

EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

**San Diego Mesa College
7250 Mesa College Drive
San Diego, CA 92111**

**A confidential report prepared for
The Accrediting Commission of Schools and Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges**

**This report represents the findings of the External Evaluation Team that visited
San Diego Mesa College March 13-16, 2017**

**Erika L. Lacro, Ph.D.
Chair**

List of Team Members

Chair

Dr. Erika Lacro
Chancellor
Honolulu Community College

Assistant

Dr. Jerry Saviano
Faculty, English
Honolulu Community College

Academic Representatives

Dr. Tara Giblin
Dean, Mathematics and Sciences
Orange Coast College

Dr. Mohamed Eisa
Faculty, Business
Diablo Valley College

Dr. Jamey Nye
Associate Vice Chancellor of Instruction
Los Rios Community College District

Ms. Dena Martin
Librarian
Woodland Community College

Ms. Caroline Naguwa
Associate Professor, English
Hawaii Community College

Mr. Matthew Jordan
Dean, Academic Affairs
Los Angeles Valley College

Dr. Gail Zwart
Professor of Business Administration/Marketing/Mgt
Norco College

Administrative Representatives

Dr. J. Laurel Jones
Superintendent/President
Cabrillo College

Dr. Anna Badalyan
Dean of Institutional Effectiveness
Los Angeles City College

Mr. Richard Kudlik
Manager, Fiscal Services
Rancho Santiago CCD

Ms. Barbara Kennedy
Associate Provost
Eastern Florida State College

Dr. Melissa Raby
Vice President Student Services
Columbia College

Summary of the External Evaluation Report

INSTITUTION: San Diego Mesa College

DATES OF VISIT: March 13 – 16, 2017

TEAM CHAIR: Dr. Erika L. Lacro

A fourteen member accreditation team visited San Diego Mesa College March 13 – 16, 2017 for the purpose of determining whether the College continues to meet the Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and USDE regulations. The team evaluated how well the College is achieving its stated purposes, providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement, and submitting recommendations to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the accredited status of the College.

In preparation for the visit, the team chair attended a team chair-training workshop on December 1, 2016 and conducted a pre-visit to the campus on January 19, 2017. During the visit, the chair met with the campus leadership and key personnel involved in the self-evaluation preparation process. The entire external evaluation team received team training provided by the staff from ACCJC on January 20, 2017.

The evaluation team received the college's self-evaluation documentation and related evidence several weeks prior to the site visit. Team members found it to be very detailed and comprehensive in its description sections but somewhat weak in the analysis and evaluation sections. The campus made every attempt to make the process transparent while encouraging broad participation from the College community including, faculty, staff, students, and administration.

On March 12, 2017, select members of the campus evaluation team began meeting with District personnel. On March 14, 2017, the evaluation team began the site visit at the Mesa campus. Upon arrival, the team was provided with a short orientation about the campus, met with campus leadership and those that led the accreditation self-study process. The meeting ended with a short tour of the campus.

During the evaluation visit, team members conducted about 45 individual interviews and meetings, and observations involving College employees, students, board members, and community members. The team also visited a total of 37 different programs / departments. There were numerous less formal interactions with students and employees outside of officially scheduled interviews and there were also informal observations of active classes and other learning venues. Two open forums provided

the College community and members of the Mesa community opportunities to meet with members of the evaluation team. The public forums were well attended and very positive. The comments illustrated the pride many of the faculty, staff and student's have in their college.

The team reviewed numerous materials supporting the self-evaluation report in the team room and electronically, which included documents and evidence support the Standards, Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and USDE regulations. Evidence reviewed by the team included, but was not limited to, documents such as institutional plans, strategic planning documents, program review procedures and reports, student learning outcomes evidence, course syllabi, distance education classes, College policies and procedures, enrollment and student success information, committee minutes and materials, and governance structures.

The team greatly appreciated the organization and hospitality the College showed during the visit. The team appreciated the assistance of key staff members who assisted the team with requests for individual meetings and additional evidence throughout the evaluation process.

The team found the College to be compliance with the Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and USDE regulations. The team found a number of innovative and effective practices and programs and issued a number of commendations to the College. The team found the College satisfies the vast majority of the Standards, but issued some recommendations to increase effectiveness.

Eligibility Requirements

1. Authority

The team confirmed that San Diego Mesa College (SDMC) is authorized to operate as a post-secondary, degree-granting institution based on continuous accreditation by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The team also confirms the College is authorized to offer a baccalaureate of science degree in Health Information Management. The ACCJC is a regional accrediting body recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

In addition, the College operates under the authority of the State of California Education Code, which establishes the California community college system under the leadership and direction of the Board of Governors (State of California Education Code 70900-70901).

The College meets the ER.

2. Operational Status

The team confirmed that SDMC is operational and provides educational services to 36,779 unduplicated student enrollments (annualized) within degree applicable credit courses for the period of the 2015-2016AY.

The College meets the ER.

3. Degrees

The team confirmed that the 96% of courses lead to a degree and/or transfer. Sixty percent of students identify transfer or associate degree completion as their primary objective.

The College meets the ER.

4. Chief Executive Officer

The team confirmed that the Board of Trustees employs a Chancellor as the chief executive officer of the San Diego Community College District (SDCCD) that has direct oversight to the President of San Diego Mesa College (SDMC). The President of SDMC serves as the chief executive officer of the campus and was appointed by the SDCCD Board of Trustees in July 2011. The CEO does not serve as a member of the Board of Trustees nor as the board president. The team found that the Board of Trustees instills authority in the President to administer board policies.

The College meets the ER.

5. Financial Accountability

The team confirmed that SDMC works in conjunction with the district to conduct externally contracted independent audits of all financial records. The Board of Trustees review all five District reports. There have been no financial, internal control or compliance issues resulting in findings, recommendations or exceptions for the last five annual audits.

The College meets the ER.

The District hires an independent certified accountant to audit all funds and all financial records annually. The auditors express an opinion on the financial statements and adequacy of accounting procedures and internal control. All special funds, grant expenditures, and bond expenditures are consistent with regulatory and legal restrictions. These funds are consistent with regulatory and legal restrictions and governed by Board Policies and Administrative Procedures. The auditors express an opinion on the financial statements and adequacy of accounting procedures and internal controls.

The District meets the Eligibility Requirement.

Checklist for Evaluating Compliance with Federal Regulations and Related Commission Policies

Public Notification of an Evaluation Team Visit and Third Party Comment

Evaluation Items:

- The institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comment in advance of a comprehensive evaluation visit.
- The institution cooperates with the evaluation team in any necessary follow-up related to the third party comment.
- The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Rights and Responsibilities of the Commission and Member Institutions* as to third party comment.
[Regulation citation: 602.23(b).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

SDMC posted the ISER for SDMC after the Board of Trustees approved the document on December 8, 2016. The team found no third party comment related to this visit.

Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement

Evaluation Items:

- The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance across the institution, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. Course completion is included as one of these elements of student achievement. Other elements of student achievement performance for measurement have been determined as appropriate to the institution's mission.
- The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance within each instructional program, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. The defined elements include, but are not limited to, job placement rates for program completers, and for programs in fields where licensure is required, the licensure examination passage rates for program completers.
- The institution-set standards for programs and across the institution are relevant to guide self-evaluation and institutional improvement; the defined elements and expected performance levels are appropriate within higher education; the results are

reported regularly across the campus; and the definition of elements and results are used in program-level and institution-wide planning to evaluate how well the institution fulfills its mission, to determine needed changes, to allocating resources, and to make improvements.

- The institution analyzes its performance as to the institution-set standards and as to student achievement, and takes appropriate measures in areas where its performance is not at the expected level.
[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(i); 602.17(f); 602.19 (a-e).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission’s requirements.

Narrative:

The College has established institutional set standards. These are evaluated and communicated to the campus and Board of Trustees.

Credits, Program Length, and Tuition

Evaluation Items:

- Credit hour assignments and degree program lengths are within the range of good practice in higher education (in policy and procedure).
- The assignment of credit hours and degree program lengths is verified by the institution and is reliable and accurate across classroom based courses, laboratory classes, distance education classes, and for courses that involve clinical practice (if applicable to the institution).
- Tuition is consistent across degree programs (or there is a rational basis for any program-specific tuition).
- Any clock hour conversions to credit hours adhere to the Department of Education’s conversion formula, both in policy and procedure, and in practice.
- The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Institutional Degrees and Credits*.
[Regulation citations: 600.2 (definition of credit hour); 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.24(e), (f); 668.2; 668.9.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.

_____ The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.

_____ The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission’s requirements.

Narrative:

The College awards course credit baccalaureate degrees, associate degrees, and certificates in compliance with state and federal laws and in accordance with standard practices in higher education. All degrees consist of units required for the major, general education, and all degree-applicable elective units to reach the 60 semester-unit minimum for associate degrees and 120 semester-unit requirements for baccalaureate degrees.

Transfer Policies

Evaluation Items:

- Transfer policies are appropriately disclosed to students and to the public.
- Policies contain information about the criteria the institution uses to accept credits for transfer.
- The institution complies with the Commission *Policy on Transfer of Credit*. [Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.17(a)(3); 602.24(e); 668.43(a)(ii).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.
- _____ The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- _____ The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission’s requirements.

Narrative:

The District office manages transcript evaluation and the transfer database with the assistance of campus discipline faculty expertise.

Distance Education and Correspondence Education

Evaluation Items:

- The institution has policies and procedures for defining and classifying a course as offered by distance education or correspondence education, in alignment with USDE definitions.
- There is an accurate and consistent application of the policies and procedures for determining if a course is offered by distance education (with regular and substantive interaction with the instructor, initiated by the instructor, and online activities are

included as part of a student's grade) or correspondence education (online activities are primarily "paperwork related," including reading posted materials, posting homework and completing examinations, and interaction with the instructor is initiated by the student as needed).

- The institution has appropriate means and consistently applies those means for verifying the identity of a student who participates in a distance education or correspondence education course or program, and for ensuring that student information is protected.
- The technology infrastructure is sufficient to maintain and sustain the distance education and correspondence education offerings.
- The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education*.
[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(iv), (vi); 602.17(g); 668.38.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

AP 5105 *Distance Education* defines and classifies a course offered through distance education and outlines practices that support academic quality and the mission of the District.

Student Complaints

Evaluation Items:

- The institution has clear policies and procedures for handling student complaints, and the current policies and procedures are accessible to students in the college catalog and online.
- The student complaint files for the previous six years (since the last comprehensive evaluation) are available; the files demonstrate accurate implementation of the complaint policies and procedures.
- The team analysis of the student complaint files identifies any issues that may be indicative of the institution's noncompliance with any Accreditation Standards.
- The institution posts on its website the names of associations, agencies and governmental bodies that accredit, approve, or license the institution and any of its programs, and provides contact information for filing complaints with such entities.
- The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Representation*

of Accredited Status and the Policy on Student and Public Complaints Against Institutions.

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(ix); 668.43.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission’s requirements.

Narrative:

The College has a student complaint process. The process is outlined and published on the Student Web Services webpage, which is the one-stop student portal. Information and instructions are also posted on the District’s Consumer information link and is in compliance with the Higher Education Act.

Institutional Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials

Evaluation Items:

- The institution provides accurate, timely (current), and appropriately detailed information to students and the public about its programs, locations, and policies.
- The institution complies with the Commission *Policy on Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status*.
- The institution provides required information concerning its accredited status as described above in the section on Student Complaints.
[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1))(vii); 668.6.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission’s requirements.

Narrative:

The College complies with these standards.

Title IV Compliance

Evaluation Items:

- The institution has presented evidence on the required components of the Title IV Program, including findings from any audits and program or other review activities by the USDE.
- The institution has addressed any issues raised by the USDE as to financial responsibility requirements, program record-keeping, etc. If issues were not timely addressed, the institution demonstrates it has the fiscal and administrative capacity to timely address issues in the future and to retain compliance with Title IV program requirements.
- The institution's student loan default rates are within the acceptable range defined by the USDE. Remedial efforts have been undertaken when default rates near or meet a level outside the acceptable range.
- Contractual relationships of the institution to offer or receive educational, library, and support services meet the Accreditation Standards and have been approved by the Commission through substantive change if required.
- The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations* and the *Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV*.
[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(v); 602.16(a)(1)(x); 602.19(b); 668.5; 668.15; 668.16; 668.71 et seq.]

Conclusion Check-Off:

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The College continues to have default rates on student loans under 20% for the three years. An administrative plan is in place and includes proactive steps to reduce the percentage of students in default.

SDMC Commendations and Recommendations

College Commendations:

College Commendation 1: The team commends the College's Office of Institutional Effectiveness for its efforts in developing operational data reports and survey results which facilitated dialogue and decision making.

College Commendation 2: The team commends the College for its overall efforts at emphasizing Equity and Diversity throughout instructional and student services programs.

College Commendation 3: The team commends the College's tutoring services for its committed employees and collaborative team oriented environment that includes professionalized student tutors. (II.B.1,II.B.3)

College Commendation 4: The College is commended for its commitment to the ongoing professional learning of all employees evidenced in the development and support of the comprehensive teaching and learning center, the LOFT. (III.A.14)

College Commendation 5: The team commends the College on its student-centered approach to utilizing and supporting technology resources, particularly the quick Help Desk response time in addressing student-facing technology issues.

College Commendation 6:

The President is to be commended for instilling a student-centered culture across the campus.

College Recommendations for Improvement:

College Recommendation 1 (Improvement): In order to ensure continuous improvement, the team recommends that the college revisit course and program assessment processes to

improve the quality, effectiveness, and consistency of student learning outcomes assessment. (I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.6, II.A.2, II.A.3)

College Recommendation 2 (Improvement): In order to ensure continuous improvement, the team recommends that a consistent formal self-evaluation process be developed and implemented across all committees and that outcomes of that assessment be posted on the governance website. (I.B.7, I.B.8, I.C.5, IV.A.7)

College Recommendation 3 (Improvement): In order to ensure continuous improvement, the team recommends that the College has student learning outcome assessment data and analysis accessible to the public. (I.B.8, I.C.3)

College Recommendation 4:

In order to improve facilities and educational planning, the team recommends that the District develop an updated comprehensive Facilities Master Plan to integrate with each campus's Educational Master Plan. The plan should be integrated with the College program review process and with the on-going and routine facilities assessments done by the College and District Facilities to include scheduled equipment replacement. The Facilities Master Plan should align with and directly support the District Strategic Plan and the College's strategic plans. (III.B.2, III.B.3, III.B.4)

College Recommendation 5 (Improvement): In order to ensure continuous improvement, the team recommends continued effective communication through the consistent development and dissemination of robust committee meeting minutes that include constituent dialogue and feedback and that these enhanced minutes will be posted on the governance website. (IV.A.6)

College Recommendation 6 (Improvement): In order to ensure continuous improvement, the team recommends continued effective communication through the inclusion and posting of the President's Cabinet minutes, purpose, goals and agendas on the governance website. (IV.A.6)

SDCCD Commendations and Recommendations

District Commendations:

District Commendation 1: The Team commends the District for its organization and collaborative systems supporting an aligned curriculum across all colleges to ensure students can access courses across the District with ease. (II.A.5)

District Commendation 2: The Team commends the District administrative staff for fostering a strong culture of service in support of the Colleges. (II.C, III.C.2, III.D, IV.D.7)

District Commendation 3: The Team commends the District for its robust professional development programs, especially the Leadership Development Academy series available to all employees. (III.A.12)

District Commendation 4: The Team commends the District on its prudent approach to establishing reserves to fund future financial obligations such as the increased pension expenses and Other Post Employment Benefits liabilities (OPEB). (III.D.12)

District Commendation 5: The Team commends the Board's establishment of, and participation with, the Citizen's Advisory Council that brings to the District a strong degree of public participation and contact. (IV.C.4)

District Commendation 6: The Team commends the high level of Board engagement with the District and its high level of commitment to continued professional development around issues impacting the District as well as the California Community College System. (IV.C.5, 8, 13)

District Recommendations for Improvement:

District Recommendation 1 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the Team recommends that the District evaluate its support for the Colleges' capacity to assess student learning in order to improve educational programs and services (I.B.6, II.A.1, II.C.2, III.A.9, III.B.2, III.C.2, III.D.1, IV.C.13, IV.D.2)

District Recommendation 2 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the Team recommends that the District enhance its efforts and extend its support to the Colleges to strengthen the linkages and alignment of institutional plans. (I.B.9, II.A.1, III.A.14, III.B.2, III.B.4, III.C.2, III.D.2, III.D.4, IV.D.5)

District Recommendation 3 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the Team recommends that the District complete the review and update of its policies and procedures and establish a formal schedule for their regular review and publication. (I.B.7, I.C.5, III.A.11, III.A.12, III.A.13, III.C.5, IV.C.7)

Standard I.A - Mission

General Observations

San Diego Mesa College's mission positions it as "as a comprehensive community college committed to access, success, and equity." Through a systematic program review process, the college uses data to assess mission-related progress, to evaluate linkages between institutional priorities and the mission, and to align the missions of programs and services to the college mission. The mission is reviewed regularly, updated when necessary, and communicated widely.

