

EVALUATION REPORT

**Mission College
West Valley-Mission CCD
Santa Clara, California**

A confidential report prepared for
The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that
visited Mission College in Santa Clara, CA from March 17-20, 2014

Douglas B. Houston, Ed.D.
Chair

**Mission College
Visiting Team Roster
March 2014**

Dr. Douglas B. Houston (Chair)
Superintendent/President
Yuba CCD

Ms. Cathy Richter (Team Assistant)
Executive Secretary to the Chancellor
Yuba CCD

Ms. Roanna Bennie
Dean Academic Affairs
Allan Hancock College

Dr. Rick Santos
Interim Dean of Instruction, Business
Fresno City College

Ms. Anna Davies
Executive Vice President
College of the Desert

Ms. Toni Sommer
Vice President Administrative Services
Cuesta College

Dr. Howard Irvin Jr.
Dean Counseling & Enrollment Services
Grossmont College

Mr. Duncan Sutton
Research Analyst
Salvation Army College

Dr. Jannett Jackson
Chancellor
Chabot-Las Positas CCD

Ms. Christine Tinberg
Faculty, Kinesiology; SLO Coordinator
Los Angeles City College

Dr. David Newnham
Vice President of Instruction
Folsom Lake College

Mr. Paul Wickline
Department Chair, Theater
College of the Canyons

Dr. Tanya Renner
Professor of Psychology
Kapiolani Community College

Dr. Carol Welsh
Dean, Library and Learning Resources
Cypress College

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION REPORT

INSTITUTION: Mission College

DATES OF VISIT: March 17-20, 2014

TEAM CHAIR: Dr. Douglas B. Houston, Chancellor, Yuba CCD

A fourteen-member accreditation team visited Mission College from March 17-20, 2014, for the purposes of evaluating how well the institution is achieving its stated purposes, analyzing how well the College is meeting the Commission Standards, providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement, and submitting recommendations to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the status of the College.

In preparation for the visit, team members attended an all-day training session on February 12, 2014, conducted by the ACCJC and studied Commission materials prepared for visiting teams. Team members read the College's self-evaluation report, including the recommendations from the 2008 visiting team, and assessed the various forms of evidence provided by the institution.

Prior to the visit team members completed written evaluations of the institution's self evaluation report and began identifying areas for further investigation. On the day before the formal beginning of the visit, the team members spent the afternoon discussing their views of the written materials and evidence provided by the institution as well as the Midterm Report completed by the institution on March 15, 2011, and other materials submitted to the Commission since its last comprehensive visit.

During the visit, the team met with approximately 110 institution faculty, staff, administrators, and students. Team members also met with the College President, District Chancellor and members of the Board of Trustees. The team also attended two open meetings to allow for comments from faculty and staff and to hear confidentially from any Mission College stakeholder. The institution provided outstanding support to the team prior to and during the site visit. All members of the Mission College community were welcoming, hospitable and gracious.

The team found that the self-evaluation report was complete and included narrative responses on all ACCJC standards. However, the team was concerned with the generally insufficient focus on reflection and analysis in the self-evaluation report. Although the institution responded on each Standard, those responses generally fell short of fully describing the institution's practices in the context of accreditation expectations and the evidence cited often did not substantiate the College's findings regarding those expectations. The team also noted several internal inconsistencies and errors with the self-evaluation report. The team suggests that the institution master the *ACCJC Guide to Evaluating Institutions*. This is the guiding document for evaluating teams and provides great insight for institutions in preparation for accreditation reports and visits.

That having been said, during the Site Visit, the team found ample supporting documentation and evidence to support our findings and is particularly concerned that the institution did not include this evidence in the evaluation report. Many interviewees confirmed that the self-evaluation would have benefited from deeper reflection and wider discussion. The team encourages Mission College to develop a more thorough understanding of the ACCJC Rubric For Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness in program review, planning, and the assessment of student learning.

The team determined that the institution is generally at a level of proficiency with respect to program review and planning and at the developmental level in the assessment of student learning outcomes. That being said, institutions are expected to already be at a level of sustainable continuous quality improvement with respect to program review and planning and at the level of proficiency in student learning outcome assessment. Mission College will benefit from mastering this rubric in its evaluation of institutional effectiveness in the context of the accreditation Standards.

The team wishes to express its deep appreciation to Mission College. Team members have developed an abiding respect for the institution, its faculty and staff, its mission, its abiding commitment to the students the College serves and the College's culture of mutual respect and collaboration. The team is confident that the College will leverage that culture to accomplish the work of evaluating and improving practices to meet ACCJC Standards.

Major Findings and Recommendations of the 2014 Visiting Team

Team Recommendations:

As a result of the March 2014 visit, the team made nine recommendations to meet the Standard and one to improve:

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 #5

Distance Education: In order to meet the Standard and comply with Commission Policy, the team recommends that the College establish policy regarding regular and effective student contact for Distance Education courses (II.A).

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).

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).

Team Commendations:

During the visit, the team also recognized numerous noteworthy aspects of the institution:

Commendation #1

The team commends the College and particularly the maintenance and operations staff for the quality of the College landscaping and grounds which are particularly attractive, well maintained, and sustainable; clearly the Grounds staff takes great pride in its work.

Commendation #2

The team commends the College, the District and the voters of the West Valley-Mission CCD Service area for supporting higher education through the passage of two general

obligation bond measures which have enabled the college to establish new state-of-the-art educational facilities that are attractive, of an architecture that compliments the college's culture and surroundings and will provide a quality learning environment for decades of current and future students.

Commendation #3

The team commends the institution for its entrepreneurial approach and success in effectively and appropriately leveraging grant funding opportunities to advance the mission of the college and its programs.

Commendation #4

The team commends the district for taking strong steps towards financial stability by:

- Establishing the Land Corporation to develop real property as a solution for resource development without exposing the District to increased risk
- Achieving the status of a Community Supported Basic Aid district,
- Assessing and refining the Associate Faculty Funding Model and the Resource Allocation Model, and
- Maintaining sufficient fiscal reserves and contingencies to sustain programs and services during periods of economic uncertainty.

Commendation #5

The team commends the College faculty, staff, and administration for their strong commitment to the college, its students, its community and for the high level of respect and collaboration within departments and committees.

**ACCREDITATION EVALUATION REPORT
FOR
MISSION COLLEGE,
WEST VALLEY-MISSION COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**

Introduction

Mission College is one of two colleges that make up the West Valley-Mission Community College District located primarily in Santa Clara County. The District was established in 1963 as the West Valley Joint Community College District. The first college, West Valley, opened on a temporary site in Campbell in 1964 and moved to its permanent campus in Saratoga in 1968. In 1966-67, 12 acres of land were purchased in Santa Clara, north of the Bayshore Freeway between Lawrence Expressway and Coffin Road for the construction of Mission College. The total 164-acre parcel was acquired in 1970.

Between 1975 and 1979, a Mission College interim campus was located at the Jefferson Intermediate School, Santa Clara. The first phase of construction at the Santa Clara site was completed in 1979, and the College began its 1979-1980 academic year with 3,500 students, 8 administrators, and 73 instructors. In September 1985, the name of the District was changed to West Valley-Mission Community College District to reflect the inclusion of Mission College.

Mission College is a comprehensive community college that offers 86 transfer, degree, and certificate programs in lower division arts and sciences, as well as occupational education, basic skills and English as a second language, community education, and workforce and economic development programs. Currently, more than 8,500 day, evening, and online students are enrolled. In fall 2012 the College employed 143 full-time faculty, 105 classified staff, and 13 administrators and managers.

The service area of the West Valley-Mission Community College District is largely urban and suburban and includes portions of Santa Clara and Santa Cruz counties. The geographic boundaries of the District include the areas served by the Campbell Union High School, Los Gatos-Saratoga Joint Union High Schools, and Santa Clara Unified School Districts. Mission College is located in the northern end of the District, off a major highway in an urban area made up of numerous high-tech companies; hotels; a major amusement park; a convention center; and the new San Francisco 49er's stadium (scheduled to open in 2014).

The technology boom and subsequent dot-com collapse has resulted in marked shifts in enrollment patterns and the demographics of the student population. While overall unit enrollment was buoyed during the technology boom, it was largely a result of older students seeking skill enhancement and technology-specific opportunities. The shift since the period of the technology bubble has seen decreases in enrollment for technology and manufacturing programs, but growth in traditional transfer-oriented and full-time students.

The College has experienced significant physical changes as well. Since the opening of the Main Building in 1979, Mission College has added a number of new facilities. The Campus

Center opened in November of 2000. It houses club rooms, conference rooms, a cafeteria, a bookstore, the District police, and will soon house DSPS and Veterans service programs with increased space for service. The Library and Telecommunications Center opened in spring 2001. A new Child Development Center was completed in 2001-2002 and the Science Building, which houses Natural Sciences and Engineering opened in 2003-2004. Phase II of the gymnasium, which includes indoor courts, lockers, showers, and offices, was completed in 2004. A second Child Development building, complete renovation of the Hospitality Management building, and new facility for Information Systems infrastructure and offices have been completed over the last three years.

Significant construction continues. Two buildings are being designed to replace the Main Building, which has been the primary service and instructional building since the opening of the current campus. The first of these buildings, the Gillmor Center, will open in summer 2014 and will house several Career and Technical Education (CTE) and specialized transfer programs, including Fire Protection Technology, Health Occupations, Computer Science and Information Technology, Music and Art, as well as general classrooms. The second building, currently in design phase, will house student services programs and the Welcome Center in a “one stop shop” arrangement, general education classrooms, and administrative offices.

The College is also actively planning for additional facilities development to be completed prior to the year 2020. A physical education annex building is in the advanced design stage to be built near the current gym, replacing Main Building physical education classrooms including weight training and adaptive physical education. In addition, the College is in the early planning stages for a new physical plant/infrastructure building, new campus plaza to be built on the site of the current Main Building, and new permanent building to replace several portable classrooms located on the campus.

Throughout its 35 years of growth and change, Mission College aspires to continue to be the student-centered community organization it has been since its founding.

Evaluation of Institutional Responses to Previous Recommendations

Team Recommendation 1 (2008):

Given two previous teams' recommendations (1995 and 2001), the team strongly recommends that the College immediately implement systematic and continuous program review and planning processes that are linked to resource/budget allocation.

(1.A.1, 1.A.7, 1.B.3, 1.B.4, 1.B.6, 2.A.2e, 2.c.2, 3.C.2, 4.B.2.a)

Over the past four years, the College has devoted considerable resources to developing and implementing processes for systematic and continuous program review and planning. They have implemented an online system using and refining Governet's CurricUNET program review and assessment modules to serve institutional planning needs. While the assessment module is not currently operational, the screenshots and narrative provided in interviews demonstrate the potential of this system to do the following: help facilitate storage of outcomes assessment plans and results; provide needed alignment between course, program and institutional Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs); and integrate with planning processes.

The College has established a schedule for a four-year program review cycle for instruction and student services programs and a two-year program review cycle for Career Technical Education (CTE) programs, each with annual updates. Program review clearly drives departmental and divisional planning, and SLO results are embedded within program review. The College will further improve this process once the assessment module is online and fully functional. The Program Review Committee (PRC) provides peer validation of the process for both the comprehensive and annual updates. The committee extracts the results from program review and sends them to various participatory governance and oversight committees (Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC), Governance and Planning Council (GAP), and Technology.)

Program review goals are linked to the strategic goals which are derived from and aligned with the mission of the College and are prominently placed in the program review template. The program review plans and goals are integrated into larger College planning via the IE and GAP committees. Budget requests developed from the program review process are sent to the College Budget Advisory Committee (CBAC) which utilizes a rubric that includes consideration of program review information including program review goals identified as supporting College strategic goals or improving learning outcomes. Significant evidence exists demonstrating the connection between College strategic goals and program review goals; however, less evidence exists demonstrating program review goals determined from SLO results. Recommendations are made through CBAC and the IEC to GAP. The GAP Council, in turn, makes recommendations to the College President.

The Program Review Committee has assessed the effectiveness of the program review process since 2008 and made regular improvements to the process. Results of program review and budget allocations are available on the internet on the Program Review Committee webpage.

The team concludes that the institution has satisfied this recommendation.

Team Recommendation 2 (2008):

The team recommends that Mission College establish and implement a schedule for systematically reviewing its mission and values statements. (1.A.3)

The Mission College Board of Trustees approved its current mission and vision statement in 2010 after a systematic review and revision by the Governance and Planning Committee (GAP), the highest college participatory governance committee. Prior to adoption, GAP approved and presented the mission statement to various constituencies, including the Academic Senate, Associated Student Government, and the Classified Senate.

GAP reviewed the mission statement annually in 2011 and 2012 and then established a four-year review cycle consistent with the comprehensive program review cycle with the proviso that the mission could be reviewed off-cycle if needs arose related to economic forces, external regulations, or pedagogy.

The team concludes that the institution has satisfied this recommendation.

Team Recommendation 3 (2008):

In an additional continuation of the 2001 visiting team's recommendation, the current team recommends that the College complete its development of SLOs at the course, program and degree level and establish authentic assessment strategies for assessing SLOs. The team further recommends the use of assessment results to improve learning and the delivery of services to students (1.B.2, 1.B.5, 1.B.7, 2.A.1.a, 2.A.1.c, 2.A.2.a, 2.A.2.b, 2.A.2.b, 2.A.2.f, 2.A.2.i, 2.A.3.6, 2.B, 3.A.1.c, 3.A.6, 3.B.1)

The College has student learning outcomes (SLOs) in place for courses, some programs, degrees, and certificates. Course level outcomes are available on the CurricUNET website, though not embedded in the Course Outline of Record (COR). Instructional Program SLOs are listed in the College Catalog and on the College website for each department. The institution has assessment processes for course SLOs and for some student services programs; but none to assess certificate and degree SLOs.

Assessment results are located on the SLO committee webpage; however the team found locating them problematic. A search using "Student Learning Outcomes" on the website does not provide a link to assessment results. Assessment reports are available at the bottom of the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment page.

Course and program SLOs are clearly listed in the catalog and on the College's website; however, course-level results are not easy to find and the team did not find evidence of any summative course-level SLO reports. The team did find what are titled "SLO REPORTS" on the CurricUNET website but determined these to be SLO plans consisting of identifications of course level SLOs, assessment plans, and identification of which ISLO the CSLO is aligned to. The team found inconsistent evidence of authentic assessments for course SLOs.

The team found vague and inconsistent practices in the identification of gaps in student learning. The course level SLO results do not consistently indicate evidence that faculty are identifying gaps, and without certificate or degree outcomes assessment present, there is little that can be presented to various constituencies as required by Standard II.A.2.f. The College provided little evidence that it is using assessment results to improve learning and the delivery of services to students as indicated in the recommendation.

The College intended to assess its Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs) in fall 2013. While the team discovered in interviews that the College used the Community College Survey of Student Engagement to assess ISLOs, evidence of this assessment is missing from the self-evaluation report. The Actionable Improvement Plans Summary Update provided on March 14, 2014, indicated that “an integrated assessment report is also being developed which includes information on Institutional Student Learning Outcomes assessment....”

Currently, there is no summary report of course, program, certificate, or degree outcomes results or findings present on the SLO website and no evidence that this report exists or has been disseminated to campus committees or College constituencies.

The team concludes that the College has not satisfied this recommendation and is currently at the development stage of the Accrediting Commission of Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) Rubric. **See new Recommendation #4.**

Team Recommendation 4 (2008):

The team recommends that Mission College improve its research capacity, more effectively utilize research, and clearly delineate the relative roles of College and District research functions. (1.B.3, 1B.6, 2.A.1.a, 2.A.2.g, 2.B.3, 3.C.1, 4.B.2.b, 4.B.3.b)

In its response to the College’s 2011 Midterm Report, ACCJC found that Mission College provided ample evidence that it had sufficiently expanded its research capacity with the establishment of a new director level position supported by a research technician, leading to the increased availability of data. This level of staffing has been maintained.

The team concludes that the institution has satisfied this recommendation.

Team Recommendation 5 (2008):

The team recommends that the College review and complete its planning agendas for both the 2001 and 2007 accreditation visits. (1B.4, 1B.6)

In response to the recommendation, as referenced in the March 2009 and March 2010 progress reports, all of the 85 planning agenda items from 2001 were completed by March 2009. As of February 2010, 44 of 45 planning agenda items from 2007 had been completed. The remaining planning agenda which referenced the District’s allocation model had a status of 80% complete.

In the fall of 2008, The District Budget Advisory Committee (DBAC) formed and charged the Budget Allocation Model Sub-Committee (BAMS) to develop and recommend a simple, equitable, and transparent District Budget Allocation Model. Through a shared governance process, BAMS recommended two budget models for DBAC consideration. The new incoming Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services evaluated the proposed models and recommended to DBAC that the Zero-based Budget Model, endorsed by the Governance and Planning (GAP) Council, take effect in spring 2010 to develop the 2010-2011 College budget. Most of the work is already completed. This was recognized by ACCJC in their acceptance on the College's 2011 Midterm Report.

The team concludes that the institution has satisfied this recommendation.

Team Recommendation 6 (2008):

As previously recommended by the 2001 visiting team, the current team also recommends that the College continue to develop, implement, and regularly assess the results of its recruitment, retention, and success plan for underrepresented faculty, staff and students and that it submit such a completed plan for the Commission's review.

(2001 team Recommendation 2, Standard 3.A.4)(2.A1.a, 2.A.4, 3.A.4.a, 3.A.4.b)

Mission College reported in its 2011 Midterm Report that in order to address this recommendation the District had prioritized and hired a Director of Human Resources who "will be the lead District level support towards implementing diversity and professional development goals District-wide." In 2013-2014 the District eliminated the human resources director position due to funding considerations. The College is evaluating its response to this decision and as of the time of the visit has not identified what College staff will assume the responsibility in this area.

The College reported in 2011 that its Staff/Faculty Diversity Committee had prioritized the review of success, retention and hiring data for the academic year. A Staff/Faculty Diversity/Campus Climate Survey was developed and administered. College administrators reported that although requests had been made to the District office, the College has not received, reviewed, or assessed the effectiveness of its recruitment of underrepresented faculty, staff, and students since the 2007 recommendation. The administrators report difficulty receiving the data from the District office and this was confirmed by District office staff.

