

EVALUATION REPORT

MT. SAN JACINTO COLLEGE

1499 N. State Street
San Jacinto, California 92583

A Confidential Report Prepared for
The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

MT. SAN JACINTO COLLEGE

Team Roster

October 18-20, 2005

Mr. Michael Rota (Chair)
Associate Vice President for Academic
Affairs
University of Hawai`i Community
Colleges
Honolulu, Hawai`i

Mr. Gary Hughes
Associate Vice President
Educational Technology and Library
Services
Hartnell College
Salinas, California

Mr. Michael Adams
Director of Facility Services
Mendocino Lake Community College
District
Ukiah, California

Mr. Vincent Piro
Instructor, English
Merced College
Merced, California

Mr. John Armstrong
Professor
Guam Community College
Yigo, Guam

Dr. Lisa Sugimoto
Vice President, Student & Learning
Services
Pasadena City College
Pasadena, California

Mr. James Barr
Senior Research Analyst
American River College
Sacramento, California

Dr. Louise Pagotto (Assistant)
Assistant Dean of Arts & Sciences and
Curriculum Management
Kapi`olani Community College
Honolulu, Hawai`i

Mr. Daniel Henry
Vice President Academic and Student
Services
Los Medanos College
Pittsburg, California

SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION REPORT

INSTITUTION: Mt. San Jacinto College

DATE OF THE VISIT: October 18-20, 2005

TEAM CHAIR: Michael T. Rota
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs,
University of Hawai`i Community Colleges

The Mt. San Jacinto College (MSJC) district encompasses more than 1,700 square miles, 12 school districts, and six federally designated Indian reservations (with one tribal school). The communities the College serves are characterized by the construction of a considerable number of newly built houses and schools on

- programs developed in partnership with local agencies and businesses.
2. Initiating a program review process in the student services division that has already resulted in the submission of several program reviews.
 3. Creating an accommodating campus climate that the students have perceived as supportive of their learning.
 4. Committing to the development and implementation of a broad-based process that produced the College Master Plan that details the College's primary goals.
 5. Making progress toward developing Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). These initial efforts need to move forward in the development, implementation, and assessment of SLO's throughout the College.
 6. Initiating pro-active safety programs and facilities development and maintenance activities to provide a safe and secure campus environment for students and staff, including:
 - Regular workstation ergonomic evaluations;
 - Finalization of a emergency preparedness plan; and
 - Successful implementation of a police department for both campuses in response to increasing campus crime.

Recommendations

1. **The team recommends that the College examine its mission statement and make the changes necessary to make it more effective in aligning programs and services by:**
 - 1.1 **clearly defining the College's educational purposes;**
 - 1.2 **its intended student population; and**
 - 1.3 **its commitment to achieving student learning. (I-A)**
2. **The Team recommends that the College develop policies, procedures and regular practices to ensure that:**
 - 2.1 **the various programs and services of the College engage in regular assessment of institutional effectiveness, including program review;**
 - 2.2 **the College set priorities for implementing plans for improvement that are based in analysis of research data;**
 - 2.3 **the College incorporate established priorities into the governance, decision making, and resource distribution processes;**
 - 2.4 **the College develop and employ a methodology for assessing overall institutional effectiveness and progress toward meeting goals expressed through plans for improvements; and that the College report regularly to internal constituencies and the Board on this progress. (Standards I.B., II A. 1. and 2., II.B.3.a., II B. 4.,**

II.C.1.e and II.C.2; III.A.6., III.B.2.b., III.C.1. and 2., III.D.1. a, IVA.1, 2, 3, B.2.b, and the Preamble to the Standards.)

- 3. The Team recommends that the College develop a comprehensive plan for the development of student learning outcomes at the program and course levels, for using data about student achievement of those outcomes to assess and improve the quality and effectiveness of programs and services, and to integrate the results of the process into decision making and planning at the College (Standards I-A, I-B.7; II-A.1, 2, 3)**
- 4. The Team recommends that the College adopt and publish implementation policies and procedures designed to help guide and provide consistent approaches to decisions that are critical to the operations of the College. (II-B.2.c, d; and IV-A.2, 3)**
- 5. The Team recommends that the physical planning and technology planning processes be integrated with, and supportive of, the implementation of the District Master Plan, the strategic plan, program plans, and the budget development process, and that the processes provide for participation of stakeholders. (III-B.1; B.2; and C.2; D.2)**
- 6. The Team recommends that the Office of Human Resources initiate a careful review of the institution's use of human resources and of its programs and services, including conducting needs assessments and evaluations of the programs and services it offers. Similarly, professional development activities need to be connected to identified faculty and staff needs and their effectiveness assessed. Planning for all aspects of human resources needs to be integrated with other institutional planning. (III-A.1.c, III-A.2, III-A.4.a, III-A.5.b, and III-A.6)**
- 7. The Team recommends that the Board implement its established policy on self-evaluation. (IV-B.1.e, g)**

**ACCREDITATION EVALUATION REPORT FOR
MT. SAN JACINTO COLLEGE**

October 18-20, 2005

INTRODUCTION

difficulty drawing clear connections between the self study report and ACCJC Standards, institutional practices, and supporting evidence, the supporting materials made available in the workroom assigned to the team were well organized and referenced to the ACCJC Standards.

Commendations for Mt. San Jacinto College

The 2005 visiting team had the opportunity to read and assess the College's self study report and supporting documents, the report of the March 1999 visiting team, and other sources of evidence related to the assertions made in the self study report. The team met on both the San Jacinto campus and the Menifee Valley campus with a variety of individuals and examined the facilities. The team conducted two open sessions (one on each campus) in which any member of the college community could meet with the team for any reason, and met with the members of the board of trustees, the faculty, students, staff, and superintendent/president. The visiting team recognizes the significant work being done by the administration, the faculty and staff by commending the College for:

1. Creating an array of vibrant career education programs in response to the needs of its community; particularly the number of successful programs developed in partnership with local agencies and businesses.
2. Initiating a program review process in the student services division that has already resulted in the submission of several program reviews.
3. Creating an accommodating campus climate that the students have perceived as supportive of their learning.
4. Committing to the development and implementation of a broad-based process that produced the College Master Plan that details the College's primary goals.
5. Making progress toward developing Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). These initial efforts need to move forward in the development, implementation, and assessment of SLO's throughout the College.

Recommendations for Mt. San Jacinto College

The College self study report was prepared using the four standards adopted by the Commission in 2002, an approach, that if well structured, allows the visiting team

1.3 its commitment to achieving student learning. (I-A)

Evaluation, Planning, and Improvement

- 2.4 the College develop and employ a methodology for assessing overall institutional effectiveness and progress toward meeting goals expressed through plans for improvements; and that the College report regularly to internal constituencies and the Board on this progress. (Standards I.B., II A. 1. and 2., II.B.3.a., II B. 4., II.C.1.e and II.C.2; III.A.6., III.B.2.b., III.C.1. and 2., III.D.1. a, IVA.1, 2, 3, B.2.b, and the Preamble to the Standards.)**

Student Learning Outcomes

Though the dialogue and activities associated with student learning outcomes at the College are very recent, there seems to be genuine willingness to approach this task with enthusiasm and seriousness both in instruction and student services. The College needs to develop long-term plans for integrating student learning outcomes at all levels.