Findings and Evidence

San Diego Mesa College's mission statement describes the institution's broad educational purposes, its intended student population, the types of degrees and other credentials it offers, and its commitment to student learning and student achievement. The mission articulates the college's commitment to diversity, access, success, and equity. (I.A.1)

The college uses data to determine how effectively it is accomplishing its mission. A review of program reviews within the software application TaskStream revealed that SDMC has a robust program review process in which comprehensive reviews are conducted at regular intervals and updates are submitted. Faculty members review outcomes and demographic data in instructional program reviews. Course-level outcomes data is disaggregated by ethnicity, gender, and delivery mode. SDMC identifies student learning and achievement as essential to its mission. In its Educational Master Plan (EMP), the college has identified six strategic directions and 23 strategic goals, which provide a framework for planning and resource allocation. Each of the strategic directions and goals clearly link with the college mission. This mission directs priorities in that programs can make resource requests based on the review of these data through the resource allocation process. The Budget and Allocation Recommendation Committee (BARC) reviews these requests with a rubric that prioritizes those items that align with the mission-based strategic goals. (I.A.2)

SDMC's programs and services are aligned with its mission. As part of the program review and planning process, all programs and services review their program missions and discuss how their missions support the college mission. Programs map unit-level goals to the mission-derived strategic goals. These unit-level goals are also aligned to SLOs and AUOs. Four committees prioritize resource requests, the Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee (FHP), the Classified Hiring Prioritization Committee (CHP), the Budget and Allocation Recommendation Committee (BARC), and the Facilities Planning Committee (FPC). Each

committee, except the FHP, uses a rubric that assesses mission alignment. (I.A.3)

The mission statement is featured on the website, in the catalog, and in the EMP. The Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee reviews the mission on a two-year cycle. When changes have been needed, the revisions have gone through the shared governance structure and approved by the governing board. The most recent mission revision was approved by the Board of Trustees on October 26, 2016 to add equity to SDMC's mission. (I.A.4)

Baccalaureate

SDMC offers one baccalaureate degree in Health Information Management (HIM). Leading up to the approval of the degree, the college conducted a needs assessment and survey of student interest. Both of these returned results that affirmed the need for the program. The first HIM student cohort began in Fall 2016. The program has been incorporated into the college's existing program review, planning, and resource allocation processes. As the program is new, it has not yet completed a comprehensive program review. However in 2016-17, the program did submit an abbreviated program review update. This update includes alignment of the HIM program outcomes to the Mesa College Strategic Directions and Goals, which in turn align to the SDMC mission.

Conclusions

The college meets Standard I.A. and ER 6

Standard I.B - Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations

The College has defined and implemented an integrated planning process. The program review process is clear with cross-campus participation and support. The College provided examples of student learning outcome assessments and improvements. However, it is recommended that the College review and update assessment processes to improve the quality, effectiveness, and consistency of student learning outcomes and use of results. The College has established institution-set standards for student achievement. Evaluation of whether the College meets these set standards occurs annually and the analysis is communicated back to the institution to support ongoing improvement. Student achievement data are disaggregated by demographics and other measures pertinent to the College and are used to support institution-set standards and program review. The College researchers supplement this information with numerous survey studies.

Findings and Evidence

San Diego Mesa College engages in dialogue about continuous improvement of student learning and achievement issues on many levels and in many venues, using data, research, and outcomes assessment to inform its discussions. One of the main venues for continuous dialogue the College utilizes is its participatory governance structure through works of respective senates, councils, and committees. For example, the Committee on Outcomes and Assessment (COA) is the College's venue for formal discussion about what affects student learning and how the College can improve it. The Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee reviews, discusses, communicates and disseminates information regarding all aspects of integrated planning and evaluates College planning processes. The final recommendations from different committees are brought to the President's Cabinet which is comprised of administrators, faculty, staff, and students. The unit-level planning process is another venue the College uses to discuss student achievement data and outcomes assessment results. The annual program review allows faculty to discuss factors, internal and external, that affect program and student success. In 2014-2015, the College's Associate Degrees for Transfer to CSU (ADT) increased significantly. (I.B.1)

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) supports the College's efforts related to integrated planning, resource allocation, program review, institutional research, and outcomes assessment. In addition, the OIE, in cooperation with the District Office of Institutional Research and Planning, provides reporting related to accreditation, federal requirements, grants, and statewide initiatives, and provides data interpretation workshops to faculty, staff, and administrators interested in understanding program-specific or college-wide data. (I.B.1)

Every course, program, and service area has developed learning outcomes. Institutional

Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) are posted on the website and printed in the college catalog. It is a common practice at the College that several different College certificates and degrees have identical Program Learning Outcomes. The Course Students Learning Outcome (CSLOs) are included in Section IV of the Course Report in CurricuNet as well as on course syllabi. At the same time, there were some discrepancies between the CSLOs included in the syllabi and those recorded in CurricuNet. Since 2010-11, the College has utilized the Taskstream data management software system to document assessment and program review efforts. (I.B.2, ER 11).

The College has established a six-year assessment cycle. The previous assessment cycle began in 2010-2011 and finished in 2015-16. The new assessment cycle started in 2016-17. Based on the assessment cycle during the first five years, twenty percent (20%) of course SLOs get assessed each year with a summative evaluation report in the sixth year. The program level learning outcomes are scheduled to be assessed every two years for career-technical programs. Based on the documents provided and on interviews, it is evident that the College has improved significantly in its learning outcome efforts. During the visit, faculty shared several examples of improvements to courses and programs that have occurred as a result of evaluation. At the same time, while reviewing Taskstream, the team found areas with missing information on course and program assessment results. After reviewing Taskstream with the College's technician, the team was still unsatisfied with the amount and quality of assessment. As a result, the team randomly selected ten courses and five programs and requested assessment documentation for them. For three of the programs, the most recent assessment of some PLO statements were conducted in 2011-12. From the selected five programs, only one, the Culinary Program, had done systematic and quality PLO assessments. While the timing of these assessments falls within the college's six-year cycle, the College could improve by ensuring assessment practices are consistently done with appropriate quality and rigor. The team does recognize the commitment the College has made to supporting the use of Taskstream and the resources allotted to make this tool accessible and user friendly, including the college's self-published Guide to Learning Outcomes Assessment. (I.B.2, ER 11).

The College established the first set of institution-set standards in 2013. Since then, each year, the data were examined and discussed by the PIE Committee and President's Cabinet meetings and new standards were set. In October 2015, the College revisited its process for establishing its institution-set standards; as a result, a new list of institutional-set standards were established. One group of the new ISS pertain to the general population:

- Course Completion Rate: 71% (ISS) – 71% (ISER)
- First-Time Student Persistence within the CCC System: 76% (ISS) – 76.2% (ISER)
- Fall-to-Fall Persistence/Retention Rate: 53% (ISS) – 51.1% (ISER)
- Students Graduating with an Associate Degree: 1,200 (ISS) – 1,470 (ISER)
- Students Graduating with a Certificate: 300 (ISS) – 283 (ISER)
- Students Graduating with a Degree or Certificate: 1,200 (ISS) – 1,606 (ISER)
- Transfers: 1,900 (ISS) – 1,971 (ISER)
- Student Success Scorecard Completion Rate: 51% (ISS) – 52.9% (ISER)

The second group relates to Distance Education:

- Distance Education Course Completion Rate: 71% (ISS) – 70% (Evidence in ISER)
- Distance Education Course Retention Rate: 81% (ISS) – 81% (Evidence in ISER)

An additional two ISS relate to the Career Technical Education programs:

- Licensure Exam Pass Rates by program
- Job Placement Rates by program

The College monitors achievement data against these institution-set standards. Currently, the College meets or exceeds seven of its ISS and is below its ISS on three indicators.

Recognizing the large gap in the success rates between online and regular classes, the College hired an instructional designer to provide more training on effective DE teaching tools and methodologies. Given the fact that the College has 71 programs in which 50% or more of the courses can be finished online and 25% of students take at least one online course, it is advisable that the College encourage faculty to participate in ongoing professional development activities provided by the College. Another area for which the College needs to develop strategies for improvement is completion of certificates. In the last five years, the number of completers dropped by 14.5% from 331 to 283. (I.B.3)

The College regularly assesses its programs, services, and institutional processes in support of student learning and student achievement. It evaluates data at the course, program, and college levels primarily through program review and President's Cabinet Retreats. As part of the program review process, achievement data are provided for each program. Data provided includes enrollment, retention, and success rates. Data are provided for the previous five academic years and disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, and course delivery mode. In addition to program review, the achievement data are presented and discussed at the PIE Committee and President's Cabinet meetings for various decision making. (I.B.4)

Program review at the College is an annual process that evaluates all academic programs, student services, and administrative services. Overall, the program review is on a four-year cycle with a comprehensive review the first year, followed by three years of annual updates. During annual updates, reviews provide information on all programmatic or service changes, review achievement and assessment data, follow-up on stated goals, and close the loop on any resources received by reporting on resulting outcomes. In preparation for the program review, demographic and KPI data for each program or service area are inserted into the relevant Taskstream workspace for each program. The demographic data are disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, age, disability support programs and services eligibility, first generation status, and prior education level. Key Performance Indicators (KPI) data are disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, and course delivery mode. In addition, the program review forms include request for faculty, staff, supplies and equipment, and facilities improvement. The request needs to be linked to program goals and outcomes. The requests are then forwarded to separate participatory governance committees (FHP, CHP, BARC, and FPC). Requests are ranked based on a rubric, and the lists are presented to the PIE Committee and to the President's Cabinet. The President has the final say on which requests are funded. Additionally, the College has a process to re-evaluate its program review and planning processes using survey feedback from the lead writers and discussions at the PRSC

committee. (I.B.5)

The Office of Institutional Research regularly provides achievement data and survey results to facilitate dialogue and decision making. The data provided by the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) are disaggregated by modes of delivery, gender, ethnicity, age, disability support programs and services eligibility, first-generation status, and prior education level. Each summer, the College reviews its performance in relation to the College goals for subpopulations of students and sets priorities for the subsequent academic year. Additionally, the equity dashboard was developed, which highlights trends for subpopulations of students and guides discussions of campus equity initiatives. For example, in April 2016, after reviewing the College's performance in relation to its standards, the College decided to pilot several interventions targeting student persistence: Summer CRUISE/Peer Navigators program, in-person orientation workshops, and expanded education planning services for entering students. Additionally, through a partnership with the Center for Urban Education (CUE), the College has engaged in deep conversations around equity. The college commitment to equity is highlighted in its QFE. (I.B.6)

Due to the current Taskstream setup, however, the college has no capability to disaggregate student learning outcomes data for different student subpopulations. There are attempts by some departments to compare the learning outcome by delivery mode. The team was not able to obtain examples of substantive assessment findings that helped to reduce student achievement gaps within Taskstream but did find this evidence within specific department data in Program Review. (I.B.6)

The College uses formative and summative techniques to evaluate the effectiveness of its planning efforts. Program review is one of the main venues for evaluating practices at the College and district levels. Each spring, the OIR conducts an evaluation of the College's integrated planning process, including its program review and resource allocation processes. As an innovative form of assessment, the College has identified "change agents," a group of faculty, staff, and administrators who were "walking in the shoes of students" to see where difficulties might be encountered: taking the placement test; visiting the offices of admissions, counseling, transfer, and financial aid; and reviewing syllabi, to see how welcoming they are for students. (I.B.7)

The College does not have a formal process for reviewing its governance processes. Voluntarily, some committees provided a report of their annual accomplishments. The review of the policies is at the district level. Since the last comprehensive external evaluation visit, the district has not completed a review of the Board Policies and Administrative Procedures in the areas of instructional programs, student learning and support services, resource management, and governance processes to assure their effectiveness. (I.B.7)

The primary method that the College utilizes to communicate the results of assessment and evaluation activities is through participatory governance groups, including President's Cabinet, PIEC, Academic and Classified Senates, and other committee and council meetings

and retreats. For example, during President’s Cabinet retreats participants from across the campus review, analyze, and draw conclusions for action based on data presented. In addition, the OIE regularly publishes a wide variety of institution wide reports, such as:

- The *Executive Summaries* report, which compiles the executive summaries of all programs into one document.
- The Annual Report, which summarizes the process and describes the current program review cycle, including responses to any recommendations made at the end of the previous cycle. It also includes a brief assessment of each program review drawn from reviewer comments.
- The *Goals Summary* report, which shows how all programs and services have mapped their goals to college goals.
- The *Integrated Planning Evaluation* report, which presents the results of the evaluative survey administered to all program review participants after submission of their document, with recommendations for the next cycle.

Course and program achievement data, as well as ILO survey results, are public via the Student Learning and Achievement link on the OIE site. Current year Program Review Annual Updates are posted under Program Review Archives on the OIE site; however, the learning outcomes assessment information referenced in these documents are only available via Taskstream. The link provided by the College in response to the ACCJC annual report question on “URL(s) from the college website where prospective students can find SLO assessment results for instructional programs:” refers to student achievement data only.

(I.B.8)

The College established a comprehensive continuous institutional planning process designed to improve institutional effectiveness and accomplish its mission. The College integrated all aspects of its planning and resource allocation into one coherent process. The annual integrated planning cycle begins in fall with three key events: convocation, the President’s Cabinet retreat and program review. At convocation, general themes and priorities are presented based on assessment dialogue from the spring President’s Cabinet retreat. During the fall President’s Cabinet retreat, College leadership considers College plans and priorities based on the College goals. The next step is program review which ties together strategic planning, student outcomes, and resource allocation. The *Institutional Planning Survey* is used to evaluate the effectiveness of the College’s program review and planning process.

(I.B.9, ER 19)

At the District level, the effectiveness of the nine districtwide participatory governance councils and committees is assessed through an online self-assessment survey on a five-year cycle. The survey gathers feedback from every districtwide participatory governance council and committee. Summary reports of the survey results are shared with each group. Furthermore, the District departments are conducting annual program review. The self-assessment process used by the District includes a similar mechanism of goal and measurement development. In 2015-2016, the District incorporated a feedback survey as an element of the self-assessment. The survey information is available on the District’s

accreditation webpage to facilitate incorporation of the feedback in the annual self-evaluation process leading to increased integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges to meet educational goals for student achievement and learning. (I.B.9, ER 19)

Baccalaureate

The courses in the baccalaureate program have followed the same practices on establishing and assessing the PLOs and CSLOs. Currently, the College has not established ISS related to its baccalaureate degree program. The College allocated \$25,000 towards library databases, books, and periodicals for HIM students to facilitate the higher level research need in their baccalaureate studies. As the program began in Fall 2016, the College has not done any formal evaluation of it.

Conclusions

The College meets the Standard I.B, ER 11 and ER 19.

College Recommendations for Improvement:

College Recommendation 1 (Improvement): In order to ensure continuous improvement, the team recommends that the college revisit course and program assessment processes to improve the quality, effectiveness, and consistency of student learning outcomes assessment. (I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.6, II.A.2, II.A.3)

College Recommendation 2 (Improvement): In order to ensure continuous improvement, the team recommends that a consistent formal self-evaluation process be developed and implemented across all committees and that outcomes of that assessment be posted on the governance website. (I.B.7, I.B.8, I.C.5, IV.A.7)

District Recommendation for Improvement:

District Recommendation 1 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the Team recommends that the District evaluate its support for the Colleges' capacity to assess student learning in order to improve educational programs and services (I.B.6, II.A.1, II.C.2, III.A.9, III.B.2, III.C.2, III.D.1, IV.C.13, IV.D.2)

District Recommendation 2 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the Team recommends that the District enhance its efforts and extend its support to the Colleges to strengthen the linkages and alignment of institutional plans. (I.B.9, II.A.1, III.A.14, III.B.2, III.B.4, III.C.2, III.D.2, III.D.4, IV.D.5)

District Recommendation 3 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the Team recommends that the District complete the review and update of its policies and procedures

and establish a formal schedule for their regular review and publication. (I.B.7, I.C.5, III.A.11, III.A.12, III.A.13, III.C.5, IV.C.7)

Standard IC: Institutional Integrity

General Observations

The College demonstrates institutional integrity through its commitment to effectively communicate College and program information through the catalog and a new website launched in 2015. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Institutional Research Office present numerous student achievement data reports for the College community and the public. Achievement and learning outcomes data are included in program review, which impacts program and budget planning. Formal and informal review processes exist for institutional policies and procedures. Information on fees, Academic Freedom, and academic integrity policies are clear and readily accessible. The College also adheres to accreditation requirements.

