AGENDA

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Pledge of Allegiance

Anyone who wishes to make a presentation to the Board on an agenda item is requested to please fill out a “REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES” card, available from the Public Affairs Officer. However, the Board Chairperson will invite comments on specific agenda items during the meeting before final votes are taken. Please make sure that the Secretary of the Board has the correct spelling of your name and address to maintain proper records. Comments should be limited to five (5) minutes or less.

I. Review of Agenda and Expected Outcomes
   Information Only
   Jim Buysse, Interim Chancellor

II. Campus Strategic Planning Updates
    Information Only
    Michael Webster
    Brenda Davis
    Irv Hendrick
    Linda Lacy

III. Industry Forums
     Information Only
     Amy Cardullo
     Linda Reifschneider

IV. Accreditation Agenda/Plan/Program
    Information Only
    Ray Maghroori
    Sylvia Thomas

V. Comments from the Public

VI. Adjourn the Meeting until Tuesday, October 2, 2007 – 6:00 p.m., Board Room AD 122, Riverside Campus

Light Supper

VII. Reconvene the Meeting (Tuesday, October 2, 2007 – 6:00 p.m.)

VIII. Environmental Scans
      Information Only
      Kristina Kauffman
      Chuck McIntyre

IX. District Strategic Plan
    Information Only
    Jim Buysse

X. Comments from the Public

XI. Adjournment
September 12, 2007

Memo to: College Presidents, Chief Instructional Officers, Accreditation Liaison Officers

From: Barbara Beno, President

Subject: Attached Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness

I am pleased to send you a new “Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness” that has been developed by the Commission for use by colleges in doing self-assessment, by teams examining college adherence to the Standards of Accreditation, and by the Commission in evaluating institutions. The purpose of the rubric is to provide some common language that can be used to describe a college’s status vis-à-vis full adherence to the standards, as well as to provide a developmental framework for understanding each institution’s actions toward achieving full compliance with standards. The Commission hopes the rubric will be a useful tool for colleges and evaluators.

For more than a decade, the Commission’s Standards of Accreditation have required institutions to engage in systematic and regular program review as well as short and long-term planning and resource allocation processes that support the improvement of institutional and educational effectiveness. The 2002 Standards of Accreditation have added student learning outcomes assessment and improvement as important components to the required institutional processes of evaluation, planning and improvement.

As teams and the Commission evaluate institutional and educational effectiveness, these three areas – program review, the use of data and analyses to inform institutional planning and improvement, and the assessment of student learning – consistently emerge as areas in which institutions’ seem to need additional guidance. The Commission, colleges, and teams have all indicated they need a devise other than pure narrative for understanding and describing how well colleges have done in reaching full compliance with the standards. In the past, self study reports and team reports have reflected the authors’ unique efforts to find appropriate summative descriptive terms to best communicate each institution’s status. This rubric provides for greater consistency in those descriptive narratives.

It is important to note the sample behaviors described in each text box of the rubric are not new criteria or standards by which an institution will be evaluated, but are rather examples of behavior that, if characteristic of an institution, would indicate its stage of implementation of the standards. College leaders may find the rubric helpful in assessing what additional efforts institutions should undertake to achieve full compliance with the Standards of Accreditation.
Finally, institutions and teams should be aware that the Commission expects that institutions be at the Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement level in Program Review of academic programs (including all educational services). Many institutions have not developed sustained processes for evaluating administrative services, but all should be above the Awareness level in these efforts. The Commission also expects that institutions be at the Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement level in Planning. The Commission further expects that institutions be at the Development level or above in Student Learning Outcomes, since these are the newest requirements included in the Standards of Accreditation. When it adopted the 2002 Standards, the Commission stated it anticipated institutions would need eight to ten years to come into full compliance with the new standards on student learning outcomes assessment and improvement. Of course, the ultimate goal is for institutions to achieve the Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement level in all three areas.

I hope that this rubric is helpful to you in your leadership work at your campus. The Commission welcomes any ideas for improving this rubric or its use to enhance institutional effectiveness.