Recommendation

- 3. The Team recommends that the College develop a comprehensive plan for the development of student learning outcomes at the program and course levels, for using data about student achievement of those outcomes to assess and improve the quality and effectiveness of programs and services, and to integrate the results of the process into decision making and planning at the College (Standards I-A. I-B.7; II-A.1, 2, 3)**

Organization

The College is confronting a number of organizational issues as it tries to respond to the dramatic growth in the district, the staffing and operation of three widely dispersed entities, including two campuses (San Jacinto and Menifee Valley) and a learning center in Temecula. In addition, there are a number of changes in the leadership including the retirement of the president. The organization is decentralized and highly dependent upon the leadership skills and vision of key administrators. Given the number of interim appointments, the ability of the campus to continue to progress in meeting its mission is dependent upon well established, published, and well understood policies and procedures.

The College has a Board Policy manual that covers the general category of issues; however, there are few details in the form of published procedures and practices available to describe how the processes are intended to function and guide faculty, staff, and administrators in meeting their various responsibilities.

Recommendations

- 4. The Team recommends that the College adopt and publish implementation policies and procedures designed to help guide and provide consistent approaches to decisions that are critical to the operations of the College. (II-B.2.c, d; and IV-A.2, 3)**
- 5. The Team recommends that the physical planning and technology planning processes be integrated with, and supportive of, the implementation of the District Master Plan, the strategic plan, program plans, and the budget development process, and that the processes provide for participation of stakeholders. (III-B.1; B.2; and C.2; D.2)**
- 6. The Team recommends that the Office of Human Resources initiate a careful review of the institution's use of human resources and of its programs and services, including conducting needs assessments and evaluations of the programs and services it offers. Similarly, professional development activities need to be connected to identified faculty and staff needs and their effectiveness assessed. Planning for all aspects of human resources needs to be integrated with other institutional planning. (III-A.1.c, III-A.2, III-A.4.a, III-A.5.b, and III-A.6)**
- 7. The Team recommends that the Board implement its established policy on self-evaluation. (IV-B.1.e, g)**

RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE PREVIOUS COMPREHENSIVE VISIT

March 1999

The College has made attempts to address all the previous team's recommendations. However, the degree to which individual recommendations have been met is uneven.

Standard 2. Institutional Integrity *[now within Standard IV]*

Recommendation 2.1: The Team recommends that the college address the issues surrounding timely and accurate communication to internal constituencies within the college and between the campuses, particularly focusing on college-wide decision making and work-in-progress in order to improve support for the planning, budget development, and shared governance processes.

The team finds that the College has made some progress in responding to this recommendation. The College intranet has provided the campus communities with easy access to both formal and informal communication mechanisms. Committees have made extensive use of the capacity to post agendas and minutes. The College has completed two comprehensive master planning processes and has provided documentation that demonstrates both widespread participation in the development

The college should clearly delineate the relationships among the Master Plan, the Educational Plan, the Strategic Plan, the Facilities Plan, and program review. The processes, timelines, and results of the master planning process should be clearly and regularly communicated to the college's constituencies.

The team recognizes the efforts the institution has made to address this recommendation; however, the team finds that this recommendation has not been satisfactorily met. The College began its 2000-2005 Master Plan immediately after the previous site visit. The second cycle of master planning, Master Plan 2004-2009, was developed through a broad-based, inclusive process in response to the 2000-2005 Master Plan Progress Report. While the self study report asserts that the College has redesigned the budgeting process to link program review, the educational plan, the facilities plan, and the master plan, the team has found no evidence of budget process redesign or of such integration of planning and budgeting processes. Though the College Master Plan has clearly defined goals and outcomes, the institution continues to operate without an integrated planning, resource allocation and program review process.

Standard 4. Educational Programs [now within Standard II]

Recommendation 4.1: The Team recommends that the college create a connection between non-credit ESL and the English curriculum that allows students to attain their educational goals.

The College has made progress in addressing this recommendation. A sequence of ESL credit courses has been developed and a non-credit “bridge course” connects the highest level of non-credit offerings to English and/or ESL credit offerings. The highest level ESL course feeds into the developmental level English course (ENGL 098 English Fundamentals). The flowcharts for these sequences are included in the Schedule of Classes. However, absent any data, the team cannot assess whether the new courses, new sequence, and other interventions actually do allow students to attain their educational goals.

Recommendation 4.2: The Team recommends that the causes of the high withdrawal rate of basic skills students be identified and measures be instituted to reduce the withdrawal rate and promote student success.

The College has not yet addressed the specific issues around high student withdrawal rates raised in this recommendation. Asked to identify causes and institute measures to reduce the withdrawal rate of basic skills students, the College reported that it responded by implementing a standardized placement test (ACCUPLACER) and implementing prerequisites. No data are provided to indicate whether this, or any other, strategy has been successful. A Summer Bridge program was piloted, but no data are provided to indicate whether this approach has been effective in lowering the rate of withdrawal. The College has also initiated a number of other strategies, e.g. an online “early alert” system and focus groups to examine intervention strategies. It appears that the College has tried to implement a

variety of approaches without first determining the causes of the high withdrawal rate.

Standard 5. Student Support and Development [now within Standard II]

Recommendation 5.1: The Team recommends that the college immediately implement a systematic Student Services program review process for all departments within the division, so that appropriate, data-based decisions can be made about program efficacy and deployment of human and fiscal resources.

The team recognizes that there has been an increasing willingness and interest in developing a functional program review process across student service groups; however, the team finds that this recommendation has not been sufficiently met.

The evidence provided by the College includes the most recent Student Services Program reviews, some of which date from 1995 and none of which has data on the evaluation of the services. Even the most recent Program Reviews (2002) do not appear to include either an assessment of the program's services or an identification of program outcomes. Measures used are more typically the number of students served, etc. Two program areas (Financial Aid and EOPS&C) conducted Program Reviews in the same year (2002), but, again, as is cited in the previous team's recommendation, the process was not systematic: the two documents are not consistent in the information that they report or in the analysis they provide.

Though the process has matured since the recommendation, there are still concerns with the overall substance and potential of the review process to provide the College with the necessary information to guide planning and budgetary processes. A second concern is that without clearly defined and integrated program evaluation, planning, and resource allocation, program review and planning are not connected to other institutional processes.

Standard 6. Information and Learning Resources [now within Standard II]

Recommendation 6.1: The Team recommends that the college systematically assess the needs of the Libraries and Learning Centers on both campuses and implement practices that will assure that consistent progress is made toward meeting minimum standards for adequacy of materials and equipment, acquisition and maintenance, accessibility, staffing, financial resources, and evaluation/review of these programs.

