

Mission College Second Progress Report

Mission College

3000 Mission College Boulevard

Santa Clara, CA 95054

Second Progress Report



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

March 15, 2010

Table of Contents

	Page
Statement of Second Report Preparation.....	03
Responses to the Second Six Identified Recommendations by the Commission:	
Recommendation 3.....	04
Recommendation 4.....	08
Recommendation 7.....	10
Recommendation 8.....	15
Recommendation 10	16
Recommendation 11.....	19
Responses to the Two Identified Recommendations for Follow-up by the Commission:	
Recommendation 1.....	22
Recommendation 5.....	25
Appendices	
Appendix I: 2007 Accreditation Planning Agenda Items	

STATEMENT OF SECOND 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. For this second progress report, the Governance and Planning Council, along with the Faculty Senate and the President's Council, focused on Recommendations 3, 4, 7, 8, 10 and 11 as directed by ACCJC. The steering committee was assisted by the Vice-President of Instruction, interim Dean of Instruction, the Vice-President of Administrative Services, the Vice-President of Student Services, and the President of the Faculty Academic Senate. A draft of the report was disseminated to the College community for review by all shared governance groups in January 2010. Comments and additions were reviewed by the steering committee and incorporated in the final draft. The final draft was reviewed by the Academic Senate on 02/11/10 and approved by the Governance and Planning Council on 02/17/10. It was then forwarded to the Chancellor.

This report was reviewed by the West Valley-Mission Community College District Board of Trustees on March 02, 2010.

Dr. Harriett J. Robles
President, Mission College

Date

Response to Team Recommendations and Accrediting Commission Letter

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.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.3.6, II.B, III.A.1.c, III.A.6, III.B.1)*

SUMMARY OF ACTION

The College has met the recommendation to ensure the College is at the ACCJC proficient level by 2012. Following are specific responses for course, program and general education (institutional) outcomes, relation of SLOs to planning, and training and support.

Course Level SLOs:

Course level assessment began with the basic skills departments of ESL, English, Math and Reading in 2005. It broadened to the rest of the college in 2008-2009. The college uses the CurricUNET curriculum management system and each course's learning outcomes statements are housed in the CurricUNET database. Further, the Curriculum Review Committee established a requirement that any new curriculum have SLOs written prior to being considered for approval by the committee. The Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator also currently serves as the Technical Review Chair and reviews all new course SLO statements for integrity.

Workshops were held in fall 2008 in which participants from each program received training on writing measurable learning outcomes statements and then wrote 2-3 statements for each course in their curriculum. The college has completed writing SLO statements for nearly 100% of its courses. Each program was asked to begin assessing 2 courses each semester and discussing the results and reporting the outcomes on an Assessment Plan form and submitting it to the SLO Coordinator. In Fall 2009, sixty-six programs (99%) submitted this Assessment Plan form as part of the program review cycle. Programs such as library skills and services, are in the third year of collecting assessment data.

In addition to integrating student learning outcomes into the curriculum development process, the College has integrated SLOs into its Program Review process. The Program Review Cycle is an integrated planning and evaluation process to ensure currency and assessment of stated outcomes. The 2009-10 Program Review process required the submission of the Assessment Plan form indicating the courses that each program planned to assess for Fall 2009. As part of the SLO update in Spring 2010, each program

has been asked to submit the results of that assessment by updating the form and submitting it to the SLO Coordinator. The Assessment Plans indicate the specific changes made to the program along with a suggested timeline for implementation. Updated assessment plans are a required element of the program review cycle. The Program Review Evaluation Committee will review these revised Assessment Plans during each round of comprehensive Program Review and during one-year updates. The Assessment Plans will also be posted on a website for access by the Academic Senate when discussions of educational planning arise.

Since program review and resource allocation are integrated, the college's resource allocation process, managed by the College Budget Advisory Committee (CBAC) also considers the annual outcomes from the program review cycle

The college has created a master schedule of course and program level assessment that demonstrates that every program will have assessed its degrees and/or certificates within the program outcomes statements at least annually and its course outcomes statements at least once by January, 2012.

Program Level SLOs:

As of Fall 2009, ninety-nine percent (99%) of all academic and student service programs and services have written program level outcomes as part of the program review process. Ninety percent (90%) of Academic Programs and forty-three percent (43%) of Services have program level outcomes statements that are described in the college catalog.

General Education (Institutional) Outcomes:

In fall 2009, the Mission College Academic Senate and the Governance and Planning Committee approved the adoption of General Education outcomes statements that serve as institutional outcomes. Starting Fall 2010, these outcomes will be measured on an annual basis through a survey administered to students receiving degrees and to transfer students.

Through the program review process, individual programs, services and offices have identified specific measureable goals linked to general institutional outcomes. A matrix has been compiled to track these goals. An update was presented to GAP on February 3, 2010.

The College has created a matrix to track the status of degree and certificate student learning outcomes. Fifty-eight percent (58%) of degrees and three percent (3%) of certificates have documented SLOs. The SLO Coordinator continues to work with any programs that have multiple degrees and certificates to record the individual outcomes statements and assessment plans for each degree and certificate offered in their program.

Training & Support:

At the college's Professional Development Day on Jan. 29, 2010, the SLO Coordinator conducted training on effective practices in assessment. The college has developed a library of resource materials on outcomes, assessment, collaborative learning and effective instructional methods. These texts are *Classroom Assessment Techniques*, *Assessment Practice in Student Affairs*, *What the Best College Teachers Do*, *Introduction to Rubrics*, and *Meaningful Curriculum Revision*. In Spring 2010, each department or program will receive copies of these four professional publications.

The College has an established framework to track course, program and degree student learning outcomes with corresponding assessments. Several programs have completed multiple assessment cycles.

Student learning outcomes are imbedded in the program review process, which is integrated into the College resource allocation process. Implementations of SLOs have been supported by the Program Review Committee, Curriculum Committee, College Budget Allocation Committee and the Academic Senate.

