California Community Colleges
Institutional Effectiveness

Partnership Resource Teams
Summary of Initial Visit
Date of Visit 1: March 22,2021

Name of Institution: Imperial Valley College
Partnership Resource Team Members: Erika A. Endrijonas (Lead), Sharlene Coleal, Eric Houck, Tate Hurvitz, Fernando Ortiz, Anna Badalyan

Area of Focus	Institution's Point Person or Group	Heard during the Visit: Institutional Activities Underway	Heard during the Visit: Ideas Expressed by the Institution[ML1]	Other IEPI Resources Needed?
Standards I.B.7, I.B. 9 College Recommendation 2: In order to meet the standard, the Commission requires the College to improve the evaluation of processes and systems that are currently in place, and ensure they are more systematic and routine.[ML2]	**President's Cabinet** **Representatives from Academic Senate and College Council** **SEMPC, AS Pres, CC Chair; Technology, Institutional Research, and Learning Outcomes Team Reps**	• The College addressed all other ACCJC recommendations. • Established Program Review is working. • The development of a new strategic plan is in progress and is expected to be completed by June 2021. • The committee self-evaluation process is in place and working. • Strategic Goals are reviewed, evaluated, and updated as needed based on an established timeline. • Work on a new participatory governance structure has begun. The new structure will be unveiled on March 24th to the campus, and it is expected to be approved and fully functional by Fall 2021.	• Two main issues to be addressed include integrated planning and improving communication regarding decision making. • Participatory Governance continues to be a problem. Committees need to have a clear purpose and correlate with one another, rather than overlapping. • Inter-committee and constituent communication need to be improved. • CART (Continuous Accreditation Response Team) has the broadest level of cross-functional communication and would serve as a good model for a college-wide approach to planning and communication. • The current resource request prioritization process needs to be improved, specifically, in the following ways: ○ Timeline ○ Clarity regarding which groups/committees/positions need to be involved ○ Alignment of the process and consistent use of rubric(s) for evaluation ○ More communication and greater transparency of how decisions get made ○ Streamline and simplify the review processes. ○ Software currently used for the resource allocation process needs to be replaced because it is not	

Area of Focus	Institution's Point Person or Group	Heard during the Visit: Institutional Activities Underway	Heard during the Visit: Ideas Expressed by the Institution[ML1]	Other IEPI Resources Needed?

		• Faculty, in particular the Academic Senate, appear to be engaged in the efforts to improve planning.	integrated with other planning processes and contributes to the lack of transparency about decision making.
			• The college needs a holistic evaluation of its current planning efforts, including a way to assess its effectiveness, identify areas for improvement, make the necessary changes, and reassess to determine if those alterations help the college to meet its strategic goals.
			• There is a need to better document and communicate information related to participatory governance, for example, in the form of a participatory governance handbook. All processes related to program review are documented in the Program Review handbook and the current committee structure and information are on the web, but there is no document that provides the governance structure and process(es).
			• There is currently no committee or subcommittee that is responsible for recommending changes to institutional processes and procedures.
			• The college needs an upgraded technical solution for integrated planning:
			   o There is great dissatisfaction with the current planning application, SPOL, because it does not integrate budget and planning.
			   o Whatever the new technology solution is, it needs to be more user friendly, more flexible, and less complicated, and it needs to fully integrate program review and budgeting.
			   o The college uses a multitude of different software systems that do not appear adaptable or flexible enough to address the institutional planning, evaluation of institutional effectiveness, and budgeting needs of the college in an integrated manner.
			• There is a consistent, shared desire to improve communication in the following ways (some points were made above; this shows how pervasive these comments were throughout the day):	

Area of Focus	Institution's Point Person or Group	Heard during the Visit: Institutional Activities Underway	Heard during the Visit: Ideas Expressed by the Institution[ML1]	Other IEPI Resources Needed?
			o There is a need for inter-committee communication. o Planning priorities need to be more widely shared and understood. o Better communication will lead to fewer silos across the college. o There is a need for clearly defined roles and responsibilities in the participatory governance structure. o There needs to be better documentation of communication for evidence gathering, especially for accreditation purposes and clarity of roles. o Greater communication will lead to more transparency in decision making. o [ML3]The urgency and need for change required by the ACCJC needs to be shared and embraced by the broader college community, not just those involved with CART. o The faculty feels stretched thin due to COVID. o Faculty leadership is on board with making necessary changes and is ready to take a leadership role in moving the college forward in collaboration with the administration.	