accreditation. The January 2013 meeting focused on economic development. The District's Division of Economic Development provided an overview of current economic development activities, achievements, and future plans. Trustees and community members discussed opportunities for vital community needs and identified gaps in service delivery. Groups were assigned topics for discussion and reported findings in the areas of emerging sectors in the county, potential partnerships, outreach possibilities, and methods to address any gaps in training and workforce development. The April 2013 Citizens Advisory Body meeting focused on development of the District *Master Plan*. Additional Ventura County community leaders were invited to attend the April 2013 Citizens Advisory Body meeting as a means to obtain additional community input for the District *Master Plan*. The September 2013 Citizens

Advisory Body meeting provided members an opportunity to review and discuss the most recent version of the District Master Plan that included Citizen Advisory Body members' ideas and input (D4-04).

Citizens Advisory Body meeting assessment findings indicate members desire and appreciate interactive meetings. As a result, all Citizen Advisory Body meetings include opportunities for discussion between Citizen Advisory Body members, presenters, facilitators, and the Board of Trustees (D4-05).

List of Evidence for District Recommendation 4

D4-01 District Committee Self-Appraisal Electronic Distribution Communications

D4-02 Participatory Governance Committees Self-Appraisal Findings and Governance Committee Meeting Notes Reflecting Discussion

D4-03 VCCCD Employee Formal Communications Survey Summary, Chancellor's Update

D4-04 Citizens Advisory Body Meeting Agendas/Minutes

D4-05 Citizens Advisory Body Assessment Findings

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)

Conclusion from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report (November 13-14, 2012): *After interviewing College employees, District staff, and individual Board members, the team concluded that the Board has implemented a professional development process to improve individual member's skills. This professional development process is dependent on an on-going self-evaluation to identify inefficiencies involving performance of Board members. The teams conclude that the District has met this recommendation.*

Summary

The Board's annual self-evaluation process to assess Board performance is clearly defined in Board Policy/Administrative Procedure 2745 Board Self-Evaluation. The Board of Trustees improved the self-assessment instrument and implemented the self-evaluation process to complete the Board self-evaluation in advance of its June 2012 Board Planning Session in accordance with Board Policy 2745.

The full Board completed an analysis of its self-assessment and formally adopted outcomes and measures of Board performance. The assessment of those outcomes was an integral part of the annual evaluation. An external constituent assessment of the Board in the form of a survey to the District Consultation Council was established per Board Policy/Administrative Policy 2745 as part of the Board's annual self-assessment process. The results of the external assessment by District Consultation Council were discussed as part of the Board self-evaluation at the June 2012 Board Planning Session. The Board also accepted the survey results from the District Consultation Council and incorporated the findings into the Board's goal setting and performance enhancement activities.

In adopting the Board's Performance Goals, conducting the continuous self-assessment activities, and reviewing and improving the self-assessment instrument, the Board demonstrated a heightened vigilance toward self-reflection and continuous quality improvement. The assessment is focused upon Board performance as related to the Board's leadership and policy-making roles.

Progress on Recommendation 5 for Improvement and Sustainability

Per Policy 2745 Board Self-Evaluation, the Board's self-evaluation process is conducted annually (D5-01). The Board's 2013 self-assessment process included the following activities:

- At the April 2013 Planning, Accreditation, Board Communications, and Student Success Committee (PACSS), PACSS reviewed existing self-evaluation survey instruments (i.e., Board's self-evaluation, Board evaluation survey provided to

District

Consultation Council for feedback, and the Board's monthly meeting assessment) (D5-02).

- In May 2013, the Board implemented its annual ongoing self-evaluation process per Board Policy/Administrative Procedure 2745. The Board of Trustees received the 2013 self-evaluation survey in electronic format for completion from the Chancellor's Office, and District Consultation Council members were provided an opportunity to complete the Board Evaluation survey electronically through the Chancellor's Office. The Board Survey was designed to gather feedback regarding Board Performance Goals, general evaluation, and individual Trustee reflective perspective. Participants were asked to indicate opinions using a rating scale of "agree," "partial agreement," "disagree," or "don't know." An option to provide comments was provided (D5-03).
- The annual summative Board self-evaluation was conducted at the Board's June 2013 Board Strategic Planning Session. Purpose and expected outcomes included evaluating Board performance; identifying and discussing areas for strengthening Board performance; incorporating identified areas in need of improvement into existing Board Performance Goals; and adopting updated Board Performance Goals. The Board's self-evaluation process also included discussion of significant findings from a summary of the Board's Monthly Meeting Assessments and a discussion of the results of the Board's Annual Self-Evaluation and Consultation Council Evaluation of the Board (D5-04).
- Following Board discussion in June 2013, Trustees assessed the Board's progress in achieving performance goals and considered significant findings in the review and update of Board Performance Goals. The Board made recommendations for improvement and renewed the Board's commitment to maintain strengthened Board performance. At a subsequent Board meeting in September 2013, the Board adopted its updated Board Performance Goals (D5-05).
- Following the Board's 2013 self-evaluation process, Board members completed a meeting assessment to ensure continuous quality improvement and effectiveness. Findings were provided for Trustee discussion (D5-06).

List of Evidence for District Recommendation 5

D5-01 VCCCD Board Policy/Administrative Procedure 2745 Board Self-Evaluation

D5-02 PACSS Meeting Notes, Existing Board Self-Evaluation Instruments

D5-03 Board Self-Evaluation, Consultation Council Board Evaluation Survey

D5-04 Board Planning Session Agenda/Minutes, Board Self-Evaluation Findings, Consultation Council Findings, Summary of Board's Monthly Meeting Assessments

D5-05 Board Meeting Minutes, Board Performance Goals

D5-06 Board Annual Planning Session Assessment Findings

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)

Conclusion from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report (November 13-14, 2012):
The teams were able to confirm that the Colleges receive equitable participation from the District Office regarding input on policies and procedures, which may affect their decision making process. College personnel cited examples of procedures that are implemented consistently and equitably across Colleges, such as the granting of early tenure. The teams conclude that the District Office has met this recommendation.

Summary

The District administered a three-pronged strategy to ensure Board-established policies and administrative procedures are administered District-wide in an equitable and consistent manner:

1. Board policies and administrative procedures are reviewed on a two-year cycle with constituent input to ensure clarity and appropriateness in field implementation.
2. The Functional Mapping narrative in the *Participatory Governance Handbook* makes explicit the delineation of functions between the District and Colleges and clarifies where District/College sites have discretionary decision-making over operations and where uniformity in practice is mandated.
3. Formal communication channels are utilized to ensure Board policies and procedures are communicated to District-wide constituents.

The Board of Trustees adopted a two-year policy/procedure review cycle calendar in March 2011. The review schedule was implemented and is being vigorously adhered to as evidenced by activities undertaken by the Board's Policy Committee and the subsequent placement of proposed, reviewed, and/or revised policies and administrative procedures on monthly Board agendas for action or information. District governance committees maintain meeting notes documenting policy/administrative procedure review and recommendations and have been requested to post agendas/minutes on the District or College websites.

To address policies and procedures that may impede operational effectiveness or result in less than uniform practice concerns, policy/procedure review and recommended changes follow the implemented *VCCCD Governance: Advisory and Recommendation Pathways* outlined in the *Participatory Governance Handbook* to ensure transparent and broad-based constituent input, consistency, and appropriate application across the District and Colleges. The Functional Mapping narrative in the *Participatory Governance Handbook* explains the delineation of functions between the District and Colleges and clarifies where

District/College sites have discretionary decision-making over operations and where uniformity in practice is mandated.

Governance committees and District/College constituents serving on governance committees are provided opportunities to review, analyze, and recommend suggestions for modification of policies/procedures under review that may present potential impediments or uniform application concerns in District/College departments. Committee members understand that they attend meetings to represent constituent groups at a College or the District Administrative Center and serve as a conduit for information and catalyst for discussion on topics raised by District groups and within the constituent groups.

