

EVALUATION REPORT

Oxnard College
Oxnard, California

A confidential report prepared for
The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

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

Dr. Jack E. Daniels, III
Chair

Oxnard College
Comprehensive Evaluation Visit Team Roster
October 11 – 14, 2010

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

Ms. Blanca E. Barajas (Team Assistant)
SFP Specialist, CalWORKs
Los Angeles Southwest College

Dr. Timothy Brown
Associate Professor, Reading Chair
Riverside City College

Dr. Kerry Compton
Vice President of Student Services
College of Alameda

Dr. James Fay
Vice President of Academic Affairs
Cerro Coso Community College

Dr. Andrew LaManque
Director, Institutional Research
Foothill-DeAnza CCD

Mr. Curt Mitchell
Vice President of Business Services
Norco College

Mr. Jeffrey Stephenson
Coordinator/Professor
American River College

Ms. M. Susan Whitener
Associate Vice Chancellor of Educational Planning
West Hills Community College District

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION REPORT

INSTITUTION: Oxnard Community College

DATES OF VISIT: October 11 – 14, 2010

TEAM CHAIR: Dr. Jack E. Daniels, III

A nine-member accreditation team visited Oxnard College from October 11 -14, 2010, for the purpose of evaluating how well the institution is achieving its stated purposes, analyzing how well the college is meeting the Commission Eligibility Requirements and Standards, providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement, and submitting a recommendation to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the status of the college.

In preparation for the visit, team members attended an all-day training session on September 8, 2010, conducted by ACCJC staff and studied Commission materials prepared for visiting teams. Team members read carefully the college's self study report, including the recommendations from the October 2004 visiting team, and assessed the evidence provided by the college.

Prior to the visit, team members completed written evaluations of the self study report and began identifying areas for further investigation. On the day before the formal beginning of the visit, the team members spent the afternoon discussing their views of the written materials provided by the college, reviewing evidence provided by the college and reviewing the Progress, Midterm and Follow-Up Reports completed by the college on March 2005 (First Progress Report), October 2005 (Progress Report), October 2006 (Second Progress Report), October 2007 (Focused Midterm Report), and October 2008 (Follow-up Report) and other materials submitted to the Commission since its last comprehensive visit.

During the visit, the team met with over 200 faculty, staff, administrators, members of the Board of Trustees, and students. The team chair met with members of the Board of Trustees, the president of the college and various administrators. In addition, team members visited the satellite campuses at the Marine Center and Aquarium and the Fire Academy and conducted a virtual review of the distance education programs/services. The team also held two open forums to allow for comment from any member of the campus.

The team felt that the self study report represented a cross section of the college; however, there were areas where the evidence was not substantiated and was left to the team to review from observations and interviews. College staff members were very accommodating to team members and available for interviews and follow-up conversations. The college was prepared and ready for the team's visit.

Major Findings and Recommendations of the October 11 – 14, 2010 Visiting Team. A summary of the major findings of the team, a list of the commendations (pulled from the body of the report), and a list of the recommendations (also pulled from the body of the report) using the same numbering follows.

Commendations for Oxnard College:

- The team commends the college for developing and completing many capital projects including new construction, safety and security enhancements, facilities and technology infrastructure replacement/upgrades, and campus accessibility.
- The team commends the college for the outstanding appearance of the campus, including well-maintained buildings and grounds, and the cleanliness of both interior and exterior areas.
- The team commends the College on a structure and process that encourages and prioritizes on-going professional development.
- The team commends the College Student Success committee and the work it has done in improving student access and support throughout the college.

Oxnard College Recommendations:

Oxnard College Recommendation 1: The team recommends, in order to meet Standards and reach sustainable continuous quality improvement for institutional planning, that the college further integrate long-range strategic planning inclusive of the Educational Master Plan, Facilities Master Plan, Technology Plan and District/College goals and use an institutional outcomes assessment process that leads to improved institutional effectiveness (Standards I.A.1, I.B.3, II.B.3, II.B.4, II.C.2, III.A.6, III.B.2, III.C.1, III.C.2, III.D.3, IV.A.1, IV.A.5, IV.B.2.b).

Oxnard College Recommendation 2: In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the college develop and implement a communication plan that facilitates awareness within the college community regarding institutional efforts to achieve goals and improve student learning (Standards I.B.1, IV.A.3, IV.B.2.e).

Oxnard College Recommendation 3: The team recommends that the college accelerate its schedule for the development and assessment of course, program, and institutional SLOs in order to reach proficiency by fall of 2012. The process should be faculty driven (Standards I.B.3, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.g, II.B.4, II.C.2).

Oxnard College Recommendation 4: In order to meet Standards, the team recommends that the college enhance its program review process by implementing a multi-year approach which includes the documentation of completing a comprehensive analysis of relevant data, identifying measurable outcomes, conducting periodic assessments, and making improvements based on those assessments (Standards I.B.3, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.i, II.B.3, II.B.4, II.C.2).

Oxnard College Recommendation 5: In order to meet Standards, the team recommends that capital planning and resource allocation processes include total cost of ownership principles. (Standards II.C.1.c, III.A.2, III.A.6, III.B.2.a, III.B.2.b, III.D.1.c, III.D.2.a).

Oxnard College Recommendation 6: In order to meet Standards, the team recommends that the college ensure the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and within intervals established by district policy (Standards III.A.1.b).

Oxnard College Recommendation 7: The team recommends that the college ensure a comparable level of support services is provided to all students regardless of location or mode of delivery (Standards II.B.1, II.B.3.a, II.C.1).

Ventura Community College District Recommendations:

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

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

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

District Recommendation 4: In order to improve communication, 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 (Standards III.A.1.b, III.A.3, IV.B.3).

District Recommendation 5: In order to meet the Standard, the Board of Trustees shall complete an analysis of its self-assessment pursuant to Board Policy 2745 and formally adopt

expected outcomes and measures for continuous quality improvement that will be assessed and reported as a component of the immediately succeeding self-assessment (Standard IV.B.1.g).

District Recommendation 6: In order to meet the Standards, the Board of Trustees shall establish and adhere to clearly written policies and corresponding procedures to ensure that decision-making is equitably and consistently administered across and within the three colleges (Standards III.A.3.a, III.A.4.c, IV.B.1.b-c).

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

ACCREDITATION EVALUATION REPORT FOR OXNARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Introduction

Oxnard College is one of three independently accredited colleges of the Ventura Community College District. This college offers instruction at the Fire Academy located in Camarillo and the Marine Center & Aquarium in Oxnard.

Oxnard College was founded in 1962 as a response to the need for a community college serving the Oxnard Plain. In 1968 a 118 acre farmland was purchased in south Oxnard. In 1969, classes were first offered at the “Oxnard Center.” The Oxnard Center expanded in 1973 and by February 1974, a Camarillo Center opened as a satellite of Moorpark College. In 1974, the Governing Board of the Ventura County Community College District voted to build Oxnard College.

Oxnard College officially opened its doors in June 1975 for its first summer session using the Oxnard and Camarillo Centers begun by Ventura and Moorpark Colleges. By mid-fall 1975, Oxnard College reported enrolling 4400 students.

During its first years, the college operated in several borrowed facilities; in churches, K-12 schools, military bases, firehouses, public athletic facilities and two storefront centers. In 1976, the college’s first Child Care Center opened and the Oxnard seal – featuring a condor atop a stack of textbooks – was introduced with the words “Truth, Knowledge, Wisdom.” In June 1976, the college held its first commencement. In September, 1976, modular units were moved to campus and in the fall of 1979, the first two permanent buildings were occupied on the Oxnard campus.

In 1986, the Occupational Education complex of buildings was completed, and classes were offered for computer information systems, HVAC, culinary arts and engineering technology programs. A new Child Development Center opened in early 1992, and a new Physical Education Complex opened in fall 1994. The new Letters and Science complex opened in 1997.

Additional programs were added in 1997 inclusive of the Dental Hygiene program and the Oxnard College Regional Firefighter Academy. Other campus buildings included an automotive technology shop and automotive painting booth, a student services center, a food services facility, and an off-campus Marine Education Center in the Channel Islands Harbor commercial center.

In 1999, the Ventura Community College District and Oxnard College entered into an agreement with the County of Ventura to construct and house a Job and Career Center on Campus. Career training and social services are provided to local residents to support career and educational goals in partnership with Oxnard College. In 2003, the Community Student Services Center was opened and EOPS moved into the facility along with the Oxnard College Foundation offices.

In 2002, Bond Measure S was passed that provided \$356 million to the Ventura County Community College District that included \$129 million for new buildings and major renovation projects at Oxnard College. New projects included a Performing Arts classroom/Auditorium complex, and a renovated Learning Resource Center/Library, a ‘one-stop-shop” Student Services and Administration Complex with Student Services program offices, and a new food facility opened in fall 2009. There is also a new Maintenance and Operations warehouse and a parking lot holding 900 parking spaces. Remodeling projects included the expansion of rooms in the Child Development Center, the renovation and expansion of the athletic facilities, and a newly constructed Fire/Sheriff Training Academy that is to be shared by the Oxnard College Fire Technology Program and Firefighter Academy and the Ventura County Sheriff’s Office.

Evaluation of Institutional Responses to Previous Recommendations

Recommendations from the 2004 Comprehensive Visit

- 1. The Team recommends that the College conduct a survey of its community to determine the community's educational needs and interests. The College should then review its mission statement and related declarations in the context of the survey results and ensure that the institution's mission statement is accurate, unambiguous, and effectively integrated into campus planning processes (Std. I.A.). Following the community survey and analysis and mission statement revision, the College should review and revise as necessary its major planning documents and processes to ensure incorporation of mission statement concepts and principles (Std. I.A.4.).**

It appears that this was not a new recommendation as the previous visiting team had similar recommendations. In 1999, the visiting Team recommended that the College review its philosophy and mission statements and set specific timelines to complete the process and incorporate all constituent groups in the process. Additionally, the 1999 visiting team recommended that the College develop and implement a plan of research and integrate it thoroughly into its planning and program review process.

The main thrust of the recommendation on Standard I appears to focus on the use of data in planning and decision-making. The college has an uneven history regarding institutional research staff. In August 2001, the college hired a Director of Research and then in May 2007, the college hired a Dean of Educational Services and Research. A research analyst was also hired in spring 2008. The college stated that the educational services and research office regularly provided the college community with updates on enrollment as well as student and community demographic changes that were used in the planning and scheduling process. The dean of educational services and research was to take a leadership role beginning in fall 2008 to support the measurement of student learning outcomes.

In June 2005, a private consulting company, KH, was retained by the district to assist both the district and all three colleges in assessing their respective communities' needs and educational interests. The survey served as the starting point in the dialogue about local community needs and interests and resulted in greater attention to what issues weren't being addressed. A subsequent external scan funded by special economic development grant funds, in addition to greater connections to the local K-12 districts, helped Oxnard College identify community needs and interests and to incorporate these needs into the revised Mission statement and key planning documents.

By mid-2006, the college's mission statement had been revised and approved by the Board, and work had been accomplished on the college's Strategic Plan, which was approved after the Board finalized its Strategic Plan in 2007 to ensure that the college's plan reflected the Board's overall plan for the district. In 2009, a college-wide task force began work on a revision to the Educational Master Plan (EMP). The starting point of that plan was the external scan conducted in 2008, which evaluated the local economic and workforce development needs of the community. The EMP, which was finalized in late fall 2009, incorporated the outcomes of this

study. As well, the EMP included 5-year plans for transfer programs, both new and continuing, with special attention paid to programs that articulate directly into California State University Channel Islands and University of California, Santa Barbara, the two closest public 4-year institutions.

The college community revised the college's mission statement to reflect an emphasis on student learning. The current mission was approved by the district Governing Board on January 17, 2006. This mission statement is promulgated through many of the college's documents and its website as well as being displayed throughout the campus. Various governance committees have worked diligently to incorporate achievement of the college mission at the heart of their planning and other governance activities.

The college's Participatory Governance, Standing, Advisory and Ad-Hoc Committee Manual (2010) identifies periodic review of the college mission as the responsibility of the Planning and Budgeting Council (p20 of the manual, "Reviews the College Mission and Goals, Strategic Plan, Educational and Facilities"-- note this is a draft document 9/16/10; "College mission and goals are reviewed every three to five years."). This committee, the Academic Senate President, and the College President have identified review of the college mission as a priority for the fall 2010 semester, as identified in the Planning Agenda for Standard I.A.3. The Planning and Budgeting Council will also establish an institutionalized procedure to complement the timeline for mission review.

In summary, the college has met the recommendation to use research to revise its mission statement. It plans another review, consistent with its committee objectives, in fall 2010.

- 2. The Team recommends the College assure the development of a set of policies and practices that describe and link institutional analysis, decision making, and resource allocation processes within a collegial governance framework. These policies and practices should guide the development of plans which should include timelines, responsible parties, and a description of how policies and practices will be communicated to all constituent groups of the college. (Std. II.B.4; Std. III.A.6; B.2.b; C.2; D.1.a.)**

The college has established a process for instructional programs that links resource allocation with institutional planning. The process is not quite as clear with Student and Business Services, although resource requests are ranked and forwarded to the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) for review. Continued progress on this recommendation has been evident throughout the accreditation cycle. Though the process is defined, assessment of the process is not in evidence.

The College provided a draft document that describes their governance process, 2010-2013 Participatory Governance, Standing, Advisory and Ad-Hoc Committee Manual, September 2010. The Participatory Governance Handbook (BOT reviewed on October 9, 2007) has been the governance document from 2007-2010.

