

STANDARD I: INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND EFFECTIVENESS

The institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes achievement of student learning and to communicating the mission internally and externally. The institution uses analyses of quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation to verify and improve the effectiveness by which the mission is accomplished.

1A. Mission

The institution has a statement of mission that defines the institution's broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning.

1A.1. The institution establishes student learning programs and services aligned with its purposes, its character, and its student population.

Summary

Mission College's first priorities are student learning and success. The college serves the ever-changing educational and economic needs of Santa Clara, Silicon Valley, and the larger community. To accomplish its mission the college provides transfer, degree and certificate programs...community, career and vocational education, and educational opportunities in basic skills and English as a Second Language

(excerpt from Mission College mission statement, 2007)

Mission College's first priorities are student learning and success (EI.A1.1). Student learning programs and services are aligned with the college's mission statement, its character, and its student population (*t1*). (Notation of themes appears throughout the standard as follows: *t1, t2, t3, t4, t5, t6*). (A list of acronyms and definitions is available on page 388).

The mission statement emphasizes that the college is a comprehensive community college. The college offers 78 certificates of proficiency and completion and 36 AA and AS degrees. The college offers over 20 vocational programs, including programs in health occupations, business, computer applications and science, fire protection technology, graphic arts, graphic design, real estate and retail floristry (EI.A1.2). Community education provides a wide array of programs and courses designed to meet the needs of older adults, prospective parents, the developmentally disabled, those needing to meet court mandates, and those seeking personal enrichment (EI.A1.3). The college offers basic skills courses in reading, writing and math, and instructional support through such services as the Learning Assistance and Tutorial Center (LATC), the English as a Second Language (ESL) Lab, the Reading Lab, and the Mathematics Learning Center (MLC).

One of the college's largest programs is ESL, which serves the Silicon Valley's substantial ESL population with beginning to advanced level courses in listening, speaking, grammar, reading and writing. The college also has a unique Institute for International Studies and an International Students Center that provide international students with the English instruction necessary to pass the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) and enter Mission College. The college's commitment to a diverse and global student population is confirmed in its mission statement, which articulates the college's commitment to diversity and global stewardship (*t1*).

The college's programs and services reflect the needs of the diverse communities it serves. To ensure that student learning programs and services are aligned with its purposes, its character, and its student population, the college relies on data and information provided by the college's Office of Institutional Research (OIR). Using such information, the college has established new services aligned with its changing student population. For example, in 2004 Mission College was able to establish eligibility and qualify as a Hispanic serving institution. As a result, the college applied for and received a \$2.75 million Title V grant (EI.A1.4). Its purpose is to enhance outreach, recruitment, and retention, in particular for the Hispanic community (EI.A1.5). The Title V grant has enabled the college to establish a Welcome Center and several satellite offices (*t1*, *t2*, *t6*). Another example is the use of data to support program review. The college's Research Analyst provided demographic, enrollment, and where applicable, labor market data for programs to analyze and guide their reviews (EI.A1.6).

In addition to instructional programs, student services programs have been established to meet the needs of the student population. Services such as the Disability Instructional Support Center (DISC), Extended Opportunity Program and Services (EOPS), Career Placement, Counseling, CalWorks, ACCESS, and MESA are listed in the college Catalog and in the Schedule of Classes each semester (EI.A1.2, EI.A1.7). In 2006-2007, a Student Services planning template was created and all programs were asked to develop annual goals and objectives, relating them to the college's mission statement. Student Services departments, including Counseling, Admissions and Records (A&R), and Student Health Services, completed an annual review of their programs in Spring 2007 (EI.A1.8). The Student Services Council (SSC) regularly met in 2006–2007 to discuss program planning and goal setting (*t2*).

In Spring 2007, the college completed an update of its educational plan through a series of college-wide meetings led by the Academic Senate. The college mission statement was actively discussed during these meetings to ensure that the plan and mission were in alignment. The program review process was included as an integral component of the Educational and Facilities Master Planning (EFMP), as were program-level student learning outcomes (*t3*). The draft of the educational plan produced in Spring 2007 will be reviewed and finalized in Fall 2007 and thereafter submitted to the Board for approval (EI.A1.6).

Evaluation

The 2007 mission statement guides the college's student learning programs and services to ensure they are aligned with its purposes, character, and student population. The mission statement is found on the website, in the college Catalog, in the Schedule of Classes, and in some college planning documents. The revised mission statement has been widely disseminated and is central to current educational and facilities planning efforts (*t1*).

The Academic Senate is addressing the implementation of a continuous program review process to ensure that student learning programs and services are aligned with the college's mission and the students it serves. Planning should be linked with the college's process for resource allocation. The college President has advised both the Academic Senate President and the Vice President of Administrative Services, who oversees the college's budget processes, that the next evolution of program review must directly link program planning and resource allocation (*t2*).

Planning Agenda

- PA1.1 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.

Evidence

- EI.A1.1 Mission College 2007 mission statement,
http://www.missioncollege.org/gen_info/gen_info.html
- EI.A1.2 Mission College Catalog, 2006-2007
- EI.A1.3 Mission College Community Education Web site;
http://www.missioncollege.org/community/comm_ed/index.html
- EI.A1.4 Title V Grant Award Notification, 06-27-07
- EI.A1.5 2005 Annual Performance Report Mission College: Title V
- EI.A1.6 Mission College Educational Master Plan, 06-18-07
- EI.A1.7 Mission College Class Schedule, Summer 2006-Spring 2007 and Catalogs 2006-2008
- EI.A1.8 Mission College Student Services Summary Reports, 2006-2007

1A.2. The mission statement is approved by the governing board and published.