As a result of dialogue by governance groups and constituent feedback, policy and administrative procedure modifications were implemented to avoid impeding College operations and ensure consistency across the District/Colleges. For example, an employee-accessible “Business Tools, Forms, and Procedures” SharePoint site was designed to facilitate consistent District-wide application of procedures, and a Field Trip/Excursion electronic workflow process was developed in conjunction with faculty and staff in response to faculty needs.

To improve communication between Chancellor’s Cabinet and governance committees, actions taken in Chancellor’s Cabinet regarding policies and procedures were recorded in Chancellor’s Cabinet meeting notes, and the Chair/Co-Chairs of the appropriate governance committees were notified of actions taken in Chancellor’s Cabinet. In addition, the Director of Administrative Relations attended various government committee meetings as a guest to assist in maintaining consistent communication regarding review of policies and administrative procedures.

All Board policies and administrative procedures are monitored and tracked using a “Policy/Procedure Review Master Tracking Document,” and all active Board policies and procedures are available to District/College constituents and the public electronically via the District website. Constituents are provided District contact information on the District website for questions or requests related to policy and administrative procedures.

The District has consistently addressed the delineation of roles and responsibilities of the Chancellor and Board of Trustees as stated in Board Policy 2434. The Board delegates fully the responsibility and authority to the Chancellor to implement and administer Board policies without Board interference and holds the Chancellor accountable for the leadership and operation of the District and the Colleges. The Board continues to be cognizant and diligent in its responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.

Progress on Recommendation 6 for Improvement and Sustainability

Since the most recent follow-up accreditation team visit in November 2012, all Board policies and administrative procedures have entered the cycle of review. Completion status as of October 2013 is as follows:

Chapters	No. of Board Policies (BPs) and Administrative Procedures (APs) Reviewed	Status
Chapter 1 The District	2 of 2 BPs reviewed No APs required	Review completed
Chapter 2 Board of Trustees	46 of 47 BPs reviewed 23 of 23 APs reviewed	Remaining BP (1) Review in progress
Chapter 3 General Institution	21 of 29 BPs reviewed 18 of 27 APs reviewed	Remaining BPs (8)/APs (9) Review in progress
Chapter 4 Academic Affairs	30 of 32 BPs reviewed 32 of 34 APs reviewed	Remaining BPs (2)/APs (2) Review in progress
Chapter 5 Student Services	10 of 25 BPs reviewed 10 of 26 APs reviewed	Remaining BPs (15)/APs (16) Review in progress
Chapter 6 Business/Fiscal Affairs	22 of 23 BPs reviewed 31 of 31 APs reviewed	Remaining BP (1) under review APs completed
Chapter 7 Human Resources	27 of 30 BPs reviewed 12 of 12 APs reviewed	Remaining BPs (3) under review APs completed

The District continues to monitor the sequence, origination points, and appropriate constituency involvement in the two-year policy/procedure review process to identify systematically criteria and evaluate impacts of same on District/College operational effectiveness (D6-01). The Board of Trustees committed to act in a manner consistent with its policies and administrative procedures by signing a strengthened Best Practices Agreement at its regularly scheduled Board meeting in March 2013 (D6-02).

To achieve continuous quality improvement across the District/Colleges, the “Business Tools, Forms, and Procedures” SharePoint site will be expanded to incorporate additional procedures, forms, and enhancements based on user suggestions (D6-03). The Human Resources Department reviews the electronic toolbox “HR Tools” on an ongoing basis to ensure the toolbox contains necessary and up-to-date materials for employees (D6-04).

In February 2012, District Consultation Council and Chancellor’s Administrative Council agreed upon a review process and timeline for an annual assessment of the *Participatory Governance Handbook* and accompanying *VCCCD Governance: Advisory and Recommendation Pathways* and *VCCCD Operational/Functional Mapping Table*. During February and March 2013, District Consultation Council members and the Chancellor’s Administrative Council members worked with constituencies at the Colleges and the District Administrative Center to gather input for a first review of the documents at the April 5, 2013 Consultation Council meeting (D6-05). Review of the *Handbook* and related documents is

ongoing through scheduled Consultation Council meetings (D6-06), with expected completion in fall 2013.

In fall 2012, the District Council on Accreditation and Planning (DCAP) designed and implemented an Employee Formal Communications Survey to collect and analyze feedback from employees about ways to improve the flow of information to and from the District through formal channels of the committee and governance structure and to identify any policies or procedures that need clarification or that are difficult to implement in practice. A summary of the survey findings was discussed at District Consultation Council in spring 2013 and provided District-wide through a subsequent Chancellor's Update, which was distributed to employees, students, and Community Advisory Body members (D6-07). The next annual Employee Formal Communications Survey is scheduled for fall 2013.

List of Evidence for District Recommendation 6

- D6-01 VCCCD Policy/Procedure Tracking Document; Board Policy/Administrative Procedure
Two-Year Review Calendar
- D6-02 Board of Trustees Best Practices Agreement (03/2013)
- D6-03 "Business Tools, Forms, and Procedures" SharePoint Site
- D6-04 Human Resources Department "HR Tools"
- D6-05 Consultation Council Agenda/Notes and *Participatory Governance Handbook* (4.5.13)
- D6-06 Consultation Council Agendas/Notes (5.30.13, 6.27.13, 8.30.13)
- D6-07 VCCCD Employee Formal Communications Survey Summary, Chancellor's Update

District Recommendation: 7

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

Conclusion from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report (November 13-14, 2012):
The efforts by the Board of Trustees to take responsibility for policing its own actions and implementing a continuous quality improvement professional development plan and calendar is commendable. The team was able to verify that all members of the Board of Trustees participates in all professional development activities to assure that they will carry out their duties and roles as policymakers. The teams conclude that the District has met this recommendation, resolved deficiencies, and now meets Standards.

Summary

The Board of Trustees committed to ongoing professional development as evidenced by Board Policy/Administrative Procedure 2740 Trustee Professional Development and the Board's March 2012 Best Practices Agreement. To demonstrate its commitment and accomplish this goal, the Board developed and adopted a "Professional Development 2012/2013 Calendar" of activities and began assessing the effectiveness of its external professional development activities to ensure that the full Board is in concordance on the content and value of its development experience. In fall 2012, to further the Board's professional growth related to Board roles and responsibilities, the Board integrated the evaluation of its internal professional development activities as part of its monthly Board meeting assessments.

During the period of November 2011 through October 2012, the Board participated in numerous professional development activities, including a visit by the President of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), several Community College League of California Conferences, and Parliamentary Procedure Training. Presentations included the Role of Faculty in Accreditation Processes; Role of Academic Senates/Areas of Authority and Responsibility; External Leadership Role; Fiscal Affairs; Legal Affairs; Legislative Matters; Human Resources; Student Trustee Role; Program Discontinuance Process; and Enrollment Priorities.

A majority of Board professional development activities are based on "Board and CEO Roles: Different Jobs, Different Tasks," provided by the Community College League of California. Activities provided on the District premises are attended by the full Board, with the exception of excused absences. Off-site activities requiring travel are attended by a minimum of one or two Board members on behalf of the full Board. Board members attending off-site activities provided verbal reports to the full Board during a regularly-scheduled Board meeting to communicate the value of the professional development experience.

Board professional development activities demonstrate the Trustees’ commitment to ongoing professional development to enhance and improve the performance of their primary leadership role in assuring the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services delivered by the District and Colleges. Furthermore, the Board of Trustees took action to ensure that it reviews its members’ ethical behavior and has procedures in place to advise, warn, sanction, and censure members regarding their conduct.