The College has taken steps to increase and institutionalize assessment of student learning. As noted above, SLOs are an integral component of the program review process. In addition, the faculty SLO Coordinator sits on the Curriculum Review Committee, thus ensuring that SLOs are systematically addressed in the curriculum development and approval process. In addition to the part-time faculty SLO Coordinator position, the College has created a high-level research director position supported by a research technician. The Director's job description includes oversight for the development, implementation, assessment and evaluation of student learning outcomes, including training for faculty. Recruitment began in the fall of 2009 for this position and was extended to January 19, 2010. The College anticipates employing a Director of Institutional Research and Institutional Effectiveness by mid- spring, 2010.

Based on the substantial progress to date and evidence of a systematic, ongoing process, including staffing, for development, implementation and assessment of student learning outcomes, the College will meet the 2012 deadline established by the Commission for "work on definition and assessment of student learning outcomes."

EVIDENCE

CurricUNET SLO pages
Technical Review Form
Assessment Plans for each program
Submitted Program Review Forms for each program
Master schedule of SLO Assessment
Spring 2010 Flex Schedule
College Catalog

Job description, Director of Research, Planning & Institutional Effectiveness
Job description, Research Technician
ACCJC Letter to President, Mission College, 6/30/09
Governance and Planning Committee Meeting Notes: 2/3/10
Institutional Outcomes/Goals Matrix
Degree and Certificate SLO Matrix

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)*

SUMMARY OF ACTION

The College has met this recommendation. Upon completion of the hiring processes, Mission will have more than doubled its research capacity. The College created a new, director-level position supported by a research technician. The College spent considerable time and effort to gather and analyze director-level job descriptions from comparable colleges and districts. A job description for a fulltime, 12-month Director of Research, Planning and Institutional Effectiveness was developed to encompass research and oversight for integrated college planning (program review, accreditation, master planning), student learning outcomes and assessment, institutional effectiveness and accountability, and accreditation activities. This new position, with its expanded duties, would be a higher position than the College's previous research analyst and will report directly to the President. The position was approved by the Board of Trustees on 6/04/09 and opened for recruitment. The College conducted second-level interviews in November 2009, but no recommendation was made. The search was extended through January 19, 2010 with interviews scheduled for completion by March 2010 and a selection by mid-spring. In addition, the College updated an existing job description for a research technician to support the Director. The revised position was approved by the BOT on November 12, 2009 and recruitment will be scheduled in order to permit the new Director to make the final selection. It should be noted that so committed has the College been to the research function that funding was secured for these positions even as the College has been forced to downsize in other areas.

The College and the District have done their creative best to delineate the relative roles of research within the confines of very limited resources. In spring 2009, in response to a district wide organization review conducted in fall 2008, it was proposed by Mission College to expand its own research capacity, which included the positions described above. Because of the need to control costs, it was recognized that the District was not in a position to establish a separate, District level research function. It was also recognized that almost all of the research needed within the District is generated by, from and for the colleges. While a college-based research office is essential, it is less so for the District. In addition, the District has made significant progress in the development of a data warehouse and standard reports that have been developed in collaboration with the colleges' research analysts. The greater availability and accessibility of data to the college researchers has also reduced the need for a District research office. As a creative solution, it was decided to revisit a model that had been used in 2001 when the District also had no funds for its own research function. Research requests were directed through a college administrator who assigned the request to one of the two college researchers and was responsible for ensuring that the

request was completed and the information submitted as required. The actual number of requests from the District was very small and manageable. It was felt that this approach might again prove workable. The District has agreed to fund 15% of the Mission College Director and technician positions in exchange for handling its research requests. District research requests will be directed to Mission's Director of Research, Planning and Institutional Effectiveness, whose job description includes assisting in District research, as necessary. The District has committed to this arrangement for two years after which time it will be evaluated.

EVIDENCE

Job Description, Director of Research, Planning & Institutional Effectiveness, BOT minutes, 6/04/09

Organizational Review Report, Research, Planning & Institutional Effectiveness, BOT Agenda Item 4.5, May 21, 2009

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)*

SUMMARY OF ACTION

This recommendation has been met. The College has developed organizational structures and strategies to more effectively provide administrative support and oversight necessary to accomplish its mission and purpose. Following is a description of the process and outcomes that resulted in short-term changes for 2009-10 and long-term changes effective 2010-11.

The District contracted for an organizational review in fall 2008 in order to address a growing structural deficit. In fact, Mission College began its own organization review in early spring 2008 in the form of a proposal drafted by the President to address long-standing college and accreditation concerns about the level of support provided to instruction. In 2001, the accrediting team recommended that “the academic administration structure should be reviewed to ensure that there is adequate time, leadership and supervision for broad academic planning, integration with related academic and student support programs, supervision, and evaluation of faculty and staff, and operational management of the academic programs.” The team specifically recognized that while the college desired a “flat” administrative structure, it must be balanced with “the growing complexity and size of Mission College.”

The organization proposal submitted to the College for consideration in March 2008 stemmed from the President's concerns that the College was not appropriately organized to anticipate and respond to the challenges of enrollment, institutional effectiveness, and accountability. According to the President, systems failures, chronic turnover in key administrative positions, and a tendency to centralize key functions without sufficient redundancy all meant that the College was forced to resort to reactive crisis management, which resulted in confusion, stress and solutions that were not always the result of thoughtful planning and implementation. In her opinion, this crisis mode necessarily distracted the College from its mission: teaching and learning. In fact, the 2008 accrediting team made the same point. They noted that “resolving these issues has required significant investment of time that could otherwise be spent on institutional improvement and student success.”

The result of that proposal was a great deal of discussion that culminated in feedback through the Governance and Planning Council (GAP). Several principal concerns were identified. These included primarily the role of Division Chairs in relation to the Vice President of Instruction and deans and a widespread concern about accountability for all employee groups: faculty, staff and administration. When it became clear in early summer of 2008 that the District was going to proceed with a district wide

organizational review in response to the growing structural deficit, the President elected to delay further action on the proposal in order to see what might emerge from the more comprehensive evaluation.

In July 2008, the College received its report from the accrediting commission. The College was given 12 recommendations and placed on warning. Recommendation 7 advised that “the college develop organizational structures and strategies to effectively provide administrative support and oversight necessary to accomplish the institution’s mission and purpose.” This recommendation was based on the team’s observation that “as noted in Recommendation 8 of the 2001 visiting team...the current organizational structure may not be optimal for the college....issues of administrative structure and governance roles must be resolved if the college is to address the serious challenges it faces.” The team cited possible factors mentioned by college personnel, including “an overly flat organization structure which places excessive demands on administrators.”

