

OXNARD COLLEGE

MIDTERM REPORT

Submitted to:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Submitted by:

Oxnard College
4000 S. Rose Avenue
Oxnard, California 93033

Date here

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges,
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

From:

Dr. Luis Sanchez, Interim President
Oxnard College
4000 S. Rose Avenue, Oxnard, CA 93033

I certify there was broad participation/review by the campus community and believe this report accurately reflects the nature and substances of this institution.

Signatures:

Dr. Greg Gillespie, Chancellor, Ventura County Community College District (Date)

Mr. Bernardo Perez, Chairperson, Board of Trustees, Ventura County Community College District (Date)

Dr. Luis Sanchez, Interim President, Oxnard College (Date)

Dr. Art Sandford, Accreditation Liaison Officer, Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs (Date)

Amparo Medina, Classified Senate President (Date)

Christian Franco, Associated Student Government President (Date)

Dr. Amy Edwards, President, Oxnard College Academic Senate (Date)

Table of Contents

DRAFT

Statement of Report Preparation

The Oxnard College 2020 Accreditation Midterm Report was prepared in an inclusive and systematic process, providing for multiple opportunities for input and revision by all campus constituencies. The report provides an update on accomplishments and progress made as a result of the comprehensive accreditation visit in 2016, as well as further implementation of college-wide initiatives resulting from the 18-month follow-up report in 2017.

Oxnard College leadership coordinated the preparation of this report with its sister colleges, adhering to an agreed-upon timeline. **(EVIDENCE VCCCD Midterm Report Timeline)**

The midterm report was prepared in accordance with this schedule, created by the ALO in September 2019:

Midterm Report Process and Timeline

ALO drafts timeline for preparing Midterm Report	September 2019
ALO, Deans, VPs, Senate Presidents/ASG recruit Accreditation Team members	September 2019
ALO and Senate Presidents convene Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) ASC conducts Gap Analyses of all sections of the report	October 2019
ASC establishes workgroups and they begin writing their sections of report	October – Dec. 2019
Workgroups submit drafts to ALO and co-chairs	January 2020
Preliminary Draft of Midterm Report vetted at Academic Senate, Classified Senate, ASG, All-Campus Forum / First Draft submitted to District	February 2020
First and Second Readings of Midterm Report at ASG, Academic Senate, Classified Senate	March – April 2020
President’s Cabinet reviews Final Draft of Midterm Report	May 2020
Draft submitted to District Policy, Planning and Student Success Committee	May 2020
Draft submitted to Chancellor’s Cabinet	May 2020
Draft submitted to Consultation Council	May 2020
Draft submitted for Board of Trustees first reading	June 16, 2020
Draft submitted for Board of Trustees second reading	June 23, 2020
Report sent for publication	July 2020
Report submitted to ACCJC	September 2020

The following members of the College Community contributed to this report:

Dr. Amy Edwards	Academic Senate President
Amparo Martinez	Classified Senate President
Christopher Renbarger	Vice President, Business Services
Dr. Oscar Cobian	Vice President, Student Success
Dr. Art Sandford	Vice President, Academic Affairs
Dr. Keller Magenau	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness
Shannon Davis	Articulation Officer
Janet Dawald	Technical Data Specialist
Dr. Luis Gonzalez	Dean, Library, Liberal Studies

Laura Gentry	Instructional Technologist/Designer
Dr. Carolyn Inouye	Dean, Math, Science, Health, PE, Athletics
Joel Diaz	Registrar
Linda Faasua	Financial Aid Director
Dr. Linda Kama'ila	Professor of Anthropology
Elissa Caruth	Professor of English
Kevin Corse	Automotive Technology Faculty
Gabriela Rodriguez	Student Activities Specialist
Dr. Leah Alarcon	Dean of Student Services
Matthew Jewett	Assistant Dean, Public Safety
Susan Lawrence	Administrative Assistant, Institutional Effectiveness
Laurie Nelson-Nusser	Senior Administrative Assistant, Academic Affairs

DRAFT

Accreditation Midterm Report – Section 5. Plans Arising from Self-Evaluation Process (2016)

Standard and Plan	Update	Next Steps
<p>Standard I.A Mission</p> <p>Develop a process and a timeline for reviewing and making necessary changes to the College Mission, Vision and Values during the 2016-17 academic year.</p>	<p>The Mission, Vision and Values were reviewed during the process of drafting the 2016 ISER. The College leadership has established a date for a campus-wide planning retreat to be held in April 2020, with the goal of making this an annual event in which the Mission, Vision and Values are reviewed and revised as needed.</p>	<p>Include time and format for reviewing Mission, Visions, and Values at Annual Planning Retreat. Codify in Participatory Governance Manual.</p>
<p>Standard I.A.4 Strategic Plan</p> <p>Complete a College Strategic Plan by June 2017.</p>	<p>Strategic Plan was completed in May 2018.</p> <p>(KELLER TO BEEF UP)</p>	<p>Strategic Plan objectives and actions will be updated annually. Objectives at the department, program and service unit level need to be incorporated into the annual program review process for updates and revision.</p>
<p>Standard I.B. Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness</p> <p>Complete an Educational Master Plan (EMP) by spring 2017.</p>	<p>Current EMP expired in December 2019. The process for drafting a new EMP will begin in earnest in spring 2020, and be incorporated into the Annual Planning Retreat in April 2020.</p>	<p>Include time and format for reviewing EMP at Annual Planning Retreat.</p>
<p>Standard I.B</p>		