Progress on Recommendation 7 for Improvement and Sustainability

Since the most recent follow-up accreditation team visit in November 2012, two or more Board members have participated in the following professional development activities:

Date	Professional Development Activity
11/15/12	Community College League of California Annual Conference
01/12/13	Effective Board/Committee Meetings: Governance Issues and the Open Meetings Act, Ventura County Office of Education
01/22/13	Technical Assistance Visit (AB 1725) by Scott Lay (CCLC) and Michelle Pilati (Academic Senate for California Community Colleges)
01/25/13	CCLC Effective Trustee Conference
01/27/13	CCLC Legislative Conference
04/05/13	Board Communications Workshop
04/09/13	Board Role in Strategic Planning
05/03/13	Community College League of California, Trustees Annual Conference
05/14/13	Emergency Preparedness
07/09/13	2013 State of the Region Report, Ventura Civic Alliance
08/13/13	State Community College Budget Overview by Scott Lay, Community College League of California
09/03/13	California Workforce Association
10/01/13	Association of Community College Trustee Leadership Congress 2013

In summer 2013, the Board, through its annual planning session, evaluated a summary of its professional development activity assessments to ensure continued growth related to roles and responsibilities, governance, effective policy and decision-making, organizational effectiveness, and ethics. A 2013-14 annual calendar of professional activities was established by the Board of Trustees at the Board’s Strategic Planning Session in June 2013 and adopted in July 2013 (D7-01).

List of Evidence for District Recommendation 7

D7-01 Board 2013-14 Professional Development Calendar

Commission Concern (February 1, 2012):

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

Conclusion from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report (November 13-14, 2012): *The teams acknowledged the systematic work that the Board of Trustees and Chancellor have made in addressing the Commission Concern. The Board has recognized and taken seriously that it must take control of its actions and maintain its focus on the "The Big Three" i.e., accreditation, budget, and new leadership. Through interviews with College employees and reviewing the evidentiary documents, the teams were able to confirm that Board members understand their roles and responsibilities as policy-making and professional development.*

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

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

Eligibility Requirement 3: *In order to meet this requirement, the Board needs to demonstrate a consistent and sustainable ability to effectively function as a Board in carrying out its responsibility for the quality, integrity, and financial stability of the District and for ensuring that the District's mission is being carried out. The individual members of the Board must demonstrate their ability to operate impartially on all matters relative to District business to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the District. The Board has demonstrated exceptional progress in addressing this Requirement, but the Mid-term report in 2013 will need to show evidence of the sustainability of the Board's efforts to be fully compliant with this Eligibility Requirement.*

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

Board completed this cycle and conducted an assessment of this process. The Board has met compliance with this Standard.

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

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

Summary

Board Acknowledgement of Commission Concern and Commitment to Reach Compliance

As evidenced by the Board's March 2012 Commission Concern Special Report, the Trustees acknowledged the Commission's Concern regarding Board governance and implemented a systematic approach in responding to the Commission Concern. Actions included:

- Conducted a Special Board meeting to determine a course of action to address the Commission's February 2012 action letter;
- Accepted "Ground Rules" for all Board and Board committee meetings as defined by the ACCJC;
- Reviewed California Community College League "Board and CEO Roles: Different Jobs, Different Tasks" and implemented professional development activities to delineate Board roles within a scope of best practices;
- Discussed the Association of Community College Trustees "Role of a Trustee" and the California School Board Association's "Professional Governance Standards";
- Reviewed policies and administrative procedures related to Board roles and responsibilities (i.e., BP 2200 Board Duties and Responsibilities; BP 2430 Delegation of Authority to CEO; BP 2434 Chancellor's Relationship with the Board; BP 2715 Board Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice; AP 2715-A Code of Ethics; AP 2715-B Standards of Practice; BP/AP 2720 Board Member Communication; BP/AP 2740 Trustee Professional Development; BP/AP 2745 Board Self-Evaluation) and further strengthened and aligned policies to accreditation standards;

- Committed to adhere to Board policies and procedures and hold all Board members accountable to provisions contained within Board policies and procedures;
- Committed to participate in Board professional development activities at least once per quarter; and
- Executed a Board of Trustees Best Practices Agreement in March 2012 under Board Policy 2715 Board Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice.

Board's Role and Board Member Mutual Responsibility to Monitor for Compliance

In complying with Standard IV.B.1.h., the Board took significant action following the March 2012 Commission Concern Special Report and the April 2012 accreditation team visit. In response to the Commission's Concern regarding a particular Trustee's role violations and the Board's lack of addressing and curtailing the Trustee's behavior, Board members improved policies and procedures to govern the actions of the entire Board to function effectively. One specific Board action taken in June 2012 was to strengthen Board Policy 2715 Board Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice and Administrative Procedure 2715-A Board Code of Ethics by including an opportunity for constituents to make verbal complaints in addition to written complaints.

Evidence of improved Board behavior was demonstrated when Board Policy 2715 Board Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice and Administrative Procedure 2715-A Board Code of Ethics were invoked by the Board on two occasions in 2012 to address an alleged violation of the Board of Trustees Best Practices Agreement and an inappropriate comment made by a Trustee. The Board Chair addressed the alleged violations by taking action in accordance with BP 2715/AP 2715-A Board Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice. Upon findings of sufficient cause, resolution was reached in both situations following discussion with the parties involved.

One Trustee's role and presence on the Oxnard College campus was clarified when the Trustee submitted a letter for the record describing his job responsibilities with the Ventura County Human Services Department and confirmed no direct business was conducted with Oxnard College personnel as a result of his assigned work space in the Oxnard College environment.

Board Self-Assessment and Continuous Improvement

To demonstrate compliance with Standard IV.B.1.g, the Board's annual self-evaluation process to assess Board performance is clearly defined in Board Policy/Administrative Procedure 2745 Board Self-Evaluation. The Board of Trustees improved the self-assessment instrument and implemented the self-evaluation process to complete the Board self-evaluation in advance of its June 2012 Board Planning Session in accordance with Board Policy 2745.

The full Board completed an analysis of its self-assessment and formally adopted outcomes and measures of Board performance. The assessment of those outcomes was an integral part of the annual evaluation. An external constituent assessment of the Board in the form of a survey to the District Consultation Council was established per Board Policy/Administrative

Policy 2745 as part of the Board's annual self-assessment process. The results of the external assessment by District Consultation Council were discussed as part of the Board self-evaluation at the June 2012 Board Planning Session. The Board also accepted the survey results from the District Consultation Council and incorporated the findings into the Board's goal setting and performance enhancement activities.

In adopting the Board's Performance Goals, conducting the continuous self-assessment activities, and reviewing and improving the self-assessment instrument, the Board demonstrated a heightened vigilance toward self-reflection and continuous quality improvement. The assessment was focused upon Board performance as related to the Board's leadership and policy-making roles.

Professional Development Focus on Accreditation: Eligibility Requirement 3 and Accreditation Standard IV

To demonstrate compliance with Standard IV.B.1.i, the Board of Trustees committed to ongoing professional development as evidenced by Board Policy/Administrative Procedure 2740 Trustee Professional Development and the Board's March 2012 Best Practices Agreement. To demonstrate its commitment and actions to sustain efforts to be fully engaged with all aspects of the accreditation process, the Board adopted a "Professional Development 2012/2013 Calendar" of activities that included professional development activities in the area of accreditation.

During the period of November 2011 through October 2012, the Board participated in numerous professional development activities involving the accreditation process, including a visit by the President of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), two Community College League of California Conferences, a Special Board Meeting, and an Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Committee and Chancellor Visit with the ACCJC President. Presentations included the Role of Faculty in Accreditation Processes and the Role of Academic Senates/Areas of Authority and Responsibility.

Professional development activities related to the accreditation process provided on the District premises were attended by the full Board, with the exception of excused absences. Off-site activities requiring travel were attended by a minimum of one or two Board members on behalf of the full Board. Board members attending off-site activities provided verbal reports to the full Board during a regularly-scheduled Board meeting to communicate the value of the professional development experience.

In August 2012, the Board formally established the Planning, Accreditation, and Communication (PAC) Committee. PAC ensures District and College planning is comprehensive and meets organizational and community needs, as well as Accrediting Commission Standards. The committee also reviews, tracks District practices and activities for alignment with Accrediting Commission Standards, and receives reports on College progress toward meeting Accrediting Commission Standards. PAC ensures the Board is informed regarding all accreditation matters within the District, and that Board communication is ongoing, timely, transparent, and meets organizational and community needs.