The District accurately informs current and prospective students of the total cost of education, including tuition, fees, and other required expenses, including textbooks, and other instructional material. The District regularly evaluates placement instruments and practices to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases. While the team found the institution maintains regular evaluation cycles for their admissions practices, the assessment data does not directly demonstrate support of student learning and continuous quality improvement. The institution maintains student records permanently, securely, and confidentially with secure file backup. The institution established well defined policies for release of student records. (I.C.6)

Findings and Evidence

SDMC provides information on its mission, program learning outcomes, educational programs, and student support services in a variety of ways, including through the College catalog, College and District websites, social media, email, print materials, on-campus displays, faculty syllabi and the Curlicue Course Reports, and through online/telephone/in-person interaction. From the Student Services link located on all College webpages, Distance Education (DE) and on-campus students can access Student Online Services, which offers numerous student support services. The College's Accreditation site contains information about its primary accreditation status and about special accrediting agencies; accreditation status is also provided in the front pages of the college catalog and on relevant program webpages. (I.C.1)

The Office of Instruction and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) is responsible for the integrity of information on student achievement. Success data on DE, in particular, is available through the Institutional Research Office's Data Warehouse webpage. Under the OIE, the Institutional Research Office (IRO) reviews the integrity of the data, which are presented in student achievement reports available via the OIE site. These data are also addressed in program review. Program SLOs are posted on Academic Program webpages

and in the catalog; course SLOs are posted publicly in CurricUNET. Changes to SLOs are sent from the program to the Catalog Committee and to the IRO, which disseminates the information to the District (which maintains CurricuNet) and updates webpages containing SLO information. In collaboration with the District, the Catalog Committee reviews and updates the catalog annually, with department and school representatives able to review first and second drafts prior to publication. All electronic representations of the institution are reviewed by the Office of Communications, with Deans and content managers and editors from divisions, programs, departments, and College offices maintaining the accuracy of information on relevant webpages. Additional web editing occurs by request from the Office of Communications, faculty, and/or staff. Print publications are frequently checked by the Office of Communications to ensure that they follow College guidelines. (I.C.1)

The college catalog is available in print and in electronic forms, and can be downloaded in PDF format from the College website. Along with the District Instructional Services and Student Services Departments, the catalog is reviewed annually by the Catalog Committee (subcommittee of the Curriculum Review Committee), which consists of faculty, staff, and administrative and District representatives who review and approve their respective sections. The team has confirmed that all department and school representatives have the opportunity to review the first and second proofs of the catalog for the upcoming year. Historical versions of the catalog are available online back to 2004-2005. The Academic Information section of the catalog describes the instructional delivery applied in distance education courses. The Board Policy on Academic Freedom is provided in the first pages of the catalog. The District facilitates ease of access to precise, accurate, and current information including College catalogs through links on the District website to each College. (I.C.2, ER 20)

Student achievement data and learning outcomes assessment information is contained and discussed in Program Reviews. Results are used to inform program goals and budget requests. The Program Review Committee produces a Program Review Annual Report which is discussed at Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee (PIEC) meetings, is shared with the President's Cabinet, and is posted on the President's Cabinet Documents webpage. Program achievement data and ILO surveys are made available to the public via the Student Learning and Achievement link on the OIE site. Program and course learning outcomes assessment results and analyses are only available internally to the College via the Taskstream assessment management tool. Though assessment is occurring across the College, random searches in Taskstream and a random sampling of program and course assessment reports provided by the College yielded that learning outcomes assessment reporting is inconsistent. Program Review Annual Updates are posted in the Program Review Archives (for the current year only) via the OIE site; however, the learning outcomes assessment information referenced in these documents is not accessible to the public. (I.C.3, ER 19)

The College describes the purpose, content, course requirements, and program learning outcomes for its degrees and certificates, including for the HIM Bachelor's degree, in the Degree Curricula and Certificate Programs section of the catalog. The College catalogs

include accurate descriptions of certificates and degrees and are made available through links on the District website. Course SLOs and objectives are required on course syllabi per the Requirements and Recommendations for Class Syllabi. Syllabi are submitted to department chairs and Deans to check that listed SLOs are accurate. (I.C.4)

The Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee reviews the mission on a two-year cycle. The most recent mission revision was approved by the Board of Trustees on October 26, 2017. This revision added equity to SDMC's mission. Outside of program review, although there is no formal review process/schedule, evaluation of existing institutional procedures and practices that have a bearing on instruction and services occurs in constituent groups (e.g., Curriculum Committee, IT Committee)—sometimes the result of assessment, and sometimes from faculty or staff ideas for change. All proposed changes follow the College's established governance process which involves all constituent groups. Changes to Board Policies and Academic Procedures undergo a thorough review and consultation by the districtwide councils. In accordance with established policy, changes to Board Policies undergo two readings at the Board of Trustees meetings, prior to approval. Once approved, they are posted to the District's website. Changes to administrative procedures are approved by the Chancellor after comprehensive review and consultation by the governance councils and committees, as well as constituent groups throughout the Institution. The team confirmed that Board Policies and Administrative Procedures are scheduled to be reviewed on a 6-year cycle beginning in 2016 (AP 2410), as some policies had last approval dates ranging from 2006 to 2010. (I.C.5)

The District informs current and prospective students of the total cost of education, as per Board Policy 3300, and in accordance with Education Code 76300. BP 3300 includes up-to-date information regarding the cost of tuition for residents, nonresidents, and international students. The total cost of education, including tuition, fees, and other required expenses is included in the Colleges' catalogs, schedule of classes, and online student portal. All fees charged and collected by the District, in accordance to the fee schedule, is established and published annually in multiple mediums including in print and online. The District complies with Federal regulations on Gainful Employment as it provides the total cost of education for Career Technical Education programs under their Consumer Information link. In the District's three-year Student Feedback Survey, most students agreed they were adequately informed of the institution's total cost of education. (I.C.6)

Based on the US DOE Eligibility and Certification Approval Report, the team found that some of the degree and certificate of achievement programs (e.g., Dietetic Services Supervisor, Journalism Program) are not financial aid eligible, but this information is not provided in the catalog or on the College website. The College is advised to communicate this information to students and to the public. (I.C.6)

The District and College have an Academic Freedom policy (BP 4030) which describes the institution's commitment to the intellectual freedom and the freedom of expression for faculty, staff, and students, for all modes of instructional delivery. The policy was most

recently reviewed in 2016, and will be reviewed every six years (AP 2410). The Academic Freedom policy is published in the catalog and online via the Student Services site. For distance education courses and programs, the policy is implemented and monitored by the District's Online Learning Pathways Department. (I.C.7, ER 13)

The District and College promote honesty, responsibility, and academic integrity through Board Policy (BP 3100)—including the Honest Academic Conduct Policy, the Student Code of Conduct, and Student Disciplinary Procedures—which describes the rights and responsibilities of all students and the responsibilities of faculty and the College in such matters. Additionally, the district has published board policy BP 7150 on mutual respect, has an Online Student Code of Conduct (Policy 3100, Section 3.0), and has procedures in place to ensure student confidentiality. These policies are located on the College and District websites. (I.C.8)

The College promotes academic honesty and integrity in the delivery of online courses in the following ways: Students enroll in online courses using the District's Reg-e system, which is the same registration process used for traditional face-to-face courses. Student identities are verified through various formal and informal strategies at the beginning of the course and throughout the semester. Students taking online courses submit all course work to instructors via Blackboard using a secure connection, username and password. Student privacy is protected using a secure connection to Blackboard and access is restricted to enrolled students. (I.C.8)

The District's Academic Freedom Policy (BP 4030) communicates the expectation that faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted discipline views: subject matter must be "appropriate to the standards of the discipline and academic community." Faculty evaluations assist in determining that the College meets this Standard. (I.C.9)

The College does not require conformity to specific codes of conduct other than those contained in BP 3100. (I.C.10)

The College does not operate in foreign locations. (I.C.11)

The District Board of Trustees demonstrates commitment to adhering to Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies (BP 0005): the Board's subcommittee on Student Success and Accreditation reviews reports on the progress of institutional accreditation, and the Board receives reports on accreditation status at public meetings and retreats. Periodic reports on institutional effectiveness and student outcomes are also received by these groups. Information on institutional accreditation is published on the District website. Board minutes describe the Board's attention to the accreditation standards and the District's efforts to comply with the standards. The College's current accredited status with ACCJC demonstrates its compliance with Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, Commission policies, guidelines, and requirements for public disclosure,

institutional reporting, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. The institution's accredited status, along with accreditation reports and documents demonstrating timely attention to Commission deadlines, are available on the College's Accreditation site. Special accreditation status for specific programs, such as Animal Health Technology and Radiologic Technology, is listed in the first pages of the catalog, and links to the accrediting bodies themselves can be accessed via the Accreditation site. (I.C.12, ER 21)

The student complaint process is posted online with a link to submit complaints. (I.C.12) (ER 21)

The College demonstrates integrity and honesty in its relationships with external agencies, including compliance with Accrediting Commission and U.S. Department of Education requirements, as evidenced by its previous self-studies, midterm and annual reports, and substantive change submissions. Further, the School of Health Sciences and Public Service has discipline-specific external accreditation which is posted on the individual program or department webpages and on the College's main Accreditation site. The District has obtained accredited status from a variety of organizations and such accredited status is listed in the College course catalogs. The District has communicated openly and honestly with the Commission and BP 0005 affirms the District's commitment for institutions to abide by Commission requirements, policies, and standards. (I.C.13) (ER 21)

The District is committed to high quality educational services as defined in their Mission Statement that has been approved by the Board (Policy 1200) in January 2015 and is published on the College's web page. The District does not have any external private financial investors; the College does not generate financial returns for investors, contribute to a related or parent organization, or support external interests. Therefore, the College and District's Mission of high quality educational services is not secondary to any external pressures. (I.C.14)

Baccalaureate

Information on the HIM BS program is housed on the Health Information Technology/HIM Program site. The program's description, outcomes, and requirements are listed, as well as Admissions Pathways and Application information. Information on student support services can be obtained via the Student Services link at the top of the webpage. The HIM program manager updates the webpage as needed. The HIM Bachelor's Degree program will use the same processes for assessment and evaluation of student achievement that currently exist at the College. In addition, data on national exam rates, graduation rates, and employment rates will be collected and shared to meet CAHIM accreditation. The College describes the purpose, content, course requirements, and program learning outcomes for the HIM Bachelor's degree in the Degree Curricula and Certificate Programs section of the catalog.

Conclusion

The College meets the Standard I.C, ER 19 and ER 13.

The District meets this standard as it demonstrated it accurately informs current and prospective students of the total cost of education in multiple mediums including in print and online, respectively in its college catalogs and online student portal. (I.C.6,7,8)

College Recommendations for Improvement:

See College Recommendation 2

College Recommendation 3 (Improvement): In order to ensure continuous improvement, the team recommends that the College has student learning outcome assessment data and analysis accessible to the public. (I.B.8, I.C.3)

District Recommendations for Improvement:

See District Recommendation 1

See District Recommendation 2

See District Recommendation 3

Standard II. A - Instructional Programs

General Observations

San Diego Mesa College offers a wide range of instructional programs leading to degrees and certificates in support of transfer, workforce development, lifelong learning and basic skill improvement. In addition to its strong transfer function, the college has an effective process for developing career technical programs in response to environmental scans, future employment projections, and recommendations from its industry advisory councils. The College offers degree programs that embody a coherent course of study that is compatible with its stated mission. These programs represent fields of study appropriate to higher education. The program length and delivery modes of instruction are appropriate for the expected level of rigor.

As of 2017, the College is offering 200 degrees and certificates, including one baccalaureate of science degree, 67 associate of arts degrees, 45 associate of science degrees, 20 associate degree for transfer, 41 certificates of achievement, and 26 certificates of performance. These degrees and certificates are in line with the College mission. All degree programs were found to contain at least one area of inquiry, with the courses in these areas reflective of the appropriate level of mastery and based upon student learning outcomes. (II.A.1)

San Diego Community College District is somewhat unique in its adherence to a common course curriculum throughout the Colleges with students receiving a single transcript, regardless of the college they attend. The District, in a support role of this process, brings colleges together at the Curriculum and Instructional Council to discuss and review curricular changes.

Findings and Evidence

Examination of evidence indicates that the institution provides degree programs that are coherent and compatible with its mission as outlined in the institution's Catalog and on the website. Degrees and programs of study provide relevant coursework and subject matter and prepare students for transfer or for the workforce, as appropriate. The college has readily accessible information regarding the transfer of credit policy found on the college website. (II.A.1)

The institutional effectiveness process is guided by the faculty with further oversight and assessment feedback by the College Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) which is co-chaired by a member of the Academic Senate executive staff. The CRC ensures that all provisions of the state mandated associate degrees for transfer are met and that courses and programs comply with required criteria as defined in the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Program and Course Approval Handbook. The CRC has a plan in place for reviewing new programs and program modifications, including activations, deactivations, and substantial changes to approved programs.(II.A.1)

Examination of evidence shows that the College has established and is currently documenting its processes for outcome assessment, program review, curriculum review, and annual planning cycles. The District Board has approved 65 Associate Degrees for Transfer and the college has over half of the student cohort transferring to a four year institution. The College offers a variety of workforce programs that include allied health fields, Geographic Information Systems (GIS) biopharmaceutical, multimedia, animal health technology, American Sign Language, hospitality, culinary art, fashion, architecture, interior design, business, architecture, engineering, and more. Beginning in 2015, the College received state approval for the bachelor's degree in Health Information Management, one of the first 15 community college baccalaureate programs in California. (II.A.1)

A program review process is in place to examine delivery modes, teaching methodologies, and learning support services to ensure that they accurately reflect the needs of the student population. However, the team noted that not all program and course outcomes have been assessed with a high degree of quality and rigor. Tenured, tenure-track, and adjunct faculty review the assessment results through dialogue in school meetings, department meetings, flex workshops, and for new tenure-track faculty, during regular meetings of the New Faculty Institute (NFI). While this collaborative approach is commendable, the team felt as if the College would benefit from adding systematic procedures for assessment of SLOs. (II.A.2, II.A.3)

The process for SLO implementation and review is in place. Discussion with the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and faculty to include Dept. Chairs, revealed that there is a high level of commitment from both fulltime and adjunct faculty in the implementation and assessment of SLO's. There are numerous avenues for discussion of SLO's including committee meetings, department meetings, and during professional development workshops. Through a thorough search on CurricUNET the team found SLO's on each course syllabus and while there was some inconsistency in the depth and development of the SLO's they were present. Each department has an assigned learning outcomes coordinator, who is responsible for promoting discussion of outcomes and assessment within their department meetings. While the team applauds the College for this collegial approach, to ensure consistent development and implementation of SLO's adding a more systematic approach to SLO development and review would benefit student success (II.A.3, II.A.11)

The College has been successful in designing and offering an innovative pre-collegiate level curriculum. The college has had an active Basic Skills Committee and has been collaborating statewide and nationally. Over the last seven years, the College has been working with the California Acceleration Project (CAP), to review and assess its current curriculum offerings and then to incorporate student data into possible alternatives. The HSI/Title V grant provides reassigned time for Math, English, and ESOL faculty to engage in curriculum revision. In addition, this grant provides funds for a curriculum revision specialist and a professional development coordinator to assist in the creation of equitable pathways to and

through basic skills courses. The College communicates information regarding the process of determining the appropriate credit type through the college webpages and YouTube videos. The College began working with the Center for Urban Education (CUE) through the University of Southern California. This collaboration resulted in a pilot project that uses high school GPA as an indicator for future success. (II.A.4)

Colleges in the San Diego Community College District offer pre-collegiate level curriculum that is distinguished from college level curriculum. The District supports colleges in this area by providing the resources necessary to adequately distinguish collegiate from pre-collegiate level curriculum. This is accomplished in accordance with State Chancellor guidelines and through the coordinated efforts of the Vice Chancellor of Instructional Services office, the Dean of Curriculum Services office and its staff, and the online resources available on the Curriculum Services website, and the Curriculum and Instruction Council. (II.A.4)

Review of Board Policy 5020 and related Administrative Procedures 5019 to 5022, the District website under “Curriculum Services”, the curriculum committee minutes, and through conversations with the Vice Chancellor of Instructional Services, the Dean of Curriculum Services, and members of the Curriculum and Instruction Council reveals that the District provides a high level of support and coordination to allow for colleges to distinguish between collegiate and pre-collegiate level curriculum. The decision to offer particular programs, degrees, and certificates (regardless of modality) resides with the faculty at the Colleges who serve as discipline experts. (II.A.4).

The District serves as a resource for curriculum development, facilitating the work done at the colleges. The faculty, as discipline experts, are the primary drivers of degrees and programs and are those who use established criteria from key resources such as the State Chancellor’s Office and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges to determining breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis in the development of curriculum. The Associate degrees meet the necessary level and rigor. The District Curriculum and Instruction Council serves as the vehicle through which collegial conversations and peer oversight and accountability related to curriculum occur. In regards to distance education, while the District supports it through dean level staffing and instructional design staff, the faculty are those who decide if degrees and programs should be offered online. Additionally, there is a District level committee, the District Distance Education Steering Committee, where issues related to online instruction and course delivery are discussed. (II.A.5)

Review of the District website under “Curriculum Services”, the curriculum committee minutes, and through conversations with the Vice Chancellor of Instructional Services, the Dean of Curriculum Services, and members of the Curriculum and Instruction Council reveals that the District provides a high level of support and coordination to allow for colleges to distinguish between collegiate and pre-collegiate level curriculum. The decision to offer pre-collegiate courses resides with the faculty at the colleges who serve as discipline

experts (Standard II.A.5).

