EVALUATION REPORT

MISSION COLLEGE
3000 Mission College Blvd.
Santa Clara, CA 95054-1897

A Report Prepared for the Accrediting Commission
for Community and Junior Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited Mission College,
March 17-20, 2008.

Robert Dees,
Team Chair

Mission College
Comprehensive Evaluation Visit Team
Monday, March 17–Thursday, March 20, 2008

Robert Dees (CHAIR)
President
Orange Coast College

Judy J. Cater
Acquisitions Librarian, Dept. Chair
Palomar College

Kate Clark
Articulation Officer, Professor of English
Irvine Valley College

Johnathan Cole
Professor, Physics and Astronomy
Mira Costa College

Pam Eddinger
Executive Vice Pres. Student Learning
Moorpark College

Brian Ellison
Vice President, Instruction and Student Services
San Diego Continuing Education

Ronald P. Gerhard
Business Manager
San Bernardino Community College District

Lynanne Minton
Executive Assistant to the President
Orange Coast College

Sheri Sterner
Director, Institutional Research and Library,
Orange Coast College

Lisa Sugimoto
Vice President, Student and Learning Services
Pasadena City College

INTRODUCTION

History

Mission College is one of two colleges in the West Valley-Mission Community College District, located 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 1966-1967, 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. 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 status of Mission College.

Mission College is a comprehensive community college that offers 114 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 9,200 day, evening, and online students are enrolled. In Fall 2007, the college employed 163 full-time faculty, 109 classified and confidential staff, and 18 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 School, and Santa Clara Unified School Districts. Mission College is located in the northern end of the District, off a major highway in a predominately urban area made up of high-tech companies such as Oracle, Yahoo!, Sun, and Google; hotels; a major amusement park; and a convention center. Most likely because of its location and the fact that many of its students are en route from home to work along the Hwy. 101 corridor, over 75 percent of the college's enrollment comes from outside its service area.

The college serves an extraordinarily diverse region that has undergone significant economic change in recent years, which has posed challenges to the college as it attempts to assess and respond to the needs of the populations it serves. The dot-com collapse and the subsequent recession significantly and negatively impacted the college's enrollment, especially its technology and manufacturing programs. In addition to the precipitous decline in enrollment, from which Mission College is only now beginning to recover, the college experienced a marked shift in the demographics of its student population. Once an older, mostly evening population, the college's students are now younger, day students who are more transfer oriented.

The college has experienced other 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 2000. It houses Student Services, club rooms, conference rooms, cafeteria, bookstore,

District police, and large computer lab facilities. 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 weight rooms, lockers and showers, and offices, was completed in 2004. Altogether, Mission College has a total of 271,844 assignable square feet in eight permanent buildings and 30 portable classrooms. In addition to its structures, the college has outdoor athletic facilities, including three softball fields, a baseball field, and tennis courts. In spite of its urban location in the heart of Silicon Valley, the college is home to a protected species, the burrowing owl. A number of acres have been designated as protected habitat and serve as a living laboratory for students in the natural sciences.

In 2004, the District passed a $235 million facilities bond, $97 million of which was designated for Mission College projects which included infrastructure improvements, a renovation of the Hospitality Management building, and at least two additional buildings, one of which will replace the portable classrooms. The bond funds were held up in litigation for almost two years, but were finally made available in 2006. In addition to bond-funded projects, the college had submitted several proposals to the State to reconstruct the Main Building. However, in 2006, two engineering reports indicated that the scope and cost of the work necessary to meet new seismic requirements made reconstruction of the Main Building unfeasible. After researching the options, the college recommended and the Board approved the decision to replace the Main Building with new buildings, which will be partially paid for with Measure H funds. The college has selected an architect and begun developing a new master plan, scheduled to be completed in February 2008. The college intends to submit new project proposals to the State by July 2008.

The college is embarking on a significant next step in its evolution as a comprehensive community college in one of the most dynamic regions of the State. As much as there are challenges, there are also opportunities to explore new ways of teaching and learning and for Mission College to play a key role in shaping the future not only of individual students, but of the communities it serves.

Conducting the Team Visit

The Chair of the 2008 visiting accreditation team and his assistant made a preliminary visit to Mission College on February 27, 2008, to meet with the college president, various administrators, and members of the Accreditation Steering Committee. The Chair also met individually with the accreditation liaison officer, the president of the Academic Senate, and the president of the Classified Senate. Following a brief tour of the campus and facilities, the Chair and his assistant also inspected the hotel at which the team would be staying and performing much of its work. The visit went smoothly, and the campus appeared prepared for the upcoming visit by the team.

In addition to the Chair and his assistant, the Mission College visiting team was composed of eight other individuals who are faculty and administrators at other community colleges. Two members joined the team later than the rest, but like them also received accreditation training before the visit to Mission College. Prior to the visit, team members studied the Commission

Handbook for Evaluators, reviewed the college's Self Study and supporting evidence, and prepared a list of topics to inquire further about once they were at the college. Each member also wrote a response to Assignment 1, covering the entire Self Study, as well as Assignment 2, which focused on his or her individual Standard assignment. Along with a summary from the Chair about the preliminary visit to the college, these assignments were shared electronically with the team for their review in preparation for the actual team visit on March 17-20.

The team met on the afternoon of March 17 for an orientation meeting at the hotel, followed by a trip to the campus to meet with college personnel and enjoy a brief tour in preparation for beginning the on-site visit the next day. For the next few days, team members interviewed a broad representation of college staff and students, held two open meetings, visited classes, and met at the district office on the West Valley campus with six of the seven District trustees. During their four-day visit to Mission College, team members were consistently busy gathering information, reviewing documentation, talking with students and staff, and generally becoming familiar with the campus, its culture, and the staff and students who work and learn there. The team also met each evening to review the day's findings and to share information.

The purpose of the team's visit was to review the college's Self Study to determine how effectively the campus had addressed recommendations from the 2001 accreditation team visit and how well it was meeting current ACCJC Standards. Following its visit, the team would complete a report reviewing the college's status in terms of the Standards and make any necessary recommendations for improvement, as well provide an appropriate recommendation to ACCJC regarding the college's accreditation status.

The 2008 visiting team found the Mission College's Self Study to be very well written, organized, and forthright. The team was impressed with the college, its staff, and its students. Although the campus is emerging from some difficult challenges, the team felt a strong culture of collegiality, mutual respect, and a dedication to students that will serve the college well in maintaining the historically high quality of its educational programs and services.

COMMENDATIONS

1. The college is to be commended for providing a well-maintained, attractive campus and safe and fully-equipped facilities that promote a positive learning environment.

2. Mission College is to be commended for its level of collaboration and inclusion in the budget development and allocation process.

3. The college faculty, staff, and administrators are to be commended for their expressed mutual respect of each other's programs, services, and achievements.

4. The team commends the faculty, staff, managers, and administrators of Mission College for their forward-looking attitude and passionate commitment to the college and its

students. The team further commends the willingness of all parties to come together in difficult times to meet challenges facing the college.

5. The college Library is commended for its establishment of an Asian American Special Collection and Speakers Program, its Basic Information Competency course, as well as its acquisition of Spanish language data bases to enhance services to campus and distance learning students.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: 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. (I.A.1, I.A.7, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, II.A.2e, II.C.2, III.C.2, IV.B.2.a)

Recommendation 2: The team recommends that Mission College establish and implement a schedule for systematically reviewing its mission and values statements (I.A.3).

Recommendation 3: 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 (I.B.2, I.B.5, I.B.7, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.3.6, II.B, III.A.1.c, III.A.6, III.B.1)

Recommendation 4: 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. (I.B.3, IB.6, II.A.1.a, II.A.2.g, II.B.3, III.C.1, IV.B.2.b, IV.B.3.b)

Recommendation 5: The team recommends that the college review and complete its planning agendas for both the 2001 and 2007 accreditation visits. (IB.4, IB.6)

Recommendation 6: 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 II; Standard III.A.4) (II.A.1.a, II.A.4, III.A.4.a, III.A.4.b)

Recommendation 7: 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. (III.A.2, III.A.6, IV.A.1, IV.B.2.a, IV.B.2., IV.B.2.a, IV.B.2.c)

Recommendation 8: 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. (IIIA.3.a, III.A.4.a, III.A.5, III.A.5.a, III.A.5.b, IV.A.2.a)

Recommendation 9: 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. (III.D.1.b, III.D.1.c, III.D.1.d, III.2.a, III.2.d, III.D.2, III. D.2.d, III.D.2.e, IV.A.4, IV.A.5)

Recommendation 10: 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. (IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a)

Recommendation 11: 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. (IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.3, IV.B.1)

Recommendation 12: 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. (IV.B.1, Iv.B.1.c, IV.B.2., IV.B.4)

RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 2001 VISITING ACCREDITATION TEAM

RESPONSE TO 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)

This recommendation was not addressed during 2001-2004. In Spring 2004, according the current Self Study, earlier draft versions of the college's original planning items were located and merged with those from the planning summary of the 2001 Accreditation Self Study, along with recommendations from the 2001 Educational and Facilities Master Plan. A total of sixty-five planning agenda items were deleted from the 2001 Report.

Although the current team has concluded that the college's actions in reviewing the 2001 planning agendas has addressed Recommendation 1, it remains significant that a number of the planning agenda items from the 2001 Self Study have not been addressed by the college. These 2001 items are significant and necessary to the college's overall effectiveness and need to be reviewed as to their continued relevancy, with a plan developed to address immediately those still considered relevant.

In addition, the team noted that the 2007 Self Study mentions in its Evaluation sections several items identified as deficient or needing the college's attention; yet these items and the need for addressing them are not included in any planning agendas in the current Self Study. The team recommends additional review of all Evaluation sections and planning agendas in the 2007 Self Study to ensure items identified in each standard are reviewed and an appropriate plan developed where needed. While there is a significant need to review and address deficiencies identified in the 2007 Planning Agenda, the college at this time has met this recommendation.

RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION 2

The team recommends that Mission College develop, implement, and regularly assess the results of its recruitment, retention, and success plan for under-represented faculty, staff, and students. (Responsive to 2001 Standards: 2.6, 4A.1, 5.7, and 7D.2)

The college met part of this recommendation by completing and implementing a Student Equity Plan accepted by the Commission as part of the college's Progress Report in 2005. Part of this plan addressed the recruitment and retention of under-represented and underserved populations. In addition, the college was successful in obtaining a Title V Hispanic Serving Institution grant that allowed it to place more resources towards recruiting Hispanic and African-American

Students and improving the success of all under-represented students. Benchmarks were set in the areas of student outreach, student satisfaction, and pedagogy. Data collected since 2005 provides evidence indicating these efforts are successful.

In its October 2005 Progress Report to the Commission, the college noted that a collaborative effort with the District was taking place via the District Faculty and Staff Diversity Advisory Committee (FSDAC) to gather data, and to complete an Equal Employment Opportunity Plan (EEO Plan) based on the June 2006 California Community College System Office model. In its October 2006 Progress Report, there was not sufficient evidence of progress with the EEO Plan, which triggered a request by the Commission for a more detailed report by March 2007. The March 2007 report deadline was further extended until April 2007. In the April 2007 report, the completion of the EEO plan by FSDAC was projected for Spring 2008. In the current Self-Study, the college has stated that completion has been further postponed to June 2008.

While there have been extenuating circumstances, such as the work-to-contract situation for both faculty and classified staff during 2006, Recommendation 2 is now in its sixth year. The college has made a good effort at completing the Student Equity portion of Recommendation 2, but evidence of work towards an EEO Plan or further completion of plans to address the recommendation are unclear. In this respect, the Recommendation 2 from the previous team has not been met.