BAB
Attachment: Rubric
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part I: Program Review
(See attached instructions on how to use this rubric.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Implementation</th>
<th>Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Program Review (Sample institutional behaviors)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Awareness                | • There is preliminary investigative dialogue at the institution or within some departments about what data or process should be used for program review.  
  • There is recognition of existing practices and models in program review that make use of institutional research.  
  • There is exploration of program review models by various departments or individuals.  
  • The college is implementing pilot program review models in a few programs/operational units. |
| Development              | • Program review is embedded in practice across the institution using qualitative and quantitative data to improve program effectiveness.  
  • Dialogue about the results of program review is evident within the program as part of discussion of program effectiveness.  
  • Leadership groups throughout the institution accept responsibility for program review framework development (Senate, Admin. Etc.)  
  • Appropriate resources are allocated to conducting program review of meaningful quality.  
  • Development of a framework for linking results of program review to planning for improvement.  
  • Development of a framework to align results of program review to resource allocation. |
| Proficiency              | • Program review processes are in place and implemented regularly.  
  • Results of all program review are integrated into institution-wide planning for improvement and informed decision-making.  
  • The program review framework is established and implemented.  
  • Dialogue about the results of all program reviews is evident throughout the institution as part of discussion of institutional effectiveness.  
  • Results of program review are clearly and consistently linked to institutional planning processes and resource allocation processes; college can demonstrate or provide specific examples.  
  • The institution evaluates the effectiveness of its program review processes in supporting and improving student achievement and student learning outcomes. |
| Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement | • Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement.  
  • The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness.  
  • The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning. |
### Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part II: Planning
(See attached instructions on how to use this rubric.)

| Levels of Implementation | Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Planning  
(Sample institutional behaviors) |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Awareness**            | • The college has preliminary investigative dialogue about planning processes.  
• There is recognition of case need for quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in planning.  
• The college has initiated pilot projects and efforts in developing systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning and implementation (e.g. in human or physical resources).  
• Planning found in only some areas of college operations.  
• There is exploration of models and definitions and issues related to planning.  
• There is minimal linkage between plans and a resource allocation process, perhaps planning for use of "new money"  
• The college may have a consultant-supported plan for facilities, or a strategic plan. |
| **Development**          | • The Institution has defined a planning process and assigned responsibility for implementing it.  
• The Institution has identified quantitative and qualitative data and is using it.  
• Planning efforts are specifically linked to institutional mission and goals.  
• The Institution uses applicable quantitative data to improve institutional effectiveness in some areas of operation.  
• Governance and decision-making processes incorporate review of institutional effectiveness in mission and plans for improvement.  
• Planning processes reflect the participation of a broad constituent base. |
| **Proficiency**          | • The college has a well documented, ongoing process for evaluating itself in all areas of operation, analyzing and publishing the results and planning and implementing improvements.  
• The institution's component plans are integrated into a comprehensive plan to achieve broad educational purposes, and improve institutional effectiveness.  
• The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes.  
• The college has documented assessment results and communicated matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies (documents data and analysis of achievement of its educational mission).  
• The institution assesses progress toward achieving its education goals over time (uses longitudinal data and analyses).  
• The institution plans and effectively incorporates results of program review in all areas of educational services: instruction, support services, library and learning resources.  
• Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement. |
| **Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement** | • The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.  
• There is dialogue about institutional effectiveness that is ongoing, robust and pervasive; data and analyses are widely distributed and used throughout the institution.  
• There is ongoing review and adaptation of evaluation and planning processes.  
• There is consistent and continuous commitment to improving student learning; and educational effectiveness is a demonstrable priority in all planning structures and processes. |
Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part III: Student Learning Outcomes
(See attached instructions on how to use this rubric.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Implementation</th>
<th>Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Student Learning Outcomes (Sample institutional behaviors)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>• There is preliminary, investigative dialogue about student learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is recognition of existing practices such as course objectives and how they relate to student learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is exploration of models, definitions, and issues taking place by a few people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pilot projects and efforts may be in progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The college has discussed whether to define student learning outcomes at the level of some courses or programs or degrees; where to begin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>• College has established an institutional framework for definition of student learning outcomes (where to start), how to extend, and timeline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• College has established authentic assessment strategies for assessing student learning outcomes as appropriate to intended course, program, and degree learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Existing organizational structures (e.g. Senate, Curriculum Committee) are supporting strategies for student learning outcomes definition and assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Leadership groups (e.g. Academic Senate and administration), have accepted responsibility for student learning outcomes implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Appropriate resources are being allocated to support student learning outcomes and assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty and staff are fully engaged in student learning outcomes development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency</td>
<td>• Student learning outcomes and authentic assessment are in place for courses, programs and degrees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Results of assessment are being used for improvement and further alignment of institution-wide practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward improving student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed on a regular basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement</td>
<td>• Student learning outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic and used for continuous quality improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive and robust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluation and fine-tuning of organizational structures to support student learning is ongoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student learning improvement is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the college.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Learning outcomes are specifically linked to program reviews.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Norco Campus, Riverside Community College District
Comprehensive Evaluation Visit Team Roster
Monday, October 8-Thursday, October 11, 2007

The self study report, a catalog, and class schedule should be sent to each team member eight weeks prior to the visit in addition to the four hard copies and one electronic version sent to the Commission office.
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