College Deans and department chairs work together to create the schedule of course offerings that align with student needs and program pathways. The team was impressed with the plan for comprehensive program review where lead writers and faculty members within each discipline assess the availability of courses while Deans and department chairs utilize enrollment management data to further assess the availability of courses and the amount of time needed to complete certificates and degrees. The College is currently using a data-driven approach to enrollment management. In fall 2013, the college formed the Enrollment Management Taskforce Committee, comprised of faculty, department chairs, deans and the Vice President of Instruction. This addition allows the analysis of course offering data to be used on a wider scale. (II.A.6)

SDMC has proven to be one of the leading colleges in equity and excellence and has committed to developing various modes of instructional learning and delivery designed to meet the needs of the students. Offering distance learning and hybrid courses has allowed students to find classes that fit their needs and schedules. All faculty teaching online courses are required to complete a twenty-hour online training program offered by the District under the supervisions of experts in online instruction. Equity-focused goals for 2015-2016 included mitigation of disproportionate impact integrating instructional and student support services to support the success of all students. The College implemented several orientation and counseling programs for students. Programs such as the First Year Experience, the Mesa Academic and Athletics Program, the Accelerated College and Continuing Education English Program, the International Student Program, along with the focus on high schools, veterans, and online students points to success in initial point of contact. (II.A.7)

The College does not use department-wide courses or program examinations (II.A.8)

The College awards credit based on student attainment of a passing grade as determined by the faculty. In 2015, the College added a new baccalaureate degree program in health information management. Offering of courses in the new program began in fall 2016. The college has a well-documented transfer policy that is articulated in the College's catalog, website, and the schedule of classes. Policies related to protocols for assessing transcripts for students entering the college are implemented by the San Diego Community College District to ensure uniformity for all three institutions within the district. Policies for awarding credit by examination, advanced placement examinations, non-college credit vocational exams, non-credit continuing education, military credit, and international baccalaureate are clearly delineated in the Board policies and in the college catalog. Examination of documents at the college indicates consistent applications of these policies. The College has articulation agreements with other two-year and four-year institutions in the state and nation-wide. Interviews of the staff at the District and at the College provided information regarding the protocol to assess transcripts for students entering or transferring to the college. (II.A.9)

Through a review of the District website, Board Policies and Administrative Procedures

(3900.1.4, and 5), and in conversations with College administrators and District Admission and Records evaluators, it is evident that the institution makes available a clearly stated transfer-of-credit policies and procedures. The process for reviewing relies on faculty input and established standards for higher education. These policies and procedures are implemented by the Colleges to facilitate degree and certificate completion. Additionally, Board Policy and Administrative Procedures 5050 provides clear guidance on articulation processes for Colleges and College Articulation Officers in the establishments of agreements with other colleges in agreement with its mission. A review of the District Articulation Committee minutes revealed that while there have not been updates to the website for the 2016-2017 academic year that sufficient evidence could be found to verify that this committee of Articulation Officers meets regularly to discuss key issues that affect articulation agreements and specific course agreements (II.A.10)

Transfer policies are communicated to students in several ways, including the college catalog, college website, and student portal. Examination of evidence confirms that transfer policies are available to students in multiple formats. The district has centralized records and transfer evaluation process, with a single district transcript to facilitate mobility of students among the district's three institutions. This is certainly a plus for all students enrolled in any of the three campuses in the district. (II.A.10)

Transfer credit policies have been developed using District and state guidelines. Policies are regularly reviewed and there is evidence from a recent revision of the policies for Credit by Examination related to articulated non credit policies, approved April 15, 2016. (II.A.10)

Several articulation agreements with different systems of higher education are in place including, the University of California, California State University, and degree granting independent colleges and universities. The College's webpage for the Transfer Center Articulation provides information on these articulation agreements. The institution uses ASSIST (Articulation System Stimulating Interinstitutional Student Transfer), a computerized student-transfer information system that can be accessed over the World Wide Web. It displays reports of how course credits earned at one California college or university can be applied when transferred to another. (II.A.10)

Based on the College's Substantive Change Report dated April 6, 2015, the baccalaureate program in Health Information Management is in the process of developing articulation agreements with four-year institutions. Articulation agreements for upper division coursework are incomplete as of fall 2016. (II.A.10)

In fall 2016, the College revised its own institutional learning outcomes (ILO) to be congruent with those of the Accrediting Commission. While there is no exact match between the Colleges' ILOs and those of the Commission, the College offered a crosswalk that correlates the two sets of outcomes. Examination of the College's 2016-17 catalog did not reflect the latest revisions. Examination of evidence shows that the revised ILOs were approved by the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee on October 25, 2016 and by the President's Cabinet on November 1, 2016. The new ILOs were posted to the

college's website but apparently did not find their way into the College's various academic programs. Accordingly, evidence of mapping the new ILOs to various programs on campus have yet to take place in the future. Program mapping, however, exists for the old ILOs. (II.A.11)

The College annually assesses of its (prior to 2016) six ILOs through a survey of graduating students, which began in June 2013. In reviewing student responses, the majority indicated that their learning experiences at San Diego Mesa College resulted in achieving most of the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs). Results also indicate that students were very secure in Self-Awareness and Interpersonal Skills, Critical Thinking, Personal Actions and Civic Responsibility. Two ILOs, Global Awareness and Technological Awareness were met unevenly. One ILO, Communication, received a response rate slightly below 50%, indicating that students did not perceive their achievement as securely as with the other items. However, achievement of learning outcomes in written and oral communications emerged as one of "best learning experiences" at the college in the open ended responses. Overall, the majority of students indicated that they had significantly achieved the institution's learning outcomes through their experiences at the college. The College should regularly assess the attainment of its ILOs, engage in dialogue regarding the findings, decide upon a target of achievement and whether students are meeting the target. (Standard II.A.11)

The general education courses at the institution were developed by the faculty and were vetted through a participatory process that included members of the faculty and administration. General education courses at the institution constitute the foundation for both the associate degree and the new baccalaureate degree program. The baccalaureate program met the required threshold of 36 semester units of lower division general education, including three courses that account for ten semester units of upper division general education coursework. The lower division courses in general education for the baccalaureate degree are designed to meet either the California State University General Education Breadth Pattern or the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (SDMC Catalog, p. 222). General education courses are distributed among four broad subject areas including: language and rationality including math, natural sciences, humanities, and social sciences. (II.A.12)

Examination of evidence in the college catalog and additional evidence examined during the visit to the college indicates that all degree programs include focused studies in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core. For the associate degree, 18 semester units or more are required. The baccalaureate degree in health information management requires a minimum of 30 semester units of lower division courses and 44 semester units of upper division courses, including ten units of general education. Examination of the San Diego Community College Board of Trustees policy on Graduation Requirements for Degrees and Certificates confirms the statement made in the college catalog (II. A.13).

Examination of evidence confirms that the institution's CTE certificates, associate, and baccalaureate degree programs include learning outcomes that reflect the technical and

professional competencies necessary to meet the employment needs of the respective industry or profession. Learning outcomes are based on input from industry experts who participate in the advisory council meetings of the respective technical education disciplines. The college has a robust website for CTE programs that include valuable information for prospective and existing students. Links to Labor market information is also available for different CTE areas. The college catalog, 2016-17 includes information on possible field trip experiences in several CTE programs, including, for example: music, political science, radiology technology and several other programs in technical and liberal arts disciplines (II.A.14).

Examination of evidence shows no programs were eliminated since the last self-evaluation. However, there have been several course deactivations in the past six years. In interviewing the administrators of academic policy at the district and the chief academic officer at the college, it was indicated that such course deactivations were mostly due to low student enrollment. (II.A.15)

The college follows the established District policy regarding discontinuation of programs. This policy outlines the process and procedure for discontinuing a program. The policy emphasizes the importance of student's completing educational goals in a timely manner. In addition to the District Board policy, the College has a local policy that was developed by the Faculty Senate's Academic Affairs Committee and is entitled Position Paper #8. (II.A.15)

San Diego Community College District has a policy (Board Policy 5052 and Administrative Procedure 5022) in place to guide program discontinuance. This policy outlines the process and procedure for discontinuing a program, which ensures that students can complete their educational goals in a timely manner. When it is necessary for a program to be eliminated or program requirements are significantly changed, the College makes appropriate arrangements and uses a number of communication avenues to ensure that enrolled students may complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption. The procedure for discontinuation of programs include steps to monitor the impact on other areas, a detailed plan for phasing out the program, a plan for currently enrolled students such as a teach out process, and a plan that ensures an open and transparent participation governance process in generating any recommendation to the Board of Trustees. In an interview with the Curriculum and Instruction Council it was revealed that this policy has not been used in recent memory. (II.A.15)

The College has an established program review process which allows for the regular evaluation and improvement of all instructional programs offered. The process is data-driven and requires assessment of student enrollment, retention, success, full-time equivalent faculty, curriculum, student achievement, outcomes measures such as graduation, and resources available to the program. In addition, the process allows for continuous dialog and discussion among members of the academic community regarding strengths, weaknesses, and student learning outcomes in various instructional programs. The resulting dialog is expected to lead to improvements in courses and programs that enhance learning outcomes and student

achievement (Standard II.A.16)

Baccalaureate

The bachelor's of science degree in Health Information Management (HIM) is consistent with the mission of the college and was determined based on the needs of the healthcare industry. The mission statement was reviewed and revised to incorporate the new degree. (II.A.I)

For the baccalaureate program, the process of assessing student learning outcomes is the same as that for the associate degrees and certificates. The BS degree program is required to meet the same level of academic rigor as the baccalaureate degrees offered by the University of California and California State University. The program was developed by faculty with expertise in health information management through researching the currently accredited 58 HIM baccalaureate programs in the U.S. The program is designed to meet the accreditation requirements of the external agency, CAHIM. SDMC evaluates success of students in the baccalaureate degree program using multiple direct and indirect measures, including student course completion rates, licensing reports, and job placement rates. The student learning outcomes were evaluated by the team and found to be consistent with generally accepted norms in higher education. The first cohort of students began in Fall of 2016 so there is little data to support assessment at this time but there is a firm plan in place for assessment. There are 16 students currently enrolled in the baccalaureate degree at SDMC. (II.A.2, II.A.5, II.A.11)

The baccalaureate degree program is clearly aligned with the institutional mission and has been included in decision making and planning processes. As in the other programs at SDMC faculty take the lead role in developing, mapping, and assessing the outcomes of the baccalaureate degree. With less than a year since the program began there has already been a program update reported. The faculty in the baccalaureate program are passionate and motivated toward success as evidenced by conversations with the lead faculty and currently enrolled students. (II.A.3)

The baccalaureate degree requires 120 hours and has the requisite general education credits. The degree builds upon the current Associate of Science in Health Information Technology program and is based on a four-year plan of completion. The team examined SLO's in the baccalaureate degree courses and found them to be appropriate and comparable to those of like degrees at higher education institutions. Student expectations, including learning outcomes, assignments and examinations of the upper division courses demonstrate the rigor commonly accepted at four year institutions. The standards for the baccalaureate degree are aligned to enable students to move on to an accredited HIM master's degree program. Each HIM course syllabus follows the CAHIM model to ensure a complete guide to the course. In addition, the Health Information Management community and the American Health Information Management Association (AHIMA) provide tools that assist colleges in delivering accredited program curricula. The baccalaureate degree provides affordable and

equitable access to RHIA professional certification. The degree draws from past graduates, community members, and those currently in the workforce who seek employment in a field with high earning potential. (II.A.5, II.A.6, II.A.9)

The baccalaureate program uses a Hybrid format that was designed to meet the needs of the students by offering night classes that are suitable for both traditional students and students who may be working in the field. The courses are offered in both 16 week sessions and 8 week sessions to ensure students will complete the program in a reasonable timeframe. (II.A.6)

Policies for student transfer into the baccalaureate program ensure that all program requirements are fulfilled, including completion of the minimum required semester units, prerequisites, experiential activities, and general education. To date, the College has not accepted any students with upper division coursework. Transfer of credit and articulation for lower division courses have followed the existing District policies for course acceptance and articulation agreements through California State University system, the University of California system, and the California Community Colleges Academic Senate are currently being considered. (II.A.10)

The HIM baccalaureate degree consists of 77 units of the lower-division, 30 of which are based on the CSU general education transfer pattern. It requires 54 upper division units, ten of which are upper division general education requirements. These courses include Organizational Psychology, Advanced Professional Writing, Database Management, and Design with a lab component. There are general education requirements distributed across both upper and lower divisions and they capture the baccalaureate level student learning outcomes and competencies. These learning outcomes are based on input from workforce partners and advisory committees, labor market information, employment data, including occupation and industry growth projections, wages, training and skill requirements, and external accrediting agencies. Where applicable, upon successful completion of the CTE program, students are prepared for external licensure and certification. The degree does include a focused study on one area of inquiry and includes key theories and practices appropriate to the baccalaureate level. The upper-division major requirements include a capstone course that requires students to conduct empirical research at a clinical site on trends in the healthcare industry specific to management of the electronic health record. (II.A.12, II.A. 13)

Through a review of the District website, Board Policies and Administrative Procedures and in conversations with College administrators and District Admissions and Records evaluators, it is evident that the institution makes available a clearly stated transfer-of-credit policies and procedures.

Conclusions

The college meets the Standard and ERs 3, 9, 10, 11, and 12.

College Recommendations for Improvement:
See College Recommendation 2

District Recommendations:
See District Recommendation 1

See District Recommendation 2

Standard II.B - Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations

Mesa College's library & learning support services are all housed in one central location, the SDMC Learning Resources Center (LRC). The LRC has 107,000 square feet of various support services, including the Library, computer labs, various academic support services for students, and a professional development center for College employees.

Findings and Evidence

The Learning Resource Center (LRC) fills four floors with various academic support services. The Library is located on the first and third floors. Their 115,000 volumes of circulating print materials are available on the third floor with quiet study areas for students. The first floor is used for services with a busier feel, such as circulation, reserve textbook collection, reference, a library classroom, periodicals, and media. The library extends itself with their digital collections of over 33,000 ebooks, two video streaming databases, and approximately 50 online databases. These databases include multidisciplinary resources commonly used throughout California community college libraries and discipline specific resources, such as Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health (CINAHL) which was subscribed to for the Baccalaureate degree in Health Information Management, Biblical Archeology Society Online Archive, and Fashion Snoop that have been especially chosen for their particular programs at SDMC. The Library's web pages include much information to help connect students with library services and research assistance. There are two recently hired librarians for a total of 3 librarians to support student learning. Due to librarian staffing changes over the last several years, librarians have not been able to offer open workshops, but have maintained course integrated library instruction. (II.B.1, ER 17)

The Mesa Tutoring & Computing Center (MT2C) also shares both the first floor with the

library and has space on the fourth floor of the LRC. MT2C offers a computer lab and various types of study environments for individual, group study, and tutoring. The High Tech Center, part of the Disability Support Programs Services (DSPS), operates a fully accessible computer lab/classroom on the first floor with remaining DSPS services located in the student services building. Sharing the third floor with the Library, the Writing Center, Language Computing Lab & Classrooms provide focused language tutoring at the point of need. The Writing Center supports writing across disciplines and the faculty co-coordinators include tutoring as a component of their credit courses. The MT2C supports the campus with tutoring services with a newly hired learning assistance coordinator who collaborates with five faculty tutoring coordinators, seven Instructional Associates, one supervisor, and tutors to support a wide variety of disciplines, including accounting, computer science, medical terminology, music, math, science, English/writing, & foreign languages. All tutors go through a training and vetting process. Tutors are required to take a tutor training course in addition to submitting grades, asking for faculty to recommend them as a tutor, and being observed tutoring before they are hired. Tutors are considered professionals and are invited to attend the same trainings available to tutoring faculty to make them more effective tutors. Tutoring services are communicated to the campus community through campus committees, convocation presentations, independent faculty members, website, and social media. The fourth floor of the LRC also includes resources for college employees, such as the LOFT (Learning Opportunities for Transformation), their professional development center and Math and Science Tutoring. (II.B.1, ER 17).

Distance education students have the opportunity for 24/7 tutoring through MT2Cs recently implemented NetTutor. Students have two options to interact with online tutors. They can submit a paper and receive written feedback within 48 hours or chat with a tutor for live assistance in several disciplines, including math, English, computer information, chemistry, & physics. MT2C is looking to expand NetTutor subject tutoring through working with faculty. The Library provides 24/7 research support to students through QuestionPoint, a virtual chat reference service in addition to offering access to subscription databases and electronic books. (II.B.1, ER 17)

The Library selects and maintains materials through several activities including the campus wide program review. Librarians work with faculty to solicit feedback and faculty can make requests for library materials. The Library also uses suggestion forums, reports, surveys, and professional resources to help inform them of what is needed to support students and the best items to fulfill those needs. Tutoring services has adopted additional strategic planning methods, including the Logic Model, as a way to strategically plan for educational equipment and material needs which they update each year. These strategic plans become part of the tutoring program review & college integrated planning process in addition. (II.B.2)

The Library evaluates their services, including SLOs & AUOs, via a survey each semester in addition to other evaluation tools, such as point of service surveys and usage data from the library system and library databases. Faculty members are given the opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of presentations made by librarians to ensure research instruction is effective. Librarians also review transcripts from the 24/7 reference tool, QuestionPoint, to look for ways to design library instruction and reference for students. Some improvements the library has made from assessing their services include reinstating Saturday library hours, increasing wifi access, and acoustical panels to reduce noise. (II.B.3)

Tutoring services also participates in program review. Tutoring schedules a campus-wide open retreat each year where they develop new plans and follow up on past plans to review success and feasibility of their services. Additionally, they have a department leadership team which includes faculty, classified staff, and student tutors. Evidence of this collaboration is seen in their program review. This team of professionalized student tutors to be leaders with faculty and staff is included in their program review. The collaborative work at their retreats is used to write their program review and improve services. Since many of their tutoring services receive funding through grants and categorical funding, they plan to use apportionment to sustain these services when that funding ends. Assessments are conducted at various points of service for tutoring and includes both the training of tutors and students obtaining tutoring services. The course that trains tutors follows the process that all courses do to assess student learning outcomes. Tutors who attend training are surveyed for feedback at the end of training sessions for success. Students who obtain learning assistance from tutors provide feedback at the end of the session and each spring when a survey created by learning support staff and the Institutional Researcher is disseminated campus wide. They review this data to determine how effectively they are supporting student learning, look for equity gaps, and make improvements. Two examples of improvements are reducing the wait time for walk in tutoring to about 30 minutes and growing specialized tutoring for student athletes. (II.B.3)

The college augments their on-site library and academic support and staff by participating in several organizations. The Library expands access by participating in San Diego/Imperial Counties Community College Learning Resources Cooperative. This cooperative provides benefits to students, including chat reference, as well as resources for library materials and professional development opportunities for the libraries. The Library also purchases databases through the Community College Library Consortium that provides discounted pricing on many resources. A district wide librarian group coordinates the integrated library system, shared subscription resource, and shared evaluation tools. They informally assess the success of participation in the cooperative and consortium and discuss any concerns at library

department meetings. Academic support participates in activities related to the California Community College Success Network (3CSN) and 3CSN's Learning Assistance Project (LAP) by attending trainings and conferences after which participants are asked to assess how successful the training was for them. (II.B.4)

Baccalaureate

Learning support for Mesa's Health Information Management (HIM) degree are the same as for all students. Students interviewed in the HIM program said they received orientations about the services and are happy with the academic support they received, highlighting the Writing Center and Library as contributing to their success. Students were also expecting a class presentation from the Librarian to instruct them in the use of relevant library resources on the evening the team interviewed them.