Recommendation 9 (2008): As previously recommended by the 2001 team, the current team 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 by fall 2008. (I.A.1, II.A.1.a, III.A.4, III.A.4.a, III.A.4.b)

RESPONSE TO 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)

Campus progress in developing assessment measures for Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) at the course level has occurred in a few academic areas, notably in English as a Second Language, English, and Mathematics courses, particularly as a result of work completed under the college's Title V grant. The campus has also formed an SLO Task Force and implemented changes to course outlines so that they include SLOs. However, efforts to identify additional performance indicators in other instructional programs seem currently stymied by a lack of overall coordination and the need for key personnel, as well as by limited existing research data.

The current Chair of the SLO Committee (currently not meeting), who is also the Coordinator for the Title V grant, has worked closely with faculty to design program and course learning outcomes. This individual has designed an evaluation template to determine the appropriateness of draft SLO proposals for programs and individual courses. Following a February 2008 flex

activity that launched writing of course-level SLOs, the SLO Chair established a goal of at least one SLO for one course in each program on campus.

The college's 2007-2008 catalog lists learning outcomes for over 85 percent of all programs—instructional and non-instructional. Courses in mathematics and English have designed course-level outcomes, focusing on basic skills courses in particular, and they provide a model for others on the campus to advance substantive dialogue on this topic.

Progress in developing assessment measures have now begun in the same disciplines, partially as a result of work under the Title V grant: ESL has begun to examine assessments and their link to course sequencing; mathematics faculty, in designing assessments, recognized that the SLOs they had written earlier needed further refinement prior to designing assessments. The English faculty have written course-level SLOs for the four composition courses that include some 80 percent of the department's composition offerings. The English department has also created rubrics and departmental standards and discussed at length needed assessments and instructional improvement resulting from data. Once collected, such data will be housed on Angel for purposes of exchange.

Faculty in a number of other campus disciplines are undertaking similar efforts, demonstrating that the college is in development stages of implementation. The work being done--especially by English, mathematics, and ESL faculty--reflects the SLO design process as intended and could serve as a model for other departments.

Despite such progress, the team concluded that the efforts of only a few dedicated faculty are propelling the college's SLO advances, and without broad institutional support. For example, there is no reassigned time for the current coordinator and no planned funding source to hire an SLO assessment coordinator as identified in the Planning Agenda. Further, the institutional researcher has limited resources for providing data and analysis generated by SLO assessment once it is instituted college-wide. For these reasons, the college's efforts to identify additional performance indicators beyond SLOs appears hindered by a lack of key personnel and limited research data that is readily accessible to the wider college community.

Mission College has identified the need for hiring an assessment coordinator and implementing a plan for SLOs in the Planning Agenda (PA 1.4 and 2.2) for the 2007 Self Study. At this point, the campus is approaching the "Development" level defined in the ACCJC "Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness—Part III: Student Learning Outcomes." The college needs to continue its efforts in this direction by giving high priority to the recommendations on SLOs made by the current and previous visiting teams. <u>Although the college is making progress in this regard, at this time the recommendation has not been met</u>.

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 (I.B.2, I.B.5, I.B.7, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.3.6, II.B, III.A.1.c, III.A.6, III.B.1)

RESPONSE TO 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: IIIA.3, IIIA.4, IVD.1, 5.10, 6.7, 9B.6, and 10C.4)

In response to recommendations from the 2001 accreditation team, the college adopted in 2003 a Program Master Planning (PMP) process intended to integrate planning with program review, facilities use, budgeting, and faculty staffing. Although originally planned for launching in fall 2004, PMP was set aside as the college instead adopted an Educational Facilities Master Plan (EFMP) process. In 2005-2006, as part of the EFMP, the college undertook a review of all instructional and non-instructional programs, using internal and external data.

A program review component addressing three areas (a historical review of the program, SLO progress, and future program needs) was included. The data utilized were based on environmental scan information covering industry trends rather than department-specific. This was a one-time process, and the college is just beginning discussions about how to systematize it and link it to resource allocation.

During Fall 2007, the Academic Senate reassessed and refined the original Program Master Planning proposal, infusing it with elements of the EFMP. In Spring 2008, the Senate established a committee to set the priorities for a systematic program review process; the first set of programs will be reviewed in Fall 2008. The college has identified assessment of its program review process as a priority in its 2007 Planning Agenda (section PA1.1). The team feels strongly that the college should give this Planning Agenda item high implementation priority so that its results can be integrated with other planning, assessment, and budget allocation endeavors. <u>Although planning for the kind of program review process called for by Recommendation 4 has been accomplished, such a process has yet to be fully implemented, and the recommendation has not been met at this time.</u>

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. (I.A.1, I.A.7, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, II.A.2e, II.C.2, III.C.2, IV.B.2.a)

RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION 5

The team recommends that Mission College implement a process for the systematic, periodic review of its existing courses. (Responsive to 2001 Standard IVD.6)

Though Mission College faculty have the responsibility for course review, revision, and removal, and while there are procedures for Distance Learning Review and for general course review, the college acknowledges that no systematic review has been undertaken.

Although departments are notified each semester about courses due for review, faculty voluntarily submit revisions with no consequences for not doing so. Currency of course outlines is not tied to inclusion in college catalogs, to retention on General Education lists, to requests for technical changes, to renewals or request for articulation, nor to proposals for new programs or certificates.

To remedy this situation, the college has set goals for conducting regular curriculum review in Planning Agenda items PA2.3 and PA2.5 of its recent 2007 Self Study. In addition, in Spring 2007 a subcommittee of the Academic Senate recommended that all GE courses be updated and revised every five years to ensure compliance with Title 5 Regulations and that courses not offered within a five-year time period should be removed from the GE Program effective Fall 2008. The college needs to ensure that these and similar efforts to address Recommendation 5 are implemented as planned and periodically reviewed to ensure their effectiveness.

Although the college has made progress in discussing and making plans to implement a systematic, periodic review of its existing courses, this recommendation has not been met.

Recommendation 5 (2008): The team recommends that the college review and complete its planning agendas for both the 2001 and 2007 accreditation visits. (IB.4, IB.6)

RESPONSE TO 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: IVC.2 and IVC.4)

A subcommittee of the college's Academic Senate reviewed the college's general Education requirements in 2007 and included the campus' Core Values in its review. The college subsequently added a Multicultural Studies requirement and information competency requirement for graduation. While these requirements reflect the college's Core Values and may in themselves appear obviously valuable for students, the team found no evidence that their adoption was based upon data or demonstrated student need.

While it is too soon to measure the effectiveness of these new requirements, the Self Study indicated that additional sections of the information competency course are now needed to meet increased student demand. The college consequently needs to periodically review these requirements to assess their success in reinforcing Core Values and their impact on degree completion rates and overall college costs. In all other regards, however, the college has met this recommendation.

RESPONSE TO 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 IVB.5)

The college began formally addressing this recommendation in 2004 when the Academic Senate formed a sub-committee to review the spoken and written language competencies for degrees and certificates and the process by which these exit competencies would be evaluated. The committee recommended 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. The college's catalog for 2007-2008 reflects these improvements, listing required courses or proficiency exams for reading, writing, and oral competencies, as well as for mathematics and information competency. The college has met this recommendation.

RESPONSE TO 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: IVA.4 and10B.3)

Although some reorganization to reduce the number of direct reports to the college president has been accomplished since the 2001 accreditation team visit, severe administrative turnover has seriously impaired the college's ability to provide support for institutional planning and management. The Self Study notes that staffing in the Office of Instruction remains "problematic" and that the college's administrative "organization in the instructional area is not meeting the needs of the instructional programs nor providing sufficient support for college-wide instructional planning team found generally that faculty and staff were concerned about the turnover rate for its administrative leadership positions."

The Mission College president has recently distributed a "Mission College Reorganization Proposal" which if adopted would significantly reorganize the college's administrative structure. The proposal identifies weaknesses in the college's current administrative structure and resulting deficiencies affecting the overall quality of the institution. The plan aims at ensuring a more holistic, decentralized administrative structure which is less vulnerable to vacancies within individual positions.

At the time of the team's visit, there had not yet been time for any of the campus-wide forums planned in the Reorganization Proposal; however, interest level was high, and the campus seemed to welcome the president's thoughtful analysis and effort to address this important topic. Although faculty and staff have indicated concerns about specific aspects of the proposal, they agree that it is moving through the college's governance processes in an appropriate way. This recommendation has been met.

RESPONSE TO 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 2002, all management employees were provided hard copies of the entire policy manual (*District Policies*) in uniform binders for easy identification. The entire manual was also placed on the district Web site so that all employees and members of the public have access to the policies at any time. A district Web administrator has been hired and is responsible for the timely uploading of all revisions to the policy manual

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 the semi-annual updates to revise existing policies and procedures and to create new ones as required by the passage of new laws and regulations. The Board routinely reviews district policies. The Board ensures that implementation procedures are available for each chapter before considering revisions. To date, the Board has reviewed the complete policy manual and made revisions each year. Changes are proposed by staff and Board members and annual reviews always include the latest recommendations of the CCLC service.

Since 2003, the Board has used a standardized process and instrument for its annual self evaluation. Although the instrument itself was altered in the 2005-06 academic year, the process remained the same and the Board added a feedback component. As of the 2005-06 cycle, the Board solicited input and feedback from district staff in the evaluation process. This feedback is reviewed and discussed by the trustees in a meeting devoted to completing the evaluation.

The District has subscribed to the Community College League of California (CCLC) policy service that assists districts in maintaining up-to-date policies. A structure has been established with the Board of Trustees for the regular review of all policies and these changes meet the standards of AACJC regarding policy review. This policy development also includes the evaluation of the board and the requirements of having consequences for violating the ethics policy of the Board.

While the structure of policy development and review is appropriately in place, the portion of the recommendation that indicates the Board is providing appropriate and effective leadership to ensure the quality integrity and effectiveness of the instructional programs and services has room for improvement. <u>This recommendation has been substantially met, but the Board of Trustees needs to develop district wide goals that address the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of instruction throughout the district.</u>

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

1. AUTHORITY

Mission College's authority to operate as a degree-granting institution is the result of continuous accreditation by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), an institutional accreditation body recognized by the Commission on Recognition of Postsecondary Accreditation and the U. S. Department of Education (2007-2008 Mission College Catalog, p. 7). The college meets this requirement.

2. MISSION

In September 2007, the Board of Trustees (BOT) approved the most recent version of the college's mission statement, which was adopted by the college's Governance and Planning (GAP) Council in June 2007. The mission statement is consistent with the college's legal authority, defines its educational purposes, its intended student population and its commitment to achieving student learning. The mission statement is published in the 2007-2008 College Catalog on page 7 and on the college's web site at http://www.missioncollege.org/gen_info/gen_info.html. The college meets this requirement.

3. GOVERNING BOARD

The West Valley-Mission Community College District (WVMCCD) is governed by seven members elected at large for terms of four years. The Board also seats two elected student trustees, one from each college. The Board is responsible for the quality and integrity of the institution and for ensuring that the institution's mission is carried out (District Policy 1.6.5). It is an independent policy-making body that reflects the interests of its constituents and the public (District Policies 1.5 and 1.6). The Board has a conflict of interest policy (District Policy 1.6.6). No member of the Board has an employment, family, or personal financial interest in the institution. The college meets this requirement.

4. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

The District has a Chief Executive Officer who was appointed by the Board of Trustees (BOT) in 2002. The Chancellor's duties are clearly defined in District Policy 2.3. The College has a president whose role is defined by District Policy 2.1.3: "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" (34). The college meets this requirement.

5. ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY

District Policies 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 state that "the organizational structure of the District

shall reflect a multi-college system of cooperating colleges, each independently accredited, and designed to fulfill the District's mission. Mission College, West Valley College, and the District Office shall be organized in the most efficient and effective manner to provide comprehensive educational services for the citizens of the District." Mission College has 19 administrators and managers, who are selected and evaluated per Board policy (District Policy 2.17) and District procedures (Classified and Administrative Recruitment and Selection Procedures, 2006). The college meets this requirement.

6. OPERATIONAL STATUS

As of Fall 2007, Mission College has over 9,200 students who are enrolled with the intent of transferring to four-year institutions, completing degree and certificate programs, acquiring basic skills and English as a second language, and engaging in life-long learning through both credit courses and community education (IS Enrollment update, 10-26-07). The college meets this requirement.