To maintain successful application of policies and procedures, ensure the Board continues to fulfill its primary leadership role, and to meet Eligibility Requirement 3 Accreditation Commission Standard IV, the Board held a special September 2012 Workshop to develop additional strategies to sustain stronger formal communication; maintain accountability; and enhance the working relationships between Trustees and between the Chancellor and Trustees. In addition, Trustees supported adhering to their conflict of interest policy and the duty to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the institution.

Progress on Commission Concern for Improvement and Sustainability

The Board of Trustees continues to demonstrate its commitment to consistency and long-term sustainability as evidenced by actions related to its primary policy-making leadership role, accountability, self-assessment, ongoing professional development activities, and accreditation. Outcomes are intended to ensure the quality, integrity, stability, and mission of the District.

Board's Responsibility to Monitor for Compliance

In complying with Standard IV.B.1.h., the Board again took action to improve policy and procedure to govern the actions of the entire Board to function effectively. A specific action taken by the Board on March 12, 2013 was to further strengthen Board Policy 2715 Board Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice and Administrative Procedure 2715-A Board Code of Ethics by including statements of clarity that addressed Trustees' responsibility to advocate, defend, and represent the District and Colleges equally, exercise authority only as a Policy Board, and fully support Board actions as a unit once taken. Under Board Policy 2715 Board Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice, the Board also executed a strengthened Board of Trustees Best Practices Agreement (CC2012-01).

On April 5, 2013, the Board held a special Board Workshop that focused on strengthening Board communications. Trustees reviewed Accreditation Standard IV as related to formal communications, reviewed the Board's progress on meeting Board Performance Goals, and discussed a summary of communication protocols prepared by the Director of Administrative Relations. Areas of discussion included communication between the Board and Chancellor; crisis communications; Board meeting communications; communication with community members; and communication with employees and students (CC2012-02).

Effective spring 2013, one Trustee, whose presence on the Oxnard College campus was required due to job responsibilities with the Ventura County Human Services Department, moved off campus when County offices relocated.

Board Self-Assessment

To demonstrate ongoing compliance with Standard IV.B.1.g, the Board conducts its self-evaluation process annually per Policy 2745 Board Self-Evaluation (CC2012-03). The Board's 2013 self-assessment process included the following activities:

- At the April 2013 Planning, Accreditation, Board Communications, and Student Success Committee (PACSS) meeting, PACSS reviewed existing self-evaluation survey instruments (i.e., Board’s self-evaluation, Board evaluation survey provided to District Consultation Council for feedback, and the Board’s monthly meeting assessment) (CC2012-04).
- In May 2013, the Board implemented its annual ongoing self-evaluation process per Board Policy/Administrative Procedure 2745. The Board of Trustees received the 2013 self-evaluation survey in electronic format for completion from the Chancellor’s Office, and District Consultation Council members were provided an opportunity to complete the Board Evaluation survey electronically through the Chancellor’s Office. The Board Survey was designed to gather feedback regarding Board Performance Goals, general evaluation, and individual Trustee reflective perspective. Participants were asked to indicate opinions using a rating scale of “agree,” “partial agreement,” “disagree,” or “don’t know.” An option to provide comments was provided (CC2012-05).
- The annual summative Board self-evaluation was conducted at the Board’s June 2013 Board Strategic Planning Session. Purpose and expected outcomes included evaluating Board performance; identifying and discussing areas for strengthening Board performance; incorporating identified areas in need of improvement into existing Board Performance Goals; and adopting updated Board Performance Goals. The Board’s self-evaluation process also included discussion of significant findings from a summary of the Board’s Monthly Meeting Assessments and a discussion of the results of the Board’s Annual Self-Evaluation and Consultation Council Evaluation of the Board (CC2012-06).
- Following Board discussion in June 2013, Trustees assessed the Board’s progress in achieving performance goals and considered significant findings in the review and update of Board Performance Goals. The Board made recommendations for improvement and renewed the Board’s commitment to continue to strengthen Board performance. At a subsequent Board meeting in September 2013, the Board adopted its updated Board Performance Goals (CC2012-07).
- Following the Board’s 2013 self-evaluation process, Board members completed a meeting assessment to ensure continuous quality improvement and effectiveness. Findings were provided for Trustee discussion (CC2012-08).

Professional Development Focus on Accreditation: Eligibility Requirement 3 and Accreditation Standard IV

To demonstrate ongoing compliance with Standard IV.B.1.i, the Board of Trustees remains committed to ongoing professional development as evidenced by Board Policy/Administrative Procedure 2740 Trustee Professional Development and the Board’s March 2013 Best Practices Agreement (CC2012-09). Since the most recent follow-up

accreditation team visit in November 2012, two or more Board members have participated in the following professional development activities that included the area of accreditation:

Date	Professional Development Activity
11/15/12	Community College League of California Annual Conference
01/12/13	Effective Board/Committee Meetings: Governance Issues and the Open Meetings Act, Ventura County Office of Education
01/22/13	Technical Assistance Visit (AB 1725) by Scott Lay (CCLC) and Michelle Pilati (Academic Senate for California Community Colleges)
01/25/13	CCLC Effective Trustee Conference
04/05/13	Board Communications Workshop
04/09/13	Board Role in Strategic Planning
05/03/13	Community College League of California, Trustees Annual Conference
07/09/13	2013 State of the Region Report, Ventura Civic Alliance
08/13/13	State Community College Budget Overview by Scott Lay, Community College League of California
09/03/13	California Workforce Association
10/01/13	Association of Community College Trustee Leadership Congress 2013

In summer 2013, the Board, through its annual planning session, evaluated a summary of its professional development activity assessments to ensure continued growth related to roles and responsibilities, governance, effective policy and decision-making, organizational effectiveness, and ethics. A 2013-14 annual calendar of professional activities was developed by the Board of Trustees at the Board’s Strategic Planning Session in June 2013 and adopted in July 2013 to demonstrate its ongoing commitment to sustain efforts to be fully engaged with all aspects of the accreditation process (CC2012-10).

In March 2013, the Board modified the Planning, Accreditation, and Communication (PAC) Committee to include “Student Success” (PACSS). PACSS continues to meet monthly or as needed to ensure that District and College planning is comprehensive and meets organizational and community needs, as well as Accrediting Commission Standards. The committee also reviews, tracks District practices and activities for alignment with Accrediting Commission Standards, and receives reports on college progress toward meeting Accrediting Commission Standards. PACSS ensures the Board is informed regarding all accreditation matters within the District, and that Board communication is ongoing, timely, transparent, and meets organizational and community needs (CC2012-11).

List of Evidence for Commission Concern (February 1, 2012)

- CC2012-01 Board Policy 2715 Board Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice, Board Best Practices Agreement
- CC2012-02 Special Board Workshop Agenda/Meeting Minutes (04.05.13)
- CC2012-03 VCCCD Board Policy/Administrative Procedure 2745 Board Self-Evaluation
- CC2012-04 PACSS Meeting Notes, Existing Board Self-Evaluation Instruments
- CC2012-05 Board Self-Evaluation, Consultation Council Board Evaluation Survey

- CC2012-06 Board Planning Session Agenda/Minutes, Board Self-Evaluation Findings, Consultation Council Findings, Summary of Board's Monthly Meeting Assessments
- CC2012-07 Board Meeting Minutes, Board Performance Goals
- CC2012-08 Board Annual Planning Session Assessment Findings
- CC2012-09 Board Policy/Administrative Procedure 2740 Trustee Professional Development, Board's March 2013 Best Practices Agreement
- CC2012-10 Board 2013-14 Professional Development Calendar
- CC2012-11 Board Meeting Minutes (03.12.2013)

Commission Concern (January 31, 2011):

The Commission noted that a recent HR audit revealed a lack of minimum qualifications and/or equivalencies for a total of 110 full- and part-time faculty district-wide. The District reported it is currently engaged in the formal review and verification of degrees for all new hires and for those who lack an equivalency review at each of the Colleges. The Commission requires the results of that review be included in the October 2011 Follow-Up Report from all three Colleges. (Standard III.A.2)

Conclusion from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report (10/31/11-11/1/11):
The team finds District and Colleges have adequately responded to the Commission Concern and have fully addressed the human resources issue regarding the lack of minimum qualifications of specific instructors. The team recommends the District continues its vigilance and rigor in its faculty hiring practices and encourages the implementation of the technology-based system for recording and monitoring HR qualifications currently under consideration.