Resource collections for the HIM degree were grown through collaboration with HIM faculty and librarians. The collections have been supplemented with print and electronic books along with a subscription to CINAHL. A student information guide is under its final review that will help students find databases, periodicals, print and electronic books, websites, and citing assistance that were purchased for the program. (II.B.1)

Conclusions

The college meets this standard and ER 17 due to the passionate employees that provide sufficient library and learning support while continually evaluating and implementing improvements to make Mesa College students successful learners.

Standard II.C - Student Support Services

General Observations

The College demonstrates a commitment to quality and innovative services that support student learning and achievement from high-school outreach leading to admissions and placement through career and transfer preparation. They promote a culture of equity and diversity which is represented in the many partnerships and Federal grants they leverage to provide a variety of specialized services for disproportionality impacted populations. The District regularly evaluates placement instruments and practices to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases. While the team found the District maintains regular evaluation cycles for their admissions practices, the assessment data does not directly demonstrate support of student learning and continuous quality improvement. The District maintains student records permanently, securely, and confidentially with secure file backup. The District established well defined policies for release of student records.

Findings and Evidence

Student Support Services are housed in the centrally located Student Services Center, which advertises services, study spaces, and refreshments. Departments located together are Admissions, Assessment/Testing, Associated Student Government, Career Services, Counseling, Outreach, Student Affairs, Student Health, Transfer, Veterans and others, in addition to special programs for first-generation, minority, and low-income students.

The College evaluates the quality of support services through direct and indirect methods and with dialogue at department and division meetings and retreats. The District regularly evaluates the quality of student support services by employing student feedback surveys. Student Services departments work with the institutional researcher to engage in data-driven improvements to their services. In order to ensure the institution is fostering student learning and development through their student support services, it is recommended that all student services areas continue to undergo, assessment practices to demonstrate support for student learning (II.C.1). While the institution diligently develops assessment plans in Taskstream, evidence provided could benefit from greater depth on how learning outcomes data is being used to support institutional effectiveness to continuously improve student support programs and services. Counseling is a model for detailing how data has been used to improve services (II.C.2).

At the District level, an annual assessment of its support of student services area goals demonstrates that they are using appropriate measures along with outcomes from the prior

year leading to continuous quality improvement. Evidence suggests continuous quality improvement practices in how the District informs, collaborates in decision making, and communicates Student Services decisions Districtwide. The team found evidence of a recent cycle of updates for Board Policies in student services that demonstrate promising practices in ensuring the quality of student support services. (II.C.2).

The College and District provide equitable access to all regular admit College students by providing comprehensive services to students regardless of location or delivery method. To provide equitable access for all of its students, the College has assembled a variety of special programs and partnerships to reach out to disproportionately impacted populations and then provide ongoing support. The College has defined their target population in comparison to the surrounding area and provides feeder and transfer institutions with an aligned experience. The Accelerated College Program (ACP), College and Career access Pathway (CCAP), the San Diego Promise project, Kearny Fast Track, and CSU and UC cross enrollment are all examples of the variety of experiences to expose students to Mesa College (IIC 3). Peer-to-peer mentoring is used as a tool to reach students in both the Outreach Student Ambassador program and in the CRUISE program, which orients students to campus and provides year-long mentor support through Peer Navigators. Partnerships provide specialized services to address disproportionality impacted populations including the Center for Urban Education (CUE), Minority Male Community College Collaborative (M2C3) and the Center for Organizational Responsibility and Advancement (CORA) (II.C.3).

The College added a Dean of Student Success and Equity who oversees a shared governance committee which supports the campus culture embodied in the Mesa College tagline, “The leading College of Equity and Excellence.” The committee provides a venue for faculty and staff to interact with Student Services and participate in planning events that reach across campus constituents, for example Flex Day Equity training workshops.

Athletics and co-curricular programs, including speech and debate, student leadership, journalism and performing arts, are overseen by standards set by both Board Policy and an operating manual. They contribute generally to the educational mission of the College (II.C.4).

There are enhanced counseling services based in collaboration with other student services programs including the First Year Experience, Athletics, STAR/TRIO and Veterans. Professional development for counselors has been made available via SSSP funding. The FLEX day is used extensively to present workshops to faculty, particularly on Equity and Diversity (II.C.5).

The District maintains appropriate, updated board policies related to admission policies that are consistent with its mission. It adheres to these policies and references them in catalogs, course schedules, and websites. It has defined standards for special admission including high school students, F-1 Visa students, and special program admission. Special program admission also includes provisions related to admission into Mesa College's baccalaureate program (II.C.6).

The College advises students on the pathways to obtaining their educational goals of a certificate, degree, and/or transfer through the College catalogs and website. An area of improvement for the District is related to the effective practices of constructing coherent, structured pathways, and simplifying choices for students seeking a degree and transfer completion. Evidence that these discussions are occurring at the District among the Vice Chancellor of Student Services along with the Vice Presidents of Instruction and Student Services was provided to the team. (II.C.6)

The District's five-year cycle of placement instrument validation falls within statewide regulations to include: disproportionate impact related to test bias, consequential validation to determine appropriate cut scores, and content-related validity for appropriateness of the test for placement into a course or course sequence. The institution intends to comply with the state's Common Assessment Initiative and while waiting for the instrument, uses Student Equity data as a proxy for their disproportionate impact study scheduled for summer. Aligned with this is the full implementation of the Multiple Measures Assessment Program (MMA) as an alternative means of assessing student preparation levels in English and mathematics courses. Districtwide involvement in MMA demonstrates the use of promising practices to better place students (II.C.7).

The District report on SSSP Reporting from Fall 2016 serves as an informative tool as institutions determine the effectiveness of their admissions and onboarding practices related to orientation, assessment, and education planning. There was no direct evidence in the self-evaluation documents that the Colleges are using this report or other assessment data to determine effective admission practices but the College does use access as one of the key performance indicators for success. In fact, the team found the College to have even more diversity of student population than the community population the campus resides in. (II.C.7).

An area of improvement is in the evaluation of admission practices and tools beyond student feedback surveys administered every three years. The team suggests the use of assessment in the evaluation of admission practices to document support of student learning to demonstrate better a model of continuous quality improvement. The team found the College to be

actively looking at roadblocks through activities such as their walk in the students shoes program. (II.C.7).

The District complies with all laws and policies related to maintaining, securing, and destruction of records as well as ensuring confidentiality of student records. The District's Records Retention Manual is thorough and consistent with information published in College catalogs, websites, and the student portal. Training on record confidentiality is provided by the District's student record custodian, the Vice Chancellor of Student Services.

The District strictly monitors the release of student records, as per *Board Policy 3001: Student Records*. Student records access policies are posted in the institution's catalog, website, and on Student Web Services. In accordance with federal and state law, students must provide a written request to grant third party access to their records.

Paper records in student services areas such as Admissions & Records, Veterans, and Student Affairs are maintained in a locked and secure area. The District uses Maxient, a third-party vendor, to securely maintain student complaints and conduct related matters. (II.C.8).

Baccalaureate

The pre-requisites and other qualifications for the baccalaureate degree are appropriately communicated and applied to students. SDMC does an excellent job of explaining the requirements and process of admission on the college website. Students were eager to report that the process of application and the help obtained by the counseling staff to identify sequencing and pathways was both easily obtained and accurate. The baccalaureate students do have a specified counselor that is shared with the Health Sciences department. (II.C.6)

Conclusions

The College meets this standard.

District Recommendations:

See District Recommendation 1

Standard III: Resources

Standard III.A - Human Resources

General Observations

San Diego Mesa College shares responsibilities for human resources administration with the District, which executes many human resources functions. The College employs a sufficient number of well-qualified staff, administrators, and faculty and follows California Minimum Qualifications for faculty positions.

All employees are regularly evaluated according to contracts and meet and confer agreements. Evaluations of employees who bear responsibility for student learning include consideration of the use of assessment results. Personnel files are maintained securely and are accessible to employees.

Personnel policies and procedures, including a code of professional ethics, are established and adhered to. Comprehensive professional development for all employees is offered through the LOFT center (Learning Opportunities for Transformation).

San Diego Community College District's Human Resources department assumes the direct responsibility for ensuring that degrees held are from accredited institutions recognized by U.S. accrediting agencies. The Human Resources department is also responsible for ensuring that foreign degrees or degrees from non-U.S. institutions are evaluated and meet the minimum qualifications of the position before submitting to the selection process.

The District has long established policies that address civility and mutual respect as well as conflict of interest. These policies pertain to all employees in support of professional ethics. However, the Board of Trustees and the AFT Guild (faculty union) have in addition adopted respective Codes of Professional Ethics, which are in alignment with the nature of their professional roles as a Trustee or faculty member. The District provides for the security and confidentiality of personnel records and ensures each employee has access to their personnel record.

Findings and Evidence

The College guarantees quality through the hiring of qualified staff. Hiring procedures are publicly documented in both Board policy and administrative procedures, including AP 4200.1 - Employment of College Faculty, AP 4200.5 - the Continuing Education Contract Faculty Hiring Procedure, AP 4200.2 - the Employment of Instructional Staff – Adjunct, and BP 7120 - Recruitment and Hiring.

Faculty job announcements are developed by screening committees and include the legally required Board of Governor's state minimum qualifications, equivalency and foreign degree process, as well as criteria specifically related to the program's needs. Job descriptions also include specific qualifications, such as licensure or certification needed in order to meet

specific programmatic needs. Following the receipt of a classified position description questionnaire, District Human Resources develops the job description to reflect the appropriate education, training, and experience. A review of current positions reflects that position duties, responsibilities, and authority of the position are clearly outlined. Academic administrator positions reflect the Board of Governor's state minimum qualifications standards to ensure they meet the educational and training requirements of the position. All job descriptions explicitly reference the mission of the college. (III.A.1)

The College ensures that faculty members have the necessary subject matter knowledge and requisite skills for teaching in their discipline by following the Board of Governor's state minimum qualifications standards, carefully constructing job announcements and descriptions, rigorously reviewing application materials and screening applicants. All of the required factors of qualification are included on job descriptions. This was noted in a review of both what was included in the self-evaluation and current online listings. The team was supplied with a District-wide classification description for faculty positions, which includes the development and review of curriculum and the assessment of learning. (III.A.2)

The College certifies that administrators and employees responsible for educational programs are appropriately qualified through its hiring and evaluation processes. Job descriptions currently posted on the website for administrators and other employees responsible for educational programs included the requisite education and experience requirements. Prior to employment consideration, District Human Resources verifies candidate educational qualifications and foreign degree evaluations are consistent with the requirements of the position. After initial employment, regular employee evaluation ensures that institutional effectiveness and academic quality are maintained. (III.A.3)

Human Resources Technicians review applications for open positions to ensure applicants meet the minimum qualifications and that degrees are from accredited institutions prior to submitting to the selection committee for review. Human Resources further reviews degrees through the solicitation of an official transcript to ensure that degrees held are verified. Applicants with foreign degrees from colleges or universities outside of the United States must have their coursework evaluated by a professional association that is a member of the National Association of Credential Evaluation Services (NACES). A copy of the evaluation must be submitted with their on-line application. The screening committee and Human Resources uses that evaluation in the same manner as a transcript to determine if the applicant meets the educational qualifications for the position. (III.A.4)

Union contracts, district policies and procedures, and human resources manuals articulate in writing the criteria and timelines for employee evaluation. The Human Resources Instruction Manual identifies effectiveness and improvement as the foci of the evaluation process. Evaluations are conducted according to required timelines and a master list of evaluations is maintained by the President's Office. Upon the request of the team, the master lists for faculty, classified staff, and managers was provided and included tracking of evaluation completion and submission to the District. Interviews with supervising employees affirmed

that per contract and meet and confer handbook requirements, when performance improvement plans are warranted, an accompanying timeline is generated. (III.A.5)

The Self-Evaluation states that while administrative evaluations include assessment, the faculty contract contains no prompts regarding assessment. Upon review, it was noted that the faculty evaluation instrument in the contract, the Faculty Appraisal Form in Appendix II, includes assessment as an item to be measured. Evaluators rate a faculty member's classroom assessment on a continuum from Needs Development to Exceeds Standards. In addition, in February 2017 the district signed a side letter agreement with the AFT Faculty Guild which provides for the inclusion of comprehensive language in the collective bargaining agreement as it relates to the use of assessments to improve student learning. The side-letter agreement is to be placed on the Board of Trustees docket for ratification on March 16, 2017. The management contract includes a feedback survey, which asks respondents to evaluate how well the manager has considered assessment of student learning outcomes in decisions. This feedback survey is a required component of management evaluation. The evaluation instrument for Classified employees in the AFT-Guild, Local 1931 - Classified Staff contract says on page 119, "Identify and evaluate each major job duty or responsibility. For this portion of the rating, refer to the district classification description (examples of duties and knowledge, skills and abilities)." The District classification description for tutors is inclusive of assessment, including the job duty "evaluate student needs and develop appropriate course of action." (III.A.6)

The College employs a sufficient number of qualified faculty members to maintain educational quality. Data provided in the Self-Evaluation indicate that the College has substantially exceeded its full-time faculty obligation number as defined by the California Community College Chancellor's Office in every year from 2005 to 2014. (III.A.7)

Individual departments orient their part-time faculty members. Full-time faculty members are oriented in a year-long new faculty institute. Administrative supervisors provide oversight for all faculty members and evaluations are conducted according to the contractual timelines identified in the AFT Guild Faculty Bargaining Unit Contract, Article 15.1.14. Professional development is made available to all faculty members through the Learning Opportunity for Transformation (LOFT) center. A review of the LOFT website revealed significant training opportunities for faculty. (III.A.8)

The College has adequate staff and administrators with suitable qualifications to support its operations. Qualifications are articulated and verified in the hiring process. Administrators must meet defined minimum qualifications. The College ensures sufficient staffing through its program review process. Programs, service areas, and units submit staff requests to the Classified Hiring Prioritization Committee, which ranks the proposals through use of qualitative and quantitative data. The ranking list is submitted to the President's Cabinet and the President makes the final decision. The District implementation of PeopleSoft and the increase in state reporting and regulatory changes has impacted staff workload. The College reports in the Self Evaluation that it will continue to assess needs to determine if additional

staffing is needed. (III.A.9, III.A.10)

The College establishes written personnel policies and procedures through its participatory governance process. This process allows for constituent review to support fairness. A District website makes public policies and procedures, including those for personnel. There is Board Policy and Administrative Procedure on personnel nondiscrimination. Managers and supervisors are trained in executing this policy and procedure.

The District is currently engaged in the process of updating their policies and procedures, vetting them through the governance process, and restructuring the website for the purpose of providing web access to the full complement of policies and procedures. Many of the District's policies and procedures are outdated. For example, Board Policy 4460, Conflict of Interest was last revised in 1998, and Administrative Procedure 4001.1 is dated 1978. The District provides a variety of professional development workshops focused on administrative procedures such as Sexual Harassment Prevention and Civility and Mutual Respect. Such activities support the policies and procedures being fairly, equitably, and consistently administered. (III.A.11)

The College has multiple diversity and equal employment opportunity policies and procedures. The District has a dedicated legal and employment opportunity office, which oversees the equal employment opportunity program. The Board of Trustees of San Diego Community College District adopted the revised Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Plan on July 29, 2014. The Plan reflects the District's commitment to equal employment opportunity and promotes practices that are nondiscriminatory. The plan includes a detailed assessment of employment by demographic categories and a specific plan to further equal employment opportunity. (III.A.12)

The College has multiple policies and procedures that address professional ethics, including BP 4460 Conflict of Interest and BP 7150 Civility and Mutual Respect. Consequences for violation of these policies follow established disciplinary procedures. The faculty contract includes a code of professional ethics. The Board of Trustees has also adopted a code of ethics specific to its members, BP 2715 Code of Ethics/Standard of Practice.

The District has adopted BP 4460 Conflict of Interest and AP 4460.2 Conflict of Interest. The District's AP 4460.2 was revised in 1998. These policies and procedures apply to all District employees and specify activities which are inconsistent, incompatible, or conflict with an employee's duties and require action by supervisory/management personnel. The District also established and adopted BP 7150 Civility and Mutual Respect, which also applies to all members of the District community. The policy describes what types of behavior are unacceptable and unethical and how it will be addressed. The AFT Guild, faculty bargaining unit agreement in Appendix 1, includes a code of professional ethics specific to all faculty members. The Board of Trustees has also adopted a code of ethics specific to its members, BP 2715 Code of Ethics/Standard of Practice.

The Human Resources department has drafted a general written Code of Ethics for all personnel, which is intended to replace the current BP 7150, Civility and Mutual Respect. Adoption of this policy will further update and elevate the principles of professional ethics. As currently written, it requires the inclusion of the consequences for violation. The draft policy is currently proceeding through the participatory governance review and approval process. (III.A.13)

Together, the College and District plan for and provide professional development for all employees. A reorganization of professional development occurred resulting in a task force developing a strategic plan and the establishment of a professional learning center (the LOFT). College resources provide for an instructional designer, an administrative support staff person, and a coordinator. The LOFT aims to provide professional learning for all employee groups. A review of the LOFT website shows that substantial learning opportunities are provided for faculty members. In interviews with LOFT staff, team members learned that they have recently expanded offerings for classified staff and plan to increase offerings for staff and managers in the near future. Touring the LOFT facilities, team members discovered an impressive professional development space. In interviews, college members spoke of the collaborative environment of good teaching and sharing that the LOFT has fostered. The College systematically evaluates professional learning to make improvements. Substantial evaluation is contained within the strategic plan. The Campus Employee Development (CED) Committee reviews Flex day and reviews needs assessment surveys to facilitate improvement and to guide planning.