<p>The Academic Affairs Division of the College Administration will develop Student Learning Outcomes to assess its performance in improving instruction.</p> <p>(REWORD & REREAD ISER)</p>	<p>The Academic Affairs Division completed an extensive program review in fall 2019. The program review document highlighted achievements and challenges in all of its service areas: Distance Education, Program Review technical support, SLO technical support, Accreditation, Enrollment Management, Curriculum and Articulation.</p> <p>Program was reviewed by Program Effectiveness & Planning Committee (PEPC) in spring 2020.</p>	<p>The Academic Affairs Division has begun an information and training campaign to assist faculty with improving their processes for SLO assessment, documenting the assessments, analyzing the data, and incorporating that analysis into the program review process for each instructional program. Discussions and trainings have taken place at Academic Senate, Department Chairs Council, Deans Council, and Student Success Committee. The VPAA staff created and disseminated a step-by-step training video for managing SLO assessments in eLumen. For fall 2020, faculty facilitators will be selected to assist their colleagues with the SLO assessment process.</p>
<p>Standard I.B. 4 and II.C</p> <p>Student Services to develop, assess and document assessments and mapping of SLOs/SUOs.</p>	<p>All Student Services programs have developed, mapped, and are assessing SUOs. Student Services programs use surveys, sign-in sheets, and other measures to track their progress in meeting SUOs. As an example, the Admissions and Records Office conducts student surveys via Survey Monkey in the spring and fall semesters to measure the two SUOs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students will leave our office with a feeling of satisfaction that their needs have been met (mapped to Initiative II.A.). 	<p>Student Services programs will continue to develop and refine the process for developing and assessing SUOs. These SUO assessments will be incorporated into the revised program review template for student services during the 2020-21 program review cycle.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GI Bill recipients are knowledgeable of benefits and services available to them and are informed of the military service-related rights and benefits (mapped to Initiative II.A.). <p>Results from the surveys are used to determine if they are meeting the needs of students and if improvements in the current process can be refined. A staff meeting is held annually to discuss the results and any changes to the current process. (NEED EVIDENCE)</p>	
<p>Standard II.C.</p> <p>Establish a robust on-line counseling system that will be accessible through the college website and student portal. Students will be able to access counseling services online for the following services: complete an educational plan, transfer and career advisement, and follow-up services.</p>	<p>In fall, 2019 the Dean of Student Services established an implementation team consisting of the Dean, Counseling department chair, two full-time counselors and one office assistant.</p> <p>The team created an implementation plan (link to evidence). The dean emailed all counselors and instructed them on how to set up a Zoom professional license (link to evidence) provided for free by the State Chancellor's Office. On December 5, 2019, counselors at CSU Channel Islands presented a workshop about how they implemented and use Zoom. This information served as the guide for OC's implementation and process (link to evidence).</p>	<p>The implementation team will work in the spring 2020 on setting up how appointments will be scheduled and will create guidelines and training for counselors and students.</p> <p>Online counseling will be piloted by three counselors in spring 2020 with the goal to have all counselors trained and using Zoom by summer 2020.</p>

<p>Standard III.B. 4 Facilities</p> <p>The college will hire a consultant to help develop an updated Facilities Master Plan (FMP).</p>	<p>The current Facilities Master Plan is a component of the recently expired Educational Master Plan (EMP). The Vice President of Business Services and the Director of Maintenance and Operations convened a Facilities Master Plan Workgroup in December 2019.</p>	<p>The college will hire a consultant to facilitate the FMP drafting process in spring 2020. The FMP will be vetted campus-wide and sent for Board approval before the end of the fall 2020 semester.</p>
<p>Standard IV.A. Participatory Governance</p> <p>Develop an evaluation/revision cycle for participatory governance processes and structures as outlined in the Participatory Governance Manual (PGM).</p>	<p>The Participatory Governance Work Group is in the process of reviewing and revising the PGM. All PG committees were tasked with reviewing and revising their charges and committee names.</p>	<p>The revised PGM will be vetted through the Senates in Spring 2020. As part of the revised participatory governance structure at the college, the College Planning Council will conduct an annual review of participatory governance as outlined in the PGM.</p>
<p>Standard IV.B. 4</p> <p>All participatory governance committees' agendas will reference relevant accreditation Standards.</p>	<p>All PG committees are including relevant accreditation Standards on their agenda.</p>	<p>Continue practice.</p>

Recommendations to Meet the Standards Section 6.A

College Recommendation 1

In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College develop, implement, and assess its academic, student services, and business services plans for human, physical, technological, and financial resources. College integrated plans and processes must be developed, implemented, and assessed informing resource allocation decisions for the replacement of equipment and technology, repair and maintenance of buildings and facilities, and the hiring of instructional and non-instructional personnel initiated through Program Review.