Summary

To identify any potential deficiencies in the area of minimum qualifications and/or equivalencies for full-time and part-time faculty, the District Human Resources Department conducted a thorough and systematic audit of faculty personnel files and a multi-tiered follow-up process with affected faculty members. The District and Colleges ultimately affirmed the minimum qualifications for nearly 100 instructors. A full remediation of personnel files occurred and now includes appropriate academic transcripts and/or approved equivalencies for all teaching faculty.

Progress on Commission Concern for Improvement and Sustainability

This work has been completed, and an additional response was not requested in the Commission's most recent action letter dated February 11, 2013. All faculty hires are reviewed by the Director of Employment Services/Personnel Commission prior to being hired to ensure they meet minimum qualifications or have been granted an equivalency in the discipline. In addition, the Human Resources Department implemented a system by which a faculty member's discipline is cross-checked with the discipline of the course at the time of assignment to ensure faculty are teaching in the discipline for which they were hired and deemed qualified.

Response to Planning Agendas Identified in the 2009 Institutional Self-study

Standard I: Institutional Mission

Planning Agenda	Status
1.1 Revise the Program Plan Template, making explicit the connection between Strategic Objectives and resources requests, including personnel, operations, facilities and technology areas. (I.B.3)	Implemented
1.2 Beginning 2010-2011, the Office of Business Services will report back to units on allocations made and deferred in preparation for planning in the subsequent year. (I.B.4)	Implemented

^{1.1} The Annual Program Plan template, now available in TracDat, explicitly ties program planning objectives to the College's Strategic Objectives, fostering strategic planning conversations at the program level. Participatory governance committees discuss and prioritize resource requests from individual programs in relation to the overall needs of the College.

^{1.2} The college has built a feedback process for resource allocation into its annual program planning cycle and this is now an ongoing practice. In 2011-2012 and 2012-13, the full cycle was completed by each of the three committees responsible for recommending resource allocations: Fiscal Planning Committee, Technology Committee on Accreditation and Planning (TechCAP), and Facilities Committee on Accreditation and Planning (FacilitiesCAP).

As part of this process, at the beginning of each annual planning cycle, the Vice President of Business Services informs each of the three committees of the status of the requests prioritized the previous year. For example, the Vice President will outline which technology equipment was purchased, which items arrived at the campus, which items were still on order, and which items were still waiting to be ordered. Reporting this information completes the feedback process from the previous fiscal year, and begins the resource allocation process for the next year. A summary of the prioritization results is posted in TracDat and on the website.

Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services

Planning Agenda	Status
<p>2.1 Complete the following tasks by 2012 to reach Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement in the implementation of student learning outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Complete the second assessment cycle of the degree and certificate program outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Complete the first assessment cycle of the general education outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Identify student learning outcomes for core competencies, and complete the first cycle of assessment. <p>(IIA.1.c, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.i)</p>	Implemented
<p>2.2 Implement and sustain the 5-year staggered cycle of curriculum review beginning 2010, and document the curriculum review status on Program Plans. (II.A.2.a, II.A.2.e)</p>	Implemented
<p>2.3 Complete review of general education program in 2010-2011 and identify core sequences for disciplines within each general education category. (II.A.2.c, II.A.3)</p>	Implemented
<p>2.4 Complete the District policy and administrative procedure on program discontinuance. Align college local practice on program status review to comply with anticipated District policy and administrative procedure. (II.A.6.b)</p>	Implemented
<p>2.5 Through venues of faculty professional development, the College will more widely disseminate the concept of distinguishing personal conviction from accepted professional views within a discipline. (II.A.7.a)</p>	Implemented
<p>2.6 Develop cluster outcome assessment methodology and implement in 2011-2012. (IIB.1, IIB.4)</p>	Implemented
<p>2.7 Formally assess extra-curricular programs and their effectiveness in encouraging personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development. (IIB.3.b)</p>	In progress
<p>2.8 Develop and implement a survey to assess student engagement and satisfaction with the Counseling Department. (IIB.3.c)</p>	Implemented
<p>2.9 Assess Multicultural Day and One-Campus, One-Book activities for currency and effectiveness at promoting the understanding of diversity in all</p>	In progress

forms. (IIB.3.d)	
2.10 Add the element of diversity into the Moorpark College Student Perception Survey in the next cycle. (IIB.3.d)	In progress
2.11 Conduct a focused dialogue regarding assessment and placement in English and Mathematics. (IIB.3.e)	Implemented
2.12 Complete the hiring of a third full-time Librarian by fall 2010. (IIC.1.a)	Implemented
2.13 Complete the reciprocal privileges arrangement with Ventura College and Oxnard College, and increase the availability of library material for students across the District. (IIC.1.a)	Implemented
2.14 Continue to assess information competency of students, both within Library instruction and in the context of instruction in English and other disciplines requiring information research. (IIC.1.b)	Implemented. Process ongoing

^{2.1} Moorpark College's Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation was sent to ACCJC in October 2012. Also, see College Recommendation #3.

^{2.2} In fall 2010, the Curriculum Committee implemented a 5-year cycle of curriculum review for every discipline. The process is ongoing. Every discipline scheduled during this time has completed the curriculum review process. Discipline curriculum status was included on discipline program plan documents in spring 2011 and was added to the annual program evaluation summary documentation by the Executive Vice President in spring 2012.

^{2.3} The college conducted a review of the general education program in 2010-2011. As a result of this work, the committee developed general education outcomes (GEOs), a rubric for general education course qualification, and a general education assessment process. Several campus discussions were held to present and gain campus input on the proposed GEOs and revisions to the GE pattern. They were approved by the Academic Senate in fall 2011. GEO assessment was implemented in spring 2012, and is ongoing. Each academic discipline has identified core course sequences as part of their program planning. These core course decisions inform scheduling patterns, curriculum development, and program resource requests.

^{2.4} In 2011, the Academic Senates from Moorpark, Ventura and Oxnard Colleges reviewed the District's Administrative Procedure on Program Discontinuance (AP 4025). The recommendations were forwarded through the appropriate channels and the revised Administrative Procedure on Program Discontinuance (AP 4025) was approved at the February 2012 VCCCD Board Meeting.

In 2011, the Moorpark College Academic Senate developed its recommendation to the Moorpark College President on how the revised AP 4025 could be aligned with the College's practice on program status review. Due to the urgent need to complete its 2011 program status review process, coupled with the absence of a completed district policy, it was agreed to develop an interim program status review process to be used in 2011, knowing that it might need to be refined once the AP 4025 was approved. The interim process was based upon the recommended AP 4025 that was under review at that time. Programs went through the interim program status review process in 2011 and recommendations were made.

This interim program status review process aligned with the February 2012 approved AP 4025, and therefore, the program status review process has been adopted and fully implemented.

^{2.5} The Faculty Development Committee offered a FLEX activity on this topic in spring 2012 and the Academic Senate held a discussion on academic freedom versus personal conviction in fall 2012. The process was implemented for a second time in fall 2012.

^{2.6} In 2011, the service faculty and staff collaborated in defining student learning outcomes for each of the stages as students progress from entry to completion. The first assessment, conducted in fall 2011, was a survey based upon the achievement of outcomes for the “First 15” stage (for students having completed between 0 and 15 units). A Web-based survey was used and the College received a 6% response rate (482 students responded).

^{2.7} Assessment is in process for Multicultural Day, One Campus One Book events, Year Of (college theme) events, student government activities and student club activities.

^{2.8} The VCCCD Student Perceptions Survey instrument addresses student engagement and satisfaction with all student service areas; the next administration of this long-standing survey is scheduled for spring 2014.