Beginning in 2009 and in response to the District's 2009-2012 strategic plan, the District designed and sponsored a robust leadership development series of academies for its personnel. The academies offer the participants the opportunity to learn new skills, examine current management philosophy, network with fellow colleagues and leadership professionals, and enhance their knowledge of the District's policies and procedures, mission, vision, and strategic planning goals. With a focus on the development of leadership skills and succession planning, the District designed four academies which provide for the leadership development of all employees. These include academies for management, supervisory leadership, classified leadership, and faculty leadership. Each module of the academies are evaluated and an overall evaluation is conducted at the end of each academy. The data collected is used to review and improve the program. (III.A.14)

The district securely maintains all personnel records, while faculty evaluations are maintained in a secure fashion on campus. Each bargaining contract articulates the process for accessing personnel files. While management does not have such language in their Management Handbook, they are accorded the same process for access to their personnel files. (III.A.15)

Baccalaureate

There has been one full-time faculty hire since the inception of the HIM degree. A review of the job description for this position revealed that it reflects the duties and responsibilities associated with the position. The job description included the minimum qualifications for faculty to teach upper division courses in the program, which requires possession of a Bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited institution, two years of professional experience in health information technology, and Certification as a Registered Health Information Technician (RHIT) OR Registered Health Information Administrator (RHIA). Currently, there are two full-time faculty members assigned to the baccalaureate program. Current faculty in the program do meet the criteria for the Standards for the Baccalaureate Degree that requires the Master's Degree.

Conclusions

San Diego Mesa College effectively uses human resources to further its mission and ensure academic quality. The College employs well-qualified administrators, classified staff, and faculty who possess the requisite knowledge, training, and experience to perform their duties. Appropriate written employment policies, procedures, and practices are in place for evaluation, oversight, orientation, professional development, and professional ethics. However, some of their policies and procedures are quite outdated.

The District has a variety of policies and procedures relative to professional ethics, conflict of interest, and civility and mutual respect attributable to all personnel. The policies on conflict of interest and civility and mutual respect also contain the consequences for violation as required by the Standard.

The team found that the District takes their role as custodian of personnel files very seriously. The District maintains a dedicated file room with restricted access provides for the confidentiality and security of personnel files. In addition, employees have a well-articulated process for access to their personnel file.

District Recommendations:

See District Recommendation 1

See District Recommendation 2

See District Recommendation 3

Standard III.B - Physical Resources

General Observations

San Diego Mesa College offers programs and services at its 104 acre campus site in the Kearny Mesa area of San Diego. The Main Campus is comprised of 32 buildings, a parking structure, and several sports fields. The evaluation team toured the campus and found that

these locations appear safe and well-maintained. The facilities function is centralized at the District with Regional Directors and maintenance staff assigned to the campus. The Regional Director reports to the District, and works closely with the Vice President of Administrative Services to ensure the needs of the College are addressed in a timely manner. The College developed a Facilities Master Plan in 2006 and an Educational Master Plan in 2014.

The San Diego Community College District (SDCCD) is comprised of San Diego Miramar College, San Diego City College, San Diego Mesa College, and seven Continuing Education (CE) campuses. The San Diego Community College District is California's second largest community college district and serves over 140,000 students annually.

To support the physical infrastructure of the San Diego Community College District (the District), Proposition S was approved by voters in 2002 for a total of \$685,000,000. Proposition N was approved by voters in 2006 for a total of \$870,000,000. Progress on building renovations and new construction through Proposition S include an energy efficient Police Station, and adjacent parking structure, new Student Services facility, Social Behavioral Science and Fitness Center buildings. Progress on building renovations and new construction through Proposition N include the Design Center renovation, Learning Resource Center Labs, and a state of the art Math and Science building. The District utilizes various processes to plan and evaluate its facilities and the needs of the Colleges and campuses; these include the Facilities Master Plan (FMP), the Educational Master Plan (EMP), Security Master Plan, and the Program Review process. The District also uses several mechanisms to assure the safety and security of their learning and working environments.

(III.B.2)

Findings and Evidence

Responsibility for facilities and scheduled maintenance planning rests with the Vice President of Administrative Services, in conjunction with the District Facilities Management department. The College ensures the safety of its facilities through the implementation of the Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) standards. Additionally, in 2015 the District finalized a Safety and Security Master Plan identifying campus vulnerabilities and risks through analysis of crime statistics surveys. Staffing and site recommendations were presented that focus on risk reduction strategies. An automated District work order process provides faculty and staff an opportunity to report unsafe facility conditions. Work orders that threaten life safety are given the highest priority and ensures proper resources allocated to these types of issues. Ongoing assessment of College facilities is done primarily through visual inspections by District and College staff. (III.B.1, III.B.3)

The evaluation team observed that the College has excellent classrooms and laboratories that assure the quality of educational programs and services. The College continues to plan, build, maintain, upgrade, and replace its physical resources in a manner that assures effective utilization and the continuing quality necessary to support its programs and services. With the help of Proposition S and Proposition N funds, the College and the District have been able to fund numerous projects on campus, including, the Student Services modernization

and expansion, Social and Behavioral Sciences building, LEED platinum Police Station, and a new Math and Science Building. These buildings allow the College to support its programs now and into the future. (III.B.2)

In a current year's survey, the majority of respondents felt that the campus was both safe and well maintained. This demonstrates the College's commitment to identifying the safety concerns of its faculty, staff, and students and its willingness to make the necessary corrections. The College's commitment to safety is evidenced by the San Diego Community College District Police Department on campus as well as online safety-based trainings and resources for faculty, students, and staff. The College has well established emergency procedures available online. Trainings for staff, faculty, and students are held in the area of emergency preparedness utilizing ALICE (Alert, Lockdown, Inform, Counter, Evacuate) at the campuses and District Office. Further, the Clery Report is published on the San Diego Community College District Police Department website. The District has also developed emergency procedure posters which are updated periodically and distributed College wide. (III.B.1)

The College's long-range capital plans have not been updated since 2006. While the College is currently in the process of updating the Facilities Master Plan, the current plan is not linked to program review, the District Strategic Plan, or the 2014 Educational Master Plan. The College has relied on the funds from the District's two general obligation bonds to upgrade facilities and equipment. Although the College has an established formula for determining the total cost of ownership for new facility projects that increase the square footage of the campus, it has not developed a comprehensive equipment replacement plan to determine the resources required to replace outdated equipment. In addition, ongoing maintenance costs do not appear to be included in the total cost of ownership calculation. (III.B.2, III.B.4)

There appears to be a lack of clear integration between the College's physical resource planning and institutional planning as evidenced through the Educational Master Plan process. Further, the District's Strategic Plan does not take into consideration the College Strategic Goals and Objectives to demonstrate its commitment to evaluating, maintaining, planning, or replacing those physical resources to ensure their effective use in maximizing access to programs and services. (III.B.4)

The District assures safe physical resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs and learning support services through employing standards of construction. The District promotes a culture of safety through training and implementing notification systems in the event of an emergency.

The District has built and renovated many of its facilities for utilization in supports of the colleges. The College's Facility Master Plans identify facility requirements to meet the educational mission but they are outdated and do not link directly to the campus' current

Educational Master Plans.

Assessment of the use of facilities occurs at the District and College levels. Long range planning is guided through the Educational Master Plans and the Facilities Master Plan. Total cost of ownership is captured through the annual planning and budget process; however ongoing resources necessary to update or maintain equipment and facilities is not considered.

Baccalaureate

The College has recently begun a baccalaureate program for Health Information Management. In order to assess the feasibility of the current facilities and other resources needed for this program, the Vice President of Administrative Services, Vice President of Instruction, Dean and associated faculty members met to determine the needs for the program. While the College is currently in the process of updating the Facilities Master Plan, the current plan is not linked to program review, the District Strategic Plan or the 2014 Educational Master Plan.(III.B.3)

Conclusions

The District assures safe physical resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs and learning support services through employing standards of construction. The District promotes a culture of safety through training and implementing notification systems in the event of an emergency.

The District has built and renovated many of its facilities for utilization in supports of the colleges. The College's Facility Master Plans identify facility requirements to meet the educational mission but they are outdated and do not link directly to the campus' current Educational Master Plans.

Assessment of the use of facilities occurs at the District and College levels. Long range planning is guided through the Educational Master Plans and the Facilities Master Plan. Total cost of ownership is captured through the annual planning and budget process; however ongoing resources necessary to update or maintain equipment and facilities is not considered.

College Recommendations:

College Recommendation 4:

In order to improve facilities and educational planning, the team recommends that the District develop an updated comprehensive Facilities Master Plan to integrate with each campus's Educational Master Plan. The plan should be integrated with the College program review process and with the on-going and routine facilities assessments done by the College and District Facilities to include scheduled equipment replacement. The Facilities Master Plan should align with and directly support the District Strategic Plan and the College's strategic plans. (III.B.2, III.B.3, III.B.4)

District Recommendations:

See District Recommendation 1

Standard III.C - Technology Resources

General Observations

San Diego Mesa College (College) emphasizes the effective use of technology in support of teaching and learning, student success, and administrative functions. Technology services, support, hardware, and software meet the institution's needs and advance its mission of serving students. College Technology Services works in collaboration with District Technology to provide appropriate and adequate support for management and operational functions, academic programs, teaching and learning, and support services. The District and College have clearly defined IT planning processes with opportunities for input from participatory governance and advisory committees. As noted in the College's Institutional Self-Evaluation Report (ISER), the District and College have not integrated the *District Technology Master Plan 2016-2018* and the *College Technology Strategic Plan 2016-2019*, so it appears that more coordination with IT strategic planning could be beneficial. However, the District's Information Technology Services Director does attend College IT committee meetings to share planning information related to districtwide operational technology projects. The District also has plans to convene a districtwide Technology Committee, as described in the *District Technology Master Plan 2016-2018*, consisting of individuals with the appropriate technology skills from the three colleges and Continuing Education. As noted in the ISER, the Technology Committee will provide a mechanism by which broad based communication related to districtwide technology support and services may be addressed.

Findings and Evidence

The College's Information Technology planning is integrated with the College's overall planning process through participatory governance. The College's Information Technology Committee (MIT) develops, implements and assesses the strategic technology plan. The MIT is the governing body that provides the strategic direction for all campus technology. The College's *Technology Strategic Plan 2016-2019* is part of its integrated planning process. The District's *Draft Technology Master Plan 2016-2018* provides the framework for addressing districtwide network infrastructure, hardware and software, help desk services, and related IT needs. The District IT department maintains a complete inventory of all equipment it supports, and it refreshes technology every four to six years depending on the useful life of the equipment. The *District Technology Master Plan 2016-2018* has not been vetted with the College, nor is the plan integrated with the College's plan. For more effective planning the College and District should align these planning documents. (III.C.1)

Additionally, technology needs for teaching, learning, & support are reviewed through the College's integrated planning process, including program reviews. More opportunities to review technology needs comes up with various grant specific programs, such as SSSP, Equity, Title V, where large, diverse groups of employees come together to review needs to help students succeed, including hardware and software needs. (III.C.1)

The College's and District's IT departments update and replace technology resources through multiple planning and administrative processes to ensure technological infrastructure, quality, and capacity are adequate to support programs and services. To increase

communication between the District and the Colleges, the District plans to convene a districtwide Technology Committee, as described in the *Draft District Technology Master Plan 2016-2018*, consisting of individuals with the appropriate technology skills from the three colleges and Continuing Education. Plans were put in place to increase Internet bandwidth through CENIC and WAN bandwidth through a dark fiber infrastructure. The District makes decisions about distance education technology resources through the Districtwide Distance Education Steering Committee (DDESC). For example, the DDESC participated in a pilot of Canvas and recommended that the District begin review of the Canvas LMS in the fall of 2016. District Online Learning Pathways administers a bi-annual student satisfaction survey to ensure students' technology needs are being met. (III.C.2)

The College utilizes a Help Desk model for addressing issues with technology in classrooms and other learning environments. The District uses industry accepted cyber security measures, and IT systems are outfitted with redundant power supplies and data backup disks and processors. The District also has an agreement with CCS Disaster Recovery Systems for timely replacement of hardware located in the Data Center. All District computer equipment is behind multiple firewalls. (III.C.3)

The Learning Opportunities for Transformation (LOFT) provides a designated space for faculty to develop and share best practices for the use of instructional technology. An instructional designer from the LOFT provides staff development training to faculty and classified. The College utilizes the District Online Learning Pathways to provide technology training for distance education teaching, including the Online Faculty Certification Program and the on-campus faculty training program for Blackboard. DDESC includes faculty and administrative representatives from each campus. The District's Online Learning Pathways (OLP) provides an extensive, required online teaching certification program which is facilitated and graded by District instructional designers. OLP also provides faculty mentors at each campus to gather input regarding training and support needs of faculty and students. (III.C.4)

In 2015, the District implemented the PeopleSoft ERP system for finance functions. Upon implementation, business processes had not been updated, so pertinent reporting tools similar to what was available in the previous system did not exist. As noted in the ISER, the system is "very complex" which has "led to frustration with the new system and the inefficient use of time and resources." (III.C.5)

The team reviewed considerable amounts of documentary evidence and conducted over 12 hours of interviews, one-on-one with District and College IT leadership and small group format with faculty and staff. Representatives of faculty and staff from all the Colleges along with District staff were included in the process to obtain a balanced 360 degree view of how the District is performing in regards to the provision of technology and support for the administrative and operational functions provided by the District.

Technology services, support, hardware, and software meet the institution's needs. Sustainability of technology is part of the planning process. The District's support of technology services and emphasis on staff professional development and certification for distance education instructors promote the effective use of technology in teaching and learning. At the District level and through the Colleges there are effective participatory processes for identifying and funding technology needs, including regular input from students, faculty, and staff. Technology planning could be improved with better integration of the *Draft District Technology Master Plan* and the College's *Technology Strategic Plan*.

Baccalaureate

The College has recently begun a baccalaureate program for Health Information Management. Technology services, support, facilities, hardware and software utilized by the baccalaureate program are appropriate and adequate for the program.

Conclusions

Technology services, support, hardware, and software meet the institution's needs. The College's support of technology services and emphasis on faculty professional development and certification for distance education instructors promote the effective use of technology in teaching and learning. The College has effective participatory processes for identifying and funding technology needs, including regular input from students, faculty, and staff. Technology planning could be improved with better integration of the *District Technology Master Plan* and the College's *Technology Strategic Plan*. The College meets the standard.

The team concludes that the District does meet the Standard. (III.C.2)

District Recommendations:

See District Recommendation 1

See District Recommendation 3

Standard III.D - Financial Resources

General Observations

The San Diego Community College District has strong fiscal practices as evidenced by the reports from the District's external auditors, strong reserves, high bond ratings and documented practices in place to allocate resources sufficient to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. They allocate unrestricted general fund resources through their Resource Allocation Formula (RAF) that supports financial resource planning integration with institutional planning. Continuous unqualified audits demonstrate that financial affairs are managed with integrity and ensures financial

stability. The level of financial resources allocated and in reserves provide reasonable expectation of both short and long-term financial solvency.

San Diego Mesa College's mission is supported by well-managed financial resources. The College has made significant improvement to facilities, with new buildings and other improvements focusing on sustainability in order to minimize future costs. The College understands the importance of updating technological equipment and resources and has developed a Technology Strategic Plan to address future needs. The College Foundation supports the College mission by providing scholarships, emergency assistance, food cards, purchasing equipment, and funding innovation.

Findings and Evidence

The College's mission states that it seeks to empower their diverse student body to reach their educational goals and shape the future. As a comprehensive community college committed to access, success, and equity, the College promotes student learning and achievement leading to degrees and certificates in support of transfer education and workforce training, and lifelong learning opportunities. The College supports a robust learning environment as evidenced throughout the campus by observing the many programs available to students. The evaluation team confirmed that the mission is clearly the foundation of financial planning. (III.D.2)

The District's Executive Vice Chancellor of Business and Technology Services oversees and monitors fiscal operations for the District, the Colleges, Continuing Education, financial aid allocations, externally funded programs, contractual relationships, auxiliary organization/foundations, institutional investments, and assets to ensure the overall financial integrity of the District.