(Standard I.A.2, I.A.3, I.B.2, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.8, I.B.9, III.A.6, III.A.9, III.B.2, III.B.4, III.C.2, III.D.1, III.D.2, III.D.3, III.D.4, IV.A.2, IV.A.3, IV.A.4, IV.A.6, IV.B.3; ER 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 14, 18, 19)

Summary

In September of 2016, Oxnard College received one *Recommendation to Meet Standards* that bridged multiple Standards. The Commission reaffirmed Oxnard College's accreditation for an 18-month period, and required the college to complete a follow-up report to address how the college had met, or was meeting, the above Standards. The college submitted the Institutional Follow-Up Report to the ACCJC in October 2017 and, in June 2018, the college received notice from the Commission that it had reaffirmed Oxnard College's accreditation for the remainder of the seven-year accreditation cycle.

Prior to the college receiving official notification of the Commission's action (in February, 2017), the college leadership had begun to formulate a plan for addressing the deficiencies in strategic and integrated planning processes. In the months following receipt of the recommendation, college leadership mobilized to form a task force to coordinate the college's efforts. Administrators, faculty and staff began the process of drafting the follow-up report in spring 2017. In fall of 2017, college accreditation team leaders conducted two all-campus forums during which they presented the highlights of the draft report and engaged in collegial dialogue with attendees. Accreditation team leaders then guided the report through the rest of the vetting process, including at President's Cabinet, Planning and Budget Council, Student Services Leadership Team, Associated Student Government, Classified Senate, and Academic Senate (first and second readings).

Update on Strategic Planning

Completion and implementation of the 2018-2023 Strategic Plan was an essential component of the college's efforts to address the Commission's recommendation. The process for completing the plan took some 18 months and involved faculty, classified professionals, administrators, students, and the community. The implementation of the plan is an on-going process, one that helps guide the college's efforts to integrate planning, assessment of outcomes, and resource allocations, while remaining true to the college's mission.

The college employed an inclusive, systematic, four-step approach to the creation of the Strategic Plan. The first step of the process involved creating a Strategic Planning Steering

Committee (SPSC) to guide the process from start to finish to implementation. The SPSC conducted an environmental scan, analyzing relevant demographic, economic, and labor market data. Thirdly, the SPSC led the review and discussion of the college's mission, vision, and values, soliciting input from faculty, classified professionals, and administrators. Finally, the SPSC coordinated the collection of feedback from students and the community.

As a result of these efforts, the SPSC proposed four Strategic Planning Initiatives:

- I. Innovate to achieve equitable and inclusive student success.
- II. Provide outstanding integrated college programs and services.
- III. Invest in people, planning and support structures.
- IV. Actively partner with the community.

For each initiative, three to four goals were created, vetted and agreed upon by the campus community. Additionally, the college developed Institutional Objectives, aligned to one or more initiatives and goals. These three objectives are:

1. Review OC's Participatory Governance process(es) and enhance as needed to maintain compliance with ACCJC and regulatory requirements by end of spring 2019.

Update:

In response to this recommendation, and to comments from Accreditation visiting team members, the college is re-designing its participatory governance committees in order to reduce confusion, eliminate redundancies, and to foster a more inclusive campus decision-making environment. Revisions to the college's participatory governance processes have been extensive and ongoing, but are still under review and modification as of this writing. As will be discussed in the update on the integrated planning process (page XX), the college has implemented changes to the program review process in order to be more inclusive and transparent, and to strengthen the links between program performance data, program review, and resource allocations.

Parallel to this process, the Participatory Governance Workgroup has been meeting regularly since XXXX, and has encouraged broader participation in the reformation of the participatory governance bodies and systems. The PG workgroup requested that each PG committee review its description, charge and membership, and that they propose and discuss changes at the committee level, and with the Academic Senate and other constituent groups. Significant changes are being proposed for spring 2020 adoption and fall 2020 implementation.

It was noted by the visiting team in 2016 that college has two participatory governance committees that include the word "planning" in their title: PEPC (Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee) and PBC (Planning and Budget Council.) It was not clear to the team, however, where any actual planning took place. As a result, under consideration is the modification of the Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee to become simply the Program Review Committee (PRC), given that the primary responsibility of this committee is

program review. Further, the Planning and Budget Council (PBC), will be re-purposed as the Budget Committee (BC). The BC will be charged with reviewing college budgeting procedures, analyze the sustainability of programs and services, and ensure that all budgeting and spending be consistent with the College's Mission, Vision and Values. In addition, the BC will take on the task of collecting, analyzing and presenting cost data from resource requests arising from the program review process. These vetted and ranked resource requests will then be passed on to the new College Planning Council (CPC) for review and final recommendation to the college president.

