June 29, 2020

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

Dear Mr. Peck:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting June 10-12, 2020, reviewed the Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER) and evidentiary materials submitted by Mission College. The Commission also considered the Peer Review Team Report (Team Report) prepared by the peer review team that conducted its onsite visit to the College March 9-12, 2020.

The purpose of this review was to determine whether the College continues to meet ACCJC’s Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and Accreditation Standards (hereinafter, the Standards). Upon consideration of the written and oral information noted above, the Commission acted to **Reaffirm Accreditation for 18 Months and require a Follow-Up Report, due no later than October 1, 2021.**

**Commendations**

The Commission recognizes the exemplary performance of Mission College in the following areas. Commendations signify practices for which the Commission believes the institution has exceeded standards.

**Standard I.B.3, II.A.15 (College Commendation 1):** The Commission commends Mission College for its implementation of the program revitalization process to ensure continuous quality improvement when programs fall below institution-set standards and/or program review standards so that students can complete their education in a timely manner.

**Standard II.C.1 (College Commendation 2):** The Commission commends Mission College for their use of the Front Door Experience data to holistically improve the quality of student services and enhance the accomplishment of the college mission.

**Standard IV.A.1 (College Commendation 3):** The Commission commends Mission College for developing a culture of equity and inclusion to support administrators, faculty, staff, and students in taking initiative for improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved.
Standard III.A.12 (District Commendation 1): The Commission commends the District for its creation of processes, programs, and services to increase faculty equity and diversity, consistent with its mission, including implementation of the Faculty Diversity Internship Program (FDIP) and EEO planning.

Compliance Requirements
The Commission also determined that the College must demonstrate compliance with the following Standards, as identified in the requirements below. This demonstration must be addressed in the required Follow-Up Report.

Standard I.B.6 (College Requirement 1): In order to meet the Standard, the Commission requires that the college implement procedures for the disaggregation, analysis, and evaluation of learning outcomes.

Standard III.A.5 (District Requirement 1): In order to meet the Standard, the Commission requires that the District systematically evaluate all personnel at stated intervals in accordance with college policies.

Standard III.C.2 (District Requirement 2): In order to meet the Standard, the Commission requires that the District continuously plan technology updates and replacements with the colleges to ensure that quality and capacity of technology are adequate to support the College’s mission, operations, programs, and services.

In accordance with federal regulations, compliance requirements must be addressed, and the institution must demonstrate that it aligns with Standards within two years.1

Modifications to Recommendations:
In taking its action, the Commission modified the team’s recommendation(s) as follows:

District Recommendation 2 is changed from an improvement recommendation to a compliance requirement. The Commission also determined that the wording of the recommendation should be revised as follows:

Original Recommendation 2 (Improvement): In order to improve quality and ensure that capacity of technology is adequate to support the College’s mission, operations, programs, and services, the District should continuously plan and coordinate technology updates and replacements with the colleges. (III.C.2)

Revised Recommendation 2 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the Commission requires that the District continuously plan technology updates and replacements with the colleges to ensure that quality and capacity of technology are adequate to support the College’s mission, operations, programs, and services. (III.C.2)

The Commission added the following Improvement Recommendation:

College Recommendation 2 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the Commission recommends the college review and revise processes to ensure that every

---

1 For more information, refer to the Commission policy on “The Two-Year Rule and Extension for Good Cause” on the ACCJC website at https://accjc.org/eligibility-requirements-standards-policies/.
sylabus includes the current and correct SLOs and published information regarding
degree applicability of courses is accurate. (II.A.3)

Recommendations for Improving Institutional Effectiveness
The Team Report includes narrative pertinent to the Commission added College
Recommendation 2 for improving institutional effectiveness. This recommendation does not
identify current areas of deficiency in institutional practice, but consistent with its mission to
foster continuous improvement through the peer review process, the Commission encourages
institutions to give serious consideration to the advice contained in the peer reviewers’ report.
The Commission anticipates that you will bring the recommendation and the team’s full report to
the attention of your institution for serious consideration. In the Midterm Report, the College will
include actions taken in response to the improvement recommendations.

Next Steps
The Team Report provides details of the peer review team’s findings. The guidance and
recommendations contained in the Report represent the best advice of the peer review team at the
time of the visit but may not describe all that is necessary for the college to improve or to come
into compliance. A final copy of the Team Report is attached.

The Commission requires that you disseminate the ISER, the Team Report, and this letter to
those who were signatories of the ISER and that you make these documents available to all
campus constituencies and the public by placing copies on the College website. Please note that
in response to public interest in accreditation, the Commission requires institutions to post
current accreditation information on a Web page no more than one click from the institution’s
home page. In keeping with ACCJC policy, the Commission action will also be posted on the
ACCJC website within 30 days of the date of the Commission’s action.

On behalf of the Commission, we wish to express appreciation for the diligent work and
thoughtful reflection that Mission College undertook to prepare for this evaluation. These efforts
confirm that peer review can well serve the multiple constituencies of higher education by both
ensuring and encouraging institutional quality and effectiveness.

If you have any questions about this letter or the Commission’s action, please feel free to contact
Dr. Stephanie Droker or the vice president assigned as liaison to your institution.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Droker, Ed.D.  Ian Walton, Ph.D.
ACCJC President  ACCJC Chair

cc:  Mr. Bradley Davis, Chancellor West Valley-Mission Community College District
     Dr. Leandra Martin, Accreditation Liaison Officer

Enclosure