Overall, the College has made some progress on this recommendation and gained momentum during the 2009-2012 timeframe with the addition of human resources staffing with explicit responsibility for EEO activities. However, since 2012 the College has made limited progress and acknowledges it has yet to identify a method to systematically collect, review, and analyze its progress in the recruitment of underrepresented faculty, staff, and students due largely to fiscal uncertainty, administrative staffing changes, and District reorganization.

The team concludes that this recommendation has not been satisfied. **See new Recommendation #1.**

Team Recommendation 7 (2008):

The team recommends that the College develop organizational structures and strategies to effectively provide administrative support and oversight necessary to accomplish the institution's mission and purpose. (3.A.2, 3.A.6, 4.A.1, 4.B.2.a, 4.B.2., 4.B.2.a, 4.B.2.c)

In response to this recommendation, Mission College gathered information and hired consultants to determine how best to restructure the College for more efficient and effective functioning. A major reorganization was implemented in FY 2009-10.

The College has invested significant resources and effort to achieve an organizational structure that better supports its mission and purpose. According to their 2011 Midterm Report, the College scheduled a second evaluation of the reorganization for spring 2012, with the intention of using the results to continue to improve its organizational structure. This evaluation is not mentioned in the self-evaluation report in the section discussing the prior recommendations, nor is there mention of use of the results of such an evaluation.

The team concludes that the institution satisfied this recommendation; however, based on findings in this visit, the team recommends that the institution evaluate the efficacy of this reorganization. **See new Recommendation #9.**

Team Recommendation 8 (2008):

The team recommends that Mission College establish a culture which supports participation of classified staff in governance, including mechanisms to release classified staff from assigned duties for governance activities and leadership training. (3A.3.a, 3A.4.a, 3A.5, 3A.5.a, 3A.5.b, 4A.2.a)

Mission College administrators and classified staff worked together to address this recommendation. Classified senate representatives meet regularly with College administration to discuss issues of mutual concern and develop strategies to improve and promote opportunities for classified staff to participate. The classified senate at Mission is recognized by the California Community Colleges Classified Senate (4CS) as a model senate, reflecting its practices are a model for others to emulate. In 2010 the District Board of Trustees recognized the classified senate of the College as providing outstanding services to the District.

A review of the College governance committee websites reflect that staff are identified on participatory governance committees and their attendance is regular. Both the GAP and the campus safety committees' agendas and minutes reflect active participation of classified staff. The classified association president affirmed that notifications go to classified staff to inform them of opportunities to participate and those who are interested are encouraged to volunteer to represent their colleagues.

Mission College has worked to improve communications to classified staff and increase participation of classified staff in College governance. Classified staff report they communicate regularly about opportunities for participation, and all classified members are

welcome and encouraged to volunteer. Classified leaders report positively that current administrators of the College are open and welcoming of classified staff participation in College governance.

The team concludes that the institution has satisfied this recommendation.

Team Recommendation 9 (2008):

The District and the College constituencies need to address the impact of the reduction in fiscal resources caused by the apportionment penalty assessed on the District this past year. (3.D.1.b, 3.D.1.c, 3.D.1.d, 3.2.a, 3.2.d, 3.D.2, 3.D.2.d, 3.D.2.e, 4.A.4, 4.A.5)

Mission College addressed the impact of the reduction in fiscal resources caused by the apportionment penalty on the District in 2008 by developing a plan to restore the FTES revenue lost. An agreement between the District and the State determined a penalty of the apportionment revenue reduction of \$5,644,227 with a reduction to 2243.57 base credit FTES. As allowed by the agreement, the District was able to achieve restoration funding of \$7,628,774 for FY 2008-09 and \$1,038,463 for 2009-10.

The team concludes that the institution has satisfied this recommendation.

Team Recommendation 10 (2008):

The team recommends that Mission College establish clear, shared understanding of its governance processes, including roles of the Academic and Classified Senates, GAP, and other major governance bodies. (4.A.1, 4.A.2, 4.A.2.a)

Mission College published their Participatory Governance Handbook in 2011. The purpose of this publication is to document collaborative governance processes and to communicate these governance processes throughout the campus community. There is no analysis of the audience for the handbook however, nor any discussion in the self-evaluation report of ways to assess dissemination and optimize communication.

The team concludes that the institution has satisfied this recommendation.

Team Recommendation 11 (2008):

The team recommends that the West-Valley Mission Community College District initiate a dialog between the Board of Trustees and District governance bodies to reach a shared understanding of the appropriate governance roles of all parties. (4.A.2, 4.A.2.a, 4.A.3, 4.B.1)

Since the current governance structure was established in 1997-1998, the West-Valley Mission Community College District has implemented various strategies to improve communication among District constituencies and the Board of Trustees. In 2010, the Board adopted a goal to provide organizational structures and systems to support teaching and

learning. Also in 2010, the Board received training on effective participation in District and College governance. Most recently, the Board implemented a town hall type of meeting, held once a semester, to meet with members throughout the District to discuss important issues.

The team concludes that the institution has satisfied this recommendation.

Team Recommendation 12 (2008):

The team recommends that the College constituencies seek input from the Board of Trustees to establish District-wide goals that address the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the educational programs of the District so that these goals may be incorporated into the strategic planning process of the College. (4.B.1, 4.B.1.c, 4.B.2, 4.B.4)

In addressing the recommendation that the Board establish goals that focus on educational issues, the Board of Trustees initiated the development of two sets of goals, one for District priorities and one for Board objectives. One of the goals was to increase the Board's focus on the District's organizational mission. In February 2009, the Board of Trustees adopted District-wide goals. The Board also adopted policy language to establish, review, and revise District goals and objectives not less than once per year. In May 2009, the District Council approved the Board's request for an ad hoc committee to create objectives which focused on educational and student services.

In fall 2010, the District contracted with the California Collegiate Brain Trust consultant group to recommend a formal strategic planning process that would enhance the planning of both Colleges and inform the resource allocation of the Land Corporation. The consultant group outlined a review of existing planning documents such as marketing research, demographic, and economic trends as well as educational master plans from both Colleges to provide the basis for the updated strategic plan.

The Board of Trustees established goals which are posted on the District's webpage. Additionally, interviews with the Chancellor and several Board members confirmed that an annual Board self evaluation takes place and is presented to the internal and external constituency groups in open session at regular meetings of the Board of Trustees. Since the academic year 2008-2009, the Board regularly adopts goals each year. In reviewing the Board Minutes there was evidence that the Board does review the previous year's goals, and then establishes the next year's goals. However, some goals appear in multiple years, for example reducing the costs of books, whereas more substantive goals such as "focus on the educational quality and student success by revising District policies regarding agenda item requirements to include how an item connects with educational priorities... and how the item ties into program review and/or educational master plan" appeared only once.

The team concludes that the institution has satisfied this recommendation.

Eligibility Requirements

- 1. Authority:** The evaluation team confirmed that Mission College has authority to operate as a degree-granting institution under California Education Code. The institution is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC).
- 2. Mission:** The evaluation team confirmed that Mission College’s educational mission is clearly defined and was reaffirmed by the Board of Trustees on June 15, 2010, and has more recently been reviewed and affirmed by the College’s Governance and Planning Council in 2012. The mission statement appropriately reflects the institution’s mission and is published in the College Catalog and on the institution’s website.
- 3. Governing Board:** The evaluation team confirmed that the West Valley-Mission Community College District (WVMCCD) is governed by seven members elected for terms of four years by trustee areas including portions of Santa Clara, Sunnyvale, San Jose, Saratoga, Monte Sereno, Los Gatos, and Campbell. The Board also seats two elected student trustees, one from each College in an advisory capacity. The Board is responsible for the quality and integrity of the institution and for ensuring the institution’s mission. No member of the Board has an employment or personal financial interest in the institution.
- 4. Chief Executive Officer:** The evaluation team confirmed that the President serves as Mission College’s chief administrator. The District chief executive is the Chancellor, appointed by the Board of Trustees in 2012 in accordance with Board Policy. The chancellor’s duties are clearly defined in Board Policy; the role of the College President is also defined by Board Policy: “Authority flows from the Board through the Chancellor to the executive staff and Presidents of the two Colleges. Each President, as College chief executive officer, is responsible for implementation of District policies at the College.”
- 5. Administrative Capacity:** The evaluation team confirmed that Mission College has a sufficient number of administrators and staff who have the experience and qualifications to provide appropriate oversight to manage the institution’s programs and services and to implement its mission.
- 6. Operational Status:** The evaluation team confirmed that the institution is operational, with over 8,500 students enrolled as of the Fall Semester 2013. All students were enrolled with the intent of transferring to four-year institutions, completing degree and certificate programs, acquiring basic skills and English as a second language, or engaging in life-long learning through both credit courses and community education.
- 7. Degrees:** The evaluation team confirmed that Mission College offers 43 associate degrees and 43 certificates of achievement in both collegiate and occupational areas and provides over 50 occupational programs. Associate of Arts/Associate of Science degree programs and certificate programs are identified in the College Catalog, which describes each program, student learning outcomes, career options, if applicable, and specific requirements.

8. Educational Programs: The evaluation team confirmed that Mission College's programs are consistent with its mission, based on recognized fields of study, and are of sufficient content and length. Quality and rigor are maintained through clearly defined curriculum review and approval processes as well as through contractually defined evaluation processes for all faculty.

9. Academic Credit: The evaluation team confirmed that Mission College awards academic credit based on generally accepted practices in degree granting institutions of higher education and adheres to California regulations regarding the awarding of academic credit. Academic standards are described in the College Catalog and in Board Policy.

10. Student Learning and Achievement: The evaluation team confirmed that Mission College has developed learning outcomes for all courses and programs. In addition, the College has adopted Institutional Learning Outcomes. Program and Institutional Learning Outcomes are published online and in the College Catalog. The College has not developed learning outcomes for all its degrees and certificates. The comprehensive program review process provides an opportunity for faculty to summarize key outcomes assessment results and identify how these results have informed curriculum, delivery of content/services, or development of new goals. The team was unable to find consistent evidence of authentic assessments in place for course, program, certificate, degree or institutional Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) as expected by the ACCJC Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness. Lastly, the team determined that the institution has not yet established Standards of Student Achievement and has instead identified "benchmarks" from which to monitor progress.

11. General Education: The evaluation team confirmed that general education courses have the required breadth to promote intellectual inquiry. The Mission College Catalog clearly identifies the General Education (GE) requirements for the Associate Degree. The College's General Education requirements were reviewed by the Curriculum Review Committee in fall 2013 and approved by the Board of Trustees in January 2014.

12. Academic Freedom: The evaluation team confirmed that Mission College clearly expresses its commitment to ensuring academic freedom and that this is documented in the College Catalog. Mission College adheres to and promotes the principles of academic freedom. Board Policy clearly describes the District's commitment to academic freedom as it applies to administrators, students and faculty.

13. Faculty: The evaluation team confirmed that Mission College had, at the time of the self-evaluation report, 143 full-time and 220 part-time faculty to serve approximately 8,500 students; all meet minimum qualifications per California regulations. The team confirmed that the core faculty is sufficient in number and qualification to support the institution's educational programs. Faculty responsibilities are described in the collective bargaining agreement established between the West Valley-Mission Community College District and the Association of College Educators (ACE). Both full-time and part-time faculty are listed in the College Catalog.

14. Student Services: The evaluation team confirmed that Mission College provides a comprehensive network of support services that are aligned with the needs of the student populations served and reflects the College's mission. Student services and development programs are listed in the College Catalog and on the institution's website.

15. Admissions: The evaluation team confirmed that Mission College's admissions policies are consistent with its mission, California law and regulations, and Board Policies. Admission requirements are clearly stated for students in the College Catalog and in the Schedule of Classes.

16. Information and Learning Resources: The evaluation team confirmed that Mission College provides onsite and distance education access to information and learning resources to support the College's mission, its instructional programs, and student support services. The Mission College Library houses 51,000 volumes and 104 periodical subscriptions. Students can access over 25,000 eBooks, nearly 3,500 streaming online videos, and over 40 electronic databases including over 11,000 full-text periodicals. All electronic resources are available to students on campus and off-campus. Mission College provides learning resources and free access to computers through the College Library and various support centers. Faculty and students have wireless access to the internet throughout the campus.

17. Financial Resources: The evaluation team confirmed that The West Valley-Mission Community College District is funded largely by local property taxes and various state and federal programs; the District and the College have sufficient resources to support educational programs. District-level and College-level annual budgets reflect Board priorities and serve to support the College's institutional mission, goals, programs and services. The College and the District maintain contingency reserves and follow prudent financial processes to ensure fiscal stability.

18. Financial Accountability: The evaluation team confirmed that the West Valley-Mission Community College District undergoes annual financial audits conducted by an independent, outside auditor. The audit is conducted by a contracted, certified public accounting firm according to California Accounting Standards and Contract Audit Guidelines issued annually by the California Community College System. The annual audit is reported to the Board of Trustees, who reviews the audit findings, exceptions, management letters, and any audit recommendations.

19. Institutional Planning and Evaluation: The evaluation team confirmed that Mission College is implementing systematic planning processes and resource allocation processes driven by program review. Evaluation of College metrics occurs through annual reporting on strategic goals progress and metrics of student achievement included in the California Student Success Scorecard. Reports are shared with College constituencies and made available to the public through the College Research and Planning website. The College has begun implementation of its actionable improvement plan to establish an integrated planning calendar for ongoing cycles of all planning activities. An integrated assessment report is under development that will include data on SLOs, the Student Success Scorecard, as well as additional data. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee evaluates planning processes and

makes recommendations toward the development of a systematic cycle of evaluation, planning, resource allocation, and re-evaluation.

20. Integrity in Communication with the Public: The evaluation team confirmed that Mission College provides public information through various means including the College Catalog, Schedule of Classes and the College website. The College Catalog provides current information concerning the official name, address, telephone number, and website address; the educational mission; course, program and degree offerings, academic calendar and program length, academic freedom statement, student financial aid, learning resources, names and degrees of administrators and faculty, names of governing board members; requirements for admissions, student fees and other financial obligations, and degree, certificates, graduation and transfer; policies affecting students, such as academic regulations including academic honesty, nondiscrimination, acceptance of transfer credits, grievance and complaint procedures, sexual harassment, and refunds of fees. Much of this information is also provided in the semi-annual Schedule of Classes and the College website.

21. Integrity in Relations with the Accrediting Commission: The evaluation team confirmed that Mission College adheres to ACCJC Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and policies. The College communicates any changes in its accredited status and has agreed to disclose all information required by the Commission in fulfilling its accrediting responsibilities.

Compliance with Commission Policies

The team reviewed each of the following Commission policies to ensure that the College is in full compliance.

Policy on Distance Education and on Correspondence Education

The team found evidence that the College has an established policy on Distance Education; however, the institution is considering but has not yet adopted a policy definition for regular and effective student contact (Standard II.A).

Policy on Compliance with Title IV

The team found evidence of the College's compliance with Title IV. An examination of financial aid documents indicates that the default rate for the College is 10.8% (2010 3-year rate) (Standard II.B).

Policy on Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status

The team found evidence of institution policy related to Advertising, Student Recruitment and Representation of Accredited Status in the College Catalog, Schedule of Classes and on the College website (Standard II.B).

Policy on Institutional Degrees and Credits

The team found evidence of College policy that complies with California and Federal Regulations for the award of credit for course and degree (Standard II.A).

Policy on Institution Integrity and Ethics

The team found evidence of Board adopted ethics policies that apply to all employees of the West Valley-Mission Community College District (Standard IV). As well, the team found evidence that the College has established policies for academic honesty, hiring processes and due process (Standards II.B.3 and III.A). The team also found evidence that the College publishes, to the public, all policies and procedures related to mission, education programs, fees, financial aid, and transcripts (Standard II.B.3). Lastly, the team has found evidence that the College demonstrates integrity and honesty in its interactions with students (Standard II.B.3).

Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations

The team affirmed that Mission College has no contractual relationships with organizations which are accredited non-regionally.

Policy on Student and Public Complaints against Institutions

The team found evidence of College policies regarding student complaints, and reviewed all complaints filed in the office of the Interim Vice President of Student Services (Standard II.B.C.2).

STANDARD I

Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

A. Mission

General Observations:

Mission College places student learning prominently in the mission statement stating the “College’s first priorities are students, their learning and their success” and demonstrates a strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes achievement of student learning. The mission statement effectively identifies the institution’s broad educational purposes, its intended population, and its commitment to achieving student learning. The institution has established student learning programs and services that are aligned with its purposes, character, and student population. The current mission was approved by the Board of Trustees in 2010 after considerable review by the various constituency groups and is published in numerous publications and on signage throughout the campus. The mission statement is central to institutional planning and decision making.

Findings and Evidence:

The College offers an extensive number of English as a Second Language (ESL) courses, transfer courses, and technical and career certificate programs that support the economic needs of the community. The institution clearly identifies its diverse intended student population and establishes student learning programs and services which are aligned with its purposes, character and student population. The College ensures the alignment by relying on data provided by the Office of Research, Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (ORPIE), utilizes labor market trend research, and conducts the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), the Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE), and internally developed surveys. The College provides evidence to support these claims. Recently the College identified itself as an Asian American Native American Pacific Islander Serving Institution (AANAPISI) serving a large population of over 50% of the student body needing ESL services.

The institution’s mission is aligned with the three primary missions of the California Community College system: lower-division academic and vocational instruction and transfer preparation, basic skills, and workforce preparation. The College offers 43 Certificates of Achievement and 43 Associate Degrees; 54 of these are vocational programs.

The institution recently instituted an electronic format for a four-year program review process with annual updates for all program and service areas. Because the College has been using the CurricUNET database for curriculum management, it also purchased the program review and assessment modules. This will allow integration between all three components which are vital to an effective data-driven budget and planning system. The team noted the College’s foresight in establishing this system (I.A.1).

The District Board of Trustees approved the current mission statement on June 15, 2010. According to documentation, the Governance and Planning Council (GAP), the highest college participatory governance committee, was instrumental in developing the current mission statement which was reviewed again in 2011 and 2012. The mission is published in the Faculty Handbook, Mission College Curriculum Handbook, Mission College Website, Mission College Catalog 2013-15, the goal development area of the Program Review, and in other institutional documents (I.A.2).