In late fall 2008, the organization review of the District, conducted by the Community College Brain Trust (CCBT), resulted in very candid and specific recommendations regarding the colleges’ organizational structures. The consultants found that the current arrangement of departments, divisions and instructional administrators directly contributed to the inefficiencies that are a principal cause of the District’s financial problems. It found the division and department structure “expensive” and “extremely cumbersome.” It noted that even though Mission is the smaller of the two colleges, it had more divisions and more reassigned time for chairs than West Valley. However, both colleges were cited for more departments, divisions and reassigned time than most comparable colleges, and both were cited for having too many direct reports to the Vice Presidents of Instruction. CCBT stated that the “current division and department structure...seems unworkable from both a financial and effectiveness point of view” and recommended that “the District develop a more efficient, accountable and less costly structure....Adherence to the current structure and decision making processes will continue to give the same results as present. The District...has little choice but to change in this area.” In spring of 2009, the District issued eight proposals to address the areas of major organizational change recommended by the CCBT report. These eight proposals were in the areas of Library Services, Emergency Services, Administrative Services, Instructional Services, Admissions and Records, Human Resources, Information Systems, and Research and Planning.

The instructional services proposal was of greatest interest to Mission College and the College moved immediately to address it. In July 2009, the Division Chair Council recommended that for 09-10 the number of divisions be reduced from 10 to 6 and that the departments within the divisions be realigned so that almost every department chair had sufficient reassigned time (.200) to be subject to evaluation per the faculty (ACE) contract. The VP of Instruction forwarded these and other recommendations to the President, who accepted them, recognizing that while much had been accomplished, more work remained. She responded with some conditions and time

lines, asking that the remaining issues be resolved by October 31. These issues included load for department chairs, discretionary reassigned time, organization and support of instructional labs, administrative job descriptions and assignments, and staffing support.

Recommendations for the long-term organization of instructional programs and services was assigned to the Organizational Review Task Force (ORTF), a college task force composed of an equal number of faculty, staff and administrators. The ORTF developed two rubrics to evaluate the existing and proposed structures and applied measures such as college relations and culture, leadership and staff development, and administrative effectiveness. The task force met through the summer and early fall and developed a proposal that was submitted to the College on October 5. The intent was to review the proposal through the participatory governance groups with a first review by the Governance and Planning Council (GAP) on October 21 and a final recommendation to the President on October 28. However, multiple proposals and/or versions for instructional services subsequently emerged. GAP considered all the proposals; however it did not make a recommendation for any one model at the October 28th meeting. The President requested a one week's extension from the Chancellor, which was granted, and one more meeting was scheduled on November 4 to allow more time for the proposals to be evaluated.

At the November 4 meeting, GAP did not reach consensus and had no single recommendation to make to the President. Even so, the President indicated she had received sufficient and clear feedback. At the conclusion of the 11/4/09 meeting, GAP members unanimously validated that participatory principles and process had been honored.

On November 9, the President provided her recommendations to the College and the Chancellor. In respect to the organization of the instructional area, the President recommended the following:

1. Reduction in the number of divisions
2. Reduction in the number of division chairs
3. Reduction in the number of departments
4. Realignment of departments within divisions
5. Reconfiguration of department chair reassigned time for a minimum assignment of .200
6. Reduction of department and division chair reassigned time to a maximum of 12.335 (the amount required by the faculty contract)
7. Reduction of discretionary reassigned time
8. Four deans, one in Student Services and three in instruction (no net increase)
9. Modification of all dean job descriptions to include a common core of duties and expectations in addition to specific responsibilities and titles to reflect primary assignments

10. Reporting structure wherein Division Chairs report to Deans and Deans have responsibility for up to two divisions each
11. Reduction in the number of direct reports to the Vice President of Instruction
12. Establishment of an educational services council
13. Development of a systematic program for training and mentoring for those with managerial responsibilities
14. Full implementation of changes in July 2010 for a pilot period of 4 semesters
15. Formal evaluation of the changes in spring 2012 with resulting revisions scheduled for fall 2012
16. 4 FTE for Senior Office Coordinators, who support the divisions, duties to be organized by the Office of Instruction and supervision to be provided by the deans
17. Replacement of one vacant administrative assistant position with a lower level position to provide a basic level of support to all administrative staff in the Office of Instruction

The Chancellor responded to the President's recommendations on November 30, 2009. He accepted her recommendations with some comments regarding those areas for which final solutions had yet to be determined.

The College has implemented a number of the recommendations and a number are in progress as indicated below:

1. Reduction in the number of divisions (Completed)
2. Reduction in the number of division chairs (Completed)
3. Reduction in the number of departments (Completed)
4. Realignment of departments within divisions (Completed)
5. Reconfiguration of department chair reassigned time for a minimum assignment of .200 (Completed)
6. Reduction of department and division chair reassigned time to a maximum of 12.335 (the amount required by the faculty contract) (Completed)
7. Reduction of discretionary reassigned time (Completed)
8. Four deans, one in Student Services and three in instruction (no net increase) (Completed)
9. Modification of all dean job descriptions to include a common core of duties and expectations in addition to specific responsibilities and titles to reflect primary assignments (In progress. Drafts due February 2010)
10. Reporting structure wherein Division Chairs report to Deans and Deans have responsibility for up to two divisions each (In progress)
11. Reduction in the number of direct reports to the Vice President of Instruction (In progress)
12. Establishment of an educational services council (In progress)

13. Development of a systematic program for training and mentoring for those with managerial responsibilities
14. Full implementation of changes in July 2010 for a pilot period of 4 semesters
15. Formal evaluation of the changes in spring 2012 with resulting revisions scheduled for fall 2012
16. 4 FTE for Senior Office Coordinators, who support the divisions, duties to be organized by the Office of Instruction and supervision to be provided by the deans (In progress)
17. Replacement of one vacant administrative assistant position with a lower level position to provide a basic level of support to all administrative staff in the Office of Instruction (Position retained at original level; hiring in progress)

EVIDENCE

ACCJC Report, 2001

ACCJC Report, 2008

CCBT Report, November 2008

WVMCCD Organization Reports, Spring 2009

Mission College Reorganization Proposal, March 2008

Organizational Review Task Force Report, 10/5/09

MC Academic Senate Organization Proposal, 10/27/09

Vice President's response to MCAS Proposal, e-mail, 11/3/09

GAP Minutes, 10/21/09, 10/28/09, 11/4/09

President's Recommendations to the Chancellor, 11/9/09

Chancellor Hendrickson's memo to President Robles, 11/30/09

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)*

SUMMARY OF ACTION

The College has met this recommendation. Mission College greatly values the expertise of its classified staff. The College President and the Classified Senate President have worked closely together to provide philosophical and practical support for the participation of classified staff in governance. The Classified Senate is equally represented with faculty, administrators and students on the College's highest participatory governance body, the Governance and Planning Council.

