



**ACCREDITING  
COMMISSION  
for COMMUNITY and  
JUNIOR COLLEGES**

*Western Association  
of Schools and Colleges*

10 COMMERCIAL BOULEVARD  
SUITE 204  
NOVATO, CA 94949  
TELEPHONE: (415) 506-0234  
FAX: (415) 506-0238  
E-MAIL: [accjc@accjc.org](mailto:accjc@accjc.org)  
[www.accjc.org](http://www.accjc.org)

Chairperson  
SHERRILL L. AMADOR  
Public Member

Vice Chairperson  
STEVEN KINSELLA  
Administration

President  
BARBARA A. BENO

Vice President  
SUSAN B. CLIFFORD

Vice President  
KRISTA JOHNS

Vice President  
GARMAN JACK POND

Associate Vice President  
JOHN NIXON

Associate Vice President  
NORVAL WELLSFRY

June 29, 2015

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

Dear President Peck:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting June 3-5, 2015, reviewed the Follow-Up Report submitted by Mission College, the report of the evaluation team that visited on April 16-17, 2015, and considered the opening testimony provided by President Peck and other representatives of the college leadership. The Commission appreciates the joint commitment to working together toward improvement that Mission College representatives spoke about. The College Follow-Up Report was certified by college leadership, including the chancellor, president of the board of trustees, the college president, the Accreditation Liaison Officer, and leaders of the faculty, staff, and student organizations.

Based on the College Follow-Up Report, evidence submitted, and the External Evaluation Team Report, the Commission finds that Mission College has addressed Recommendations 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10 from the 2014 comprehensive evaluation and resolved the deficiencies in College policies, procedures, and practices which led to noncompliance with Standards II.A, II.B.3.a, II.B.3.d, III.A.1.c, III.B.2, III.B.2.a, III.C.1, III.C.2, III.D, and IV.A. Therefore, the Commission took action to remove Probation and **issue Warning**. The Commission also acted to require Mission College to submit a **Follow-Up Report by March 1, 2016**.<sup>1</sup> The Report will be followed by an external evaluation team visit.

Warning is issued when the Commission finds that an institution has deficiencies which lead to noncompliance with the Commission's Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, or Commission policies to an extent that gives concern to the Commission.

**Need to Resolve Deficiencies:**

The Accreditation Standards represent practices that lead to academic quality and institutional effectiveness. Deficiencies in institutional policies, procedures, practices, and outcomes which lead to noncompliance with any

Mr. Daniel Peck  
Mission College  
June 29, 2015

Standard will impact quality at an institution and ultimately the educational environment and experiences of students. The Commission finds that Mission College has taken the steps required to meet the Standards cited above and should now complete the work necessary to meet the Standards noted below.

The Follow-Up Report due **March 1, 2016** should demonstrate that the College has addressed Recommendations 1 through 4 and 9, noted below, from the 2014 comprehensive evaluation, fully resolved the remaining deficiencies, and meets Eligibility Requirement 10 and 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, II.B.4, III.B.2. The recommendations provide guidance for resolving the remaining deficiencies.

**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

Mr. Daniel Peck  
Mission College  
June 29, 2015

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 #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).

### **Additional Information:**

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. With this letter, Mission College is being given notice of the Standards for which it remains out of compliance and is being provided time to meet the Standards. The remaining deficiencies must be resolved and the Standards met by **March 2016**.

Institutions are expected to meet Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies at all times during the six-year review cycle. Mission College must demonstrate to the Commission at the time of the March 2016 Report that it has resolved all remaining deficiencies and meets the Standards noted above.

A **final** copy of the External Evaluation Team Report is attached. The Commission has made a correction to the typographical error in the subtitle on page 4 changing 2011 to 2014. The Follow-Up Report submitted in March 2015 will become part of the accreditation history of the College. The Commission requires that you give the Follow-Up Report, the External Evaluation Team Report, and this letter appropriate dissemination to your College staff and to those who were signatories of your Follow-Up Report. This group should include the campus leadership and the Board of Trustees. The Commission also requires that these documents be made

Mr. Daniel Peck  
Mission College  
June 29, 2015

available to students and the public by placing a copy on the College website. *Please note that in response to public interest in disclosure, the Commission now requires institutions to post accreditation information on a page no more than one click from the institution's home page.*

On behalf of the Commission, I wish to encourage your continued work to ensure Mission College's educational quality and to support students' success. Professional self-regulation is the responsibility of an accredited college and the accreditor. Thank you for sharing in that responsibility.

Sincerely,



Barbara A. Beno, Ph.D.  
President

BAB/tl

cc: Dr. Patrick Schmitt, Chancellor

Enclosure: Final External Evaluation Team Report

---

<sup>1</sup> Institutions preparing and submitting Midterm Reports, Follow-Up Reports, or Special Reports to the Commission should review *Guidelines for the Preparation of Reports to the Commission* found on the ACCJC website at: <http://www.accjc.org/college-reports-accjc>.