As addressed in Recommendation 2 (2008) and clarified in I.A.3 of the College's Self-Evaluation Report, the College now systematically and regularly reviews the mission statement in GAP, the highest College participatory governance committee. A task force of faculty, staff, administrators and students convened in 2010 to help develop the current mission. GAP will evaluate the mission every four years to coincide with the four-year strategic planning cycle. As evidenced in the Self-Evaluation Report and confirmed in interview, the mission statement review process allows for incorporating the interests of the College's stakeholders. Prior to final adoption, the institution vetted the mission statement through various constituency groups including the Associate Student Government, Classified and Academic Senate, and the administrative cabinet (I.A.3).

As demonstrated by the narrative and evidence provided in the Self-Evaluation Report, the mission is central to institutional planning and decision making. The mission statement is provided to College personnel in a variety of documents and is mounted prominently in a variety of locations on campus, including the meeting space for GAP and the Academic Senate. As discussed, the mission is embedded and featured in all planning documents; most noticeably in the program review. Moreover, it is one of the criteria by which budget requests are prioritized and grants are approved.

In reviewing programmatic documents, the team verified that the program review process is directly linked to the larger planning and resource allocation process. To be eligible for additional College resources, programs are required to have an approved program review plan or annual update plan. The mission statement prompts planning and decision making and is central to the choices the College makes (I.A.4).

Conclusion:

The institution has a statement of mission that defines its broad educational purposes, intended student population, and a commitment to achieving student learning. Student learning programs and services are clearly aligned with the purposes of the College and the needs of the student population. The College allocates resources to help fulfill its mission as evidenced by the purchase and use of Governet's CurricUNET database including the program review and assessment modules. The institution meets this Standard (I.A.1).

College participatory governance committees and planning groups reviewed the current mission which the Board approved in 2010. This new mission statement is appropriately published in all informational and planning documents, as well as posted in buildings throughout the campus. The institution meets this Standard (I.A.2).

The College received a recommendation after the last accreditation site visit to implement a schedule for systematically reviewing its mission and values statements. It has done so. Over the last six years, the College revised its mission statement to reflect the needs of the stakeholders and to make certain that students, their learning, and their success are the central business of the College. The institution now regularly reviews its mission every four years. GAP, the College's highest participatory governance committee, guides the review of the mission statement and ensures that all constituencies (faculty, staff, students, and administrators) have the opportunity to provide feedback on mission statement revision. The institution meets this Standard (I.A.3).

The mission statement prompts planning and decision making and is central to the choices the College makes. The mission statement is embedded in the online program review process which college programs and services must complete every four years with annual updates. The institution meets this Standard (I.A.4).

The team concludes that the institution meets Standard I.A.

STANDARD I

Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations:

This section of the self-evaluation report is generally well written. It provides ample description of the College's processes, supported by evidence of their development, approval, and implementation. The College, therefore, provides an adequate description of what it does to meet the Standards. However, for the most part, the evaluation portions are more descriptive than they are an evaluation of how the College knows it is successful in meeting a Standard, beyond the existence of a process or policy. Although references are made in places to the use of surveys or other data, evidence of these data, their analysis, and how they were used is minimal. Although survey instruments and data are provided in support of the response to Standard I.B.5, these are not relevant to the Standard. Because these surveys are not provided or referenced elsewhere, it is not clear how these data were used.

Inconsistency exists with the institution's identification of Actionable Improvement Plans (AIP). An AIP that is provided twice in this section of the report is, on one occasion, not fully supported by any evaluative statements (I.B.3) and on another, not directly related to the Standard (I.B.7). Secondly, although AIPs included elsewhere in the report, highlight deficiencies that also pertain to this section, these issues are not identified within this Standard.

Findings and Evidence:

Dialog at Mission College occurs within the institution's student services and instructional councils, participatory governance committees, constituent senates, division, department, and administrative meetings, and program review. The College claims that dialog occurs on a "near-daily" basis and is built around data provided by the Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness (ORPIE). The team found that although dialog does occur in these individual meetings and through program review, there is little evidence of College-wide dialog on institutional effectiveness and the improvement of student learning. Further, the data provided on student progress and achievement is mostly quantitative and the team found little evidence of analysis of that data as a basis for dialog. It does not appear that the institution has a collective understanding of the role of data and the purpose of dialog and evidence in the evaluation of student learning. Further, the team was unable to verify that the institution has systematic and ongoing plans or processes to evaluate itself in this area.

Although the College has yet to publish approved Institution-Set Standards for student success and achievement, there has been some dialog on their development, assessment, and dissemination. However, these discussions are in their infancy and are not well documented. Though some initial baseline standards have been proposed, the rationale behind them is not clear. The institution has yet to determine that these will be the final adopted standards as dialog is ongoing regarding whether its set-standards will be baseline or target oriented.

Mission College employs broad-based participation in the development and revision of its goals. A 2010 series of visioning sessions produced seven proposed core directions that were subsequently adopted as College Strategic Focus Area Goals. These Focus Areas provide the framework for goal development. To facilitate completion, the College organized its institutional four-year plan into smaller, more manageable one-year plans. The College writes its goals and objectives with measurability in mind, and communicates progress towards completion through Annual Goal Status Reports. All programs and services at Mission College have set four-year goals that are developed and assessed through Program Review. Though the College adequately described the processes for developing goals and evaluating their completion, the team could not verify whether constituents' understanding of and commitment to the identified goals has been fully assessed. Further, it is not clear how the institution closes the cycle and re-evaluates changes and improvements that have been implemented.

The College achieves integrated planning through its Decision Making Process Model. This process relies on input from Program Review and is informed by learning and service outcomes data. The College's "Integrated Resource Request Process" guides the resulting resource allocation. ORPIE provides data through the Research and Planning website to support this process. However, though the College claims that these data include progress towards "core benchmarks," it is not clear what these benchmarks are, how they were developed, or how progress towards their achievement is determined to be sufficient.

The College ensures broad-based participation in College planning through the use of participatory councils, committees, and subcommittees that are representative of all constituencies. However, though the process is thoroughly described, the team could not verify that the College has evaluated the efficacy of the process in allocating resources and fostering improvement.

The College collects data on course level Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) and Service Area Outcomes (SAO) assessment, student progress and achievement, and indicators of progress towards College goals. The College makes these data available through College websites and a newly developed Data Dashboard. Further, the College is looking to enhance its collection and reporting capabilities through improvements to its data management system. However, the team could not verify the existence of ongoing and systematic assessment of its efficacy in communicating information about institutional quality to the public.

The College's Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) coordinates the constituent or participatory groups responsible for overseeing evaluation of the College's planning and resource allocation processes. The report and supporting evidence include examples of changes that have been made as a result of evaluative efforts.

Though the College claims that it assesses its evaluation mechanisms through its "Model of Institutional Effectiveness," little evidence is provided of a systematic process for assessing

College evaluation mechanisms. Further, the data provided as evidence would not be sufficient to support such evaluative efforts.

Conclusion:

Using the ACCJC Rubric for Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness, the team determined that Mission College is at the developmental level for both program review and planning but has made significant progress towards reaching a level of Proficiency in both. Though Program Review and planning processes at Mission College allow for ongoing dialog, the institution needs to better document how these processes “refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning” (statement from rubric). Further, the team could not verify that dialog is “robust and pervasive” and there is limited evidence of “data and analyses [being] widely distributed and used throughout the institution.” The institution does not meet this Standard (I.B.1).

The College is engaged in dialog on the development and assessment of Institution-Set Standards, but these have yet to be approved and published. The institution does not meet this Standard (I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.5).

Since the last comprehensive evaluation, Mission College has reorganized its goals and objectives and made improvements to the process for developing and identifying new goals and objectives. Goals are developed with broad-based input and the institution aims to define goals and objectives in measurable terms. Progress towards goal completion is updated and published annually. Goals are both produced for and reviewed in program review, however, there is no evidence that the College has evaluated whether a broad-based understanding of and commitment to the goals exists. The institution does not meet this Standard (I.B.2).

The College’s “Model of Institutional Effectiveness” and “Decision Making Process Model” informs the College’s cycle of evaluation. However, how the institution achieves the re-evaluation portion of the cycle is not clear and “quantitative and qualitative data” needed to support the process is minimal. The institution does not meet this Standard (I.B.3).

Planning at the institution is broad-based, allows for input from all constituents, and there is evidence that this leads to resource allocation. The institution meets this Standard (I.B.4).

The College collects and disseminates some assessment results through the College websites and a newly developed Data Dashboard. These data are predominantly quantitative in nature and frequently lack the analysis or interpretation needed for “easy understanding by the College community.” The team could not find evidence of data on achievement of degree and institutional learning outcomes or data that are disaggregated for purposes of analysis. Further, the team could not verify how the institution assures its effectiveness in communicating matters of quality assurance to its constituents. The institution does not meet this Standard (I.B.5).

The College's Governance and Planning (GAP) Council oversees the evaluation of planning and resource allocation processes. Review by participatory groups overseeing the processes has resulted in appropriate modifications. However, these reviews do not appear to be systematic nor is it clear if resulting improvements have been evaluated. The institution does not meet this Standard (I.B.6).

Though guided by a Model of Institutional Effectiveness, it is not clear how the College assesses its evaluation mechanisms, nor what data are used in the process. The institution does not meet this Standard (I.B.7).

The team concludes that the institution does not meet Standard I.B.

Recommendations to meet the Standard:

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).

STANDARD II

Student Learning Programs and Services

A. Instructional Programs

General Observations:

Mission College offers 43 certificates of achievements and 43 Associate degrees. Over 54 of these degrees and certificates are vocational programs. These programs include: health occupations, business, computer applications, computer science and information technology, fire protections technology, graphic arts, graphic design, and retail floristry. The College offers basic skills courses in reading, writing, and math, and instructional support through the Academic Support Center and Library. Community Education courses are designed to meet the needs of older adults, the developmentally disabled, court mandated courses, and personal enrichment. All instructional programs, whether taught in a classroom or via distance education, address the mission of the institution through the coordinated oversight of the Mission College Academic Senate in cooperation with the College administration.

Findings and Evidence:

Three standing Academic Senate subcommittees, the Curriculum Review Committee (CRC), the Program Review Committee (PRC), and the Academic Directions Committee (ADC) ensure the instructional quality of all academic courses, degrees, and certificates. The Board of Trustees (BOT) relies on the Academic Senate regarding curriculum and academic programs. This communication is first achieved and documented by faculty who participate on CRC, ADC or the PRC. These committees report to the Academic Senate, which then determines how their input will be used.

New instructional programs require preliminary review by the ADC and approval by the Academic Senate prior to development to ensure that they fit within the college's overall goals and are appropriate to the mission of the College. Once a program is granted preliminary approval, it undergoes multiple levels of review by both faculty and administration to make certain that the program will comply with all state regulations and will meet the level of rigor and academic integrity expected of a community college course of study.

The College provides diversity and demographic data on students and the surrounding community; however, data are not disaggregated to show how the institution aligns student characteristics with student learning goals or the economy in surrounding communities (II.A.1.a).

Mission College utilizes face-to-face, online, and hybrid modes of instruction to facilitate the needs of its students. Career Technical Education (CTE) advisory committee meetings offer program feedback concerning community needs to many of the college's departments such as Hospitality Management, Retail Floristry, Computer Applications, Computer Systems and Information Technology, among others.

While most instruction continues to occur in a traditional, face-to-face classroom setting, Mission College offers an increasing number of distance learning courses. In 2011, the college submitted and received ACCJC approval for a Substantive Change Proposal for Distance Education (DE), listing 20 associate degrees and 38 certificate programs which could be completed at 50 percent or more via distance education or electronic delivery. The College is preparing a second Substantive Change Proposal for Distance Education for submission to ACCJC listing additional programs that now meet the requirements; due to changes in staffing, the new proposal will not be forwarded to ACCJC until late spring.

The College's Distance Learning Committee is a subcommittee of the Academic Senate and is charged with recommending procedures and standards for distance learning courses, recommending training for distance learning instructors, and advising the Curriculum Review Committee on distance learning compliance with applicable regulations. The College updated its Guidelines for Distance Learning Instructors in spring 2013. The guide includes distance learning class and course activities including a definition of Distance Learning at Mission College. In the spring of 2013, the Distance Education Coordinator position was vacated. A faculty has temporarily filled the DE Coordinator position; however, agreements with the faculty union prevent this position being refilled as a faculty position. As such, the management and faculty are considering the creation of a new classified staff DE Coordinator position. In the meantime, the college is relying on faculty from West Valley College working on stipends to provide support. The DE guidelines, and the training or ongoing training of faculty, is a voluntary process with no requirement for completion of training prior to teaching an online course (II.A.1.b).

The College uses the ANGEL learning management system to provide online instruction. All instructors at Mission College are able to use elements of the system to enhance student learning even in a traditional classroom setting.

The College has student learning outcomes (SLOs) in place for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees. Course level SLOs are included in CurricUNET; and program, certificate and degree SLOs are included both in the catalog and on the college website. Faculty develop these outcomes, and the Curriculum Committee approves them. Course level assessments are completed and results entered into the Evidence of Assessment forms which are available on the College research website. Faculty use course level SLO assessment results to inform pedagogy, instructional practices, curriculum changes, and resource requests and this is included in the comprehensive and annual program reviews (II.A.1.c).

The Board of Trustees has empowered the Academic Senate at Mission College to be primarily responsible in all eleven areas identified as "academic and professional matters" in Title 5, including curriculum, program development, and program review. The Board has adopted policies and procedures requiring each college to establish the curriculum approval and program review process to ensure the quality of instructional courses and programs. Mission College charges the CRC, PRC, and ADC with ensuring the quality of instructional courses and college programs. Program review is a regular and ongoing process with the responsibility of faculty from each department driving the process.

Program review serves a dual purpose: to assure faculty and administration provide the highest quality educational programs for students and to identify opportunities for improvement in these programs. Mission College incorporates three distinct cycles of review: yearly update, every two years for CTE programs, and a comprehensive four year cycle to collect and assess the effectiveness of program level outcomes as well as student data for all means of delivery. The College's curriculum is mostly up-to-date; the team discovered some active curriculum is out of date and should have been updated during the comprehensive 4-year program review process. The College has spent considerable time and effort in addressing and updating the College's program review process since their mid-term report. Its efforts have clearly demonstrated that elements of program review proficiency have been reached. However, the evidence suggests that the College has not yet demonstrated that it evaluates the effectiveness of its program review processes in supporting and improving student achievement and student learning outcomes (II.A.2.a).

Through both the curriculum review process and through the design of individual syllabi, faculty are responsible for identifying both competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes for all courses, certificates and programs. For CTE programs, meeting minutes reflect regular advisory committee meetings to ensure that industry expertise informs faculty decisions regarding curriculum design and competencies. CTE programs participate in the program review process every two years with annual updates to ensure currency and relevancy (II.A.2.b).

The Curriculum Review Committee provides the College with necessary oversight and assurance of educational programs of appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning. The committee reviews courses and programs, approves prerequisites, provides training and assistance to the faculty in developing and revising courses and programs, and verifies appropriateness of course for inclusion in the General Education (GE) pattern. Committee membership includes representatives from the Office of Instruction, academic divisions, and the articulation officer, who ensure that agreements are created and maintained in vocational programs between high schools, Mission College, and receiving Universities of California and California State Universities.

The College carefully sequences courses in programs such as English as a Second Language (ESL) to ensure effective student progression upon content mastery. The College provides professional development opportunities in basic skills, student retention practices, learning communities, success strategies for low-income, first-generation students, and other practices to encourage high-quality instruction.

The College's office of institutional research tracks and provides departments with student retention and success data which personnel use to review instructional program effectiveness. Departments analyze this data within the program review and discuss ramifications in department meetings and various committees (Academic Directions). Additionally, student learning is discussed by faculty in department meetings and in the context of the Student Learning Task Force, the Program Review Committee, the Curriculum Review Committee and the Academic Senate (II.A.2.c).

Mission College recognizes the need to provide a variety of instructional approaches in order to meet the learning needs of its diverse student population. The College has been awarded two Title III grants to support these endeavors. Additionally, the College offers an ESL program to support second language learners and a large number of distance learning courses to accommodate students who must also manage work and family obligations. Face-to-face instructors are expected to assess the learning styles of their students and make adjustments accordingly. Further, there is also evidence of the use of learning style assessment tools by one of the College's programs. However, the team could not verify how these data were used to make improvements or that dialog in this area had occurred (II.A.2.d).

Mission College evaluates its programs through the program review process. Individual courses are reviewed through the integration of the program review and curriculum review processes. Occupational and vocational programs undergo a comprehensive program review every two years, while all other programs undergo a comprehensive program review every four years. Revision and updating of curriculum occurs the year prior to each academic program's comprehensive review. These processes are well described in the report and are supported by the evidence provided. (II.A.2.e)

Mission College has developed SLOs for all of its courses and some of its programs which are listed in CurricUNET, the course management system used by the college. The College assesses course level outcomes, and the program review process provides an opportunity for faculty to summarize their findings and identify how assessment results have informed curriculum, delivery of content, and goal development.

Program review includes data on success and retention of students overall as well as in courses offered via distance education. The College also evaluates delivery methods as part of ongoing evaluation of enrollment trends, and departments adjust their course offerings based on enrollment and student need. In addition, some departments conduct surveys of students in their distance learning courses to gather feedback that may be used in improving the course design and delivery.

Course level assessments are uploaded to the College's research website and are available to appropriate constituents. The assessment of Program Level Outcomes (PLOs) is still in the beginning stages. Some programs, such as Biology, have already begun assessment of their PLOs. Others are not quite as far along. In February the SLO Task Force recommended changes in the information on SLOs used by the Program Review module (II.A.2.f).

The College's instructional programs do not utilize departmental course and/or program examinations as assessments of student learning. Though some departments require students to take an external examination as an element of their program of instruction the results are not used as an assessment of student learning (II.A.2.g).

Mission College awards credit consistently with institutional policies. These policies reflect the generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education. The College provided evidence that the College goes through a rigorous process to ensure that scheduled seat-time corresponds to determined unit value of each course (II.A.2.h).

Though assessment of student achievement of programmatic learning outcomes is occurring (through program review), the College plans to revisit and revise these program level outcomes as part of its efforts to develop effective degree and certificate learning outcomes. Dialog about the learning expectations occurs in numerous forums. In addition, in 2013 the College joined ACCJC's Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP) project (II.A.2.i).