In 2009, the Classified Senate developed a form by which staff could formally request time and receive approval to participate in governance groups and committees. In 2010, the process was taken to a more proactive level with the development and implementation of a means by which managers would be responsible for informing staff about opportunities to participate and encouraging them to select those opportunities of most interest. A form was created that confirms the college's commitment to participation of its staff, provides them with access to information about college and district governance groups and standing committees, and also provides current information about ad hoc task forces. Managers are directed to work with staff on at least an annual basis to confirm their interest and work on accommodations to support their participation. Interested staff are then directed to contact the Classified Senate, which is responsible for formally assigning staff to these activities.

In addition, the College supports professional development for classified staff to the extent possible given fiscal constraints. Classified staff are encouraged to attend Flex Day activities as much as possible given that Flex days normally occur during peak admissions and registration periods. The Classified Senate has an annual budget of \$4,000 to support its activities, including attendance at workshops and conferences. In 2009, the President augmented the conference funds in order to send 5 additional staff to the 4CS conference. In 2010, the President again committed funds in order to send two additional staff. However, for all college groups – faculty, administration and staff – conference attendance will be negatively impacted by proposed budget cuts beginning in 2010-11.

EVIDENCE

Participatory governance model – GAP
Classified Staff Participation Request Forms
Classified Senate Budget, 2009 and 2010
President's Office Budget, 2009 and 2010

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)*

SUMMARY OF ACTION

This recommendation has been met. In 2007, the College's Governance & Planning Council (GAP), initiated a discussion of its role in the participatory governance and decision-making process. A task force was formed to assess the role and responsibilities of GAP, which necessarily meant that the roles and responsibilities of those groups represented at GAP would need to be reassessed, as well. The task force met during the spring semester and reconvened in the fall 2008 to continue its work. Focus of the review was the Mission College Shared Governance and Decision-Making Plan, which had been developed in the late 1990s but had never been approved by all college groups. GAP reviewed the document in detail and identified specific concerns. The task force was directed to incorporate those concerns into a new draft and submit it to GAP at the first meeting in spring 2009. The College provided a progress report on this planning agenda item (and Recommendation 10, scheduled by the Accrediting Commission for completion in March 2010) to the Board of Trustees on January 15, 2009 and again at special Board meetings held on August 29, 2009 and November 5, 2009.

Since the last progress report, the College has continued the update of its participatory governance model. The College's Governance and Planning Council, its highest participatory governance body and also the College's Accreditation Steering Committee, initiated a review of the College's governance model in 2008-09 and has thus far accomplished the following:

Developed a definition of participatory governance.

Participatory governance at Mission College:

- Provides opportunities to utilize the full range of skills, talents, expertise and interests of our faculty, administrators, students and staff by implementing a structure and processes that allow all parties to participate in making recommendations at the most appropriate level in order to support the College's mission.
- Provides opportunities for faculty, administrators, students and staff to make substantial contributions to the operations, policies and procedures of the College;
- Provides opportunities for open communication, input and shared information among all constituency groups;
- Provides opportunities for the opinions of faculty, staff, administrators and students to be given reasonable consideration;

- Provides for collaborative working relationships across the College. (Adopted 4/22/09)

Revised its participatory governance structure.

The new model, adopted 6/3/09, is composed of up to 5 representatives for each of the college constituencies: faculty (Academic Senate), classified (Classified Senate), students (Associated Student Body), and administration. The President is a non-voting member and facilitates the GAP Council. It was agreed that this model will be reviewed after one year.

Revised its charge.

The revised charge reads: The Governance and Planning Council (GAP) serves as the College's highest coordinating body for college governance, planning and institutional effectiveness and in that role, makes recommendations to the College President. It also acts as the College's Accreditation Steering Committee. (Adopted 9/30/09)

Confirmed 09-10 membership based on the new model.

Representatives were confirmed in October 2009. The model recommends that each body represented at GAP select their representatives in such a way that their various constituency groups are represented. For example, the Classified Senate would consider representatives from classified, supervisor and confidential groups and also attempt to represent both instruction and student services.

Began to develop operating procedures.

- Calendar of Meetings 2009-10 Academic Year: GAP will meet on the first and third Wednesdays except for October 2009, when it will meet weekly on the reorganization and in December 2009, when it will meet every Wednesday until December 16, 2009 to address accreditation issues.
- Basis for recommendations: GAP agreed to adopt consensus as its method for making recommendations. Examples of definitions of *consensus* have been distributed to GAP, discussions took place in December 2009, and a definition was approved on January 27, 2010.

The College has greatly improved the degree to which agendas and minutes for governance groups and major committees are posted and disseminated in a timely manner to all college constituencies. Agendas and minutes are posted online for the Classified Senate, the Academic Senate, the Associated Study Body and the Governance and Planning Council.

Training in the concepts of participatory governance has taken place through the Academic Senate, most recently in September 3, 2009 and with the Board of Trustees at a special meeting on November 5, 2009.