The College has made progress in meeting this recommendation, committing funds to improving the facilities for Learning Resources at the Menifee Campus and to enhancing the students' access to library resources in general and to online resources in particular. While there is still concern with the services of the library because of the age of the collection and the lack of inventories and weeding efforts, the level of support given this area has improved substantially since the last accreditation visit: (1) additional funding for collections has been provided, (2) new full time librarians have been hired, (3) a new LRC/Library is now being built at the -0.0tationystevisit:ude 9(rev libS3upe9he level of support giveecae5verall subao7)/

College has obviously made a concerted and honest effort to improve this area as much as budget could allow. The self study report notes that a new tracking system has been implemented to monitor student use. No data are reported to confirm the effectiveness of the tracking system. No data are presented to indicate that the College has developed an ongoing, systematic assessment of the adequacy or effectiveness of its learning resources and services.

Standard 7. Faculty and Staff *[now within Standard III]*

Recommendation 7.1: The Team recommends that the college examine the dual standard of equivalencies for equity.

The College has addressed this recommendation. In July 2000, the Board of Trustees adopted a policy that eliminated a dual standard for equivalencies. The Vice President for Human Resources provided assurances that the same measures of equivalencies are used for full-time and part-time faculty. However, materials available on the website report different standards. Instructions for associate faculty ([www.msjc.edu/hr/associate faculty.htm](http://www.msjc.edu/hr/associate%20faculty.htm)) explain the equivalency policy for this class of instructional faculty, posted September 28, 2000, after the Board of Trustees' decision on the equivalency policy, states that there are no equivalencies for full-time faculty. The latter document, posted by the Academic Senate, is incorrect, according to the Office of Human Resources.

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

The

5. Administrative Capacity

Mt. San Jacinto College meets this eligibility requirement. The College reports that it employs 25 administrative staff, all of whom have the requisite preparation and

knowledge and promotes intellectual inquiry. General education requirements include demonstrated competence in writing and computational skills and an introduction to some of the major areas of knowledge (physical science, social science, and the humanities). Degree credit for GE programs is consistent with levels of quality and rigor appropriate to higher education. While the degrees do require credits in GE, General Education learning outcomes have not been identified.

- (EOP&S); Cooperative Agencies Resources for Education (CARE); Veterans Services; and International student services
- _ Student activities and clubs
- _ Tutorial services

15. Admissions

Mt. San Jacinto College meets this eligibility requirement. While the mission does not define the population served by the College, MSJC is a public community college, and all college locations, educational modalities, facilities, services, and courses without established prerequisites are open to high school graduates or persons over the age of eighteen. Admissions requirements are stated in the catalog, the schedule of classes, and on the College's Website.

16. Information and Learning Resources

Mt. San Jacinto College meets this eligibility requirement. Leaving aside the broad scope of the College's mission, the information resources are adequate, and while the library operations are severely constrained by a lack of consistent funding, the services are adequate.

17. Financial Resources

Mt. San Jacinto College meets this eligibility requirement. The College maintains educational programs and services through prudent fiscal management. By Board of Trustees policy, the district maintains a minimum 5% reserve.

18. Financial Accountability

Mt. San Jacinto College meets this eligibility requirement. The College reports that an independent accounting firm conducts an annual audit, the results of which are shared publicly at an open Board of Trustees meeting, as well as through distribution of reports. MSJC complies with all financial reporting requirements by the CCCCO, the State of California, and the U.S. Department of Education (Chapter 6 of the MSJC Board Policy Manual).

19. Institutional Planning and Evaluation

Mt. San Jacinto College does not fully meet this eligibility requirement. While MSJC regularly reports institutional achievement data, the team found no evidence that MSJC regularly assesses or reports on learning outcomes. The Master Plan provides evidence of planning for improvement, including environmental scanning, assessment of services, and implications for institutional directions. However, the team found no evidence that the College integrates program assessment, master planning, budget allocation, and other decision making, nor does it engage in a regular cycle of evaluation of its decision-making processes.

20. Public Information

Mt. San Jacinto College meets this eligibility requirement, with two exceptions noted below. MSJC publishes precise and accurate current information in the printed college catalog, in the schedule of classes, and on the website. All

categories of General Information required by the Commission are present in the catalog except for two: academic freedom statement and information on the acceptance of transfer credits. All categories of information for Requirements are included. All major policies affecting students are included in the catalog.

21. Relations with the Accrediting Commission

Mt. San Jacinto College meets this eligibility requirement. MSJC and its Board of Trustees provide assurances that the College complies with Commission requests, directives, decisions and policies, with a Board policy confirming this responsibility pending approval.

EVALUATION OF MT. SAN JACINTO COLLEGE

communities. There is a dramatic difference in income between the service areas of the two campuses. The Meniffee campus area average family income is \$57,476 while the San Jacinto campus area average family income is \$38,366. There are also other significant differences between the two campuses. The San Jacinto campus has more students of color, more ESL students, more students with disabilities, and more students below the poverty line. The College's

assurance that the item being reviewed by the committee supports the mission of the college. (I-A)

According to the self study report, the institution attempts to assess whether it is meeting the needs of its student population through student surveys, instructor evaluations, data about student success rates, Performance for Excellence evaluation reports, and community/business advisory groups. The College does not appear to have formal, systematic process to measure institutional effectiveness. For example, program review has been implemented inconsistently over the years, which weakens the ability to review institutional effectiveness. This unsatisfactory implementation of program review has been an on-going issue with recommendations from previous accreditation teams. (I-A.1)

The college mission statement has been approved by the governing board and published and communicated broadly. The self study report notes that on June 6, 2005, the Board of Trustees adopted the mission statement, and it notes that the mission statement is published in the College's master plan, catalog, and schedule of classes as well as posted on the College's website. The College's mission statement appears in the most recent College catalog and online. (I-A.2)

The College reviews its mission periodically, approximately every 4-5 years as part of the master planning process. During the last development of the Master Plan (2004-2009), the College revised its mission statement, and the Board of Trustees approved it in 2005. The *Charrette* method used during the master planning process allows for incorporating the interest of the institution's stakeholders. According to the Master Plan 2004-2009, the two-day *Charrette* included approximately 100 district and community members. (I-A.3.)