The evidence indicates that the college upholds Title 5, section 55061 by demonstrating an understanding of their basic content and methodology of the major areas including humanities and fine arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences. Board Policy 4025 outlines the criteria for Associate Degrees and GE courses. The Curriculum Review Committee has the responsibility for determining which courses should be included in the GE curriculum (II.A.3.a).

All degree-applicable courses including those in the GE pattern meet the standards for community college courses required by Title 5, section 55002 and can be found in the College Catalog (II.A.3.b).

The evidence indicates Mission College recognizes the meaning of how to be an ethical human being and an effective citizen as demonstrated through its institutional learning outcomes, course syllabi, and the courses included in its GE pattern. The Student Orientation Handbook includes a statement explaining their rights and responsibilities as a student. The Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) showed that 47% of the students felt that the College contributed "Quite a Bit" or very much to their development of the personal codes and values; 31% of the students felt that the College contributed "Quite a Bit" or "Very Much" to their knowledge, skills, and development to contributing to the welfare of the community (II.A.3.c).

The evidence indicates that all degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core. In accordance to Title 5, section 55063(a) and further explained in the state's Program and Course Approval Handbook, Mission College requires that all associate degree programs contain a minimum of 18 semester units in a major or area of emphasis (II.A.4).

The degree and certificate requirements of all vocational and occupational programs are developed by faculty working closely with advisory committees comprised of faculty, staff, and industry partners who provide oversight and guidance to the programs. These programs aim to meet relevant employment standards and the curriculum is developed to reflect the requirements for external licensure and certification. For example, the Computer Science and Information Technology Department offers a number of certificate programs that are closely aligned with the certifications offered by Cisco Systems. These certificates have courses that are sequenced and scheduled in such a way that completion of the specified series of courses prepares students for globally-recognized certification in the computer industry. Additionally, several vocational programs are subject to external regulation by state boards (II.A.5).

The College presents clear and accurate information on transfer policies, including the requirements for students transferring to four-year institutions, GE requirements for transfer, and information about transferability of courses in both the Catalog and the schedule of classes. Additionally, the Articulation Office maintains a website with information about transfer policies and articulation. The College Catalog also includes the policies and allowable credit for students entering Mission College with credit earned through Advance Placement, College Level Examination Program (CLEP), or International Baccalaureate examinations.

The Transfer Center provides students a centralized resource area for information and assistance with transfer. The College assigns a number of counselors to the Transfer Center on a full or part-time basis where they assist transfer-oriented students with education plans, college applications, and transcripts. The College has Transfer Admissions Agreements or Guarantees (TAAs/TAGs) with a number of different universities, including the University of California and the California State University, as well as numerous articulation agreements with private universities and colleges (II.A.6.a).

The Mission College Academic Senate developed a process for program discontinuance in May of 2001 and implemented it in 2010 when several programs went through the discontinuance process or were significantly changed. The process assures that students who remained enrolled in the College for at least one term per academic year are considered to be continuously enrolled will retain catalog rights and be able to complete any degrees or certificates for which they had catalog rights (II.A.6.b).

Mission College presents clear, accurate, and consistent information to prospective and current students, the public, and its personnel through a variety of publications, documents, and electronic media. The College ensures information on student success and retention, achievement transfer, etc., as well as a link to the state's *Student Success Scorecard* are made available to the public by means of publications on the College research and planning website. Mission College developed a district-wide "Data Dashboard" to simplify access to information from the Community College Data Mart. In addition, the College website contains a link to a multimedia presentation showing users exactly how to access the *Student Success Scorecard*, with explanations of how to interpret the data available on the site. Though the college website contains accurate and updated information, the institution recognizes that it is not organized in a way that makes that information easy to locate for people unfamiliar with the structure of the website. This issue is addressed in an appropriate actionable improvement plan (II.A.6.c).

The evidence indicates that faculty not only distinguishes between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline but present data and information fairly and objectively. The board policies concerning academic freedom can be found on the district website and College Catalog. Board Policy 4030 describes the district commitment to the right of faculty to interpret and communicate information. The College Faculty Handbook reminds faculty of their obligation to academic freedom (II.A.7.a).

The evidence indicates that the College's policy on cheating can be accessed by all through the College Catalog. Sanctions implemented by instructors in the classroom, as well as the

obligations of instructors to prevent academic dishonesty, can be found in The Faculty Handbook. The College subscribes to Turnitin.com to access students' papers for plagiarism. All students that enroll in distance education courses are required to affirm that they are the student enrolled in the course when they login to their class. Certain departments have established their own policies that require on campus midterm and final exams for distance education courses (II.A.7.b).

Mission College does not require its staff, faculty, administrators, or students to conform to specific codes of conduct nor does it seek to instill specific beliefs. A general "Code of Student Conduct" is published in the College Catalog that outlines those standards of behavior essential to its educational mission and campus life. Specific examples of misconduct are listed such as possession of firearms, smoking, verbal or physical abuse, and academic dishonesty (II.A.7.c).

Mission College does not offer curricula in foreign locations (II.A.8).

Conclusions:

Mission College ensures instructional quality through its Academic Senate subcommittees, the Curriculum Review Committee (CRC), Program Review Committee (PRC), and the Academic Directions Committee (ADC). New instructional programs require preliminary review by the ADC and approval by the Academic Senate prior to development to ensure that they fit within the College's overall goals and are appropriate to the mission of the College. Subsequent review by faculty and administration ensures compliance with state regulations and appropriate levels of rigor and academic integrity. Though the College provides diversity and demographic data on students and the surrounding community, these data are not disaggregated to show how the institution aligns student characteristics with student learning goals or the economy in surrounding communities. The institution does not meet this Standard (II.A.1.a)

Mission College utilizes face-to-face, online, and hybrid modes of instruction to facilitate the needs of its students. The Program Review and Curriculum Review processes provide oversight to all courses. The Distance Learning Committee, a subcommittee of the Academic Senate, provides additional oversight for DE courses. The position of DE Coordinator is currently vacant and the institution would benefit from some clarity on the training required for teaching an online course. The institution meets this Standard (II.A.1.b).

While the institution has course level assessments in place and data are gathered by faculty through the assessment process, not all departments consistently and universally review results to make improvements. The team's review of the outcomes evidence in the Evidence of Assessment forms indicates varied levels of effectiveness in capturing dialog and identifying use of results and action plans based on results. While program, degree, certificate and institutional outcomes are in place and advertised in the catalog and on the College website, they are not currently assessed, nor is program-level assessment dialog

occurring. Therefore, the College does not currently use results for program improvement. While the College intends to align course SLOs with certificate and degree SLOs and Institutional SLO's with the CurricUNET Assessment Module, currently only course SLOs align with Institutional SLOs. However, the assessment of these Institutional SLOs using course level assessments is unclear. Finally, while the institution claims that course SLOs are included on the syllabi for every section of every course, evidence provided to the team did not support that assertion. The institution does not meet this Standard (II.A.1.c).

Program Review serves a dual purpose, to assure faculty and administration provide the highest quality educational programs for students and to identify opportunities for improvement in these programs. The College has spent considerable time and effort in addressing and updating the college's Program Review process since their mid-term report. However, the team could not verify that the college has evaluated the effectiveness of its Program Review processes in supporting and improving student achievement and student learning outcomes. The institution does not meet this Standard (II.A.2.a).

As previously discussed, the College has course SLOs in place and assesses these to determine student progress toward achieving these outcomes. However, the team did not find evidence of an established relationship between student learning outcomes and competency levels for degrees, certificates, programs, and courses. While program SLOs exist, the College has not yet assessed these outcomes. Therefore, the College cannot currently demonstrate effectiveness of learning at each level (course, program, certificate and degree). The institution does not meet this Standard (II.A.2.b).

The College recognizes the need to provide more effective assessment and evaluation of distance learning programs and to ensure academic integrity of distance education and has included this as an Actionable Improvement Plan. The team did not find evidence of assessment practices in place for certificates and degrees to ensure students can demonstrate synthesis of learning at the completion. The institution does not meet this Standard (II.A.2.c).

Mission College understands the importance of using multiple delivery modes and teaching methodologies to meet the diverse educational needs of its students. Though the team recognizes that the College is making efforts in this regard, the institution would benefit from a more systematic approach to identifying learning needs and better documentation of its dialog and resulting improvements to student learning. The institution meets this Standard (II.A.2.d).

Through their integrated processes the College has engaged in an ongoing systematic review of its programs' and courses' relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans. Annual program review updates are vital in maintaining a record of progress on these efforts. The institution meets this Standard (II.A.2.e).

Though course and some program level SLOs have been developed and are being assessed (to some degree), the College has yet to develop certificate/degree level outcomes and develop a systematic process for measuring ILO achievement and the use of those data. The institution does not meet this Standard (II.A.2.f).

Mission College does not employ departmental and/or program examinations. This Standard does not apply (II.A.2.g).

Mission College awards credit in a manner that is consistent with its policies, which reflect generally accepted norms or equivalences in higher education. The institution meets this Standard (II.A.2.h).

In order to fully address this Standard the College needs to complete its self-identified actionable improvement plan to develop certificate and degree learning outcomes that are linked to program and course level outcomes. The institution does not meet this Standard (II.A.2.i).

Mission College's General Education (GE) offerings encompass the humanities and fine arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences and offer students opportunity to demonstrate an understanding of the basic content and methodologies of these areas. Further, all degree-applicable courses, including GE, meet the standard for community college courses. Mission College places a high value on ensuring that its students learn the qualities necessary to be both an ethical human being and an effective citizen. This is supported by the narrative of the report and accompanying evidence. The institution meets this Standard (II.A.3).

Degree programs at Mission College include at least one area of focused study or interdisciplinary core. The institution meets this Standard (II.A.4).

The College uses academic assessment tools, practical exams, and feedback gained from employers, to assess and document student competence in its vocational and occupational programs. The institution meets this standard (II.A.5).

Mission College provides clear and accurate information on its courses, programs, and applicable credit-transfer policies. Student mobility is facilitated through appropriate articulation agreements. The institution meets this Standard (II.A.6.a).

The team verified that when a program is discontinued or significantly changed, enrolled students may complete their education in a timely manner with minimal disruption. The institution meets this Standard (II.A.6.b).

Though the institution does represent itself clearly, accurately, and consistently through electronic and print media, the team was unable to verify how the institution reviews its publication policies and practices and assesses its publications to ensure their integrity. The institution does not meet this Standard (II.A.6.c).

The team verified that Mission College faculty not only distinguishes between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline but present data and information

fairly and objectively. The College Catalog and Faculty Handbook provide information on both sanctions that instructors can implement in the classroom and the obligations of instructors to prevent academic dishonesty. The college subscribes to Turnitin.com and measures are in place to verify the identity of distance education students. Mission College does not require its staff, faculty, administrators, or students to conform to specific codes of conduct nor does it seek to instill specific beliefs. The College Catalog outlines for students standards of behavior essential to the institutions mission and campus life. The institution meets this Standard (II.A.7).

Standard II.A.8 does not apply.

The team concludes that the institution does not meet Standard II.A.

Recommendations to meet the Standard:

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).

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 #5

Distance Education: In order to meet the Standard and comply with Commission Policy the team recommends that the College establish policy regarding regular and effective student contact for Distance Education courses (II.A).

STANDARD II

Student Learning Programs and Services

B. Student Support Services

General Observations:

Mission College Student Services demonstrates its commitment to a level of quality that enhances student learning and achievement. In an effort to support the learning needs of its students, the College offers a wide range of services that are available to students in person, on the telephone, and on the College's website through ACCESS (federal TRIO grant program), ANGEL Learning Management System, and via the Student Services Portal. In addition to the traditional services provided by Admissions and Records, Counseling, Financial Aid, and Assessment, the College has dedicated resources to fund specialized services to veterans, international students, disabled students, and economically disadvantaged and underrepresented students.

Findings and Evidence:

Mission College exhibits a commitment to quality student support services across campus through the alignment of human capital and technology conduits. All services and programs are designed to assist, guide, develop, support, retain, and encourage students in the pursuit of their educational and career goals. Student satisfaction surveys are conducted to identify gaps in service provision. The College offers a variety of high quality support services that enhance student learning and achievement. The College makes available a wide range of services to students both in person and on the College's website and via the Student Services Portal. Core services such as Counseling, Admissions and Records, Assessment, Testing and Orientations fulfill the College's mission and vision by providing services that enhance student learning. Some student support services have written student learning outcomes and are engaged in using assessments to improve their effectiveness. The College is incorporating Student Learning Outcomes (SLO)/Service Area Outcomes (SAO) Assessment information into their program review documents. Surveys and pre and post assessments are examples of appropriate measures that are being used in some service areas (II.B.1).

The team found evidence that Mission College Student Services is fully committed to serving and meeting the needs of the student population that it serves. While the College actively supports all students through its array of student support services, the team finds that the College should leverage the success experienced with special programs such as Academic Success for Asians (ASAP) and scale these efforts in order to replicate success rates with an increased number of eligible students of other underrepresented student populations. The College provides a clear, accurate, well organized, and easily understood catalog for its constituencies with current information concerning all areas. The catalog is updated biannually to reflect changes in offerings, policy, and/or practice and is made available in both printed and electronic online format for prospective and current students. Hard copies of the catalog are available for purchase at the College Bookstore or can be downloaded from the website for free. All required information including student's rights and responsibilities,

the grievance process, student code of conduct, sexual harassment prevention, and the Academic Freedom Policy is readily accessible through the printed catalog and on the College website (II.B.2, II.B.2.a, II.B.2.b, II.B.2.c, II.B.2.d).

Since the last self-evaluation report in 2008, the College has made a concerted effort and progress to extend its services to all students regardless of the location or mode of delivery. This was maintained despite a system-wide reduction in funding for general student populations as well as for categorically funded programs for state-supported programs for special populations such as students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged students and educationally disadvantaged students. Through the use of technology, even with its infrastructure concerns, Mission College has maintained quality support for student learning by using technology such as SKYPE for academic advising and counseling and ESARS for scheduling appointments online (II.B.3.a).

Mission College's Associated Student Government (ASG) encourages personal and civic responsibility as well as personal development through its various campus cultural, social, and educational activities. There are a number of different clubs where students may take on a leadership role and develop their communication skills. Intercollegiate sports teams provide additional opportunities for personal development. An art gallery, the Mission Dance Company, and an author lecture series are additional examples of how the College provides an environment that encourages aesthetic development. Associated Student Government further serves as a conduit for student recommendations to institutional personnel and the Board of Trustees (II.B.3.b).

The College designs and maintains services and prepares key personnel in order to support student development. In this regard, the College provides comprehensive counseling/academic advising services through the Counseling Department, grant-funded initiatives, and categorical programs and services, such as CalWORKS, EOPS, and DSPS. Counseling services are provided to students through a variety of means to include, traditional in-person counseling, phone appointments, video calls via SKYPE, and email for which the College has established a dedicated email account to allow students to obtain counseling information. Counseling services assist students with the development of their educational goals and track students' academic success and course progression as a part of the counseling and matriculation activity. The College requires most new, transfer, and returning students to attend orientation unless they fall into one of the categories defined as "exempt" for purposes of matriculation. The College provides orientation to students through a COUNS 000A course which is offered both on campus as well as via distance learning.

Counseling professionals meet state minimum qualifications for professional service as counselors in the California community colleges and also receive ongoing professional development through participation in statewide conferences and meetings, through on-campus training workshops and through regularly scheduled weekly meetings. Part-time counselors undergo a specific training regimen including job shadowing more senior counselors prior to being released to service students. Counseling services are evaluated on a

regular basis through College-wide program review, faculty and staff evaluations, and student surveys (II.B.3.c).

Mission College's appreciation for diversity is evident in its design and maintenance of programs, practices, and services such as designing College curriculum with the awareness and the reflection of the community that the College serves. Among the College's curricular offerings are many courses explicitly designed to enhance student understanding of diversity. However, even courses that are not specifically designed to address diversity are required to address the issue of multiculturalism and diversity as appropriate to the course content. In 2010, the college was awarded a five-year \$2 million Asian American Native American Pacific Islander Serving Institution (AANAPISI) grant that targeted students in English as a Second Language (ESL).

In 2011, AANAPISI awarded the College an additional \$2 million grant to specifically target student performance improvement in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) courses that have presented barriers for students in the past. It is important to note that funds have been used from this grant to establish the Academic Success for Asians Program (ASAP) initiative which provides comprehensive services to help Asian American and Pacific Islander students including workshops on student success, personal development, and more.

In 2012, the College became a participant in a National Endowment for the Humanities grant, Bridging Cultures, which culminated in the development of a new degree program in Asian Studies.

In 2012, in an effort to promote understanding and appreciation of diversity among students, the College opened the Veteran's Active Learning Opportunity Resource (VALOR) Center. The Center provides counseling, certification and academic advising resources for veterans returning to college.

The College has a comprehensive international student program that recruits students from 47 different countries.

The Associated Student Government demonstrates appreciation of diversity of students around them by celebrating and supporting events and clubs that represent diversity. An annual International Day celebrates the many cultures and ethnicities of the student population, and numerous clubs allow students to learn from one another. The Latino Student Union, the Muslim Student Association, the Asian American Pacific Islander Club, and Umoja are just a few of the student groups available on campus (II.B.3.d).

Although the College embraces diversity by supporting various cultural events and displays an appreciation of student diversity around them, students who were interviewed expressed that there was an overemphasis on the Asian American Pacific Islander student population, the majority population at the College. Board Policy 3410 states the following:

“To have available positive images provided by individuals from historically under-represented groups, and to observe that such individuals can assume responsible and diverse roles in society is educationally sound for all students attending Colleges of the District. The richness that cultural and racial diversity brings to our national heritage and the exercise of democratic principles can be best taught in the presence of a staff and student body of both genders, diverse ethnic groups, handicapped individuals, and veterans.”

Mission College engages in the process of admissions and placement instrument evaluation with validated methods. Admissions and Records instruments, practices, processes, and procedures are routinely discussed and reviewed at both the College and District level to make certain they are effective, consistent, and unbiased. The College uses CCCApply as its primary application process. This online process which was designed with collaboration from other college users and in consultation with the Chancellor’s Office, allows the College to collect and respond to data about individual student needs.

The College ensures that its assessment tools and practices are in compliance with the California Community Colleges System Office. The Compass diagnostic tool which is maintained by American College Testing (ACT) is used by the institution. Validation of all tests is conducted on a six-year cycle or every time a change in testing instrument or cut score is initiated (II.B.3.e).

