Mission College First Progress Report

Mission College

3000 Mission College Boulevard

Santa Clara, CA 95054

First Progress Report

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

March 1, 2009

Table of Contents

STATEMENT OF FIRST REPORT PREPARATION

This report was prepared under the direction of Dr. Norma Ambriz-Galaviz, the Accreditation Liaison Officer and Vice-President of Instruction of Mission College.

The Accreditation Steering Committee, comprised of faculty, staff, administration, and students on the college Governance and Planning (GAP) Council, was charged with assessing the progress made on each of the Accrediting Commission's recommendations from the 2008 visit and developing the responses that are included in the progress report. During the fall of 2008, the Governance and Planning Council, along with the Faculty Senate and the President's Council, established the process for addressing the accreditation recommendations. To address Recommendations 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, and 12, which comprise the First Progress Report, the steering committee was assisted by the Vice-President of Instruction, the Vice-President of Administrative Services, the Vice-President of Student Services, and the Faculty Academic Senate. A draft of the report was disseminated to the College community for review by all shared governance groups in January 2009. Comments and additions were reviewed by the steering committee and incorporated in the final draft of the first progress report. The final draft was reviewed and approved by the Academic Senate on Thursday, February 5, 2009, and by the Governance and Planning Council on Wednesday, February 11, 2009. It was then forwarded to the Chancellor.

This report was reviewed by the West Valley-Mission Community College District Board of Trustees on February 19, 2009.

_____ _____

Dr. Harriett J. Robles **Date**
President, Mission College

Response to Team Recommendations and Accrediting Commission Letter

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)*

SUMMARY OF ACTION

Mission College has implemented systematic and continuous program review and planning processes that are linked to resource/budget allocation. The College has established a schedule for continuous program review, completed the program review process for all program areas, and linked program review to a regular update of the Educational and Facilities Master Plan as well as resource and budget allocation.

Establishing a Program Review Schedule

In September 2008, the Academic Senate and the Governance and Planning Council approved a four-year rotation for program review (1, 2). In order to provide a common baseline for all programs and departments, all program areas have completed the program review process in 2008-2009 (3). In 2009-2010, all programs will be required to complete an annual update. The regular cycle of four-year rotations will begin in the academic year 2010-2011. This rotation requires a full review of all program areas every four years (two years for vocational programs) with an annual update in the intervening years.

As part of the process, programs and offices undergoing program review are required to provide or review information in four primary areas (4):

1. Program data (enrollment or service information and resource expenditure and usage)
2. Short-term and long-term program goals with timelines for completion (tied to District and College goals and based on internal and external program-related data)
3. Progress on assessment plans and outcomes statements for student learning programs, student service programs, and administrative offices.
4. Resources needed to meet stated program goals

Completion of Program Reviews

Ninety-seven departments, offices, and program areas submitted first drafts of program reviews in late October 2008. During the following month, nine college planning and governance groups critiqued the submitted reviews by completing an evaluation rubric and feedback form on each program (5). This critique was conducted in order to ensure that the information provided was deemed sufficient for resource allocation groups to make determinations regarding resource allocation and to ensure programs were engaged in productive self-evaluation and data-based, collaborative program planning.

During the month of December 2008, programs were given the opportunity to make changes based on the feedback from the planning and governance groups. The revised reviews were forwarded to the highest participatory governance group at the college, the Governance and Planning Council (GAP), chaired by the College President. This group conducted the final review of the forms in January and February 2009 utilizing a rubric for approval (6). Programs that did not reach approval, or that were given conditional approval, were required to further revise their program review. The approval was based on the GAP's assessment as to whether a program had developed appropriate goals based on data and college and district goals, was requesting the appropriate resources required to complete those goals and had completed written outcomes and assessment statements and plans for all courses and services.

Linkage to Resource Allocation

Programs with approved program reviews became eligible for consideration for resource allocation requests in the spring resource allocation process conducted by the College Budget and Advisory Committee, which makes recommendations to the Governance and Planning Council. The Council, in turn, makes recommendations to the President.

