SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2001 evaluation team made nine recommendations in the areas of planning, personnel, institutional effectiveness, curriculum, organization, and Board policy:

**Planning:** The team made two recommendations related to planning. Recommendation 1 advised that the college should revise its planning summary from the Self Study to incorporate other major planning agenda activities, and distribute the revised summary to the college and to the Accrediting Commission. The complete list of activities was presented to the Governance and Planning (GAP) Committee on August 25, 2004. This list was distributed to the Commission as Appendix B of the Midterm Report sent to the Commission in October 2004. The college has responded to all 84 planning agenda items. The responses can be found in Appendix B. This recommendation has been met.

Also related to planning, the team recommended (Recommendation 4) that the college “develop, refine, and implement its program review and evaluation processes for both instructional and non-instructional programs to provide a tighter link to the planning goals and directions.” Since the visit, the college has revised its program review model twice and used the most recent model as the core of its educational master planning process. One hundred percent of instructional and non-instructional programs and services participated in program review, completed in Spring 2007. The Academic Senate is undertaking a review of the program review model in Fall 2007. One of the goals of this review is to ensure that program review is linked to resource allocation. This recommendation has been partially met.

**Staff and Student Diversity:** Recommendation 2 advised the college to “develop, implement, and regularly assess the results of its recruitment, retention, and success plan for underrepresented faculty, staff, and students.” The college is working with the District Faculty and Staff Diversity Advisory Committee (FSDAC) to write a diversity plan using the criteria from the Model Equal Employment Opportunity Plan and Guidelines for California Community Colleges/2006 (California Community Colleges System Office) as its starting point. The time line for a first draft of this plan has been pushed out by the State Chancellor’s Office pending completion of a workforce availability analysis. However, the FSDAC is continuing its work on un-impacted areas of the plan, with the expectation of having a first draft by June 2008. The college has been able to collect and analyze substantial existing data regarding the recruitment and retention of staff. This information was provided in April 2007 to the Accrediting Commission upon ACCJC’s request for additional information to support the 2006 Progress Report, which addressed this recommendation. Also provided to the Commission was an update on the college’s progress in the implementation of its Student Equity Plan and Title V grant. The Commission accepted this report at its June 2007 meeting. This recommendation has been partially met.
**Institutional Effectiveness:** The evaluating team recommended that the college “identify outcome measures or performance indicators and the means to assess those measures for its major college and program objectives” (Recommendation 3). Mission College has made strides toward this goal. The college’s newly revised mission statement specifically states that the college is committed to systematic assessment and evaluation. For example, since the 2004 Midterm Report, the college has made progress in developing and implementing Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).

Mission College is committed to establishing outcome measures in areas beyond student learning. The college is in the initial phases of creating a college-wide, systematic process for measuring and improving institutional effectiveness. The recently completed program review process is an example. In addition, the new President has charged the Research Analyst to develop a research agenda that includes proposed models for benchmarking institutional performance, such as an institutional scorecard. Such a model should incorporate state accountability indicators as well as institutional indicators reflecting the college’s educational and master plan priorities. This recommendation has been partially met.

**Curriculum:** Three recommendations were made related to curriculum. Recommendation 5 advised the college to develop a process for the systematic review of curriculum; Recommendation 6 advised the college to review its General Education (GE) program; Recommendation 7 advised the college to re-examine spoken and written language competencies.

The college has made some progress toward implementing a curriculum review process that supports a systematic review of existing courses and programs. The program review model adopted in 2004 called for a review every five years. Because so many programs and services had not conducted program review as scheduled, the model was set aside in favor of a process that would make all programs and services current. This process was begun in 2005-2006 and completed in Spring 2007. Curriculum review was not included in that process because it would have been impossible for the Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) to manage a review of the entire curriculum at once. The Academic Senate is now revisiting the 2004 model, as well as the 2005-2007 EFMP, to make modifications. The intent is to implement a new version incorporating the best elements of both approaches in 2008-2009. In the meantime, a number of programs have submitted their curriculum for review as necessary but no systematic schedule has been developed. The President has charged the interim Vice President of Instruction with developing a schedule for periodic review with the CRC and also with implementing a process for review of vocational curriculum every two years. The implementation of an online Curriculum approval and management program, CurricUNET, will greatly assist the college in monitoring the status of its curriculum. This recommendation has been partially met.
Regarding General Education (GE), the college completed a review of its GE program in April 2007. A subcommittee of the Academic Senate determined that Mission's GE requirements meet the Title 5, Section 55022 requirements for the Associate Degree (R6.2, R6.4). In addition, the committee reviewed each GE area and the related courses, as listed in the Mission College Catalog (R6.5). This recommendation has been met.

The Mission College Academic Senate (MCAS) responded to Recommendation 7 in 2004 by forming a sub-committee to review the spoken and written language competencies for its degrees and certificates and the process by which these exit competencies would be evaluated. The committee forwarded recommendations to the Academic Senate that the new graduation requirement for the AA/AS degrees be raised to the transfer (English 1A) level and that students illustrate oral competency through completing Communication Studies courses or by passing a proficiency exam. The Academic Senate approved these requirements in Spring 2003 (R7.1). This recommendation has been met.

**Organization:** The visiting team recommended that the college review the administrative structure for academic programs to ensure adequate support. Since 2001, major changes in the organizational structure included reducing the number of direct reports to the President from seven to five, which resulted in more direct reports to the Vice President of Instruction. This re-structuring placed the Dean of Information Technology and Services and the Dean of Workforce and Continuing Education under the Vice President of Instruction. The Dean of Instruction position, also reporting to the Vice President of Instruction, was created and filled. The 10 Division Chairs, representing 48 departments, continue to report directly to the Vice President, as do a staff of 4, including the Research Analyst.