7. DEGREES

Mission College offers 36 associate degrees and 78 certificates in both collegiate and occupational areas. Over 20 occupational programs are provided. All AA/AS 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 (2007-2008 Mission College Catalog). The college meets this requirement.

8. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

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 full- and part-time faculty (Curriculum Review Committee Handbook; ACE Contract). The college meets this requirement.

9. ACADEMIC CREDIT

Mission College awards academic credit based on generally accepted practices in degreegranting institutions of higher education and adheres to Title 5 regulations regarding the awarding of academic credit. Academic standards are described in the Catalog and in District Policy 4.0, Educational Services (2007-2008 Mission College Catalog). The college meets this requirement.

10. STUDENT LEARNING ACHIEVEMENT

The college Catalog includes a statement for each program that describes the learning outcomes for students (2007-2008 Mission College Catalog). The college meets this requirement.

11. GENERAL EDUCATION

The college Catalog clearly identifies the General Education (GE) requirements for the Associate Degree. General Education requirements fall into five areas: Language and Rationality, Natural Sciences, Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences, and Lifelong Learning. Students must fulfill either a General Studies AA major or other specialized major. In addition, students must meet basic competency requirements in reading, writing, oral communication, mathematics, and information competency (2007-2008 Mission College Catalog). The college's GE requirements were reviewed by the Academic Senate most recently in Spring 2007 (Academic Senate minutes, May 2007). The college meets this requirement.

12. ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Mission College adheres to and promotes the principles of academic freedom. District Policy 4.8, revised in 2003, clearly describes the District's commitment to academic freedom as it applies to administrators and students, as well as faculty: "Academic freedom in the pursuit and dissemination of knowledge through all media shall be maintained at the District. Such freedom shall be recognized as a right of all members of the faculty, whether of tenure or non-tenure rank, of all administrative officers, and of all students." Board policy is based on the California State University (CSU) system's statement on Academic Freedom. The CSU statement on Academic Freedom is, in turn, substantially based on the 1940 AAUP Statement of Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure, while their statement on Professional Ethics is an exact transcription of the 1966 AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics. The college meets this requirement.

13. FACULTY

Mission College has 163 full-time and 264 part-time faculty (2007-2008 Position Control file). All meet the minimum qualifications for their disciplines. Equivalency is determined as necessary by a District committee of faculty and administration who follow state and local guidelines for minimum qualifications. Faculty responsibilities are described in the contract established between the District and the Association of College Educators (ACE) (ACE Contract). Both full-time and adjunct faculty are listed in the Catalog. Full-time faculty listings include their degrees and first year of employment (2007-2008 Mission College Catalog). The college meets this requirement.

14. STUDENT SERVICES

Mission College is committed to student success and understands the importance of support services in assisting students to achieve their goals. The college provides an extensive network of support services that are aligned with the needs of the student populations the college serves and that reflect its mission statement and core values

(2007-2008 Mission College Catalog). The college meets this requirement.

15. ADMISSIONS

The college's admissions policies are consistent with its mission and follow state law and District policies. Admission requirements are clearly stated for students in the college Catalog and in the schedule of classes (2007-2008 Mission College Catalog, pp. 171-72; Fall 2007 Schedule of Classes, pp. 5-9). The college meets this requirement.

16. INFORMATION AND LEARNING RESOURCES

Mission College provides face-to-face and on-line access to information and learning resources and services to support the college's mission and its instructional programs and student support services (2007-2008 Mission College Catalog, pp. 181-85; Summer/Fall 2007 Schedule of Classes, pp. 130-31, District Policies 5.0). The college meets this requirement.

17. FINANCIAL RESOURCES

The West Valley-Mission Community College District (WVMCCD) develops an annual budget that reflects Board priorities and serves to support the college's institutional mission, goals, programs and services. The college has developed participatory processes to prioritize needs and allocate resources (WVMCCD Final Budget, 2007-2008; College Budget Advisory Committee Budget Allocation Model, 2007). The District's repayment fine to the State of $6 million and a reduction of approximately 2000 base FTES could result in more than a $9 million annual loss to the District and its two colleges. The college and the District need to address the near- and long-term fiscal impact of the repayment to the State and loss of District-wide base FTES.

18. FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILTY

The WVMCCD undergoes annual audits conducted by an independent, outside auditor. The audit is conducted according to Governmental Accounting Standards Board Statements Number 34 and 35. The college meets this requirement.

19. INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND EVALUATION

Mission College has instituted systematic planning and evaluation at a number of levels, including curriculum, technology, budget, facilities, student learning outcomes, student equity, programs and services, and staffing. The college has adopted mechanisms for evaluating a number of aspects of institutional effectiveness, including accreditation standards and Accountability Reporting for the California Community Colleges (ARCC) criteria. The college is engaged in a continuous process of identifying and implementing evaluation criteria for the purposes of improving institutional effectiveness and student

learning (2007 Educational Master Plan; Technology Plan; College Budget Advisory Committee (CBAC) Budget Allocation Model; 2007-2008 Facilities Master Plan process and schedule; Student Equity Plan). The college meets this requirement.

20. PUBLIC INFORMATION

The college produces an annual Catalog that provides current information about its mission, philosophy, admission and registration requirements and procedures, academic and occupational programs, student services, degree and certificate requirements, courses, fees, academic regulations and standards, academic calendar, discrimination policies, grievance procedures, and academic credentials of faculty and administrators. Essential contact information (address, telephone numbers, web site) is provided. Governing board members are listed. The Schedule of Classes, published twice a year (summer/fall and winter/spring) also includes much of this information, as does the web site (2007-2008 Mission College Catalog; Summer/Fall 2007 Schedule of Classes; www.missioncollege.org). The college meets this requirement.

21. RELATIONS WITH THE ACCREDITING COMMISSION

District Policy 1.4.2 states: "The District's Colleges 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. 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." Mission College adheres to this policy (Midterm Progress Reports; 2007 Self Study). The college meets this requirement.

ACCREDITATION THEMES

Dialogue:

The self study and interviews the team had with staff indicate that the college effectively engages in meaningful dialogue about institutional quality and improvement. The college's several efforts during 2004-2007 at selecting a new or revised mission statement generated much campus-wide discussion of the institution's purpose and values, as did the controversial "work to contract" issue of 2006-2007. Inclusive, collaborative campus dialogue also occurred during the formation of the Educational Facilities Master Plan, and review of the college's core values.

Although campus dialogue about Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) slowed during the "work to contract" period, the college's effort in establishing these at the program and course level has obviously involved sustained dialog among the faculty, especially those in Math, English, and ESL. The self study indicates that in November 2007 and again in February 2008 the college held campus-wide activities aimed at writing and discussing SLOs, and a report by the Academic Senate's SLOs Task Force addressed outcomes in all of the college's programs and courses.

The team also noted that the president's recent reorganization proposal generated a great deal of considerate discussion around the college's need for more administrative support and oversight, as well as the turn-over in administrative positions. The president has indicated that there will be several forums in the near future to provide the campus community further opportunities for comment on and discussion of the proposal.

Student Learning Outcomes:

Mission College is currently approaching the "Development" level as defined in the ACCJC "Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness—Part III: Student Learning Outcomes." In Fall 2005, the Academic Senate convened an SLO Task Force charged with defining goals and overseeing the college's progress in implementing Student Learning Outcomes across the campus. The committee issued a report in 2006-2007 summarizing the college's progress to that point. Several faculty attended a CCLC conference on learning outcomes in Fall 2007 and subsequently trained other faculty in Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). As a result, the college's 2007-2008 catalog lists learning outcomes for over 85 percent of all instructional and non-instructional programs.

Course outlines in mathematics and English include course-level outcomes and provide a model for others on the campus to advance substantive dialogue on this topic. Progress in developing assessment measures for (SLOs at the course level has occurred in a few academic areas, notably in English as a Second Language, English, and Mathematics courses, particularly as a result of work completed under the college's Title V grant. Performance indicators in other instructional programs are few or none, apparently due to a lack of overall coordination and the need for key personnel, as well as by limited existing research data. There is a faculty coordinator for SLOs,

but this person has no reassigned time provided for the responsibilities of that role. While the college has made progress in developing SLOs at the program level, there is substantial work remaining to be done to establish them at the class and institutional levels and to integrate the results of SLOs into the planning, program review, and resource allocation processes.

Learning outcomes have also been developed for five Student Services areas: Career Center, Disability Instructional Support Center (DISC, LATC, and Student Health Services. Student Services developed a 2006-2007 Summary Report providing goals, objectives, activities and outcome measures based on research and evidence. The document has generated helpful dialog among student services and instructional programs.

Institutional Commitments:

Although Mission College has been faced with a number of significant challenges since the last accreditation team visit in 2001, the campus has worked effectively to prepare for its Application for Reaffirmation of Accreditation in 2007. The institution's commitment to its students is affirmed in the first sentence of the mission statement, which declares that the college's "first priorities are student learning and success."

The college's mission statement was reviewed and reaffirmed by the campus as recently as 2007. Subsequent to the 2001 accreditation team's visit, the college revisited its existing mission statement through a collegial process that began with the Governance and Planning (GAP) Council in 2004-2005 and resulted in two campus-wide votes to select a new statement. Eventually the campus retained the existing mission statement, which was eventually forwarded to and approved by the Board of Trustees on September 6, 2007. Though this process was apparently successful in generating campus-wide consideration of the mission statement, there is no policy for routinely reviewing and revising its mission statement on a regular basis.

In continuation of its commitment to serve students and to maintain high levels of instruction and support, the college in 2004 applied for and was awarded a Title V grant focusing on serving the needs of Hispanic students. In that same year, it joined with the District in getting a $235 million bond passed, with $97 million coming to Mission College for new technology, safety, ADA access, and new construction. Further, the college administration is in the process of seeking an additional $74.7 million in proposed state funding to leverage the bond funds.

The need for full implementation and measurement of student learning outcomes is being addressed in as yet small but increasingly evident ways. Although there is a great need for further progress, learning outcomes are identified at the program level, in basic skills courses, and in a few, but increasing number of courses within other disciplines. The Student Services area has developed a planning template to address goals, objectives and outcomes. The college as a whole needs to continue efforts to fully implement effective instructional and student support processes linked to planning, program review, student learning outcomes, and curriculum review.

The college's commitment to maintaining well qualified faculty and staff was readily apparent to the team. The District and college collaborate on employee professional development, including

orientation and training, and the District has responded to a staff needs survey by piloting a new leadership academy. In addition to maintaining a Flex calendar for professional activities on the campus, the college also supports a variety of professional development opportunities for faculty and staff, and it supports a faculty member with 20 percent reassigned time for professional development coordination. There is a 3-year Staff Development Plan validated by the academic senate.

Within the college overall are a number of programs that address specific populations, many of them focusing on at-risk students and offering counseling and student success support: MESA, ACCESS, and the DISC programs are most notable. These programs are located in geographically central areas of the campus, and they affirm the college's commitment to serving the needs of underrepresented students.

Instructional programs are designed and taught with student needs in mind. Introduction of the course management Angel system to support on-line teaching and learning is an example of the college's commitment to improving its service to students and maintaining quality instruction in any mode.

Well in advance of most other community colleges, Mission College has also adopted an information competency requirement. Due to the success of the new requirement, there is a need to offer more sections of this course, and the college will need to address that need in future campus planning efforts. The college Library provides an outstanding environment for students to study and to conduct research, along with providing a wide variety of resources to the campus community and local patrons.

The college's overall commitment to addressing recommendations from the previous team, especially in regards to curriculum review, student learning outcomes, program review, and planning, clearly suffered during the "work-to-contract" dispute during the previous year or more. At this point, faculty and staff appear to understand the need for recommitment, not only to accreditation standards but also to the values and high quality of programs and services they want their college to represent.