Summary

The college's revised mission statement, unanimously approved by the Governance and Planning (GAP) Council and the college President on July 11, 2007, was given its first review by the District's Governing Board on August 16, 2007 (EI.A2.-2). The second review and final vote to accept the revised mission statement was made on September 6, 2007 (EI.A2.3) (*t1*).

The mission statement is published in the college's annual Catalog (EI.A2.4) and can be found on the college's website (EI.A2.5). There are plans to post the mission statement in classrooms and offices and it will be included in the Spring 2008 Schedule of Classes. The college President has taken action to publish and widely disseminate the latest revised mission statement on the campus through such means as printing it on business-size cards that have been distributed throughout the college and developing a template for meeting agendas that incorporates the mission statement and that can be used by committees throughout the college (EI.A2.6).

Evaluation

This standard has been met.

Planning Agenda

None.

Evidence

- EI.A2.1 Governance and Planning Council Summary Notes, 07-11-07
- EI.A2.2 WVMCCD Board of Trustees Agenda, 08-16-07
- EI.A2.3 WVMCCD Board of Trustees Agenda, 09-06-07
- EI.A2.4 Mission College Catalog, 2007-2008 (7)
- EI.A2.5 Mission College website
(http://www.missioncollege.org/gen_info/gen_info.html)
- EI.A2.6 Governance and Planning Council Agenda, 10-04-07

1A.3. Using the institution's governance and decision-making processes, the institution reviews its mission statement on a regular basis and revises it as necessary.

Summary

The previous mission statement was adopted along with a set of core values and goals in Fall 2000. A formal review of this mission statement was initiated through the Governance and Planning (GAP) Council in 2004-2005 (EI.A3.1). The Academic Senate President agreed to lead a subcommittee to review the statement and, if the committee felt it was warranted, draft a new or revised statement. The mission statement review was folded into the overall Educational & Facilities Master Plan (EFMP) process (EI.A3.2) to provide direction for the process, with a planned college-wide vote to determine the final mission statement. In Fall 2005, the Academic Senate President brought forth four proposals (including the existing statement) for consideration by GAP and the Academic Senate (EI.A3.3). The EFMP process, including the mission statement vote, was placed on hold in Spring 2006 due to passage of the Academic and Classified Senate resolutions for work to contract (*t1*).

The process resumed in Fall 2006 with GAP narrowing the mission statement choices to two, one being new and one being the existing statement (EI.A3.4). A college-wide vote was announced through a series of emails and conducted via an on-line survey open to all college community members (EI.A3.2). The initial vote resulted in an exact tie, and voting was extended twice—both times also resulting in an exact tie. GAP membership decided to break the tie through a vote of GAP members; however this vote also resulted in a tie situation. Further consultation with college and District leaders resulted in a final decision to keep the existing mission statement due to a lack of clear consensus. GAP and the Academic Senate agreed that the mission statement should be reviewed again as part of the EFMP process. This review was completed in Spring 2007. GAP approved a revised statement on July 11, 2007 (EI.A3.5), and the Board of Trustees (BOT) approved it on September 6, 2007 (EI.A3.6) (*t5*).

Evaluation

The college has reviewed its mission statement through a participatory governance and decision-making process that included all constituencies. This process, however, did not initially lead to consensus on a revised statement. This lack of consensus reflected differences in perception as to the purpose of a mission statement. In revisiting the statement, GAP reviewed state and accreditation guidelines for mission statements as well as examples of mission statements from other California community colleges and shared this information with their constituencies (EI.A3.7). While Mission College did review and revise the mission statement during this time frame, no permanent policy for routine review and revision has been established.

Planning Agenda

- PA1.2 In the design of a systematic and integrated planning process, the college will ensure that the process include a scheduled review of the mission and values statements, and that the values and mission be visible and incorporated into decision-making processes.

Evidence

- EI.A3.1 Governance and Planning Council Summaries, 03-24-04, 10-13-04, 03-02-05, 11-08-05, 11-16-05
- EI.A3.2 Email Announcements for Survey Participation, 03-13-07, 03-14-07, 03-19-07, 03-22-07
- EI.A3.3 Mission College Academic Senate minutes, 11-10-05, 11-17-05
- EI.A3.4 Governance and Planning Council Summaries, 08-16-06, 10-11-06, 10-25-06, 11-15-06
- EI.A3.5 Governance and Planning Council Summary, 07-11-07
- EI.A3.6 WVMCCD Board of Trustees Agenda, 09-06-07
- EI.A3.7 Governance and Planning Council Summary, 06-06-07

1A.4. The institution's mission is central to institutional planning and decision making.

Summary

The college's previous mission statement, revised in 2001, served as the basis for many of the college's planning efforts. For example, individual division chairs have utilized the mission statement to inform their department's planning (EI.A4.1). The Grant Advisory Committee (GAC) requires that the request for funding be aligned with the mission statement (EI.A4.2). The Academic Senate, Governance and Planning (GAP) Council, College Budget Advisory Committee (CBAC), Division Chair Council (DCC), Classified Senate, and the Title V Grant Committee have not always consistently or explicitly referred to the language and content of the mission statement during their meetings, but the nature of their planning and decision-making has revolved around students' academic success, which is a core value expressed in the mission statement (*t1*, *t2*).

The college began a review of the 2001 statement in 2005 and over the course of many discussions, the college's mission statement received much greater attention than it had previously. As the college moved ahead with program review and educational planning, the mission statement was revisited many times to determine whether it accurately reflected the college's understanding of its purpose. Eventually the college was able to reach final consensus on the newly revised and approved statement. On July 11, 2007, GAP members unanimously approved the draft of the mission statement that has been under consideration. The President reported this outcome to the entire Mission College community through an email on July 13, 2007 (EI.A4.3) (*t5*).