It remains to be seen whether this reorganization has been sufficient to ensure an appropriate and necessary level of support for instructional programs and services. The situation is further complicated by the fact that at this time, four key positions in the Office of Instruction are filled on an interim basis due to retirements and resignations. These include the Vice President of Instruction, the Dean of Workforce and Continuing Education, the Executive Administrative Assistant, and the Curriculum Specialist. This recommendation has been met but may require additional evaluation.

**Board Policies:** Recommendation 9 called for the establishment of processes for the regular review of board policies and for the assessment of board performance. After completing a comprehensive review and revision of its policies in 2003, the Board established a process for the regular review of its policies, which results in a comprehensive review of each of the six chapters of the District Policy Manual at least once per year. In 2006-2007, the Chancellor directed the appropriate administrators within the District to collect, review, update or develop, as necessary, the procedures called for in each chapter of existing policy. On an on-going basis, changes are proposed through the participatory governance process by staff, faculty, students, administrators, and Board members. Annual reviews always include the latest recommendations of the Community College League of California (CCLC) Policy and Procedure Service. This portion of the recommendation has been met.
In respect to its self-evaluation process, the Board has made several changes. In the 2005-2006 academic year, the Board substantially revised the questionnaire that was distributed to administrators and constituent group representatives in addition to the trustees themselves. All feedback is reviewed and discussed by the trustees in a meeting devoted to completing the evaluation. In Fall 2007, the Board began working with a consultant to further revise its self-evaluation process. This portion of the recommendation has been met.
RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS
FROM 2001 ACCREDITATION REPORT

Recommendation 1: Mission College should revise the planning summary from the Self Study to incorporate major planning agenda activities identified in the Educational and Facilities Master Plan and other relevant planning documents and distribute this revised summary to the college community and the Accrediting Commission. (Responsive to all 2001 Standards)

The 2001 Self Study “provided extensive self-evaluation but did not include extensive discussion or identification of planning agenda items related to the issues or deficiencies raised.” Prior to the completion of the final draft of the Self Study, a decision was made to eliminate many of the planning activities under each standard in favor of the final 2 page planning summary of 19 items. Thus, many of the specific planning agenda items developed by the standards committees were not included in the Self Study.

In Spring 2004, the Vice President of Instruction located previous drafts with the original planning items and she merged these planning activities with those from the planning summary from the 2001 Accreditation Self Study and the recommendations from the 2001 Educational and Facilities Master Plan (2001 EFMP). The complete list of activities was presented to the Governance and Planning (GAP) Council on August 25, 2004 (R1.1) with the intent that as a first step in organizing the college’s planning agenda, the list be refined to eliminate redundancies and produce a more manageable list of activities for the college to pursue and monitor, including clear outcome measures and performance indicators. This list was distributed to the Commission as it was included in Appendix B of the Midterm Report submitted in October 2004 (R1.2). The complete list of planning agenda items from the 2001 Self Study with responses has been included with this Self Study (Appendix B). The 19 items included in the Self Study are addressed separately from the additional 65 planning items that were deleted from the report.

The college has recently completed another Educational and Facilities Master Planning process (EFMP 2007) (R1.3) and will be coordinating plan recommendations with the planning agenda items included in the 2007 Self Study, as well as those from the Student Equity Plan and other major planning documents such as matriculation and technology. With this information, the college will be in a better position to prioritize, implement, assess, and evaluate its goals and do so more efficiently.

This recommendation has been met.

Evidence:

R1.1 Governance and Planning (GAP) Coouncil Meeting Minutes, 08-25-04
R1.2 Mission College Midterm Report, Appendix B, 10-04
R1.3 Educational and Facilities Master Plan process (EFMP 2007)
Recommendation 2: The team recommends that Mission College develop, implement, and regularly assess the results of its recruitment, retention, and success plan for underrepresented faculty, staff, and students. (Responsive to 2001 Standards: 2.6, 4A.1, 5.7, and 7D.2)

As noted in the college’s progress report of October 15, 2006 (R2.1), Mission College determined that the most effective approach to the development of a recruitment, retention and success plan for its faculty and staff would be to develop its plan in collaboration with the District and the District Faculty and Staff Diversity Advisory Council (FSDAC). FSDAC is representative of numerous participatory governance groups and serves as an advisory group to the Associate Chancellor of Human Resources.

Noted in the April 2007 progress report (R2.2) was the fact that both colleges in the West Valley-Mission Community College District (WVMCCD) were operating under work-to-contract status, which had a major impact on the college’s progress since its October 2005 progress report. The Academic Senates implemented a resolution on March 14, 2006 (R2.3) that halted faculty participation on all committees, including accreditation, the college’s Student Equity Committee (SEC) and the District FSDAC. The Classified Senates also supported the resolution and suspended committee work effective March 15, 2006 (R2.4). Without full faculty and staff participation, many activities and initiatives came to a halt. Faculty participation in committees did not resume until after November 2, 2006 (R2.5). The Classified Senate did not lift its participation in the resolution until February 7, 2007 (R2.6). Many committees were not able to schedule and resume their activities in the time remaining in the fall semester and only resumed their activities beginning in February 2007. In spite of the work-to-contract environment, the college was able to continue its data collection efforts and was therefore prepared to move forward when the committees reconvened. Developing a recruitment, retention, and success plan, however, proved difficult without full participation of faculty and staff.