The Oxnard Strategic Plan 10-05-07 (located on the web page) is an outline of goals and objectives with measurable outcomes, assessment, or evaluation. As an ancillary governance document for Oxnard College, the VCCCD Strategic Plan 2001-2005 needs to be revisited with an expectation of providing

goals and objectives, measurable outcomes, assessment, and regular evaluation. The 2005-15 VCCCD Strategic Plan has annual updates; however, the annual assessment is omitted.

The Technology Strategic Plan 2008-2011 for Oxnard College was updated in 2008 in Draft, but it is not clear that it was ratified by the PBC or moved beyond one Draft form. The Technology Strategic Plan 2008-2011 is integrated with the College Strategic Plan goals and objectives, assigns responsible parties, and has expected outcomes and timelines.

The Oxnard College Educational Master Plan 2004 was revisited in 2008 with a completed OC Educational Master Plan in 2009-2010.

Technology program review or strategic planning was not addressed in the institutional response to Recommendation 2. However, the Technology Strategic Planning document exists with clear integration of college goals and objectives, responsible parties, expected outcomes, and timelines. (III.C)

The team concluded that this recommendation has been met.

- 3. The Team recommends that the College leadership and governance committees assure there be a focus on obtaining relevant and timely information to understand its community needs, its enrollment patterns, and the needs of the students it serves. Following analysis of the information, the College should develop a comprehensive but realistic multi-year college plan for program development, managing enrollment, determining what students are learning, and regularly identifying where appropriate changes are needed. (Std. IV.A.2.b, 3). A comprehensive planning process for the college should include:**

- **Timely completion of unit plans that lead to meaningful review and adoption by the Planning and Consultation Council and other campus planning and resource allocation groups (Std. I. B.2,3,5,6,7);**
- **The implementation of a process of regular evaluation of the college physical resources, including buildings, equipment, and other critical technology resources. The various college entities working on physical resources planning should collaborate in the assessment and utilization of campus facilities (Std. III. B.2);**
- **A technology plan for the future growth, support, and maintenance and repair of critical technology resources; the training of personnel; and a policy and practice that incorporates consideration of technology needs into all college planning processes (Std. III.C; from 1999);**
- **A formal link between the planning processes and the resource planning, acquisition, and allocation processes; and**
- **Regular evaluation of all these process and links (Std. III. A.6; B.2.b; C.2; D.1.a. from 1993 and 1999).**

The college has established and revised institutional planning processes throughout this accreditation cycle. Revisions to these processes have occurred, primarily from improved dialogue. However, it is not clear if a specific plan exists for ongoing assessment of the various planning *processes*. Further, there seems to be minimal connection between the Madrid Study and its analysis reflective of enrollment management development. Additionally, the college

reorganized its Economic Development and Contract Education into two separate divisions in an effort to better meet the needs of the community.

Regular evaluation of the Oxnard College Strategic Plan, the Participatory Governance Handbook, and the OC Educational Master Plan has not occurred resulting in linkages that are inconsistent or nonexistent in all plans. (III.A; III.C)

Technology planning was not addressed in the institutional response for Recommendation 3. However, the Technology Strategic Planning document exists with clear integration of college goals and objectives, responsible parties, expected outcomes, and timelines. There seems to be ongoing evaluation of the plan; however, the process to revisit goals and objectives remains unclear.

The Administrative Technology Advisory Committee (ATAC) meets regularly at the district level; the college level Technology Committee meets, Banner Student Project Group, Distance Learning Task Force and MyVCCCD Project Team all hold meetings and send district level technology issues to ATAC. (III.C)

The OC Self Study Report in Standard III.C.1 Self Evaluation states: *The current technology plan does not address the staffing and structure required to support the technology goals and objectives, the technology refresh planning process, the technology needs of distance education, the network infrastructure, training of staff, and techniques to measure satisfaction with campus technology. A separate IT tactical or operational plan will be developed to address these issues.* Recommendation 3 seems to continue to be an issue. (III.C.1)

Overall, The College Strategic Plan and Educational Master Plan does not provide for goals and objectives with measurable outcomes and reasonable timelines. There has been no ongoing assessment, evaluation, and continuous quality improvement for the existing planning processes.

This team determined that this recommendation was partially met. (See Oxnard College Recommendation 1)

- 4. The Team recommends that Oxnard College develop policies and procedures that establish a clear designation of responsibility for the implementation of a plan, to ensure the creation and assessment of student learning outcomes at the course, program, and degree level (Std. II.A.2.a; A.2.e). The procedures should include a process that ensures all courses and their course outlines of record are meeting the five-year course review policy of the College (Std. II.A.6).**

The team is satisfied that Oxnard College has developed policies and procedures that have established a clear designation of responsibility for the creation and assessment of student learning outcomes at the course, program, and degree level through the Student Services Leadership Team, the Student Learning Outcomes committee, and the curriculum committee. The new software program, e-Lumen, will further assist in the assessment process.

- 5. The Team recommends that the College leadership (including administrative, faculty senate, classified senate, and student leadership), as part of its evaluation of the recently**

created planning processes and as a reflection of the college’s commitment to improving institutional effectiveness, engage administrators, faculty, classified staff, district leaders and the board in a more substantial and comprehensive dialogue (Std. I. B.1, 3, 4, 7; Std. II. A.1.c; A.2.e, f) about how to implement the elements of:

- **Program review and other data reflecting educational effectiveness;**
- **Student learning outcomes and assessment and evaluation processes that allow the faculty and those responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes to demonstrate their effectiveness in facilitating students’ achievement of those learning outcomes;**
- **Effective collegial governance and leadership that is accountable for achieving expected outcomes; and**
- **A process that results in the communication of the results of institutional assessment, evaluation, and the College community’s commitment to continuous quality improvement.**

Oxnard College has intensified its college-wide dialogue regarding SLOs and degree requirements. However, the assessment of courses has not been as directive. A District Technical Review Workgroup (DTRW) was created, and the role of the deans in support for development of SLOs has increased. The college has completed SLOs institutionally for programs and a large number of its courses. However, as indicated above, the assessment needs to have increased attention. The college also purchased the CurricUNET software to aid in its tracking of curriculum changes.

The college’s program review process is a three-year cycle with “short form” reviews annually.

Since 2006, Oxnard College’s Academic Senate has coordinated an assessment process for each of the college’s committees; a process designed for the committee to examine its success in meeting its charge throughout the school year and its recommendations as to how it might improve. There is little evidence related to the documented assessments and how they are used to reach continuous quality improvement.

The team concluded that the recommendation has been partially met and that the college is in the “developmental” stage of the ACCJC rubric on SLOs.

The Team recommends that the college assure through its policies, practices, and publications:

- **An appropriate understanding of, and concern for, its communication with the public (Std. II.A.3);**
- **Issues of equity and diversity (Std. III.A.4);**
- **Appropriate programs, practices, and services that support its diverse personnel by assessing the professional development needs of its employees, and plan and implement professional development activities to meet those needs (Standard III. A.5.a; A.5.b.);**
- **Regular assessment of its record in employment equity and diversity consistent with its mission (Std. III.A.4.a; A.4.b.); and**

- **Integration of its human resources planning with institutional planning; and**
- **Systematic assessment of the effective use of human resources and use the results of the assessment as the basis for institutional improvement (Std. III.A.6).**

The institutional response to this recommendation does not address assessment of professional development needs and the subsequent activities to address the diverse needs of the college. The response does not address assessment of its record in employment equity and diversity. Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning through the Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee (PEPC) process feeding into Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) with recommendations that go to the President for final approval. However, since 2008, final approval of employee hires occurs at the Chancellor's Executive Cabinet level. Human Resources have not engaged in a program review process through PEPC, nor have they engaged through Business Services in a Continuous Quality Improvement process. There have been professional development opportunities for employees, but the calendar and schedule of events has not been updated or opportunities have not been offered since April 2008, nor assessed. (III.A)

The team concluded that this recommendation has been partially met.

Recommendations Related to the Ventura County Community College District Practices

Oxnard College is a part of the three-college Ventura County Community College District. As part of the comprehensive visit, a team composed of the visiting team chairs to the three colleges and selected college visiting team members dealing with leadership, governance and resource issues played the role of a visiting team to the district. The Team met with members of the District governing board, the District chancellor, and staff members in the chancellor's office. The following recommendations were jointly developed by the participants in that process:

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

District governance mechanisms were developed and a new policy related to personnel selection was adopted. Evaluation of staff has been included in relevant labor contracts. The college presidential selection process has been formalized. This recommendation has technically been addressed.

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

In 2007, the District Council on Administrative Services (DCAS), which has participation from all constituency groups across the district, developed a districtwide resource allocation model that was approved and adopted by the Board of Trustees. The model is readily understood and

considers issues of accountability, predictability and equity. The model is reviewed annually by DCAS and by the Chancellor's Cabinet and revised as appropriate, with subsequent Board of Trustees approval. This recommendation has been addressed.

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

In November 2004 the Board of Trustees approved a plan to be implemented over a three-year period to begin funding the retiree health benefits liability. Effective July 1, 2007 the District began recording full expenditures as required by GASB 43/45 and setting aside a portion of the appropriate amount in a special fund. The District intends to establish an irrevocable trust account in the 10-11 academic year to hold the funds for retiree health benefits. This recommendation has been addressed.

- 9. The Team recommends that the District honor its policy on shared decision-making by implementing operational and evaluative procedures that delineate the roles and responsibilities of the various college/district constituencies that participate in collegial governance. (Stds. IV.A.2.a and IV.A.3)**

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

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

The District has reviewed all policies in the past two years. These policies have been reviewed and adopted by the District Chancellor's Consultation Council. A new Board Member orientation process has been developed and implemented. Three of the District's five trustees have participated in this training.

It was concluded that the District would benefit from the adoption of a calendar for continuing review and evaluation of policies. Further, there is some question related to the sufficiency of the policies that actually exist. The District has utilized the Community College League Policy and Procedure Template. There needs to be a more comprehensive review of the existing policies in light of this document.

Technically, this recommendation has been partially addressed.

11. The Team recommends that the District assume leadership for a district-wide, collaboratively developed strategic plan that is informed by District research and coordinated with College planning. (Std. IV.B.3).

The District has developed a strategic plan which included the broad spectrum of constituencies. This plan identified themes and further expanded these into a new vision, mission, and values statement for the District. A Vice Chancellor of Planning and Organizational development was hired. However, the person has left the District and the position was not replaced due to current budget constraints. Additionally, the District Researcher was laid off. Data needs are now the responsibility of the District Information Technology department. The District will need to carefully evaluate the adequacy of this new system of research information support for the strategic planning process.

This recommendation has been addressed.

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

The District has developed a system of Councils at the district level. One key component of this system is the District Chancellor's Consultation Council. The Council system has improved district-wide communication. Nonetheless, the three teams believe that there are still gaps and deficiencies. The District has a pattern of relying on formal structures for communication, but surveys show that there still remains a level of concern about communication across the District, such that additional attention is needed.

This recommendation has been partially addressed.

Eligibility Requirements

Certification of Continued Compliance with Eligibility Requirements

Oxnard College continues to meet the eligibility requirements established by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges.

1. Authority: The evaluation team confirmed that Oxnard College is authorized to operate an educational institution and to award degrees by the California Community College Chancellor's Office, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), and the U.S. Department of Education. The college has been recognized as a degree-granting institution by WASC since 1975.

2. Mission: The evaluation team confirmed that Oxnard College's mission clearly defines its role as a degree-granting institution dedicated to providing higher education opportunities for local residents in a student-centered framework. The mission statement is reviewed regularly by the college community and approved by the Board of Trustees, most recently in January 2006.

3. Governing Board: The evaluation team confirmed that Oxnard College has a governing board composed of six elected board members, five elected to represent specific geographic areas of the county and one non-voting student representative elected by students at the three colleges. The Board is responsible for ensuring that fiscal resources are sufficient to maintain the quality and integrity of instructional programs, policies, and procedures. Board members annually complete a conflict of interest statement.

4. Chief Executive Officer: The chief executive officer for the Ventura County Community College District is the chancellor, who is appointed by and reports to the Board of Trustees. The chancellor's full-time position is to provide effective leadership for this three-college district by implementing board policies, managing resources, and ensuring compliance with statutes and regulations. The chief executive officer of Oxnard College is the college president, who is appointed by the Board of Trustees and reports to the chancellor. The college president's full-time position is to fulfill responsibilities parallel to those of the chancellor at the college level.

5. Administrative Capacity: Oxnard College employs one president, one executive vice president, one vice president of business services, seven managers (five academic and two classified), and the support staff for these positions. The college attempts to maintain an administrative structure tailored to its student learning mission and conducive to an effective learning environment. All administrators possess appropriate qualifications, training, and experience.

6. Operational Status: Oxnard College operates with between 8,000 and 8,400 students enrolled each fall and between 7,500 and 8,000 students each spring semester. Students' goals include completing transfer requirements, associate degrees, career and technical certificates, skill attainment, and personal enrichment. The college maintains operations and systems to support various forms of educational delivery to include distance education.

7. Degrees: Oxnard College offers a range of Associates degree and certificate programs described in both the published and online versions of the catalog.

8. Educational Programs: Oxnard College's degree programs are congruent with its mission and reflect recognized fields of studies in higher education. The degree programs are conducted with rigor and are of sufficient content and length.

9. Academic Credit: Credit for coursework, regardless of the instructional delivery method, is awarded using the Carnegie Rule as stated in Title 5 of the California Education Code and the Curriculum Handbook.

10. Student Learning and Achievement: The college's overall planning process includes the assessment of student learning and achievement through the Program Review. Data regarding student achievement including degrees and certificates awarded, students transferring to four-year institutions, persistence, and course success is available to the campus community.