Mission College maintains student records permanently, securely, and confidentially with appropriate and secure backup of files. The College’s governing board policies outline the maintenance and security of student records, as mandated by federal regulations, California Education Code, and Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations. The District maintains procedures to ensure that access to student records is restricted only to those individuals permitted such access by law and who require such access to carry on the operation of the District. Permanent student records are being converted into digital format (Avante/Laserfiche) to improve security. Electronic storage provides a higher level of security by ensuring fireproof, waterproof storage of data that is backed up nightly and stored offsite. Records access information is provided to students in the College Catalog. Family Educational Rights Privacy Act (FERPA) training is reviewed on a regular basis with Admissions and Records staff (II.B.3.f).

Mission College administers surveys designed to identify learning support needs of the students served by the institution. The College participates in the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) and the Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE) biannually. In the self-evaluation report, the College has provided a table with the results of the 2013 CCSSE for particular items that have relevance for student services. In the table, the survey prompt listed for Item No. 12n of the CCSSE is identical to the survey prompt listed for Item 12o, but the data is different; this is an error. The self-evaluation did not include an analysis of the results, describing the data or suggesting significant findings. The report also did not evaluate the data or explain how the survey data has contributed to the College’s knowledge about how their student support services are meeting student needs. In addition, the self-evaluation evidence included a link to the 2011 SENSE

results. The particular items that are relevant to this Standard were not identified in the report. Also, the self-evaluation did not tell what the College found out from the survey or give an interpretation of the data. Thus, it is unknown how the survey has contributed to the College's review of its student support services. It is good that the College is soliciting feedback from students, but the College needs to analyze and evaluate the data. Also, the College needs to engage in a widespread institutional dialog about the survey results and identify gaps (II.B.4).

Some student support services have been engaged in writing student learning outcomes since 2008. The extent to which all support services are currently engaged is difficult to gauge, because it is unclear who the identified student support services are and just how many support services are in operation. In March 2013, Mission College submitted the ACCJC College Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation and, the College reported that they have 36 student learning and support activities and that 100% of those have defined SLOs. The team reviewed the Student Life link off the College's main website, but did not count 36 services. The evidence listed in the self-evaluation report documenting student services assessment activities was very minimal, so the team requested additional evidence. The team received a binder entitled "Mission College Student Services, Evidence of Assessment Implementation". Inside were documents for 17 distinct student services areas. The team also explored the program review committee's website and downloaded a printout of the SLO reports entered into the CurricUNET program review for 2012-2013. A total of 13 student services areas were included in this printout. More investigation showed that some, but not all, student support services areas have outcomes listed in the catalog and on their respective websites. The team found that some, but not all, student support services have identified outcomes (II.B.4, II.A.1.b, II.A.1.c).

There was variable quality in the SLO statements the team reviewed. Some statements, such as those for the MESA program, are written appropriately with an active verb and are measurable. Yet, there are outcome statements for other support services that are not measurable. Instead, they are written using vague verbs, such as "learn" and "understand". These words indicate internal mental processes for students which cannot be directly assessed. Examples of outcomes written in this manner begin, "The student will understand" (Student Activities) or "The student will learn" (Student Enrollment and Financial Services). Instead, the SLOs need to focus on what the students can do or produce and use action verbs from Bloom's Taxonomy with an emphasis on higher-order thinking skills (such as analysis, synthesis, or evaluation) (II.A.2.b, II.A.2.c, II.B.3.a, II.B.4).

There are several concerns regarding the information presented in the Evidence of Assessment Implementation documents. These concerns are:

- (1) There is no place in the Implementation template for a description of the assessment method.
- (2) In the Assessment Results column, many areas did not report actual data.
- (3) There is little evidence that robust dialog is occurring. No meeting minutes were provided. Additionally, in the Dialog column, AANAPISI reported, "On Schedule", and Athletics wrote that, "Basket Weaving

Instructors shared teaching techniques and discussed ways to improve teaching strategies”.

Student services participated in annual and comprehensive program review as a method to assure their adequacy in meeting student needs. The team took the initiative to look at the program review website, which shows that they have been involved in program review since 2008. The comprehensive program review report includes a discussion of the trends in student demand, student usage, and student demographics. The self-evaluation report listed the comprehensive program reviews for Counseling and the Intensive English Program as evidence. The self-evaluation report states that, “the Intensive English Program uses a point of service survey to evaluate and identify any needs not being met and adjusts accordingly”. However, the team did not find any point of service survey data or a discussion of said survey in the English program review. If survey data was indeed collected, then it needs to be documented in program review, analyzed, and evaluated. The self-evaluation report also states that the Counseling Department “tracked student usage trends “and adjusted service hours accordingly to meet student demand”. Their program review document does mention that there have been “minor changes in student usage patterns” and that they will “coordinate hours to accommodate student demand”. The team was unable to verify if these trend results were actually used. Since 2008, the College has included an update on SLO assessment as part of program review. The extent of SLO information requested for program review increased with the 2009-2010 program review annual update form. SLO information has remained a part of program review in all subsequent annual updates and comprehensive reviews (II.A.2.b, II.A.2.c, II.B.4).

Some, but not all, student support services have been engaging in assessing learning outcomes. The self-evaluation report provided no evidence of the extent of learning outcomes assessment across the student support services area of the college. Yet, in an interview with student services administration, it was stated that student support services has been engaging in SLO assessment since 2009. The team requested additional evidence, and was provided with the binder mentioned in the previous paragraph. The evidence in this binder shows that additional support services, such as MESA, CalWORKs, and others have engaged in outcomes assessment. However, there are also documents in the binder stating either that assessment did not occur for some support areas, like Articulation in 2011-2012, or that lack any assessment reporting, as is the case for the Career Center and Student Enrollment and Financial Services. This is in conflict with the claim in the March 2013 report to ACCJC that 100%, or all 36 of the student support services are engaged in ongoing assessment of learning outcomes. Some programs, such as the International Student Center and MESA, deserve mention for their excellent practice of determining standards of achievement for their outcomes (II.A.2.b, II.A.2.c, II.B.3.a, II.B.4).

Conclusions:

The College offers a variety of high quality student support services that enhance student learning and achievement. A wide range of services are available to students both in person and online. Core services fulfill the College’s mission and vision by providing services that enhance student learning. Some student support services have written student learning

outcomes and are engaged in using assessments to improve their effectiveness. The College is incorporating SLO/SAO Assessment information into their program review documents. In order to provide more effective assessment and evaluation of distance learning practices, the team suggests the College continue to enhance infrastructure. The institution meets this Standard (II.B.1).

The College produces a precise and accurate bi-annual catalog that contains all of the general information including the official name, address(es), telephone number(s), and the website address of the institution; educational mission, courses, programs, and degree offerings; academic calendar and program length; academic freedom statement; available student financial aid; available learning resources; names and degrees of administrators and faculty; names and job titles of classified staff, and names of governing board members. It also fully describes all student requirements for admission including information on residency, acceptance of transfer credits, matriculation, and fees. The institution meets this Standard (II.B.2.a).

The College provides recent, precise, and accurate information about requirements students must satisfy in order to qualify for a degree, certificate, graduation, and transfer. The College's articulation officer works collaboratively with the Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) to review, modify, and update graduation requirements for degrees and certificates. The College reviews proposed changes and forwards them to the District Board of Trustees (BOT) before changes are posted to the catalog. The institution meets this Standard (II.B.2.b).

The College Catalog also includes a section entitled "academic regulations and standards" which contains information about faculty/student responsibilities, the discipline process, academic honesty policy, minimum standards of progress, academic probation, dismissal and the college policy on credits transferred from another institution as well as the conditions for a refund of enrollment fees is listed in this section. The "Right to Know" section of the catalog lists specific information about the college's AIDS policy, sexual harassment and sex discrimination policies, student privacy rights, student rights and responsibilities, and the College's status as a drug-free campus. The institution meets this Standard (II.B.2.c).

The College Catalog serves as one of the primary resources used by students to obtain information about the College and all applicable programs, services and policies. Students or potential students obtain additional and updated information about the College, its services, and all relevant policies by accessing the College's website using the link printed on the back cover of the College Catalog. Other District policies and links to Board policies are also available on the Student Services website. The institution meets this Standard (II.B.2.d).

In an effort to support the learning needs of its students, in addition to in-person services, the college provides a wide range of telephone and online services through ACCESS, ANGEL and a new Student Services Portal that was implemented in 2012. The portal provides students with a safe and secure way to conduct a wide range of business with Student Services staff. The team notes there is room for improvement in the services provided to distance education students. The College meets this Standard (II.B.3.a).

The Associated Student Government (ASG) of Mission College offers various campus cultural, social, and educational activities. There are a number of different clubs where students may take on a leadership role and develop their communication skills. Intercollegiate sports teams provide additional opportunities for personal development. An art gallery, the Mission Dance Company, and an author lecture series are additional examples of how the College provides an environment that encourages aesthetic development. The institution meets this Standard (II.B.3.b).

The College provides comprehensive counseling/academic advising services through the Counseling Department, grant funded initiatives and categorical programs and services such as CalWORKs, EOPS, and DSPS. Counseling services are provided to students through a variety of means to include, traditional in-person counseling, phone appointments, video calls via SKYPE and email of which the College has established a dedicated email account to allow students to obtain counseling information. Counseling services assist students with the development of their educational goals and tracks students' academic success and course progression as a part of the counseling and matriculation activity. Orientation is provided to all students through a COUNS 000A course which is offered both on campus as well as via distance learning. Counseling professionals meet state minimum qualifications for professional service as counselors in the California community colleges and also receive on-going professional development through participation in statewide conferences and meetings, through on-campus training workshops and through regularly scheduled weekly meetings. Part-time counselors undergo a specific training regimen including shadowing other more senior counselors prior to being released to service students. The institution meets this Standard (II.B.3.c).

The Associated Student Government demonstrates appreciation for the diversity around them by celebrating and supporting events and clubs that represent diversity. An annual International Day celebrates the many cultures and ethnicities of the student population, and numerous clubs allow students to learn from one another. The Latino Student Union, the Muslim Student Association, the Asian American Pacific Islander Club, and Umoja are just a few of the student groups available on campus.

Although the College embraces diversity by supporting various cultural events and displays an appreciation of student diversity around them, students who were interviewed expressed that there was an over emphasis on the Asian American Pacific Islander student population, the majority population at the College. In order to reach a greater number of traditionally underrepresented student groups, the team recommends that the institution replicate the success experienced by special programs, such as Academic Success for Asians (ASAP). The institution meets this Standard (II.B.3.d).

Admission and Records instruments, practices processes and procedures are routinely discussed and reviewed at both the College and District level to make certain they are effective, consistent, and unbiased. The College ensures that its assessment tools and practices are in compliance with the California Community College System Office who approves the Compass diagnostic tool which is maintained by American College Testing

(ACT) and used by the institution. Validation of all tests is conducted on a six-year cycle or every time a change in testing instrument or cut score is initiated. The institution meets this Standard (II.B.3.e).

The College's governing board policies outline the maintenance and security of student records as mandated by federal regulations, California Education Code and the California Code of regulations, Title 5. The District maintains procedures to ensure that access to student records is restricted only to those individuals permitted such access by law and who require such access to carry on the operation of the district. Permanent student records are being converted into digital format (Avante/Laserfiche) to improve security. Electronic storage provides a higher level of security by ensuring fireproof, waterproof storage of data that is backed up nightly and stored off-site. The institution meets this Standard (II.B.3.f).

Mission College administers surveys designed to identify learning support needs of the students served by the institution. The college participates in the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) and the Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE) biannually which affords the College the opportunity to monitor student usage, satisfaction, and perceived importance of student services over time. The CCSSE also allows Mission College to compare itself to other like-sized colleges to identify areas for improvement. Some student support services have written student learning outcomes and are engaged in using assessments to improve their effectiveness. The College is incorporating SLO/SAO Assessment information into their program review documents. Surveys and pre and post assessments are examples of appropriate measures that are being used in some service areas. The team concludes that some, but not all, student support services have identified outcomes. The institution does not meet this Standard (II.A.2.b, II.A.2.c, II.B.1, II.B.3.a, II.B.4).

The team concludes that the institution does not meet Standard II.B.

Recommendations to meet the Standards:

See Recommendation #4

Recommendations to improve:

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, IIB.3.d).

STANDARD II

Student Learning Programs and Services

C. Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations:

Mission College Library and Learning Support Services sufficiently support the College's instructional mission. Services include the College Library and the Academic Support Center (ASC), formed in 2011 through the consolidation of the former Math Learning Center (MLC), and the Learning Assistance and Tutorial Center (LATC). The ASC includes all College tutoring as well as credit-non-credit skills-building courses. Additional learning support is provided through Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS), Mathematics, Engineering, Science Achievement (MESA), and Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) offered at other sites on campus.

The College's self-evaluation report provides evidence of the quality of its learning support services. The Library and ASC are well staffed and have ample print and electronic resources to assist students on campus. The Library also provides more than adequate electronic resources for students regardless of their location.

Findings and Evidence:

The Library provides ample resources to students regardless of their location. Print materials include 51,000 volumes and 104 periodical subscriptions. Students have access to over 25,000 eBooks, 3,500 streaming online videos and over 40 electronic databases. Databases include over 11,000 full-text periodicals, and remote access to the Library's electronic resources is available 24/7 through the library website linked directly from the College's home page. The Library provides reference service during all open hours of the library. Librarians respond to reference questions in-person, via phone, or email. The College reports 'number of reference questions' in the Library's Annual Report. The Library collects "satisfaction" survey data from students on site. Resulting data show generally positive student user feedback. The Library provides remote access to its electronic resources 24/7 through the library website linked directly from the College's home page (II.C.1.a, II.C.1.c).

The ASC offers a variety of learning support services to students enrolled in English, Reading, Writing, ESL, Math, and subjects identified as particularly challenging. Both the Math Lab and ASC offer face-to-face one-on-one or small group tutoring as well as some computerized tutorials (e.g., My Math Lab). Tutoring for on-campus and DL students offered outside regular hours (of the ASC) via SmartThinking© began in 2013. The institution is studying a new 'chat' interface for potential use for tutoring remote students (II.C.1.a).

Librarians offer a transferable Information Competency (Library 010) course, a College requirement for graduation with an AA or AS degree. The institution offers this course face-to-face and online through the College's Learning Management System (ANGEL). The College provides an option to 'test out' of Lib 010, but data show very few students are successful at this attempt. The Library collects data from all course offerings, including the number of Lib 010 sections taught each semester, FTES generated, student enrollments, and completion rates (II.C.1.b, II.C.2.).

The Library offers a variety of workshops including ANGEL (LMS) orientation for new faculty each semester. On Flex days (one each semester), the College provides further assistance with ANGEL to interested faculty. At other times during the semester the institution provides additional one-on-one faculty assistance with ANGEL on a drop-in basis. Faculty can access video tutorials online 24/7. Students experiencing problems with ANGEL can link to a “frequent problems” page for rapid response, and if their issue is not resolved, they complete an online form sent immediately to tech support housed on the West Valley College campus. That support person then responds remotely to the student (II.C.1.b, II.C.1.c).

The Library and the Academic Support Center (ASC) conduct Program Review annually, and Student Learning Outcomes are available for all courses within these programs. Based on the evidence, it appears the institution provides effective maintenance and security for its library and learning resources holdings, computers, equipment, and other learning support materials (II.C.2).

The Library has the capacity to collect longitudinal data relevant to usage of its services and materials and to analyze the data. The Library then uses data for continuous program improvement. The Library’s “Annual Report” includes the number of items borrowed, reference questions, database searches, orientations, and e-books accessed. This institution also uses this report in Program Review posts it on the College Website. An annual Library Collection Plan drives development of the Library collection. Selection decisions are based on published reviews, faculty and student discipline-specific requests, and course assignments. Librarians informally consult with faculty in the library and via email with respect to ongoing collection renewal (e.g. replacement of obsolete references). Funding for the Library’s textbook collection comes from Associated Student Government as well as donations from faculty (II.C.2).

The ASC routinely distributes and collects Student “Satisfaction” surveys in the tutoring center, math center and language lab with generally high levels of satisfaction with specific facilities and services provided. The ASC does not ‘formally’ collect survey data for the purpose of program review. Rather, the ASC notes feedback from instructors who regularly use the center. Student demand is the mechanism by which curriculum is updated each semester (e.g., ESL, Math), and faculty often provide free copies to the center to replace outdated texts still on file. The ASC assesses student use of its facility by collecting attendance data from SARS-Trac (Attendance Tracking Software). The ASC then uses these data to plan open hours of operation when faced with downsizing, or with scheduling tutors (II.C.2).

Tutors available in the ASC are local University or College upper division students (subject specialists), and the College requires them to complete a Tutoring Training course (IS010A) before they can be hired to tutor in the ASC. Students requesting tutoring must enroll in a non-credit Supervised Tutoring course (947) for purposes of collecting apportionment. The College offers additional courses for tutors who wish to enhance their knowledge and ability as a tutor. Students and faculty submit requests for subject-specific tutoring. The ASC usually provide tutors for those subjects with the greatest demand, based on funding availability. Faculty is testing other modes of tutoring that involve ‘live chat’ applications (II.C.1.c).

The Library is clean, bright, attractive, well maintained, and provides a variety of study locations throughout the facility including group study rooms, individual carrels, a collaboration room for larger group interactions, computer stations, open reading areas, and casual seating along

windows with a view of the central campus. The Library utilizes electronic security gates to prevent materials from being removed from the Library without approval (II.C.1.d).

Resulting data collected from the Library's Student Satisfaction Survey show generally positive student user feedback. The College does not formally measure faculty satisfaction with Library services. However, the Library's Annual Report illustrates a 63% decline in the number of faculty requests for Library Orientations or Bibliographic Instruction workshops offered to classes upon faculty request. Librarians do not distribute student or faculty evaluation instruments following such sessions, and there is no evidence that Library Bibliographic Instruction or Library Orientations are evaluated by students and/or faculty, or linked in any way to course, program or institutional student learning outcomes (II.C.2).

Conclusion

Mission College provides sufficient learning support services for students and relies on ongoing data gathering and analysis to inform decisions on selection and updating its learning materials, equipment and services. The Library provides ongoing information competency instruction on a regular basis. The Library provides adequate access to the learning resources regardless of student location or means of delivery. The ASC continues to improve its accessibility to tutoring for all students regardless of location. The Library maintains a contract to secure its premises using security gates. The institution meets this Standard (II.C.1).