The college's mission statement is now more visible and a more explicit part of the college's planning processes than in the past. The college's budget allocation process requires that proposals indicate the relationship of the request to the college's core values and goals, which are directly related to the college's mission statement (EI.A4.4)

Evaluation

There is a heightened awareness of the mission statement now that the college has completed an extensive review and revision. The mission statement has been explicitly incorporated into the decision-making processes, including educational planning and resource allocation.

Planning Agenda

None.

Evidence

- EI.A4.1 Mission College Technology Division Agenda & Minutes, 09-28-04
- EI.A4.2 Grants Advisory Committee application form, 03-01-06
- EI.A4.3 College President Update, email, 07-13-07
- EI.A4.4 CBAC approved Budget Request Form, 2007-2008

1B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

The institution demonstrates a conscious effort to produce and support student learning, measures that learning, assesses how well learning is occurring, and makes changes to improve student learning. The institution also organizes its key processes and allocates its resources to effectively support student learning. The institution demonstrates its effectiveness by providing 1) evidence of the achievement of student learning outcomes and 2) evidence of institution and program performance. The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.

1B.1. The institution maintains an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes.

Summary

The shift in focus from teaching to learning and the increased emphasis on student learning outcomes (SLOs) have reinforced and given shape to the college's historical commitment to student learning. In 2004 the college began an intensive dialogue about improving student learning through the use of SLOs, as well as taking significant action to begin their development and use. Initially, several faculty attended training in SLOs through support from the Title V grant (EI.B1.1) (*t1*).

In October 2005, the Academic Senate created an SLOs Committee comprised of the Academic Senate President, the Assessment Coordinator, and three faculty members (EI.B1.2). Each program head was asked to write a Program Level Outcome statement collaboratively with other members of the program. SLOs presentations were made by faculty at various campus forums, and an assignment was incorporated into the Educational and Facilities Master Planning (EFMP) process, which ensured that student learning was a fundamental component of the college's new Educational Master Plan (EI.B1.3) (*t3*).

During Spring 2006, Title V faculty in Math and ESL piloted courses with newly written SLOs. Fifty-six percent of programs submitted an SLOs statement for review. The final drafts were submitted and some met the deadline to be included in the 2006-2007 college Catalog, and additional changes were added to the 2007-2008 Catalog (EI.B1.4).

During the 2006-2007 academic year, course-level SLOs continued to be developed in math, reading and English. The Reading and English Departments received training in SLOs statement writing from in-house faculty trainers and external faculty trainers. They each wrote SLOs statements with assessments for their separate lab courses. The Math Department piloted several courses with new SLOs, and developed a learning community with one of these courses, Math 903 (Elementary Algebra). The Reading and English departments piloted new labs, and the English Department alone saw over 900 students participate in their new lab course in Spring 2007 (EI.B1.5).

In April 2007, the college was required by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) to submit an update on its progress in the development and implementation of SLOs. This matrix provided the college with an assessment of its progress and will serve as a benchmark and road map for continued work on SLOs (EI.B1.6). This report was discussed and accepted by the Academic Senate (EI.B1.7)

Basic skills are another area in which the college is engaging in dialogue about improvement of student learning. The college has been able to build upon the work it has done under the Title V grant in relation to basic skills, and the current Basic Skills Initiative from the State has increased dialogue and planning in this area. On September 28, 2007, the college sent a large team of faculty and staff to training for implementation of the Basic Skills Initiative. The team included the college President, the Academic Senate President, the Vice President of Student Services, basic skills faculty, counseling faculty, student support services staff, the Research Analyst, and the Director of Community Education. The team attended an all-day workshop that resulted in a list of challenges the college needs to address and the beginning of action plans to implement the initiative (EI.B1.8) (*t5*).

The college uses feedback to ensure that its continuing dialogue on student learning leads to improvement. This feedback includes measures of student success such as student engagement and satisfaction. The college conducted an internal student satisfaction survey in Fall 2001 and 2003 and conducted the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI)TM in Fall 2005 and 2006 (EI.B1.9). The Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI)TM is administered to a representative sample of students and asks students to rate both the importance of and satisfaction with over 100 items related to services and experiences at the college (EI.B1.10). Presented through the Governance and Planning (GAP) Council and the Title V Grant Advisory Group, responses are grouped with national responses from other participating community and junior colleges and allow for the college to identify areas of strength and areas needing attention, as experienced by the student body. Other student surveys have also been conducted, including Winter session Surveys (EI.B1.11) and surveys on specific student service programs (EI.B1.12). Surveys for student satisfaction with Counseling and Library services are in the planning stages and the new Vice President of Student Services is reviewing other instruments for possible use.

The college has taken steps to improve internal processes in order to be more effective, efficient, and ensure that faculty and staff can focus on student learning. For example, the Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) acquired CurricUNET, an online curriculum review and process application, which was implemented in 2006. This software facilitates a reviewable, step-by-step process that is open, documented and clear. There is extensive training for faculty to utilize CurricUNET (EI.B1.13).

The colleges have also been able to recover the wait list function, which was lost in the conversion to Datatel. Wait lists have proven to be a valuable tool in ensuring that the Schedule of Classes meets students' needs. The college has also been working on refining its enrollment reports used by the Performance Goals Committee (PGC) and the Office of Instruction to track FTES and make plans for the allocation of FTEF resources (EI.B1.14). As one of her first acts, the new President hired a consulting firm to assist the college in mapping its curriculum and scheduling processes in order to identify ways in which the college could streamline those processes and reduce inefficiencies (EI.B1.15). The results of this project will be available in Fall 2007 for college review and consideration. Should this approach prove beneficial, other internal college processes may be included (*t2*).