11. General Education: All associate degree programs require a general education component. These general education courses are designed to ensure breadth of knowledge and to promote intellectual inquiry. Students completing the Oxnard College general education program must demonstrate minimum competency in communication, reasoning, and critical thinking. The quality and rigor of the general education courses, regardless of instructional delivery method, are consistent with levels of quality and rigor appropriate to higher education.

12. Academic Freedom: Oxnard College and the VCCCD Board of Trustees support faculty members' rights to examine and test all knowledge appropriate to their disciplines. Intellectual freedom and independence are documented in the Board Policy Manual and presented as a condition of the college and the district in the faculty handbook.

13. Faculty: In the fall of 2009, Oxnard College employed 96 full-time faculty and 186 part-time faculty members. Faculty members at Oxnard College generally exceed the minimum qualifications as designed by the regulations established in the California Education Code, Title 5. All faculty are qualified by education and experience to guide the college's educational programs. Roles and responsibilities of faculty members are clearly delineated in the faculty handbook and the collective bargaining agreement between the American Federation of Teachers and the VCCCD.

14. Student Services: The evaluation team confirmed that Oxnard College provides a full range of student services and development programs to meet the needs of the college's student population.

15. Admissions: Oxnard College is an open-access, public community college. All high school graduates or equivalent or persons over the age of eighteen are eligible and invited to take courses at the college. Open access extends to all college facilities, services, and courses, other than those with established prerequisites. Admissions requirements are stated in the college catalog and in the schedule of classes.

16. Information and Learning Resources: The evaluation team confirmed that the library and learning resources programs are the primary resources for information and learning resources. The library includes more than 32,000 books, 87 periodical subscriptions, instructional media for student use, and online access to five full text databases.

17. Financial Resources: The Ventura County Community College District Board of Trustees exercises sound financial oversight of the district's resources. The district and the colleges follow generally-accepted accounting principles and control procedures to help ensure financial stability.

18. Financial Accountability: The Ventura County Community College District is audited annually by an independent auditing firm and complies with routine financial reporting requirements of the California Community College Chancellor's Office and the U.S. Department of Education. The college provided a copy of the current budget and the most recent audited financial statements for onsite review by the validation team.

19. Institutional Planning and Evaluation: The evaluation team confirmed that Oxnard College understands and embraces the concept of integrated planning and has established an overall planning process that integrates planning, implementation, resource allocation, and evaluation in a continuous cycle of improvement.

20. Public Information: Oxnard College publishes accurate and current information describing its purposes and objectives, admissions requirements and procedures, rules and regulations, programs and courses, degree and certificate programs, educational costs, refund policies, grievance procedures, academic credentials of faculty and administrators, and other relevant information in the college catalog, schedule of classes, press releases, and other printed materials, as well as on the college's website.

21. Relations with the Accrediting Commission: The Ventura County Community College District Board of Trustees and Oxnard College provide assurances that the college adheres to the eligibility requirements and accreditation Standards and policies of the Commission, describes itself in identical terms to all its accrediting agencies, communicates any changes in its accredited status, and agrees to disclose information required by the Commission to carry out its accreditation responsibilities.

STANDARD I
Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

A. Mission

General Observations:

The college's mission statement was last revised in fall 2005 and approved by the Board of Trustees in January 2006.

The current version of the college's participatory-governance manual, Participatory Governance, Standing, Advisory and Ad-Hoc Committee Manual (2010), states that among the activities of the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) is that it "reviews the College Mission and Goals, Strategic Plan, Educational and Facilities Master Plans."

A variety of student services exist at Oxnard College to support the college mission of "promot[ing] high quality teaching and learning that meet the needs of a diverse student population."

One of the Expected Outcomes of the PBC is that the "college mission and goals are reviewed every three to five years." (Manual, Draft, 9/16/2010, p20)

In June 2009, the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) adopted the recommendation of the Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee (PEPC) on guiding principles for identifying core courses. The document explicitly links the guiding principles to the mission statement: "to meet the essential needs of the college's students in fulfillment of the college's mission."

The college's Participatory Governance, Standing, Advisory and Ad-Hoc Committee Manual (2010) identifies the purpose of the Curriculum Committee's activities as being "in the fulfillment of the college's mission," which is also reflected in the committee's mission in the Curriculum Committee Handbook.

The mission statement is also included in the planning and budgeting process described in Oxnard College's Budget Planning, Development & Management Process Fiscal Year 2009-10. The Mission Statement is included as a component of the Oxnard College Educational Master Plan adopted in January 2010.

Findings and Evidence:

The college has used a number of resources over the last five years to assess whether its student learning programs are meeting the needs of its student population. Most of the analyses have been the result of large projects such as the KH Report, the Educational Master Plan environmental scans, and surveys administered by the District Research Office. Beyond these reports, few research studies that track cohorts of students or examine the effectiveness of special programs, have been done. (I.A.1)

The current mission statement was developed with input from the college community (Academic Senate Minutes, 9/12/2005) and approved by the governing board on January 17, 2006 (Board of Trustees Minutes, 1/17/2006).

The college's mission statement is published on the college's website under the "College Information" tab. The mission statement is published, along with statements of vision, values, and goals, on page 4 of the 2010-11 Catalog. These statements are published in each semester's schedule of classes, also available in hard copy and online, and referenced in the table of contents. (I.A.2)

The college is within its defined timeline for mission review under a process conducted by the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC). The expected PBC outcome is that the mission is reviewed every three to five years. The Manual does not specify the process for review.

The Self Study includes the following Planning Agenda:

The Planning and Budgeting Council will lead a review process for the college's current mission within the five-year time frame and will establish a process to institutionalize future review. Both the 2010 review and the process for future services of the college mission will ensure that all college constituencies have an opportunity to participate.

In October 2010, the college hired a consultant to help review the mission statement. Two community forums were held to gather input. Each forum lasted about 2 hours and was attended by about 30 faculty and staff in total. The consultant is to provide a report to the PBC later in the fall. (I.A.3)

The PEPC Reporting Instructions 2008-09, provided for developers of Program Effectiveness and Planning Reports (PEPRs), did not reference the college mission.

In its 2008-09 year-end evaluation of its processes, the Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee (PEPC) acknowledged the need to incorporate mission in its review and planning documents. Subsequently, the Program Effectiveness and Planning process for instructional programs incorporated the following in the program effectiveness element of the PEPR:

"Review the college's Educational Master Plan: What plans are there in fulfillment of the program's plan, the college's plan, and the missions of both the college and the program?"

The Guiding Principles on Core Courses approved by PEPC in June 2009 is congruent with the mission statement. The self study states that this was not used to guide decisions on course reductions, but interviews with the Academic Senate President and EVP indicated that department chairs did use the Principles as a guide in their course planning recommendations to the Deans.

In 2008-09 and 2009-10, the college was faced with a severe budget crisis requiring the elimination of a number of classified positions, both vacant and filled. Decisions regarding budget reductions did not go through the shared governance process. It is unclear if the mission was used to guide those decisions. (I.A.4)

Conclusions:

The Oxnard College, Educational Master Plan 2010-2015, January 20, 2010, p12 lists six “Oxnard College Strategic Goals,” but there are no metrics outlined or targets for success, nor is a process outlined for the provision of research necessary to assess the goals. As noted: “Analysis of the college’s changing internal and external environment, assessment of community and student needs, and measurement of effectiveness in meeting those needs form the basis for institutional planning” and is necessary for the institution to establish student learning programs and services aligned with its purposes, its character, and its student population” (p8).

The team did not see evidence of a research agenda outlining major research studies that will be implemented to provide not only data, but analysis, of student needs. Such a research agenda would provide support for activities aimed at ensuring the college student learning programs and services are aligned with its purposes, its character, and its student population.

With only a research analyst position, the college will be limited in the future in its capacity to systematically assess whether its programs are meeting student needs. Data is used, but there are few examples of rigorous analysis and thorough assessment of institutional effectiveness. Research studies are needed which assess the effectiveness of special programs developed to meet student needs.

The college meets this standard.

Recommendations:

See Recommendation 4 in Standard I.B

Commendations:

None.

B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations:

The college uses a variety of assessment results to effectively communicate matters of quality assurance to its constituencies. The assessment results include the Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC) and the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). The district web site includes a Report to the community which describes, in addition to the mission and vision, reports on Bond Measure S. These reports include financial data and student success figures for degrees/certificates earned and transfers to both UC and California State Universities from all three colleges in the district.

Although this and other data are made available to the various college constituency groups, it is provided in its raw form without analysis or summary of findings. The end users must analyze the statistical findings and draw their own conclusions. Therefore, when the data is used in the PEPR or program review, it tends to be more descriptive than analytical.

There is an annual review of the functions of the college's participatory governance processes as prescribed in the Participatory Governance, Standing, Advisory and Ad-Hoc Committee Manual. The Program Effectiveness and Planning processes are reviewed by the PEPC at the end of each academic year.

Though the college is at the developmental stage in SLO development, concern is heightened whether the college will have all SLOs (course, program, instruction) assessed by fall 2012.

Findings and Evidence:

Oxnard College maintains ongoing dialogue about continuous improvement of student learning between five major constituency groups on the campus. Those are the college-wide and district-wide strategic planning; program review, integrated planning, and resource allocation; curriculum review and revision; student learning outcomes assessment and reporting; and student success and institutional effectiveness. College-wide flex days provide forums for this dialogue to take place. The Curriculum Committee has established a process for review and revision of every course offered at least every five years. In addition, the college has established assessment procedures for assessing SLOs in all classes creating quality improvement dialogue occurring amongst faculty. However, the Curriculum Committee is not directly involved with the development of SLOs at the course level.

On an annual basis, the PEPC reviews instructional programs through the process of integrating program review with program planning and resource allocation and assure that the results of program review and student learning outcome assessment are linked to the Educational Master Plan (EMP). The Student Services Leadership Team (SSLT) and Business Services Council (BSC) provide a parallel processes for student services and business services respectively. There is evidence of feedback from PEPC, the SSLT and the BSC to their constituency groups thus closing the "loop" at this level of the planning process.

Program Effectiveness Planning Reports (PEPRs) are done annually and are primarily resource request templates. Currently, there is no multi-year comprehensive program review conducted in the instructional units. The same is true for the SSLT and BSC. Even though the planning documents for these two divisions of the college are called “Program Review,” they are completed annually. Although the EMP is a true multi-year planning document for the college, it is not clear how updates to the plan are made or whether or not these updates occur regularly. There is no planning calendar. Further, it is not clear how the PEPRs and program review from the SSLT and the BSC integrate with that plan.

The college President and the Academic Senate President meet on a weekly basis to discuss issues directly related to faculty. Department Chair meetings are held with division Deans and the Executive Vice President; the Student Success Committee has created still another opportunity for faculty to engage in on-going quality improvement at the college.

The Student Success Committee is not linked to the formal planning process. It operates as a “think tank” assessing various processes and their outcomes throughout the college which impact students. The Student Success Committee membership comes from various college units inclusive of the registrar, grant directors, deans and faculty. Any member of the campus community has an open invitation to attend a meeting to have their issue(s) heard. In assessing the various college processes, the committee utilizes various forms of data much of which is derived from simple surveys. The results of the assessments have been reflected in simple changes in business practices leading to improved student access and support. However, significant resources aren’t attached to the outcomes that allow them to be an effective catalyst for quick change. Basic Skills funds are available to this committee with loose oversight by the Executive Vice President for Administrative Services. When assessments lead to an issue requiring significant resources, the committee relies on its members to advocate for inclusion of needed resources into the PEPR’s and the program reviews from the SSLT and BSC. (I.B.1)

Oxnard College has set and revised multiple goals that are aligned with the college’s vision and mission as well as the vision and mission of the District. In addition, these goals are supportive of the goals and strategic objectives of the Ventura County Community College District Master Plan 2007-2015. (VCCCDMP 2007-2015) The District Board Imperatives were adopted in September of 2005. The five imperatives are Student Success, Community Needs, Diversity, Organizational Dynamics and Communication, and Fiscal Integrity. The strategic action plans for the college are found in the VCCCDMP 2007-2015 and these action plans specify measurable outcomes with regard to 12 specific objectives. For the year 2010-2011, those objectives were consolidated to six. The action plans for the year 2010-2011 have not yet been implemented. (I.B.2)

There does not seem wide agreement on the college goals. There are Oxnard College goals identified in the strategic plan outline, and there are college goals found in the EMP, but they are not the same. In asking the question, “what are the Oxnard College goals” to administrators, faculty and staff, there were no consistent answers. Furthermore, without adequate research and analysis capacity, the college cannot effectively incorporate the data collected into improvement plans for programs and services to students. (I.B.3)

There is evidence that the action plans identified in the VCCCDMP 2007-2015 for the college in the 2009-2010 school year were implemented and reviewed. Each action plan review begins with the objective. Further it identifies the responsible party, due date, timing, funding source, dollar impact, difficulty and outcomes. It remains unclear if there are any institutional metrics designed to assess the outcomes.

The overall planning process at Oxnard College is year to year. There are some existing planning documents, such as the EMP and the VCCCDMP, that are designed to look four to five years out. However, the process the institution engages in that links budget to planning to those documents is not clear. Prioritizing requests on PEPR's and program review by the PEPC and the PBC seems more operational than strategic. (I.B.4)

During program review and planning processes, programs describe the connection between their objectives and those found in the college/district strategic plan. The college has prepared an Enrollment Management Plan in an effort to effectively integrate marketing scheduling, staffing, and budget processes in a strategic manner in order to set and meet enrollment targets. In addition, the college completed its current Educational Master Plan (EMP) during the 2009-2010 school years. The EMP incorporates a connection between the district's Vision, Mission and Values, the district's planning objectives, the college's Technology Plan, and the college's Facilities Master Plan.