As part of its newly revised integrated budget and planning process, the College is phasing out rollover budgeting. In the first year of the new budget allocation process, beginning spring 2009, each program will be allotted 75% of the total operating resources which it was allocated in spring 2008 for the 2008-2009 school year. All remaining funds will be set aside for distribution through a request and evaluation process conducted by the College Budget Advisory Committee (CBAC). This process commences in March 2009 in accordance with the approved allocation timeline (7). Programs wishing to request funds - above their 75% allotment will need to complete a request form and the requests will be evaluated using a rubric containing the following criteria:

1. Funding request was identified in Program Review
2. Number of students served and efficiency ratio
3. Impact on positive enrollment and/or retention
4. Health, safety, and legal considerations
5. Link to District and College planning goals and the Educational and Facilities Master Plan
6. Overall strength of justification for request

GAP has determined that the recommendations of the Educational and Facilities Master Plan, along with the mission and values statements, will be reviewed each spring following the completion of the program review process (8). In this way the primary educational planning document will reflect the most current information and will be revised prior to the start of each new academic year.

The college has scheduled a complete evaluation of this most recent program review process in February 2009 and will continue to revise and improve the process as needed. As noted above, the college has begun to move away from roll-over budgeting and has established a goal for 100% of all program operating funds to be evaluated by the budget committee on an annual basis. GAP has approved creation of a master planning calendar for coordination of all major planning activities to better inform the college of all review, planning, and allocation processes (9). The master planning calendar was adopted by GAP on January 28, 2009 (10).

EVIDENCE

1. Academic Senate Meeting Minutes, 09/18/08, 09/25/08 MCAS minutes
2. Governance and Planning Council minutes, 09/24/08
3. Program Review Committee minutes
4. Program Review/Program Master Planning process documents and forms
5. Program Review Feedback Forms
6. Program Review Evaluation Rubric for GAP
7. Mission College Budget Allocation Model 2009
8. Governance and Planning Council minutes, 10/01/08
9. Governance and Planning Council minutes, 11/05/08
10. Governance and Planning Council minutes, 01/28/09

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

SUMMARY OF ACTION

Mission College has established and implemented a schedule for systematically reviewing its mission and values statements.

The college has met this recommendation by designating the Governance and Planning (GAP) Council as the group to systematically review the college's mission and values statements on an annual basis. GAP serves as the overall coordinating and planning body in the college's governance structure and includes representation from all constituents. Through GAP, the college has developed and approved creation of an annual master planning calendar for all major planning activities, including the mission and values statements (1). The mission and values statements will be reviewed following completion of Program Review no later than May 1.

The mission and values statements were most recently updated during Mission College's update of the Educational Master Plan, in the fall of 2007. Through a participatory process, the college's mission statement was revised and unanimously approved by the Governance and Planning (GAP) Council on July 11, 2007 (2). The District's Governing Board reviewed and accepted the revised mission statement on September 6, 2007 (3). The updated mission and values statements were affirmed through inclusion in the college's Educational and Facilities 99% Draft dated August 28, 2008 (4, 5). The mission and values statements will next be reviewed in spring 2009 and annually thereafter.

<u>EVIDENCE</u>

1. Governance and Planning Council Meeting Minutes, 10/1/08, 11/05/08
2. Governance and Planning Council Summary Notes, 07-11-07
3. WVMCCD Board of Trustees Agenda, 09-06-07
4. Mission College Educational and Facilities Master Plan- 99% Draft
5. Mission College Facilities Master Plan – Educational Component–Draft Fall 2007

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)*

SUMMARY OF ACTION

The College has reviewed and completed its planning agendas from 2001. It has completed or initiated all planning agenda items from 2007.

In response to Recommendation #5, the administrative leadership team, along with the shared governance bodies of Mission College, designed a plan to reassess and complete a grand total of 130 planning agenda items from the prior visits (1). There were 85 from 2001 and 45 from 2007. The process began in July 2008 with the college president and the three vice presidents assuming administrative responsibility for specific planning agenda items. As a consequence, a master list of all planning agenda items was developed which displayed the planning agenda number, description, assigned owner or governance group, progress details and executive administrative assignment (2).

The College Governance and Planning (GAP) Council, which serves as the College's Accreditation Steering Committee, assumed institutional leadership for monitoring and assessing the progress of the planning agenda items. The Office of Institutional Research provided a template for groups to use in reporting progress updates for their planning agenda items. The template, called Action Plan Overview (3), identified the specific objectives for the planning agenda item, measures, due dates, assignments and current status of activity. Each planning agenda item was assigned to a specific faculty or staff member to conduct the necessary activities to complete the agenda item and report on the item's progress to the designated Vice President. Many of the planning agenda items were completed by committee members from the various governance groups on campus, for example the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Student Services Council, President's Council, Curriculum Review Committee, College Budget Advisory Committee, and the Division Chair Council.

