Addendum to the 2015 Accreditation Follow Up Report

Submitted on April 16, 2015

By:
Mission College
3000 Mission College Boulevard
Santa Clara, CA 95054

To:
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges
10 Commercial Boulevard, Suite 204
Novato, CA 94949
Addendum to the 2015 Accreditation Follow Up Report

This Addendum provides a narrative of the additional work towards meeting accreditation standards that Mission College has completed since submitting the Follow Up report on March 15, 2015. Since the follow up report was submitted just a month ago, this Addendum is relatively short, and highlights only the major items of development at Mission College.

Daniel A. Peck
President

Institutional Planning

RECOMMENDATION 1:

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).

- The Institutional Effectiveness Committee has continued to refine the Master Planning and Evaluation Calendar, with four additional readings at the Governance and Planning Council (March 4, March 18, April 8, April 15). These readings were conducted to be sure that the document included relevant district plans, while clarifying the different levels of ownership between district and college processes and plans. The Master Planning and Evaluation Calendar was approved at GAP on April 15, 2015.

- Recognizing that multiple evaluation cycles will occur this spring, the Office of Research, Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (ORPIE) created a summary chart of action items and dates for evaluation. This is being used to monitor progress and assure completion of activities on the Master Planning and Evaluation Calendar.

- The program review committee analyzed all program review document submissions and created a goal alignment report detailing the frequency with which each college strategic focus was identified as being aligned with a program’s stated goal. This analysis will be used at the May 1 Strategic Planning Summit to inform planning at the college level. In addition, committees have once again been asked to complete an evaluation and progress update form which will be analyzed and discussed at the May 1 Summit to identify improvements.
Evidence:

1. Updated Master Planning and Evaluation Calendar
2. Evaluation Action Item Schedule
3. Program Review Goal Alignment Report

**Culture of Evidence**

**RECOMMENDATION 2:**

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)

- The College research staff recently met with researchers from five other community colleges in the South Bay with whom they will be collaborating on a survey of students who are enrolled at more than one of these colleges. The data we collect will enable the colleges individually to better understand the reasons students attend colleges outside their respective service areas and whether there are opportunities for collaboration across colleges to better serve students. The survey will be administered in Fall 2015 at all six colleges with analysis and presentation in Spring 2016. Intended audiences will include multiple groups within the college, including the Governance and Planning Committee, Marketing Committee, President’s Cabinet, Student Services Council, and Division Council.

- The Facilities and Safety Committee and the research office developed the college’s first comprehensive facilities survey. The survey was deployed to all students and employees on April 13th. Responses will be disaggregated to identify issues that may differ between daytime and evening students, for example, or between students and employees. Results will be used to identify areas in need of improvement in facilities, maintenance, and related policy.

- The student technology survey was deployed in late March 2015 and 1,020 students have respondent to date. The survey focuses on several areas of technology that can help (or hinder) student success: the college website; My Mission Portal; the registration process; the Welcome Center; computer labs; Wi-Fi on campus; smart classrooms; and whether there is a need for technology training for students and in which areas. The open-ended survey responses will be categorized and given to appropriate committees and staff who are responsible for addressing issues in each of the areas. The Technology Committee will analyze the quantitative results as a group and identify recommendations for improvement.
• The Library faculty surveys students annually to make sure they are meeting student needs for reference material, study space, and support with information competency. This year’s survey will be deployed April 27. The survey results will be analyzed to identify recommendations for changes in library hours, identification of which types of media are most useful to students, and satisfaction levels with different components of service.

• In April, the California Community College system office announced the new Institutional Effectiveness Framework of Indicators that will be published system-wide and by college, in three increments, the first due on June 30, 2015. Eighteen indicators in the areas of student success, fiscal health, and accreditation status were identified as metrics that should be made publicly available. Although only 4 of the indicators are required to be published in the first year of the initiative, Mission College is prepared to publish current performance and goals on as many as 12 for the June 30 date. The College’s work on setting a robust set of institution set standards (and corresponding aspirational goals) has prepared us well for this new requirement.

• In conjunction with the new Institutional Effectiveness Framework of Indicators, the state Chancellor’s Office and its partners have established the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative, which enables colleges to seek technical support and grant funding to improve institutional effectiveness efforts at their own colleges. Mission College has submitted a Letter of Intent, requesting technical team support in the area of culture of evidence with a particular focus on changing the culture around outcomes assessment.

• The Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness continues to support the College’s drive for data that can be used in decision-making. On April 3, 2015 the 2014-2015 Fact Book was published. Hard copies will be printed for distribution to the Board of Trustees and community partners.

Evidence:

4. Facilities Survey
5. Technology Survey
6. Library Survey
7. Mission College IEPI Letter of Intent
Institution-set Standards of Student Achievement

RECOMMENDATION 3:

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).

No addendum for this recommendation.

SLO ASSESSMENT

RECOMMENDATION 4:

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).

- Mission College has submitted a Letter of Intent to the state Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) requesting technical team support in the area of culture of evidence with a particular focus on changing the culture around outcomes assessment.