The college has adopted six Institutional Student Learning Outcomes/Core Competencies that support the overall student learning goals. These outcomes are measured through the various student learning outcomes assessment processes at the course and program levels. At Oxnard College these programs are referred to as "Degree-level" SLO. (I.B.5)

The PBC is the primary entity for linking planning to resource allocation. The PBC reviews and makes recommendations on program review, program effectiveness and planning from the various units in the college including instructional, student services and business services. The PBC recommendations are forwarded to the college President on planning and resource allocation as well as program development, reduction or elimination.

The college assesses progress toward achieving instructional goals through the PEPC structure and the SLO assessment process. The PEPC reviews instructional programs annually using quantitative data related to student headcount enrollment, FTES, faculty FTEF, and student retention and success. In addition, references are made to recency of course outline updates and the linkage of program goals to the college's Educational Master Plan as well as quantitative analysis of observed trends. Planning and resource requests are part of the Program Effectiveness and Planning Report (PEPR). The PEPC prioritizes requests for resource allocations and then advances those to the PBC.

The various deans and faculty and staff sit on the PBC. They are charged with providing feedback to their respective constituency groups regard the actions taken by the PBC. The President provides feedback to the PBC on their recommendations thus "closing the loop" in the planning process. (I.B.5)

As of July 1, 2010, the District Accounting Office is responsible for MIS reporting, which was previously housed under Institutional Research. The Associate Vice Chancellor for Information Technology is responsible for a Data Mart to be used to develop standardized reports. The plan is to refresh the Data Mart three times a semester. An enrollment report is sent to the campus each day to assist with enrollment management. The IT department plans to produce a number of standardized reports for the campuses to use in reviewing the demographics and success of students. There is no capacity or expertise to administer surveys, produce research studies or analyses of the data.

The college research office has posted some enrollment information and demographic information on the website. The college conducted the Community College Survey of Student Engagement but little analysis of the results was done. Offices such as EOPS and Records have conducted their own surveys to assess student satisfaction. The Business Services Division conducts a customer satisfaction survey each year. (I.B.6, I.B.7)

In August 2008, the district hired a Vice Chancellor of Planning and Organizational Development and later a Director of Institutional Research to provide support to the district's planning activities. Subsequently, the Vice Chancellor position was vacated in June 2009, and not filled due to cost savings measures; the Director of Institutional Research position was eliminated by the Board of Trustees in July 2010. The Research Analyst position was also eliminated resulting in the elimination of the Office of Institutional Research at Ventura Community College District.

In summer 2010, the college eliminated the dean of educational services and research position and relied on a research analyst, partly (50 percent) funded by a Title V Grant, for its data and analysis needs. No funding has been identified to replace the grant's funds when the grant runs out. While the research analyst has been able to provide some data to college committees, the position will likely not have the capacity/time to produce analyses of the data and research studies. There is no research capacity to help faculty develop and analyze student learning outcomes assessments. (I.B.6)

The SLO assessment process occurs in classes each semester and is reported annually. The report calls for dialogue among faculty, particularly those faculty teaching courses with multiple sections, and evaluation of all strengths and limitations identified along with strategies to address any areas of concern. The college has implemented e-Lumen; a software tool to help manage its SLO assessment. It is estimated 62 percent of the courses have established SLOs that are linked to the Institutional SLOs and the Degree-level SLOs. These links are evident on the Course Outline of Record (COR). There are at least two SLOs for each course. The college catalog maintains a large number of courses that are no longer offered and there needs to be a concerted effort to archive these. SLOs are not be established for these courses making it difficult for the college to determine which courses still require the SLOs to be established. Approximately 27 percent of the courses with established SLOs have assessed them.

Assessment of the SLOs in instruction has begun and, the processes for linking these assessments to the program reviews has been established. The PEPR now has a resource request page that requires a link to be drawn between the resource request, the assessment, and the

subsequent dialogue leading to the desired improvement. Similar processes have also been established for student services and beginning in the next program review cycle, the program review will include the assessment results for their SLOs. SLOs in business services are assessed with the Customer Satisfaction Survey. It is unclear whether this division has identified specific outcomes.

The SSLT and the BSC provide parallel processes for the assessment of SLOs in their respective areas. In the case of student services, the dean of student services in conjunction with the SSLT, review complete program review documents and prioritize personnel and resource requests. Business services have developed a customer service survey. The survey focused on gathering feedback from all of the various college constituencies on levels of satisfaction with all of the units contained within business services. This instrument is delivered on-line by Survey Monkey and serves as the basis for the program review.

The college's EMP was conducted in accordance with Program Effectiveness and Planning processes with representation from each college department and program. The Program Effectiveness Planning process and its counterpart in Student Services are coordinated at the department level and included stakeholders at both the program and discipline level. Though these processes are in place, the institution has not reviewed its evaluation mechanisms to assure effectiveness. (I.B.7)

Conclusions:

Oxnard College does not have identifiable college goals necessary to ground or direct its strategic planning efforts. The college does not have multi-year comprehensive program review for its instructional units which integrate the Educational Master Plan, Facilities Master Plan and the Technology Plan. The college does not have an institutional assessment process for student learning outcomes leading to improving institutional effectiveness, nor does it have adequate research capacity to make effective use of the data that is collected.

The college does not meet Standard IB.

Recommendations:

Oxnard College Recommendation 1: The team recommends, in order to meet Standards and reach sustainable continuous quality improvement for institutional planning, that the college further integrate long range strategic planning inclusive of the Educational Master Plan, Facilities Master Plan, Technology Plan and District/College goals and use an institutional outcomes assessment process that leads to improved institutional effectiveness (Standards I.A.1, I.B.3, II.B.3, II.B.4, II.C.2, III.A.6, III.B.2, III.C.1, III.C.2, III.D.3, IV.A.1, IV.A.5, IV.B.2.b).

Oxnard College Recommendation 2: In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the college develop and implement a communication plan that facilitates awareness within the college community regarding institutional efforts to achieve goals and improve student learning (Standards I.B.1, IV.A.3, IV.B.2.e).

Oxnard College Recommendation 3: The team recommends that the college accelerate its schedule for the development and assessment of course, program, and institutional SLOs in order to reach proficiency by fall, of 2012. The process should be faculty driven (Standards I.B.3, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.g, II.B.4, II.C.2).

Oxnard College Recommendation 4: In order to meet Standards, the team recommends that the college enhance its program review process by implementing a multi-year approach which includes completing a comprehensive analysis of relevant data, identifying measurable outcomes, conducting periodic assessments, and making improvements based on those assessments (Standards I.B.3, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.i, II.B.3, II.B.4, II.C.2).

Commendations:

None.

STANDARD II

Student Learning Programs and Service

A. Instructional Programs

General Observations:

The College has weathered a considerable turnover of administration and has persisted, yet struggled, in moving forward toward its courses and program SLO objectives as well as integrating its planning and budgeting processes. There appears to be solid administrative understanding and buy in to the SLO assessment, evaluation, reflection, and improvement “virtuous circle” feedback loop, however, faculty buy-in has been difficult. Faculty leadership and administrators comprehend what they must accomplish and have deadlines to reach the required goals, but recognize that the faculty, as a whole, must participate actively in the process.

Findings and Evidence:

The Madrid environmental scan was released in fall 2007. The scan, completed before the economic downturn, is now three years old. The scan is a compilation of demographic and economic data with no interpretive summaries or recommendations. As such, it did not assist the college to meet the educational needs of its students. There is no additional information presented that the college has endeavored to update the scan or collect and analyze more current data.

The Educational Master Plan incorporated additional environmental data that the college found to be relevant. (II.A.1.a)

There is minimal planning guidance regarding the direction and future use of alternative delivery systems. The meetings of the Technology Committee and the Distance Education Committee have been somewhat sporadic. The recommendations in the Education Master Plan do not specifically mention alternative modes of learning. Despite concern for continued robust enrollment, the Educational Master Plan focuses exclusively on obtaining more classroom space and ignores distance learning alternatives.

Some departments want to expand hybrid and fully online classes. The college appears to be making good progress in the updating of smart classrooms. (II.A.1.b)

It appears that a majority of courses have SLOs although the typical class has only one or two SLOs. Some SLOs have been assessed and the faculty or department has made modifications based on the evidence. This is a good illustration of an appropriate feedback loop.

The college is making progress regarding SLO data collection and early analysis. Although the Executive Vice President (EVP) has set a schedule for departments to assess all classes over a 4-semester cycle/calendar which will be completed by Fall 2012, faculty ownership of this process is lacking and raises concerns for completion by Fall 2012. Newly acquired software, E-Lumen, will be used to record assessment and analysis (II.A.1.c)

The Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee (PEPC) has a timeline to identify SLOs for the remaining courses without them and to prepare program SLOs. Program reviews are evaluated by PEPC. In PEPC meeting minutes, there is evidence of “closing the loop” prioritizations. The college acknowledges that more comprehensive program assessment is underway, but is not complete. The college is at the development level here.

The college has a Basic Skills program with four levels of English courses below college level English and three levels of math courses below college level math. Testing of incoming students indicates that a substantial number of students need both Basic Skills math and English.

The college established its Basic Skills program without specific research guidance under the assumption that such a program was clearly needed. The college has a Math Success Center in the LRC. The Center helps 50 percent of students who had previously failed math to pass appropriate math requirements at the basic skills level.

The college also has a strong Marine Biology center and a successful Fire Academy. The Marine Biology center has close links with both K-12 and university partners and is well connected with fisheries, governmental, and private groups. The Fire Academy and the Fire Technology Program have close links with Federal, regional, county, and city fire agencies and fire science vendors. It will occupy a new fire science building early in 2011 along with the County Fire Agency in Camarillo. (II.A.2.a)

Sixty-two percent of college courses have incorporated SLOs, although a much smaller fraction of those SLOs have been assessed. A 4-semester assessment cycle for all courses has been established as a college-wide standard. The college needs to accelerate its drafting and assessment of SLOs in order to reach the level of sustainable continuous quality improvement by fall 2012. (II.A.2.b)

Using its Transitional Studies Advisory Committee, the Math and English departments reviewed the entry and exit skills Standards for their respective department offerings. No specific evidence was offered for other departments.

Expertise of the faculty in the curriculum review process is critical to the process of maintaining quality. A faculty credential review was recently completed to support quality assurance. Also the PEPC review process assures integrity in this area of curriculum. Career and Technical Education programs (CTE) review whether their students obtain jobs in their areas of training to ensure both the quality and relevance of training. (II.A.2.c)

Although the college has increased the number of its smart classrooms which can assist in meeting varied student learning needs, has provided classes in different format and schedules, provided tutoring and student success learning tools, there is no specific evidence that it has assessed the diverse needs and learning styles of its students.

The Substantive Change Proposal approved by ACCJC in Summer, 2010 clearly delineates those degrees where a student can complete in excess of 50% of the coursework online for the degree. There is one on-line degree program (Legal Assisting/Paralegal Studies). Although there is no

mandatory training for prospective online faculty, the course management system (Desire2Learn) contains orientation/training material for both faculty and students. A faculty member in the English department, who has taken the lead in online education, offers flex-week training for prospective online faculty as does the instructional technologist.

Distance Education courses and programs receive the normal approval through the department chair and the curriculum committee. There is no online tutoring but various online resources, like “Owls” are available for students as are two tutors in the library. Extensive online library materials are available to all students.

While the college has not formally adopted specific online “Best Practices”, such practices are distributed to faculty by the lead online faculty member. Further, faculty guidance regarding “Best Practices” come from online training and off-campus conferences. The Distance Education Committee reviews and approves the distance education appendices for all courses offered online. (II.A.2.d)

Most of the current college courses have embedded Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) (450 of 724 [62 percent] as of October 2010). Approximately 27 percent of the course SLOs have been assessed as of 2009-10. A few departments have also reflected on those assessments and made relevant course modifications. Again, the college needs to accelerate its drafting and assessment of SLOs in order to reach the level of proficiency by 2012.

The college is at the development level regarding course SLOs with processes in place to continue evaluation on a regular basis. The college recognizes the need to link resource requests with all relevant committees in an ongoing feedback loop. The e-Lumen software is projected to be operational in late fall 2010, and as a result, faculty evaluation and assessment of SLOs should be streamlined.