GAP elected to have the four executive administrators regularly report on each assigned planning agenda and assess their progress in terms of percentage toward completion of the agenda item, for example: 100% equaled *completed,* 75% was termed *near completion*, 50% was *underway,* 25% was categorized as *stalled* and 0% was *no work on planning agenda* item. The reporting dates were September 24, October 8, October 22, November 19, and concluded with final reports on December 3, 2008 (4).

On December 3, 2008, GAP received the final update on the completion status for the planning agenda items. All of the planning agenda items for 2001 had been completed.

The planning agenda items from 2007 that could be completed within a year were completed and those that required more time to implement were designated as *in-progress (5)*. A final matrix was developed for all the 2001 and 2007 planning agenda items (6) and is appended to this report.

EVIDENCE

1. Planning agenda items from Mission College's 2001 and 2007 self- studies
2. Master Listing of all planning agenda items with designated assignments
3. Accreditation Self-Study Planning Agenda Action Plan Overview
4. College Governance and Planning Council meeting minutes from July 23, 2008 to January 28, 2009.
5. Progress Summary on Planning Agenda Items from each executive administrator Final
6. Final Matrix for all Planning Agenda Items for 2001 and 2007 , Inside Mission, Accreditation, Accreditation Planning Agenda Matrix for years 2001 and 2007

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.A1.a, II.A.4, III.A.4.a, III.A.4.b)*

SUMMARY OF ACTION

The College has continued the development, implementation, and assessment of the results of its recruitment, retention and success plan for underrepresented faculty, staff and students. It is submitting its completed plan (Appendix II) for the Commission's review with this report.

The District reconvened the Diversity Advisory Council (formerly the Faculty and Staff Diversity Advisory Committee) in November 2006 (1) as the lead body for recommendations regarding faculty/staff diversity and equal employment opportunity. The Council continued to work on a District adoption of the State Chancellor's Office model Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Plan in spring 2008 (2). In summer 2008, a Mission College Task Force (3) began meeting to complete the draft of the Mission College Staff/Faculty Diversity Plan. The District EEO Plan (4) is included as a fundamental element of the Mission College Staff/Faculty Diversity Plan (5). Drafts of the Mission College Staff/Faculty Diversity Plan and the District EEO Plan were submitted for approval to the Academic and Classified Senates in December 2008. The Mission College Staff/Faculty Diversity Plan was adopted by the Governance and Planning (GAP) Council in January 2009. As part of the revised plan, a Mission College Diversity Committee (6) has been formed for spring 2009 to guide implementation, oversight and ongoing review of the Mission College Staff/Faculty Diversity Plan. The committee charge was approved by the Academic Senate (7) in December 2008 and GAP in January 2009. The District Equal Employment Opportunity Plan (EEO) was placed on the Board of Trustees agenda for a first reading on January 15, 2008 and was considered for final approval on February 5, 2009. Copies of the final Mission College Staff/Faculty Diversity Plan are kept in the President's Office, Office of Instruction, Human Resources Office, and the College Archives (Library).

In spring 2005, the college completed its Student Equity Plan (8), which identified on-going campus interventions, specified goals, and established a schedule for evaluation and implementation. Following an analysis of key indicators, goals were developed to address specific needs in access, retention, and success among underrepresented and underserved student populations. A progress report of indicators (9) was evaluated by the Student Equity Committee in spring 2007, and the Committee released an Update (10) for 2007-2008 which outlined contributing factors, summaries of progress,

implementation of plan activities, and additional activities and recommendations for each of the Student Equity Plan goals. Activities of the plan are guided by the Student Equity Committee (11), and include participants in the Title V Grant, Matriculation Advisory Committee, and Academic Senate, among others. The committee is scheduled to complete its annual review in spring 2009. The annual review cycle for the Student Equity Plan is incorporated into the college's master planning calendar. The Student Equity Plan and Update are available to the college community on the Inside Mission website.