Although creating a plan for the recruitment and retention of faculty and staff did not occur during the time of the work-to-contract stipulation, the college was able to collect and analyze the information that already existed to assess its current state regarding the recruitment and retention of students. This information was included in the Spring 2007 progress report that was submitted to the Commission. Readers are referred to the 2007 Progress Report for a detailed description and analysis of the data (R2.2).

At its February 5, 2007 meeting, FSDAC established subcommittees to work on different diversity-related activities. One group was assigned to draft an updated diversity plan using the criteria from the Model Equal Employment Opportunity Plan and Guidelines for California Community Colleges/2006 (California Community Colleges System Office) as its starting point. The time line for a first draft of this plan has been pushed out by the State Chancellor’s Office pending completion of a workforce availability analysis. However, FSDAC is continuing its work on un-impacted areas of the plan, with the expectation of having a first draft by June 2008. A second group was tasked to work with Human Resources to devise standardized and easy-to-read formatting for data reports. A third group was assigned to draft a diversity survey for distribution to the full District community, with the possibility of targeted focus groups following this survey. Finally, college researchers were assigned to work on further and expanded updates to this report (R2.7).
In Spring 2005, the college completed its Student Equity Plan (R2.8), which identified the college’s on-going campus interventions for student success. Goals were developed to address recruitment and retention issues of under-represented and underserved student populations. These goals are:

1. **Access**: Increase access for the most underserved populations (Hispanic by 5% and African-American by 3%) based on 2002-2003 data.
2. **Course Completion (Retention)**: Increase retention in basic skills. Increase Hispanic and African-American retention to achieve benchmark numbers based on the 1992-2000 composite data. Benchmarks as listed in Student Equity Plan: Basic Skills 61% and All Courses 67%.
3. **ESL & Basic Skills**: Improve completion rates for the following: (1) Math completion rate by 10% for African-American, Filipino, and Hispanic students; (2) ESL completion rates by 5% for males.
4. **Degree & Certificate Completion**: Increase number of awards (degrees for all students and certificates for male students) so that males represent 75% of females who earn certificates based on 2003-2004 data.
5. **Transfer**: Increase the number of Hispanic and African-American students transferring to the UC and CSU systems based on 2001-2002 data. For the UC and CSU systems, within the Hispanic transfer-seeking population, increase transferring students to 45 students annually for years 2006 through 2008 and to 55 students annually for years 2009 and 2010. Within the African-American transfer-seeking population, increase transferring students to 14 students annually for years 2006 through 2008 and to 16 students annually for years 2009 and 2010.

In April 2007, the college reported its progress on student equity to the Accrediting Commission as part of the follow-up report to its 2006 progress report. This report describes in detail the status of the equity indicators as well as future plans based on the data that have been collected. This information has been used by the Committee to develop action plans for each of the goals. These plans are also included in the April 1, 2007 report to the Commission.

The awarding of the Title V Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) grant in 2004 to Mission College has allowed the institution to place more emphasis on recruiting Hispanic and African American students and improving the success of all under-represented students. The benchmarks for the Title V grant are:
Outreach
- Hispanic participation in Orientation/pre-enrollment assessment will increase 5% over Fall 2004

Student Satisfaction
- 80% of students surveyed will indicate a high degree of satisfaction with improvements so far.
- Ability to track and monitor student outcomes through college and/or District data bases will be increased by 30%.

Pedagogy
- 100% of ESL and math basic skills instructors will be able to use student learning outcomes (SLOs) to evaluate improvements to track student cohorts.
- Success rates for ESL and math will increase over Fall 2004; success rates will increase by 2% over Fall 2003.
- Cohorts in first ESL and math pilots will persist to next level at a 5% higher rate than other students
- Semester-to-semester persistence of Hispanic 1st time freshmen will increase 3% over 2004-2005 baseline.
- One-year retention of Hispanic students will increase by 3% over Fall 2003 (R2.9).

The data show that since 2005, the enrollment of Hispanic students increased by 6% in Fall 2006 over Fall 2004. The Welcome Center and student ambassadors work one-on-one with first time freshmen to ensure they understand the steps to matriculate into classes and complete their educational goals. Title V provided funding to expand the college’s telephone registration system and financial aid materials so they are now also available in Spanish. Increasing the number of Hispanics who attend Orientations and take the pre-enrollment assessment is also a goal of Title V. The percentage of Hispanics who completed assessment and Orientation increased by 22% in Fall 2006 over Fall 2004. The number of African-American students who participated in Orientation and assessment during this time period also increased by 21.5% (R2.10).

This recommendation has been partially met.

Evidence:
R2.1 Mission College Progress Report, 10-15-06
R2.2 Mission College Progress Report, 04-07
R2.3 District Academic Senate Minutes, 03-14-06
R2.4 E-mail, Doug Masury, 03-15-06
R2.5 Mission College Academic Senate Minutes, 11-02-06
R2.6 Doug Masury, 02-07-07 (Classified Senate Resolution)
R2.7 FSDAC meeting agenda, 02-05-07
R2.8 Student Equity Plan, 03-03-05
R2.9 Title V Grant Award 2004
R2.10 Title V update email, Lin Marelick, Grant Director, 02-20-07
**Recommendation #3:** The team recommends that Mission College identify outcome measures or performance indicators and the means to assess those measures for its major College and program objectives. (Responsive to 2001 Standard 3C.1)

Since the 2004 Midterm Report, the college has made progress in developing and implementing Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). The SLOs Task Force was convened by the Academic Senate in Fall 2005 and has met regularly to define goals and processes related to implementing college-wide SLOs (R3.1). One outcome of this effort is an annual report documenting the progress of all college programs, and courses within programs, in meeting SLOs goals. In 2006-2007, the Academic Senate produced a report summarizing college-wide SLOs activities (R3.2).