The new President has made documentation and improvement of institutional effectiveness one of her goals. The Research Analyst has participated in the state's implementation of the new accountability model, Accountability Reporting for the California Community Colleges (ARCC). The college's response to the 2007 ARCC findings (EI.B1.16) lists several areas where Mission College has undertaken steps to address issues such as developing new programs and adding class sections in high-demand subjects. The Research Analyst has been charged with creating a research agenda in 2007-2008 that incorporates the ARCC indicators. Further, the Analyst has been asked to research institutional scorecards used by other community colleges and make recommendations to the college for an approach that will allow the college to more easily and visibly monitor its performance in key areas. In September 2007, the Research Analyst made a presentation to GAP and provided samples of institutional scorecards for consideration as one approach to measuring effectiveness (EI.B1.17).

Evaluation

Ongoing, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes takes place at Mission College, as described above. One of the challenges to maintaining an ongoing, collegial self-reflective dialogue is the lack of documentation through published minutes. Major participatory governance groups, such as GAP and the Academic Senate, have agendas and minutes, but a number of smaller committees do not publish agendas nor keep minutes. The smaller committees generally have an agenda that is distributed at the beginning of their meetings, but these are not recorded, filed nor passed down from chairperson to chairperson. In some cases, no staff or committee members are assigned to take minutes, so the decisions and progress of these committees are left to the memory of the participants (*t5*).

There is currently no Assessment Coordinator to direct the assessment planning process, and no release time for faculty to lead the activities. This presents a challenge in ensuring an ongoing, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning. The new President has included among her 2007-2008 goals to support the hiring of a coordinator to facilitate student learning assessment, planning and implementation, and the replacement of the Assessment Coordinator needs to be the highest priority in the next hiring cycle.

Planning Agenda

- PA1.3 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.
- PA1.4 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.

Evidence

- EI.B1.1 Mission College Academic Senate Minutes, 04-29-04
- EI.B1.2 Mission College Academic Senate Minutes, 10-06-05
- EI.B1.3 Mission College Educational Master Plan, 06-18-07
- EI.B1.4 Mission College Catalogs, 2006-2007 and 2007-2008
- EI.B1.5 Mission College Report on SLO Activities, 04-16-07
- EI.B1.6 Mission College Progress Report, 04-07
- EI.B1.7 Mission College Academic Senate Minutes, 04-26-07
- EI.B1.8 Information and website for Basic Skills Initiative, <http://www.cccbsi.org/>
- EI.B1.9 Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI)TM results, Fall 2005
- EI.B1.10 Student Satisfaction with Academic & Student Support Services, 04-27-04
- EI.B1.11 Mission College Winter session Surveys (2005, 2006, and 2007)
- EI.B1.12 DISC Surveys Fall 2005 and 2007, Math Learning Center Satisfaction Assessment Summary, 05-02-06
- EI.B1.13 Kara Chambers emails Re: Schedule of Curricunet Trainings, 09-12-07 & 09-18-07; <http://www.curricunet.com/mission>
- EI.B1.14 Performance Goals Committee minutes, 2006 and 2007
- EI.B1.15 Proposal and contract with Phoenix Group, August 2007
- EI.B1.16 ARCC 2007 Report: College Level Indicators Self-Assessment, Mission College West Valley/Mission Community College District Response
- EI.B1.17 Governance and Planning Council Summary, 09-19-07

1B.2. The institution sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purposes. The institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. The institutional members understand these goals and work collaboratively toward their achievement.

Summary

The college's statement of Core Values and Goals, initiated in 2001 by a previous President (EI.B2.1), constitutes an important framework of "stated purposes" that address this standard. The Core Values, each with a set of goals, are:

1. Culture of the Institution
2. Teaching and Learning
3. Comprehensive Student Services
4. Community Connections
5. High Performance Educational Institution
6. Diversity
7. Planning and Institutional Effectiveness
8. College Facilities

In 2003, the former President attempted to revise the Core Values and Goals with the assistance of the Governance and Planning (GAP) Council; however, little progress was made (EI.B2.2). On February 26, 2004, the Core Values and Goals were introduced to the Academic Senate by the Senate President. Senators were asked to “consider to what degree cuts will impact those goals, consider if the goals are truly operational and realistic, and how should the Academic Senate proceed” (EI.B2.3). After queries to appropriate constituencies—committee chairpersons, Division Chair Council (DCC), Student Services, GAP, and the Academic Senate—and a subsequent review of meeting minutes and documents, it was determined that the overall majority of constituent groups were not explicitly using the Core Values and Goals as a guide to improving institutional effectiveness. In fact, most queried were not aware of the Core Values and Goals. However, because the Core Values and Goals are so broad, some constituents, by default, had articulated a vision that is in line with some of the Core Values and Goals (EI.B2.4) (*t1*).

Despite an apparent lack of consistent application across the college, at least two committees, the College Budget Advisory Committee (CBAC) and the Grants Advisory Committee (GAC) have taken a leadership role in championing the Core Values and Goals by using them as a guide in their planning processes.

Many individual programs or departments address the Core Values and Goals when they begin the process of submitting a funding request to CBAC. In a college-wide email, the Vice President of Administrative Services sends instructions electronically on how faculty and staff can make their budget needs known. The budget form requires that the budget requesters link their request to the college's Program Review and Core Values and Goals. This information is evaluated by CBAC in determining funding priorities (EI.B2.5).

The GAC requires that those planning to submit a grant must first follow the grants review process (effective 03-01-06) which necessitates that applicants “describe how [your] program would benefit students and align with the mission and core values of the college” (EI.B2.6).

Evaluation

Until recently, the awareness and implementation of the Core Values and Goals has been limited. Incidental alignment with the core values and goals or the focus on a few of the goals within a core value has been more the norm. Because of the breadth and complexity of the 8 Core Values and 53 Goals, implementation and follow through have been difficult.