Among other functions, the CPC will be responsible for making recommendations to the college president regarding college planning, budgetary priorities, and participatory governance structures and functions. It will serve as the forum in which to discuss program improvement plans and program discontinuance. The CPC will be representative body of faculty, classified professionals, administrators, and students.

2. Develop and implement Guided Pathways and make them easily accessible for students by 2022.

Update:

The Guided Pathways (GP) work group has been meeting on a monthly basis since September of 2018. The group began by reviewing dozens of examples of career and major clusters, or meta-majors, at other community colleges. They completed, vetted and submitted the GP Work Plan to the State of California Chancellor's Office, and identified eight of the 14 "Key Elements" of the plan to address in the first year of implementation. The work group has attended multiple training sessions, conferences, and webinars that led to the drafting of eight career clusters, or "areas of interest" that were then vetted, edited and ultimately adopted by the Academic Senate. The committee leaders completed, vetted and submitted the GP "Scale of Adoption" to the State Chancellor's Office in February 2019. In the spring of 2019, the GP work group finalized the college meta-majors/areas of interest.

In the summer of 2019, GP leaders hired faculty as professional experts to work collaboratively on the mapping of all college majors to the eight chosen areas of interest. During the fall 2019 semester, the mapping of degree/certificate programs to areas of interest was completed, and presented to the local GP work group and the district-wide GP workgroup for discussion and alignment among the three colleges in the District. The next step in the process is to align careers to areas of interest and our degree/certificate programs. This work is expected to be completed in spring of 2020.

Once this step is completed, the GP work group will work with instructional departments on creating course sequences that can be aligned with degree/certificate programs & areas of interest. This work is expected to begin in the summer and fall of 2020. The goal will be to have completed draft program maps to be vetted during the spring of 2021.

3. Develop and implement an integrated institution-wide Communication Plan by spring 2020.

Update:

The Communication Plan Workgroup formed in spring 2019 and developed a Campus Communication Survey. Prior to administering the survey, however, there was a shake-up in senior college leadership, which disrupted the workgroup's plan. Parallel to this process, though, the District had contracted with a consultant group, Collaborative Brain Trust, to conduct an in-depth survey and analysis of employee perceptions. The data from this study will inform the outline of the draft Communication Plan. With the turnover in senior leadership, and the anticipated hiring of a Director of Marketing and Outreach in fall 2019, the Communication Plan Workgroup went on hiatus in fall 2019. The group will re-form in spring 2020, with faculty, classified professional, and administrator tri-chairs, and with the support of the new Director of Marketing and Outreach, to complete the Communication Plan by the end of the spring 2020 semester.

In the interim, the Communication Plan Workgroup prioritized the creation and vetting of a Crisis Communication Plan for the college. This plan was written in October 2019 with assistance from faculty in the Public Safety program and Campus Police and provides guidelines and procedures for college personnel for the coordination of communication in case of a campus or outside emergency affecting the campus. The plan identifies key personnel and defines their roles in the communication process at the college and between the college and the media.

Update on Integrated Planning Processes:

The college has succeeded in bringing all campus areas and operations into the annual program review and resource allocation process. Prior to the implementation of an integrated planning process, differing areas of college operations conducted their own version of program review, with little to no coordination or consistency. This lack of coordination and consistency created the appearance of a lack of transparency in resource allocations and hampered efforts to improve the college's overall effectiveness.

Beginning in fall 2018, as a result of the implementation of an integrated planning/resource allocation process, each college program or service area, whether academic, student services, or business services, submits either an annual (abbreviated) or multi-year (more in-depth) Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Report (PEPR). Members of the Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee (PEPC) review discuss and rate the effectiveness of each program based on their report. Programs or service areas that request additional resources must justify those requests based on program effectiveness data. The PEPC leadership collects the resource requests and distributes them to the college committee or work group charged with providing leadership in that area. For example, requests for additional full-time faculty are sent to the Academic Senate for their consideration. Likewise, requests for additional classified personnel are sent to the Classified Senate. The Technology Task Force reviews requests for computers and instructional technology. Campus Use, Development and Safety (CUDS) coordinate requests for new or improvement to existing facilities. With input from faculty and Classified professionals, the Deans Council reviews requests for instructional supplies and equipment.

Program Review Resource Request Review Process

Resource Category	Assigned to:
Classified Personnel	Classified Senate
Full-Time Faculty Positions	Academic Senate
Equipment Technology	Technology Effectiveness Committee
Instructional Equipment	Deans Council
Instructional Supplies	Deans Council
Facility Improvements of Capital Projects	Campus Use Development and Safety Committee
Non-Instructional Equipment	Business Services Council
Professional Development	Professional Development Committee

Each committee reviews and ranks each request, and then sends those recommendations to the Planning and Budget Council (PBC). The PBC reviews and discusses the committees' findings and rankings, and then sends its final recommendations to the college president. There are opportunities at PEPC and PBC for those programs requesting resources to provide additional input in support of their requests. Finally, the college's Executive Team reviews all resource requests prior to finalizing and communicating the prioritized lists to the campus community.