The college has identified and approved program-level SLOs for 31 out of the 55 programs leading to certificates and/or degrees, which represents 56% of programs and has implemented them in requirements for major and General Education (GE). Outcomes for many programs were updated and revisions were incorporated into the 2007-2008 Catalog.

In respect to course-level SLOs, the college has developed SLOs for a total of 14 of its courses in the following disciplines: English, English as a Second Language (ESL), Mathematics, and Reading. This number comprises only 1% of the total number of courses (1,051 in 2006-2007) offered by the college (R3.2). The assessment of the SLOs in all of the 14 courses has been completed. The results of the assessment have been analyzed in eight of those courses, all of which are in the ESL and mathematics departments. These results have led to improvements in pedagogy and learning in all eight of these courses (R3.2).

The college also completed the SLOs matrix required by the Accrediting Commission in Spring 2007. The report proved to be a useful measure of the college’s progress.

In November 2007, the college has planned two SLOs activities. First, representatives from each division are being recruited to attend SLOs sessions sponsored at the Community College League of California (CCLC) conference held on November 15-16. Then on November 30, the college has scheduled an all-college day focused on writing course-specific SLOs. Faculty will have an opportunity to interact with their colleagues and will also be provided with clear guidance, examples, and assistance in writing course SLOs. The goal is to have one course per program completed in Fall 2007. In addition, Math will complete the writing of SLOs for all its basic skills courses during the Fall 2007 semester (R3.2). Then on Flex Day, February 19, 2008, a follow-up workshop is scheduled to focus on the assessment and implementation component of SLOs (R3.3).
One barrier to progress with SLOs and other assessment tools has been a lack of key personnel. In Fall 2004, the college hired a full-time, certificated Assessment Coordinator. Unfortunately, the person hired to fill the position left in 2005. The position has remained vacant since 2005-2006, in part because it was felt the job description needed revising. This required working with the Association of College Educators (ACE), the faculty union. The job description was finalized early in 2007. The major duties of the Assessment Coordinator include the planning, coordination, and organization of the assessment functions and processes of the college, including SLOs (R3.4). However, the position remains unfilled at this time since the college did not fill all of its vacant faculty positions for 2007-2008. Without a person in this position to take the lead and coordinate various college activities related to assessment, responsibility for continued progress on SLOs and other assessment tools has fallen back on the SLOs Task Force, and thus continued progress has been slow. The position will be reconsidered during the Fall 2007 prioritization of faculty positions for 2008-2009.

Within the curriculum review process, all new and revised curricula must link course objectives with the specific assessment tools (exams, papers, oral presentations) used to evaluate student performance according to established general guidelines for student learning outcomes (e.g. analytical skills, written communication skills) (R3.5). In addition, new and revised courses must provide specific examples of the assignments used to demonstrate mastery of course objectives. One recommendation of the SLOs Task Force was that the curriculum forms for all new and revised courses include a section for explicit statement of SLOs and the tools used to assess them. The Curriculum Reviews Committee (CRC) began meeting in late April and May 2007 to begin a wholesale review and revision of all facets of curriculum review, including the addition of SLOs (R3.6).

Five student support services programs have SLOs printed in the 2007-2008 Mission College Catalog (R3.7) (E11.4.1) (t1,4,5,6). They are the Career Center, Disability Instructional Support Center (DISC), Career Placement Center, the Learning Assistance and Tutorial Center (LATC), and Student Health Services.

The college is committed to establishing outcome measures in areas beyond student learning. The college’s newly revised mission statement specifically states that the college is committed to systematic assessment and evaluation. The new President has charged the Research Analyst to develop a research agenda that includes proposed models such as an institutional scorecard for benchmarking institutional performance. Such a model should incorporate state accountability indicators as well as institutional indicators reflecting the college’s educational and master plan priorities. In September 2007, the Research Analyst presented some examples to the Governance and Planning (GAP) Council for its review (R3.8).

This recommendation has been partially met.
Evidence

R3.1 Mission College Academic Senate minutes, 09-29-05; Mission College Report on SLO Activities, 04-16-07
R3.3 E-mail, Cindy Vinson, Staff Development Coordinator, 10-15-07
R3.4 Assessment Coordinator Job Description Approved, 02-15-07
R3.5 Mission College Curriculum Manual,
R3.6 Curriculum Review Committee Minutes, Spring 2007
R3.7 Mission College Catalog 2007-2008
R3.8 Governance and Planning Council Summary, 09-19-07

Recommendation #4: The team recommends that Mission College develop, refine, and implement its program review and evaluation processes for both instructional and non-instructional programs to provide a tighter link to the planning goals and directions. (Responsive to 2001 Standards: 3A.3, 3A.4, 4D.1, 5.10, 6.7, 9B.6, and 10C.4)

In response to recommendations from the 2001 accreditation team visit, the college began work in 2002 on an improved format for program review. Non-instructional programs and services had completed a program review in 2001, but instructional programs lacked a workable model. In December 2002, the Academic Senate accepted a draft version of what eventually came to be known as Program Master Planning (PMP) (R4.1). Over the 2003 academic year, Senate subcommittees worked with the administration to refine the design and scope of PMP, and in October 2003 the Academic Senate presented the final version to the Board of Trustees (BOT) (R4.1-2). Although this model was never implemented, it is necessary to describe it in detail because the college is committed to revisiting this model in 2007-2008.

