July 3, 2014

Mr. Daniel Peck  
President  
Mission College  
3000 Mission College Blvd  
Santa Clara, CA 95054

Dear President Peck:


The Commission took action to impose Probation and require the College to submit a Follow-Up Report by March 15, 2015.¹ The Report will be followed by a visit by Commission representatives.

Probation is imposed when the Commission finds that an institution deviates significantly from the Commission’s Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, or Commission policies, but not to such an extent as to warrant a Show Cause order or the termination of accreditation. If the probation is imposed as a result of the institution’s educational quality and institutional effectiveness review, reaffirmation is delayed during the period of probation. The accredited status of the institution continues during the probation period.

The Follow-Up Report of March 2015 should demonstrate that Mission College has addressed the team recommendations, resolved the deficiencies, and meets Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies noted in the recommendations below.

Need to Resolve Deficiencies:

The Accreditation Standards, as an integrated whole, represent indicators of academic quality and institutional effectiveness. Deficiencies in any Standards will impact quality at an institution, and ultimately the educational environment and experiences of students. The Commission found Mission College deficient in meeting the following Eligibility Requirement 10, Accreditation Standards: I.B.2; I.B.3; I.B.5-7; II.A.1; II.A.2; II.A.6; II.B.1; II.B.3,4; III.A.1.c; III.B.2; III.B.2.a; III.C.1; III.C.2; III.D; IV.A; and IV.B.
Recommendation #1 Institutional Planning:
In order to meet the Standard and achieve a level of sustainable continuous quality improvement in institutional planning, the team recommends that the College establish an integrated planning calendar (in accordance with its Actionable Improvement Plan), document and publish its planning processes ensuring broad dissemination, evaluate the planning processes to ensure alignment with College and District strategic goals and to ensure integration with facilities, technology and human resources planning and resource allocation to ensure ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine institutional processes and improve student learning (I.B.2, I.B.3, III.B.2).

Recommendation #2 Culture of Evidence:
In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College develop a culture of evidence that fosters an institution-wide understanding of data and analysis and its use in planning and institutional effectiveness and establish a research agenda that leverages the analysis of disaggregated data, institution-wide reflection and productive dialog on those analyses to refine institutional processes and improve student learning (I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7).

Recommendation #3 Institution-set Standards of Student Achievement:
In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College establish institution-set standards for student success and achievement and evaluate institution performance in regards to those standards as a measure of how well it accomplishes its mission (ER 10, II.A.1, II.A.2, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.5).

Recommendation #4 SLO Assessment:
In order to meet the Standard move the entire institution beyond the developmental level and achieve proficiency in the assessment of student learning outcomes, the team recommends that the College establish a systematic and continuous cycle of outcomes assessment and institute a standing body to oversee the outcomes assessment process (in accordance with its “Actionable Improvement Plans”), establish and provide leadership and training in the development and assessment of Student Learning Outcomes in all instructional and student support services programs, assess all Course, Program, Certificate, Degree-level SLOs, evaluate results and foster and sustain institution-wide dialog on the results of assessment to ensure that decision-making aligns with institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning (II.A.2, II.A.6, II.B.1, II.B.3, II.B.4).

Recommendation #7 Student Learning Outcomes:
In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College and the District ensure that faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing these learning outcomes (III.A.1.c).
Recommendation #8 Facilities Planning:
In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends the institution evaluate its facilities and equipment on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account and reflecting projections of total cost of ownership (III.B.2, III.B.2.a).

Recommendation #9 Technology:
In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College and District clarify the role and relationship of District and College technology planning, integrate technology planning with institutional planning to ensure alignment with College and District strategic goals, incorporate analysis of total cost of ownership, ensure faculty, staff and students are provided with quality training in the effective application of information technologies, systematically assess the effective use of technology resources and use the results of evaluation as a basis for improvement (III.C.1, III.C.2).

Recommendation #10 Organization and Communication:
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College regularly evaluate governance and decision-making structures and processes, including internal controls that implement District policy, to assure their integrity and effectiveness; to ensure these processes facilitate effective communication among the Colleges’ constituencies and between the College and District, and that the College widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement (III.D, IV.A, IV.B).