^{2.9} Outcomes for Multicultural Day and One Campus One Book activities have been developed. Assessment has been conducted in classes that are engaging in the One Campus One Book activities and readings. The first cycle of assessment for Multicultural Day events was conducted in April 2013.

^{2.10} The next administration of the VCCCD Student Perceptions Survey is under discussion in Chancellor’s Cabinet and will be addressed as part of the VCCCD Education Master Plan process.

^{2.11} From 2010 to the current semester, the College has conducted ongoing, focused dialogue regarding assessment and placement in English and Mathematics. These discussions have taken place within each department, within the Counseling Department, in Student Services meetings, and in Matriculation Workgroup meetings. The campus dialogue has been informed by assessment exam results, student success data, and input from local high schools, CSUs and adult schools. See College Recommendation #3.

^{2.12} The college hired a full-time Librarian in fall 2010. However, the librarian who took the position resigned at the end of the 2010-2011 academic year. After following the program plan and hiring prioritization processes, another Librarian position was approved and a new Librarian was hired fall 2012.

^{2.13} The three colleges implemented a Universal Borrowing system in fall 2012.

^{2.14} Moorpark College Librarians have developed and implemented a variety of assessment assignments for students who come to the library for instruction and for discipline faculty who require information research.

Standard III: Resources

Planning Agenda	Status
3.1 Complete the re-organization of the College driven by the loss of two Academic Deans, and review the medium-term impact of the re-organization at the end of 2011-12. (IIIA.2)	Implemented
3.2 The Human Resources Department will develop an equal employment opportunity plan based on the Model Equal Employment Opportunity Plan provided by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. The plan will contain specific plans and procedures for ensuring equal employment opportunity. (IIIA.4.b)	Implemented
3.3 The Office of Student Learning, in collaboration with the Faculty Development Committee, will review the curriculum and the implementation strategy of New Faculty Orientation to ensure currency and effectiveness. (IIIA.5.b)	Implemented
3.4 The Emergency Operations Committee will review the Emergency Incident Task List generated after the debriefing of the 2009 Guiberson Fire. An operating plan will be developed based on this review. The operating plan, once implemented, will be evaluated for updates regularly. The plan and its subsequent updates will be reported to District Emergency Management for overall coordination. (IIIB.1.b)	Implemented
3.5 Provide training to faculty and staff on accessibility technology. (IIIC.1.b)	Implemented
3.6 Strengthen the feedback process from the Vice President of Business Services to TechCAP regarding the details of budget/item allocations at the end of each annual program planning cycle. As one cycle ends and the next begins, the Vice President of Business Services will communicate back to the programs and the College the final list of resources allocated, and items that have been tabled. In cases of non-allocation, needs must be re-examined and incorporated into the next year's plan. The mechanism for this feedback loop exists, and will be used in the next planning cycle. (IIIC.1.d)	Implemented
3.7 Improve the Program Plan Template to specifically address the impact of prior year budget allocation/increases on goal implementation. (IIID.1.a)	Implemented
3.8 Promote greater understanding and transparency in the budget development process by continuing to host Town Halls and similar forums. Continue to monitor the level of engagement and satisfaction of employees	Implemented

with subsequent surveys for comparison. (IID.1.d)	
3.9 Revise the document Making Decisions at Moorpark College 2008-2010 by adding a companion timeline to the program planning process that more clearly articulates the budget building component of planning. (IID.1.d)	Implemented
3.10 The Business Services Division will complete the development of a “Balanced Scorecard” as a performance planning and resource management tool, and complete the first cycle of evaluation based on the new tool by the close of fiscal year 2011-2012. (IID.3)	Implemented

^{3.1} The college completed a re-organization in 2010-2011, which continued to support the core competencies and helped balance the workload among the six remaining deans. The college organizational structure was reviewed at the end of 2011-2012, and to maintain stability across campus, the six divisions remained constant for fiscal year 2012-2013 and the foreseeable future.

^{3.2} The Ventura County Community College District Equal Employment Opportunity Plan was adopted by the Board of Trustees on November 9, 2010 (AP 3420)

^{3.3} In reviewing the central place of New Faculty Orientation (NFO) in sustaining the quality of the academy, the President has chosen to retain the function of the NFO program within the executive office. Renewed effort has been made to ensure that faculty leadership is sustained. The review of the NFO is complete.

^{3.4} The college Emergency Operations Committee meets periodically to review the Emergency Incident Task List. As items are completed, they are marked on the form. New items are added to the list as they arise. The ongoing updates to the list refine and direct the college emergency operating plan. The committee continues to review, update, and add practice exercises and emergency response assistance to improve college emergency preparation. The college reports its emergency operations plans to District Emergency Management in an ongoing fashion.

^{3.5} Training on accessibility technology has been provided to faculty and staff. The Instructional Technologist has developed a faculty guide to making documentation and content accessible. In addition, online accessibility training sessions have been offered once a semester since 2010-11; accessibility tips and 508 compliance requirements are now included as part of the technology training provided to DE faculty; video captioning available through the DECT grant program; and the Staff Resource Center provides faculty access to necessary software tools to edit and scan documents, and to edit and caption videos.

^{3.6} The college has a built a feedback process for resource allocation into its annual program planning cycle and this is now ongoing practice. In 2011-2012, a full cycle was completed by the Technology Committee on Accreditation and Planning (TechCAP).

At the beginning of the cycle, the Vice President of Business Services informs the committee of the status of the requests prioritized the previous year. This completes the feedback process from the previous fiscal year, and begins the resource allocation process for the next year.

At the end of each academic year, the Vice President of Business Services writes a memo to the College President, Executive Vice President of Student Learning, and the Academic Senate President, that reviews the prioritization process and includes the committee’s prioritization list. After reviewing the list, the President accepts the prioritization as recommended by the committees or makes changes to the lists. The Vice President of Business Services then reports back to the committee regarding the President’s decision.

^{3.7} The college program planning document was revised to include an area for programs to respond to the following question: Did you receive these resources? The template also includes an area for programs to explain how resources received benefitted their programs and helped them achieve their program goals.

^{3.8} The college continues to offer Town Hall and Y’All come meetings to promote a greater understanding of the budget development process. In fall 2012, the Vice President of Business Services also led a Town Hall on

Budget and a Y'All Come meeting to gain feedback from the college community to help ensure that the College was sharing timely budget information in a format that employees could understand and use.

The District continues to survey employees to monitor their level of engagement and satisfaction.

Note: This survey covers feedback for a wide range of District and campus topics.

^{3.9} Moorpark College has updated the Making Decisions document. Chapter 3 (Timeline and Sequences in Key College Decisions) now addresses both the Development and Review of Program Plans and Assessment (section 3.1) and College Budget Development Timeline (section 3.2).

^{3.10} The Business Services Division has completed three cycles of evaluation using its “Balanced Scorecard.” Survey results were posted to the Business Services website.

Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

Planning Agenda	Status
4.1 Develop a process to evaluate the effectiveness of the Fall Fling agendas and activities in advancing the College’s planning efforts. (IVA.5)	Implemented
4.2 The Chancellor will provide more staff information to Trustees regarding the broader District needs and implications of staff recommendations in order to diminish fractional or narrowly focused decision-making. (IVB.1.a)	Implemented
4.3 The employees will be surveyed again to assess the degree to which the implementation of Board Policy 2434 has diminished the perception that the Board can occasionally stray from its policy role into operational matters. (IVB.1.b)	Implemented
4.4 The Board will designate a review cycle to ensure that all policies and procedures continued to be revised in a timely manner. (IVB.1.e)	Implemented and Ongoing
4.5 Board education will continue in the form of orientations, training sessions, and conference attendance. (IVB.1.f)	Implemented and Ongoing
4.6 The survey of the Board will be distributed in July 2010, in accordance with established procedure. The data will be compiled in August 2010, and an agendized discussion of the findings will take place in September 2010. (IVB.1.g)	Implemented and Ongoing
4.7 An administrative procedure will be developed to support the implementation of Board Policy 2715 Board of Trustees Code of Ethics. (IVB.1.h)	Implemented and Ongoing
4.8 Conduct regular reviews of new and revised Board Policies and Administrative Procedures with College managers to ensure understanding and compliance (IVB.2.c)	In progress
4.9 The Board will communicate its expectations of educational excellence and integrity by adopting more and strengthened policies in the following areas: associate degree and certificate credit requirements; credit hour limits for associate degrees and career certificates; discontinuance of programs and courses for which have not been regularly offered. (IVB.3.a)	Implemented and Ongoing
4.10 The Board will develop a policy and procedural mechanism to review tenure recommendations where disagreements exist between College	Ongoing Review

administration and tenure committees. (IVB.3.a)	
4.11 In order to enhance the effective operation of the colleges, the District Human Resources Division will review its HR Toolbox for strengthened and consistent user-friendly guidelines in approaching standard employment activities, such as hiring, employee classification, and evaluation. (IVB.3.a)	Implemented
4.12 The Human Resources Division will establish and keep reasonable timelines for basic, ongoing, and repetitive functions, such as recruitment and testing, evaluation, and termination. (IVB.3.a)	Implemented and Ongoing
4.13 By spring 2011, a data driven program review system for assessing all District services, DTRW, and DCSL will be implemented. (IVB.3.b) and (IVB.3.g)	In Progress
4.14 The Board will adopt strengthened academic and program standards through collegial consultation with the Academic Senates informed by local administrative perspectives. (IVB.3.e)	Completed
4.15 Recommendations from the three independent colleges pertaining to faculty academic and professional matters will contain comment from appropriate campus administrators and Presidents regarding the adequacy of proposals. (IVB.3.e)	Implemented
4.16 Administrative oversight of faculty proposals within DCSL and DTRW will be strengthened by assessing them for overall effectiveness in meeting student needs. Academic matters taken to the Board for action will contain the primary recommendation of the Academic Senate and the College President or her designee, such as the Executive Vice President of Student Learning. (IVB.3.e)	Implemented
4.17 The BoardDocs system will be fully implemented by the end of the fall 2010 semester. (IVB.3.f)	Implemented
4.18 The Office of Administrative Relations will conduct a publications audit, develop an annual report to the community or other signature publication, and create a district wide newsletter. (IVB.3.f)	Implemented
4.19 An online style guide will be developed for employee access and use. (IVB.3.f)	Implemented
4.20 The Office of Administrative Relations will assess approaches to providing technical support necessary to maintain technological communications. (IVB.3.f)	Implemented

4.21 District governance bodies covered by the Brown Act will post meeting agendas and minutes on the District website for public access. (IVB.3.f)	Implemented
---	-------------

^{4.1} An evaluation survey was administered in 2011; faculty, managers, staff and students were asked to provide feedback on the effectiveness of the Fall Fling agenda and activities. Evaluation results from the 2011 event suggested a need for more interactive activities; therefore, 2012 Fall Fling participants were asked to participate in several interactive activities. 2011 and 2012 participants continue to request additional information on the status of the College’s budget, which is agendized each year.

^{4.2} The Chancellor provides the Board of Trustees a weekly report that addresses district and college matters. The Chancellor's Update, distributed to employees/students, is now provided to the Board of Trustees and includes governance committees meeting summaries.

^{4.3} An annual formal communications survey was developed and implemented in fall 2012 through the District Council on Accreditation and Planning.

^{4.4} A two-year policy/procedure review cycle was adopted by the Board of Trustees in March 2011. All Board Policies and Administrative Procedures have entered the cycle of review.

^{4.5} The Board of Trustees has established an annual calendar of professional development activities, conference attendance opportunities, and training sessions.

^{4.6} Each year the Board conducts a self-evaluation and holds an agendized discussion of the findings.

^{4.7} An administrative procedure to support Board Policy 2715 (Board Ethics) was developed and adopted.

^{4.8} The College President leads the review of new and revised Board Policies and Administrative Procedures with college managers during Administrative Council meetings.

^{4.9} The identified expectations were communicated through the Board’s planning agenda. Steps were taken by the College constituent groups to adhere to these expectations.

^{4.10} Article 11.1.E of the collective bargaining agreement identifies the steps involved in resolving disagreements about tenure recommendations. There can be no formal separate policy or procedural mechanism outside of the steps identified in the collective bargaining agreement.

^{4.11} The Human Resources Department reviews the electronic toolbox (HR Tools) on an ongoing basis to ensure the toolbox contains necessary and up-to-date materials. Since August 2010, approximately 68% of the documents in HR Tools were updated or are new.

^{4.12} The Director of Employment Services/Personnel Commission approves recruitment and examination schedules for all classified selection processes to ensure eligibility lists are produced within an approximate five to six week time frame.

The Director of Employment Services/Personnel Commission facilitates the hiring process for academic management positions which includes reviewing and approving committee activity calendars as proposed by the committees to ensure adherence to the administrative procedure.

The Director of Employment Services/Personnel Commission develops a schedule each fall semester to assist college management with planning as it relates to the hiring of full-time faculty for the upcoming academic year.

Employee evaluation schedules are determined by collective bargaining agreement provisions, Personnel Commission rules, and other District procedures. For example, evaluation procedures for faculty are described in the AFT contract in Article 11 for full-time, tenure-track instructors and in Article 12 for all other faculty members; Personnel Commission Rule 192 requires classified employees to be evaluated after the end of each fiscal year.

To ensure that the colleges stay current with their evaluations, the Human Resources department periodically provides information to college administrators regarding employee evaluations that are required or overdue. For example, each spring District administrators are sent information regarding the evaluation process for managers; the colleges received an evaluations due report for classified employees in October 2012.

4.13 A program review model for district services will be implemented in 2013. District councils are assessed each year through surveys of their membership.

4.14 Completed. Recommendations to the Board now contain a space for comment from appropriate campus administrators, presidents and academic senate presidents as appropriate. Additionally, Board agendas also indicate dates of when PG groups reviewed a given item before being placed on a Board agenda for action or information.

4.15 Recommendations to the Board now contain a space for comment from appropriate campus administrators and presidents.

4.16 Proposals from the District Technical Workgroups for instruction and student services now are routed through the new District Council on Academic Affairs (DCAA), which in turn makes recommendations to Chancellor's Cabinet. If the membership of Chancellor's Cabinet is in disagreement, feedback is given to DCAA and the Board of Trustees is informed of the reasons for the disagreement.

4.17 The BoardDocs system has been fully implemented. A assessment on effectiveness will be conducted in spring 2013.

4.18 Following completion of a publications audit, the annual publication was eliminated due to cost and an online, annual digital magazine "MOTiVate" is under development through Marketing and Public Relations. A news/announcements channel was established following implementation of the employee/student portal, and an updated district wide news channel will be launched with the implementation of the redesigned district/college websites in fall 2013.

4.19 Following the integration of marketing, all District wide marketing materials are designed and formatted for appropriate style through Marketing and Public Relations, eliminating the need for an online style guide.

4.20 Technology tools were implemented to streamline communications, including the Intranet portal for employees/students allowing for posting of news/events/announcements and regularly-scheduled OmniUpdate software training offered through Information Technology to support portal and website activities. Findings of a fall 2012 website survey indicate the existing websites/portals are adequate but in need of updating, particularly in the area of navigation. District/college websites and portals are currently under redesign for implementation by fall 2013.

4.21 Governance committees covered by the Brown Act have been instructed to post their agendas and minutes on the district or college websites.