According to the Vice-President of Instruction and Curriculum Chair, the institution's mission is central to institutional planning and decision making as is evident in its use during the curriculum process, master planning process, and planning process of various areas, such as Instructional Services and Student Services. (I-A.4)

B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

The development of the 2000-2005 College Master Plan was supported through a broad-based dialogue across college units to define the College's goals for the next five years. This process was repeated again in the development of the 2004-2009 College Master Plan. With the development of a research office in 2000 and the availability of research data for evaluation of college processes, a greater opportunity for dialogue among college units also emerged to better address institutional effectiveness and planning. As a result, the College has been able to extend the dialogue on evaluation of college efforts to a much greater constituency through a wide variety of reports and publications, such as the annual Fact Book. Because the College has only recently begun to address student learning outcomes, there is little evidence at this point of the research

improve the overall evaluation of institutional effectiveness and planning efforts, but does not have a clear plan specified at this time. (I-B.3)

At the most fundamental level, the College creates task forces comprised of trustees, faculty, staff, administrators and students to participate in developing the College Master Plan. It is not clear how membership in the different planning units, the Curriculum Committee, and the Program Review Committee interact with the Master Plan process, but there are no indications that adequate or broad representation is an issue at the College. Though Business Services seems committed to a budget cycle of planning, evaluation and improvement to direct resources across the College, it has not yet completed a formal program review, so evidence for the effectiveness of this process has not been established, communicated, or integrated within the overall planning cycle. The College appears to adequately deal with economic issues as noted under other standards, but the College would like to pursue securing resources through alternative means more aggressively. The College did provide evidence for a number of improvements and changes that have resulted from planning and evaluation efforts associated with Master Plan in Progress Report in 2002, and have made plans for another progress report some time in fall 2005. (I-B.4)

Currently, the College produces a variety of quantitative data and reports for evaluating the dimensions of institutional effectiveness. The Fact Book appears to be the primary document to convey matters to both the College and public and is available in both paper and online. The College has plans in fall 2005 to provide workshops to better describe the range of data and reports that are currently available to faculty and staff. At this point, there has been little progress with student learning outcomes, so no assessment evidence relating to student learning has been published for discussion or dissemination. (I-B.5)

The entire planning and evaluation process appears to revolve around and be driven by the College Master Plan, but there is little evidence of how planning in program review, budget and the curriculum actually interacts or is integrated within this overall planning process on a regular basis. The College has provided evidence that the planning and evaluation cycle has produced improvements within individual areas. The revised 2004-2009 College Master Plan based on the evaluation of the 2000-2005 Master Plan through progress reports is evidence of changes and improvements. Overall, the College seems to implement improvements based on a cycle of evaluation and planning, but it is not clear just how the overall planning process functions. (I-B.6)

Currently, program review serves as the primary process for the College to evaluate its programs and services and is overseen by the Program Review Committee. Instructional services are currently on a five-year cycle, and student services are on a two to three-year cycle. There are plans to implement a program review cycle for administrative services and other student learning support services, but no timeline has been established at this point. Though program review is designed to address goals within the College Master Plan, it is not clear how evaluation efforts in program review are shared with other

decision making groups in terms of budget and overall planning efforts. Currently, instructional program review is described as a cumbersome process, and faculty describe resistance to a process that does not appear to feed into or be integrated with any existing planning or budget process. Another concern from instruction is the lack of a well-defined and easily interpreted data set from research to support the needs of the process. At this point, there is little evidence that instructional program review systematically contributes to college improvement in programs and services. It is also not clear how student learning outcomes will be integrated with program review, though recent dialogue in the Student Learning Outcomes Committee has recognized the need as have the members of the academic senate and curriculum committee. (I-B.7)

Conclusions

The College takes great pride in its mission statement as evident by its placement throughout the College and the statements of administration, faculty, and staff. However, the statement is quite broad, and it is difficult to determine how effective this statement is in stating the College's purposes and whether these purposes, then, are appropriate to a community college. The mission statement itself does not set boundaries for degrees or programs offered, nor does it define the intended student population or show the College's commitment to student learning. (I-A)

Overall, the College appears to meet many aspects of the standard, but does warrant recommendations regarding the overall integration of evaluation, planning and budget process. The team could not find evidence that program review was implemented systematically in all program areas. Though the dialogue and activities associated with student learning outcomes at the College are very recent, there seems to be genuine willingness to approach this task with enthusiasm and seriousness both in instruction and student services. The College needs to develop long-term plans for integrating student learning outcomes at all levels. The Program Review process is not stable and has not been implemented consistently over the years.

Recommendations

- 1. The team recommends that the College examine its mission statement and make the changes necessary to make it more effective in aligning programs and services by:**
 - 1.1 clearly defining the College's educational purposes;**
 - 1.2 its intended student population; and**
 - 1.3 its commitment to achieving student learning. (I-A)**

- 2. The Team recommends that the College develop policies, procedures and regular practices to ensure:**

2.1 the various programs and services of the College engage in regular assessment of institutional effectiveness, including program review;

planning in summer 2005 for the beginning of a college-wide discussion of learning outcomes and assessment in fall 2005, only very limited efforts to address these topics, in isolated instructional programs and by sending a few faculty members to a workshop, had occurred. In an addendum provided to the team immediately prior to the site visit, the College outlines its recent, intensive efforts to engage faculty in the development of course- and program-level learning outcomes. The results of Fall 2005 workshops indicate that the College has taken an important step in developing SLOs for its courses and program. (II-A.1.c; II-A.2.i)

Interviews confirmed that the initial review of the need for an instructional program is conducted by the Instruction Office and is based on the recommendations of an advisory committee in the case of occupational programs. Proposals for new courses and programs are reviewed and approved by the Curriculum Committee. (II-A.2.a)

The College provides assurances of quality instruction by citing its faculty hiring and evaluation processes and the support services provided to faculty (e.g., Faculty Resource Center and faculty development activities) and students (e.g., Disabled Students Programs and Services). The review of breadth, depth, rigor and sequencing of curricular offerings is conducted by the Curriculum Committee and interviews with faculty and management representatives confirmed that this process of course review is effective. (II-A.2.b, c)

Efforts to assess student learning styles and to provide instruction that addresses the needs identified are not described in the self study report. The College uses peer and student evaluations to determine the effectiveness of instruction via various delivery modes. (II-A.2.d)

The college program review process calls for instructional programs to be evaluated regularly with each program conducting a self study based on data that it selects, on input from advisory committees in the case of occupational programs, and on analysis provided by the faculty. Faculty and instructional managers interviewed by

As reported in the self study report, use of departmental course examinations is minimal. For those course level examinations that are listed, there is no mention of any effort to validate the tests. (II-A.2.g)

Units of credit are granted according to generally accepted norms in higher education as evidenced by statements in the College catalog. Course outlines link student evaluation to course objectives and the faculty evaluation process includes attention to evaluation practices. The self study report indicates that the awarding of degrees and certificates is based on completing a required set of courses which build skills and competencies in the field. (II-A.2.h, i)

The college general education pattern requires coursework in the major areas of knowledge and the curriculum approval process is used to ensure that content and methodology for these areas are included in the course outlines. (II-A.3.a)

The self study report did not provide information regarding college efforts to ensure that outcomes related to life long learning and ability to be productive are addressed in the general education curriculum other than the assertion that “All degree applicable courses are required to meet standards of critical thinking and college-level reading.” However, the team was informed that learning and behavioral objectives are included in the online Faculty Curriculum guide (II-A.3.b)

The self study report indicates that effective, ethical citizenship is addressed both through coursework in multicultural/gender studies and U.S. history and through observation in “some political science courses or in student government coursework”. (II-A.3.c)

As outlined in the college catalog, degree programs include at least one area of focused study. (II-A.4)

