FOLLOW-UP VISIT PEER REVIEW TEAM REPORT

Imperial Valley College 380 East Aten Road Imperial, CA 92251

This report represents the findings of the Peer Review Team that conducted a virtual visit to Imperial Valley College November 16, 2021. The Commission acted on the accredited status of the institution during its January 2022 meeting and this team report must be reviewed in conjunction with the Commission's Action letter.

Submitted by

Dr. Roger Schultz, President, Mt. San Jacinto College Brian Greene, Librarian, Columbia College Brian Murphy, Director of Institutional Research, Butte College

Date:	November 22, 2021
To:	Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
From:	Dr. Roger W. Schultz
Subject: 2021	Report of Follow-Up Team Report to Imperial Valley College, November 16,

Introduction

The Peer Review Team for Imperial Valley College (IVC) completed its original visit to the college from March 11-14, 2019. As part of the original Commission action at its meeting June 5-7, 2019 the college's accreditation was reaffirmed for 18 months and was asked to submit a Follow-Up report no later than October 1, 2020. During the subsequent Commission meeting January13-15, 2021 it reviewed the Follow-Up Report and related evidentiary materials submitted by the college. The Commission found that the college had addressed and corrected Compliance Requirement 1. The Commission further found continued non-compliance with Standards I.B.7 and I. B. 9 (Compliance Requirement 2) from the original action letter. The Commission acted to grant a Good Cause Extension to the college and it was required to submit a follow up report by November 1, 2021 to address the remaining deficiencies noted in Compliance Requirement 2, along with a follow up visit by a peer review team. The peer review team conducted a virtual Follow-Up report prepared by the College was an accurate and thorough examination of the evidence, to determine if the institution has resolved the remaining compliance deficiencies, and now meets the Accreditation Standards.

The team was comprised of the following members:

Dr. Roger Schultz, Team Chair President Mt. San Jacinto College

Brian Greene Librarian Columbia College

Brian Murphy Director of Institutional Research Butte College

In general, the team found that the College had prepared well for the visit by arranging for meetings with the individuals and groups agreed upon earlier with the team chair. Over the course of the day, the team met with the following groups: Department Chairs & Faculty SLO

Coordinator; Institutional Effectiveness and Development Committee; Representatives to demonstrate the Nuventive program for outcomes assessment; Program Review Committee; Integrated Consultation Council; Representatives involved in drafting the new Governance Handbook; Executive Cabinet & Superintendent/President. Overall, the peer review team had six group sessions, in which 17 individuals were interviewed during the visit.

The Follow-Up Report and Visit were expected to document resolution of the following:

Standards I.B.7, I.B.9 (College Recommendation 2 -Compliance): In order to meet the standards, 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.

Team Analysis of College Responses to the February 1, 2021 Commission's Requirements

Requirement

College Requirement 2: In order to meet the Standards, 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. (Standards I.B.7, I.B.9)

Findings and Evidence:

The visiting team found evidence (artifacts and through interviews with college personnel) that demonstrate Imperial Valley College has developed and implemented systems for broad based systematic evaluation and planning. As described in the Follow-Up Report and confirmed via interviews, the college has also developed governance structures and methods for the self-evaluation of practices and policies that take into account broad input from the college community. Evidence also confirms that the college has timelines and draft evaluation instruments in place to guide the implementation and future revisions of their new governance structure and evaluation and planning systems. All of these changes have made the college's evaluation practices more systematic and routine. The college has demonstrated its evaluation of processes in three ways:

- The college restructured its participatory governance structure based on the feedback of college leadership and committees, including: the Academic Senate and Classified Union. Further, the college sought input from a Partnership Resource Team (PRT) consisting of field area experts from outside the college. With information gained from internal and external sources, the college drafted a new participatory Governance Handbook that defines the roles and membership of committees while clearly delineating the processes of college self-evaluation and methods for college constituencies to collect and communicate findings that could potentially identify any future needed changes to systems and processes. As a result of this process, the college developed new committees and dissolved others to better meet its needs.
- The college evaluated its system of Program Review and found that a change was needed to more easily integrate planning across all areas of the college. The revised method utilizes Nuventive, a planning and improvement software tool. The team saw evidence

that the new system is being used and heard through interviews with college constituents that they believed the college was moving in the right direction with the change of systems. The college has mechanisms in place to gather feedback on the system and has indicated that it will use the feedback to make improvements in the future.

• The college evaluated its system for collecting Learning Outcomes assessments and communicating the results to constituencies. This new system utilizes the Nuventive planning and improvement software tool, which integrates outcomes assessment and program review processes. The college demonstrated the system to the team and interviewees shared their confidence in its ability to improve planning practices. The system makes it easier to tie planning to learning outcomes and program leaders described how they use it when developing planning documents. The participatory governance structure can keep learning outcomes top of mind as it makes decisions related to resource allocation and program development.

The team has affirmed that these accomplishments demonstrate that the college has thoughtfully laid the groundwork for evaluating its systems and processes and is making changes based on those findings. The team further confirmed that the college has the systems and practices in place to evaluate its academic and non-academic programs, and to make resource allocations in alignment with the college's mission. These new systems and processes are institutionalized and well-positioned to become routine. The team encourages the college to continue adhering to the plans and timelines it has established in order to sustain the improvements it has made.

Conclusion:

The institution has addressed the requirement, corrected the deficiencies, and now meets Standards (I.B.7 & 1.B.9).