EVIDENCE

Governance & Planning Council Summaries: 9/5/07, 1/30/08, 3/12/08, 9/10/08, 9/24/08, 11/12/08, 12/3/08, 4/22/09, 6/3/09, 9/30/09, 12/2/09, 1/27/10

Mission College Shared Governance & Decision Making Plan

Participatory Governance Model

BOT Minutes, 1/15/09

BOT Agenda & Packet, 8/29/09

BOT Agenda & Packet, 11/5/09

MC Participatory Governance Model

Academic Senate Meeting Minutes: 09/03/09

http://www.missioncollege.org/senate_classified/index.html, Academic

[http://www.missioncollege.org/senate/and Associated Students,](http://www.missioncollege.org/senate/and%20Associated%20Students)

[http://www.missioncollege.org/student_services/asb/index.html.](http://www.missioncollege.org/student_services/asb/index.html)

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)*

SUMMARY OF ACTION

The District has met this recommendation. The West-Valley Mission Community College District has initiated a dialog between the Board of Trustees and District governance bodies to reach a shared understanding of the appropriate governance roles of all parties, most recently at a special Board study session conducted on November 5, 2009.

The current District governance structure was developed during 1997 and 1998, when leaders throughout the District reassessed and revised the participatory governance structure for the District. Through a process of open discussion and facilitated by an outside consultant, the resulting governance structure became part of a larger strategic planning process. On October 15, 1998, the Board took action to accept the “Strategic Planning Report” as presented and discussed at that evening’s meeting. Following is the section of the report related to District Council, which became the new highest level District participatory governance.

District Council. Another area involved shared governance. Although the two Colleges had been reviewing and modifying how they implemented AB 1725 in their own respective college councils, no comparable capabilities had been developed for the District as a whole. This frustrated administrators and staff alike. Administrators were disturbed by an over-abundance of overlapping committees, which often involved the same people wearing different hats addressing different topics, and an overly time-consuming deliberative process. Staff, especially faculty and classified employees at the two colleges, were disturbed by a lack of access to the Chancellor and concerns about accountability. This led to fragmented operations, critical items falling between the cracks, confusion and disagreement about whether shared governance involved advisory or decision-making responsibilities, and increasing mistrust on all sides. The Executive Management Team took this issue up as one of its first priorities in spring 1997. Working through the existing Chancellor's Advisory Committee (ChAdCo) and in cooperation with the two college councils, it extended the lessons that had been learned about shared governance at the college level and made several major changes. It redesigned ChAdCo into a new District Council with representation from all constituencies; created an Administrative Services Council so the three units were similarly equipped to participate in shared governance; and developed ground rules and guidelines for proceeding. The District has spent the past year implementing these changes, refining the process, and laying the foundation for further progress.

Each of the three units of the District, West Valley College, Mission College, and District Administrative Services, has a council that acts as its highest level participatory

governance body, advising the chief executives of those units. Constituent groups as well as the three aforementioned units are also represented on governance bodies at the District level. The District Budget Advisory Committee (DBAC) makes recommendations to the Vice Chancellor and the District Council advises the Chancellor. Both organizations have provisions to allow for their recommendations to be communicated to the Board of Trustees when the Vice Chancellor or Chancellor does not affirm their recommendation on an issue of district wide importance. Additional descriptions of the participatory governance structures of the District include District Council Operating Principles, roles and responsibilities of the District Budget Advisory Committee, the West Valley Shared Decision-Making Plan, the Mission College Participatory Governance Structure, and the Administrative Services Council Statement of Purpose. The meeting schedules of these organizations have been combined into one master document.

Participatory governance bodies regularly conduct self reviews of their guiding documents and operating processes. For example, as a result of its semi-annual orientation and review of its guiding documents process, District Council approved changes/refinements to its operating principles as recently as fall 2009. A review of these principles by the District Council most recently occurred on February 8, 2010. Administrative Services Council has tasked a small group to draft operating guidelines along the lines of those utilized by District Council and DBAC. The Council intends to discuss and approve draft guidelines once the small group has reported back to the Council in spring 2010.

In reviewing the recommendations of the Community College League of California Model Policy and Procedure Service regarding "Participation in Local Decision Making," the majority of suggested policy is covered in District Policy sections 3.2.6, "Classified Senate," 3.3.4, "Academic Senate," and 5.15.1, "Associated Student Body." It does seem appropriate, however, to establish a brief policy statement that acknowledges (as was done, in part, by Board action in 1998) the existence of participatory governance bodies at the District level and their recommending responsibilities as they relate to the Board's ultimate authority as "decision maker" in "those areas assigned to it by state and federal laws and regulations," as quoted from the Model Policy and Procedure Service. The Board discussed this option at a special Board study session on November 5, 2009, part of which was dedicated to a review and discussion of District and College participatory governance structures.

At the conclusion of that study session, the Chancellor proposed that the Board of Trustees formally take action to recognize the participatory governance structures at both the College and District levels at a meeting in the near future. Such recognition would be in addition to existing Board policy (3.2.6, 3.3.4 and 5.15.1).

EVIDENCE

Flow chart of WVMCCD Participatory Governance Structure

District Council Operating Principles

DBAC Roles, Responsibilities, and Operating Procedures

West Valley College Shared Decision-Making Plan

Mission College Participatory Governance Structure and Update

Administrative Services Council Statement of Purpose

District Council Minutes, 11/4/09

Master Meeting Schedule, 2009-10

WVMCCD Board Policies 3.2.6, 3.3.4 and 5.15.1

Follow-up 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

This recommendation has been met. Mission College continues its systematic program review cycle, which is linked to resource/budget allocation. In the 2008-09 academic year, 97 departments, offices, and program areas completed full/comprehensive program reviews. In Spring 2009, for continuous process improvement, a survey was conducted to evaluate the program review process and the results were used to refine the practice in 2009-10.

For the 2009-10 academic year, departments, offices and program areas have completed annual program updates. To maintain a four-year cycle, 50% of the programs, offices and program areas will conduct full program reviews 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.

2009-10 Program Review Schedule

On September 17, 2009, program review update forms, data sheets and the previous year's program review forms were made available to departments, programs, and offices via email and posted on the internal website, Inside Mission.

As part of the update process, programs and offices undergoing program review were required to provide information in three primary areas:

1. Program Overview (a brief description of current developments and an overview of activities and accomplishments over the Academic Year 2008-09.
2. Goals and Implementation Activity Update (providing a progress report on the goals and timeline listed in the last Program Review)
3. Student Learning Outcomes Overview (copy of the *SLO Assessment Plan*)

To assist programs in completing forms, the Program Review Committee and the SLO Coordinator held six workshops during September and October 2009. Completed program review update forms were due to the Program Review Committee (PRC) by November 4, 2009.