Central to the creation of an integrated program review, planning and resource allocation is the evaluation of the process. Each spring semester, PEPC members take time to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the process and to make the required modifications. Members discuss the relevancy of the data provided to each program, the readability and accessibility of the data, and the timeline for completing the program effectiveness reports, and the manner and timing of the review of each program. For example, in order to improve the efficacy of the program review process, PEPC will be considering moving away from the current fillable pdf format, to the use of the existing *eLumen* program review product, which is fully integrated with the Student Learning Outcome assessment data for each program.

The integration of program review and resource allocation processes across all sectors of the college has improved transparency and accountability at all levels of college operations. With these campus-wide reforms, the college has developed a process that ensures that programs and service areas engage in self-evaluation, and are also evaluated by their peers. Requests for additional resources must be justified using relevant program data, and resource allocations for technology, equipment, personnel and facilities are aligned to this peer-review, transparent process.

Recommendation 2a:

Oxnard College Distance Education (DE) is primarily the responsibility of the Distance Education Committee, a subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee and advisory to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Student Learning. The elements of distance education at Oxnard College include the following: Collective Bargaining Agreement parameters; Distance Education Handbook; Faculty Training; & Support for DE Students.

The parameters for faculty involvement in distance education are outlined in the District collective bargaining agreement, which states, "... as instruction in which the instructor and student are separated by distance and interact through the assistance of communication technology. A class in which any portion of the instructional class hours are delivered in this mode is considered a distance education class." (AFT/VCCCD Agreement 2016-19 Article 23)

The Distance Education Handbook was developed by the Distance Education Committee and it outlines faculty training and support, expectations for students, regular and effective contact, best instructional practices, and legal, regulatory and accreditation requirements for distance education classes.

Faculty training is developed and facilitated by the Instructional Technologist/Designer who educates faculty on best practices, standards, uses of technology in instruction, and DE classroom management. The Instructional Technologist/Designer communicates with the Distance Education Committee, Deans, Department Chairs, and the Vice President of Academic Affairs about trends, ongoing issues, outreach, and general distance education success.

Support for DE students consists of all-hours support and online training from Canvas, by phone, device apps, and a website called the Canvas Community. The Canvas Community has student-specific user guides, tutorials, video training, Frequently Asked Questions, and Q&A Forums. Students can access the Student support options with the "Help" button available on every page in Canvas, which includes a link to ask the Instructor.

The Ventura County Community College District (VCCCD) website maintains support contacts and videos for all students at <https://www.vcccd.edu/departments/information-technology/distance-education>, plus information for other related technology needs for students. The Oxnard College Instructional Support Services website <https://www.oxnardcollege.edu/faculty-staff/instructional-support-services/technology-resources/resources-for-faculty-and-staff>, offers a Technology Resources for Students help page with direct links to user guides and tutorials, plus support for supplemental technology, such as Microsoft Office and plagiarism detection applications.

Additionally, library staff have been trained on Canvas navigation and commonly used features. Students often come to the library to work on Canvas for the availability of multiple computers and free access to the internet. Library staff receive general Canvas questions from students and are now capable of providing support to those students.

The Distance Education Plan is part of the larger Oxnard College Strategic Plan. The goals of the DE Plan have been aligned to meet the goals of the OC Strategic Plan and to support the Mission, Vision and Values of Oxnard College. A key tenet of the Oxnard College mission is that the college provides "multiple pathways to student success." Distance education (DE) classes help to fulfill this element of the college mission by providing students flexibility in meeting degree and certificate requirements.

Given that the technology for delivering instruction is ever evolving, this Plan is intended to be written in the broadest terms and is to be updated at least every 24 months with vetting through

all the proper participatory governance bodies. The current plan was developed by the Distance Education Committee and will be finalized in spring of 2020 for implementation in fall of 2020.

DRAFT

6.B Reflection on Improving Institutional Performance: SLOs and Institution Set Standard I.B.2

Reflect on the college's assessment processes since the last comprehensive review:

- *What are the strengths of the process that helps lead the college to improve teaching and learning?*

Across the campus, each semester, faculty are encouraged by their department chairs to complete CSLO assessments for each course they teach. Faculty are largely willing to complete assessments and many do full assessments. During the spring semester, department chairs generally dedicate one department meeting, usually April, to review and revise the CSLOs. The department chairs review all discipline CSLOs, review reflection summary feedback, and engage their departments in transparent and meaningful dialogue about the observations and feedback from the assessments of the CSLO data.