However, in Spring 2007, the GAP Council reviewed the core values and goals as part of the educational planning process. It was determined that the core values were still viable but that some updating of the goals was necessary. GAP made and approved the revisions and they are included in the draft of the educational plan (EI.B2.7). Combined with the revised mission statement, the values and goals provide a foundation for strategic planning. Given the renewed focus on planning, it is anticipated that the values and goals will be more visible and more integrated into planning decisions (t2).

In order to improve the utility of the goals as a planning tool, there need to be measurable objectives developed for each goal so that the degree to which they have been achieved can be determined and discussed by the college community. The college has become more knowledgeable about developing outcomes measures with the implementation of student learning outcomes and the training that has taken place in the construction of effective, measurable outcomes statements. This knowledge will be used to incorporate measurable outcomes throughout institutional planning processes.

Planning Agenda

- PA1.5 The college will ensure that the Core Values and Goals be visible and incorporated into decision-making processes.
- PA1.6 The college will develop measurable outcomes for its goals.

Evidence

- EI.B2.1 Mission College Core Values and Goals, http://www.missioncollege.org/gen_info/pdf/mc_coreValuesGoals.pdf
- EI.B2.2 Governance and Planning Council Summary, 09-10-03
- EI.B2.3 Mission College Academic Senate Minutes, 02-26-04
- EI.B2.4 Rosalie Ledesma statement RE: conversation with Clement Lam, Division Chair, 05-17-07
- EI.B2.5 CBAC approved Budget Request Form, 2007-2008
- EI.B2.6 Mission College GAC: Mission College Grants Review Process, 03-01-06
- EI.B2.7 Mission College Education Master Plan, 06-18-07

1B.3. The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.

Summary

In 2003, the Academic Senate approved a new model for program review, called the Program Master Planning process (PMP). The model and its development are described in detail in the college's 2004 progress report to the Accrediting Commission (EI.B3.1). For various reasons noted in the Responses to Recommendations in this Self Study, implementation of this model was delayed to Fall 2004.

In Fall 2004, in consultation with the Academic Senate, it was determined that too many instructional programs were not current in terms of program review, and the 5-year cycle called for in the model would result in unacceptable delays in reviewing many programs (EI.B3.2). Given the abrupt demographic changes in the region, it was felt that a process should be implemented that would bring all programs up to a current level of review and that this process could also address other planning initiatives, such as the need for a current Educational and Facilities Master Plan (EFMP) and student learning outcomes (SLOs). Thus, PMP was temporarily set aside in favor of a comprehensive EFMP process intended to get all departments involved at the same time (*t2*).

The EMFP process was begun in 2005-2006 and was completed in Spring 2007 (EI.B3.3). The EFMP included elements of program review that were beyond a standard EFMP, as well as a student learning outcomes component. The third “assignment” of the EFMP process laid the foundation for linking planning and resource allocation (*t5*).

As agreed, the PMP process is being reviewed in Fall 2007 by the Academic Senate with the intent of beginning an ongoing cycle of regular review by Spring 2008 (EI.B3.4).

The college is engaged in on-going assessment focused on improving institutional effectiveness as evidenced by the draft of a new Educational Master Plan and by the program review processes outlined above (EI.B3.3). Efforts to improve effectiveness are not only college-wide but also occur within specific college areas. At the Division Chair level, for example, each Division Chair holds an individual pre-evaluation conference with the Vice President of Instruction to set goals (EI.B3.5). Goals for the DCC are set through communication from the Vice President of Instruction, who bases their goals on those of the President, who bases her goals on those of the Chancellor. As noted in the response to 1B.1, the college has acquired software tools to monitor and improve effectiveness and the President has instituted process mapping as an approach to increase institutional effectiveness and efficiency (*t4*).

The college uses both quantitative and qualitative data to inform decision making. The college Research Analyst provides trend information on enrollment, student success, and student demographics for instructional programs, as well as labor market data and community scan data to inform program review and educational planning. Student service areas are provided similar data, where possible. This data was extremely valuable during the EFMP process as evidenced in the final draft of the Educational Plan (EI.B3.3). Qualitative data from student assessments were shared with college leaders for Fall 2003, Fall 2005, and Fall 2006. In addition, qualitative data has been collected for specific programs and services, including the Disability Instructional Support Center (DISC) and Math Learning Support Center (MLSC).

Class Tracks, a new software program, provides departments with historical data to assist in the scheduling of classes. In addition, an online database, PARIS Vital Stats, provides formatted reports with key enrollment and success metrics updated on a semester by semester basis. State accountability data, student equity data, and placement data are also utilized for planning purposes. The college's Marketing Director is investing funds into market research that will help the college target its marketing efforts and make the best use of limited funding (EI.B3.6).

The college's new President has made planning a priority for the college with the intent that the college's existing processes be integrated into "an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation." For 2007-2008, the college President has directed the Academic Senate President and the Vice President of Administrative Services (who oversees the college's participatory budget process) to work collaboratively to ensure that the new program review model has such a link (EI.B3.4). Further, the college's budgeting model has been revised to begin the process earlier so that programs and services can know what funds they have available and can expend them in a timely manner (EI.B3.7).

Evaluation

Overall, the college is at the beginning phase of a resurrected cycle of systematic evaluation, implementation and re-evaluation. In spite of administrative turn-over and resulting changes in administrative focus and priorities, and in spite of delays created by a work-to-contract situation, the college has made impressive strides in institutional planning. Since 2006, all programs and services have completed program review, the mission statement and core values and goals were updated, an educational plan was completed, and progress was made in the implementation of SLOs (*t2*).

In addition, the college made a significant decision regarding the future of the physical plant, recommending that the main building be replaced by new facilities. The Board of Trustees (BOT) accepted this recommendation in Fall 2006 (EI.B3.8). A master planning architect was selected in Summer 2007 to complete the college's master plan by Spring 2008. The educational plan will appropriately drive the facilities plan. The college's next step is to integrate the educational and facilities master planning processes and forge a direct link with resource allocation.