Completion of Program Reviews

Sixty-six departments, offices, and program areas submitted program review update forms and comprehensive program review forms by November 2009. This amounted to

a 99% completion rate. During the following month, the Program Review Committee (PRC) evaluated the update forms and the Program Review Evaluation Committee (PREC) evaluated the 4 comprehensive program review forms by completing evaluation rubrics. Recommendations were based on compliance as to whether a program had (a) met deadlines, (b) articulated progress toward completion of goals with relevant timelines and (c) had completed an SLO Assessment Plan.

In February 2010, final recommendations will be presented for approval to the highest participatory governance group at the College, the Governance and Planning Council (GAP), chaired by the College President. Departments, offices and program areas with approved program reviews will be eligible for the resource allocation process. In April 2010 an annual program review report will be given to the Board of Trustees.

Linkage to Resource Allocation

Beginning in spring 2009, programs and services with approved program reviews became eligible to submit resource allocation requests. The resource allocation process was conducted by the College Budget and Advisory Committee (CBAC), which makes recommendations to the Governance and Planning Council (GAP). 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 its place it has developed a “Zero-based Budget Model”. This Model was developed in fall 2009 for implementation during spring 2010 to build the 2010/2011 college operating budget. In the “Zero-based Budget Model,” programs and services with approved program reviews must follow a college approved budget request process and compete for funding by demonstrating their justifiable needs to secure their annual operating budgets, which include supplies, duplicating and hourly services. The process commences in March 2010 in accordance with the approved allocation timeline. Programs wishing to request funds will need to complete a request form and the requests will be evaluated using a rubric with the following criteria:

1. Funding request as identified in Program Review
2. Impact on quality of service to students
3. Number of students served
4. Impact on positive enrollment and/or retention
5. Link to college goals and Educational & Facilities Master Plan
6. Health, safety, regulatory and/or legal considerations
7. Impact of funding on program (funded or not)
8. Availability of other sources of funding
9. Past expenditure patterns (most recent 3-year average)
10. 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. 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 completed an evaluation of this most recent program review process in spring 2009 and will continue to revise and improve the process as needed. As noted above, the College has moved 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. The master planning calendar was reviewed by GAP most recently on February 17, 2010.

Process Improvement

In March-April 2010 the Program Review Committee will finalize the criteria and comprehensive program review forms and evaluation criteria for 2010-11. In 2010-11 half of the departments, offices and program areas will complete comprehensive program reviews, while the remaining areas will complete program update forms. In May 2010 the Program Review Evaluation Committee (PREC) will be formed for the following academic year and 4 departments will have the opportunity to beta-test the process in summer 2010. A four year comprehensive program review calendar was presented to GAP on 02/17/10. All departments, offices and program areas will complete a comprehensive program review every four years with yearly updates forms due the alternate years. Vocational programs have a two-year review cycle.

EVIDENCE

Spring 2009 Program Review Survey Results
Program Review Update Forms
Department Data sheet
2008-09 Program Review Forms
Program Review Committee Minutes
Program Review Process 2009-10
Program Review Evaluation Rubric
Schedule of Board of Trustees Reports
Mission College Budget Allocation Model 2010
Governance and Planning Council minutes, 11/05/08
Governance and Planning Council minutes, 01/28/09
Governance and Planning Council Planning Master Calendar
Program Review 4 Year Cycle Calendar

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 met this recommendation. As referenced in the first progress report (March 2009), all 85 planning agenda items from 2001 were completed by March 2009. Additionally, 28 of the 45 planning agenda items from 2007 were completed. Between March 2009 and the present, the college continued to make steady progress towards completing the remaining items. As of February 2010, the remaining 17 of 2007 planning agenda items have been completed.

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. In September 2009, planning agenda summary reports were returned the primary stake holders for completion and to provide supporting evidence. The four executive administrators were each assigned responsibility to ensure fulfillment of the process in their respective areas. Completed forms and supporting documentation were due on November 12, 2009.

Accreditation is a standing agenda item for GAP. On December 16, 2009, GAP received the final update on the completion status for the planning agenda items. All of the planning agenda items have been completed. A final matrix was developed for the planning agenda items and is appended to this report.

EVIDENCE

College Governance and Planning Council meeting minutes from September 16, 2009
Accreditation Self-Study Planning Agenda Summary Reports

Email sent to primary contacts

College Governance and Planning Council meeting minutes from December 16, 2009
Final Matrix for all Planning Agenda Items for 2007