The Library and Learning Resource programs and curricular offerings, equipment and materials are evaluated through ongoing Program Review process. However, the Library could strengthen its program review process by including a more thorough evaluation of its instructional program (II.C.2). The institution meets this Standard (II.C.2).

The team concludes that the institution meets Standard II.C.

STANDARD III Resources

A. Human Resources

General Observations:

The Human Resources section of the self-evaluation reviews a variety of College procedures and policies. In the self-evaluation summary sections, the College has described its processes and highlighted areas of achievement. Summaries included references to evidence, although the College did not directly link the evidence for those evaluations to the text. Planning agendas were identified to support the future work of the College in order to fully meet the Standard.

Findings and Evidence:

Mission College hires faculty, staff, and administrators using established criteria and procedures. The College establishes hiring procedures through board policy, and aligns hiring procedures with state educational code. Faculty subject matter experts are primarily responsible to ensure that faculty hiring criteria include an emphasis on effective teaching. Although recent budget reductions have created a need to reduce staffing levels at the College, the College is proud of its dedicated staff, faculty, and classified leaders. The College provides hiring committees with training to ensure they align with policies and procedures of the District, as well as the mission and values of the College. All employee groups report optimism that the College is moving in a direction which supports and values the participation of all employees in College decision making. Participatory governance committee membership reflects broad membership and regular attendance and participation by members.

Mission College systematically evaluates its faculty, staff, and administrators. The Human Resources Department, who operates within the guidelines of collective bargaining and District board policy, leads these processes. District bargaining agreements, where applicable, clearly describe the methods and instruments utilized in the completion of evaluations. Mission College tracks evaluations for all faculty and staff through the Office of Instruction, with support from the District Human Resources Department. Board policies are in place to guide the self-evaluation of the Board of Trustees as well as District senior administrators. The District securely files current evaluations of the Board of Trustees and other administrators in the District Office of Human Resources. The College assigns faculty, staff, and administrators based on their expertise, although the College is continuing to develop norms and clarify expectations of the role of the Dean of Instruction, which is a new position implemented in 2010. The division chairs and deans both report an overlap of responsibilities, and some institutional practices, such as hiring of adjunct faculty, seem to confirm inconsistent practices (III.A.1.b).

Faculty have direct responsibility for the development and assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). Although the College does not have explicit language in any evaluation forms to document progress, it explains its culture as having an “implicit” focus in this area through the direct observation of faculty during classroom visits. Interviews with department and division chairs, who are responsible for the evaluation of both adjunct and full time faculty did not confirm this practice. The Interim Associate Vice Chancellor of Human Resources

reported that attempts to formally introduce SLO assessment as part of the faculty evaluation have been unsuccessful.

The College does not have an agreed upon method for the consideration of the achievement of student learning outcomes for online offerings, and planning agendas reflect work in this area is in progress. In response to conflicting information between the self-evaluation report and reports from faculty evaluators, the team did an audit of faculty evaluations to determine the level of synthesis reflecting student learning outcome achievement included in typical faculty evaluations. The team completed a review of 15 evaluations and was unable to identify any references to how the classroom observation or student evaluations confirmed the consideration of the faculty's effectiveness in producing learning outcomes (III.A.1.c).

Mission College operates under an institutional code of ethics which is documented in board policy. The College expects staff to adhere to the policies and procedures related to ethical behavior, and information is made available to employees through the Human Resources Department as well as the College and District website. Faculty, staff, and administrators are given specific information on relevant policies as part of their orientation process. Also, District board policies and administrative procedures related to ethics, academic freedom, conflicts of interest, and political activities are available on the District website (III.A.1.d).

The College considers a variety of factors when validating the number of employees to hire. The budget limitations over the past two years have forced the College to engage in a process to consider staffing reductions. Employees report that the process for evaluating budget reductions was done in a collaborative manner, involving faculty, staff and administrators. When the funding is in place for hiring, planning documents, requirements for full time faculty, as well as FTES generation are all inputs to determine priorities for appropriate hiring. Faculty division chairs have responsibility to evaluate requests for full-time faculty and submit a prioritized list to the College President. The College has met its full-time faculty obligation over the past six years; although, as the College transitions to a basic aid District, the need for utilizing this as a measure of full-time faculty will be alleviated.

The team was unable to find evidence of an institutionalized process for prioritization and decisions related to administrative or classified hires; however, these requests are reflected in program reviews for their respective areas (III.A.2).

The College relies on policies and procedures developed by the District Human Resources Department. The College does participate in the development of these policies through representation on the District Council. All policies and procedures are available to employees as well as the public on the District and College website. To ensure consistent implementation, the College relies on the District Human Resources Department for application and administration of policies and procedures. Inequitable treatment can be reported through official grievance procedures defined in human resources policies as well as collective bargaining agreements (III.A.3.a).

All official employee personnel records are maintained in the Human Resources Department at the District Office. The institution keeps all official records in a safe and secure environment, and employees are able to access their individual files through a request for an appointment. District administrative procedures accurately describe the management of employee files (III.A.3.b).

Mission College demonstrates its understanding of and concern for issues of equity and diversity in a variety of ways. Board policies clearly guide the College in demonstrating a climate and culture which promotes diversity in educational programs, employment, and access to institutional programs and activities. Board policies promote an equal opportunity program and call for the adoption of a District plan for equal employment opportunities. The College has developed and begun the implementation of a diversity plan, last updated in 2012. This plan includes goals as well as specific strategies the College would like to take to make progress toward goals. Although work on this plan has been limited since 2012, the College does have the information and committee structures in place to continue robust work in this area. The College communicates with its community in both English and languages appropriate for the community demographics.

The College promotes diversity and training on issues of equity and diversity through professional development activities as well as its publications (catalog, core values). The College completed student equity and diversity planning over the past six years. Although the plans were originated in 2009 and annual updates were completed in 2010 and 2011, the College has had limited action in this area for the past three years. Human Resources reported they are working on an update; however, at the time of the visit the EEO plan was in final draft form and expected to be approved at the Board of Trustees meeting in April 2014 (III.A.4, III.A.4.a).

Human Resources professionals at the District, as well as the College, report that professional development has been available and completed with those involved in hiring on issues of diversity and equity. Recent hiring reflects the College is making progress in this area as half of the 2013 cohort of new faculty was from underrepresented communities (six of twelve).

The College reports an intent, and commitment to assessing its record in employment equity. A College diversity plan has helped guide processes to ensure the regular consideration and review of data; however, the College has not updated the plan since 2012, and the committee responsible has had limited meetings since that time. Although the College has a deep commitment to issues of diversity in hiring, they also report challenges to accessing data through the District's Human Resources Department. Despite a commitment to the review of data on the recruitment efforts for underrepresented faculty and staff, the College President acknowledges that the cycle of gathering data, analyzing and discussing the data, and using that information to inform future activities has not occurred (III.A.4.b).

Mission College cites several examples of board policies and procedures which relate to a philosophy of integrity and ethical treatment. Both District board policy and administrative procedures explicitly describe the role of integrity and ethics expected of College employees (III.A.4.c).

Mission College promotes professional development opportunities for all employees in a variety of ways. The College has a comprehensive online professional development program which is available to all employees and is designed to provide flexible training opportunities. The College also organizes formal professional development activities through its flexible calendar program. The College has utilized its status as an Asian American Native American Pacific Islander Serving Institution (AANAPISI) to pursue grant funds and provide targeted professional development to improve teaching and learning. Although a recent elimination of the Director of Human Resources position at the District will influence the leadership of professional

development at the College, employees and administrators report confidence that their commitment to development opportunities will continue in a formal manner (III.A.5, III.A.5.a).

The College provides a wide variety of professional development opportunities. Individual activity evaluations are collected to ensure that each offering is assessed for effectiveness. The College distributes an annual survey to identify perceptions of program participants. The College also completed an annual survey to identify training and development needs of the community (III.A.5.B).

The College utilizes a program review process to integrate human resources planning with institutional planning. The process provides a mechanism to describe staffing needs and includes both quantitative and qualitative data. Faculty hiring is an extension of the program review process, while classified and administrative positions are prioritized directly from the program review process. The College has had limited opportunities to implement the prioritization process for classified and administrators over the past few years due to funding limitations (III.A.6).

Conclusions:

The team determined that Mission College is dedicated to serving its diverse student body by recruiting and hiring qualified and diverse faculty, staff and administrators. Board policies and procedures clearly articulate the District's commitments and procedures used to ensure the alignment with the philosophy, mission, and values of the District and College. The institution regularly evaluates employees utilizing well established processes and instruments. The College promotes the recruitment, hiring, and development of a diverse faculty, staff, and administrative team. Although the College acknowledges it has been unsuccessful in establishing an infrastructure of data to allow for the analysis and reflection of its efforts to promote diverse hiring, the College has evidence of success in successful recruitments of diverse faculty. The College continues to have documented goals related to the hiring of diverse personnel and remains committed to this pursuit. The institution meets this Standard (III.A.1, III.A.2).

The team recommends that Mission College works to ensure faculty and employees responsible for the achievement of student learning outcomes are evaluated for their achievement of learning. The District has reported limited success in formalizing this as a component of faculty evaluation, which is negotiated with the faculty collective bargaining unit. The institution does not meet this Standard (III.A.3.c).

To the extent possible, and given the limited fiscal resources available, professional development programming is available to faculty as well as staff and administrators. Through the Organizational and Professional Development Committee, the College has established a formal venue to discuss and plan for a systematic professional development program. Faculty also organize professional development through the College's flexible calendar program. The recent loss of a key District position supporting professional development will require the College to assess and confirm responsibility for future leadership in this area. The institution meets this Standard (III.A.3, III.A.4, III.A.5).

The College has developed systematic planning processes for the integration of human resources requests into annual planning. Although continuing to evolve, the process will ensure the College has opportunities to strengthen the link between resource allocation and planning. The

team finds that the College needs to clarify and publish expectations for the prioritization of administrative positions, the one employee group not currently represented in the annual planning documents. The institution meets this Standard (III.A.6).

The team concludes that the institution does not meet Standard III.A.

Recommendations to meet the Standard:

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).

STANDARD III

Resources

B. Physical Resources

General Observations:

The response to Standard III.B in the Mission College self-evaluation addresses relevant topics and sub-points. The summary offers the context and process for the planning and the start of executing the College's Educational and Facilities Master Plan which was designed in 2007 and published in 2008. The Master Plan identifies a long-range view of 25 years, and it explains the vision for re-developing the entire campus to meet the needs of students. With the passage of a second bond measure in 2012, the West Valley-Mission Community College District has positioned itself to continue carrying out extensive renovation and development in order to support educational programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness; Mission College is fully engaged in that process. There is also a Technology Plan for the District and the College. The current Program Review process allows for the identifying of needs in resource areas such as technology, facilities, and/or equipment. The District/College Functional Map identifies all areas of physical resources responsibility as shared between the District and Mission College with the exception of "primary" responsibility belonging to Mission College in the areas of institutional planning, assessment, and improvement of facilities and equipment. The College prioritizes safety, sustainability, and a healthful learning and working environment.

Findings and Evidence:

The campus grounds are well groomed and show an eye to the future during this time of facility renovation and growth. Buildings are accessible, and pathways are easy to maneuver in spite of the current building project. The design style of the new building departs from the previous cement and beam style on campus and blends beautifully with the local skyline and gives an updated look to the campus. This construction project is coming to a close, and the next will begin soon; within five to ten years the entire campus will have been replaced or renovated. All buildings appear well maintained, including the large primary campus building which will be demolished in about three years due to the high cost of retrofitting needs. Planning initiatives have supported this extensive work both on the largest scale of the Master Plan and as each new project moves forward. The College generates room utilization reports through AdAstra for review. The College reports yearly to the state through their Scheduled Maintenance Five-Year Plan and the Five-Year Construction Plan (III.B.1.a).

The Facilities and Safety Committee is part of the governance structure of Mission College, and it has developed processes to communicate with faculty, staff, and students in the event of emergency situations that may arise on the campus or to escalate attention to emerging hazards such as those identified in the day-to-day work of maintenance and facilities crews. The District employs an Emergency Preparedness Coordinator who maintains a website, provides training for the faculty and staff, and maintains the Emergency Preparedness Plan for the District and Mission College. Most recently, the College conducted a full scale mock evacuation drill on campus; solicited feedback from participants, and developed a chart for identified improvement. During the new building planning phase of each campus construction project, the College reviews plans for accessibility to ensure compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act guidelines. During a 2013 visit by the Office of Civil Rights, the College developed a voluntary

plan of action and timeline for current increased accessibility and convenience for all students. The College is responding to each listed recommendation for compliance. Recently the DSPS Office relocated to the second floor of the Campus Center; access doors to the area and the nearby restroom are currently without automatic openers, and a plan has not been developed to correct the situation. College staff suggested it was in the program review process and would move to the Facilities and Safety Committee; although, this could not be documented, and the District Director of Buildings and Construction reported a lack of awareness of this ADA issue (III.B.1.b).

The College engaged in extensive planning efforts and widespread dialog as facilities planning was conducted for the 2008 Educational and Facilities Master Plan. This included a Core Group from the District and the campus, departmental input, community and campus open forums, consultant direction and input, approval by Governance and Planning Council (GAP), and acceptance by the Board of Trustees. This document identifies a long-range perspective and is referred to by faculty and staff as the primary facilities planning document. The self-evaluation report references updating the 2008 plan through the Strategic Planning Process, the newer Program Review Cycle, and the Technology Plan though it appears no campus dialog or integrated updates are documented into a more current Educational and Facilities Mater Plan. The College asserts that the total cost of ownership will be reduced as they improve and modernize facility operations though it is not apparent how that has been ascertained. Although the self-evaluation identifies total cost of ownership planning, no total cost of ownership documents exist for the new buildings that have previously come on line, the building opening this spring, or future projects that are being planned. The District primarily funds projects through the passage of the District's 2004 Measure H bond and the 2012 Measure C bond; they are considered one-to-one exchanges of offices and classrooms, so the Director of Buildings and Construction reports there is no anticipated need for increase of resources. The College Vice President of Administrative Services identifies the District as managing all total cost of ownership on new building including staffing, custodial services, etc., and the District Director of Buildings and Construction indicates that if needs were to arise for a new building, they would go through the program review process. Larger requests, such as the change to add science labs to the newest building, would go to the District planning group with the Vice Presidents. The District developed a prioritized list of facilities projects for each campus in 2012. The Board of Trustees approved allocations submitted for the various capital projects (III.B.2.a).

The institution conducts physical resource planning at both the District and the College. Departments are able to identify the technology, equipment and/or facility needs in the Program Review process. When the College Vice President of Administrative Services finds that an identified technology need fits the criteria of technology support managed at the District level, he forwards the request. The College handles facilities requests primarily at the bi-monthly meeting of the Facilities and Safety Committee as members bring needs forward, or they come through program review. The College offers presentation to each department by having a member on the committee. The College advances needs that rise to a certain level of cost (not clearly determined) to the District for consideration at the District Vice Presidents meeting for approval and funding. The institution prioritizes campus projects based on safety, then compliance, and finally need. The Colleges directs some needs to known sources such as "small" items from the Safety and Facilities budget or current grants and moves others through the budgeting process. The District annually develops the Scheduled Maintenance Five-Year Plan of District-wide facilities maintenance needs and the Five-year Construction Plan. The process for developing

these two particular reports is not integrated with other committees and facilities planning processes.

The West Valley-Mission Community College District has an agreement with the Land Corporation Auxiliary. The Board members of the Land Corporation Auxiliary are the same Board members as the District Board of Trustee members; the proceeds from this non-profit corporation have been available to fund projects in the past. In the past four years, the Land Corporation has assisted the District by supplementing the budget shortfall due to cutbacks. This year the Land Corp is considering new ways to move forward with funding (III.B.2.b).

According to some individual activities reported Mission College is assessing the effective use of physical resources and using the results of the evaluation as a basis for improvement. The College conducted a survey after the renovation of a group of temporary classrooms, and used the results to guide further room renovation. The Technology Committee conducts surveys of students, faculty, and staff to assess technology resources. A yearly schedule of planned rotating assessments exists in the Technology Plan. Departments and programs have the opportunity to respond to facility, technology, and equipment needs in the program review process by identifying and listing those needs. The program reviews are examined by the Program Review Committee, the division chair, and the dean, who are each welcome to comment or suggest revisions. The College compiles equipment needs and forwards them to any particular funding stream that may seem appropriate, such as Career and Technical Education Act (CTEA) funding or District consideration. The institution's component plans are not integrated into a comprehensive, well known and widely distributed process. They are not systematically assessed for effectiveness and adapted for improvement (III.B.2.b).

Conclusions:

Mission College provides safe and adequate facilities to support the programs and services for students and staff. The campus is well maintained. The College is inclusive and comprehensive in the planning and development of the campus site which will be completely renovated or built new with the aid of local bond measures. The College reviews and uses classroom and lab utilization information in its planning. The College has provided safe and sufficient physical resources to support the programs and services of the College. The institution meets this Standard (III.B.1).

Although the institution identifies the integration of physical resource planning into other planning processes as important, the team noted there are various sources of planning and not all are integrated. The large scale physical resource planning for facilities does show some links to the ten core educational directions in the Educational and Facilities Master Plan, such as in expansion of the Hospitality Management area. The team found it difficult to verify integration of this document with the goals identified in the more recent Strategic Plan Comprehensive List of Goals document and with the District or College Technology Plans or with funds available through the Land Corporation. The smaller maintenance and safety needs on the campus do seem to have a process for review, prioritization, and response; however, there is not systematic assessment of the effective use of these resources or survey results analyzed and used as the basis for improvement. This process is not integrated into other planning processes. The newer CurricUNET program review process may be assisting with more direct integrative links by the gathering of equipment and technology requests into one location, yet the various types of needs

are then managed in a variety of ways without systematic assessment or the use of evaluation results for improvement. The institution does not meet this Standard (III.B.2).

The team concludes that the institution does not meet Standard III.B.

Recommendations to meet the Standard:

See Recommendation #1

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 reflecting projections of total cost of ownership (III.B.2, III.B.2.a).