EVIDENCE

1. Diversity Advisory Council Announcement (Email November 2006)
2. Diversity Advisory Council Meeting Minutes (4/15/08, 3/25/08, 12/17/07, 11/26/07, 10/29/07)
3. Diversity Advisory Council Mission College Task Force Meeting Notes (8/13/08, 8/19/08, 9/30/08)
4. Mission College Staff/Faculty Diversity Plan
5. West Valley Mission Community College District Equal Employment Opportunity Plan
6. Mission College Diversity Committee Proposal
7. Academic Senate Meeting Minutes (12/18/08)
8. Student Equity Plan, 2005
9. Progress Report, April 2007
10. Student Equity Plan Update, 2007-2008
11. Student Equity Committee Membership List and Current Schedule, spring 2009

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)*

SUMMARY OF ACTION

The District and the College constituencies have addressed the impact of the reduction in fiscal resources caused by the apportionment penalty assessed on the District this past year. District and College constituencies have developed and implemented a plan for 2008/09 and 2009/10 to rebuild revenues and ensure continued fiscal stability. At the core of the plan is the restoration of FTES revenue lost as a result of the apportionment penalty assessed on the District last year.

The apportionment penalty assessed on the District was established in the Resolution Agreement entered into between the California Community College Chancellor's Office and the West Valley Mission Community College District (WVMCCD) in December 2008 (1), and approved by the Board of Trustees on December 4, 2008 (2). The value of that penalty was an apportionment revenue reduction of $5,644,227 with an accompanying Base FTES reduction of 2243.57 credit FTES, according to the agreement. $4,903,995 has been paid and the remaining $740,232 will be paid in three equal installments of $246,744 over a three-year period beginning with the 2007-08 recalculation of apportionment scheduled for February 2009 and ending June 30, 2010 (3).

One positive aspect of the agreement is the opportunity for the District to restore this FTES reduction in 2008/09 and 2009/10. The California Community College apportionment allocation includes $4,092,093 for WVMCCD restoration funding in 2008/09 and $4,385,123 for 2009/10 (4). In order to maximize FTES and apportionment funding restoration during this period, both colleges implemented a number of strategies including more effective and efficient scheduling of classes and increased marketing and outreach. The colleges also benefitted from the state's economic situation, which has resulted in a significant increase in community college enrollment state wide and in the colleges' service areas.

The 2008-09 final budget assumed that the colleges would increase total FTES by 328 over 2007-08 (5). The colleges' enrollment enhancement efforts have resulted in significant enrollment growth to date and the District will reach this goal. However, the recalculation received in October increased that goal to 896, which was 568 more FTES than anticipated. As a result, both colleges increased their efforts to maximize enrollment. The District's P-1 report, submitted on January 15, 2009, indicates that the District is in an excellent position to achieve this goal as both colleges are presently

exceeding their mid-year targets (6). Mission College is projected to exceed its total 2008/09 goal of 6,924 credit and non-credit FTES by 467.14; West Valley is projected to exceed its total 2008/09 goal of 9,310 credit and non-credit FTES by 469.74.

As a District, it is projected that the total 2008/09 goal of 16,234 FTES will be exceeded by 936.88 FTES, thus qualifying the District for all available restoration and positioning the District to make significant progress towards full restoration in 2009/10 (7).

In addition to increasing revenue through the generation of FTES, the District's Land Corporation made a one-time contribution of $3,396,851 to offset the impact of the HBA penalty (8).

The District has initiated other measures to ensure long-term financial stability, including reallocating expenditures from the General Fund to other funds, reducing transfers to the District's 3% contingency reserve, defunding all vacant positions, reducing staffing through retirement incentives, and reducing operating budgets (9). Additionally, the District contracted with the California Collegiate Brain Trust (CCBT) to complete an organizational review of the District. The purpose of the review was to reduce costs and among the tasks that were contracted to CCBT, they were asked to develop options and recommendations that would achieve savings in the ranges of $5-6 million and $9-10 million. (10) CCBT completed its review in November 2008 and presented its findings and recommendations to the District on December 1, 2008. (11) The District is in the process of evaluating their recommendations, which if fully implemented, could result in $10.62 million in savings.

In summary, the impact of the reduction in fiscal resources as a result of the HBA penalty was $5,644,227 plus an accompanying base FTES reduction of 2243.57 credit FTES valued at $8,477,216. The District addressed this situation by paying $4,903,995 of the $5,644,227 penalty from a contingency fund it had established for that purpose and will pay the remaining $740,232 over a three-year period. The enrollment enhancement plans that were implemented in 2008/09 have been successful. P-1 projections indicate that the District will produce sufficient FTES to qualify for the maximum allowable restoration funding of $4,092,093 for 2008/09 and to make significant progress toward qualifying for the $4,385,123 available in restoration funding for 2009/10.