Program SLOs have been completed for almost all departments (27 of 28), but data collection and assessment have yet to be done for most programs outside of CTE. The college is at the development level regarding program SLOs with processes in place to continue data collection and assessment on a regular basis. (II.A.2.e)

Planning is linked to the budget process. PEPC makes recommendations to Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) regarding its priorities. A new Learning Outcome Team (LOT) participatory governance committee will provide the structure to assist the college in reaching the “proficiency” level. (II.A.2.f)

Only a few CTE departments regularly use department or program exams and these are employed to meet discipline specific safety Standards. (II.A.2.g)

Quality Standards relative to the awarding of credit are maintained by faculty review, local Curriculum Committee review, and PEPC review. Additionally, the district curriculum committee (DTRW) offers feedback on all new and substantially revised courses prior to Board approval. (II.A.2.h)

The college has increased its certificates from 167 in 2004 to 290 in 2010. It has also increased associate degrees for the same period from 457 to 523. As of 2009-10, 27 of the 28 academic programs had completed program SLOs. All degrees and certificates are linked to the program SLOs. Quality Standards in this area are maintained by faculty review, Curriculum Committee review, and PEPC review. (II.A.2.i)

The General Education (GE) subcommittee just developed SLOs in October 2010. Now there are specific required reasons why a course should be incorporated into GE (see Misc Evidence for the self-study). Before 2010, departments just submitted courses to the GE committee for inclusion into the GE package without any specific reason to justify the inclusion. (II.A.3.a)

Though the Team was unable to evaluate whether Oxnard College had met its assessment goal relative to the general education areas of lifelong learner and being an ethical and effective citizen, the new GE SLO requirements will assist the college in determining whether it has met its assessment goals in this area. (II.A.3.b)

All degree programs have 18 units in the major and have a focused core per the college catalog. All programs are in compliance with Title 5 of the California Education code. (II.A.4)
CTE advisory committees meet, at least annually, to review currency of programs. (See Minutes of CTE committees.) The College is not formally tracking some CTE programs such as EMT & Fire Academy though state certification could validate the fact that students are meeting Standards. There was no evidence of this validation. Dental Technology is tracked. (II.A.5)

The college catalog contains descriptions of each discipline and program of study. The catalog does not include student learning outcomes per se, but does describe the result or outcome of study in all areas. The college catalog provides detailed information on transfer requirements to both public and private universities. Multiple reviewers check the accuracy of the catalog. As of 2010, there is a systematic collection of syllabi, which is maintained by the respective dean's office and in the office of the EVP. Syllabi are checked for inclusion of learning outcomes. (II.A.6)

The college catalog clearly delineates the various pathways of transfer, all of which are based on articulation agreements with four year colleges. This information is also available in the Transfer Center which supports a coordinator and counselor. (II.A.6.a)

The Curriculum Committee website lists several hundred deleted or suspended courses. Example of a deleted program is Journalism. Journalism was consolidated at a sister college. Oxnard installed instructional television equipment to permit its students to complete the program. An example of a revised program is Child Development. Child Development faculty made curriculum changes, modifications and substitutions to the program based on new state guidelines. Alternative courses and waivers enabled all of the Child Development students who were enrolled prior to the new program standards to complete their programs under the original program requirements. (Evidence: interview with EVP and flyers prepared for Child Development program completion) Process for elimination of programs is now being developed and will be finalized at the end of fall 2010. (II.A.6.b)

The college provides clear and complete information to prospective students in its catalog pages (9-17). The college is updating its website to prepare the most current information. Evidence: interview with EVP. All committee websites are being updated with the assistance of a new instructional technology staffer. (II.A.6.c)

There is adequate Board policy (Board Policy 4030) in this area, but it needs to be more widely promulgated.

Faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline. They present data and information fairly and objectively. (II.A.7.a)

Until recently, adjunct faculty members have been given no guidance in this area. In fall 2010, a new Faculty Handbook was distributed to all faculty. Department chair meetings have been another venue for distributing this guidance. (II.A.7.a)

Board Policy F.20.A.3 covers student misconduct as does the college catalog. The Board Policy Manual does not cover this issue. Faculty have discretion to address this issue in their syllabi or in class discussions. The EVP will review college publications to ensure consistency with Board Policy. Discussion of college policy regarding cheating and misconduct might be enhanced by including such material in all class syllabi. The college catalog covers this issue on page 174. (II.A.7.b)

The College requires no such conformity. The Board passed a new ethics policy in 2010 and a "District Council on Human Resources" will promulgate the general Code of Conduct during the 2010-11 academic year. (II.A.7.c)

The College offers no programs in foreign locations. (II.A.8)

Conclusions:

The College is at the developmental stage in Planning and SLO development and assessment; therefore, only partially meets the standard.

Recommendations:

Oxnard College Recommendation 3: The team recommends that the college accelerate its schedule for the development and assessment of course, program, and institutional SLOs in order to reach proficiency by fall, of 2012. The process should be faculty driven (Standards I.B.3, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.g, II.B.4, II.C.2).

Commendations:

None.

B. Student Support Services

General Observations:

In spite of turnover in Student Services Leadership Team, the coordinators have kept the program review process, services for students and compliance at a quality level for the past six years. There are two student services complexes: the Student Services and Administration Center in the new building has created a one stop environment in enrollment services as well as support for students who are just learning how to enroll on-line; and, the community services complex housing EOPS, CARE, CalWORKs, Career Center, and county offices assure that students who need all of these support services find them in a one stop environment that is welcoming to students.

The college offers a variety of student services that enhance the supportive learning environment for its diverse students. The Student Services division has partially assessed student services using student learning outcomes and faculty and staff input, but the level of effectiveness of the Student Learning Outcomes varies widely from awareness to development to proficiency and the SLOs are not incorporated into the college planning process. The Student Services Leadership Team and the Student Success Committee regularly engage in discussions about how student access, progress, learning, and success are consistently supported.

Findings and Evidence:

The college does not fully demonstrate that these services, regardless of location or means of delivery, support student learning and enhance achievement of the mission of the institution. The assessment of the success of these services has not yet been fully integrated into the planning and budgeting process. Student services does have a program review cycle, a program review template, and an annual action plan, as well as student learning outcomes for most of the departments and programs. Program reviews have been done for Admissions and Records, Articulation, CalWORKs, EOPS and CARE, EAC (program for students with disabilities), Financial Aid, Matriculation (including assessment), Outreach and Recruitment, Student Activities, Student Health Center, and the Transfer Center. Program reviews and student learning outcomes have not been done for Athletics (will be done in 2011), PACE, Veteran Affairs, the Child Development Center, or the Student Services division as a whole. The dean has plans to use the Student Services Master Plan as the program review for the division. (II.B.1)

The official name, address, telephone number and web site address of the college is provided in the catalog. The mission, values, vision and goals of the college are stated on page four. The course, program and degree offerings are outlined, with clear and extensive pathways to specific goals, stated in detail in the catalog. The academic calendar is stated, as well as the length of each certificate, degree and transfer program. The statement on academic freedom is missing from the catalog and there is no reference to its availability elsewhere (it is in the faculty handbook). The availability of financial aid is listed on page 26. Services of the Learning Center and Tutoring center are listed on page 27. Names and degrees of faculty and administrators are at the end of the catalog. The names of the members of the District Board of Trustees are listed at the end of the catalog. (II.B.2.a)

Admissions information is on page nine and is also in Spanish. Student fees and other financial obligations are described on pages 14-16. Graduation and transfer requirements are described extensively throughout the catalog. (II.B.2.b)

All major policies affecting students are in the catalog. Academic honesty is discussed on page 23. Nondiscrimination is on page 182. Acceptance of transfer credits is fully explained on page 13. Grievance and Complaint procedures are found on pp. 175-176. Sexual harassment is covered from pp. 182-184. Refund of fees is on page 15. (II.B.2.c)

The catalog is current, complete, clear, easy to understand and use, and well-structured. Gateway information is in English and Spanish. Although the academic freedom policy is not in the catalog, it is in the faculty handbook. The dean of students maintains records of student complaints/grievances.

Specific references to the website location are stated in the catalog if further information is available elsewhere. The catalog is available in print and on-line. It is updated annually in print and frequently on line. The evidence contains a catalog development chronology for two years. (II.B.2.d)

Assessment of learning support needs of students through individual student assessment cannot substitute for in-depth analysis of data on student success to determine institutional effectiveness. Through research, the college identifies the learning support needs of its student population, but in-depth analysis is needed to demonstrate how the data informs the development of appropriate services and programs. A national assessment of student engagement and learning support needs, CCSSE, was done in 2008 and 2010, but the data has not been analyzed and applied to learning support improvement. The Student Equity Plan of 2005 contains data and activities that have not been analyzed. Student success data is reviewed and discussed by the Student Success Committee, but this committee is not a shared governance committee and does not have a role in the planning and budgeting process. The development of the Basic Skills plan was done without baseline data although that data is now available. However, the one exception to the lack of data analysis of student needs is found in the college's federal Title V grant for strengthening Hispanic-serving institutions. (II.B.3)

The college has provided an on line registration and enrollment system to provide services regardless of location (in both English and Spanish, the latter beginning in January 2011); however, additional online services for distance learners are in the exploratory stages. The degree audit system is in place on-line. The counseling department is piloting an on-line educational plan system this fall. Through the Title V Grant, an on-line orientation is being developed. Online tutoring is planned when the new Library/LRC goes on line. (II.B.3.a)

The college goals of providing an environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development are met via a speakers' bureau, student activities and student government. Budget cuts have been deleterious to these activities. (II.B.3.b)

This section of the self study describes the counseling functions that address student needs; the evaluation of such services is not in evidence. (II.B.3.c)

The college relies on student activities and the speakers' bureau to support and enhance student understanding and appreciation of diversity. The college also has nearly twenty clubs and organizations that support diversity because they represent diverse views and backgrounds. Student leaders expressed frustration that more students did not attend events and few faculty support the events. Student leaders are not able to use the student e-mail system to notify students of events and programs. Student leaders pointed out that communication with both students and faculty was difficult.

One Student Services faculty member said she was surprised that there were no in-service programs on working with Latino students since the majority of the students at the college are Latino. (II.B.3.d)

The instruments used for placement of students have not been validated recently. The college follows the open admission policy of the California Community College and its practices are evaluated by auditors on an annual basis. (II.B.3.e)

The institution maintains records in a secure area within the Admissions and Records office and follows legal Standards for the release of student records. (II.B.3.f)

Evaluation of Student Services programs are through program reviews and student learning outcomes. In addition, the Student Services Leadership Team meets regularly to discuss improvements to the programs and services. The college has not yet used the results of student learning outcomes as the basis for improvement. (II.B.4)

Conclusions:

The team finds that student services at Oxnard College are, for the most part, comprehensive and welcoming to students. However, Oxnard College could profit from enhanced communications and evaluation of the effectiveness of its student support services. The College should more vigorously analyze existing data about the support needs of all students. The catalog and schedule of classes are complete and important gateway services are also in Spanish. The college should continue to support and implement services to on-line students.

The college partially meets the standard.

Recommendations:

See Oxnard College Recommendations 2, 3, and 7

Commendations:

None.

C. Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations:

The current library and learning resource building is inadequate to meet student need, but it is unclear what the student need is as there was no evidence linking the construction of the new library building to a master plan or report or program review. Staffing may need to be evaluated for the new facility.

The Library/Learning Resources Center/Tutoring Center includes library services and collections, tutoring, learning centers, and computer laboratories. The college does provide access and training to students, though limited, so that the library and other learning support services may be used effectively. The college did not offer evidence that these services are assessed in order to improve their effectiveness.

The college provided evidence in terms of lists of software, media, and book holdings to assert that library and other learning support services for students are sufficient to support the quality of its instructional programs. No evaluation or current program reviews have been done to assert that the library and other learning support services are sufficient in quantity, currency, depth, and variety to facilitate educational offerings.

Findings and Evidence:

The institution only evaluates library and other learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs through anecdotal evidence. Evaluation of these services via a program review would provide evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes and as the basis for improvement. (II.C.1)

The college selects and maintains educational equipment and materials to support student learning by relying on the appropriate expertise of faculty, including the librarian and other learning support services professionals. The new library and learning resource building will enhance this capability. (II.C.1.a)

The college provides instruction for users of library and other learning support services through instruction within the library and instruction in the classroom. Given that there is only one librarian, it is difficult to satisfy the student demands. (II.C.1.b)

The institution provides students and personnel responsible for student learning programs and services adequate access to the library and other learning support services, regardless of their location or means of delivery. However, the access for on-line students is more limited than land-based students. Full online access to all but the paper books is available. Library hours have been extended to 9 p.m. (II.C.1.c)

The institution provides effective maintenance and security for its library and other learning support services. The security for the new Library/LRC is being planned by the committee planning for the new center. (II.C.1.d)

The library has formal agreements with the Gold Coast Library Network and the community college library consortium. These resources are adequate and used by faculty, staff and students. (II.C.1.e)

Standard IIC had very little evidence on the core issue, i.e., whether the library and learning resources area are sufficient to meet student need.

No program review for the library or the learning resources center has been done since 2007-2008 and it was not part of the documents for evidence. No student learning outcomes have been done. Library staff and faculty may benefit from training in completing student learning or services area outcomes.

Although the institution evaluates the three full-time staff in the library as employees, no general evaluation of the services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs.

A program review with data on the adequacy of the learning support services would assist in the planning for space and technology for the new Library/LRC. (II.C.2)

Conclusions:

Library and Learning Resources staff and faculty should do a thorough needs-assessment that can be incorporated into the program review and planning for the new building.

The college partially meets the standard.

Recommendations:

Oxnard College Recommendation 1: The team recommends, in order to reach sustainable continuous quality improvement for institutional planning, that the college further integrate long range strategic planning inclusive of the Educational Master Plan, Facilities Master Plan, Technology Plan and District/College goals and use an institutional outcomes assessment process that leads to improved institutional effectiveness (Standards I.A.1, I.B.3, II.B.3, II.B.4, II.C.2, III.A.6, III.B.2, III.C.2, III.D.3, IV.A.1, IV.A.5, IV.B.2.b).

Oxnard College Recommendation 3: The team recommends that the college accelerate its schedule for the development and assessment of course, program, and institutional SLOs in order to reach proficiency by fall, of 2012. The process should be faculty driven (Standards I.B.3, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.g, II.B.4, II.C.2).

Oxnard College Recommendation 4: The team recommends that the college enhance its program review process by implementing a multi-year approach which includes the documentation of completing a comprehensive analysis of relevant data, identifying measurable outcomes, conducting periodic assessments, and making improvements based on those assessments (Standards I.B.3, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.i, II.B.3, II.B.4, II.C.2).

Oxnard College Recommendation 5: The team recommends that capital planning and resource allocation processes include total cost of ownership principles. (Standards II.C.1.c, III.A.2, III.A.6, III.B.2.a, III.B.2.b, III.D.1.c, III.D.2.a).

Oxnard College Recommendation 7: The team recommends that the college ensure a comparable level of support services is provided to all students regardless of location or mode of delivery (Standards II.B.1, II.B.3.a, II.C.1).

Commendations:

The team commends the College Student Success committee and the work it has done in improving student access and support throughout the college.