Evaluation, Planning, and Improvement

Previous accreditation teams, dating back as far as 1995, have noted the college's need to develop and institutionalize ongoing evaluation and budget allocation processes linked to planning. The college has made some headway since the 2001 visit by adopting several college-wide committees and procedures intended to strengthen its overall planning and resource allocation processes, although many of these have not yet been implemented. Together with a number of un-addressed planning agenda items, they leave the college with much to accomplish, but also with the needed direction and tools to improve.

To strengthen its planning and resource allocation model, the college has instituted a number of systematic planning and evaluation processes, including its 2007 Educational master Plan, a Technology Plan, a 2007-2008 Facilities Plan, and completion of Accountability Reporting for

the California Community Colleges (ARCC) reports. The Program Master Planning (PMP) process is designed to operate on a 5-year cycle, with all departments undergoing program review within this time frame. Although scheduled for pilot implementation in Spring 2004, this review process has not yet been implemented. Other potentially useful planning mechanisms are in place, such as the Education and Facilities Master Plan (EFMP), and the Budget Advisory Committee (CBAC). These mechanisms are participatory and collaborative, though their formal linkages back to unit or program planning is unclear.

As part of its response to Recommendation 2 from the 2001 team, the college completed and implemented a Student Equity Plan that was accepted by the Commission as part of the college's Progress Report in 2005. While the college has made progress in completing the Student Equity portion of the earlier recommendation, further work toward completing Equal Employment Opportunity Plan remains to be done.

Frequent administrative turnover and issues relating to participatory governance have severely hampered college progress in vital areas, including program review and institutional planning. The college president has recently proposed an administrative reorganization intended to promote a more decentralized structure that is less vulnerable to vacancies in individual positions. The proposal recommends assignment of deans to specific instructional divisions, resulting in a reduction of duties and reassigned time for faculty department chairs except in departments where program integrity would be compromised. The proposal presents an important opportunity for the college to evaluate its current administrative structure, as well as the necessary responsibilities of administrators and faculty, and to plan ways to improve upon these accordingly.

Organization:

Mission College has a long and well-established tradition of participatory governance. The primary governance committee is the Governance and Planning Council (GAP), which is responsible for making recommendations concerning strategic planning and campus processes to the college president. The president serves as chair of GAP, whose other members include representatives from the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, the associated student organization, other campus groups, and representatives of administration. Other groups whose decisions have broad-reaching impact across the campus include the College Budget and Advisory Committee (CBAC), the Student Services Council (SSC), the Division Chair Council (DCC), the Academic Senate, and the Classified Senate. These groups all have various roles in representing their constituencies and ensuring that needs and planning are widely shared and discussed before moving to GAP or otherwise being implemented.

While the college's current organizational structure has appears generally effective, the president's recently proposed administrative reorganization has identified areas and means for improvement. Staff reported to the team that they feel governance structures and roles need to be better defined and clarified. Classified staff feel strongly that they should have more opportunities for increased and more effective participation in the college's governance processes. Additionally, although there has been significant improvement since the contentious

"work to contract" period of 2006, serious concerns remain relating to Board roles, as well as communication and the relationship between the Board, Chancellor, District offices, and the college. The president's reorganization proposal is not specifically aimed at all of these concerns, although if implemented it may indirectly help to lessen them Because it would alter established roles of faculty and administration members, the development and implementation of this proposal will test participatory governance structures at the college. However, issues of administrative structure and governance roles must be resolved if the college is to address the serious challenges it faces.

Institutional Integrity:

Mission College has met the Eligibility Requirements for Accreditation by the ACCJC and has sufficiently responded to many, but not all of the recommendations made by the 2001 visiting accreditation team. As discussed in other areas of this report, several recommendations remain to be adequately addressed, and a number of planning agenda items from the previous and current accrediting visits must still be addressed.

The college has addressed identified needs of its students by completing and implementing a Student Equity Plan and establishing a Multicultural Requirement and information competency as degree requirements. In addition, the campus was successful in obtaining a Title V Hispanic Serving Institution grant that allows it to place more resources towards recruiting Hispanic and African-American Students and improving the success of all under-represented students. Progress toward developing assessment measures for Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) at the course level has occurred in some academic areas, notably in English as a Second Language, English, and Mathematics courses, particularly as a result of work completed under the Title V grant. The college's 2007-2008 catalog lists learning outcomes for over 85 percent of all programs—instructional and non-instructional, and a new program review process is slated to begin in Fall 2008. Despite these advances, there is serious need for the college to implement program review, course-level SLOs and their measurements, and to integrate the outcomes of these with campus-wide planning and resource allocation.

Finally, the District and its two colleges must address the short-term and long-range fiscal impact of the $4.5 million pay-back to the State for disallowed "Hours-to-be-arranged" at both campuses. This debt, coupled with the severe drop of enrollment already experienced at Mission will require the college's utmost attention and review over the next few years.

STANDARD I: INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND EFFECTIVENESS

Observations:

The team was impressed with the collegiality and positive tone found at Mission College. The college was forthright in its Self Study Report and in frankly discussing the challenges it has encountered since 2001. These challenges have delayed program review, the implementation of SLOs, and systematic assessment and review of institutional improvement since the last visit.

The college makes continual efforts to match its mission with the needs of its student population and the surrounding community. The current mission statement identifies several broad educational purposes (e.g., transfer, community, career and vocational education, basic skills) and the institution's commitment to achieving student learning. The mission statement specifically mentions providing for student learning and success as the college's primary purpose. Rather than identify particular types of students, the college identifies its intended objective as serving the educational and economic needs of its surrounding communities. It has done this by instituting a broad range of diversified programs and courses, including reaching out to domestic and international students with such support programs as EOPS, CalWorks, a student disabilities center, and MESA. In addition to regular transfer and degree courses, the campus also supports a strong English as a Second Language program and a variety of basic skills tutorial centers and labs. To strengthen the international and global focus of its curriculum and culture, the college has additionally established a unique Institute for International Studies and an International Student Center. Finally, in further response to serving the needs of traditionally underrepresented students, the college also applied for and was awarded a Title V grant to enhance outreach, recruitment, and retention, especially of Hispanic students. (I.A.1)

The college's mission statement is disseminated in variety of venues and formats, such as the 2007-2008 Catalog, the 2008 Winter Session/Spring Schedule of Classes, and the college website. The mission statement is also printed for distribution on business card-sized handouts which are posted in several areas throughout campus. The standard team noted as well that the agenda for the Governance and Planning (GAP) meeting of March 19, 2008 included the mission statement on the left-hand boarder of the document. (I.A.2)

The team found that the college effectively uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to its appropriate constituencies. The Self Study indicates that student satisfaction and campus climate surveys have been conducted, documented, and communicated to appropriate constituencies, including the Governance and Planning Council (GAP), Academic Senate, academic divisions, student support services, and the Title V Grant Committee. Data derived from the Accountability Reporting of the California Community Colleges (ARCC) report is communicated to the college community. The PARIS Vital Stats website provides automatically generated reports on key performance indicators at the college, department, and course level. An institutional scorecard is slated to be developed by the Office of Institutional Research, with annual distribution. In addition, the Student Services

Council oversees the wide-scale evaluation of services, and several areas within Student Services conduct their own department-level evaluations. (I.B.3, I.B.6, I.B.7)

A. Mission.

The college's mission statement was reviewed and reaffirmed by the campus as recently as 2007. Subsequent to the 2001 accreditation team's visit, the college revisited its existing mission statement through a collegial process that began with the Governance and Planning (GAP) Council in 2004-2005 and resulting in two campus-wide votes to select a new statement. As reported in the Self Study Report and confirmed during the team's interviews with college staff, sustained discussions and intensive dialog occurred as the college reviewed a newly proposed mission statements and the previous one. Eventually the campus decided to revise the existing mission statement, and that version was eventually forwarded to and approved by the Board of Trustees on September 6, 2007. As apparently successful as this process was, however, the college has no policy for routinely reviewing and revising its mission statement on a regular basis. (I.A.1, I.A.2, I.A.3, I.B.1)

While the college's Self Study indicates that data and information provided by the Office of Institutional Research is used in establishing new services reflecting the campus's changing student population, it appears the mission statement, although widely disseminated, is not yet clearly integrated into planning and decision-making processes for the college. Data are apparently available, but the standard team, in discussions with the Office of Institutional Research, was made aware of difficulties that office and others on the campus have in accessing district data regarding changing student characteristics and needs. (I.A.3, I.B.2, I.B.3)

B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

In 2004, the college began a dialogue regarding student learning outcomes and took action to develop and implement their use for improving student learning in ESL, English, and mathematics. In October 2005, the Academic Senate created the SLO Committee. Program chairs were asked to write program-level outcome statements, and an assignment was embedded into the EFMP which made student learning one of three components of the new Educational Master Plan. Mathematics and ESL faculty piloted newly written SLOs in Spring 2006, with fifty-six percent of programs submitting a SLO statement for review. During 2006-2007, the campus developed course-level SLOs in reading, Math and English. Eighty-five percent of the course offerings in English (two levels below freshman composition and the first two courses of transfer English) currently have SLOs at the course level. Based on the team's interviews with faculty in these disciplines, it was apparent that sustained dialogue had occurred as these SLO statements were developed.

The Self Study indicates that not all committees publish meeting minutes and, therefore, cannot substantiate institutional self-reflective dialogue. Moreover, for many of the smaller committees, agendas are not retained and actions taken are not recorded. It is likely the absence of published meeting minutes and retained agendas may impact the college's ability to sustain a self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning. (I.B.1)

In 2003 the college attempted to refine its core values, as well as goals for their implementation and use in institutional decision making. While the College Budget Advisory Committee (CBAC) requests on its "Budget Request Form" information regarding Core Values and Goals, the extent to which that information is used to prioritize the allocation of funds is unclear. The Self Study indicates that the Grants Advisory Committee (GAC) uses the Goals Core Values and Mission in the Grants Review Process, and yet, how the GAC uses these items was not documented.

In spring 2007 the GAP Council reviewed the eight core values and fifty-three goals indicating the core values are still viable and the fifty-three goals need to be reviewed and updated. Revisions were made, and the Core Values and Goals and are now part of the Education Master Plan. However, as the college's Self Study itself indicates, there remains a need to have the Core Values and Goals visible and incorporated into the decision making processes. (I.B.2)

It appears that the college has yet to develop and institutionalize an ongoing, systematic program review with a budget allocation process linked to planning. Program Master Planning (PMP) was designed to operate on a 5-year cycle with all departments undergoing program review within this time frame. While Program Master Planning was scheduled for pilot implementation in Spring 2004, at the time of the team visit this review process had not been implemented.

The college's Self Study indicates that "regular program review should begin by Fall 2008." Several reasons were cited for delaying implementation until then, including the retirement of a key faculty member in 2003, the subsequent development of EFMP, and the "work to contract" situation that occurred during 2006. A "program review component" was included in the college's 2005-2007 Educational Facilities Master Plan, but reviewed only three areas (historical review of the program, SLO progress, and future program needs), and was relatively limited in scope. The data utilized were primarily based on program-level trends and did not include more detailed analysis or data from external scans. However, this was a one-time process, and the college is just beginning discussions about how to systematize it and link it to the college's planning and budgeting processes.

Overall, the college has not developed effective feedback mechanisms to assess the relationship between resource allocation and outcomes. It should be noted that the 2001 team based its recommendation on a prior recommendation from the 1995 evaluation report that recommended the college "establish a budget development/allocation process that is based upon a long-range educational master plan." The recommendation is significant and suggests a long-standing concern which is now expressed by a third accreditation team. (I.B.3)

Key planning committees are broad-based and representative of a variety of constituencies. Committee membership is solicited through the shared governance structure and includes administration, faculty, classified staff, and students. Although student participation in college governance committees appears to be limited, team interviews with students substantiated that the lack of participation was not due to the absence of any opportunity for student input.