EVIDENCE

1. Resolution Agreement No. 08120401between WVMCCD and the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges
2. Board Minutes, December 4, 2008
3. Resolution Agreement No. 08120401between WVMCCD and the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges
4. California Community Colleges 2007-08 Simulated Recalculation, October 2008.

5. WVMCCD Final Budget, 2008-2009, pp. 14-15
6. WVMCCD P-1 Report, January 15, 2009.
7. WVMCCD P-1 Report, January 15, 2009.
8. Land Corporation Statement of Revenues, Expenses & Changes in Fund Balance as of August 31, 2008, Att. to 10/16/08 agenda
9. WVMCCD Final Budget, 2008-09: Section III, Exhibits 1 and 3; pp. 8-9, 16-18
10. RFP for Organizational Review
11. Final Report for WVMCCD by California Collegiate Brain Trust (CCBT), November 14, 2008.

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)*

SUMMARY OF ACTION

The College has sought 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.

Beginning in fall 2008, the Board initiated the development of two sets of goals, one for District priorities and one for Board objectives. Each addresses the recommendation that the Board establish goals that focus on educational issues.

On November 6, 2008, with the support and facilitation of the Chancellor, the Board of Trustees held a workshop to review the mission statements and educational plans of both colleges. Mission College reviewed its current mission statement (revised and adopted in 2007) (1) as well as its educational and facilities master plan. The educational portion of the plan was approved in 2007 and provided the foundation for the development of the College's facilities master plan (2). The facilities plan is in 99% draft form (3). The Environmental Impact Report was completed in fall 2008 and is scheduled to be posted for public review in February 2009. The final plan will be presented to the Board for approval in March or April of 2009.

At the November 6, 2008 workshop, the Board also initiated a discussion of its strategic planning goals (4). The Chancellor was directed to prepare a report on alignment of institutional goals currently found in separate District Policy and District strategic planning documents. The Executive Management Team reviewed and provided input on the initial draft report to align district level goals and District Council reviewed them on January 28, 2009. The goals were placed on the February 5, 2009 agenda (5). With a minor change, the Board adopted the goals as presented. As part of its action, the Board committed to developing specific and measurable objectives for each of the goals by the end of the 2008-09 academic year.

On December 4, 2008, the Board held a special study session (6) on participatory governance and the role of trustees. Follow-up actions resulting from the workshop include:

- The Chancellor will present a report to the Board in February 2009 describing college and district formal participatory governance structures.

- In order to reduce the appearance or reality of micromanagement, the Board President, working with the Chancellor, will develop a recommended amended policy on delegation to improve operations and to reduce BOT meeting time on contract and routine personnel matters.

- The Chancellor will arrange for a presentation to the BOT on contract development and approval. The purpose of the presentation is to inform the BOT and public about district practices, to gain BOT insight and direction on the use of standard contract language, to set parameters for the development of contract terms and to improve the process for contract development and approval.

- The Chancellor will work with the BOT President to recommend agenda and relevant policy revisions to make the BOT governance role more effective, including the objective of spending less time on administrative matters and more time on educational, student and community matters.

On January 15, 2009, the trustees approved 2008-09 Board Goals (7). One of the goals is to increase the Board's focus on the district's organizational mission, including conducting strategic conversations regarding curriculum and program review and student success and revising Board agenda items to show how an item connects with educational priorities as defined in District policies and procedures, performance indicators, planning documents, program reviews, and educational master plans.

With the development and approval of these goals, Mission College can begin to incorporate them into future strategic planning processes, beginning with the college's resource allocation process in spring 2009 and thereafter into the regular review cycles for other processes including program review, educational planning, and review of the mission statement.

EVIDENCE

1. BOT Minutes, 9/6/07
2. Mission College Educational Master Plan, 2007
3. Mission College Facilities Master Plan, 99% Draft, 2008
4. BOT Minutes, 11/06/08
5. BOT Agenda, Item 8.1, 2/5/09
6. BOT Agenda, 12/4/08
7. BOT Minutes, 1/15/09