For example, departments such as Letters (which includes American Sign Language, English, and Spanish) regularly review and revise their Course Student Learning Outcomes (CSLOs) to align with the college's Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs). All SLO assessments are recorded, tracked and mapped to Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOS) in the college's adopted application *eLumen*.

Institution set standards and equity plans receive regular vetting across constituencies and undergo collaborative revision via the Participatory Governance process. The Faculty Senate provides feedback and input. The Student Success and Equity Committee, a representative body of faculty, classified staff, students, and administrators, is charged with reviewing and revising the institutional goals. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (IE) provides the committee baseline and outcomes data in early spring semester, goals are adjusted and recommendations for improvement are brought to the president.

- *What growth opportunities in the assessment process has the college identified to further refine its authentic culture of assessment?*

Growth opportunities the college has identified include a more systematic review of a broad representation of student success metrics and increasing participation in the academic disciplines in CSLO assessment.

The Student Success and Equity Committee will benefit from a more systematic review of data for all student success initiatives across the campus to include Guided Pathways, AB705, strategic enrollment management metrics, and grant-funded initiatives such as the First Year Experience (FYE) program and STEM initiatives. Adhering to a data review calendar will ensure integrated assessment that will drive a cycle of continuous improvement.

The VPAA, Academic Senate, and other participatory governance committees will promote and ensure greater participation amongst all faculty across all department for the timely completion of CSLO assessments, as well as to engage in a routine review process to ensure that CSLOs are relevant, appropriate, and applicable for the classes for which they are associated. More assessment from departments will contribute to the culture of assessment on campus. The VPAA

office shares data with department chairs who then share the data with their departments, thus encouraging a culture of data. However, the culture of assessment is still developing as faculty are continually encouraged to work towards completing CSLO assessments and to revise existing CSLOs as needed.

Some faculty have shared their displeasure with the choice of the *eLumen* software, so the college's technical data specialist has worked diligently to simplify the process for creating, mapping and assessing all SLOs. She has created screen-capture videos, regularly presents at Department Chair meetings, and offers one-on-one training sessions. Department chairs are encouraged to participate in the ongoing CSLO discussion at Department Chairs meeting with the VPAA.

- *Provide examples where course, program, or service improvements have occurred based on outcomes assessment data.*

It is evident that academic departments at the college are using SLO assessment data to make informed decisions about student learning in order to increase student success. The following are several examples of how this has been working in different areas at the college:

Faculty who teach Spanish have been developing heritage speaker classes to better meet the educational needs of the students at Oxnard College. As a result of CSLO review in the Letters department, Spanish revised existing CSLOs and wrote new ones so that the CSLOs now reflect each specific class better, and the assessments provide more meaningful, actionable data. Spanish is an exemplary department in its service to students, demonstrating great adaptability, and innovation.

The Communication Studies department has ongoing SLO discussions every year as part of their program review and at various department meetings throughout the academic year. Recent discussions have been geared toward the growth of their program; for example, there was a lot of discussion about whether it would be effective for students to add more Communication Studies courses when we hired a new full-time faculty. These discussions also led to the writing of new courses and a discussion about how the new curriculum bridges with existing courses. SLO discussions also inform scheduling future Communication Studies courses (alternating theory courses with skill-based courses) and graduating more Communication Studies students with a clear pathway for their success. This dialogue also ensures that instructors use accurate measures for each course, and helps in the development and implementation of Open Educational Resources. Further, SLO discussions help Communication Studies faculty identify a skills-based pathway for students in the major, so they graduate more majors who are more prepared for transfer institutions. Further, in the Communication Studies classroom, SLOs simplify the skill goal for students and the SLOs are our primary purpose. For example, for students with high anxiety in Communication Studies courses, the SLOs are the life raft one can return to regain our perspective. As a student, they can review the SLOs at the end of the semester and identify specific areas where they have improved, even if they did not get a perfect grade. These ongoing discussions have an explicit impact of student success.

In the English department, they annually review SLO results and adjust their SLOs/PSLOs per the data and their discussions. These discussions are evident in the evidence provided (**see attached Letters minutes evidence**). English faculty have been diligent about tasking colleagues with either revising or keeping the existing CSLOs as well as revising the PSLOs based on the effectiveness for students in the classroom. They have many discussions about how and why this process is important to improve their services to their students. Recently, the department members even evaluated the effectiveness of their action plan questions for each of their respective courses and invited the OC Institutional Researcher to their meeting to get her take on the data and how best to analyze it.

The Anthropology department meets regularly to discuss outcome data and strategies for improving outcomes. Their emphasis is on continuous assessment and they have a number of assignments that occur across the semester to track outcome data. Many of the courses utilize discussion post assignments that test and track specific outcomes across the semester. These discussions ask similar questions at the beginning (formative) and end (summative) of their courses to determine how student learning has progressed. Faculty analyze this data collaboratively to evaluate areas of strength or weakness and to develop a plan for future assessment and strategies for improving outcomes.