Students who complete vocational and occupational degrees and certificates meet employment competencies. One way the College assures students have such competencies is to get feedback and input from advisory boards about necessary employment skills. Such advisory committees meet annually and provide feedback to the College so that students can meet employment competencies. Vocational students are also prepared for licensure and certification as is evident by their pass rates on licensure and certification exams. It appears the College receives information on whether students can demonstrate the appropriate competencies required and that adjustments to curriculum have been made to address certain concerns. (II-A.5)

The College’s catalogs, schedules, and website provide students with clear, accurate information about educational courses and programs. They also clearly describe degrees and certificates offered. Information about programs is reviewed annually

by the Office of Instruction, faculty, Student Services, and Community Education and Workforce Development. (II-A.6)

The College provides faculty and department chairs with a course syllabi checklist and a sample syllabus that indicates one of the requirements is to include course objectives. These syllabi are submitted to the Office of Instruction and department chairs for review. The College is currently designing a plan to implement student learning outcomes on campus, and during the 2005-2006 academic year, instructors are becoming initiated with the student learning outcomes assessment cycle. (II-A.6)

Counselors review course work transferred into the institution to ensure it is comparable to Mt. San Jacinto curriculum. The College's statement on the acceptance of transfer credits into the institution is difficult to find in the catalog. It is included in a section entitled "Graduation Requirements" (p. 63), rather than in the section called "Transfer and Articulation," where a student might more logically look.

The College has agreements for the transfer of course work. The College publishes transfer of credit agreements in its catalog and schedule and refers students to counselors to guide students through matriculation. These policies are reviewed annually, according to the self study report. (II-A.6)

The College has articulation agreements with many colleges and universities. It should be noted that the self study report stated that CSU and UC transfers have decreased by 6% in recent years. However, according to CPEC (California Postsecondary Education Commission), MSJC had an overall 3% increase in transfers. (II-A.6.a)

A review of the Board Policies and Administrative Procedures reveals that the College has no policies or procedures to address the elimination of programs. However, the Academic Senate and Curriculum committee are in the final stages of approving policies and procedures related to the elimination of programs. According to the Vice-President of Instruction, the curriculum committee handles major changes in programs and courses, and it has a functional set of policies and procedures. The self study report indicates that "when programs are eliminated or modified, students are notified of these changes" (p. 72) and efforts are made by faculty and counselors to assist students in completing their education in a timely manner. (II-A.6.b)

The self study report indicates that the College reviews its policies, procedures, and publications regularly, and it identifies the departments and offices responsible for the review of the catalog for accurate information. The College represents itself clearly, accurately, and consistently to prospective and current students, the public, and its personnel through its catalogs, statements, and publications, including electronic formats. The self study report noted that the college website provides

accurate data on the Student Right to Know web page about information on student transfer, graduation, retention, and success rates. (II-A.6.c)

The self study report and interviews with faculty reveal that the Board of Trustees recently approved statements on academic freedom and professional ethics. These, however, are not published in the faculty handbook, catalog, or college website. The College also clearly states policies on student academic honesty. The College is currently drafting its student discipline administrative procedures regarding student

program proposals is typical of the review process conducted by the Curriculum Committee.

Although the self study report asserts that “College Faculty excel at their employment of a variety of teaching innovation,” the team was not able to confirm that the College makes systematic efforts to assess student learning needs and styles. Faculty evaluation teams assess the effectiveness of various teaching methodologies in meeting student needs by reviewing student evaluation survey data and conducting class visits to assess faculty performance.

Although the college master planning and program review processes have been utilized to respond to changing community needs and to provide some level of quality assurance, a great deal of work remains to be done by the College in order to meet the expectation that high-quality instruction is ensured via systematic assessment and improvement processes that are based on student learning outcomes.

The College by and large meets the standards of this section. The Academic Senate and Curriculum Committee are in the final stages of approving policies and procedures to address the elimination of programs. Currently, student learning outcomes are not integral to course syllabi. However, college faculty leaders realize that the implementation of a student learning outcomes assessment cycle must be integrated into the institutional, program, and course levels. The College has no formal process to evaluate whether instructors are distinguishing between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline and whether they adhere to the course learning objectives. However, it should begin the implementation of a Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle that is integrated into institutional, program, and course level evaluation. Also, while the College states that policies and procedures exist, the College needs to proceed with the revision and completion of its policy and administrative procedures work in areas such as procedures for enforcing student discipline.

Recommendations

See Recommendations 2 and 3 at the end of Standard 1.

B. Student Support Services

Observations and Findings

The college catalog and website provide current information to students and constituencies. The currency and accuracy of information are ensured through a review process that has been developed by the Office of Instruction. The online version of the catalog was developed and was linked to the website in 2001. The material on the website is available in a text-based version. (II-B.2)

While the self study report indicates that policies that are published in the catalog are reviewed and updated annually by key contact individuals, when specific policies or procedures are not available through the official publications (e.g., Academic Freedom Statement), information is not easily accessible and, on the most part, is not available (i.e., policies and related procedures are in the process of being developed) (IIB, 2a and d).

When students were asked for their view of the College and their overall satisfaction with services, those interviewed commented on the supportive faculty and staff. Students perceived the College as being very student oriented and student centered. Students who were interviewed felt their input was honored and in situations where specific student input was requested, students felt that their concerns were heard (e.g., student input on the need for a student center). Students commented that they were involved on a variety of committees such as the Student Services Committee and College Council. They believed that through these committees they had a voice in improving services at the College. (II-B.3)

Student perceptions of student services

students. Currently seventy-five percent of the students use online services for completing the admissions form, and an online Spanish admissions form is being currently developed. The College is committed to a continued assessment of student needs at its offsite locations and has indicated that a number of services will be provided online. (II-B.3.a)

Admissions practices are evaluated on a three-year program review cycle and this assessment is used to provide improved services and equitable access for all students. These evaluations have led to improved online admission access and indicated the need for the current development of a paper and online Spanish admissions form. The ACCUPLACER assessment instrument is used to place students into math and English reading and writing courses, while the CELSA is employed for ESL placement. Both instruments are on the California Community College Chancellor's Office approved list, and the College is currently involved in the process of validating current cut scores, content validation and cultural bias. (II-B.3.e)

The College maintains student records with the Datatel system and employs multiple levels of security to maintain student confidentiality, including nightly back ups. Separate networks for instruction and student records, firewalls and secure socket layer (SSL) encryption are utilized to prevent unauthorized access to student information. The College conforms to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and the California Education Code requirements for access, record keeping and maintenance, and these policies are communicated to students through the MSJC catalog. With the move to online services, enhanced security and access issues have been addressed through ongoing training for staff. (II-B.3.f)

Student support programs such as Enrollment Services, Counseling, Financial Aid, Career/Transfer, EOP&S, DSP&S, LSP Matriculation/Outreach, Upward Bound, and Athletics are evaluated through program review on a two to four-year cycle. The results are used within individual units to improve services for students and

implemented. The strongest concern with student services as in the past accreditation cycle remains with the incompleteness of the program review process and the lack of linkage with planning and budgetary process.