STANDARD III Resources

A. Human Resources

General Observations:

Human Resources at the District do not engage in regular, sustainable, quality improvement through program review self assessment. One program review process occurred in summer 2010, the survey results were not shared with the college district community, and improvement based on assessment and data of the program review process has not occurred.

The lack of inclusion in the self study of the audit of personnel files and subsequent action taken by the District is a concern.

The lack of current evaluations for some employees is being addressed; however, a process to address regular communication to supervisors regarding employee evaluations is still under consideration by the District.

Findings and Evidence:

A member of the visiting team met with the VCCCD Vice Chancellor of Human Resources on two occasions during the visit. A member of the visiting team met with the co-chairs of the professional development committee, the college president, and the academic senate president. All evidence provided was reviewed. (III.A) With the exception of equivalencies, It was confirmed that all employees met the requirements for the positions in which they are employed.

Hiring procedures are well established and include minimum qualifications for all positions at Oxnard College. These are made available and meet all local, regional, state, and federal requirements. The college website provides information on all position openings and job application processes. All degrees held by administrators and faculty are currently verified by human resources personnel. Through the Merit System of the Personnel Commission and the minimum qualifications adopted by the BOG, all classified employees are qualified and meet employability Standards. Procedures for personnel selection and hiring is addressed and implemented in AP 7120. (III.A.1.a)

The employee evaluation process is not up to date and not verified; a Planning Agenda addresses this. (III.A.1.b)

The college and district do not address student learning outcomes as a component of faculty evaluations. (III.A.1.c)

Board Policy 7205 Employee Code of Ethics was developed and presented to the college community several times over a year for input and revision and adopted in June 2010. There was no evidence that employee managers have received ethics training.

The Administrative Procedure 7205 Employee Code of Ethics has not been developed; there is a Planning Agenda to address this (III.A.1.d) and is expected to be completed in the fall 2010. (III.A.1.d)

The head of Institutional Research for the college was eliminated, and this could be problematic for the college's ability to conduct comprehensive self evaluations with data analysis for planning.

The college/District did not plan for cost of ownership with new capital construction and does not have necessary staffing to service additional facility square footage.

While not addressed in the Oxnard College Institutional Self Study, the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources provided information upon request on the audit by Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Company, LLP revealing a lack of minimum qualifications and/or equivalencies for a total of 110 full and part time faculty (90 percent part time and 10 percent full time) district wide. The District is now engaged in a formal process to review and verify degrees for all new hires. All Oxnard College faculty requiring equivalency are scheduled to go through an equivalency process at the college in October 2010. (III.A.2)

The College hires qualified faculty, administration and staff to support the college operations and mission. Personnel policies and procedures are clearly identified.

In the negotiated faculty AFT/VCCCD Agreement (Academic) November 13, 2007-June 15, 2010, Section 11.1 Tenure Review of Probationary Faculty 11.1.A. it states: *The tenure review process should ensure that students have access to the most knowledgeable, talented, creative, and student-oriented faculty available. To that end, a four-year probationary period provides sufficient time for contract employees to understand the expectations for tenure, to develop the skills and acquire the experience to participate successfully in the educational process, and to use the District's and other resources for professional growth. The process should promote professionalism and enhance academic growth by providing a useful assessment of performance, using clear evaluation criteria.* Section 11.1.E.6.a states: *The committee shall submit its recommendation for the candidate's subsequent contract status to the College President. The College President shall review all materials and make a recommendation for the candidate's subsequent contract status to the committee. If the recommendations differ, the Committee and the President shall meet and attempt to resolve the differences. If no resolution is reached, the recommendations of the Committee and President shall be forwarded to the governing Board.* Section 11.1.E.6.b states: *Until a candidate is tenured or terminated, the President shall each year forward the Tenure Review Committee reports and recommendations to the Governing Board.*

In the Oxnard College Institutional Self Study Report, Abstract of the Self Study, IV.B Board and Administrative Organization it states: *The Chancellor also expresses concerns about issues of programs of instruction and about Standards of excellence for achieving tenure.* In Standard IV.B.3.a Self Evaluation it states: *Although the faculty tenure process is contained in the district's union contract with the American Federation of Teachers, resolution of tenure disagreements between tenure committees and college administrators falls to the Board of*

Trustees. The Board has not communicated a standard of excellence for determining tenure when it falls under its purview.

The Board of Trustees has engaged in early tenure approval for some faculty nullifying the equitable administration of personnel policies and procedures. While there is a planning agenda to address tenure recommendations, the equitable administration of personnel policies remains an issue. (III.A.3.a)

Various personnel files were viewed in the secure file area located at the district administration center.

Personnel records are secured and confidential. Employees have access to their personnel records as required by law. (III.A.3.b)

The Oxnard College faculty handbook addresses diversity. A *Model Equal Employment Opportunity Plan* is in development. (III.A.4.a)

Record of regular, annual diversity assessment by human resources personnel and the Director of Employment Services is available at VCCCD. There is no evidence that that change or improvement is implemented based on assessment. (III.A.4.b)

Policies on Oxnard College employee equity and diversity exist under Board Policy 7100 adopted May 2007; there is no correlating administrative procedure and no planning agenda exists to address the administrative procedure. (III.A.4.c)

The Oxnard College Professional Development Committee is active and coordinates activities on the college campus. Funding for professional development activities is available; an application process is administered by the PDC for funding of individual professional development activities. Grant funds for professional development are also available.

VCCCD human resources have implemented the HR Toolbox for strengthened and consistent user-friendly guidelines in approaching standard employment activities, such as hiring, employee classification, and evaluation. (III.A.5.a)

Direct evaluation of professional development activities occurs after the training sessions and at the annual review by the Professional Development Committee (PDC) for future decision-making on training needs. The professional development committee in concert with the college president has established an exemplary process that continues to fund professional development for faculty and staff in a difficult fiscal climate. (III.A.5.b)

Human Resources at the college district engaged in a program review self assessment process in 2010.

Oxnard College human resource needs are identified and communicated through the PEPC, then are forwarded to PBC, who forwards prioritized recommendations to the college president. Since 2008, due to district-wide budget concerns and in order to incorporate district-wide

resource coordination, these recommendations are discussed at the Chancellor's Cabinet prior to final selection.

Due to budget concerns, the college participatory governance committee, PEPC, identified core principles for schedule reduction.

Though capital planning and construction has been excellent, there has been no analysis of "cost of ownership." Due to increasing facility square footage and staff reduction in facilities, the team identified concern for facility maintenance. (III.A.6)

Conclusions:

Human Resources at the District do not engage in regular, sustainable, quality improvement through program review self assessment processes. Employee evaluations at the college are not current. There are no corresponding administrative procedures for the BP 7205 code of ethics and BP 7100 human equity and diversity.

Professional development occurs and engages a planning, self assessment, and continuous quality improvement cycle.

The college partially meets the standard.

Recommendations:

Oxnard College Recommendation 5: The team recommends that capital planning and resource allocation processes include total cost of ownership principles. (Standards II.C.1.c, III.A.2, III.A.6, III.B.2.a, III.B.2.b, III.D.1.c, III.D.2.a).

See Oxnard College Recommendation 6

See District Recommendation 4 and 6

Commendations:

The team commends the College on a structure and process that encourages and prioritizes on-going professional development.

B. Physical Resources

General Observations:

Many facilities projects have been completed, or are in progress, throughout the campus. The new buildings and strengthened infrastructure will provide students with improved facilities and access to programs for many years. Physical resource planning processes are effectively linked to institutional planning and resource allocation, but are limited in the scope of outcomes assessment and total cost of ownership.

Findings and Evidence:

The college uses the Educational Master Plan (EMP) as the primary document to identify facility and equipment requests for each educational program, and the Facilities Master Plan (FMP) supports these needs. Specific links between identified program needs and facility plans to address those request are described in Appendix B of the EMP.

Space inventory data is used to identify gaps in existing facilities compared with the FMP ideals. The Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) helps establish budget priorities based on expected funding, and makes recommendations to the president for a final decision.

Oxnard College's share of Measure S bond funds provided \$111 million to construct new buildings, renovate existing buildings, and upgrade the campus infrastructure. The Facilities Planning Steering Committee helped develop an implementation plan based on campus needs and available space. However, because of escalating construction costs, some identified projects were not able to be completed with existing funds. As a result, the college modified its project list, and is renovating previously vacated spaces into large classrooms and several learning laboratories to meet current needs. Communications to the campus community regarding progress on Measure S construction projects is provided during regularly scheduled Campus Use, Development and Safety committee meetings, and in other forums. (III.B.1.a)

An impressive list of projects have been completed from Measure S and other available funding, particularly in the areas of safety and security enhancement, facilities and technology infrastructure replacements/upgrades, and campus accessibility. New buildings include a Student Services and Administration facility and a completed warehouse. Performing Arts and Learning Resource Center buildings are under construction. These projects have also significantly improved the appearance of the entire campus.

The Maintenance and Operations department has done an excellent job in helping create a welcoming learning environment by maintaining the appearance of the buildings and grounds, and keeping both interior and exterior areas clean. However, with ongoing reduced staffing levels and two new buildings nearing completion, concerns have been expressed whether the same levels of maintenance and upkeep can be provided in the future.

A safe and secure learning environment is maintained through regular inspections by public agencies and facilities department staff, ongoing facilities review by college committees, and the continued implementation of emergency and security systems.

The college demonstrates control of its off-campus facilities by improving the Marine Education Center, and constructing a new Fire Academy in the City of Camarillo. (III.B.1.b)

The EMP drives the development of the FMP for long-range capital planning. Requests for state funding are included in the Five Year Capital Plan, which is updated annually. Facility and equipment needs are assessed and identified annually during program review and unit planning processes. Program Effectiveness and Planning Reports (PEPR) identify specific needs, are submitted to a PEP sub-committee for initial review and priority determination, forwarded to the full PEP committee for final review, and submitted to the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC). A similar process is in place for Student and Business Services before being forwarded to the PBC. The PBC then determines resource allocation recommendations and priorities for consideration by the president. For the most part, the PEP process does not include outcomes assessment, and resource allocation requests are identified for only the current year.

Total cost of ownership (TCO) principles are not currently a component of the district budget allocation model, and have only recently been incorporated in planning discussions for new construction. Identified components include utilities, supplies, equipment, staff requirements, and ongoing maintenance. TCO components are planned to be included in the next revision of the FMP. (III.B.2.a)

The PEP process is used to assess and identify ongoing facility and equipment needs, and this process is integrated with institutional planning. The planning processes have resulted in many facilities projects being completed, or in progress, throughout the campus.

Physical resource planning processes are effectively linked to institutional planning and resource allocation, but are limited in the scope of outcomes assessment and total cost of ownership. (III.B.2.b)

Conclusions:

Many facilities improvements have been completed, or are in progress, throughout the campus from Measure S and other available funding. Besides new and renovated buildings, these improvements include safety and security enhancements, facilities and technology infrastructure replacements/upgrades, and campus accessibility.

The physical resource planning processes are effectively linked to institutional planning and resource allocation, but outcomes assessment and total cost of ownership components can be improved.

The college meets the standard.

Recommendations:

Oxnard College Recommendation 5: The team recommends that capital planning and resource allocation processes include total cost of ownership principles. (Standards II.C.1.c, III.A.2, III.A.6, III.B.2.a, III.B.2.b, III.D.1.c, III.D.2.a).

Commendations:

The team commends the college for developing and completing many capital projects including new construction, safety and security enhancements, facilities and technology infrastructure replacement/upgrades, and campus accessibility.

C. Technology Resources

General Observations:

Information technology planning and processes are detailed, linked to other planning documents, and engaged in self assessment for continuous quality improvement.

Findings and Evidence:

A member of the visiting team met twice with the Associate Vice Chancellor of Information Technology, the Supervisor of Technology Support Services assigned to Oxnard College, the co-chairs of Standard IIC, the VCCCD Director of Technology Support Services, the OC Technology Committee Co-chairs, and the Co-chairs of the Distance Education Task Force. All documents provided for evidence were reviewed.

Due to fiscal challenges and repetition of services, the college technology functions have been reorganized to the district level information technology department. On campus provision of technology resources and support continue. The participatory governance Technology Committee has not met regularly; there is a planning agenda to address this. Various committees at the district level hold meetings to discuss technology issues including Banner Student Project Group, Distance Learning Task Force, and MyVCCCD Project Team. Administrative Technology Advisory Committee receives recommendations from all areas when significant resources are required. (III.C.1)

Technology enhancements for Oxnard College include installation of smart classrooms, and various computer technology/labs supported by a STEM grant. Use of the learning management system, Blackboard, increased from 2007-2010. In 2009-2010, the district and college engaged in a Learning Management System review process in order to provide a more stable and cost effective platform. The conversion from Blackboard to Desire2Learn occurred from fall of 2009 to spring 2010. Oxnard College is in compliance with the Higher Education Opportunity Act with regard to student identification in distance education courses.

Technology initiatives, hardware, and software is fiscally supported through a combination of district and college general fund allocations, STEM grant funding (expires 2011), and bond funding (through 2012). The ongoing assessment and planning of technology funding including allocation of personnel resources is a priority and addressed in a planning agenda. (III.C.1.a)

Technology training occurs both at the college and district level. Qualitative and some quantitative assessment of technology training needs occur for students, faculty, and staff. The new position for instructional technologist has provided the college with necessary support for online technology initiatives and technology training. The District Distance Education Task Force has begun to hold regular faculty meetings for information sharing. Expansion of faculty and student help desk hours is a planning agenda. (III.C.1.b)

Information technology has an ongoing planning process that includes the Oxnard College Technology Plan 2008-2011 and the OC Operational Plan draft 2010-2011.