Appendix A

2011-2012 Membership of the Education Committee on Accreditation and Planning

Co-Chairs

Lisa Miller	Dean of Student Learning
Lee Ballestero	Academic Senate Appointee; Political Science Faculty

Members

Patricia Ewins	Dean of Student Learning
Inajane Nicklas	Dean of Student Learning
Julius Sokenu	Dean of Student Learning
Kimberly Hoffmans	Dean of Student Learning
Lori Bennett	Dean of Student Learning
Nenagh Brown	Faculty, History
Kim Watters	Instructional Data Specialist
Richard Torres	Outreach Specialist
Kathy Colborn	Registrar
John Sinutko	Director of Maintenance & Operations
Lisa Putnam	Faculty, Institutional Research
JT Mendoza	Student
Hannah Coyle	Student
Sherry D'Attile	Faculty, ACCESS Coordinator
Robert Salas	Faculty, Dance
John Loprieno	Faculty, Theatre
Corey Wendt	Faculty, Counseling
Cesar Flores	Faculty, EOPS Counselor
Sharon Miller	Student Activities Specialist
Sharon Manakas	Faculty, Student Health Center Coordinator
Mary Mills	Faculty, Computer Information Systems
Sydney Sims	Faculty, English/Humanities
Darryl Perry Bennett	Faculty, World Languages
Faten Habib	Faculty, Library Services
Bonnie Baruch	Child Development Center Coordinator
Joanna Miller	Faculty, Journalism
Tim Stewart	Faculty, Visual and Applied Arts
Brenda Woodhouse	Faculty, EATM/Animal Sciences
Norm Marten	Faculty, Life Sciences
Carol Higashida	Faculty, Health Sciences Coordinator
Deanna Franke	Faculty, Chemistry
Martin Chetlen	Faculty, Computer Science
Chris Cole	Faculty, Mathematics
Clint Harper	Faculty, Physics/Astronomy
Cherisse Sherman	Assistant Athletic Trainer
Cynthia Barnett	Faculty, Sociology
Tim Weaver	Faculty, Business
Ranford Hopkins	Faculty, History
Del Parker	Faculty, Kinesiology/Health Education

2012-2013 Membership of the Education Committee on Accreditation and Planning

Co-Chairs

Lori Bennett	Dean of Student Learning
Lee Ballestero	Academic Senate Appointee; Political Science Faculty

Members

Patricia Ewins	Dean of Student Learning
Inajane Nicklas	Dean of Student Learning
Julius Sokenu	Dean of Student Learning
Kimberly Hoffmans	Dean of Student Learning
Lisa Miller	Dean of Student Learning
Jane Harmon	Interim Executive Vice President
Nenagh Brown	Faculty, History
Richard Torres	Outreach Specialist
Kathy Colborn	Registrar
John Sinutko	Director of Maintenance & Operations
Lisa Putnam	Faculty, Institutional Research
Kimberly Ederen	Student
Sherry D'Attile	Faculty, ACCESS Coordinator
James Song	Faculty, Music
Jill McCall	Faculty, Communication Studies
Corey Wendt	Faculty, Counseling
Cesar Flores	Faculty, EOPS Counselor
Sharon Miller	Student Activities Specialist
Sharon Manakas	Faculty, Student Health Center Coordinator
Mary Mills	Faculty, Computer Information Systems
Sydney Sims	Faculty, English/Humanities
Helga Winkler	Faculty, World Languages
Faten Habib	Faculty, Library Services
Bonnie Baruch	Child Development Center Coordinator
Joanna Miller	Faculty, Journalism
Lydia Etman	Faculty, Art
Brenda Woodhouse	Faculty, EATM/Animal Sciences
Norm Marten	Faculty, Life Sciences
Carol Higashida	Faculty, Health Sciences Coordinator
Rob Keil	Faculty, Chemistry
Martin Chetlen	Faculty, Computer Science
Chris Cole	Faculty, Mathematics
Clint Harper	Faculty, Physics/Astronomy
Sherry Ruter	Faculty, Athletics
Cynthia Barnett	Faculty, Sociology
Reet Sumal	Faculty, Business
Ranford Hopkins	Faculty, History
Del Parker	Faculty, Kinesiology/Health Education

2011-2012 Membership of the District Council for Accreditation and Planning

Chair

Robin Calote	President, Ventura College
--------------	----------------------------

Members

Pam Eddinger	President, Moorpark College
Richard Duran	President, Oxnard College
Sue Johnson	Vice Chancellor, Business & Administrative Svcs., VCCCD
Riley Dwyer	Academic Senate President, Moorpark College
Robert Cabral	Academic Senate President, Oxnard College
Peter Sezzi	Academic Senate President, Ventura College
Arshia Malekzadeh	Student Trustee

2012-2013 Membership of the District Council for Accreditation and Planning

Chair

Pam Eddinger	President, Moorpark College
--------------	-----------------------------

Members

Jamillah Moore	Chancellor, Ventura County Community College District
Annette Loria	Interim Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, VCCCD
Sue Johnson	Vice Chancellor, Business & Administrative Svcs., VCCCD
Claire Geisen	Director of Administrative Relations, VCCCD
Richard Duran	President, Oxnard College
Robin Calote	President, Ventura College
Riley Dwyer	Academic Senate President, Moorpark College
Linda Kamaila	Academic Senate President, Oxnard College
Peter Sezzi	Academic Senate President, Ventura College
AJ Hernandez	Student Trustee

Appendix B

Type of Structure of Groups that Develop Recommendations

- **Governance Groups**

Venues to host governance conversations in a participatory manner

- Academic Senate and Standing Committees as Authorized by Academic Senate
- Classified Senate

- **Organizational Groups**

Developed to coordinate and fulfill operational, procedural, and policy implementation

- Presidents Council
- Vice Presidents Council
- Administrative Council
- Deans Council
- Student Services Council

- **Advisory Committees**

Venues for college wide conversations on topics chosen by the College as important and worthy of concentrated college wide energy.

- Campus Environment
- Honors
- Learning Communities
- Safety
- Wellness

- **Project Groups**

Formed to complete a specific task that has college wide impact and benefits the college community.

- Multicultural Day
- One Campus, One Book
- Year of . . . (college theme)

The groups in all four categories are essential to involving the college community in making decisions and to ensuring the college community is informed about issues of college wide importance.

College Standing Committees (as authorized by Academic Senate)

Six College Standing Committees have been recognized and authorized by the Academic Senate. These committees serve as venues to conduct discussions regarding academic and professional matters. As such, these College Standing Committees carry out their work in matters of “ten plus one.” The primacy of faculty in these discussions is ensured through the composition of committee membership, where faculty holds the majority.

- Committee on Accreditation and Planning – Education (EdCAP)
- Committee on Accreditation and Planning – Facilities (FacilitiesCAP)
- Committee on Accreditation and Planning – Technology (TechCAP)

- Curriculum Committee
- Faculty Development Committee
- Fiscal Planning Committee

It is the responsibility of the faculty co-chairs of the Standing Committees to ensure that their committee's delegated authority from the Academic Senate is accountable, and the committee's recommendations communicated. The primary functions of the College Standing Committees are to plan, monitor, and assess initiatives under their stated purview. All meetings of the College Standing Committees are conducted under the Brown Act.

Members are selected as follows:

- Faculty members are elected by their department or division (depending on criteria established for the governance group) and recommended to Academic Senate for appointment.
- Administrators are appointed by the Executive Vice President or Vice President of Business Services.
- Staff members are selected by the position they hold in the college or by elections conducted by the Service Employees International Union.

Task Groups within College Standing Committees

College Standing Committees may form Task Groups to perform particular organizational or data-gathering tasks as needed. Membership of a Task Group must be drawn from current members of its parent committee. No authority for recommendations is delegated to the Task Group by its parent committee except, through its findings, to inform discussions and the crafting of recommendations in the main forum of the College Standing Committee.

Recommendations Developed within Governance Groups

Recommendations developed by governance groups must flow through on-campus processes in the prescribed sequence as delineated in the timeline/sequence for key college decisions referenced in Chapter 3 of the *Making Decisions document*.

The College Standing Committees make recommendations to the College President only after following the on-campus process in the prescribed sequence before being forwarded to the College President.

The College President reviews the process and the recommendations, and either returns the recommendation for further consideration by the governance group or directs implementation of the recommendation. If the College President's decision differs from the formal recommendation, the President's final decision is communicated in writing, and includes the rationale for the final decision.

When a recommendation has District wide impact, the College President forwards the recommendation for review by the Chancellor.