Under U.S. Department of Education enforcement regulations, the Commission is required to take immediate action to terminate the accreditation of an institution which is out of compliance with any standard. In the alternative, the Commission can provide the institution with additional notice and a deadline for coming into compliance that is no later than two years from when the institution was first informed of the noncompliance.

In exceptional situations, if the institution has done all within its authority to reach compliance on any standard but remains out of compliance, the Commission is permitted by regulations to allocate a one-time, short-term “good cause extension” for the college to reach compliance prior to acting on the institution’s termination. However, continued noncompliance with multiple standards would diminish the appropriateness of such an extension. Mission College should fully resolve the noted deficiencies by March 2015.

Federal regulations also require the Commission to post a Public Disclosure Notice (PDN) for institutions placed on Probation or Show Cause, or when accreditation is withdrawn. The PDN is used to inform the public of the reasons for such a severe sanction. The Commission will post the PDN on the College’s entry in the Directory of Accredited Institutions online at www.accjc.org. The institution is permitted to post a response to the PDN. Enclosed find the proposed notice for Mission College with this action letter; your comments on it are invited. Please provide the College response for posting, if any, by July 31, 2014.
Improvement of Institutional Effectiveness:

Recommendations have also been made for Mission College to improve institutional effectiveness. Recommendations for improvement may be made to highlight areas for continuing or expanding excellent practices.

Recommendations for improvement may also be made when an institution is currently in compliance with Standards, but additional levels of effort should be demonstrated in the future. In the Commission’s experience, these recommendations may provide indicators of possible future noncompliance if left unattended by the institution. The College should plan to fully address the improvement recommendation below in the Follow-Up Report of March 2015.

Recommendation #6 Student Support Services:
In order to improve, the team recommends that the College replicate the practices of its own successful special programs, particularly the Academic Success for Asians Program (ASAP) and scale these efforts in order to close the achievement gap with other underserved student populations (II.B.3.a, II.B.3.d).

During its institutional self evaluation, Mission College identified improvement plans for advancing its continuous improvement efforts. The Commission suggests that those plans for improvement be taken into account as the College continues into the next accreditation cycle. In its Midterm report, the College should address steps undertaken in those improvement areas.

The External Evaluation Report that was sent to the institution provides details of the team’s findings with regard to each Eligibility Requirement and Accreditation Standard and should be read carefully and used to understand the team’s findings.

The recommendations contained in the External Evaluation Report represent the best advice of the peer evaluation team at the time of the visit. Institutions are expected to take all actions necessary to continuously comply with Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies. The Commission wishes to remind you that while an institution may concur or disagree with any part of the Report, Mission College is expected to use the External Evaluation Report to improve educational programs and services.

The Commission requires that the College give the Institutional Self Evaluation Report, the External Evaluation Report, and this letter appropriate dissemination to College staff and to those who were signatories of the College Self Evaluation Report. This group should include the Chancellor, campus leadership, and the Board of Trustees.

The Commission also requires that the College’s Institutional Self Evaluation Report, the External Evaluation Report, and this Commission action letter be made available to students and the public by placing a copy on the College website.
Mr. Daniel Peck
Mission College
July 3, 2014

Please note that in response to public interest in disclosure, the Commission now requires institutions to post accreditation information on a page no farther than one click from the institution's home page.

On behalf of the Commission, I wish to express continuing interest in the institution’s educational programs and services. Professional self-regulation is the most effective means of assuring institutional integrity, effectiveness, educational quality, and student success.

Sincerely,

Barbara A. Beno, Ph.D.
President
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1Institutions preparing and submitting Midterm Reports, Follow-Up Reports, and Special Reports to the Commission should review Guidelines for the Preparation of Reports to the Commission. It contains the background, requirements, and format for each type of report and presents sample cover pages and certification pages. It is available on the ACCJC website under College Reports to ACCJC at: (http://www.accjc.org/college-reports-accjc).