- Department Chairs and Division Chairs received additional training on assessment, with a focus on Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), at the Department Chair/Division Chair/Dean meeting on March 20, 2015. At this meeting, department chairs were given templates to map PLOs for Degrees and Certificates to Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs). All degrees and certificates have now been mapped to ILOs with completed mapping documents submitted to the Office of Instruction.
Outcomes Assessment Committee (OAC) has scheduled two major training events for Spring:
  o Representatives from OAC, including the SLO Coordinator, are providing training May 11, 2015 to Student Services Council related to SAO assessment and reporting to improve the usefulness of assessments in planning and decision making.
  o At the Strategic Planning Summit scheduled for May 1, 2015, OAC is leading the group in an interactive review of the college ILOs. This will include both a review of ILOs from different institutions and an interactive process to identify patterns from a review of PLOs with the goal of identifying stronger ILOs. This is the first step in the process of evaluating, reviewing and perhaps revising the ILOs.

Evidence:

9. OAC Minutes noting May 11 Training
10. Department Chair /Division Chair/Deans Meeting Agenda
11. May 1st Strategic Planning Summit Draft Agenda

Distance Education

Recommendation #5:

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).

The Faculty Union (ACE) and the District reached a tentative agreement for a new contract on March 27, 2015. This tentative agreement includes language specific to Regular Effective Student Contact (RESC) and Distance Education (DE) that is not present in the current contract.
  o The proposed contract includes language on RESC in Articles 26A, 26B, 112 and Appendix D.
  o The proposed contract requires training equivalent to 1 credit unit for new DE instructors.
  o The proposed contract requires peer evaluators of DE courses to have access to and to evaluate the course management systems for all DE courses.

Evidence:

12. Tentative Agreement
Student Support Services

Recommendation #6:

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).

No addendum for this recommendation.

Student Learning Outcomes

Recommendation #7:

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).

- The Faculty Union (ACE) and the District reached a tentative agreement for a new contract on March 27, 2015. This tentative agreement includes language specific to Student Learning Outcomes Assessment that is not present in the current contract.
  - The proposed contract includes language on SLOs in Articles 26A, 26B, 112 and Appendix D.

- Board Policy 3200 was revised to specifically reference assessment of learning outcomes. Below is the relevant text for Board Policy 3200 ACCREDITATION:

  **Board Policy 3200 ACCREDITATION**

  References:

  WASC/ACCJC Accreditation Eligibility Requirement 21 and; WASC/ACCJC Accreditation Standards I.C.12 and 13 (formerly IV.B.1.i); Title 5 Section 51016

  - Colleges within the district adhere to the eligibility requirements, accreditation standards, and policies and procedures of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (ACCJC/WASC).
  - The Colleges are committed to presenting themselves in a uniform manner to all their accrediting agencies, to communicating any changes in accredited status, and
to disclosing information required by accrediting agencies in carrying out their accrediting responsibilities.

- The Chancellor shall ensure the District complies with the accreditation process and standards of the Accrediting Commission of Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) and of other District programs that seek special accreditation.
- The District shall ensure that faculty, staff and administrators directly responsible for student progress toward achieving student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes.
- The Chancellor shall keep the Board informed of approved accrediting organizations and the status of accreditations.
- The Chancellor shall ensure that the Board is involved in any accreditation process in which Board participation is required.
- The Chancellor shall provide the Board with a summary of any accreditation report and any actions taken or to be taken in response to recommendations in an accreditation report.

**Facilities Planning**

**Recommendation #8:**

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).

No addendum for this recommendation.

**Technology**

**Recommendation #9:**

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, integrated 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).

No addendum for this recommendation.
Organization and Communication

RECOMMENDATION 10:
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 that these processes facilitate effective communication among the College’s 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).

- Over Spring 2015, the College revised its Participatory Governance Handbook. The College’s Governance and Planning (GAP) Council is the highest-level participatory governance body and is the one to which all other participatory governance bodies report. In order to ensure that the participatory governance and decision-making processes are fully understood, a task force from GAP was charged with updating this central document.
  o Sections were either updated or reaffirmed, including an overview of participatory governance, governance at the district level, budget related tenets, and opportunities for participation.
  o A description of constituent representative roles and expectations.
  o Included is an affirmation of the importance of student learning outcomes in decision making.
  o The Decision Making Process Model, which visually illustrates the process for introducing and approving college-wide decisions, is now included in the Handbook.
  o The revised Participatory Governance handbook has gone through three readings at GAP (March 4th, March 18th, and April 8th) and was approved at the April 15th GAP meeting. At the time of adoption, GAP also approved a two-year review cycle for revisions to this document.

- As part of the discussions and evaluation of governance and decision-making, providing further support to the Classified Senate was identified as an area for improvement. Multiple steps have been taken in response.
  o For the first time, the College identified funding to provide backfill for the Classified Senate President, increasing capacity for active participation (started Fall 2014).
  o The College organized the first annual classified professional development day; this day was supported by the President, and organized and presented by classified staff themselves (Fall 2014).
  o The Classified Senate was provided with a dedicated MC Classified Senate email address (mc.classified.senate@missioncollege.edu) to give continuity in messaging and continuity across changes in senate leadership (Spring 2015).
  o The Classified Senate was provided with a dedicated laptop for Classified Senate business use as well as office space directly adjacent to the Academic Senate, which is hoped will further collaboration (Spring 2015).
College administration has tentatively approved a Classified Participation form proposed by the Classified Senate for use by staff when serving on committees and task forces. The intent is to provide a formal mechanism for requesting participation from supervisors, thus making the request easier to make. This form will now move to GAP for discussion and potential approval (Spring 2015).

Evidence:

13. Participatory Governance Handbook
14. Draft Classified Participation Form