At the core of PMP was a forward-looking approach that aligned the retrospective Self Study with future planning goals and directions. PMP also sought to integrate each program’s review with college-wide services such as facilities use, budget modeling, faculty recruitment, and full-time equivalency (FTE) allocation. One important aspect of PMP was its ability to identify student service programs that serve a number of different instructional programs and which as a consequence, might be in need of additional support.

PMP was designed to operate on a 5-year cycle for each department or service area. Each year, 7 academic departments, 3 student service units, and 1 administrative service area would be scheduled to develop a 5-year master plan. Part of the master plan for each department or service area is a list of 5 goals accompanied by an implementation timeline.
PMP reports were to be reviewed by the Forum, a 10 member group drawn from each college decision-making body. Throughout the planning process, forum members review draft portions and provide feedback to planners. Completed plans would then reviewed by the Forum. Once validated, each group must provide the Forum with an annual update in which completed goals would be noted and new ones added. These updates would then provide college decision-making groups with the most up-to-date information possible on the status of each department and service area.

PMP was originally scheduled for launch in Spring 2004, with a small sample group of departments and service areas. The key faculty member who developed the 2003 PMP format retired, resulting in the loss of impetus and follow-through. The implementation of the process, including Phases II and III of the non-instructional program review, were delayed one semester, to Fall 2004. In Fall 2004, in consultation with the Academic Senate, it was determined that too many instructional programs were not current in terms of program review and that the 5-year sequencing of the new model would result in further delays. Thus, it would take several years for all programs to be reviewed. Given the abrupt demographic changes in the region, it was felt that a process should be implemented that would bring all programs up to a current level of review. It was also determined that if properly designed, a new process could address other planning initiatives, such as the need for a current educational and facilities master plan and SLOs. Thus, the PMP was temporarily set aside in favor of a comprehensive Educational and Facilities Master Plan (EFMP) process.

EFMP was an approach to get all departments involved at the same time (R4.3). The EFMP process began in Academic Year 2005-2006 as a project of the Academic Senate and the Governance and Planning Council (GAP). This process was unique in that it integrated several planning initiatives into one process: program review, SLOs, and the update of the college’s educational plan in preparation for the development of a facilities master plan. As part of this process, all departments and services at the college were asked to complete a series of three “assignments” looking at past trends, SLOs, and future expectations. The third assignment of the EFMP process laid the foundation for linking planning and resource allocation. An EFMP Core Group, with diverse representation of faculty, staff, students, and administrators, was created to review the assignments, solicit additional information as necessary, and recommend programs and services that warranted additional review on the part of the college.

Starting on March 2, 2007, a series of five college-wide forums were held with presentations and discussions on a wide range of topics and issues related to the future of the college. The first forum focused on visionary topics related to future directions in the employment sector, growing and emerging programs, and new approaches to the delivery of education. Internal and external factors – planning assumptions – were considered, including regional economic and demographic trends. The next three forums focused in turn on vocational and community education programs, traditional academic programs, and student and support services. The fifth forum was designed as a synthesis and review of key areas discussed in the previous four forums. As a result of this discussion, 10 core recommendations were developed to guide overall services and facilities planning.
1. Pursue opportunities in Health Care and Wellness
2. Pursue green opportunities in Engineering and technology
3. Improve global information competency
4. Develop detailed plans of action for existing programs with significant challenges: Computer Information Systems (CIS), Computer Networking Electronics Technology (CNET), and Manufacturing
5. Support potential growth of Hospitality Management
6. Support potential growth of Chemistry, Biology, and Health Occupations
7. Review current systems and staffing
8. Review and support training needs
9. Review and support student tutorial needs and basic skills services
10. Pursue enhanced learning opportunities for students (R4.4)

As agreed, the PMP is being revisited in Fall 2007 by the Academic Senate (R4.5) and implementation of regular program review should begin by Fall 2008.

Mission College believes that educational planning should drive facilities planning. With direction from the Board of Trustees (BOT) to pursue new academic buildings to ultimately replace the existing Main Building, a series of facilities-specific forums were scheduled to follow the educational planning phase. These forums were held in April and May of 2007 to program two new buildings to replace the first/third floors and second floor of the Main Building (R4.6). In August 2007, an architectural firm was hired to develop a full facilities master plan based on the educational plan. That planning process is underway and the final plan is scheduled to be presented to the Board in Spring 2008 (R4.7).

This recommendation has been partially met.

**Evidence**

R4.2 Mission College Academic Senate Minutes: 12-05-02, 10-23-03, 05-15-03, 09-25-03, 03-11-04
R4.3 EFMP Documents, 2005-2007
R4.4 EFMP Core Recommendations Spring 2007
R4.5 President Harriet Robles e-mail, 10-16-07
R4.6 Mission College Main Building Forums and Discussions on Paris Intranet, http://paris/mc/predidents_office/index.html; Paris  Main Building Discussion Documents  Emails or Discussion (Q & A)
R4.7 Master Planning Process and Schedule
**Recommendation #5:** The team recommends that Mission College implement a process for the systematic, periodic review of its existing courses. (Responsive to 2001 Standard 4D.6)

Overall, the college has made incremental progress toward implementing a curriculum review process that supports a systematic review of existing courses and programs. The educational and master planning process, described above, included components for program review and student learning outcomes, but did not ask programs to conduct a complete review of their curriculum. Since every program and service was completing the process in order, it would not have been possible for the Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) to process a curriculum review for every instructional program at once. Although the Academic Senate is currently reviewing and revising the program review model, the President has nonetheless charged the interim Vice President of Instruction to move forward with the CRC to develop a schedule for the systematic review of curriculum and to initiate the process, which can be incorporated into the new model.