Collegial participation of constituent groups occurs at many levels, and appropriate constituencies appear to be involved. Nonetheless, planning and program review have not yet resulted in data-based resource allocation or wide-spread institutional planning**.** (I.B.4)

The self-study indicates that student satisfaction and campus climate surveys have been conducted, documented and communicated to appropriate constituencies, including the Governance and Planning Council (GAP), Academic Senate, academic divisions, student support services and the Title V Grant Committee. Data derived from the Accountability Reporting of the California Community Colleges (ARCC) report is communicated to the college community. The PARIS Vital Stats website provides automatically generated reports on key performance indicators at the college, department and course level. An institutional scorecard is slated to be developed by the Office of Institutional Research with annual distribution. In addition, the Student Services Council (SSC) oversees the wide-scale evaluation of services and several areas within student services conduct their own department-level evaluations.

The college has contracted with several consultants to provide data and information about students, programs, and services. In addition, there appears to be sufficient data available at the District level; however, limited access to the District data has apparently stymied assessment results which would be helpful to the college in assuring the quality of instruction and services provided to students. Based on team interviews with staff, communicating assessment results with various relevant constituencies is sporadic and reflects identified staffing limitations in this area.

By the college's own assessment, it has as a goal the development of a more systematic and fully integrated planning process that links planning with resource allocation. Separate areas such as the Student Services Council, the Library, and Student Health Services have methods of evaluating their programs. However, there is no systematic coordination or documented guidelines for reviewing evaluation mechanisms, and the Self Study includes no planning agenda to address this need. While the college acknowledges the desire to base planning on data and information to ensure data-driven decision making, staffing limitations may be a constraint in making data available for systematic planning, review, and resource allocation**.** (I.B.5)

Conclusions:

The college has made good progress in its efforts to review and revise its mission statement and supplemental philosophy, commitments, and cultural pluralism statements. It has established effective means for widely disseminating these statements and incorporating them into decision-making processes to ensure that the institution defines its broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning.

Overall, although some progress has been made in developing SLOs at the program, course, and degree levels, development of SLOs are lagging, with assessment of SLOs at the program level actually occurring only episodically. In terms of the ACCJC "Rubric," the team finds that the college is also at the develop stage in implementing SLOs. (I.B, I.B.1)

As indicated in the college's self study, "most areas lack systematic coordination as well as

documentation of guidelines for reviewing evaluation mechanisms" (87). Although no planning agenda was written regarding this deficiency, the college should address it as part of fulfilling Recommendation 5. (I.B.7)

The team had difficulty fully understanding the reasons surrounding the delayed implementation of program review. While team appreciates the decision to implement the EFMP process in lieu of the PMP process to ensure continuity of the application of program review in 2003-04, the absence of a sustained program review cycle from 2004 to present is troubling, despite a plan to implement program review in Fall 2008. It is consequently the team's assessment that Mission College is in the Development stage of implementing program review as defined in the ACCJC "Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part I: Program Review."

The team feels the college is also at the developmental stage of Part II of the ACCJC's "Rubric" in regards to implementing institution-wide planning processes. Efforts such as the 2006-2007 Summary Report generated by Student Services can provide goals, objectives, activities, and outcome measures based on research and evidence. The report has also promoted dialog among student services and instructional programs. The team encourages the college to use such examples to develop similar practices in other areas for planning.

Recommendations:

Recommendation 1: 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. (I.A.1, I.A.7, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, II.A.2e, II.C.2, III.C.2, IV.B.2.a)

Recommendation 2: The team recommends that Mission College establish and implement a schedule for systematically reviewing its mission and values statements (I.A.3).

Recommendation 3: 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 (I.B.2, I.B.5, I.B.7, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.3.6, II.B, III.A.1.c, III.A.6, III.B.1)

Recommendation 4: 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. (I.B.3, IB.6, II.A.1.a, II.A.2.g, II.B.3, III.C.1, IV.B.2.b, IV.B.3.b)

Recommendation 5: The team recommends that the college review and complete its planning agendas for both the 2001 and 2007 accreditation visits. (IB.4, IB.6)

STANDARD II: STUDENT LEARNING PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

A. INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

General Observations:

Mission College is overall currently responding effectively to the new challenges it faces in meeting the needs of a changing and diverse student population. The recent deterioration of the dot-com industry that once contributed a large population of students to Mission College's enrollment has resulted in the loss of a great number of older, working students who enrolled in evening and weekend classes, particularly in technology-related fields. As a result, the college noted two significant shifts in its demographics: (1) the increased numbers of 18-21 year olds who prefer daytime classes and are taking more units; and (2) increased numbers with limited language preparation, particularly of those of Hispanic and Vietnamese origins. To address the needs of such students, the college offers campus orientations in English, Spanish, and Vietnamese, and printed materials are available to them in those languages. During peak times of registration, Admissions and Records staff are present at computer stations outside their offices to assist students who have difficulty navigating the English instructions or computer functions of the on-line enrollment systems. (II.A.1.a)

Within the college as whole are a number of programs that address specific populations, many of them focusing on at-risk students and offering counseling and student success support: MESA, ACCESS, and the DISC programs are most notable. These programs are located geographically in the central part of the college and so viewed as valued by the campus. (II.A.1.a)

Beyond the traditional transfer, basic skills, and career technical education courses, the college also offers a variety of non-traditional courses and programs that are perhaps less immediately visible but that respond to community needs and contribute to the diversity of the college. These programs include the 160 students of the Intensive English Program (IEP), non-credit education, corporate training, community and contract education, a Middle College of 53 students, and a program for developmentally delayed adults. The college has included several items in the Planning Agendas of its 2007 Self Study to further address the needs of its diverse and changing student population. (II.A.1.a)

The college has long been known as progressive in its offerings of distance learning, in formulating technology policies, in its use of technology to support student learning and services, and in its support of a total-cost-of-operations model to ensure on-going replacement and upkeep of its many technology resources. As a result, distance learning opportunities have increased annually for several years, experiencing a 13 percent jump in 2006, and a 25 percent increase in 2007, while television courses continue to drop about 4 percent annually. Courses ranging from

chemistry to ESL or from English composition to computer applications are regularly offered on-line. (II.A.1.a, II.A.1.b)

The introduction of the course management Angel system supports on-line asynchronous and synchronous communication among class members and instructor, provides tutoring, and is a mechanism for submission of course materials. Over 60 percent of the faculty have been trained to use this program. The Distance Learning Coordinator and associates offer frequent flex activities, demonstrations, and brown-bag training sessions in the Technology Center in order to support faculty innovation. A shell for each course is available to faculty and students who find it a convenient means to access information and to share instructional and resource materials. Angel also offers options for hybrid courses for faculty who are new to using technology-based instruction. Other faculty, for example some ESL faculty, are eager to use media and audio and video streaming. The college is exploring purchase of additional software to enable faculty to develop course-specific learning outcomes assessment and reinforcement modules. (II.A.1.b, II.A.1.d)

Although few departments use common course or program examinations, the Math department is developing common rubrics for a basic skills course, accounting courses use a common project across all sections, and English faculty use a rubric to score a common final exam in the course one level for the transfer composition course. Only nursing uses a commercial "mock" LVN licensing exam that must minimize any test bias and adhere to standards of institutional integrity. The considerable work arising out of Title V may contribute to further articulation of SLOs and subsequent assessment—all leading to instructional improvement. The tem found that faculty who formulate grading rubrics engage in intensive dialogue to reach consensus about the rubric's standards and then train their full and part-time colleagues in their use. (II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.g)

The assessment instruments used for composition and reading placement have been approved at the state level, indicating their status as approved, validated tests. Math tests have similarly been approved, while ESL will add an additional test to meet on-line assessment needs. Faculty and staff in these discipline areas seem particularly knowledgeable about conventional expectations of content validity, consequential validity, disproportionate impact and general cultural sensitivity of the instrument—including its instructions, tasks, or associated reading. Cut scores have been locally determined and continue to be refined and adjusted as populations change. (II.A.2.f, II.A.2.g)

Units of credit awarded by Mission College are comparable to those of other institutions of higher education. The awarding of credit, at present, is based on successful completion of course requirements stipulated on the course syllabi distributed in classes by the instructor of record; credit is also awarded on the basis of completion of course objectives specified in the official course outlines of record housed on CurricUNET, the college's curriculum management system. Although this information is not publicly available, some instructors' syllabi reflect both the official course objectives and available student learning outcomes for that course. As the final more program-level SLOs are completed and published and as more course-level SLOs are written and assessed, it is reasonable to assume that credit for courses, degrees and certificates will be awarded for completion of stated learning objectives as well. (II.A.2.h, II.A.2.i)

The Mission College General Education requirements include communication skills, problem solving and values clarification, and cultural pluralism. Moreover, the college has reviewed and upgraded its graduation requirements to reflect more rigorous graduation expectations in math and English. The cultural pluralism requirement and the values clarification component of the college's general education directly contribute to the education of an "ethical citizen." (II.A.2.i, II.A.3a. II.A.3.b, II.A.3.c.)

The catalog and numerous publications of the counseling office and transfer center provide students with appropriate information, and the degree requirements are spelled out. The addition of learning outcomes for most programs announces the college's expectations for students pursuing degrees and certificates. (II.A.6)

While the college has a program discontinuance policy, no programs have been discontinued in a very long time. That circumstance may be a result of another factor: until very recently, low enrolled courses of any size could be offered without threat of cancellation. The Vice President of Instruction estimated that about 45 percent of all sections in any semester had fewer than 20 students enrolled. A new practice now permits classes "in single digits" to be cancelled, although exceptions can be made. (II.A.6.b)

The college expects students and faculty to uphold high principles of Academic Honesty as described in catalogs and schedules of classes. The institution subscribes to Turn-it In.com to encourage academic honesty and simultaneous instruction in academic citation to enable students to avoid those published consequences for dishonesty. (II.A.7.b)

Findings and Evidence:

In conversations students had with team members, the Mission students noted the absence of an organized Honors Program; believing that the Honors Club could not offer the same advantages to a potential transfer student, they travel either to West Valley or to DeAnza College to take the "rigorous" Honors courses that will prepare them for transfer. They also expressed regret that too frequently transfer/general education courses were cancelled here on this campus. Their claim seems at odds with statements about course cancellations earlier, and if incorrect, might be indicative of a student perception that the college can address in its campus communications and marketing. Both the Self Study and the team's discussions with students suggested that there were limited club and leadership opportunities for students still acquiring language skills or students enrolled primarily in distance learning. Pursuing Planning Agenda 2.11 will further the objectives of this standard and stimulate healthy dialogue among the constituent groups of the college family. (II.A.1.a)

The TCO model of purchase and support does not appear to function, and supplying and supporting five learning centers, computers of faculty, staff and administrators, and the public computer lab in the library is labor intensive. Students noted that they did not have on-line assistance in evenings and weekends, nor did they always have access to on-campus facilities. An unanticipated burden of increased on-line courses is the difficulty the college now has finding

occasional meeting space for orientations, mid-term and final exams for students enrolled in those courses. Faculty and instructional technology faculty are uncertain how this on-going need will be met with the new construction. At present, however, there is no forward planning that would address the future needs of students—including the cost of purchase of equipment, software, licensing, training, and maintaining the necessary equipment and providing aid and support. It will be important for the future, then, that the college include the technological needs of present and future students in its planning processes. (II.A.1.b)

Planning agenda responses to the 2001 recommendations indicated that the college would establish an evaluation cycle to review and update the mission statement, core values, goals, and objectives on a regular basis. The college recently undertook an extensive dialogue to revise its mission, but there is no established mechanism to review and update the mission on a regular basis. As with other standards, there appears to be no linkage between the single isolated activity of revising and publicizing the mission statement and the planning and on-going evaluation and revision. The need for the college to establish a scheduled review of its mission and values statements is acknowledged in Planning Agenda item 1.2 in the 2007 Self Study. (II.B.1)