The college's research capability is constrained by limited staffing, lack of a fully functioning data warehouse, limited reporting tools, and lack of a District research and planning office to provide additional support. The District's Chancellor has made it a goal of 2007-2008 to establish a research and planning office at the District level and proposed a model to the District Council in Fall 2007 (EI.B3.9). District Information Systems has been working with the college's Research Analyst to select a computer applications vendor for the design of a comprehensive data warehouse with enhanced reporting capabilities. Information Systems has identified this vendor and is currently updating data servers in preparation for installation of software and the subsequent creation of the data warehouse (EI.B3.8) (*t4*).

Planning Agenda

None.

Evidence

- EI.B3.1 Mission College Midterm Report, October 2004
- EI.B3.2 Mission College Academic Senate Minutes, 05-15-03
- EI.B3.3 Mission College Educational Master Plan, 06-18-07
- EI.B3.4 Mission College Academic Senate Minutes, 09-13-07
- EI.B3.5 Clement Lam, Division Chair, Math, conversation, 05-17-07
- EI.B3.6 Mission College Academic Senate Minutes, 09-27-07
- EI.B3.7 Mission College Budget Allocation Models, 05-05 & 05-07
- EI.B3.8 WVMCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Agenda, 11-16-06
- EI.B3.9 Chancellor's Goals, 2007-2008

1B.4. The institution provides evidence that the planning process is broad-based, offers opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.

Summary

All key college planning committees, such as the Governance and Planning Council (GAP), the College Budget and Advisory Committee (CBAC), and the Facilities Safety Committee (FSC) are broad-based and offer opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies. The Academic Senate produces a list of all committees and their members with their departments. The charge of each committee and the term length are included in this list, which is posted on the campus intranet (*t2, t3, t4, t5, t6*) (EI.B4.1). Members are solicited through the participatory governance structure, and membership is representative of administration, faculty, classified, and students whenever possible (*t5*).

The college resource allocation process is primarily carried out through budget requests made following the processes outlined in the college budget allocation model (EI.B4.2). CBAC decides on financial allocations to departments and programs, through a prioritization process developed through participatory governance. Budget requests submitted to CBAC are reviewed and prioritized at several levels by various participatory governance groups before CBAC makes a final recommendation to the GAP. There is a "Last Resort" subcommittee of CBAC that decides on emergency funding for special needs. The budget allocation model is reviewed biannually, and in Fall 2007 the Academic Senate began a review to tie it more closely with the college's program review process (EI.B4.3).

New faculty position requests are jointly prioritized and ranked by the Academic Senate and the Division Chair Council. Positions other than faculty are normally presented by programs and services during the budget allocation process, prioritized by CBAC, and forwarded to GAP, which, in turn, makes recommendations to the President (EI.B4.4-6) (*t4*).

During much of 2006, “work to contract” resolutions hindered the progress of and broad-based participation on many of the key committees. Even during this difficult period, planning processes at Mission College showed a strong commitment on the part of the administration to gathering input from the broadest possible range of participants, as demonstrated by the forums held to discuss facilities planning during Fall 2006 (EI.B4.7) (*t5*).

Evaluation

To ensure institutional effectiveness, the college has in place planning structures to ensure that all constituencies have an opportunity to participate in planning decisions, including resource allocation. As noted in the summary, there is a good cross-representation of the college in most of the key committees. There are many faculty, however, who participate in committees at a very minimal level, while there are others who are on multiple college committees. The report resulting from the Technical Assistance Visit in September 2006 revealed that many faculty/staff lack clarity about their roles on committees and their responsibilities to communicate with their constituencies (EI.B4.8). The Presidents of the Academic and Classified Senates and the college President are discussing ways in which to encourage and support broader participation in committees (*t5*).

Institutional effectiveness may be diminished by committees that do not record meeting minutes. Communication between major committees needs to be strengthened, which could be enhanced by improved distribution of minutes. Many college and District committees do not send their meeting minutes outside of their own committee membership. The Academic Senate actively provides thorough minutes of each meeting and posts them in e-mail messages, as well as providing print copies (EI.B4.9) (*t2*).

While the Academic Senate’s committee list shows that nearly all committees encourage student participation, few college committees actually have active student representatives (*t4, t5, t6*) (EI.B4.1). College-wide decisions are discussed and prioritized in the Student Services Council (SSC) and the Division Chair Council (DCC). Their recommendations are given to GAP. Some individuals have reported their concern that their representatives do not distribute or actively solicit information. In August, 2007, GAP initiated a review of its purpose with the intent of clarifying roles and responsibilities (EI.B4.10).

Planning Agenda

- PA1.7 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.
- PA1.8 The District and college will explore and implement ways to encourage and support the active participation of all employees, especially classified, in college and District governance.

Evidence

- EI.B4.1 Academic Senate Committee List, 2006–2007
- EI.B4.2 Mission College Budget Allocation Model, 05-07
- EI.B4.3 Mission College Academic Senate Minutes, 09-06-07
- EI.B4.4 Student Services Council Planning Templates 2005
- EI.B4.5 Academic Senate Meeting Minutes, 11-02-06, 10-26-06 & 10-10-06
- EI.B4.6 PGC Agendas & Minutes 12-06-06, 11-20-06, 10-09-06, & 09-25-06
- EI.B4.7 Mission College Main Building Forums and Discussions on Paris Intranet, http://paris/mc/predidents_office/index.html; Paris→ Main Building Discussion Documents→ Emails or Discussion (Q & A)
- EI.B4.8 WVMCCD Technical Assistance Visit, 09-09-06, http://www.missioncollege.org/senate/documents/Part_Gov_Rept.pdf
- EI.B4.9 Mission College Academic Senate Minutes, available online at http://www.missioncollege.org/senate/agendas_minutes.html
- EI.B4.10 Governance and Planning Council Summary, 08-29-07

1B.5. The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.