Commendations:

Commendation #1

The team commends the College and particularly the maintenance and operations staff for the quality of the College landscaping and grounds which are particularly attractive, well maintained, and sustainable; clearly the Grounds staff takes great pride in its work.

Commendation #2

The team commends the College, the District and the voters of the West Valley-Mission CCD Service area for supporting higher education through the passage of two general obligation bond measures which have enabled the college to establish new state-of-the-art educational facilities that are attractive, of an architecture that compliments the college's culture and surroundings and will provide a quality learning environment for decades of current and future students.

STANDARD III Resources

C. Technology Resources

General Observations

The Technology Resources section of the Mission College self-evaluation described, quite adequately, the extensive technology resources available to college personnel and students. The report delineates District, College and shared responsibilities as well as general oversight by District and College personnel and committees. A full description of all technology applications used by/for student services, instructional services, research and planning, and network safety and security was included. Also outlined was a summary of the college's Technology Master Plan and how the plan fits into the overall planning process.

Technology services, professional support, facility, hardware and software are the primary responsibility of the West Valley-Mission Community College District. The Director of Information Systems (DIS) is the chief information systems officer for the District and provides administrative oversight of all Information Systems (IS) operations. The DIS also chairs the District Technology Committee (DTC) a body that developed the most recent Five-Year Equipment Replacement Plan and the District Technology Strategic Plan (DTSP) approved by the Executive Management team June 2013). The Vice President of Information Systems group provides ultimate prioritization of Mission College departmental educational technology requests, consisting of Administrative Vice Presidents from both Colleges and District Information Systems staff who meet every two weeks to review the status of the DTSP.

Mission College has secondary responsibility for technology services, professional support, facility, hardware and software. The District Systems Analyst (DSA) meets regularly with Mission College Registration staff to review aspects of registration software. The Systems Analyst also meets on an ad hoc basis with Mission College counseling staff to offer training. The District Computer Operations Manager (COP) provides oversight of the District's servers, portals, office technology (desktop computers, printers, phones) and the wireless networks. The COP is also an ex-officio member of Mission College's Technology Committee (MCTC). Day-to-day technical support at the College is provided by two District IS support and six Instructional Technology & Support (ITS) staff including: a Telecommunications/AV Multimedia Specialist, a Server Systems Administrator, an Instructional Media Producer/Director, two Desktop Support staff, and the College Webmaster. Oversight of the ITS staff is provided by the Director of Student Enrollment and Financial Services.

Findings and Evidence

The College appears to place a high value on acquiring technology in terms of hardware, software, facilities and services, as noted in the College's Strategic Plan. There is evidence that sufficient training (on campus or remotely) is unavailable to students. There is also evidence that a "help desk" system for students on campus is present, but cumbersome at best. Help Desk personnel are located in the "Welcome Center" of the Main Building on campus. When problems arise with the wireless network on campus, various approaches can be taken, depending on the person requesting assistance. Faculty and staff can reach Help Desk staff via

online requests for service, email, campus phone, or cell phone. Student ambassadors in the Welcome Center offer assistance to students by contacting the Help Desk staff and staying with the student until IS assistance is provided. Faculty and Staff requiring assistance with educational (instructional) technology issues contact IT&S staff by a variety of means (phone, online form, email, or cell phone) (III.C.1.a., III.C.1.c).

The College provides assistance to Students and Faculty with the Distance Learning Management System (ANGEL) on the ANGEL website and face-to-face in the Library. No other systematic on-campus support for ANGEL exists. Evidence was not provided that students requiring assistance with other applications (e.g. Adobe) have access to help on campus or online. Previously a Tech Center (TC) existed on the second floor of the Campus Center and “tech-savvy” assistants were available to help their peers with technology questions or problems. This was not a revenue-generating lab, and a few years ago the College closed the TC. Computers housed in the TC were moved to the Academic Support Center. The Library has assumed functions of this center. The Library is the only open-access computer laboratory on campus providing student access to MS Office software (III.C.1.a).

Technology training is a shared responsibility (District/College). The District/College offers training in MSOffice® applications to Mission College staff online through the District Portal or through the District Human Resources Department. The institution provides online training for the District’s Learning Management System and, until spring 2013, by the Distance Learning (DL) Coordinator and DL Instructional Designer/Trainer at Mission College. The College Webmaster provides one-on-one training for departments and faculty who wish to produce their own webpage. The Webmaster typically maintains the page, once it is uploaded. The institution offers staff and faculty educational training through occasional face-to-face workshops including Flex-day activities. In past years, the DL Coordinator offered “orientations” to Distance Learning (DL) faculty and students. The former DL Coordinator left this position at the end of spring semester and is currently being filled by an Interim DL Coordinator. The Instructional Designer/DL trainer position is currently vacant (III.C.1.b).

The District’s Technology Master Plan contains an implementation grid that should show the current status of each objective. However, no status is included in the current plan (all status fields are blank). Furthermore, there are no mechanisms in place to assess whether acquired technologies have been effective in enhancing and/or supporting student learning. The planning document mentions the provision of information technology training, but evidence that the training provided is evaluated for effectiveness is lacking (I.B.3, III.C.1.b).

While the College does have a College Technology Master Plan (CTMP), evidence of ongoing systematic evaluation of classroom technologies and their support of student learning does not exist. The CTMP does not include provision for ongoing, systematic quality training for students, whether on campus or from a remote location, nor does the plan include quality training for college personnel (III.C.1.b).

While the CTMP provides a calendar for procuring ‘emerging technologies’ over the next few years, the plan does not describe a mechanism for evaluating the effectiveness of these technologies in meeting the learning and teaching needs of College constituents. For example, the college has purchased three lecture-capture systems and is expanding their use in 15 different courses with more due in the coming months. How these systems support and enhance student learning is not addressed in the self-study (I.B.3, III.C.1.d.).

Evidence that the District regularly distributes technology survey instruments for purposes of evaluation and continued quality improvement is not provided; however, the College distributes, collects, and tabulates ‘satisfaction’ surveys every year. These measure satisfaction with technology and training provided on the Mission College campus, but not effectiveness. No evidence exists showing the data are analyzed for continuous quality improvement. For example, while the self-evaluation reveals 56 percent ‘satisfaction’ with the ‘quality’ of training, there is no explanation or analysis provided regarding the remaining 44 percent of faculty who are not satisfied (I.B.3, III.C.1.b, III.C.2).

There appears to be inadequate access to computers for students on campus. At one time, a Tech Center offered access to computers, with assistance provided by peer students. For one semester a librarian was available to assist students. The former College President decided to close the Tech Center. Some of the computers were placed in the Academic Support Center while others were placed in the Library. The only open computer lab on campus for student use is in the Library resulting in insufficient computer access for students on campus (III.C.1.a, III.C.1.d).

Evidence of systematic technology training on campus is lacking. Trainings which are offered are somewhat random, quite infrequent, and not evaluated/analyzed for purposes of continuous quality improvement. Evidence also indicates the College does not provide formalized face-to-face trainings for students on campus. Librarians in the Library’s open access lab provide assistance with ANGEL and general office applications (word, excel, power point). In past years the DL Coordinator offered orientations to Distance Learning students. The College charged a College Distance Learning Committee, chaired by the DL Coordinator with conducting faculty workshops on “best practices” this past fall 2013. However, documentation of these events and/or descriptions or structure does not exist (I. B.3, III.C.1.b, III.C.2).

Conclusion

There is insufficient evidence that the technology support Mission College provides is designed to meet the needs of learning and teaching. More specifically, there is a lack of computer support for students in open lab areas and on campus with Wi-Fi problems. While some training is offered online, and on occasion face-to-face, there is no systematic training program available to students, faculty and staff. Furthermore, evidence of evaluation of trainings offered does not exist. The institution does not meet this Standard (III.C.1, III.C.2)

The team concludes that the institution does not meet Standard III.C.

Recommendations to meet the Standard

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).

Standard III Resources

D. Financial Resources

General Observations:

Although, the Financial Resources section of the self-evaluation report is complete, at times it loses focus where the sub-sections of the Standards are not always addressed in the “evaluations.” The self-evaluation report did not supply evidence that demonstrated the implementation of processes. The self-evaluation report was clear as to “what” the processes are, but no explanation was provided as to “why” a process was decided upon or “how” it was utilized. Processes do not appear to have been assessed and the results of assessment used for College improvement.

Both the self-evaluation report and interviews indicate that there is limited communication and collaboration between the District and the College.

Findings and Evidence:

At the annual review of budget priorities the West Valley-Mission Community College District Board of Trustees sets direction and parameters on which the District bases financial planning. The Board-adopted funding allocation mechanism allows Mission College to set funding priorities to accomplish its institutional plans and mission. Board policy states, “The annual budget shall support the District’s Master and Educational Plans.” Both the District and the College review their mission and goals as a part of the budget planning process. The College’s mission statement was last reviewed in 2012 when it was decided that the mission statement would be reviewed every four years (III.D.1).

The College uses the Strategic Plan for baseline budgetary planning. For budget allocation, the Offices of the President, Student Services, Instruction, and Administrative Services use the four-year College Strategic Plan to drive financial planning with strategic program goals to support the institution (III.D.1.a).

The institution adopted an update of the Associated Faculty Funding Model and the Resource Allocation Model in 2013-2014. The College has a Performance Goals Committee (PGC) that decides the allocation of FTEF to academic programs according to factors such as productivity and success of programs as measured by efficiency and program completion. This allows the assignment of FTEF to meet targeted FTES in order to fulfill the mission and core values of the College (III.D.1.a).

The District and the College have a realistic assessment of financial resources available as well as the development of financial resources which has allowed the District to make the strategic decision to position itself as a “Community Supported Basic Aid” district in order to stabilize funding. The District has recently formed a Community Supported Basic Aid Taskforce to develop a policy on the distribution of excess fund (III.D.a.1.b).

The level of financial resources provides a reasonable expectation of both short-term and long-term financial solvency. In the budget development process the District projects on-going operational expenditures as well as selected priorities. The District allocates resources for payment of its liabilities and long-term obligations, which includes Faculty Banked Leave, Vacations, Lease Revenue Bonds, CalPERS and CalSTRS, and OPEB. The District participates in an OPEB investment fund that levels out the funding annually for this long term liability (III.D.1.c, III.d.3.c, III.D.3.d).

The Board of Trustees Budget Priorities states that “the priority of the Board is to establish a budget that structurally balances ongoing expenditures with ongoing revenues and maintains a prudent Unrestricted General Fund Reserve of 5 percent.” Additionally, the District attempts to maintain an additional 3 percent “contingency reserve” to cover fiscal emergencies. This resulted in the maintenance of a College Reserve Funds account in the amount of \$30,000 in order to fund unforeseen expenses each year (III.D.1.d, III.D.3, (III.D.3.a).

The District has been given unqualified opinions by independent auditors in the past three audits. All audit recommendations have been addressed in a sufficient and timely manner (III.D.2.a, III.D.b).

A Joint Power Authority group provides risk management for the District’s property and liability. The District’s long-term debt is secured through property assessment as a result of the Measure E passage. (IIID.2.c).

The Student Loan Default rate has been as high as 19.7 percent in the past three years. The most current default rate is 16.5 percent. Previously, the Financial Aid default rate was between 3 to 5 percent. The College has entered into a Default Prevention Initiative agreement sponsored by the California Community College Chancellor’s Office to analyze, evaluate and determine options to reduce the default rate (III.D.2.d, III.D.3.f).

The College demonstrates its effective oversight of finances by assigning one Financial Analyst to specifically monitor all grant and externally funded accounts. This has in fact ensured that all required annual reports to funding agencies are accurate and timely. Financial Aid also has a dedicated employee to oversee its finances (III.D.3.b).

Internal controls are vague. For example, no formal administrative oversight exists in adjunct faculty hiring decisions and signature authority is delegated to faculty which is not consistent with board policy (III.D.3.h).

Conclusions:

Overall, the accreditation standard for finance is well addressed. The District and the College have sufficient budget and reserves and a resource allocation method to set priorities, especially with the revenue stream from the Land Corporation. The institution has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability. The institution plans and manages its financial affairs with integrity as reflected by its audits. The condition of state finances and community college

funding is uncertain; however, the District has reached “Community Supported Basic Aid” status that alleviates the District’s dependence on an uncertain state budget while enjoying increasing property tax revenue in order to provide institutional effectiveness and support to student learning programs and services. For the past five years, the District and College have utilized revenues from the Land Corporation in balancing the budget. Since obtaining the status of a Community Supported Basic Aid district last year and with the most recent reduction to “right size” the budget, the District and College are able to operate within normal funding sources, and therefore, again utilize the revenue from the Land Corporation for special projects rather than to balance the budget (III.D).

Mission College and the West Valley-Mission Community College District complete planning and resource allocation with the mission and goals as the foundation. The Faculty Funding Model and the Resource Allocation Model is integrated with and supports all institutional planning. The institution meets this Standard (III.D.1).

The team has concerns with the College’s internal control regarding who has the authority to make hiring decisions and who has signature authority. For example, the Division Chair is the highest level of signature authority for adjunct faculty contracts. There is no formal process for informing the deans or the Vice President of Instruction when an adjunct faculty member is hired. Full-time faculty contracts are signed by the Division Chair; there is no dean or Vice President of Instruction signature required. This behavior is not consistent with either BP 6150 or AP 6150 (III.D.2.e, III.D.3.h). The institution does not meet these Standards (III.D.2, III.D.3)

The College provided no evidence that the College’s internal control systems and other financial management practices are evaluated and assessed for validity and effectiveness, and the results of this assessment are used for improvement. Nor is there evidence that the institution systematically assesses the effective use of financial resources or uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for the improvement of the institution (III.D.2.e, III.D.3.h, III.D.4). The institution does not meet this standard (III.D.4)

The team determined that there is not clear and consistent communication of processes within the College or with the District. This lack of communication hinders the implementation and understanding of processes and responsibility for assessment and improvement of the processes.

The team concludes that the institution does not meet Standard III.D.

Recommendations to meet the Standard:

Recommendation #10

Organization and Communication: In order to meet the Standard 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 widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement (III.D, IV.A).

Commendations:

Commendation #3

The team commends the institution for its entrepreneurial approach and success in effectively and appropriately leveraging grant funding opportunities to advance the mission of the college and its programs.

Commendation #4

The team commends the district for taking strong steps towards financial stability by:

- Establishing the Land Corporation to develop real property as a solution for resource development without exposing the District to increased risk
- Achieving the status of a Community Supported Basic Aid district,
- assessing and refining of the Associate Faculty Funding Model and the Resource Allocation Model, and
- Maintaining sufficient fiscal reserves and contingencies to sustain programs and services during periods of economic uncertainty.

STANDARD IV

Leadership and Governance

A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations:

Mission College is part of the West Valley-Mission Community College District and is overseen at the District level by the District's Board of Trustees (BOT) and Chancellor. Information and proposals originating at the College that require District approval are sent to the District Council, which is composed of representatives from both Colleges, including College Presidents, and Presidents from the Academic and Classified Senates. Ultimate responsibility for decisions at the College level lies with the College's President.

After Mission College implemented a major reorganization of its organizational structure in 2009-2010, the institution updated, re-envisioned, or established a number of policies regarding collaboration and inclusive decision-making. The College's model for decision making, approved in May 2012, routes evidence-based proposals, first through relevant committees and leadership positions such as Department chairs and groups such as Division Council, for initial input and review. The College then sends the proposals to the Governance and Planning Council (GAP), which, as in most committees, is comprised of four constituencies, administrators, faculty, classified staff, and students. From there, the institution sends College-specific proposals to the President.

Findings and Evidence:

The institution charges College leaders with ensuring that the College provides an environment that promotes empowerment, innovation, and excellence. Mission College leadership has experienced a great deal of change since the last accreditation site visit, and interviews with faculty, staff, and administrators indicate that a number of key senior administrative positions have been filled recently with individuals who have little or no experience at this level. The perception shared with the team is that the collective lack of experience and short duration in current positions have not produced an environment that can be objectively demonstrated to be conducive to creativity, inclusivity, and effective leadership throughout the organization.

As shown in the Mission College Participatory Governance Handbook, the College has policies in place for decision-making processes that provide for equal representation of and collaboration among students, classified staff, faculty, and administrators. Review of minutes of committees and groups indicates that, while participation in decision making at various levels is available, students and sometimes classified staff do not participate as often, and therefore, in practice, do not have equal representation. Interviews with classified staff indicate that lack of participation is largely due to understaffing and inability to attend due to time and responsibility constraints. The Director of Student Development indicated that it is difficult to get students to participate on committees, and that having one student sit on each committee is the current goal (IV.A.1).

The self-evaluation report mentions various opportunities for participation of the different constituencies in professional development and other venues for collaborative discussion, including Flex Days and visioning forums. The evidence provided for these activities primarily relies on email announcements, administrative procedures, and BOT policies (IV.A.1).

The self-evaluation report emphasizes the reorganization of 2009-2010 and the resulting organizational procedures and practices. Evidence, in terms of policies, procedures, invitations to events, and goals, is provided in some cases. Evidence exists that illustrates assessment and evaluation of these activities, practices, and goals; however, the College does not have systematic evidence regarding the effectiveness of its organizational structures and processes for collaborative, effective, and ethical leadership. Interviews with administrators and faculty leaders, including department and division chairs, indicate that surveys for specific topics have been conducted, and informal debriefings are used to determine the effectiveness of current practices and policies (IV.A.1).

The April 2012 status report on two-year goals for the College's core values indicates completion of a number of goals relevant to collaborative leadership and monitoring of progress, including development of the College handbook, participation on committees, participation of classified staff in professional development, and institutionalization of opportunities for different constituencies to participate in efforts to improve the campus (IV.A.1).

The College's written policies comply with participatory governance and collaboration as prescribed by California regulations. After the 2009-2010 reorganization, GAP commissioned the Mission College Participatory Governance Handbook. The policies in the handbook identify roles and responsibilities for students, classified staff, and faculty, and administrators. Collaborative processes identified in the handbook indicate that primary opportunities for collaborative decision making for all four constituencies occur through various committees and other decision-making bodies, such as the College Budget Advisory Committee (CBAC), the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC), and GAP. Good documentation exists in the form of minutes for CBAC, GAP, IEC and Academic Senate (AS) committee participation (IV.A.2.a).