Critical thinking and writing are elements of all classes, although several of the syllabi examined did not reflect written work beyond "multiple choice exams." The CurricUNET management system will make the course outlines of record more uniformly responsive to these local requirements. (II.A.3.b)

The college has adopted an information competency requirement, well in advance of most other community colleges. That requirement is now having an unanticipated consequence as it increases the demand for librarian instructional time and for spaces in which to accommodate the Library 10 courses. (II.A.3.b)

Longitudinal data was not evident to demonstrate students' readiness, their success rates, or their employment. Although such data may have been available to campus planners, it was not contained in the self-study or upon request. (II.A.5)

The team found that the matter of the syllabus is essentially compromised and does not meet this Standard's requirements. It was explained in interviews that some faculty have not seen the official course outline for their courses for some time and because it may not have been reviewed by the course originator or the department, they may be uncertain as to what it contains. Further, in the shift to CurricUNET, entire courses or portions of courses appear to have been lost; it may be some time until the curriculum data base is fully restored. The college needs to investigate means for including syllabi with appropriate course-level SLOs in every course. (II.A.6)

Recently several low-enrolled programs, with 2-5 students in each, blended their offerings to avoid discontinuance; what resulted was a stronger, more attractive program in Industrial Technology. It provides the college with a model and could be used to strengthen other programs should enrollment or marketability diminish in the future. It might also be used to develop a program such as teacher preparation (either multi-subject or single-subject) that would build a cohort of students for transfer courses. (II.A.6.b)

The college has eight advisory committees and an unknown number of programs without advisory committees, mostly in the business and finance areas; specific data was not available from any administrator at the time of the team's visit. The team noted that the college at present lacks a Dean of Workforce Preparation. Nonetheless, connections that Workforce Education faculty are making in the community could advance their programs, promote contract education, draw in new students, and provide direct assistance in designing and assessing learning outcomes if supported by administrative leadership and active advisory committees. Item PA2.4 in the Self Study indicates the need for all vocational programs to establish active advisory committees. The team encourages the colleges the college to implement this Planning Agenda item as soon as possible. (II.A.2.b)

A faculty subcommittee of the Academic Senate, during 2006-07, reevaluated the GE program, making several minor realignments and recommending one major policy shift that was adopted by the CRC: Effective Fall 2008, "courses not offered within five years would be removed," presumably from the GE list. The "five-year" restriction is not clearly stated in the Self Study, since generally the "five-year" concept applies to the number of years between a course's review and updating, not the frequency of its offering. Rather, it is expected that courses will be offered within a two year period; students have a right to expect that courses listed in the college catalog will be offered during their two-year stint on the campus. They further should expect that their studies will not be delayed because courses are not routinely offered. In interviews with team members, faculty acknowledged that courses not removed from the catalog could mislead students, and courses not routinely revised or refreshed would not reflect currency. However, because curriculum revision is voluntary, there is currently no enforcement. (II.A.2.c, II.A.3)

Planning Agendas responsive to the 2001 recommendations charge the Academic Senate with reexamining the Cultural Diversity component required of all courses, and faculty were asked to determine its "efficacy." That agenda item remains unaddressed and appears again as PA 2.8 in the 2007 Self Study. (II.A.2.f)

The college appears to make every effort to represent itself in marking statements and publications with accuracy and integrity. Departmental websites conform in content and design to standards to ensure both an aesthetic and quality continuity. Faculty complaints about materials omitted from the catalog may be a result of haste or the departure of key people involved in the process. At the same time, the team found no evidence that the college routinely "reviews policies and procedures to assure integrity in all representations." A more significant problem are the "Hours by Arrangement" (HBA) for which the college scheduled students and received state funding for unapproved additional course hours. The error was a result of unintentional, inadequate monitoring, and the college will need to ensure it maintains community confidence by more careful oversight in the future. (II.A.6.c)

See the preceding Response to Recommendation 2 of the 2001 visiting team regarding the college's progress toward implementing program review.

See the preceding Response to Recommendation 3 of the 2001 visiting team regarding the college's progress in establishing student learning outcomes.

Recommendations:

Refer to Recommendation 1 in Standard I. (I.A.1, I.A.7, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, II.A.2e, II.C.2, III.C.2, IV.B.2.a)

Refer to Recommendation 3 in Standard I. (I.B.2, I.B.5, I.B.7, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.3.6, II.B, III.A.1.c, III.A.6, III.B.1)

Refer to Recommendation 4 in Standard I. (IB.4, IB.6)

Recommendation 6: 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. (II.A.1.a, III.A.4, III.A.4.b)

B. STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

General Observations:

The team found that the college ensures readily accessible services to students in all areas of the campus. Offices and operations are responsive to student needs, as demonstrated by the changes in hours that reflected changes in student attendance patterns. Registration is available on-line, and drop-in counseling is available all from 9:30-7, Monday through Thursday, and 9:30-3 Fridays all year. During peak enrollment periods, additional counselors are on duty and are available on Saturday. These hours generally mirror the hours of adjacent student services, including Financial Aid and Admissions and Records. Auxiliary assistance is also provided by the Intensive English Program and the International Institute, as well as staff in LATC and even ESL faculty who accompany their students to these enrollment or assessment areas and personally coach them through the processes. Students enrolled in Distance Learning or those who log onto Angel receive advice and reminders about forthcoming events or deadlines. (II.B.3.a, II.B.3.b

The Associated Student Body supports a wide range of activities, clubs and events to support and enhance diversity. Broader institutional support is evident in the campus artifacts, including the "world's largest dragon kite" suspended in the common area of the Main building and other ethnic symbols and artifacts displayed in windows, on office doors, and across campus. Of particular note is the library's Asian-American collection secured under the auspices of the Richard Chang Foundation. Librarians report that since they moved the entire collection to a more visible location in the library, circulation has increased five-fold. The team also noted that orientation services are offered in the three languages primarily represented on campus: English, Spanish, and Vietnamese. Faculty, staff and administrators further represent a visible diversity that "enhances" students' experience when they are on campus. Student satisfaction surveys (Noel-Levitz and Garcia) confirm a level of comfort among the very diverse populations of the college. (II.B.3.b)

Findings and Evidence:

The college practices for storage and retention of documents seem conventional. Some documents are currently stored in cardboard boxes throughout the admissions and records area. Self Study comments about the "rosters stored on top of filing cabinets" had apparently been addressed by the time of the team's visit, though they were now stored in unsecured boxes, awaiting arrival of secure cabinets ordered recently. The electronic security of the on-line and back-up systems was superficially confirmed as team members lacked the expertise necessary. (II.B.3.f)

Several of the Student satisfaction surveys alluded to in the Self Study could not be found. There is a concern, however, that students' statements of satisfaction—or dissatisfaction—does not necessarily transfer as an identified "student need." Momentum in conducting program review and establishing SLOs and assessment for program improvement should be continued. (II.B.3.f, II.B.4)

C: LIBRARY AND LEARNING SUPPORT SERVICES

General Observations:

This section of the self study provides a comprehensive description of the operations of the Disability Instructional Support Services (DISC), Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS), Math Achievement Pathways to Success (MAPS), Math Engineering Science Achievement (MESA), Mathematics Learning Center (MLC), the Library, the Learning Assistance and Tutorial Center (LATC) and the Technology Center, Instructional labs and Television and Audio/Visual (TAV) Services. These programs are designed to support and enhance the institution's instructional programs in a variety of ways and in general appear to have achieved success. Staff in these areas were enthusiastic in their support of the college, the accreditation process, and of the students and faculty served. Documentation was complete, accessible and along with observations and conversations with staff and students, supported the statements made in the self study. The newly proposed reorganization model under discussion (March 2008) will have an effect on the administrative structure and many reporting relationships in this area and this has created a variety of reactions from unqualified to qualified support to what one person described as "cautious optimism." Final resolution of the HBA issue and the effect of the eventual payback on the fiscal health of the district as well as the overall budget uncertainties facing the state are of concern to staff at all levels as well as to students.

Findings and Evidence:

In general the support services housed in the main building do an admirable job of providing effective service despite limitations of space, lighting and access issues and configurations challenges. Staff are actively involved in planning for both temporary and permanent facilities to be constructed from bond money and their expertise and projections of current and future needs will be critical in these planning processes. (II.C.a, II.C.c))

The Disability Instructional Support Services (DISC) program and its associated lab provide effective support to students with a wide variety of disabilities. Accommodation and support are provided to the students while mainstream class instructors both receive support to help their students and have the opportunity to be involved in the decision making through committee participation. Staff are already anticipating an increase in needs for service as more veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan return to the college. (II.C.a, II.C.c)

EOPS is effective in offering educational support to historically underrepresented groups to assist its students in college success. (II.C.b)

MAPS, MESA and the MLC coordinate support for math students at all levels, including the educationally disadvantaged, those needing remediation and other students with specific needs in the area of mathematics. The MLC provides effective tutoring services, resource support, computer aided instruction and a place for these students to study. (II.C.b)

The Library is a welcoming, clean and comfortable facility providing a wide variety of resources to the college community. Library faculty and classified staff are available to assist students. Individual study space, group study rooms, an open computer lab and a lounge compliment a robust book, periodical and non print collection. Collections also include e-books and on line journals accessible through the library home page, which also provides a wealth of instructional support material. Materials selection is done by qualified librarians and based on faculty recommendations and analysis of curricular changes and needs. Agreements are in place for faculty and students to easily obtain materials from other local libraries through the LINK+ consortium. The Asian American Collection and speakers program and the e-book collection were funded from grants, alleviating documented materials budget deficiencies. Despite budget reductions and uncertainty of funding for essential services such as evening and weekend hours. The library maintains consistent hours and services to the college community. In response to the information competency requirement, librarians developed a course Lib 010, which meets the information competency graduation requirement. Appropriate student learning outcomes have been developed for this class and an assessment model is under development. (II.C.2)

The LATC provides tutoring, study space and support materials and formal courses to assist students. Since the self study was written, on line tutoring through the Angel course management system has been expanded from Accounting to include Biology, Chemistry, Philosophy and Physics. A similar on line tutoring program for Nursing is under consideration. In addition the outdated and non functional computers and other equipment have been replaced. Budget concerns remain an issue as the cuts from the last budget crisis have not been restored to the base budget and staff are often unsure of how much money will be available from special allocations. (II.C.II.C.1, II.C.1.b)

The TAV staff work effectively to provide a wide variety of services which effectively support student learning. (II.C.II.C.1, II.C.1.b)

Conclusions:

The above mentioned areas for Standard IIC substantially meet the accreditation standards and are continuing in the process of self-evaluation and continuous improvement.

Refer to Recommendation 1 in Standard I. (I.A.1, I.A.7, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, II.A.2e, II.C.2, III.C.2, IV.B.2.a)

Refer to Recommendation 3 in Standard I. (I.B.2, I.B.5, I.B.7, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.3.6, II.B, III.A.1.c, III.A.6, III.B.1)

Refer to Recommendation 4 in Standard I (I.B.3, IB.6, II.A.1.a, II.A.2.g, II.B.3, III.C.1, IV.B.2.b, IV.B.3.b)

Refer to Recommendation 6 in Standard II. (III.A.4, III.A.4.b)

Recommendation 6: 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 II; Standard III.A.4) (II.A.1.a, II.A.4, III.A.4.a, III.A.4.b)

Recommendation 7: 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. (III.A.2, III.A.6, IV.A.1, IV.B.2.a, IV.B.2., IV.B.2.a, IV.B.2.c)

Recommendation 8: 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. (IIIA.3.a, III.A.4.a, III.A.5, III.A.5.a, III.A.5.b, IV.A.2.a)

STANDARD III: RESOURCES

A. Human Resources

General Observations:

Human Resources process management is designated as a district function that includes recruitment, qualification, and orientation of faculty and staff. Evaluation processes are definite district-wide, while implementation is local. The faculty is represented by ACE and the classified staff by SEIU. The district and college work through a Faculty and Staff Diversity

Advisory Committee (FSDAC) to ensure policies and procedures are in place to meet the mission.