Although the student services division has made strides in implementing a program review process, the degree to which survey results and research have been integrated in the program review and planning process varied in the sample program reviews provided. The team discovered that those involved in program review perceived the process as evolving and maturing. Nonetheless, given the original recommendation to implement program review was made five years ago, the progress made to date is a concern.

When asked about the suggestion boxes, which are located at the SJC and Menifee Campuses, students and support staff knew where the boxes were located, but were not sure they were consistently used to gather information on services. It was also unclear to the staff if the survey results were used in any manner to improve services to students. New sites will require an evaluation of services and the effectiveness of those services in meeting student needs and improving student learning.

As more and more online services are developed and made available, evaluating the effectiveness of this method of delivering service will be required.

Recommendations

- 4. The Team recommends that the College adopt and publish implementation policies and procedures designed to help guide and provide consistent approaches to decisions that are critical to the operations of the College. (II-B.2.c, d; and IV-A.2, 3)**

The agreements are adequate with sufficient provisions for evaluating services through usage data and quality of service provided metrics. (II-C.1)

The library has conducted student satisfaction surveys for both the San Jacinto and the Menifee campuses. These surveys, which are included in the program reviews at both campuses, document high levels of satisfaction with services provided. These surveys are being used to improve existing services at both libraries. Student and faculty feedback processes are not in place to evaluate and make changes to instructional courses the library provides. This is an area that needs improvement. There are no student learning objectives now in place in library or the learning resource centers. This is an area in which planning is now taking place. (II-C.2)

Conclusions

The College has used student surveys and other college comparisons, to determine if they have sufficient depth and variety of collection materials to meet student needs. Data in these documents support the finding that students are generally happy with the services provided. However, statistical reviews of collection usage data and the overall age of the collection support the finding that there is concern as to the student value of a good portion

Mt. San Jacinto College are found in a policy developed by the MSJC Academic Senate and approved by the Board of Trustees (www.msjc.edu/academicsen/ab1725.htm). According to the self study report, these criteria are in alignment with those established statewide in *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges*, and the Office of Human Resources website includes a link to minimum qualifications on the Chancellor's Office website. By adhering to the established

evaluation of personnel was related in any way to institutional effectiveness and

the contents of their personnel records through appointment while they are monitored by HR staff. (III-A.3.b)

of the Faculty Resource Center surveys faculty needs. (III-A.5.a)

A faculty-coordinated FLEX committee organizes professional development activities. The faculty coordinator of the Faculty Resource Center provides workshops, as well. The College has made a commitment to helping faculty understand and develop student learning outcomes, an effort which was conducted through the Faculty Resource Center. MSJC also provides paid sabbatical leave to eligible faculty. Beyond evaluations for the most recent Classified Day program of activities, which are available on the College website

professional development activities need to be connected to identified faculty and staff needs and their effectiveness assessed. Planning for all aspects of human resources needs to be integrated with other institutional planning. (III-A.1.c, III-A.2, III-A.4.a, III-A.5.b, and III-A.6)

See recommendation 2 at the end of Standard 1.

B. Physical Resources

Observations and Findings

The self study report is vague and does not provide evidence of compliance with many areas of this standard or in its approach to identifying the role that physical resources plays in meeting Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). The self study report does not provide a clear picture of where the district is headed, nor does it provide specific findings that confirm that systematic internal assessment of physical resources is taking place. Consultants are referenced in response to many critical areas of campus physical resource planning, suggesting that the district relies heavily on consultant services for planning. (III-B.1)

The self study report provided no indication of the criteria and process utilized to evaluate the safety of facilities. Interviews with the Vice President of Human Resources, the Director of Maintenance and Operations, and the Chief of Police confirmed that a high level of awareness of campus safety is present on both the San Jacinto and Menifee campuses. An active safety committee takes a pro-active approach to workplace safety, and a campus police department was established in 2003 in direct response to goals delineated in the 2000-2005 Master Plan. (III-B.1)

The district's facilities are in line with the space allocations authorized by the State Capitol Outlay Guidelines. The facilities are well kept and provide a pleasant and safe environment for students and staff. (III-B.1)

The site resource allocation for facility needs, at both the San Jacinto and Menifee campuses, is subject to review by the facilities planning committee, whose function is to address elements included in the master plan that are primarily focused on individual program needs. Broader institutional facilities planning is done based on state standards and is developed utilizing a consultant. The work of this committee does not appear to be directly related to the institution's master planning process. (III-B.1)

A representative from each site participates in the facilities planning committee and in the operational prioritizing of needs. Plans are implemented into action through the College Council. While no clear written process for either planning or

The district utilizes the Chancellor's Office system (FUSION) for assessing facilities utilization, physical resource needs, and maintenance. The district is in the process of developing an internal assessment of facilities condition. Implementation of this internal assessment, separate from FUSION, is essential to maintain a responsive maintenance plan. Equipment in support of distance services is contracted to outside vendors. A commitment to support these programs is indicated in the substantive change report submitted for online asynchronous web delivery. (III-B.1)

An extensive list of projects is referenced in the self study report. The district master plan is discussed but no mention is made of total cost of ownership of any of the areas covered in the standard. Some pre-planning for staffing and for new facilities has taken place, but the team did not find proof of a formal process for identifying these needs through planning. (III-B.1.a)

Equipment replacement needs are met at the college unit level (Instruction or Administrative Services) with no apparent overall institutional prioritization. Facility needs are identified and forwarded to the facilities committee while equipment needs are met through the instruction or administrative services offices as noted above. The team found no formal internal assessment process to assure access to all facilities and programs. (III-B.1.a)

The physical presence of on-site maintenance supervisors appears to be the method utilized for maintaining sufficient control over off-site facilities. (III-B.1.b)

Assessment of facility use is done annually using the Chancellor's Office FUSION program, which assesses utilization, facilities capital outlay, and scheduled maintenance needs. Given the lack of clarity of the self study report document and the lack of evidence provided, the team cannot determine whether the College conducts any comprehensive evaluation of facilities or what method is utilized to make capital plans. (III-B.2)

While the district acknowledged the impacts related to the total cost of ownership, the inconsistency in State financial resources was also identified as a deterrent to meeting this need. The College does not appear to have formal internal planning processes that link college goals with long-range capital planning. The team could not find any documented policies or procedures linking the master plan, the strategic plan, and physical resource planning. (III-B.2.a, b)

Conclusions

The district is in substantial compliance with this standard. The district physical resources are effectively managed and maintained. However, long range planning and individual project planning do not include input and communication with all stakeholders in the planning process. Furthermore, facilities' planning is done without a comprehensive review of the district master plan, strategic plan, student

learning outcomes or program plans, resulting in facilities that may not be responsive to student learning outcome needs. Planning for resources needs to be integrated with other institutional planning processes.