The District utilizes a heavily centralized financial model, particularly in relation to policy setting and initial allocation of resources to the Colleges through the budget process. The District's "Resource Allocation Formula" (RAF) establishes the proportional share of dollars available to each employee unit, with each unit then responsible for determining how to distribute its allocated compensation dollars to its unit membership. The RAF defines the methodology and calculations as agreed upon by all employee units. Board Policy with regards to the budget preparation process ensures compliance with Title 5 and the State Compliance. A balanced budget is presented to the Board of Trustees for annual adoption. The District has consistently ended each fiscal year without a financial deficit, where actual expenses do not exceed actual revenues. In addition, the District consistently maintains adequate cash reserves, avoids external borrowing costs and meets all state mandated fiscal requirements such as the 50% Law and the Faculty Obligation Number. (III.D.1, III.D.2)

The integration of financial planning is described in the Institutional Self Evaluation Report, which is driven by a well-defined and long-standing formula-based Campus Allocation Model (CAM). Using the CAM, the District allocates financial resources to the College based on FTES revenue generated by the College and a productivity factor in order to

attempt to capture growth and support student learning. The CAM then flows through the Budget Allocation Model (BAM), which includes all District divisions and departments, salary and benefit costs for contract positions, and other district wide commitments. Line item allocation is delegated to the College. (III.D.1)

The District is self-insured for losses arising from public liability, auto and property claims. Self-insurance amounts are \$100,000 per individual claim for property and \$200,000 for auto and public liability. The District is covered for losses in excess of these amounts by outside insurance carriers. The District is also self-insured for workers' compensation claims. (III.D.2)

The College follows its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget development, will all constituencies having appropriate opportunities to participate in the development of institutional plans and budgets. The College's program review and Integrated Planning processes provide a model for planning in which all constituency groups are included. (III.D.3)

The College recently implemented the PeopleSoft Finance system in July of 2015 to control and track the numerous transactions that occur throughout the various programs and services provided by the College. Appropriate approvals are integrated into the various processes and provide an adequate control environment for the tracking and reporting of expenses, which are periodically reviewed through external audits. With the recent implementation of this District wide system, various reporting and functionality has changed or been lost resulting in inefficiencies in the decision making process on campus. (III.D.5, III.D.8)

The District is largely responsible for most matters related to the required annual external audit largely due to the centralized nature of the financial model in place. The District and College's internal control systems are evaluated by the external auditors. The District has had a vacant internal audit position for several years that the College feels would be a valuable resource in testing and validating information and evaluating internal control processes. The annual external audits of the District, Proposition 39 General Obligation Bond, and the San Diego Mesa Foundation have all received an unmodified opinion for the past six years. In addition, those same audits all identified no findings and identified no significant weaknesses. (III.D.7)

The College, through the annual program review process, programs and administrative units assess needs and plan for the financial resources necessary to support student learning programs and service. The financial documents used in this process have a high degree of credibility and accuracy and reflect appropriate allocation and use of resources to support student learning. (III.D.6)

The College Budget Allocation and Recommendation Committee (BARC) has primary responsibility for reviewing the budget requests, segregating them based on type of request and making recommendations to the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee

(PIEC). In most cases, College discretionary funds are distributed on a one-time basis, allowing for the opportunity to address new needs in subsequent years while not putting additional continued strain on future budgets. This process allows all constituencies to participate in the development of the institutional plans and budgets, and is open, transparent, and predictable. The District's Campus Allocation Model (CAM) does not appear to be integrated with the College planning processes. (III.D.7, III.D.8)

The District maintains general fund reserves in excess of the required 5 percent to cover unanticipated costs and emergencies. The District's total reserves and set asides totaled \$78,171,460, which represents approximately 7.5 percent of total expenditures of the general fund. Through the District and College's conservative budget approach, and its commitment to maintaining sufficient reserves, the District and College have been able to avoid layoffs and salary reductions with minimal impact to student programs and services. The College has maintained a sizeable reserve over the past three years consistently exceeding the five percent minimum required by Board policy and has set aside funds for future PERS and STRS increases. (III.D.9, III.D.11)

Financial oversight occurs throughout the District and campus. Budget to actual variances are calculated and monitored in terms of expenditures. Grant requirements are monitored by the District's Fiscal Services department. Assets are recorded, tagged, and entered into the system in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles and Education Code requirements. (III.D.10)

The District appears to have its Government Accounting Standards Board (GASB) 45 future health and welfare benefit commitment well provided for as evidenced by the fact that it has deposited assets into an irrevocable trust that currently total approximately 83 percent of the actuarially determined liability. At the end of the 2015-16 fiscal year, the District had assets of \$18,586,921 in the irrevocable trust with a corresponding actuarially determined liability of \$22,479,610. The 2015 actuarial valuation confirms the College's commitment to funding this liability as the District's assets at the end of the 2015-16 fiscal year increased by \$3,385,793 resulting in a net increase in funded percentage of its liability of more than 11 percent. The District obtains an actuarial valuation of its liability relative to its contributed assets every two years. (III.D.11, III.D.12)

The District has passed two separate general obligation bonds to support construction at its four major locations. Proposition S was passed in 2002 for a total of \$685,000,000 and Proposition N was passed in 2006 for a total of \$870,000,000. With the help of Proposition S and Proposition N, the College has been able to fund several projects on campus, including among others, a platinum LEED Police Station and adjacent parking structure, new Student Services facility, Social Behavioral Science, Learning Resource Center Labs and a state of the art Math and Science building. These buildings allow the College to support its educational programs. The College has made a commitment to maintaining technological standards through the development and periodic updates of its Technology Strategic Plan. The College and District collaborate in order to maintain District wide standards for

technology infrastructure in order to gain economies of scale when purchasing from various vendors.

The District has not incurred any local debt instruments with the exception of its General Obligation 39 bond debt capital project program for Proposition S and Proposition N. The general obligation bond debt is administered through the County of San Diego Auditor and Controller's offices with direct payment on the debt service from property tax assessments to local taxpayers. (III.D.13)

The District monitors and manages student loan default rates, which have consistently remained well below the 30 percent federal limit, revenue streams and compliance with Title IV. One of the methods utilized by the District to remain in compliance is through the use of a third party default prevention agency to proactively provide students with available options to avoid defaulting. The oversight of finances, including management of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contractual relationship, auxiliary organization, and institutional investments and assets are primarily at the district level with some aspect of the oversight process being at the responsibility of the campuses. Results of external audits indicate the functions and entities are effectively operated and overseen. (III.D.10, III.D.15)

In conjunction with the District, the campus' financial resources are used with integrity in a manner consistent with the intended purpose of the funding source. External audits confirm that the District uses its financial resources with integrity and for intended use. The District has not received any modified opinions for its financial statement for over 10 years. (III.D.14)

The College budget process allocates funds on an annual basis for payment of debt and contractual obligations. The District maintains Board Policies and Administrative Procedures which outline the detailed process for purchasing goods and services. All purchase requisitions are created at the College department level and are approved by the Vice President of Administrative Services prior to being forwarded to the District Purchasing Department for tacit approval. The Vice President of Administrative Services is responsible for ensuring compliance with laws and regulations for all purchases and, along with the President, has authority to prepare and issue purchase orders. (III.D.16)

Baccalaureate

The College has recently begun a baccalaureate program for Health Information Management. In order to assess the feasibility of the current facilities and other resources needed for this program, the Vice President of Administrative Services, Vice President of Instruction, Dean and associated faculty members met to determine the needs for the program. In addition, the College has allocated funds to support and sustain the program which are overseen by an assigned administrator. (III.D.1)

Conclusions

The College has sufficient revenues to support educational improvements and provide for innovation. The team found that District finances are managed with integrity as evidenced by continuous unqualified audits as well as an excellent bond rating. (III.D.1)

The College's financial resource planning is well-established and has been functioning effectively for a number of years. The College assures the financial integrity by transparency and engaging its constituents in College-wide presentations and dissemination of information that is timely and has a high confidence level. The College's current planning is reviewed by the College Budget Allocation and Recommendation Committee, the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee, and the President's Cabinet. Timelines for completing program reviews are established and communicated out College wide, and are tied to the Educational Master Plan. The College Budget Allocation and Recommendation Committee periodically assesses discretionary funding requests for one-time expenditures to ensure that it effectively allocates funds to address any unmet needs identified through the program review process. (III.D.3, III.D.4, III.D.5)

The integrity of the District financial oversight and internal control is evidenced by continuous unqualified audits with no material findings over the past several years. Reserves held for future expenditures consistently exceed the five percent recommended by the State Chancellor's Office and in accordance with Board Policy. This level of reserve provides a reasonable expectation that both long-term and short-term commitments are accounted for and payment of future liabilities and obligations are planned for. (III.D.6, II.D.7, III.D.8, III.D.9, III.D.11, III.D.12, III.D.13)

The College meets the Standard.

District Recommendations:

See District Recommendation 1

See District Recommendation 3

Standard IV A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations

The San Diego Community College District (SDCCD) has a five member Governing Board responsible for the oversight of three colleges, including Mesa College. The SDCCD establishes board policies and procedures that are consistent with its district mission statement, shared vision, and shared values statements. The Board reviews Mesa College educational programs as part of its authority given through board policy. The Chancellor of the district executes policies and procedures and provides oversight to the needs of the operations of Mesa College through the College President who reports directly to the Chancellor of the district.

The district also supports effective governance through a district-wide committee, District Governance Council, that ensures constituency governance roles and voice in institutional policy, and district/college planning. Participatory governance process is the primary method through which all college constituents participate in the district level decision making process.

Mesa College has developed and promotes a participatory governance process that encourages wide participation and innovation that leads to institutional excellence and student success. Governance roles are defined in policy which facilitate improvements and support student learning. Through interviews and other evidence the team has documented outcomes demonstrating a decision making process that has continued to improve planning and that allows for inclusion throughout the process.

The College provides documented roles and responsibilities for college constituents along with defined and demonstrated areas of primacy and collective decision making inputs and opportunities. The District provides Delineated Responsibilities that show primary and secondary roles as part of the shared governance process between the College and the District. The committee structure is defined and provides for broad input into processes and decisions that promote both institutional effectiveness and quality outcomes.

Findings and Evidence

Through interviews conducted by the visiting team and a review of evidence, the College demonstrates an encouragement of innovation and quality programs. Such innovations are supported by facilities, staff, and program planning documentation. Campus interviews also demonstrate a pride in the college's ability to try innovative ideas and to work collaboratively as a team. Evidence showed that there is support for practices and programs that allow for improvement and participation. (IV.A.1)

The district and the institution establish and implement policy and procedures that authorize administration, faculty, staff, and student participation in the decision making process. The Planning and Institutional Effectiveness committee (PIE) role is well defined and it, along with other governance committees, provides a conduit for all constituent groups to have a role in decision making. The College provides the website for the governance committees which documents membership, goals, purpose, minutes, and agendas. Performance data is used as part of the decision making process, and advises additional planning. (IV.A.2).

Communication is documented through meeting minutes, agendas, reports, and study sessions; however review of minutes demonstrates a disparity between committees as to the amount of constituent feedback and dialogue that is documented and some minutes represent mostly outcomes. The President meets with institutional leaders and includes all constituent groups on the Cabinet and at the Cabinet Retreat, where it is anticipated that college leaders will disseminate information as well. Communication of minutes and other materials are also posted on the Office of the President's website. Interviews confirmed that the President is

available and open to conversation with a variety of constituent groups and committees. (IV.A.2)

The College promotes an environment that is open and committed to teamwork and leadership roles. The staff acknowledges this as a positive effect on planning through the satisfaction survey. The College shares information through a variety of mechanisms including the website, reports, social media, and email. Interviews noted an increasing number of participants in both faculty and classified representation on committees and in event planning. However, the bi-annual survey conducted in 2015 did demonstrate a lower satisfaction score with decisions being widely communicated. (IV.A.2) (IV.A.6)

Evidence shows Mesa's commitment to planning. The Planning and Institutional Effectiveness committee provides a college venue for directing continual goal completion in planning. Leaders encourage innovation and participation in planning through an annual theme, and through faculty senate driven committees such as curriculum. Although it was not specifically mentioned, it is assumed that the baccalaureate is subsumed within governance participation practices. (IV.A.2)(IV.A.3)

Board policies 2510, 2310 and 0210 define the roles of the board and constituent groups. The District Administration and Governance Handbook exemplifies a commitment to the participatory governance decision making process. A website redesign clearly shows how individuals participate in the decision making process. (IV.A.3)

Through the Institutional Planning and Governance Guide, the governance councils and committees are communicated to the College. Mesa has classified, faculty, and students represented through formalized senates, all of whom are involved in the governance decision making process throughout committees. Communication from these constituents at the District level also occurs with governance participation in the formal governance council. Although the President's Cabinet is visually depicted in the governance chart, the minutes, purpose statement, goals, and membership are not included on the governance website. (IV.A.5)

The participatory governance structure of the District is designed to facilitate a collaborative process of decision-making. Decisions reached through the participatory process are documented in minutes publicly available on the District website. The District values strong communication and ensures effectiveness by employing a variety of methods of two-way information sharing. The Chancellor's Cabinet holds weekly meetings including the campus Presidents, District Vice Chancellors, and the Director of Communication and Public Relations. Chancellor's Cabinet members are expected to share relevant information from their respective organizations and conversely, carry back to their institution or division relevant information from other members of the Chancellor's Cabinet. A *Cabinet Update* is prepared monthly during the academic year and distributed electronically and via print to the Colleges and Continuing Education. (IV.A.6)

At the campus level, the collegewide governance is embedded in the planning efforts through two mechanisms. The first is the College's participatory governance structure and the integrated planning process. Through participatory governance, the various college constituents: faculty, staff, administrators, and students, provide representation to the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee. The second mechanism works through the integrated planning process of program review. (IV.A.6)

The District Governance Council has an annual evaluation timeline that produces an evaluation report on process. All districtwide governance councils and committees undergo a process of comprehensive evaluation on a five year cycle. (IV.A.7)

The team verified that some committees and governance bodies are utilizing rubrics to measure outcome of completed goals at the campus level. The campus would benefit from a more formalized process to be applied consistently through the governance structure. These evaluations are also reviewed by the Presidents Cabinet during their regular retreats, allowing for a review of data and reflection by governance committees. (IV.A.7)

The College has designed a thorough governance structure that promotes inclusion and participation. The College has added transparency and communication information through its governance website, and through a variety of communication strategies. However, the minutes of committees need to provide more in depth representative feedback and consistent dialogue summaries, and the President's Cabinet is noted as the central focus for all committee recommendations, it is not posted with similar information on the governance website. Committee evaluations and improvements need to be available to the campus through a formalized process and should be posted.

The College meets the standard.

College Recommendations:

College Recommendation 5 (Improvement):In order to ensure continuous improvement, the team recommends continued effective communication through the consistent development and dissemination of robust committee meeting minutes that include constituent dialogue and feedback and that these enhanced minutes will be posted on the governance website.

College Recommendation 6 (Improvement):In order to ensure continuous improvement, the team recommends continued effective communication through the inclusion and posting of the President's Cabinet minutes, purpose, goals and agendas on the governance website.

Standard IV.B - Chief Executive Officer

Standard Responsibility: IV.B

General Observations:

By policy, the San Diego Community College District delegates full responsibility and authority to the Chancellor who in turn delegates the responsibility and authority to the President (CEO) to ensure the institution offers quality programs and services to its students. The President is actively engaged in the institution and participates in college community service. The President provides leadership for organizational structure, planning, and selection and development of personnel and is also accountable for institutional effectiveness assessment.

The College has structures in place to allow for broad participation and information sharing. The president leads the college through its established processes and is the final decision-maker at the college level for hiring, delegation of operation, budget and expenditures, and curriculum based on appropriate participatory or administrative input. The President has created a culture of camaraderie and student-centered attitudes as evidenced by comments by faculty, staff and students in the open forum.

Findings and Evidence:

Board Policy and Administrative Procedure support the reporting structure of the President to the District. Direct leadership occurs predominantly within the President's Cabinet, through multiple participatory governance committees, institutional planning documentation and process. The President provides leadership in planning by serving as Chair of President's Cabinet and as an engaged consultant for the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee (PIEC). President's Cabinet serves as the primary decision-making body, which consists of senior level management, mid-level management, faculty, classified staff, and students. Recommendations from other governing bodies flow up to the Cabinet, who then make recommendations to the President. The President approves all permanent hiring requests. The District has policies and guidelines on the processes for administrative, faculty, and staff positions. Hiring committees are used to pre-screen applicants and forward nominations to the president for consideration and final selection. (IV.B.1)

The administrative structure is appropriately staffed and organized relative to the purpose, size and complexity of the institution. The institution is organized by three primary functioning areas in addition to the President's office, including Instruction, Student Services, and Administrative Services, with each area led by a Vice President. Additionally, each of the vice president areas have deans, directors, and managers with supervisory and leadership responsibilities to manage the day-to-day operations. In addition to the three

primary operating areas, The Director of Resource Development, Information Officer and Dean of Institutional Effectiveness report directly to the President. (IV.B.2)

The President uses program review to ensure the quality of education throughout the resource allocation and hiring procedures on the campus. Evidence of leadership planning and the direct report to the President of the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness shows the link to the CEO and to the quality of college programs and services overall. The executive team comprised of the President and Vice Presidents meet regularly to discuss updates and budget status. The President also attends the Chancellor's Cabinet at the District and the District Governance Council, which allows for information flow between the District and all colleges. All updates to the budget are provided in regular updates to the President's Cabinet. Budget discussions are disseminated through the Budget Allocation and Recommendations Committee (BARC), which is charged with developing principles, recommendations, and priorities for allocating funds in support of one-time General Fund Unrestricted purchases. (IV.B.2)

The institution has a dedicated Office of Institutional Effectiveness which reports directly to the President and provides a variety of information and data to the different working areas and committees. Committee rubrics indicate that the college is analyzing their goal structure and its effectiveness. Program review is used to link student learning, institutional goals and objectives and resource allocation. Program review also closes the loop with a narrative regarding how resource allocations in the prior year helped to increase student learning in the current year. (IV.B.3)

The President ensures collegial participation through the use of constituent representatives on the President's Cabinet, Planning and Institutional Effective Committee, various college committees, and Academic Senate. Additionally, there are other mechanisms in place that allow for broad discussions and information sharing on values, goals, and priorities through the twice yearly convocations and various standing committees that the President attends. The College has established a minimal set of institutional set standards (ISS) through the Planning and Institutional Effective Committee. In 2016 and continuing each subsequent spring, the College examines its performance in relation to the ISS. Activities and initiatives in response to the ISS are then established, focusing on below standard performance. The President works with college leadership to ascertain college goals and college performance of key performance indicators of statewide level goals. At the time of this report the college has just approved institutional learning outcomes and therefore will be revising its process for this standard requirement. (IV.B.3)

The President has promoted a culture focused on teamwork, structure, communication, and

trust, which includes an intentional focus on accreditation. Accreditation has been a theme and openly discussed on campus at committee meetings. Workgroups for the standards and sub-areas were implemented and dedicated work time was allocated to ensure adequate time could be given. College constituents were represented on all accreditation workgroups, including students. The team found the President to be an instrumental leader in the accreditation process. In addition to the President's leadership role, it was evident that the appropriate delegation of responsibilities are assigned to the Accreditation Liaison Officer and that participation in the accreditation process is appropriately shared across constituencies. (IV.B.4)

The President assumes primary responsibility for ensuring consistent implementation of board policies, statutes and other regulations, as well as, for budget oversight and management. The president delegates authority for day to day budget management to the Vice President of Administrative Services, and this is clearly delineated in the Institutional Planning and Governance Guide. (IV.B.5)

The President ensures that the constituents and communities of the college are regularly informed about the college and its various activities. The President uses the monthly *First Monday on the Mesa* newsletter that outlines any news or information that may be of interest to the college constituents. In addition, the President holds Convocation, twice yearly retreats, and participates in many college committees. (IV.B.6)

Conclusion:

The college meets all the requirements set forth in Standard IVB. The Board and Chancellor delegate authority and responsibility to the college president. The President has ensured an administrative structure to allow for effective leadership, management, and operations. The President engages in a system of structured meetings with administration, constituent groups, and participatory governance groups to allow for open discussion and broad participation in institutional planning and evaluation including emphasis on institutional effectiveness, budget, and accreditation.