Faculty and classified staff selection and evaluation processes are documented in respective manuals (2006) and in the collective bargaining agreements. The current faculty prioritization process calls for the division chairs and the academic senate to jointly rank recommendations; the classified staff prioritization process is conducted in CBAC. Both processes are collaborative and participatory, both in the initial request phase (college-wide) and in committees. (III.A.1, III.1.a, III.A.b)

The district and college collaborate on employee professional development, including orientation and training. There is a leadership academy being piloted by the district after surveys indicated a need. There is substantial evidence of participation of employees in all categories. Faculty has baseline professional development opportunities, including a faculty member with 20 percent reassigned time for professional development coordination, and a FLEX calendar. There is a 3-year Staff Development Plan validated by the academic senate. (III.A.5)

Findings and Evidence:

Staff diversity planning and student equity planning was a recommendation (Recommendation 2) made by the 2001 visiting team. Only the student equity portion of the recommendation has been met. The district does not have an EEO plan, and the planning process has stalled.

In terms of institutional planning, neither the faculty nor the classified prioritization process is formally connected to the Education and Facilities Master Plan (EFMP) process, or formally and directly linked to unit or program plans. Initial requests are surfaced through individual submissions; it is unclear what program data and analyses are used in shaping those recommendations. This lack of connection might be addressed with the Program Master Plan process (PMP – unit planning). Although the PMP is not yet implemented, there is evidence that the templates and process are developed and ready to launch. (III.A.6)

The Self Study expressed concerns of employee evaluations not being timely in all cases. While a full round of administrator evaluations was completed, some classified and faculty evaluations are still incomplete. There is an inconsistent offering of staff development opportunities for classified staff. The district-run Leadership Academy is extensive, and may provide one viable venue to serve this purpose. There is no campus-based, ongoing initiative to serve this category of employees.

There is evidence that student learning outcomes are being addressed by appropriate personnel. Outcomes are produced at the program level, in the basic skills courses, and in a small, but growing number of courses within other disciplines. (III.A.1.c)

There is a sense of confusion and frustration expressed about the hiring processes and the amount of time it takes to complete a recruitment and hiring cycle. This concern was expressed both in the Self Study, and in team visit campus meetings. The district has recently revised

hiring guidelines and manuals in response to prior concerns. However, the existence of these documents is not well communicated, and there is no evidence that they are making a difference in facilitating a more efficient hiring process.

There is an ongoing concern regarding the high administrative turnover at the college. Further, there are concerns regarding the organizational structure and an appropriate span of control under the Vice President of Instruction. There is evidence that the college is strained in its ability to provide the administrative services necessary to support the institution's mission and purpose.

Conclusions:

The Standard has essentially been met. Further improvements can be made in the areas of district-college communication on hiring processes, the faculty and staff diversity plan, campus-based staff development for classified staff, linkage of unit planning to human resource allocation, and the organizational structure in the area of Instruction.

Recommendations:

> **Refer to Recommendation 7 above**. (III.A.2, III.A.6, IV.A.1, IV.B.2.a, IV.B.2., IV.B.2.a, IV.B.2.c)

B. Physical Resources

General Observations:

The college is to be commended for its well maintained, safe, and well-equipped campus facilities that promote a positive learning environment. Mission College recently completed their Educational and Facilities Master Plan (EFMP) which was developed through a collaborative process and will serve as a road map as it proceeds with facilities projects for many years to come. Additionally, with the passage of the District's $235 million bond measure, Mission College will receive $97 million restricted for the purposes of technology upgrades, classroom upgrades, safety and accessibility improvements, and construction of new facilities.

Findings and Evidence:

Mission College's facilities are outstanding. The institution provides a safe, accessible, well-maintained environment that supports student learning. With the passage of the District's bond measure, Mission is scheduled to receive $97 million for technology, safety, ADA access, and new construction. Further, administration is seeking an additional $74.7 million in proposed state funding to leverage the bond funds. The campus facilities are maintained properly, and there is evidence that the institution has plans in place for maintenance of its equipment and facilities.

Mission recently went through a very inclusive and collaborative process for the purposes of creating an EFMP. This plan will now and in the future serve as the campus' working road map as it undertakes prioritized facilities projects. Physical resource evaluation and planning will need to continue to be a high priority in the future because of escalating financial costs involved with constructing and maintaining campus facilities. (III.B.2.a, III.B.2.b)

C. Technology Resources

General Observations:

Information technology function is shared between the college and the district. The district, under the direction of a District Information Systems director, oversees information systems (IS) infrastructure, district-wide MIS (Datatel), email, and administrative computer hardware distribution and maintenance. (III.C.1)

The college, under the direction of the Dean of Information Technology (ITS), oversees the planning and implementation of instructional technology and services, along with a range of operational support on campus for instructional delivery. Support services include local network systems for workstations/servers in open and classroom labs; web services, MIS campus support, the course management system ANGEL and associated training, and audio-video 2services. (IIIC.1) Both the district and Mission College systems have security and redundancy measures in place, and there are disaster recovery provisions.

District IS is supported by a combination of operational and fixed costs allocations. The college IT budget includes personnel, maintenance and operations, and equipment acquisition and refresh. College budget sources are a combination of general funds, one-time state allocations, and consistent grants from the Land Corporation. (III.C.1.c)

District planning resides with the District Information Systems Planning Advisory Committee (DISPAC), with memberships from the district's two colleges, and chaired by the chief technology officer. A new District Technology Plan is being developed, with completion expected in Fall 2008. There is a District Operations Committee comprised of instructional technology specialists and users from both district colleges; the committee addresses user and MIS programming issues.

Campus IT planning resides with the Technology Subcommittee of the Academic Senate, supported by the Dean of Information Technology. A draft three-year Technology Master Plan is substantially complete. There is provision in the plan for instructional technology maintenance and refresh, training, and support. (III.C.1.c)

Findings and Evidence:

There is a clearly defined set of responsibilities for district ID and college ITS, and evidence of collaboration to leverage physical and human resources. However, the college community has

little understanding in regard to how priorities are set for IT funding at the district, and how IT "fixed cost" funding interacts with the college's IT budget. The team suggests the college develop and implement a plan to educate the college community more on the interaction between district Information Systems and college Information Technology Services in terms of budget and planning priorities. (IIIC.1, IIIC.1.d, 3C.2)

There is scant evidence that the campus technology funding requests are directly linked to the planning process (EFMP and the yet untried PMP). The requests come from individuals and are eventually funneled to the Budget Advisory Committee (CBAC), the Technology Subcommittee, then circles back to CBAC again. The prioritization process in CBAC uses a funding rubric, including BTI (big ticket items), operations, and strategic directions. It is unclear where and how the strategic directions are determined or documented, and if they change over time, and how. While the current process is participatory and collaborative, the formal linkages from the EFMP (strategic planning), to the Program Master Plan (unit planning), to the prioritization of technology requests (resource allocation) are not clearly shown and documented. (III.C.2)

The Self Study identified two concerns in information technology. The first is the heavy reliance on one-time state funding for fulfilling instructional technology requests and the implementation of TCO (Total Cost of Ownership). The team suggests the college identify and implement funding strategies to ensure adequate support for growing technology demand and that TCO plans are implemented to ensure currency though technology refresh. Nonetheless, IS and ITS have adequately met the needs of instruction as well as new initiatives such as Distance Learning.

The second concern is the lack of a long term plan for IT training at the district and at the college. There is some evidence of training for IS staff at the district to maintain currency, and district sponsored MIS training for campus users. There is also evidence of ongoing faculty training conducted by instructional designer, who is part of the ITS staff. The college will benefit from the new Technology Plan (to be completed in Fall 2008) that includes (1) a direct link, by programmatic needs and planning processes, between funding requests for technology and institutional planning, and (2) a long-term plan for assessing and meeting IT staff professional development needs and end-user training needs. (III.C.1.b)

Conclusions:

Most portions of this Standard have been met. Instructional programs and student learning are adequately supported by technology. In addition to the self-identified concerns above, further improvements can be made in the areas of district-college communication of planning and budget priorities, and the linking of funding to planning.

Recommendations: None.

D. Financial Resources

General Observations:

State General Apportionment and local property taxes are the primary source of revenue for the District and College. Due to the declines in enrollments over the last four consecutive fiscal years, the state of California's current fiscal condition, and because of the Hours-by-Arrangement audit and conclusion, concern does exist regarding the financial health of the college as well as the district. The District is in the process of developing a multi-faceted strategic approach to returning the institution to a stable financial condition by the end of fiscal year 2009.

Findings and Evidence:

Upon analysis of the financial statements and budgetary documents, it is apparent that the college and District had been in an environment of declining enrollments. Over the course of the last four consecutive years as a District, Full Time Equivalent Students have declined approximately 12 percent. Additionally, the District has adopted a $4.1 million deficit budget and more likely than not will receive an on-going base credit FTES reduction by some 2,000. It is believed that this base credit FTES reduction will translate into an ongoing General Apportionment reduction of approximately $9 million.

Given all this, the District is fortunate that the current fund balance is $17.3 million. The District and college have both one-time and on-going options that they are discussing to address this ongoing budget shortfall. In response to the deterioration in financial condition, the District and College's management and Board of Trustees are evaluating alternatives that will both increase revenues and reduce expenditures that may possibly include abolishing or leaving vacant existing and new employee positions, cutting ongoing discretionary budgets, and capping retiree health benefit costs.

Despite Mission College's current fiscal state, there are sufficient financial resources to support the goals and mission of the college. Current enrollment projections indicate that the college and District are showing signs of increasing FTES as of December 31, 2007 and new marketing and outreach efforts are being funded and implemented. At this time, appropriate measures are being taken to assure sufficient resources continue to exist to continue to provide the level of services that are currently provided to students.

Mission College is to be commended for its level of collaboration and inclusion in the budget development and allocation process. All faculty and staff have the opportunity to participate either individually or through their respective constituent group. The College has successfully completed a process in which individual departments/units completed a program review-like process and the results fed into a college-wide comprehensive (EFMP). Although this plan is in existence there does not appear to be a clear link to budget and resource allocation.

The budget and resource allocation model employed at Mission College is a two pronged approach. First, all new discretionary funds and vacant classified and administrative positions are allocated based on a rigid formulaic model by the College Budget Advisory Committee (CBAC) that is comprised of four key components. They are big ticket items (30 percent),

Strategic Direction (17.5 percent) Program Maintenance (42 percent) and Facilities Modification (10.5 percent). The actual funding requests funnel up from the departmental level up to the Vice Presidents who, if they approve of the funding request, move it forward to the CBAC. The CBAC then classifies all requests according to the categories contained in the model and prioritizes them. Once this process is complete, the recommendations are jointly reviewed by CBAC and GAP and final recommendations are then forwarded.

The second part of the college's budget and resource allocation model includes vacant faculty positions. The filling of these positions involves the Vice President of Instruction working with the Student Services Council and Division Chair Council. Working in collaboration with these two bodies, the college prioritizes vacant positions based on various factors including continuity of programs, size of programs, and student enrollment. Recommendations for faculty positions are reviewed by GAP; GAP recommends to the president, who makes the final decision about which positions are funded first. When funding is allocated down from the District the highest prioritized positions are filled and the remaining positions left vacant. This budget and resource allocation model does not have a clear link to the EFMP and program review. (III.D.1.a)

Conclusions:

Financially, Mission and the District currently are in a state of financial instability. Primarily because of the decrease in enrollment, when comparing the four most recent fiscal years completed, revenue has increased approximately 26 percent while expenditures have increased by 29 percent. As equally important, the District has adopted a current year deficit budget of $4.1 million and is expecting an on-going reduction in the operating budget of some $9 million. This trend of declining enrollments cannot continue if the institution is expected to meet the student and community needs and provide an environment that supports learning programs and services. Although management has identified alternatives to put the District and Mission on the right track to stability, the institution must act quickly and take decisive measures.