The College's decision-making process model identifies distinct roles for faculty and administrators in institutional governance and implementation of policies, planning and budget. In practice, however, the actual responsibilities are not always clear, especially for the relatively newly created dean positions and the division chairs. Students and staff also have clearly defined opportunities to participate in committees and councils. This has been confirmed through interviews with administrators, faculty, and classified staff. As indicated above, interviews with classified staff indicate that understaffing and workload limit opportunities to participate in committees and other collaborative leadership activities. Additionally, also noted above, the Director of Student Development indicated that, while the College creates opportunities for students to participate on all committees and GAP, it can be difficult to find enough students who are willing to do so. The current practice is to try to obtain a minimum of one student per committee (IV.A.2.a).

The College President described the integration of the various steps in the planning and budgeting process, which provide for participation by all four constituencies. Minutes of

meetings of the Program Review Committee, as well as various other committees, provide evidence that demonstrates how this process ensures program review recommendations are aligned with the College's strategic goals, and how requests from throughout the campus community are prioritized, funded, and tracked. The Program Review Committee developed and archived this process in *Goal Analysis Reports* (IV.A.2.a).

Another example of collaboration across administration, faculty, and classified staff is the process used for program revitalization, which documents problem-solving among faculty and administrators to find ways to improve program viability (IV.A.2.a).

Per Title 5, the Board of Trustees (BOT) adheres to transparent policies with respect to the responsibilities of different constituencies. The BOT relies on the Academic Senate regarding curriculum and academic programs. This communication is first achieved and documented by faculty who participate on either of two committees, Academic Directions or Curriculum Review. These committees report to the Academic Senate, which then determines how their input will be used (IV.A.2.b).

The established structures and processes are clearly defined as delineated in the District Council Operating Principles; Board Policy 2510 regarding reliance on the Academic Senate for curricular decisions and academic programs; the Mission College Participatory Governance Handbook; and the provision of seats on various committees and groups for administrators, faculty, classified staff, and students. The actual practice of inclusion in decision-making is not as clear. According to meeting minutes and rosters, some entities, such as GAP and CBAC, appear to have regular participation by administrators, faculty and classified staff. Student participation is permitted, but is not as frequent. As documented by meeting minutes and membership rosters, the Program Review Subcommittee consists of faculty members, as well as at least one administrator and one classified staff member (IV.A.3).

At the College level, the President's Roundtable has a confidential, informal, unrecorded monthly meeting where the College President and the Presidents of the Academic Senate, Associated Students, and Classified Senate are free to communicate concerns and current projects. At the District level, the Chancellor's Roundtable similarly meets monthly with Presidents from both Mission and West Valley Colleges, as well as Academic Senate and Classified Senate Presidents from both Colleges (IV.A.3).

The BOT has a policy regarding transparency and full disclosure to accrediting agencies. In 2010, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) determined that the College had remedied the 12 recommendations from 2008. The ACCJC also approved a Substantive Change Proposal for Distance Education filed by Mission College in 2011. Additionally, the College interacts with external agencies that may require audits, compliance monitoring, and annual reports. These include Title III and Puente program grants (IV.A.4).

In 2010-2011, GAP assessed the effectiveness of the governance and decision-making processes and developed the Participatory Governance Handbook, which was published in 2011 and which realigned membership on committees and councils. GAP evaluated committee functioning in spring 2011 through a College-wide survey, the results of which were shared widely in the

campus community. Although GAP discussed the results at meeting, no improvements were made as a result of this survey (IV.A.5).

Neither rosters of participants nor assessment were provided for Flex days and visioning forums. Participation in Flex Days is documented and records are retained by Human Resources. Participants complete evaluation forms, but no analysis or use of the data is in evidence (IV.A.5).

In spring 2012, the institution adopted a decision-making process model for use throughout the College. The College President stated that they do not conduct a formal evaluation of this model; instead, they have used an informal formative evaluation to drive the process of improvement over the past several years. This may be documented in notes from the debriefings, but no formal minutes have been kept (IV.A.5).

Also in spring 2012, as indicated in the midterm report, the College scheduled a second evaluation, following an evaluation in 2011, of the 2009-2010 reorganization to be conducted in spring 2010. However, per interviews with faculty leaders, the College deferred this evaluation in part because of the need to begin work on the self-evaluation report, and also because the addition of deans and revisions of position duties seemed to be working very well (IV.A.5).

Per the self-evaluation report, the Academic Senate has annual goals that are assessed as part of an annual self-evaluation process, but evidence of use of the results to guide planning, as claimed in the self-evaluation report, was not provided. The BOT conducts an annual self-evaluation and update of its goals. Goals are listed for GAP, but evidence of results of evaluations of the goals was not provided (IV.A.5).

Committees provide annual reports to GAP, and GAP collected information about the effectiveness of participation on the committees in 2012, whose minutes reflect discussion and plans for a retreat based on that assessment data (IV.A.5).

Conclusions:

The College has taken many steps to include all constituencies in the campus community in decision making, and there are systematic processes and practices in place to initiate, discuss, and prioritize ideas and requests. The perception communicated to the team, however, regarding the lack of experience of key senior administrators indicates major limitations on the ability of the College's leadership to effectively promote and sustain an empowering and innovative environment that results in institutional excellence. The institution does not meet this Standard (IV.A.1).

The College has, for the most part, clearly-defined roles and responsibilities for various entities and positions. The reorganization implemented in 2009-2010 resulted in changes in job descriptions and duties that were, in time, successfully resolved. There are examples of practices and policies that demonstrate effective collaboration among the various College constituencies. The institution meets this Standard (IV.A.2).

The Board of Trustees' policies and the College's Participatory Governance Handbook describe established structures and policies for cooperation throughout the institution. There are routine meetings of leadership committees and councils (e.g., CBAC and GAP) where collaboration among administrators, faculty, staff, and students is evident. In addition, there are confidential Presidents' Roundtable meetings at the College and District levels. The institution meets this Standard (IV.A.3).

The College abides by its policies regarding transparency and compliance with external agencies' standards and reporting requirements. The institution meets the Standard (IV.A.4).

There are various examples of assessment of policies and practices for collaborative leadership, but there is no integrated assessment across committees, councils, and other activities to determine whether the College, overall, has effective, ethical, inclusive leadership. The institution does not meet the Standard (IV.A.5).

The team concludes that the institution does not meet Standard IV.A.

Recommendations to meet the Standard:

See Recommendation #10

Commendations:

Commendation #6

The team commends the College faculty, staff, and administration for their strong commitment to the College, its students, its community and for the high level of respect and collaboration within departments and committees.

STANDARD IV

Leadership and Governance

B. Board and Administrative Organization

General Observations:

Mission College, as well as the West Valley-Mission Community College District, has undergone several leadership changes since 2012. The College's former president left in fall 2013 to accept a superintendent/president position. Its Vice President of Instruction took a presidency position one year earlier in 2012, and the current president was confirmed in January 2014. The Vice President of Instruction, who serves as the Accreditation Liaison Officer, was selected in July 2013 and has been with the College for just under seven months.

At West Valley College the previous president, after serving three years at the College, departed in 2012 for a superintendent/presidency position. And, the current president (who formerly worked at the District office since 2009 as an associate vice chancellor), became the permanent president at West Valley in May 2013. The current chancellor of the West Valley-Mission Community College District was hired from a community college in the state of Washington and began his term on July 1, 2012, succeeding a chancellor who retired after serving in that capacity for just under four years.

The governing board for the West Valley-Mission Community College District is composed of seven elected officials representing distinct areas of the District. At the College level, the Governance and Planning Council (GAP) is the highest participatory governance body, representing all constituency groups, faculty, students, classified professionals, and administrators. Each governing body has an established number of representatives with term limits to allow for continuity. The GAP's minutes are posted, and it is one of the major bodies in which the College President communicates and receives input from the internal constituents, and the President is also the chair of this committee. Other methods for communication are through College forums, listening sessions, email, print media, and in the past the president also videotaped segments each year entitled the "President's Goals".

Findings and Evidence:

Board Policy 1200 clearly identifies the mission of the District and the two Colleges. It states that it "promotes an environment conducive to open dialog and the free exchange of ideas leading to the achievement of successful student learning outcomes". Board Policy 2410 calls for a regular review of both the District Board Policies and District Administrative Procedures. In fall 2011, all board policy chapters were revised to align with the Community College League of California's (CCLC) *Model Policy Manual*. Further, a Board ad hoc committee in conjunction with the chancellor, legal counsel, and key management staff, proposed revisions that were reviewed by various governance groups throughout the District and sections of the policy were revised and approved by the WVMCCD Board of Trustees in January, 2012. The Board has established a procedure for the hiring of the chancellor, BP 2431, and interviews and minutes confirm that this process was followed. Additionally, regular evaluations are established

within policy and personnel files were available for review. However, with the exception of BP 7120 which speaks to overall recruitment and hiring, specific policies on the hiring of senior administrators, such as College Presidents and Vice Presidents, could not be located. When the Mission College President, who was hired in January 2014, was asked if he had met with the chancellor to establish mutually agreed upon goals, the answer was "not yet" (IV.B.1, IV.B.1.b, IV.B.1.e).

BP 2715 Code of Ethics Standards of Practice clearly delineates the expectations of Board members as it relates to: ethical standards, how Board members should conduct themselves, its authority as a Board to communicate through appropriate channels of authority and responsibility, confidentiality of closed session items/discussions and compliance with the Brown Act (IV.B.1.h)

To ensure Board members' compliance with their role as trustees and the administrative oversight of District/College operations BP 2715 specifically addresses the expected protocol for Board members in requests for information, admonishments regarding direct contact with staff members and delegation of authority to the Chancellor (IV.B.1.d).

The College is involved with the communities that make up its service area (chamber of commerce, service clubs, and involvements with local K-12 districts). Initiatives such as its community listening sessions with local high tech companies have been successful in providing internships for its students through its MC²IT program as well as the successful passage of the District's general obligation bond, Measure C (IV.B.2.d, IV.B.2.e).

In accordance with Education Code 70902, the governing board derives its power and authority as the singular body responsible for the approval, review, amendment, and deletion of general policies which govern the operations of the District. BP 1200, BP 2410, BP 2715 clearly identify and outline the Board's role in the approval, review, amendment, and deletion of general policies which govern the operations of the District. Board minutes indicate that fiscal matters are part of the Board's agenda, are voted on, and the results posted in minutes and on the webpage. The governing board also has the responsibility of educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity (IV.B.1, IV.B.1.a, IV.B.1.b, IV.B.1.c).

Chapter 2 of the Board of Trustees Policy Manual, updated in 2012, outlines the role of the governing board and establishes a code of behavior consistent with practices. It also establishes a code of ethics and identifies actions it will take if there are violations to these policies (IV.B.1.d, IV.B.1.e, IV.B.1.h, IV.B.3.a).

The governing board receives regular and timely updates from its various constituency groups, its participatory governance bodies and the Chancellor and Presidents of the Colleges. This takes the form of reports to the Board, newsletters, presentations, agenda items and accreditation updates (IV.B.1.f)

Board Policy 2745 requires that the Board complete an annual evaluation process. Also provided in policy is the commitment to ongoing training and new trustee orientations. Meeting minutes

of the governing board, as well as travel and conference attendance documents, validate the Board's compliance with its policies (IV.B.1.f, IV.B.1.g).

In fall 2010, the District contracted with the California Collegiate Brain Trust consultant group to recommend a formal strategic planning process that would enhance the planning of both Colleges and inform the resource allocation of the Land Corporation. The consultant group outlined a review of existing planning documents such as marketing research, demographic and economic trends, and educational master plans from both Colleges to provide the basis for the updated strategic plan and a recommended reorganization plan (IV.B.3.g).

In 2011, a College wide survey was conducted one year after the reorganization that resulted in shifting some administrative functions from a release-time method to full-time administrators. This was done to provide increased oversight and accountability with regard to legislative and legal mandates, enrollment management, and to streamline the flow of communication within the Office of Instruction. It was thought the use of full-time administrators for these functions would provide twelve-month coverage for administrative duties. Further, reductions in faculty release time were seen as an opportunity for skilled full-time faculty members to work with students in the classroom and maintain continuity of their programs. As outlined in Academic Senate minutes (4/23/09), the revised structure was also intended to improve transparency, provide more "checks and balances" and address shortcomings with the "peer- to-peer" system of division chairs. Lastly, the revised structure was proposed to better align departments within instructional divisions.

As part of the discussions, College participatory governance groups reviewed multiple proposals before a final adoption. The adopted proposal was selected as a balance of addressing identified needs with minimal financial impact. The financial data provided indicated that the recommended reorganization would result in cost savings. While cost savings were not the primary motivation for the restructuring, the College moved forward with this proposal with an expectation of reduced costs and improved efficiency.

In total, 98 people responded, including 44 full-time faculty, 27 classified staff, 18 administrators/managers/supervisors, and 9 associate faculty. Full-time and associate faculty together represented 54 percent of all respondents. Most of the respondents were from the instructional area at 58 percent. Student Services respondents accounted for 25 percent of the total and 17 percent were from other areas. At the time 79 percent, over three quarters, of all survey respondents had worked at Mission College for over five years. Several key themes:

- Unclear roles and responsibilities.
- Concerns with implementing the reorganization at a time of workforce reductions; whereas the changes from the structural reorganization and the reductions in workforce were completely separate processes, survey respondents perceive the two processes as linked.
- Concern that workloads had become overwhelming at all levels.
- Need for cost-savings financial information.
- Some respondents expressed doubt as to whether there have been any cost-savings, while others expressed frustration at being asked to provide evaluation without the financial data at hand.

The College has not conducted a follow-up survey to ascertain if these concerns still exist or have abated with time, and moreover increased familiarity with the structure and processes. However, based on extensive interviews with faculty, classified staff, and administrators there seems to be general consensus that the current consolidation of departments and the creation of division deans is more effective than the previous structure (IV.B.2.a).

The College implemented a Decision Making Process Model two years ago. The College prioritizes requests identified through the Program Review subcommittee of the Academic Senate or one of several operational councils depending on whether the request is primarily instructional, student services or administrative. The College Budget Advisory Committee (CBAC) and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) then reviews the prioritized requests, before forwarding to GAP for a final review with a recommendation to the College President. This process is documented in the College's Integrated Resource Request Process (IV.B.2.b.1, IV.B.2.b.2, IV.B.2.b.3, IV.B.2.b.4).

The College President has the responsibility to implement District policies as the chief executive officer for the institution through Board Policy 3100. This includes the authority to: approve expenditures, curriculum, budget, and ensure that human resources requirements are met. To ensure consistency, the Executive Management Team, comprised of the two College Presidents, the Chancellor, and Vice Chancellors meet weekly (IV.B.2.c, IV.B.3.f).

After review by GAP, the College forwards all resource request forms to the President, the chief executive officer, for disposition. The current Resource Allocation Model (RAM) is based upon a budget allocation model that was adopted in fall 2011 by the District. This model is based upon the amount of FTES generated and aligns with the system allocation model from Senate Bill 361 which became law in 2006. As identified in the self-evaluation report, "the College's internal resource allocation process meets this Standard; however, the degree to which the District's allocation of resources ensures adequate support to the College is still being reviewed and evaluated". The District identified discrepancies in compensation vs. actual cost in the Associate Faculty Funding Model which have been adjusted but which cannot be fully funded given the state revenue reductions to the District. Compared to its sister College, Mission College has several career and technical programs that are less efficient and are more expensive than traditional lecture courses. Additionally, several staff stated that the demographics of the student population require additional support services. It was felt that these factors may hamper the institution in reaching its FTEF goals which would adversely affect the College's budget and increase the possibility of over-spending (IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3.c, IV.B.3.d, IV.B.3.e).

As part of the accreditation process, the College Presidents provide reports to the Board of Trustees as informational items. In reviewing minutes and based upon interviews the Board of Trustees has received regular reports on the preparation of the self-evaluation report and the progress of responses to accreditation recommendations (IV.B.1.i).

Historically, Mission College has been involved with its communities. They have received several civic awards that reflect this commitment, and with the passage of Measure "C", a \$350 Million bond measure that passed with almost 60 percent of the total vote count for Santa Clara and Santa Cruz counties; there is tremendous support for the institution within the community.

Both internal and external stakeholders have had substantial dialog around student learning and student learning outcomes. The team observed the College has a broad array of data reports which are available in both print and electronic formats and are available for review (IV.B.2.d, IV.B.2.e).

Conclusions:

The Board reviewed its policies in 2011 and 2012. Contained in policy are the District's and the two College's mission statements which are aligned in support of student success. Additionally, the District policies address the assurance of integrity, quality and improvement of student learning programs. The Board regularly evaluates the chancellor and conducts an annual self-evaluation. District strategic plans set forth goals for the District which are aligned with College goals and initiatives. The institution meets this Standard (IV.B.1).

Documentation produced by the Governance and Planning Council (GAP) and the review of documentation and minutes from the division chairs, Performance Goals Committee, College Academic Senate Minutes and the District Wide Planning Committee demonstrates that all constituencies were involved in the process of budget reductions and reorganization. Planning and budget documents as well as individual interviews show that the College has used the new planning process, which includes representatives from all constituencies, to inform the budgeting process. An example of this is how the College responded to budget cuts and the resultant administrative reorganization in 2010 and the resultant survey in 2011. Ongoing program review is at the heart of College planning and budgeting. What was not evident was the process for assessment as identified in the functional chart depicting the *Decision Making Process Model* adopted May 23, 2012. The institution does not meet this Standard (IV.B.2).

The Board of Trustees authorizes the Chief Executive Officer the rights and responsibilities to implement its policies and to insure institutional practices are consistent with its mission. Additionally, board policy clearly delineates the services that are provided by the District and those that are shared responsibilities. Resources allocated to the College are based upon a budget allocation model (RAM) that was adopted in fall 2011 by the District. There continues to be concern, expressed by staff at Mission College that the College will continue to face challenges in meeting the needs of less efficient programs and the needs of the student population it serves. Additionally, in reviewing reports contained in the self-evaluation report, the team noted that Mission College has not fully evaluated the impact of recent District financial decisions on the College's ability to sustain educational programs and services. The College did describe the principles and practices around fiscal decisions at the District and the Colleges, and yet it was unclear what specific impact the reductions or changes will have on the long-term viability of the campus and what will be the future impact of those reductions and changes. The institution does not meet this Standard (IV.B.3)

The team concludes that the institution does not meet Standard IVB.

Recommendations:

See Recommendation #10