Summary

Based primarily on the work from the Office of Institutional Research (OIR), student satisfaction and campus climate surveys (EI.B5.1-4) have been conducted, documented and communicated to appropriate constituencies, including the Governance and Planning Council (GAP), the Academic Senate, academic divisions, student support services and the Title V Grant committee. In addition, standard performance indicators such as the Partnership for Excellence Summary were previously utilized and communicated to the campus community through email announcements and website postings (EI.B5.5-11) (*t3, t5*). Since Partnership for Excellence was suspended as a statewide assessment, these reports are no longer created. The new statewide assessment, Accountability Reporting for the California Community Colleges (ARCC), was implemented in Fall 2006 and results of this assessment were communicated through the President's Council, GAP, and the Academic Senate (EI.B5.7) (*t2*).

PARIS Vital Stats (the college intranet) includes automatically-generated reports on key performance indicators at the college, department, and course level. Vital Stats reports are accessible year-round through the internal PARIS website, updated each Fall and Spring semester, and include information on enrollment, student success, student retention, grading variability, student awards, and more. Summaries of these reports were distributed through part of the Educational and Facilities Master Plan (EFMP) process (EI.B5.6).

Academic departments, such as Math, have utilized these assessments (EI.B5.4) and the PARIS Vital Stats online data system to guide their course planning and inform their student learning outcomes. Based on enrollment trends, student surveys and other internal data from the institution, the Technology Advisory Task Force created in February, 2004 re-examined its technology course offerings to guide the future of the curriculum (EI.B5.12) (*t1, t3, t5*).

The OIR is currently researching models for an institution-wide “scorecard” which can be distributed annually to all academic departments and core student services. This “scorecard” will provide feedback and assessment on a regular basis to supplement the EFMP review processes. Models for the template were shared and discussed with GAP in September of 2007, and will be taken to the Academic Senate, the Classified Senate, and other constituencies for consideration (EI.B5.13).

Evaluation

The college uses documented assessment results with the intention to improve institutional effectiveness. However, the process could be conducted in a more consistent and systematic manner that would encourage participation by all academic departments. Documented assessment results have been used and communicated to departments since 2001, but there has not been a clearly defined cycle of evaluation. As noted in the response to Standard 1.B.1, the college’s lack of an Assessment Coordinator at present also poses difficulties in efforts to develop and utilize effective assessments. Moreover, the college’s ability to assess and document institutional effectiveness and progress are constrained by the lack of a District research and planning function, the lack of a fully functioning data warehouse, and limited staffing to support college research (*t6*).

Planning Agenda

- PA1.9 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.
- PA1.10 To support the planning processes and improvement of student learning, the college will develop an institutional effectiveness website through the Office of Institutional Research.

Evidence

- EI.B5.1 Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI)TM results, Fall 2005
- EI.B5.2 Student Satisfaction with Academic & Student Support Services, 04-27-04
- EI.B5.3 Winter session Surveys (Winter 2005, 2006, 2007)
- EI.B5.4 Math Learning Center User Satisfaction Assessment Summary Details, 05-02-06
- EI.B5.5 Mission College Partnership for Excellence Status, 04-25-04
- EI.B5.6 Mission College EFMP binder 2007
- EI.B5.7 ARCC 2007 Report: College Level Indicators Self-Assessment, Mission College West Valley/Mission Community College District Response
- EI.B5.8 PARIS online data system (Intranet only: <http://paris/>)
- EI.B5.9 Student Equity Plan, 03-03-05
- EI.B5.10 Student Equity Documents 2007
- EI.B5.11 Mission College Staff Demographics 05-07
- EI.B5.12 Mission College Technology Division Task Force, 08-24-06
- EI.B5.13 Governance and Planning Council Summary, 09-19-07

1B.6. The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts.

Summary

The college is committed to systematic review and revision, as necessary, of its planning processes to ensure their effectiveness. As noted in the response to standard I.B3, the Academic Senate is currently evaluating the program review process and assessing ways to integrate the results of this process with the resource allocation process (EI.B6.1). This is the third review of the program review process since 2001 (*t2*).

The resource allocation process at Mission College is primarily conducted through the budget request process carried out annually by the Office of Administrative Services through the efforts of the College Budget Advisory Council (CBAC). The college's current budget allocation model was established in 2001 (EI.B6.2) and contains a provision for biannual review and revision. Revisions must be approved by the Academic Senate. The most recent revision was adopted in Spring 2007 (EI.B6.3).

The College and District Budget Advisory Committees (CBAC and DBAC) evaluate and adjust the resource allocation processes as necessary. Prompts for such adjustment may include one-time funding from the State, enrollment shifts, or budget shortfalls. The participatory governance composition of both committees, with balanced representation from faculty, staff, students and administration, ensures a balance of interest and input in these matters.

Mission College has an Office of Institutional Research (OIR), staffed by one Research Analyst who reports to the Vice President of Instruction (EI.B6.4) and sits on the President's Council. The need for institutional research is driven by many factors: annual enrollment cycles, market/outreach analysis, grant report data requirements and Board requests. Periodic reporting such as the Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (ARCC), the Educational and Facilities Master Plan (EFMP) process, and other efforts, drives the need for institutional research and requires adjustments to workload and focus of the research staff (EI.B6.5-6). Research data is acquired through a number of approaches, including the registration computer system, student and staff surveys, and county demographic reports.

Evaluation

The college engages in systematic review of its planning and resource allocation processes and modifies them as necessary and appropriate. As noted throughout this Self Study, the college's goal is to develop a more systematic and fully integrated planning process that directly links planning with resource allocation (*t2*).