In 2004, the Vice President of Instruction initiated the development of a model process for a two-year review process for vocational programs. A subcommittee of the Division Chair Council (DCC) was created and faculty researched models used by other colleges. The model is nearly complete but with the change in administration, the model has yet to be finalized or implemented. The President has charged the interim Vice President of Instruction to complete this process in addition to the development of a schedule for the regular review of all curriculum.

Impedance to progress in this regard has been due to continued rapid turnover of administrators in charge of oversight of instructional programs, as noted in the 2004 Midterm Report, coupled with an *ad hoc*, unstructured approach to curriculum review on the part of both the administration and the Academic Senate (R5.1-2). Courses and programs continue to be reviewed only when the departments themselves bring them forward, and there has been no tracking process in place to identify and assist departments that experience problems in conducting their scheduled curriculum review. Additionally, the Academic Senate Resolution beginning on March 14, 2006 suspended faculty participation on most committees, including Curriculum, for a period of 9 months. During this time all review of existing and new curricula came to a halt.

Despite these challenges, there has been progress in curriculum review since 2004, and a number of departments and programs have completed full review of their curriculum, including Computer Applications (CA), Marketing and Art (R5.3). In September 2004, the CRC discussed strategies for serving as an overview committee to facilitate systematic review of curriculum (R5.4). The committee now sends out an email at the start of every semester that informs all campus personnel of the deadline for submitting curriculum and includes additional deadlines for those departments that are up for curriculum review as part of their cycle. In Fall 2006, Mission College implemented “CurricUNET,” an online service for the creation and review of curriculum and programs (R5.5-6). CurricUNET represents a major step forward in helping the college to meet the
The objective of this recommendation. The online format greatly streamlines the process, from uploading new and revised course outlines to obtaining the required signatures for approval. The online process also improves recordkeeping and accountability measures by highlighting courses and programs that have become “stuck” somewhere in the development and approval pipelines. Moreover, with CurricUNET, the administration can easily identify and provide assistance to those departments and programs that have not carried out their scheduled, periodic review of curriculum. In Spring 2007, the CRC began to discuss a process to review and revise the existing curriculum review process to better meet this needs of ongoing program review efforts (5.7).

In a related effort to introduce a more systematic approach to curriculum review, the Academic Senate convened a new subcommittee to review the entire General Education (GE) curriculum for content and articulation status (see Response to Recommendation 6).

This recommendation has been partially met.

Evidence

R5.1 Mission College Midterm Report, 10-04
R5.3 Programs and departments that have carried out full reviews of their course offerings since 2004 include: CA 2005 (CRC Minutes 10-31-05), MKTG 2007 (CRC Minutes 04-16-07), ART/GDES 2007 (CRC Minutes 04-16-07)
R5.4 Curriculum Review Committee Minutes, 09-13-04
R5.5 Curriculum Review Committee Minutes, 10-24-05
R5.6 Mission College Academic Senate Minutes, 02-01-07
R5.7 Curriculum Review Committee Minutes, 04-16-07, GE Review of Subcommittee Recommendations, 05-07

Recommendation 6: The team recommends that Mission College undertake a review of its General Education program to ensure that the requirements reflect newly defined values of the college and the needs of the students. (Responsive to 2001 Standards: 4C.2 and 4C.4)

The college has undertaken a review of its General Education (GE) program. In April 2007, the Mission College Academic Senate (MCAS) formed the Subcommittee to Review the GE pattern (R6.1). This committee consisted of faculty members from several departments and the Mission Articulation Officer. The committee members used Title 5 guidelines to determine whether courses were appropriate for GE (R6.2). In addition, when undertaking the review, the committee considered the Mission College Core Values, including: "Provide an educational environment that prepares all students to communicate clearly, think analytically and critically, work collaboratively and utilize technology effectively" (R6.3).
The committee determined that Mission College’s GE requirements meet the Title 5, Section 55022 requirements for the Associate Degree (R6.2, R6.4). In addition, the committee reviewed each GE area and the related courses, as listed in the Mission College Catalog (R6.5):

**Process Areas**
- Communicating, Solving Problems, Clarifying Values

**Content Areas**
- Language and Rationality:
  - English Composition
  - Communication and Analytical Thinking
- Natural Sciences
- Humanities
- Social and Behavioral Sciences
- Lifelong Learning

The committee recommended a number of changes to the CRC. These changes consisted mainly of courses to be added to the GE Program and courses to be reviewed for correct placement within the GE areas. Furthermore, the committee recommended that courses in the GE Program be updated and revised every five years to ensure compliance with Title 5 regulations. Finally, courses not offered within any five-year time period should be removed from the GE Program effective Fall 2008 (R6.4, R6.6).

The committee also recommended that the Academic Senate consider adding a Multicultural Studies requirement (R6.4, R6.6). This would entail looking at existing courses rather than adding units to GE requirements. This discussion will continue in Fall 2007. With the inclusion of this requirement, the college’s Core Value of promoting "cross-cultural understanding among and between students, faculty, and staff" will be more closely realized (R6.3).

One additional change occurred in 2003, when the Academic Senate voted to approve information competency as a proficiency requirement for graduation (R6.7). The District Board of Trustees (BOT) approved the new requirement on May 19, 2005 (R6.8). This requirement provides further realization of the Mission College’s Core value to help students "utilize technology effectively."

This recommendation has been met.