Bond funding has provided technology infrastructure for the college as well as the technology needed in new construction projects including the Learning Resource Center expansion in 2012. Refresh planning and budget allocation occurs with resource evaluation and assessment to accommodate current budget restraints.

Information technology meets all criteria for disaster recovery, redundancy of network paths, and system backup.

The information technology infrastructure runs over dual OC3s with a SAN storage system and virtual blade servers. VCCCD is a member of the regional I-Net, a collaborative with Ventura County and the Ventura Unified School District for high-speed dark fiber in various areas of the county. Video surveillance is installed in parts of the campus with additional installations ongoing. The information technology division has invested in an opt-out student notification system for emergencies only. (III.C.1.c)

Smart classrooms are installed in 70 percent of classrooms and include: ceiling mounted projectors with closed captioned capabilities; DVD/VCR combo decks; self amplified powered speakers; projector control systems; VGA distribution amplifiers; document cameras; instructor multimedia workstations; and PC workstations with 17” LCD displays.

In order to support and enhance programs and services on campus, the program review process at Oxnard College drives technology needs. The OC Technology Committee makes recommendations to President’s Cabinet as well as the VP of Business Services and district Information Technology division. There is no program review process for Technology, and the assessment of the 2008-11 Technology Plan is not in evidence. (III.C.1.d)

Technology integration and planning is included in the overall planning processes at Oxnard College. The OC Educational Master Plan 2010-2015 includes the process for technology assessment and integration and is a component of any program review that moves forward through the Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee, who then forwards recommendations to the Planning and Budget Council. In addition, the information technology department works with the Campus Use, Development, and Safety Committee to integrate with facilities planning.

As both a cost saving and communication function, the college is moving more information to the website. The responsibility for management and operation of the website is provided by webmasters assigned to information technology. The college and college district have implemented a SharePoint and Luminis portal for communication. The MyVCCCD Project Team meets to discuss issues related to the ongoing portal implementation.

While Information Technology has planning processes in place through a district technology strategic plan and a college technology operational plan, there is no evidence of engaging college-wide assessment of IT. (III.C.2)

Conclusions:

The college partially meets the standard.

Recommendations:

None.

Commendations:

None.

D. Financial Resources

General Observations:

The district has significantly increased its ending balance of unrestricted funds during the past few years. The district has begun to set aside funding to meet its retiree benefit obligations, but the funds have not yet been placed in an irrevocable trust. A revised resource allocation process has improved the link between college institutional planning and the budget process.

Findings and Evidence:

The Ventura Community College District has a total budget for the 2010-11 fiscal year of over \$273 million, with a General Fund unrestricted budget of approximately \$159 million. Oxnard College's unrestricted funding is nearly \$26 million, or 19 percent of the district total, and is based on the district budget allocation model (BAM). The college Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC), created in 2006, establishes priorities for available funding above fixed costs, and makes recommendations to the college president for consideration. The state budget difficulties have resulted in minimal additional funding during the past few years, but the college has made adjustments in expenses and re-allocated resources to support educational programs and meet operational needs.

The college states the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) reviews the college mission and goals as part of the fiscal planning process, and there is evidence from PBC minutes to confirm this assertion, but it is limited. The PBC reviews funding requests based on criteria determined through committee discussion and related to institutional planning documents. However, this resource planning is only based on an annual budget cycle. The components of an effective planning process are in place, but the links to specific planning documents are not always clear. (III.D.1.a)

The primary basis for establishing budget priorities and recommendations for the college President is through the program review process and the PBC. The adopted budget and updated financial information are provided to the college community through the district's website, regular budget forums, college department meetings, and the PBC. The planning process includes projections for available resources for the current budget cycle, and identifies specific needs for the various college programs. (III.D.1.b)

The district has established processes for addressing long-term college obligations. A fund has been established to comply with the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) statements #43 and 45 for other post-employment benefits, with a current balance of approximately \$9.2 million. The district plans to ask the Board of Trustees for approval to place these funds in an irrevocable trust within the next few months. The district is using a "pay-as-you-go" approach to meet an actuarially determined \$174 million obligation. For the 2009-10 and 2010-11 fiscal years, the amount included in the adopted budget is less than the actuarially determined annual required contribution in anticipation of placing the \$9.2 million from the retiree health payment fund in an irrevocable trust. Participation in such a trust will lower both the liability and required annual contribution.

Building maintenance costs are included in the operating budgets, but total cost of ownership for capital improvement projects, including staffing, equipment, and other maintenance expenses has not been fully implemented. (III.D.1.c)

Financial information is provided through the district and college budget development committees, with representatives from college constituencies. The PBC establishes budget priorities and recommendations, and forwards these to the college president for review. Budget planning documents are distributed to constituency groups, and documents are available on the district's website. (III.D.1.d)

The district budget allocation model was revised in 2007 from an expenditure-driven to a revenue-driven approach. It was reviewed and modified again in 2009, with revisions to the class schedule delivery and FTES allocation components. These ongoing revisions are intended to ensure the model is objective based, formula-driven, easily understood and applied, and perceived as equitable. Total cost of ownership principles are not a component of the current model.

The Banner financial management system is used for ongoing monitoring of college and departmental budgets during the year. Department managers and staff have been trained on the use of the system for generating their own financial reports as needed.

All funds of the district are audited annually by an independent contract firm. There are relatively few management findings in these financial audits, and these were addressed and resolved. Measure S bond funds are also audited annually, with no findings and a conclusion that all expenditures were for authorized projects each year. (III.D.2.a)

Regular updates of the district's and college financial resources are provided at the PBC, and in budget forums, to ensure all groups are aware of current conditions to assist with planning and program development. Budget planning is an integrated process, but does not include a longer range perspective. (III.D.2.b)

Despite the state budget difficulties, the district has significantly increased its ending balance of unrestricted funds during the past few years. Besides the System Chancellor's Office required unrestricted general fund ending balance of 5 percent, the district Board of Trustees has designated an additional \$3,000,000 minimum to help cover unanticipated revenue shortfalls. The reserve balances have allowed the district to maintain adequate cash flow, even with the recent significant increase in apportionment deferrals. The district does not anticipate a need to borrow cash in the near term.

Some district and college functions have been consolidated, and the college has also made adjustments in expenses and re-allocated resources to support educational programs and meet operational needs. However, particularly with two new buildings nearing completion, concerns were expressed whether ongoing staffing reductions will allow the college to maintain expected levels of operational support in the future.

The district's insurance plan is through a Joint Powers Authority that allows unexpected losses to be spread over time, and it also carries a reserve specifically designated to cover self-insured deductibles and other expenses. (III.D.2.c)

The institution practices effective oversight of finances, including management of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contractual relationships, auxiliary organizations or foundations, and institutional investments and assets. Annual audits and financial reports were reviewed, and interviews conducted with the VP, Business Services and Institutional Advancement Specialist. (III.D.2.c)

College fiscal staff members help oversee and manage the college unrestricted budget. Contract, grants and foundation requests are thoroughly reviewed at the college level and forwarded to the district office for review and approval.

All funds of the district are audited annually by an independent contract firm. The few management findings in these audits were addressed and resolved. The Oxnard Foundation is also audited annually as required, with no findings noted. (III.D.2.d)

Agreements with outside agencies include Title 5 agreements with local high school and universities, a STEM agreement, and child care grants. Grants are reviewed for supporting the college mission before Board approval. (III.D.2.e)

Besides the annual audits, department managers perform program and fiscal reviews to assess their management of funds and respective needs. The PBC uses information from program reviews and budget documents to make recommendations on resource allocations to make college improvements. (III.D.2.f)

The district and college review instructional productivity measurements as one way to assess the effective use of resources. Program reviews are the basis for determining program needs. However, for the most part, these reviews are more descriptive rather than analytical, do not include outcomes assessment processes, and resource allocation requests are identified for only the current year. (III.D.3)

Conclusions:

The district is in a relatively strong financial position, and uses a budget allocation model to provide necessary resources to support educational programs and meet operational needs. Long-term obligations such as other post-employment benefits are being addressed. Total cost of ownership principles are not a component of the current BAM.

The Planning and Budgeting Council makes college resource allocation recommendations to the president for consideration, but these proposals are only based on an annual budget cycle. The components of an effective planning process are in place, but the links to specific planning documents are not always clear.

The college partially meets the standard.

Recommendations:

Oxnard College Recommendation 1: The team recommends, in order to reach sustainable continuous quality improvement for institutional planning, that the college further integrate long range strategic planning inclusive of the Educational Master Plan, Facilities Master Plan, Technology Plan and District/College goals and use an institutional outcomes assessment process that leads to improved institutional effectiveness (Standards I.A.1, I.B.3, II.B.3, II.B.4, II.C.2, III.A.6, III.B.2, III.C.2, III.D.3, IV.A.1, IV.A.5, IV.B.2.b).

Oxnard College Recommendation 5: The team recommends that capital planning and resource allocation processes include total cost of ownership principles. (Standards II.C.1.c, III.A.2, III.A.6, III.B.2.a, III.B.2.b, III.D.1.c, III.D.2.a).

Commendations:

The team commends the college for developing and completing many capital projects including new construction, safety and security enhancements, facilities and technology infrastructure replacement/upgrades, and campus accessibility.

The team commends the college for the outstanding appearance of the campus, including well-maintained buildings and grounds, and the cleanliness of both interior and exterior areas.

The team commends the College on a structure and process that encourages and prioritizes on-going professional development.

STANDARD IV Leadership and Governance

A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations:

The college functions in a participatory governance structure that allows for each constituency group to be represented. The structure is included in the Participatory Governance, Standing, Advisory, and Ad Hoc Committees Manual (2010). There are seven participatory governance committees which include Campus Use, Development, and Safety Committee, Curriculum Committee, Learning Outcomes Team, Professional Development Committee, Planning and Budgeting Council, Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee, and the Technology Committee. Each group (staff, faculty, administrators, and students) are represented on the committees, and the number of representatives varies by the individual group.

The information and decisions from each committee are then reported to the Academic Senate President for dissemination to the faculty. The district has several advisory committees which include the Chancellor's Cabinet, District Accreditation Coordination Workgroup (DACW), District Council on Administrative Service (DCAS), District Council on Human Resources (DCHR), District Council on Student Learning (DCSL), District Technical Review Workgroup (DTRW), Administrative Technology Advisory Committee (ATAC), and Distance Learning Task Force (DLTF). Each constituency has a role on the district groups.

At Oxnard College, the information and planning process is channeled through the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) which makes recommendations to the president. The president then consults the president's cabinet on final decisions.

As part of the participatory governance process, both the faculty and administrators have a channel of communication for exercising a voice in institutional policies, planning, and budgeting. Both groups have positions on the Planning and Budgeting Council which makes recommendations to the college president. The Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee forward the recommendations from the faculty to the Planning and Budgeting Council. As part of the participatory governance, the students and staff are also members on each of the committees. Each participatory governance committee consists of a faculty and administrator co-chair and representation from all groups.

The head of Institutional Research for the District was eliminated in July 2010 and the IT division is responsible for "data elements" reporting to the District Chancellor who assumed responsibility for district wide planning. This could be problematic for the college's ability to conduct comprehensive self evaluations with data analysis for planning.

The self assessment relative to engaging continuous quality improvement for college business services and educational services is limited. The college district in the areas of business services and human resources has not engaged in a full planning and assessment cycle with continuous quality improvement.

The Oxnard College Dean of Educational Services and Research position created in 2007 was eliminated due to budget issues. The college research analyst is responsible for providing data to the college community.

The Oxnard College Institutional Self Study as well as the Oxnard College Budget Planning, Development, and Management Process 2009-2010 indicates that the business services department engage in a self assessment process entitled Continuous Quality Improvement. In practice, business services engage in program review that is internal to the business services area, but it is unclear if the assessment is used for improvement the following year.

Concerns regarding linkages for the various planning documents include the Oxnard College: strategic plan; participatory governance, standing, advisory and ad-hoc committee manual 2010; budget planning, development, and management process 2009-2010; technology plan 2008-2010; and the educational master plan 2010-2015; as well as the VCCCD participatory governance handbook 2010 and VCCCD strategic plan.

Despite needs for integrated planning with comprehensive self assessment, no planning agendas exist for Standard IV.A.

Findings and Evidence:

The college does have a shared governance manual (IV.A.1) which was adopted in August 2010 and gives details on the makeup of various committees, their objectives, when the committee meets and their internal evaluation process.

A member of the visiting team met with the District Vice Chancellor for Business and Administrative Services, the college President, the college Vice President for Business Services, the college educational Executive Vice President, the Academic Senate President, the campus based Director for Technology Support Services, the District Associate Vice Chancellor for Technology Support Services, the co-chairs for the Planning and Budgeting Council committee, the co-chairs for the Program Evaluation and Planning Committee, the co-chairs of the Technology Committee, and the co-chairs of the Professional Development Committee. All documents provided for evidence were reviewed.