Even with the creation and implementation of the college's EFMP, the resource and budget allocation model is not clearly tied to a program review and evaluation process for both instructional and non-instructional programs. This appears to be a continuing recommendation dating back to at least 2001.

Recommendations:

> **Refer to Recommendation 1 in Standard I.** (I.A.1, I.A.7, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, II.A.2e, II.C.2, III.C.2, IV.B.2.a)
>
> **Recommendation 9:** 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. (III.D.1.b, III.D.1.c, III.D.1.d, III.2.a, III.2.d, III.D.2, III. D.2.d, III.D.2.e, IV.A.4, IV.A.5)

`

STANDARD IV: LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE

A. DECISION-MAKING ROLES AND PROCESSES

General Observations:

Since the previous visiting team's report, Mission College has faced significant challenges in governance. One major issue was a contentious "work to contract" period in 2006-07, when faculty and staff participation in governance committees was halted; a second issue has been severe administrative turnover. These problems have severely compromised the college's ability to address pressing issues, including the recommendations of the previous visiting team. (IV.A.3)

Although Mission College faculty and staff are proud of their strong tradition of participatory governance, there appears to be a lack of clarity regarding participatory governance roles and structures. The college is aware of this problem and has made some progress, but the college appears to be in only the early stage of clarifying and documenting its processes. The college also needs to find ways to improve support for classified staff participation in governance. There are also a variety of concerns relating to the relationship of Mission College to the District, and the role of the Board of Trustees. (IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a)

The governance issues cited above have resulted in a serious lack of progress in key areas. Despite previous recommendations, the college has not instituted regular curriculum review, nor fully implemented program review processes for instructional and non-instructional programs. (IV.A.4)

Since the publication of the 2007 Self Study, the college President has proposed a significant reorganization, in particular of the Instructional division. (IV.B.2, IV.B.2.a)

Findings and Evidence:

Administrative turnover at Mission College has been unusually high. The Self Study reports that during "the 7 years of this accreditation cycle, Mission College has had 5 presidents, 5 Vice Presidents of Instruction, and 4 Vice Presidents of Student Services" (p. 290). The current Vice President of Instruction is interim, and the president is required to spend much of her time on instructional issues. The reason for this high level of turnover is unclear. The 2001 Self Study included a planning agenda to study the presidential turnover rate (Standard 10, planning agenda 4), but the 2007 Self Study reports that no such study has been conducted (p. 356). A variety of factors have been cited by college personnel as a possible cause for this turnover, including personal factors; conflicts with the Chancellor and Board; an overly flat organization structure which places excessive demands on administrators; and Mission College's perceived status as a less prestigious "stepsister" to West Valley. The 2007 Self Study includes a new planning agenda to study administrative turnover.

The frequent turnover in key positions and the large number of vacancies and interim hires has

severely hampered the college's ability to address vital institutional issues, and carry out day-to-day operations. This has resulted in what the president refers to in her reorganization proposal as "systems failures," including the recent issues arising from inappropriate FTES claimed for "hours by arrangement." Resolving these issues has required significant investment of time that could otherwise be spent on institutional improvement and student success.

Harriett Robles assumed the presidency of Mission College in 2007 after three years as Vice President of Instruction. She is generally well regarded by faculty and staff, most of whom report that she has brought an increased sense of stability to the college. (IV.B.2, IV.B.2.a, IV.B. 2.c, IV.B.2.d, IV.B.2.d, IV.B.2.e)

As noted in Recommendation 8 of the 2001 visiting team and Recommendation 7 in the current Self Study, the current organizational structure may not be optimal for the college. In March 2008, the president issued a reorganization proposal which aims to produce a more holistic, decentralized structure which is less vulnerable to vacancies in individual positions. A primary feature of the proposal is the assignment of deans to specific instructional divisions, resulting in a reduction in the duties and reassigned time for faculty department chairs except in departments where program integrity would be compromised. Although faculty and staff have indicated concerns about specific aspects of the proposal, most agree that the proposal appears to be moving through the college's governance processes in an appropriate way. (IV.B.2, IV.B.2.a, IV.B. 2.c, IV.B.2.d, IV.B.2.d, IV.B.2.e)

Mission College uses the term "participatory governance" to describe the involvement of all college constituencies in planning and policy-making processes. This process has been severely tested in recent years, in particular during a "work to contract" period in 2006, when faculty and staff participation on governance committees was essentially halted. Although much of the conflict centered on negotiation issues, there were severe morale issues dating to dismissal notices issued to faculty in 2003 when a budget deficit was predicted (but ultimately did not materialize). The college senates also expressed serious concerns about the Chancellor and Board's respect for participatory governance processes. This period had severe negative repercussions on the college's ability to address vital issues. The 2006 reports of both the Technical Assistance Visit and the visit by the Fiscal Crisis & Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) indicate a lack of clear understanding by the Board and Senates of their relative roles in governance. There is evidence that many of the specific concerns leading to the "work to contract" period have been addressed and most faculty and staff report that the climate has improved, although some issues remain. (IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a)

There are also questions regarding college governance structures. The Self Study reports that there has been no systematic review or documentation of participatory governance structures since the late 1990s, and there is not a consistently shared understanding of their interrelationships and function, especially those existing between the college and District. (IV.A.5)

The Governance and Planning Committee (GAP) is identified as "the college's highest participatory governance body," but its role is not clearly defined. The Self Study reports that GAP's role and responsibilities changed over the past seven years with changes in college

administration. GAP began a discussion of its role in participatory governance in Fall 2007. This has led to a broader initiative by the Academic Senate to begin a general review of the college's participatory governance structures. At the time of this report, the committee has been formed and is planning to meet later this semester. The Self Study also includes a planning agenda to update the college's participatory governance model. (IV.A.2.a, IV.5)

The college does appear to have a collegial culture which allows for college constituents to come together to confront crises or meet critical deadlines. For example, in Spring 2007 the Academic Senate organized a series of college forums to receive input for the development of the Educational Facilities Master Plan. A similarly broad discussion was conducted when developing proposals to replace the college's Main Building. However, such ad hoc discussions are not a substitute for a culture of systematic, ongoing evaluation and planning. (IV.A.2b, IV.A.3)

The Self Study survey and interviews with faculty indicate that the faculty and Academic Senate have a substantial voice in college governance. However responses to similar questions about the staff and Classified Senate were less strong. In interviews, classified staff indicate that there is general support from the college for their involvement in governance activities, but participation is limited by two main factors. The major issue for staff is of the college's inability to provide backfill for time missed while participating in participatory governance activities, requiring them to work late or come in on weekends to catch up on duties not completed. A second issue identified by staff is insufficient understanding of participatory governance and their role in it, or a lack of adequate information on the opportunities available. Many staff indicated that staff development activities designed to increase leadership skills would increase their comfort in participatory governance committees. Two planning agendas from the 2001 Self Study (Standard 10, Planning Agenda items 9 and 10) were also intended to address this concern. The District Leadership Academy was initially established at least in part as a venue for such training, but to date it does not appear to have been utilized for this purpose. (IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a)

Problems in student participation in committees were also cited. Student leaders indicate that student participation is encouraged, but it is difficult to find enough volunteers. A likely factor is the large percentage of evening commuter students at Mission. (IV.A2.b, IV.A.3)

B. Board and Administrative Organization

Mission College is one of two colleges in the West Valley-Mission Community College District, governed by a seven-member elected board. Most of the District offices and operations are located at West Valley College, which is located ten miles away from Mission College.

The Self Study reported significant dissatisfaction at Mission College regarding District operations and the Board. In the fall 2007 Self Study survey of the college community, nearly two-thirds of respondents disagreed with the statement "the governing board provides the support to effectively manage the District." Survey responses were generally negative on questions relating to Board and District leadership and support, compared to questions relating to college leadership. The reports from the 2006 Technical Assistance and FCMAT visits reported

concerns about excessive length of Board meetings, negative comments directed at staff by trustees, and perceptions of micromanagement. (IV.A.2.b, IV.B.1.j, IV.B.3, IV.B.3a)

Interviews with personnel on campus indicate that these concerns have lessened substantially since 2006, but have not been entirely resolved. Interviews with Board members indicate that they are sometimes unsure when Board decisions might cross the line from establishing policy and be perceived as micromanagement. There still appears to a need for substantial dialog between college constituents and Board members about the appropriate role of the Board in governance. (IV.B.3, IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.f)

Faculty and staff also indicated a variety of communication issues with the Board. Many feel that Board members are inaccessible. As a result, they feel that the Board does not receive the information they need to make informed decisions about the district and the college. There is also a perceived lack of transparency in Board discussions and decisions due to sparse detail in written Board minutes and the limited distribution of Board meeting packets. Similar concerns are mentioned in the Self Study. The chancellor and Board have indicated they are in the process of instituting a software system called "Board Docs" to allow greater public access to Board packets. There have been discussions about video streaming of Board meetings, but this has not yet been implemented. (IV.B.3.f, IV.B.3.g)

There are also significant concerns relating to Mission College's interaction with the District. Mission College is often perceived as a "poor stepsister" to West Valley, in part because West Valley is older and larger, and in part because District operations are located at West Valley. Many faculty and staff feel that the Chancellor does not communicate effectively with the Mission College community. The 2001 Self Study included a planning agenda to investigate a possibility of relocating the District offices (Standard 10, Planning Agenda item 13). There have been some discussions about this topic, but there is no evidence of any resolution of this issue. (IV.B.3.c, IV.B.3.f, IV.B.3.g)

There is support for a re-examination of the current District budget allocation model and the percentage of monies allocated to the District office. Although the Board of Trustees have also identified the need for a new budget allocation model, the Self Study reports that progress has been slow. This has been identified as a planning agenda in the Self Study (planning agenda 4.3). (IV.B.3.c, IV.B.3.d)

Another concern relates to institutional research. The Self Study indicates that the college's research and planning capacity has been compromised by perceived lack of support for institutional research at District. In Fall 2007, the chancellor indicated his intent to establish a District Office of Research, Planning and Advancement. However, the details of how this position would coordinate with college research at Mission College have yet to be worked out. (IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3.c)

Conclusions:

Severe administrative turnover and issues relating to participatory governance have severely hampered college progress in vital areas including program review and institutional planning.

Mission College has a long and well-established tradition of participatory governance, but recognizes that its governance structures and roles need to be better defined and clarified. Opportunities should be provide for increased and more effective participation by classified staff.

Although there has been significant improvement since the contentious "work to contract" period of 2006, serious concerns remain relating to Board roles, and the communication and relationship between the Chancellor and District office and the college.

The president's recently proposed administrative reorganization attempts to improve the college's problematic organizational structure. Because it would alter established roles of faculty and administration members, the development and implementation of this proposal will test participatory governance structures at the college. However, issues of administrative structure and governance roles must be resolved if the college is to address the serious challenges it faces.

Recommendations:

Refer to Recommendation 1 in Standard I. (IA.1, IB.3, IA.7,IB.4, IB.6, II.A.2e, II.C.2, III.C.2, IVB.2.a)

Refer to Recommendation 4 in Standard I. (I.B.3, IB.6, II.A.1.a, II.A.2.g, II.B.3, III.C.1, IV.B.2.b, IV.B.3.b)

Refer to Recommendation 7 in Standard III. (III.A.2, III.A.6, IV.A.1, IV.B.2.a, IV.B.2., IV.B.2.a, IV.B.2.c)

Refer to Recommendation 8 in Standard III. (IIIA.3.a, III.A.4.a, III.A.5, III.A.5.a, III.A.5.b, IV.A.2.a)

Recommendation 10: 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. (IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a)

District Recommendation 11: 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. (IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.3, IV.B.1)

District Recommendation 12: 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. (IV.B.1, Iv.B.1.c, IV.B.2., IV.B.4)

District Recommendation: Refer to Recommendation 9 in Standard III. (III.D.1.b, III.D.1.c, III.D.1.d, III.2.a, III.2.d, III.D.2, III. D.2.d, III.D.2.e, IV.A.4, IV.A.5)