MISSION COLLEGE SECOND ACCREDITATION PROGRESS REPORT - 2007 PLANNING AGENDA ITEMS APPENDIX I

PA #	DESCRIPTION	STATUS	EVIDENCE	ASSIGNMENT
STANDARD I				
07.01.01	The Academic Senate will assess the program review process and in collaboration with other participatory governance groups, assist the college in developing a systematic, integrated planning process that is in alignment with the college's mission and values and links the outcomes of assessment and evaluation of its programs and services with the allocation of financial, physical and human resources.	Complete	The Academic Senate revised its Program Review process and completed program review for all programs in the 08-09 academic year. All programs completed a program review update in 09-10. A 4 year cycle of review for each program (2 year cycle for CTE/Voc Ed programs) will begin in 10-11. The Governance and Planning Council and the College Budget Advisory Council created a new budget planning process, approved by the Academic Senate, which uses information from the Program Review process to inform the budget decision-making of the college. The Program Review forms include a requirement to link goals to the college's mission/values/planning statements.	GAP, CBAC, MCAS minutes 09/03/09, Program Review Committee minutes and agendas Vice-President, Instruction (Academic Senate)
07.01.03	To support college-wide dialogue for the purpose of improving student learning and institutional effectiveness, the college will ensure that minutes for all participatory governance groups, major committees and task forces be recorded and tied to agendas, then filed in a centralized, searchable online repository where they can be accessed and reviewed.	Complete	The College's website was updated to display campus committees and shared governance groups with agendas and minutes.	Website of Inside Mission committee page Vice-President, Instruction (GAP)
07.01.04	To facilitate on-going, institution-wide discussion and activities for the improvement of student learning, the college will make the replacement of the Assessment Coordinator the highest priority in the next hiring cycle.	Complete	SLO Assessment Coordinator duties have been assigned to a faculty member while organizational review is being completed. SLO workshops were held inconjunction with program review workshop.	Contract for SLO coordinator - Fall08/Sp09; Program Review Emails Vice-President, Instruction (Instruction)
07.01.05	The college will ensure that the Core Values and Goals be visible and incorporated into decision-making processes.	Complete	Core values have been incorporated into the decision making process and are visible electronically and in print.	"Inside Mission" : Committee minutes and agendas; http://paris.wmcccd.cc.ca.us/mc/committees.php Vice-President, Instruction (GAP)
07.01.06	The college will develop measurable outcomes for its goals.	Complete	The College developed core goals with specific recommendations as part of the EFMP process. Additional presentations were made at all college forums and at Flex Days. Administrators develop annual goals which are tied to District goals. The college piloted a process based on the 4 year program review cycle to ensure all college goals have measurable outcomes.	EFMP Core Goals; Presentations at College Forums and Flex Days; GAP Minutes 1/27/10 Vice-President, Instruction (GAP)
07.01.07	Participatory governance and standing committees will annually review their charge and membership, set goals and conduct an evaluation at the end of each year, following the example and model of District Council.	Complete	In Fall 2008, the Governance and Planning Council reviewed the District Council model and approved a form and process so that participatory governance and standing committees at the College could annually review their charge and membership, set goals and conduct an evaluation at the end of each year. A template was prepared and the President's office staff began the process to enter current information on the template so that the forms could be provided to groups to be updated beginning in Spring 2009. Among the outcomes of the December 4, 2008 special board meeting on participatory governance was a charge to the Chancellor to "prepare a report describing college and district formal participatory governance structure, to compile a binder with a description of each group's charge, policies and procedures, membership, bylaws, and mission statements as available, and to ask each formal committee to affirm or revise their respective bylaws to be reported to the BOT." The Chancellor has requested that the College provide this information by February 10, and the College President and Academic Senate President are working together on this assignment. In Fall 2009, final revisions were made to the templates and the Office of the President distributed them to standing committees and governance groups on 09/25/09. A progress report will be made to GAP on 11/18/09. Reminders will be sent to the groups to complete their evaluations and submit them to GAP in May 2010.	GAP Minutes, 10/22/08, 11/05/08 and 11/18/09; Template Chancellor's notes, December 4, 2008 special BOT meeting; 09/25/09 email President (GAP)
07.01.09	As part of a systematic and integrated planning process, the college will establish benchmarks for all components of institutional effectiveness and develop assessment, evaluation and reporting strategies and tools.	Complete	Institutional effectiveness indicators were developed as part of the 2005 Educational & Facilities Master Plan (EFMP) process and were shared through a series of college-wide forums. These indicators were refined for the current Program Review Process and were published at the college and program level on the Mission College website. The Research Analyst worked with specific programs and areas to develop additional tools and aid in assessment. A rubric was used to provide feedback to programs as part of annual update program review process and benchmarks were used to provide recommendations for programs completing comprehensive program reviews..	EFMP documents; Program Review Update Feedback Form, Evaluation Criteria and Website Vice-President, Instruction (GAP)
STANDARD II				
07.02.02	The college will create and implement a strategic plan for Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).	Complete	The MCAS and GAP will be reviewing and approving a plan in Spring 2010. The college has been implementing a plan set out by the SLO Coordinator in coordination with the Office of Instruction and the College President.	Certifying documents from SLO workshops; participants list from workshops; SLO Coordinator email; assessment plans; SLOs on Curriculumet Vice-President, Instruction (Academic Senate)

MISSION COLLEGE SECOND ACCREDITATION PROGRESS REPORT - 2007 PLANNING AGENDA ITEMS APPENDIX I

PA #	DESCRIPTION	STATUS		EVIDENCE	ASSIGNMENT
07.02.06	The College will pursue the institutionalization of the effective practices and services that have been implemented through the Title 5 grant.	Complete	The College has plans to institutionalize the Title 5 Programs by integrating the Welcome Center activities into the K-16 Bridge Program and programs supported by the Basic Skills grant. Funding for the staffing and coordination will be funded through the Basic Skills Initiative. The Tutorials and Counseling activities are to be funded at reduced levels by Basic Skills. In Fall 2009 the College continued institutionalized components of the Title 5 Grant by relocating the Welcome Center to a permanent location in the Main Building, relocating permanent staff from Admission and Records to the Welcome Center, reassigned Outreach staff to supervise Welcome Center activities, and implemented ambassador training for peer advisors.	1. Flow chart for BSI, Matriculation and Welcome Center; 2. Funding proposal for BSI grant; 3. Relocation of Welcome Center to Main Building; 4. Implemented ambassador training for peer advisors to staff Welcome Center; 5. Relocated permanent staff from A and R to Welcome Center; 6. Reassigned Outreach staff to supervise Welcome Center activities	Vice-President, Student Services (Title 5)
07.02.16	The college will assess and address student needs for services and access in the Library and Technology Center, including weekend/evening hours.	Complete	An analysis of library hours, including weekends and evening hours, was completed in October 2008. The analysis included circulation data trends, hourly visitor counts, comparisons to comparable local Districts, EFMP goals, and a break down of costs associated providing with Saturday service. Technology Center has around 100 computers. Currently we open 45 hours a week including Saturday. In Spring 2009, over 100 students completed a survey on Technology Center services. The survey provided a good assessment of student needs. The library conducted a follow up analysis of the gate count by hour and day in September 2009.	1. October 2008 Library Final Report Regarding Hours and Trends; 2. Spring 2009 Technology Survey; 3. September 2009 Library Gate Count Analysis	Vice-President, Instruction (Library Services)
07.02.17	The LATC will improve online access to instructional support services.	Complete	The LATC has been conducting online tutoring since Spring 2005. The primary way that this online tutoring has been achieved is by using: • CCC Confer • Angel Learning • The college streaming server	• CCC Confer url: http://www.cccconfer.org/index3.aspx A course was developed in Angel called IS_947 Merged_SP08 This course offers online tutoring. A screen shot from this course is included electronically.	Vice-President, Instruction (LATC)
STANDARD III					
07.03.01	The college and Human Resources will ensure the timely completion of faculty and staff evaluations in all departments.	Complete	The Vice Presidents of Instruction, Student Services, and Administrative Services in conjunction with Human Resources was charged with modifying the evaluation process to ensure timely completion.	Office of Instruction Correspondence; ACE Contract; Police Association Contract; SEIU Contract; Administrative Handbook; Agreement between Supervisors Association Teamsters Local 856 and WVMCCD	Vice-President, Instruction (Human Resources)
07.03.02	The college will regularly assess staffing needs with the intention to improve support for instructional and student service programs.	Complete	Classified staffing needs are identified by area managers or supervisors and budget requests are submitted through the CBAC budget development process. The District is assessing all staffing needs as part of its plan to address its 08-09 and 09-10 budget deficit. To meet BOT directive to structurally balance the district budget starting with 10/11 fiscal year, the college has proposed reduction by five classified positions to meet its \$1.5M reduction target.	2007 MC Participants Survey; MC 10/11 Budget Reduction Plan	Vice-President, Administrative Services (CBAC)
07.03.07	The College should review the current college budget allocation process to ensure alignment with District budget policies procedures.	Complete	The College Budget Allocation Model was revised in Spring 2009. Since then, CBAC has introduced a GAP endorsed Zero-based Budget Model to take effect in spring 10 to develop the 10/11 college budget. The college budget development process and timeline well aligned with the district budget policies.	WVMCCD Final Budget (08/09); MC Budget Allocation Model, Spring 2009; MC Zero-based Budget Model	Vice-President, Administrative Services (CBAC)