The curriculum committee and Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee (PEPC) provide input to the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) who then provides recommendations to the president. Through appointments from Associated Student Government, Academic Senate, and Classified Senate, students, faculty, and staff are systemically integrated in the overall governance processes. (IV.A.1)

Student services conducts program review, evaluation, and assessment within student services on an annual basis. PEPC, Business Services, and Student Services submit resource needs to the PBC which then provides recommendations to the president. (IV.A.1)

The Oxnard College Participatory Governance, Standing, Advisory, and Ad-Hoc Committee Manual 2010-2013 outlines the college's governance committee process. The manual provides for appointments from Associated Student Government, Academic Senate, and Classified Senate

to assure that students, faculty, and staff have an opportunity to be systemically integrated in the overall governance processes. Oxnard College instructional program review processes feed into the Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee (PEPC) that forwards prioritizations to the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC), who makes recommendations for prioritization and funding to the college president. The governance and standing committees have a process to engage in annual self evaluation. There is no evidence of sustainable and continuous quality improvement through an ongoing self assessment process. (IV.A.1)

Student services do not have a direct link to the participatory governance structure, but do have the standing committee, Student Success. Student Services Committee is a campus-wide committee not dedicated specifically to Student Services. Business administrative services are partially represented through the participatory governance committee, Campus Use, Development and Safety. Business administrative services are also represented on the PEPC. Business administrative services are not a part of standing committee processes. (IV.A.2.a)

Instructional services are represented in the participatory governance structure through Curriculum Committee (Academic Senate), Learning Outcomes Team Committee (Academic Senate), Technology Committee (Academic Senate), and Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee. Standing Committees are not participatory governance committees, but function in the governance and planning processes. Instructional services are linked to standing committees through the Distance Education and Transitional Studies (Basic Skills). Faculty, staff, and students participate and provide recommendations to appropriate constituencies.

The Board of Trustees receives recommendations from the college's Academic Senate in academic and professional matters under the mutual agreement option (Board Policy 2510). The recommendations are made to each college administration and the District on specific academic and professional matters (Participatory Governance Handbook).

Student learning programs and services rely on faculty participation and input through the Curriculum Committee and the District Technical Review Workgroup. College faculty working within their disciplines, establish and assess student learning outcomes that are communicated through the Learning Outcomes Team. Counseling faculty work with student services in the program review process. (IV.A.2.b)

Institutional governance structures exist for broad based communication and participatory decision-making. Each participatory governance committee has representation from the college stakeholders. Standing committees, task force, and ad hoc committees have identified representation and governance processes.

The self evaluation study expresses concerns over participatory governance practices and transparency. In addition, concern regarding the effectiveness of the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) in responding to budget reductions is indicated. Due to a lack of evidence as well as inconsistencies in the college planning documents, these claims were unverifiable. No planning agenda was provided. (IV.A.3)

While not addressed in the Oxnard College Institutional Self Study, the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources provided information upon request on the audit by Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Company, LLP revealing a lack of minimum qualifications and/or equivalencies for a total of 110 full and part time faculty district-wide. This may indicate a lack of full disclosure by the college and/or the District in their self study process. (IV.A.4)

The Oxnard College Participatory Governance, Standing, Advisory and Ad-Hoc Committee Manual -- 2010 provides the structure and process for the college community to engage in ongoing dialogue, assessment, and improvement. The adherence to the process is not uniform. (IV.A.5)

Conclusions:

The college has engaged in the shared governance process and faculty, staff, administrators, and students can bring forward ideas and concerns to representatives of their respective group. The participatory governance process needs to be disseminated to all involved constituencies. Through the interviews and evidence, some constituencies are unclear of their role in the process, who can be voting members, and how many members are actually on a particular committee. Effective communication needs to be disseminated to all groups in a clear and timely manner (IV.A.3).

Planning documents are not fully linked and inconsistencies exist between actual planning processes and the planning documents. The results of self assessment are not ubiquitous or widely distributed. No planning agendas were provided in Standard IV.A.

The college partially meets the standard.

Recommendations:

Oxnard College Recommendation 1: The team recommends, in order to reach sustainable continuous quality improvement for institutional planning, that the college further integrate long range strategic planning inclusive of the Educational Master Plan, Facilities Master Plan, Technology Plan and District/College goals and use an institutional outcomes assessment process that leads to improved institutional effectiveness (Standards I.A.1, I.B.3, II.B.3, II.B.4, II.C.2, III.A.6, III.B.2, III.C.2, III.D.3, IV.A.1, IV.A.5, IV.B.2.b).

Oxnard College Recommendation 2: The team recommends that the college develop and implement a communication plan that facilitates awareness within the college community regarding institutional efforts to achieve goals and improve student learning (Standards I.B.1, IV.A.3, IV.B.2.e).

Commendations:

None.

B. Board and Administrative Organization

General Observations:

The district provides overall leadership to the colleges through the delegation of authority from the chancellor to the president. The District Administrative Center (DAC) provides support for many services in a centralized format that lends to better efficiency and effectiveness at the colleges. The delineation of roles and communication with the Board of Trustees is clearly documented by policy. The district fulfills its role ensuring budget integrity and distribution of resources. Many processes are in place; however, the assessment of those processes leading to continuous improvement is minimal.

Communication and assessment of processes appear to be the greatest issues with the Board. This is evidenced through a review of board meetings as well as interviews with board members. There has not been a regularly scheduled review of policies and procedures and no assessment of processes, especially as it relates to strategic planning and decision making processes.

Board members' professional development is individually driven as opposed to a strategic goal for all board members.

The Oxnard College administrative structure continues to change, at the discretion of the president, based on budget and task functionality. The campus has had its human resources decreased due to budget cuts and course retrenchment. The president has managed to maintain the integrity of the college as enrollment has increased and budgets dwindled.

The president also is a communicative leader and involved various constituencies in planning and development. This communication is also observed in internal and external relationships to the college include committees, College Foundation, and the community at-large.

The president has also been instrumental in providing direction to planning; however, the college has minimal involvement with an outcomes assessment process.

There is no evidence that the President has been evaluated even though the Vice President of Business Services and the Executive Vice President have been evaluated in the previous academic year.

Findings and Evidence:

The governing board consists of five elected officials by geographical region. The Board acts as one unit in its decision making processes, though, due to the represented area, the interests of the entire district can become territorial. Board members represent the district at various events district-wide and at specific college events. There is progress, through interview with the president and board members, that the broader district perspective in decision making is becoming more apparent. (IV.B.1.a)

Policies are developed to be consistent with the mission and are facilitated by the Chancellor to

ensure consistency. The board reviews the mission statement of the district and the college as well as set district-wide strategic planning goals annually. There is a lack of assessing their processes that would lead to continuous improvement. While most staff indicate either a positive or neutral perception of board policy and mission development, there was a small percentage who indicated, through surveys, that the Board did not strictly adhere to their policy role. (IV.B.1.b)

The Board adopts academic and curricular policies based on appropriate Title 5 and California Education Code sections. All legal issues are discussed with the Board and the Board makes final decisions on legal matters. The Board provides fiscal oversight and approves the tentative and final FY budgets, appropriate purchases and capital expenditures. The Board has not formally assessed its processes in assuring educational quality, legal and financial integrity. (IV.B.1.c)

The board has passed policies on size, duties, responsibilities, structure and operating procedures. Additionally, it has had workshops facilitated by CCLC, Association of Governments, ACCCT and ACCJC. Through discussion with senior district and college staff and through interviews with Board members, the Board needs to assess its policies and bylaws for continuous quality improvement and make appropriate reports reflecting the assessment. (IV.B.1.d)

Though there has been a review of board policies recently, there is no evidence of regular and consistent assessment of those policies and procedures that would lead to continuous improvement. (IV.B.1.e)

The majority of the board, absent one member, has been through board member orientation. Additionally, several groups (ACCCT, Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, and CCCT) have presented workshops contributing to board development. There is no evidence of on-going Board professional development that leads to improve its primary role in assuring effective student learning and services. (IV.B.1.f)

The Board's self-evaluation is bi-annual and clearly defined and published in Board policy. However, there is no formal assessment, analysis and discussion of the results and how they are used to inform continuous improvement. (IV.B.1.g)

A Code of Ethics has been adopted with a disciplinary action of censure for non-compliance. Administrative procedures related to the policy are in development. (IV.B.1.h)

The governing board has been made fully aware of the accreditation process by the Chancellor and Presidents. The Board approved the self-studies and participated in interviews with Team members. (IV.B.1.i)

Trustees, pursuant to Board Policy 2431, have the responsibility for the selection of the chancellor. The Governing Board has vested into the Chancellor the authority to implement and administer board policies and is held accountable for the operation of the district and the evidence is for this authority is found in Board Policy 2430. (IV.B.1.j)

The president is responsible for planning, overseeing and evaluating the administrative structure of Oxnard College. In 2008, the president identified changes in the administrative structure and after assessing the structure with interim appointments, returned to a structure consistent with district wide structures. The president also decreased staff to maximize budgets and has begun to hire in areas (i.e., Title 5 Coordinator) where staffing is necessary for effective program operations. The president has delegated appropriate authority to staff and evaluates staff annually. (IV.B.2.a)

The president meets weekly with the President's Executive Staff as well as the cabinet consisting of senior staff, all deans, Maintenance and Operations (M&O) Director, and the STEM Director. Further, the president meets weekly with the Academic Senate President. The president has been involved in a "hands-on" mode in staff development and has successfully doubled the funds available for professional development. The president reviews grants and programs fully with the cabinet prior to submission to the Chancellor. Also, the president has taken an active role in the Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee (PEPC) and the Planning and Budget Council (PBC) in ensuring that their responsibilities are met. There is minimal evidence that the processes of this committee and council have been evaluated in line with continuous improvement. (IV.B.2.b)

The president supports compliance with board policies and through the strategic planning process, ensures that college planning is reflective of District Board strategic planning and goals. (IV.B.2.c)

The president works with management to oversee budget development and implementation and ensure that the college operates within the college budget. The President hosts campus forums and meets with each manager in budget development. The process of budget development, however, has not been assessed. (IV.B.2.d)

The president is very active in the community- business, education and residential. He is a requested community speaker and is actively engaged locally as well as nationally as a board member of AACC and serving on the National Community College Hispanic Council. He is also a visible leader and communicates with all constituencies on campus as reported by faculty, staff and committee members. (IV.B.2.e)

The general responsibilities and functions of the Oxnard College committees is found in the Oxnard College Participatory Governance Handbook. However, there is no clearly defined organizational mapping at the District that indicates the specific responsibilities and functions of each unit of both the college and the District. The District Administrative Center provides centralized services including communications, emergency services, information technology, economic development, human resources, labor relations, fiscal and budgeting, planning, and research. Though the roles and responsibilities of these services are communicated through the various participatory governance groups, there is no defined connection between these entities and college and district-wide committees. (IV.B.3.a)

The district provides centralized services in a cost effective and efficient manner. However, there has been no assessment of these services. A planning agenda has been devoted to assessing

district-wide services. (IV.B.3.b)

The funding model, based on productivity, was adopted by the Board of Trustees in 2007 and addresses the needs of Oxnard. The model was refined in 2008 that reflected actual productivity as opposed to projected productivity as a part of the district allocation formula. Administrators and faculty alike reported support for the model and considered the allocation equitable. (IV.B.3.c)

The District has successfully addressed shortfalls in its budget through expenditure controls. These controls consist of personnel reductions/lay-offs, reduction of classes, and increased productivity. The Vice Chancellor of Business oversees general business and administrative practices and annual audits have supported this expenditure control. Oxnard's Planning and Budgeting Council also reviews campus budgets and makes recommendations to the president. The budgeting process, though it appears effective, has not been assessed as to its processes and functionality. (IV.B.3.d)

Oxnard's President has delegated authority from the Chancellor for the operations of the college. The Chancellor's cabinet meets regularly where Oxnard's President interacts with the other district presidents and presents and supports items from the campus. The president is evaluated by the Chancellor on an annual basis, though there was no evidence of an evaluation for the 2009-10 academic year. The president also facilitates campus strategic planning based on board goals and expectations. With the exception of management personnel decisions, which are made by the Chancellor's cabinet in consultation with the president, the president has full authority for allocation of resources within the allocated college budget. (IV.B.3.e)

The chancellor serves as an effective liaison between the college presidents and the Board of Trustees. The chancellor has established an environment of trust with the district presidents and advocates effectively on their behalf with the Board. Communication policies have been created to ensure that communication with the board follows an organized format. The employee code of ethics (Board Policy 7205) was adopted by the Board to strengthen the communication processes within the district with Board members. (IV.B.3.f)

Through interviews of the Board members and the college president, there is no evidence of on-going assessment of decision-making processes and governance used to improve services and processes. Though a planning agenda was created to assess all district services, there have been no formal assessments, and a formalized process is planned to be operational by spring 2011. (IV.B.3.g)

Conclusions:

In all the planning documents with the Board, there has been no assessment that leads to improvement. There is no clear documentation on organizational maps that delineate primary and second responsibility – though that process is understood. There needs to be ongoing review of policies and procedures and assessment of organizational structures in an ongoing formalized sequence. In the past, through discussions with Board members, taking advantage of professional development is left to the individual Board members and as such, limited

development outside of district seminars presented by organizations such as ACCJC, the League and ACCCT. There needs to be ongoing development in engaging all board members in professional development.

This standard has been partially met.

Recommendations:

Oxnard College Recommendation 1: The team recommends, in order to reach sustainable continuous quality improvement for institutional planning, that the college further integrate long range strategic planning inclusive of the Educational Master Plan, Facilities Master Plan, Technology Plan and District/College goals and use an institutional outcomes assessment process that leads to improved institutional effectiveness (Standards I.A.1, I.B.3, II.B.3, II.B.4, II.C.2, III.A.6, III.B.2, III.C.2, III.D.3, IV.A.1, IV.A.5, IV.B.2.b).

Oxnard College Recommendation 2: The team recommends that the college develop and implement a communication plan that facilitates awareness within the college community regarding institutional efforts to achieve goals and improve student learning (Standards I.B.1, IV.A.3, IV.B.2.e).

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 (Standards IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3.g).

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

District Recommendation 3: 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 (Standard IV.B.3).

District Recommendation 4: 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 (Standards III.A.1.b, III.A.3, IV.B.3).

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

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 (Standards IV.A.3, IV.B.1.e-g).

Commendations:

The team commends the College on a structure and process that encourages and prioritizes ongoing professional development.