**Evidence**

R6.1 Mission College Academic Senate: Call for Subcommittee Members e-mail, 03-15-07
R6.2 Title 5 Approval of Associate Degree Requirements
R6.3 Mission College Core Values
R6.4 GE Review of Subcommittee Recommendations, 05-07
R6.5 Mission College Catalog, 2006-2007
R6.6 Mission College Academic Senate Meeting Minutes, 05-17-07
R6.7 Mission College Academic Senate Meeting Minutes, 03-13-03
R6.8 WVMCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, 05-19-05
Recommendation # 7: The team recommends that Mission College re-examine the spoken and written language competencies for its degrees and certificates and the means by which these exit competencies will be assessed. (Responsive to 2001 Standard 4B.5)

The Mission College Academic Senate (MCAS) responded to this recommendation in 2004 by forming a sub-committee to review the spoken and written language competencies for its degrees and certificates and the process by which these exit competencies would be evaluated. To this end, the committee forwarded recommendations to the Senate that the new graduation requirement for the AA/AS degrees be transfer level English (English 1A) and that students illustrate oral competency through completing Communication Studies courses or by passing a proficiency exam. The Academic Senate approved these requirements in Spring 2003 (R7.1).

In addition to addressing written and spoken language competencies, the college has instituted a requirement for information competency. In Spring 2005, the Information Competency Committee (ICC) recommended that students be required to take a one-unit Information Competency Course (Library 10) as a pre-requisite or co-requisite to English 1A or complete an adaptation of the OASIS online tutorial program from San Francisco State University (R7.2).

At the March 10, 2005 MCAS meeting, the Senate voted to require students to take a one-unit Information Competency course, Library 10, in order to fulfill the graduation proficiency requirement for Information Competency (R7.3). The MCAS approved the implementation plan on April 14, 2005 (R7.4). At the May 19, 2005 West Valley Mission College District (WVMCCD) Board of Trustees (BOT) Meeting, the Board approved the Mission College Graduation Proficiency Requirement for Information Competency, effective Fall 2006.

As of Fall 2006, students must fulfill a graduation proficiency requirement for Information Competency. They can satisfy this requirement in three ways:

1. Take the one-unit Library 10 course, Basic Information Competency.
2. Pass either the Mission College Information Competency Proficiency Exam or the Credit by Exam.
3. Take a course that has been deemed equivalent to Library 10 at another college or university.

Three sections of Library 10 were offered in Fall 2006, and four were offered in Spring 2007. For Summer 2007, one section will be offered, and in Fall 2007, there will be two online sections as well as two eight week face to face sections (R7.5). In the future, the institution will increase the number of courses offered as dictated by the demand.
Ongoing stages: 2007-2008:

- Offer Library 10 and English 1A as a Learning Community
- Evaluate the implementation plan and revise as necessary
- Track student results and success

This recommendation has been met.

**Evidence**

R7.1 MCAS minutes, 02-06-03, 02-27-03, 03-13-03, 03-27-03
R7.2 Information Competency Task Force Committee (ICTF) minutes, 10-13-05
R7.3 MCAS minutes, 03-10-05
R7.4 MCAS minutes, 04-14-05
R7.5 Mission College Catalogs 2006-2008

**Recommendation 8:** The team recommends that during its planned review of organizational structure Mission College focus on the administrative structures for academic programs to ensure that any new organization structure provides adequate support for college-wide planning, assessment, and operational management of academic programs. (Responsive to 2001 Standards: 4A.4 and 10B.3)

In 2001, the administrative structure for the college had 7 direct reports to the college President, including 2 Vice Presidents, 3 Deans and a Director. Academic programs were structured under the Vice President of Instruction, and divided into 45 departments represented by 10 Divisions, in addition to the Library. The Vice President had 4 direct staff reports: a Manager of Special Projects, Executive Assistant, and 2 Administrative Specialists, 1 handling course content and schedule/catalog production, and 1 handling personnel and hiring procedures (R8.1). The manager of special projects retired and the position was not filled and eventually converted to a Dean of Instruction.

In 2003 some minor shifting of departments within divisions occurred but the reporting structure remained the same (R8.2).

In 2005, the administrative structure for the college reduced the number of direct reports to the President from 7 to 5 and now included the college’s Staff Development Coordinator. This re-structuring increased the number of reports to the VP of Instruction by 3: the Dean of Information Technology and Services, the Dean of Workforce and Continuing Education, and the newly created Dean of Instruction (initially filled on an interim basis). The Director of the Library moved under the Dean of Information Technology and Services. Academic programs remained under the VP of Instruction and included 48 departments represented by 10 divisions. Institutional Research was also moved under the direction of the VP of Instruction (R8.3). Although the Vice President of Instruction gained more direct reports as a result of the 2005 reorganization, this reporting restructure was intended to allow the Vice President of Instruction to focus on “the big picture” issues, such as accreditation, curriculum, and strategic planning, while leaving more operational matters under the guidance of the Dean of Instruction.
Also as part of the 2005-2006 reorganization, the position of evening and weekend supervisor was revised and expanded to include emergency services. Titled Director of Evening, Weekend and Emergency Programs and Services, the new position was aligned under the Dean of Administrative Services. The first search failed to attract a sufficient pool, but the second search, conducted in Spring 2007, was successful and the position was permanently filled in May 2007.