• In those areas where assessment may be falling behind, what is the college doing to complete the assessments per the college's schedule.

The VPAA shares SLO-specific information with the department chairs at the Department Chairs monthly meeting and encourages departments to complete their CSLO assessments. The VPAA continues to work toward developing a culture of assessment and data, but there still is room for improvement. In spring 2020, the Office of Academic Affairs and Student Learning will propose that faculty SLO leads be identified, receive additional training and funds to attend SLO-related workshops, and partner with the Technical Data Specialist in developing trainings and videos to improve the participation in and effectiveness of the Student Learning Outcome assessment process.

In collaboration with the VPAA, the Institutional Effectiveness (IE) office will encourage departments to invite IE staff to participate in CSLO discussions to offer guidance, feedback and support. Additionally, IE will regularly provide data analysis and SLO workshops at the fall FLEX professional development days.

Further, the Office of Academic Affairs will collaborate with Academic Senate and Classified Senate leaders to stress the importance of assessing student learning and service unit outcomes as an integral and required element of the program review and resource allocation processes.

Institution Set Standards (Standard I.B.3)

“The institution establishes institution-set standards for student achievement, appropriate to its mission, assesses how well it is achieving them in pursuit of continuous improvement, and publishes this information.”

Institution set standards and equity plans receive regular vetting across constituencies and undergo collaborative revision via the Participatory Governance process. The Academic Senate provides feedback and input. The Student Success and Equity Committee, a representative body of faculty, classified staff, students, and administrators, is charged with reviewing and revising the institutional goals. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (IE) provides the committee baseline and outcomes data in early spring semester, goals are adjusted and recommendations for improvement are brought to the president.

Has the college met its floor standards?

Has the college achieved its stretch (aspirational) goals?

What initiative(s) is the college undertaking to improve its outcomes?

How does the college inform its constituents of this information?

Section 6.C Report on Outcomes of Quality Focus Essays

Quality Focus Area 1: Improved Use of Data in Transitional Studies – Update

The 2016 ISER and Quality Focus Essays were drafted prior to the approval and implementation of Assembly Bill 705. The Governor of the State of California signed AB 705 bill into law in 2017, and it took effect in 2018. AB 705 mandates that California Community Colleges do everything possible to maximize the possibility that students will attempt and complete transfer-level courses in English and Math during their first academic year (three years for students who begin their studies by taking ESL courses). Colleges are required to adopt a multiple measures approach that incorporates high school courses and grade point average. Colleges are prohibited from “requiring students to enroll in remedial English and mathematics coursework” without valid and reliable placement research that indicates that students are unlikely to be successful in transfer-level English or mathematics courses without taking a remedial course or courses. Community colleges were required to demonstrate compliance with AB 705 by fall semester 2019.

Beginning in fall 2017 and through summer 2019, faculty in English and mathematics began the process of restructuring their curricula, assessment practices, and support services in order to better serve Oxnard College students and to comply fully with AB 705. Faculty in both disciplines attended multiple trainings and workshops sponsored by the California Acceleration Project (CAP), collaborated with colleagues in counselling and assessment offices, and engaged in substantive and collegial discussions regarding how best to improve outcomes for all students.

English faculty decided on a co-requisite model for freshman composition, adding a 2-unit support course to approximately 20% of all sections of English R101. Math faculty collapsed two semesters of algebra into one, and reduced the total units of the combined classes. This created support courses for Introduction to Statistics. They also developed plans to train and deploy imbedded tutors in the classroom. At all phases of the process, instructional faculty consulted and collaborated with student support services, and college administration. As of this writing, the data collection and analysis process for these initiatives is ongoing, with support from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. It is expected and hoped that by fall 2020, a clearer picture of the effectiveness of the implementation of AB 705 will be better understood and discussions will continue on how to improve the graduation and transfer rates of all students.

Quality Focus Essay Area 2: Revisions to Shared Governance Processes

The Quality Focus Essay related to shared (participatory) governance helped guide the efforts to reform and refocus the college’s participatory governance structures, functions, and flow. During the last comprehensive accreditation cycle, it had become clear that committee charges had morphed over time, areas of purview had become blurred; there was abundant duplication of efforts against a backdrop of a lack of collaboration, coordination and communication.

As discussed in Section 6.A, the college began the process of reviewing and revamping its participatory governance structures and processes even before the Commission issued its

findings. The chart below summarizes the changes made and the changes to be made in spring 2020.