The College provides “Blackboard” training to faculty via the Faculty Resource Center. Documentation of staff training does exist although it is dated and reflects a reduction of training in the last three years. The team found no evidence that the College has processes in place to determine the effectiveness of training provided or the technology needs for staff or students. (III-C.1.b)

The College demonstrates excellent support and implementation of its enterprise software system – Datatel. It also documents good support for its delivery of network services. The College’s computer network is of high quality, fully supported with firewalls, virus and spam protection. (III-C.1.c)

The College conducts full backups of essential data that could be used in a disaster recovery incident. These data are stored at a different site than where the computer center is located. Server or other hardware loss would require emergency procurement and recovery would take a substantially longer time. (III-C.1.c)

The distribution of academic equipment is made at the Dean’s level through a list of equipment that is available for redistribution, which the Dean of Information Services provides. The College has built a state-of-the-art network that links the two campuses together with a DS3 connection. This network on both campuses is sufficiently robust to meet current and future needs. The College does not have a technology obsolescence plan or procedure in place to keep the technology infrastructure current. As needs arise, requirements are forwarded to the budget committee for consideration. That committee makes recommendations to the Executive committee for funding decisions. Sufficient consideration is given to equipment and software decisions for distance education. It is unclear how the College evaluates the effectiveness of technology. (III-C.1.d)

The college has charged the Information, Communication, and Technology Committee (ICTC) with setting standards establishing facility needs and recommending purchases. However, the team found no documented policies or procedures for how the ICTC executes its charge. The team found no evidence of processes for plans and improvement of facilities that emanate from institutional need. Additionally, the team found no evidence that evaluations of programs and services drive technology procurements. The team found no evidence that technology decisions are based on the results of assessment of program and service needs. Technology purchases do not appear to be prioritized. Technology needs submitted to the Budget Committee reference the Master Plan. (III-C.2)

Conclusions

The College has made substantial achievements in the use of technology on both the academic and administrative sides. Additional effort is needed in assessing the effectiveness of this technology and in dialoguing the need of technology with all stakeholders.

Recommendations

budget committee but instead in the College Council. The Budget Committee studies funding allocations provided by the State; considers proposals provided by departments and forwards that to College Council. (III-D.2.a)

A review of the budget and audits indicates the College does allocate budget in a realistic manner that supports the institution. External audits are done annually for budget and auxiliary activities. The audits reflect that the College complies with generally accepted accounting standards. Audit findings are dealt with promptly and satisfactorily. The latest audit (June 30, 2004) was unqualified with no material weaknesses. There were two questioned costs, to which the College promptly responded. This standard appears to be fully met. (III-D.2.a)

The self study report states that the College Council, a shared governance committee, reviews the College's financial status quarterly. The budget committee, also a shared governance committee, meets monthly. The committee's minutes provide evidence that fiscal conditions, financial planning and audits are being

Managers and the budget office conduct internal reviews on grant submittals to assure they are consistent with the mission of the College and externally submitted budget reports (Department of Education, California Chancellor's Office). The institution has not received any negative audit review during the last six years. Based on the evidence provided in each of the external audits, the College deals with findings immediately. (III-D.2.e)

The College's use of all financial resources supports its mission, as attested to in budget and audit documents. All required audits and reviews have been verified and are in order with no substantial findings. All evidence supports the finding of integrity in the management of financial transactions. There was no evidence seen that would suggest this standard is not being met. (III-D.2.e)

The College has developed partnerships with community, civic, education, healthcare, and business entities. Review of these partnerships indicates that they are being developed in support of academic programs. These initiatives are also supported by external advisory committees. (III-D.2.f)

The College Council reviews the College's financial status on a quarterly basis. The Master Plan describes the role of the budget committee and its processes. The Budget Committee, which reports to the College Council, is made up of administrators, faculty, classified staff, and student representatives and is responsible for reviewing and recommending changes in allocation of discretionary funds. Though both the College Council and the Budget Committee actively monitor and update the budgetary process throughout the year, with input from other planning efforts, there is no formal program review process in place. The College has indicated that it plans to develop and implement a program review process for Business Services. Though the College has experienced fiscal strain in the last four years, the evidence for the effective use of financial resources is seen in the district's ability to maintain fiscal stability during this period. Recent land acquisitions made by the College are a good indication of the College's commitment to improving access to education services in outlying areas. (III-D.2.g)

Conclusions

The linkages among planning, the budget development, and budget allocation processes still need to be clarified. The description of the Budget Development process was not easy to understand. The process by which the College sets its priorities is not clear; in addition, the College needs to assess the effectiveness of funding specific priorities in accomplishing the learning outcomes and planning priorities. Members of the College expressed concerns about the integration of the budget process with other campus processes and the empowerment of all stakeholders in the budgetary process. A second concern is the assessment of capital investments on improved student learning outcomes

Recommendations

See Recommendation 2 at the end of Standard I.

See Recommendation 5 at the end of Standard III-B.

STANDARD IV: Leadership and Governance

Observations and Findings

A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

The College communicates a commitment to excellence through its mission statement, its master planning processes and a variety of other planning and communication vehicles. Information regarding institutional performance is regularly shared via the publication of fact books and one progress report has been published in recent years. The master planning process is highly inclusive and participatory. (IV-A.1)

The self study report provides minimal information regarding the effectiveness of college governance processes at the College and constituency leaders indicated that the shared governance processes do not provide clearly defined vehicles for planning and decision-making. (IV-A.1)

The College has a shared governance document that describes the structure and purviews of the governance committees and the administration. The official responsibilities of the Curriculum Committee are clearly outlined in their operating procedures. The master planning processes have provided opportunities for substantive involvement by all constituencies. Interviews and reviews of governance documents confirm that the institution relies on the faculty, through established governance and curriculum review procedures, for recommendations about learning programs and services. (IV-A.2.a, b)

Both the governing board and the College have written policies describing the roles of the constituencies in the governance process. A survey conducted by the College indicates that the majority of employees understand the college governance processes and that they feel encouraged to participate. The majority of all employees and students surveyed think that the College does a good job of communicating its goals and values and that the activities the College undertakes reflect the college goals. (IV-A.3)

While the survey results indicate general understanding, and approval, of the governance process, interviews with administrators and faculty leaders surfaced negative opinions regarding the effectiveness of the governance and decision-making processes in bringing all constituencies together to formulate recommendations that make a positive impact on the institution. (IV-A.3)

The self study report indicates that the College provides assurance of compliance with the policies of the Accrediting Commission and that it commits to providing accurate and consistent information to other external agencies. A board policy encompassing these commitments has been submitted to the Governing Board for approval. (IV-A.4)

The self study report cites the “Standard IV Survey” as its only reference to evaluation of leadership and governance at the College. (IV-A.5)

The Mt. San Jacinto Community College District is a public non-proprietary institution with a publicly elected governing board. The Board is an independent policy-making body. The Board has adopted a mission statement that addresses the quality of its programs. (IV-B.1.a, IV-B.1.c)

The Board has a policy manual that identifies the role and responsibilities of the Board in establishment of policies. The Board has policies specifying its size, duties, responsibilities, structure and operating procedures. With the exception of self-evaluation, the Board acts consistently with its policies, and records all actions and resolutions in its minutes. The board policy manual outlines procedures for policy review and development. While the Board has policies in place for most areas of the institution, most of the policies adopted by the Board have been developed utilizing outside consultants. (IV-B.1, IVB1.a, IV-1.d)