Standard IV.C - Governing Board

Findings & Evidence:

The San Diego Community College District's locally elected Board of Trustees has the authority over and has adopted the necessary policies to assure the proper operation and the financial stability of the District. Through the sub-committee on Student Success and Accreditation, the Board regularly monitors the effectiveness of student learning programs

and services. Through the subcommittee on Budget Study and Audit, the Board oversees the financial operation of the District. Board Policy 2200 clearly outlines the duties and responsibilities of the Board. Board policies are available on the District's website and are planned to be reviewed and updated on a six-year rotational schedule. Starting in 2015 and continuing into 2016, the Board has adopted updated Mission Statements for each of the Colleges and the District. All Board members support decisions made by the Board and act in a respectful manner in all interactions with the administration, the public, and students. The District meets the requirements of Standard IV.C.1 & 2, as well as the requirements of ER 7 as evidenced by the Board's adopted policies and Board practices described in meeting minutes. (IV.C.1, IV.C.2)

The Board adheres to Policy 2431 for selecting and evaluating the leadership of the District. Board Policy 2431 and Board Policy 2432 were adopted on 12/14/2006 and revised on 11/10/2016 describing how future vacancies will be filled. Board Policy 2435 describes how the Board evaluates the Chancellor. The evaluation process calls for the Board to solicit input from various constituents from within and outside the District. The review of the Chancellor occurs through a series of closed sessions occurring during the August and September Board meetings. The process for the selection and evaluation of College Presidents by the Chancellor is included in Policy 2432. Additional policies affecting this Standard are 2436, 2437, and 2250, and Board minutes describe the work of the Board in these matters. The District meets the requirements of Standard IV.C.3 as evidenced by their policies and Board practices. (IV.C.3)

Board Policies 1020 and 2100 and the District's implementation of a Trustee Advisory Council providing community input and review of proposed District programs provide for public awareness of the District's operation. The Board maintains its knowledge base by studying all materials in advance of meetings, remaining informed of state and federal educational issues, and requesting additional District information as needed. The Board members are elected from various geographic neighborhoods within the San Diego city limits although the final election is city wide thus minimizing undue influence by any one group or neighborhood. The District complies with the requirements of Standard IV.C.4 as evident by their policies and practices. (IV.C.4)

The Board demonstrates its commitment to educational quality and student performance through its sub-committee on Student Success and Accreditation, which engages in continuous review of student performance. However, the Board must continue to support the District's full implementation of the SLO program as required by the Standards. The Board monitors the financial integrity and stability of the District in accordance with state and federal laws and regulations. This is evident in the Boards' annual goals, policies, and procedures, concerning academic programs and services, fiscal practices, and ethical and legal standards for operation of the District. Actions of the Board are final, and not subject to actions of any other entity. The Board establishes policies consistent with the mission of the District. Some Board policies address quality and integrity of academic programs as well as financial integrity and stability such as policies 6300 and 2200 both adopted in December,

2016. The Board's focus on the financial integrity of the District is evidenced by the Board's adopted plan in 2006 to fully fund the District's OPEB liability and in 2015 the Board adopted a plan for funding the District's pension liability. Board policies are regularly reviewed through the District participatory governance structures. The Board's commitment for quality and continuous improvement is also evidenced by its regular review of student and program outcomes, budget and the construction bond program. The District meets Standard IV.C.5 and complies with ER 7 as evidenced by the Board policies and the financial performance of the District. (IV.C.5, ER7)

The Board's by-laws and policies are published on the District's web site. Board policies 2010, 2015, 2100, 2110, 2200, 2310, 2330, and 2340 describe the various bylaws and criteria as required by Standard IV.C.6 and have recently been revised in 2016. The District meets Standard IV.C.6 as evidenced by the referenced Board policies. (IV.C.6)

Proposed policies are first reviewed through the District's participatory governance process allowing for input by the various District groups before reaching the Board for consideration. Through interviews and evidence the team determined that the Board acts in compliance with its policies and is establishing a six-year review schedule for the on-going update of such policies as required by the accreditation standards. Not all policies have been updated although the District has updated many and have 18 more policies scheduled to be updated at the April, 2017 Board meeting. The six-year review schedule will ensure the policies are kept up to date and reviewed on a regular basis. (IV.C.7)

The Board monitors student performance through the establishment of its sub-committee on Student Success and Accreditation. This sub-committee reviews reports on student performance. In May 2016, the Board adopted student success goals for the District. Additionally, public meetings are annually held on each of the College campuses to inform the Board about academic programs and services that support student learning and success. The District meets Standard IV.C.8 as evidenced by its practices focusing on student performance. (IV.C.8)

The Board holds on-going training programs and retreats for Board education and development. The Board members individually participate in mandated ethics training through an on-line training program last completed in January and February 2016. In addition, the Board attends trustee related training through periodic conferences. The District will comply with California State law beginning in 2017 to provide the Board with sexual harassment training. Board Policy 2740 revised in November 2016, provides for Board education and Board Policy 2010, also revised in November 2016, provides for Board membership and staggered terms of office. The District meets Standard IV.C.9 as evidenced by their policies and Board minutes describing their practices. (IV.C.9)

Board policies 2410 and 2415 establish a process for Board self-evaluation and the Board annually assesses their own performance and effectiveness. Board minutes describe the Board's annual self-evaluation and includes input from a variety of sources beyond the Board

itself. There is also full participation in Board training and educational programs. The Board's participation results in improved Board performance and District effectiveness. The District meets Standard IV.C.10 as demonstrated by their policies and practices. (IV.C.10)

Board Policies 2355, 2710, 2715, 2716, and 2717 regulate how trustees are to conduct themselves in an appropriate and legal manner, as well as follow the Brown Act. Individual trustees annually complete a Conflict of Interest form to avoid any potential conflict of interest. Board policy includes corrective action for dealing with behavior that violates the policy. None of the District Board members have employment, family, ownership, or other personal financial interest in the District and do not have family members working for the District. The District meets standard IV.C.11 as demonstrated by their policies and practices. (IV.C.11)

The Board has adopted and complies with Board policies 2430, 2432, and 2435 that delegate administrative and operational authority to the Chancellor and follows a process that holds the Chancellor accountable through annual performance evaluations, as well as ongoing communication. Board Policy 2436 describes the evaluation process for College Presidents and the appropriate involvement of the Board. The District complies with Standard IV.C.12 as demonstrated by their adopted policies and practices. (IV.C.12)

The Board's 2016 annual goals include reference to the accreditation review of the District. The Board's commitment includes discussions by the Board Subcommittee on Student Success and Accreditation to monitor the Districts progress towards compliance with the Standards, as well as full board discussions of the accreditation process. The Board has reviewed all the District's accreditation reports. As an example, the Board minutes of October 16, 2016, describe the Board's review of the accreditation reports and progress by the District. The Board is responsible for adequately supporting the capacity of the colleges to provide for sufficient assessment. As evidenced in Standard I, the District must increase its capacity for assessment and does not meet the Standard. The District does not meet Standard IV.C.13 as evidenced by the need to increase capacity for assessment. (IV.C.13)

The college meets the standard.

District Recommendations:

See District Recommendation 1

See District Recommendation 2

Standard IV.D.1-7 -Multi-college Districts

General Observations

The San Diego Community College District (SDCCD) is comprised of three colleges; San Diego Mesa College, San Diego City College, and San Diego Miramar College, and

Continuing Education. The Chancellor is the chief executive officer of the district and responsible to the Board of Trustees. The college Presidents report directly to the Chancellor. In total, the District has nine district-wide councils and committees led by vice chancellors and individuals who report directly to a member of the Chancellor's Cabinet. District and college administrative staff, faculty, classified staff, and students engage in district-wide participatory governance. All district-wide governance councils and committees undergo a process of comprehensive evaluation every five years.

The District engages in an annual update of the *Delineation of Function Map*. The map describes and communicates the operational responsibilities and functions of the District departments providing clarity for all college constituencies.

SDCCD has a budget development process delineated in Board Policy that supports allocation and reallocation of resources to ensure the sustainability and effectiveness of the Colleges. The District funds the Colleges based upon each entity's proportional share of the District's FTES target.

Findings and Evidence

The Chancellor has served the district for twelve years, providing strong leadership and establishing and communicating expectations of educational excellence and integrity. The Chancellor establishes and shares the annual goals that serve as a planning framework for the year. The Chancellor holds forums each fall on each of the college campuses and the District Office. The Chancellor's Forums provide a venue to communicate updates and planning priorities for the academic year including enrollment, student demographics, and budget. The Chancellor also communicates electronically via Chancellor Messages to the entire District and through the published and widely distributed *Chancellor's Cabinet Update*, which reports on matters discussed and decisions made at the weekly Chancellor's Cabinet meetings. The Chancellor has established, regularly reviews, and communicates clearly defined roles and responsibility of the District Administrative departments through the *Delineation of Function Map*. An additional functional map has been implemented which specifically addresses the roles of the District and Colleges related to each Standard to facilitate the self-evaluation process. (IV.D.1)

A District *Delineation of Function Map*, first established in 2004, undergoes annual review and update on a regular basis. This document communicates operational responsibilities and functions of the District from those of the Colleges. The Chancellor holds each President responsible for the operation of the respective College according to the *Delineation of Function Map* and the roles and responsibilities outlined in the Presidents' job description. The ongoing effectiveness of District services provided to the Colleges was assessed via a district-wide survey spring 2016. The results have been broadly shared and reflect overall high satisfaction levels with the services provided by the District in support of the effectiveness of the Colleges. District departments undergo annual review and have developed action plans that address the feedback obtained through the survey. (IV.D.2)

The District has Board Policies and Administrative Procedures that guide the allocation of resources to support the effective operations and sustainability of the Colleges and District. The Executive Vice Chancellor of Business and Technology Services holds District authority to supervise, administer, and ensure adequate controls to comply with all laws and regulation regarding the financial status of the District. Board Policies and Administrative Procedures delineate the roles, responsibilities, and process of budget development. The annual resource allocation is based primarily on the state revenue apportionment funding, state restricted funds, and all federal, state, and local grants and contracts in the fiscal year. The District's Resource Allocation Formula is used in the development of the annual budget and provides effective control of expenditures. College FTES targets are translated into FTEF funding for each institution. The Colleges, Continuing Education, and District Offices are responsible for resource allocation within their areas of responsibility according to their own operational needs, planning documents, and the Resource Allocation Formula. (IV.D.3)

The District provides comprehensive budget and financial oversight, including an annual finance and budget report (CCFS-311), a final budget, an annual financial audit, a bond financial audit report, a performance audit of bond construction programs, year-end balance and open-order reports, full-time Faculty Obligation Number (FON) reports and targets, enrollment projections, and year-to-year comparisons with enrollment targets. The District has established effective policies and mechanisms to control expenditures. The District website has detailed monthly expenditure reports for the District and the Colleges to assist with tracking, monitoring, and maintaining budgets, financial commitments, and expenditures. The Colleges and District financial reports are reviewed by staff and are submitted to the Board of Trustees. Evidence in the self evaluation reports illustrates that College presidents have full responsibility and authority to conduct their work without interference from the Chancellor. College Presidents have full authority in the selection and evaluation of their staff and management team. (IV.D.3)

Through BP 0010, *District Administrative Organization*, the Board designates authority to the Chancellor, who then delegates authority to the Presidents. College Presidents are held accountable for the performance of their institution by the Chancellor, the Board, and the communities they serve. The Chancellor expects that College Presidents adhere to all District Policies and that communication between the Colleges and the District be thorough and regular. The College Presidents regularly communicate through monthly reports or newsletters which are widely distributed. All critical and negative matters are immediately communicated to the Chancellor by the College Presidents. (IV.D.4)

SDCCD adopted a Districtwide Integrated Planning Framework Model to illustrate the planning processes of the District and intersection with the Colleges and Continuing Education. The Colleges and District have closely aligned goals of maximizing student learning and achievement and improving institutional effectiveness through integrated planning. At each level of planning; area, unit, department, division, and institution, multiple stakeholders are involved in the development of strategic plan goals, operational planning, budget development, and continuous improvement. The Districtwide Strategic Planning

Committee (SPC) serves as the overarching planning committee for the District responsible for developing a Districtwide Strategic Plan on a four-year cycle. The District deployed a District Offices Employee Feedback survey in spring 2016 to all employees in the District, the Colleges, Continuing Education, the District Offices and the District Service Center. Feedback obtained via the survey served to inform department self-assessments, to varying degrees, and assisted the District divisions' planning and improvement efforts to strengthen their effectiveness in serving the Colleges. (IV.D.5)

The District values strong communication and ensures effectiveness by employing a variety of methods of two-way information sharing. The Chancellor's Cabinet holds weekly meetings including the campus Presidents, Vice Chancellors, the Director of Communication and Public Relations. Members of Chancellor's Cabinet are expected to share relevant information from their respective organizations and conversely, relay back to their institution relevant information from other members of the Chancellor's Cabinet. A *Cabinet Update* is prepared monthly during the academic year and distributed electronically and via print to the Colleges and Continuing Education. (IV.D.6)

The nine district governance councils and committees meet regularly and provide an essential communication mechanism for the District. The councils and committees are composed of faculty, staff, and student representatives from throughout the District. The meetings are open to anyone from the District to attend and provide an important venue for sharing information. Meeting minutes and agendas for the District governance councils and committees are available on the District website. (IV.D.6)

Presentations, campus meetings, and reports provide additional avenues of communication. Meetings are held at campus locations periodically to ensure students, faculty, and staff have the opportunity to hear directly from representatives of the District and to ask questions and share concerns. Key among campus meetings are the four annual meetings that the Board of Trustees holds at each of the Districts three Colleges and Continuing Education. The Chancellor also holds a meeting at each site on an annual basis. Summaries of the meetings and copies of presentations are available online. Board of Trustees meeting action summaries are prepared and distributed electronically and via print following each Board meeting. The District adheres to the Jeanne Clery Act and annually shares information with members of the District and the public on safety and security. The College and Continuing Education reports are compiled into an annual security report entitled "Safe and Sound, A Guide to Safety and Security in the SDCCD". SDCCD Police hold town hall style meetings at campus locations to provide information, updates, and answers to questions. (IV.D.6)

The District makes strong use of electronic media to support effective communication. The District web site is maintained with current information from the each of the District's primary divisions. A web portal has recently been deployed for use by faculty and staff and a student portal is currently under development. Email is used to provide regular updates from District Office departments to the Colleges and Continuing Education. Social media is used to communicate with members of the public, as well as District employees and students.

District social media platforms include Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, LinkedIn, and Instagram. (IV.D.6)

The Chancellor uses summative and formative assessment of the organization, governance, and decision-making processes to ensure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals for student achievement and learning. Chancellor's Cabinet weekly meetings address operational matters, governance, and decision-making. Summaries of actions items and expected completion dates are produced after each meeting. The Chancellor expects that the Executive team provide regular updates on important matters and notice of any concerns that may be surfacing. (IV.D.7)

The effectiveness of the nine district-wide participatory governance councils and committees is assessed through online self-assessment survey distributed to members of each council and committee. On a five-year cycle, the survey seeks feedback on the contributions of each district wide participatory governance council and committee. Summary reports of the most recent survey results were shared with each group to inform review and revision of functions and responsibilities leading to improvements. (IV.D.7)

District divisions and departments engage in ongoing planning and assessment that support defining a clear purpose, establish goals and key activities for achieving the goals, and developing measures of progress toward the goals. The self-assessment process used by the District Office includes a similar mechanism of goal and measurement development as part of the annual program review. In 2015/16, the District incorporated a feedback survey as an element of the self-assessment. The survey information is available on the District's accreditation webpage to facilitate incorporation of the feedback in the annual self-evaluation process leading to increased integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges to meet educational goals for student achievement and learning. (IV.D.7)

Conclusions

Through review of evidence and interviews, the team confirmed that the district Chancellor provides leadership and communicates expectations of educational excellence and integrity throughout the District and assures support for the effective operation of the Colleges. The Chancellor is in her thirteenth year of service in the role with a total of twenty-four years with the District. The operational responsibilities and functions of the District and Colleges are presented in a *Delineation of Function Map* that undergoes regular review and revision. The District has a policy for allocation and reallocation of resources to support the effective operations and sustainability of the Colleges and District. Fiscal reserves are transparent to the stakeholders of the District and community.

The Chancellor delegates full responsibility and authority to the College Presidents for the operation of the Colleges and supports the Presidents in the implementation of District policies without interference. District planning and evaluation is integrated with College planning and evaluation in support of improved student learning, achievement, and institutional effectiveness. The District recently engaged in a comprehensive evaluation of its

integrated planning practices to ensure the connection of planning across institutions.

Communication between the Colleges and District supports effective operation of the Colleges. There is broad monthly communication and immediate communication of any emerging issues of a critical nature. The Chancellor regularly reviews District and College role delineations, governance, and decision-making processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the College in meeting their institution set standards. The team concludes that the District meets the requirements outlined in Standard IV.D.

District Commendations:

See District Commendation 2

District Recommendations:

See District Recommendation 1

See District Recommendation 2

See District Recommendation 3