Evaluation Question from QFE Area 2	Update
How can the process of shared governance be streamlined (e.g., fewer hours spent on the process) while ensuring that a goal of full participation is met?	The Participatory Governance Workgroup has created a new structure and functional map for all participatory governance bodies. The goal is to streamline committee charges and clarify reporting structures while broadening participation. The two committees with the term “planning” in their names (PEPC and PBC) have been refocused to concentrate on program review, and fiscal operations, respectively.
Have relevant committees been established that enable constant campus-wide dialogue on all matters pertaining to student success?	The Student Success Committee has been meeting regularly since XXXX. The committee is in the process of reviewing its charge to put more of an emphasis on equity, and equitable student success and student learning outcomes. This committee will incorporate oversight for Student Learning Outcomes that was once the purview of LOT (Learning Outcomes Team), but with an emphasis on achieving equitable outcomes for all subpopulations of students.
Are committee meetings scheduled within a time frame that encourages participation?	Beginning in the fall semester of 2020, all participatory governance committees will begin their meetings at 3:00 p.m. (rather than 2:00 p.m.) in order to allow more teaching faculty to attend. College leadership has encouraged supervisors of classified professionals to allow greater flexibility for their employees in order to promote greater classified participation on participatory governance committees.
Have adequate pathways been established to effectively solicit student representation?	The college Activities Director has worked closely with Associated Student Government (ASG) to train students on parliamentary procedure and to inform them of participatory governance committees and their purposes. Student participation as voting members (or non-voting members, depending on the committee) has been written into the membership list for all participatory governance committees.

<p>What is the role of Classified Senate in any new-shared governance structure?</p>	<p>Several committees have adopted a tri-chair model (faculty, administration and classified professionals) for leading participatory governance committees. The number of classified professionals to serve on each participatory governance committee has been codified into the committee charge, which will be incorporated into the latest version of the Participatory Governance Manual, which will be finalized, vetted and submitted to the Board of Trustees in spring 2020.</p>
<p>Have we met expectations for improved communication, especially between student services and academic affairs?</p>	<p>There is always room for greater and improved communication between Academic Affairs and Student Services. That said, the newly integrated program review process provides greater transparency and understanding between both offices. Further, both Student Services and Academic Affairs faculty, staff, and Administration serve on multiple operational and participatory governance bodies including: Department Chairs Council, President’s Cabinet, Curriculum Committee, and the Student Success Committee.</p>
<p>Have we increased general campus understanding of shared governance?</p>	<p>It is difficult to assess general campus understanding of participatory governance, but the changes made in the make-up of participatory governance committees, and the leadership of said committees, along with common formatting of agendas and minutes are thought to have served to create a greater awareness in the general campus community relative to participatory governance.</p>
<p>Is the linkage between shared governance, strategic planning, budgeting, and resource allocation clearly defined and understood by the campus?</p>	<p>The integration of program review to include academic, business, and student services has helped create a better understanding on campus of the links between participatory governance structures, strategic planning, budgeting, and resource allocation. Clearly, faculty, classified professionals and administrators understand the critical role that data-driven program review plays in the strategic planning and resource allocation processes. The budgeting process on campus is becoming more transparent, and the new Fiscal Review Committee will be charged with ensuring the integrity of the budgeting</p>

	processes and communicating with the campus community their findings and rationale for their recommendations to the college president.
--	--

Quality Focus Area 3: Re-Establishment of Centrality of Strategic Planning Process -- Update

As discussed in section 6.A, the college’s lone recommendation to meet the Standards focused on the lack of a Strategic Plan, and the lack of integrated, centralized program review, planning, and resource allocation processes. The chart below summarizes the changes that the college has implemented, or is in the process of implementing, in order to continue to meet this Standard.

Essential Elements of Centralized, Integrated Strategic Planning and Resource Allocation Processes	Update
1. Integration of Program Review across all college programs and service areas	The college now requires that all college entities participate in the program review process. The updated process has been modified to accurately assess the effectiveness of academic, student services, and college services areas.
2. Resource requests and resource allocations are linked to an integrated program review process for human, physical, technological and financial resources.	Requests for resources must be supported by program review data. The college has developed a system for reviewing resource requests based on the category of the resource: full-time faculty, full-time classified staff, instructional equipment, instructional supplies, technology, and facilities.
3. The program review, planning and resource allocation process is evaluated regularly.	Each spring semester the Program Review Committee assesses the efficiency and effectiveness of the process, and makes necessary modifications.
4. The college has clear and widely understood process for the allocation of resources, planning, and program initiatives.	The latest draft of the Participatory Governance Manual includes the modification of the committee structure designed to eliminate redundancies and clarify the roles of each committee. There will be standing committees for program review (Program Review Committee – PRC), budgets (Budget Committee – BC), and one centralized planning committee (College Planning Council – CPC).
5. There are established procedures for assessing the overall effectiveness of the	Each spring semester, executive leadership, along with the Classified and Academic Senates, will conduct a campus-wide

<p>college and for planning innovative strategies to improve student success.</p>	<p>Planning Retreat. At the planning retreat, stakeholders will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• review the college mission, vision and values• assess student success data, performance on institution set standards, and discuss strategies for improving equity across all college operations• review the college’s fiscal health and state-wide financial outlook• envision improvements to the college participatory governance structures and functions• review the college’s strategic, enrollment, facilities and technology plans• analyze enrollment trends and review marketing strategies
---	--

DRAFT