MISSION COLLEGE SECOND ACCREDITATION PROGRESS REPORT - 2007 PLANNING AGENDA ITEMS APPENDIX I

PA #	DESCRIPTION	STATUS		EVIDENCE	ASSIGNMENT
07.03.09	The college should respond as appropriate to the recommendations of the FCMAT.	Complete	<p>The Vice Chancellor created a matrix of the recommendations for the purposes of assigning ownership, establishing timelines, implementing the recommendations according to established benchmarks, and monitoring progress. Regular reports on the District's progress are made to the District Budget Advisory Committee. All the critical elements of the FCMAT college recommendations have been adhered to.</p> <p>Appropriate recommendations have been implemented to date including: instituting biweekly Chief Business Officers meetings, ensuring continued compliance with state and federal guidelines, drafting of Fund 17 procedures, aligning annual budget calendars, closer examination of rollover budgets, cross training of budget staff, and running of quarterly budget to actual analysis – the college actually runs monthly reports.</p>	WVMCCD FCMAT Recommendations Matrix; Fund 17 Procedures; MC Budget to actual analysis for Funds 100, 017 and 120 as of October 31, 2009	Vice-President, Administrative Services (GAP)
STANDARD IV					
07.04.01	Through the college's participatory governance process, the college will update its participatory governance model, procedures, and policies. The college will implement training and strategies for faculty, administrators, staff and students to improve participation in college governance and ensure that all participants be knowledgeable about decision-making processes.	Complete	<p>In 2007, the College's Governance & Planning Council (GAP), initiated a discussion of its role in the participatory governance and decision-making process. A task force was formed to assess the role and responsibilities of GAP, which necessarily meant that the roles and responsibilities of those groups represented at GAP would need to be assessed, as well. The task force met during the spring semester and reconvened in the fall 2008 to continue its work. Focus of the review was the Mission College Shared Governance and Decision-Making Plan, which had been developed in the late 1990s but had never been approved by all college groups. GAP reviewed the document in detail and identified specific concerns. The task force was directed to incorporate those concerns into a new draft and submit it to GAP at the first meeting in Spring 2009. The College provided a progress report on this planning agenda item (and Recommendation 10, scheduled for completion by the Accrediting Commission in March 2010) to the Board of Trustees on January 15, 2009 and again at special Board meetings held on August 29, 2009 and November 5, 2009. Since the last progress report, the College has continued the update of its participatory governance model. The College's Governance and Planning Council, its highest participatory governance body and also the College's Accreditation Steering Committee, initiated a review of the College's governance model in 2008-09 and has thus far accomplished the following:</p> <p>Developed a definition of participatory governance. (Adopted 4/22/09) The new model, adopted 6/3/09, is composed of up to 5 representatives for each of the college constituencies: faculty (Academic Senate), classified (Classified Senate), students (Associated Student Body), and administration. The President is a non-voting member and facilitates the GAP Council. The Governance and Planning Council (GAP) serves as the College's highest coordinating body for college governance, planning and institutional effectiveness and in that role, makes recommendations to the College President. It also acts as the College's Accreditation Steering Committee. (Adopted 9/30/09) Confirmed 09-10 membership based on the new model. Representatives were confirmed in October 2009. . • Basis for recommendations: GAP agreed to adopt consensus as its method for making recommendations. GAP agreed to a definition of consensus on December 2009. Training in the concepts of participatory governance has taken place through the Academic Senate, most recently in September 3, 2009.</p>	<p>Governance & Planning Council Summaries: 9/5/07, 1/30/08, 3/12/08, 9/10/08, 9/24/08, 11/12/08, 12/3/08, 4/22/09, 6/3/09, 9/30/09; 11/18/09, 12/09/09, 12/16/09; Mission College Shared Governance & Decision Making Plan; BOT Minutes, 1-15-09; BOT Agenda & Packet, 8-29-09; BOT Agenda & Packet, 11-5-09; MC Participatory Governance Model; MCAS Minutes 09/02/09</p>	President (GAP)
07.04.03	The District should adopt a new budget allocation model that ensures equitable distribution of resources to the colleges.	80% Complete	<p>The District Budget Advisory Committee (DBAC) formed and charged the Budget Allocation Model Subcommittee (BAMS) to develop and recommend a simple, equitable and transparent district Budget Allocation Model. In the fall of 2008, BAMS through a shared governance process recommended two budget models for DBAC consideration. With the arrival of the new Vice Chancellor, he has taken up the task of evaluating the proposed models to recommend a new model to DBAC by spring 2010. Most of the work is already completed.</p>	Current District Budget Allocation Model; The RSAC Model	Vice-President, Administrative Services (Board of Trustees)