The college recognizes the importance of basing planning on data and information and attempts to ensure data-driving decision making within the constraints of limited resources. Institutional and other research efforts were advanced by the hiring of a permanent Research Analyst in August 2005 after a one-year vacancy in the position. Discussions began in Fall 2005 with District Information Systems on the creation of a comprehensive data warehouse which would greatly enhance reporting capabilities (EI.B6.7). Subsequent informal discussions have been held in various forums, including the Governance and Planning Council (GAP), regarding the need for a District research and planning function, as well as support staff for the existing college research office and the need for equipment and software to warehouse data. As noted above, the resources available to the OIR are limited and may impact the overall effectiveness of the review of these processes (*t4*).

Planning Agenda

- PA1.11 The college will evaluate the staffing and resources available to its Office of Institutional Research to ensure that the office is able to provide the data and information necessary for systematic planning and continuous improvement of student learning.

Evidence

- EI.B6.1 Mission College Academic Senate Minutes, 09-13-07
- EI.B6.2 Mission College 2001 Budget Allocation Model, 09-27-00
- EI.B6.3 Mission College Academic Senate Minutes, 05-03-07
- EI.B6.4 Mission College Organization Chart, 08-06
- EI.B6.5 ARCC 2007 Report: College Level Indicators Self-Assessment, Mission College West Valley/Mission Community College District Response
- EI.B6.6 Mission College Education Master Plan, 06-18-07
- EI.B6.7 District-led Data Warehouse Project Launch Meeting Announcement, 11-28-05 email; Data Warehouse Timelines document, 01-30-06

1B.7. The institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services.

Summary

The college has a series of evaluation mechanisms for improving effectiveness of programs and services, both formal and informal.

The Student Services Council (SSC) oversees the wide-scale evaluation of services. In 2004, an initial plan for annual reporting of accomplishments and evaluations of program effectiveness was initiated, but not fully adopted due to difficulties with the reporting document. Members of the SSC consulted with the college Research Analyst in Fall 2005 to create a revised version of this annual report (EI.B7.1). The revised report was completed by all Student Services areas for 2005-2006; goals identified in this report will serve as the basis for future evaluation. This report serves as a report of activities, review of progress to date, and opportunity to set new goals. The SSC will review the effectiveness of this report each year and revise the reporting instrument as needed (*t2*).

In addition to the annual report of the SSC, several areas within student services conduct their own department-level evaluations. Many programs which receive outside funding submit annual reports to the State Chancellor's office and follow mandated guidelines, and several other support services also prepare annual reports (EI.B7.2.) Student Health Services also collects information through a Customer Satisfaction Survey given following services, which is reviewed by all staff on an annual basis, with the survey last having been revised in 2002 (EI.B7.3). Student Health Services also has an Advisory Committee, including students, which meets on a biannual basis to advise the Coordinator of Health Services on recommended changes in programs and services as well as to provide support in securing necessary resources (EI.B7.4).

The Library also prepares reports on an annual basis, and has instituted a series of specific goals beginning in 2005 as part of the Educational and Facilities Master Plan (EFMP) process (EI.B7.5). Evaluation of activities and programs is reviewed during departmental staff meetings and during annual retreats.

For all courses utilizing placement tests (ESL, English, and Math), evaluation instruments used for placing students into classes have been reviewed, and in some cases replaced by alternate tests. All assessments used for placement are listed on the state's list of approved instruments, and instruments have been reviewed by area faculty working with the college Research Analyst or Assessment Coordinator to meet all components of the assessment cycle at the college level (EI.B7.6).

Instruction as a whole is reviewed through the EFMP process as well as through Program Review. Both of these processes have been revisited and revised through the leadership of the Academic Senate (EI.B7.7-9). Various individual departments also have internal methods of evaluation, primarily through *ad hoc* discussions at the departmental level.

Evaluation

While there are a wide range of evaluation mechanisms in place at Mission College, core evaluation activities are largely overseen at the department level with some additional activities conducted through representative governing committees. Many services have revised their evaluations as a result of departmental discussions and incremental modifications. Most areas lack systematic coordination as well as documentation of guidelines for reviewing evaluation mechanisms. The use of an institutional scorecard, introduced at the GAP in September 2007 (EI.B7.10), is one promising approach for achieving the goal of systematic evaluation.

As noted in the response to Standard 1B.5, as part of a systematic and integrated planning process, the college plans to establish benchmarks for all components of institutional effectiveness and develop assessment, evaluation and reporting strategies and tools that are informative, easily updated, user-friendly, and widely available to all college planning groups.

Planning Agenda

None.

Evidence

- EI.B7.1 Mission College 2006-2007 Student Services Summary Reports
- EI.B7.2 Annual Reports (EOPS, MESA, Access, DISC, LATC), 2001-2007
- EI.B7.3 Fall 2003 Student Satisfaction Survey: Health Services, Student Services Summary Report: Student Health Services 2006-2007, End of Year Report: Student Health Services 2005-2006
- EI.B7.4 Mission College Health Services Advisory Committee Minutes, 09-24-02 & 12-04-03
- EI.B7.5 Mission College Library Annual Report 2005-2006 & Mission College Library Annual Report 2005
- EI.B7.6 Placement Tests for Mission College with Activities, 2001-2006

- EL.B7.7 Mission College Task Force Program Master Planning Design 2003, 05-13-03
- EL.B7.8 EFMP Planning Documents: EFMP Presentations 10-21-05, 08-26-05, & 01-26-06; Educational & Facilities Master Plan Review & Update Governance and Planning Council 11-15-06, Mission College Task Force Program Master Planning Design 2003, 05-13-03
- EL.B7.9 EFMP Assignment Templates; 2005
- EL.B7.10 Governance and Planning Council Summary, 09-19-07