In May 2006, the position of Dean of Instruction was filled permanently. The Dean of Workforce and Continuing Education retired but was retained on a limited contract to continue to manage Continuing Education and the Institute of International Studies. While the position was being filled, the remaining duties were reassigned to existing administrators. The Workforce component was assigned to the Dean of Instruction and some tasks were assigned to the Dean of Student Support Services. A search was begun for a permanent replacement for the Dean of Workforce and Continuing Education, but that search failed in December 2006 and again in 2007 because of an inadequate pool of qualified applicants. The duties were again reallocated among existing administrators with the Workforce component being assigned to the new interim VP of Instruction and Continuing Education to the Dean of Instruction. The new President decided to open an internal search for a full-time, interim to fill the position. That search was successfully concluded in November 2007 with the appointment of an interim through June 2008 (R8.4).

In June 2007, the Dean of Administrative Services was upgraded to VP of Administrative Services in order to address increased responsibilities for fiscal management, facilities planning, and emergency preparedness.

Staffing in the Office of Instruction remains problematic. When the permanent VP moved to the interim Presidency in August 2006, an interim VP of Instruction was hired for Fall 2006. The interim VP did not return in Spring 2007 and another interim was hired. Currently, the interim VP of Instruction supervises all the Deans, the Division Chairs, the Research Analyst, and the 3 staff members within the Office of Instruction (Admin. Asst., Admin. Specialist for Instruction & Admin. Specialist for Personnel). Two of these critical staff positions—Administrative Assistant and Administrative Specialist for Instruction—are vacant and filled with interim employees.

All these changes have resulted in the use of interims and the reallocation of duties in order to cover the gaps. Thus, it has been difficult to assess the effectiveness of the 2005 reorganization. Currently, indications are that the organization in the instructional area is not meeting the needs of the instructional programs nor providing sufficient support for college-wide instructional planning. The increased responsibilities of the college in terms of strategic planning at all levels as well as the need to ensure sufficient support for all aspects of the instructional programs will require the college to reassess its organizational structure. The Chancellor has indicated in his 2007-2008 goals his intent to “conduct an organizational review of District/Colleges’ management structure, reporting lines, and responsibilities” (R8.5). The President has likewise indicated her priority to fill vacant positions and to work with the Chancellor in such an organizational review at the college level (R8.6).
Evidence

R8.1 2001-2002 Organizational Chart
R8.2 2003-2004 Organizational Chart
R8.3 2005-2006 Organizational Chart
R8.4 WVMCCD Board of Trustee Meeting Minutes, 11-01-07
R8.5 Chancellor’s Goals, 2007-2008
R8.6 Mission College President’s Goals, 2007-2008

Recommendation 9: The team recommends that the board establish a regular review of board policies and processes for assessing its performance in order to ensure that it is providing effective and appropriate leadership for the college. (Responsive to 2001 Standards: 10A.2, A.3, and A.5)

Following completion of a comprehensive review and revision of District policies in March 2003 (R9.1), all management employees were provided hard copies of the entire District Policy Manual in uniform binders for easy identification in offices (R9.2). The entire manual was also placed on the District Web site in order that all employees and members of the public have access to the policies at any time (R9.3). A District Web administrator has been hired and is responsible for the timely uploading of all revisions to the policy manual on an as-needed basis.

The District subscribes to the Community College League of California (CCLC) Policy and Procedure Service. Since joining the service, staff members have utilized the model policies and procedures and their semi-annual updates to revise existing policies and procedures and create new ones as indicated by the passage of new laws and regulations. The Board has committed to a comprehensive review of each of the six chapters of the District Policy Manual at least once per year (R9.4). The Special Assistant to the Chancellor works with the Board on the review, which is structured so that a chapter is reviewed and approved every other month. Despite a lapse in the process during 2006 because the Board decided it would not consider another change to any policy until the Chancellor had ensured that administrative procedures called for in existing policies were in place, the Board resumed Board review of policy revision in 2007, adopting a revised Chapter 1 in January (R9.5). The Chancellor, for his part, assigned procedures called for in each chapter of existing policy to the appropriate administrators within the District, and those procedures were collected and reviewed in the Spring and Summer of 2007 (R9.6). On an on-going basis, changes are proposed through the participatory governance process by staff, faculty, students, administrators, and Board members. Annual reviews always include the latest recommendations of the CCLC service.
Since 2003, the Board had used standardized questionnaires (true/false and rating sheets) in the process of completing its annual self evaluation (R9.7). In the 2005-2006 academic year, the Board eliminated the true/false questionnaire and revised the rating questionnaire substantially (R9.7). The same questionnaire was distributed to administrators and constituent group representatives in addition to the trustees themselves. This represented the first time in recent memory that the Board solicited input and feedback from staff in the evaluation process. All feedback is reviewed and discussed by the trustees in a meeting devoted to completing the evaluation (R9.8).

On October 4, 2007, the Board held a special meeting to discuss its evaluation process. An external consultant has been hired to provide guidance in this process. Trustees are establishing measurable criteria for evaluation, defining the values and priorities upon which they are to be evaluated using the CCLC\textsuperscript{1} Trustee handbook, WASC accreditation handbook, and other appropriate resources (R9.9).

This recommendation has been met.

**Evidence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R9.1</th>
<th>WVMCCD Board of Trustee Meeting Minutes, 03-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R9.2</td>
<td>WVMCCD Board Policy Binders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9.3</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/board/policies/index.php">http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/board/policies/index.php</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9.4</td>
<td>Records, Office of the Special Assistant to the Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9.5</td>
<td>WVMCCD Board of Trustee Agenda, 01-18-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9.6</td>
<td>E-mail from Chancellor to College Presidents, 12-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9.7</td>
<td>Records, Office of the Special Assistant to the Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9.8</td>
<td>Records, Office of the Special Assistant to the Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9.9</td>
<td>WVMCCD Board of Trustee Agenda, 10-04-07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>