There are no clear internal procedures for orientation or education of new board members. The Board has utilized the Community College League of California’s (CCLC) new board member workshops to provide new board member orientation. District administration has reported to the Board regarding accreditation standards and expectations, but no active involvement by the Board was apparent to the visiting team. Board policy outlines the term of office for board members and establishes a rotation of membership through staggered election terms. No specific training was provided to the Board on the accreditation process. The district administration reported detailed reports to the Board regarding progress as the accreditation process moved forward. Active participation by the Board was limited to interviews during the team site visit. There is no clear evidence of active board involvement in the accreditation process or action, but reports and related agenda items at its regular meetings indicate an active awareness of the accreditation process. (IV-B.1.f)

The Board has an adopted policy for board self-evaluation, which will result in an effective review of board performance. The adopted policy calls for regular self-evaluations. However, the Board has not evaluated itself in accordance with this policy. (IV-B.1.g)

The Board has established a code of ethics/standard of practices, but does not have any procedure or process for addressing deviations from this policy. (IV-B.1.h)

The Board adopts policies, hires and evaluates the chief administrative officer (CEO) for the purpose of providing service consistent with purposes of the California Community College system. There is no established process for the selection of the district's chief administrator (CEO). The selection process for the current president was developed and coordinated by an outside consultant and the same firm is being used to direct the current search process. (IV-B.1.j)

Delegation of authority to the CEO is delineated in the board policy. The delegation of authority is covered in two sections of the board policy manual (Chapter 2, BP2430 and Chapter 7, BP7110). The Board, as a whole, understands its role within the institution regarding policy development and supervision of the CEO. (IV-B.1.j)

The Board evaluates its CEO every two years by a formal evaluation process, assessing prior objectives established and establishing goals and objectives for the following evaluation period. There was no clear evidence that the Board has a formal process for the review of institutional performance, though the CEO gives regular reports to the Board regarding all district operations and programs. (IV-B.1.j)

B. Board and Administrative Organization

The administrative structure of the College is organized into four functional divisions: Instructional Services, Student Services, Business Services, and Human Resources, each of which is headed by a vice president. (IV-B.2.a)

The president is an experienced administrator who was appointed to the position in 1999. As noted in the self study report, the president has a number of organizational entities that he meets with on a regular basis, including: the Executive Cabinet (consisting of four vice presidents), the cabinet (consisting of the four vice presidents, deans of Instruction, the dean of Information Services, the director of Public Information and Marketing, and the director of Research and Development), and management leadership (which consists of all administrators) on a regular basis. The cabinet and management leadership meetings serve as informational clearinghouses where decisions and recommendations are made (with information based on research provided by the director of Research and Development) pertaining to institutional goals, values, and priorities. (IV-B.2.a)

The superintendent/president also facilitates a meeting twice per month with the College Council, which consists of three vice presidents, three faculty (one from the Faculty Association), three classified representatives (one from the CSEA), and three students. The College Council reviews and approves items that have come forth from other shared governance committees and eventually makes recommendations to the Board of Trustees. (IV-B.2.a)

The superintendent/president delegates authority to the four vice presidents to make decisions regarding mission, function, and evaluation of their particular units. He works collegially with each of the vice presidents to solve problems and address

concerns. (IV-B.2.a)

The team was not able to find any evidence that the effectiveness of this administrative structure and the approach taken by the president to lead the process has been evaluated. (IV-B.2.a)

The President is an experienced educational leader who has been effective in providing leadership to a district that had been experiencing severe financial and internal communication difficulties. As reported and observed by the team, he works in a collegial manner with various constituencies of the College to communicate goals and values of the institution. The President gives state-of-the-college reports to the MSJC college community at two annual pre-semester orientation meetings; he supports the work of the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, and Associated Student Body, and supports and upholds their decisions and recommendations. The President has established and meets regularly with leadership councils and uses the college website and email to communicate with faculty and staff. (IV-B.2.b)

An institutional research office that reports to the president was established and provides reports such as the college fact book; however, given the absence of a written set of policies that describe the campus planning, assessment and resource allocation processes, the role that institutional performance data plays in the overall management of the institution is not clear. (IV-B.2.b)

The Board has established institutional policies that guide institutional practices. However, many of these policies are quite general, and the team was not able to find any specific operational policies or administrative procedural documents that would assure that institutional practices are consistent with Board policies. (IV-.2.c) The College has a Board Policy manual that covers the general category of issues; however, there are few details in the form of published procedures and practices available to describe how the processes are intended to function and guide faculty, staff, and administrators in meeting their various responsibilities. (IV-.2.c)

Prior to the appointment of the current president, the College had been experiencing significant financial difficulties. These difficulties have been overcome with the adoption of a more conservative financial strategy. The current administration has adopted a number of regular fiscal review checkpoints to assure conformance with the approved budget. As reported, since the last accreditation visit, MSJC has maintained a reserve in excess of the Board policy minimum level of 5%. (IV-B.2.d)

The president is actively involved with the Riverside County community through memberships in a wide variety of community organizations. This involvement has contributed to support for the capital funding necessary to respond to the rapid growth of the region, and the implementation of a number of career oriented programs developed in partnership with the local business community. (IV-B.2.e)

Conclusions

Board and college documents describe roles, responsibilities and processes for college governance. There are many opportunities to participate in college governance. Outcomes of the governance and decision-making processes are broadly communicated. Student leaders express a positive view of their ability to impact decision-making processes, but some administrators and faculty in leadership positions pointed to “dead ends” and general ineffectiveness in college governance processes. The self study report includes the assertion that “The shared governance process in place produces continuous institutional improvement,” but no evidence is provided to support that claim.

The master planning processes are effective vehicles for promoting dialogue on institutional goals and for eliciting ideas for improvement. Communications regarding planning and decision making processes are broadly disseminated in a consistent fashion. The College needs to more clearly define and link planning and decision-making processes.

The college is at the beginning stage of developing a framework for establishing and assessing learning outcomes at various levels; thus, it is difficult for the College to make the case that the governance processes are currently used to enhance student learning. A general lack of clearly articulated evaluation processes (e.g., for governance processes, leadership, institutional effectiveness, and program improvement based on program review findings) to gauge the effectiveness of improvement efforts and decision-making processes.

The College is confronting a number of organizational issues as it tries to respond to the dramatic growth in the district, the staffing and operation of the San Jacinto and Menifee Valley campuses and a learning center in Temecula. In addition, there are a number of changes in the leadership including the retirement of the president. The organization is decentralized and highly dependent upon the leadership skills and vision of key administrators. Given the number of interim appointments, the ability of the campus to continue to progress in meeting its mission is dependent upon well established, published, and well understood policies and procedures.

Recommendations

- 7. The Team recommends that the Board implement its established policy on self-evaluation. (IV-B.1.e, g)**

See Recommendation 2 at the end of Standard I.

See Recommendation 4 at the end of Standard II-B.