

EVALUATION REPORT

MODESTO JUNIOR COLLEGE

435 College Avenue
Modesto, CA 95350-5808

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

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
Modesto Junior College from October 24-27, 2011

Glenn R. Roquemore, PhD
Chair

Modesto Junior College
Comprehensive Evaluation Visit Team Roster
October 24 - 27, 2011

Dr. Glenn Roquemore (Chair)
President
Irvine Valley College

Ms. Sandy Jeffries (Assistant)
Executive Assistant to the President
Irvine Valley College

Ms. Yolanda Bellisimo
Professor, Social Sciences
College of Marin

Ms. Mona Lee
Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
Kapi'olani Community College

Dr. Lan Hao
Director of Institutional Research
Citrus College

Dr. Tammy Montgomery
Dean of English
American River College

Mr. Robert Isomoto
Vice President, Business & Administration
Santa Monica College

Ms. Eileene Tejada
Professor, English
Napa Valley College

Dr. J. Laurel Jones
President
Mission College

Dr. Margaret Tennant
Associate Professor, Psychology
Moorpark College

Dr. Rebecca Kenney
Vice President of Instruction
College of Alameda

Summary of Evaluation Report

INSTITUTION: Yosemite Community College District

DATES OF VISIT: October 24-27, 2011

TEAM CHAIR: Glenn R. Roquemore, PhD

A ten member accreditation team visited Modesto Junior College October 24-27, 2011, to evaluate how well the institution is achieving its stated purposes and Commission standards, provide recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement, and to submit recommendation to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the accreditation status of the Modesto Junior College.

In preparation for the visit, team members attended an all-day training session on September 7, 2011, conducted by the ACCJC. Team members carefully read the college's self study report, including the evaluation report and recommendations from the most recent visiting team, and other materials submitted to the commission since its previous comprehensive visit in 2005, and assessed the evidence provided by the college. Prior to the visit, team members completed written evaluations of the self study report and began identifying areas for further investigation. The day before the visit began, the team members met to discuss their views of the written materials provided by the college, reviewed evidence provided by the college and reviewed the current self study report.

During the visit, the team met with faculty, staff, administrators, members of the Board of Trustees, and students. The team chair met with the district chancellor, members of the Board of Trustees, the president of the college, and various administrators. In addition, the chair visited the fire science facility. The team also held two open meetings to allow for comment from any member of the campus or local community.

The team felt that the self study report was, in many instances, poorly written and lacking references to evidence. College staff members were accommodating to team members and available for interviews and follow up conversations. With the exception of incomplete computer network access and incomplete hard copy evidence in the team room, the college was prepared for the team's visit.

Major Findings and Recommendations of the October 24-27, 2011 Visiting Team

After carefully reading the self study report, examining evidence, interviewing personnel and students at the district office as well as the college campuses, and discussing the findings in light of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges' Accreditation Standards, the two teams offer the following recommendations to the Yosemite Community College District and its colleges/campuses.

Yosemite Community College District Recommendations

Yosemite Community College District Recommendation 1

In order to fully meet the standard and improve the effectiveness of its human resources, the team recommends the systematic evaluation of all personnel at stated intervals with appropriate documentation. (Standards III.A, III.A.1.a.)

Yosemite Community College District Recommendation 2

In order to fully meet the standard, the teams recommend that the district and the colleges review institutional missions and their array of course offerings and programs in light of their current budgets. (Standards III.D, III.D.1, ER17.)

Yosemite Community College District Recommendation 3

The team recommends the district and Board of Trustees develop policies on the Delegation of Authority to the college president. (Standards IV.A.2.a, IV.B.3.e.)

Yosemite Community College District Recommendation 4

The team recommends the district develop policies that clearly define, and follow, the process for hiring and evaluating the college president. (Standards III.A, III.A.1, III.A.3; ER3, ER5.)

Modesto Junior College Recommendations

Modesto Junior College Recommendation 1

In order to fully meet the standards for mission and effectiveness, the team recommends the college analyze community demographic and student enrollment data to more descriptively define the intended student population and emphasize their commitment to student learning in the mission statement. The team further recommends that course and program planning be explicitly linked to the defined population so the college is able to clearly assess its success in institutional planning, decision making, and meeting student needs as related to its mission. (Standards I.A, I.A.1, I.A.4; II.B.3; ER2.)

Modesto Junior College Recommendation 2

The team recommends the college attain the level of proficiency according to the ACCJC Rubric for Student Learning Outcomes by 2012. The college must ensure that faculty members differentiate between course learning outcomes and course objectives. It must also establish clear standards for assessing course learning outcomes that will inform course-level curricular and pedagogical improvement. In addition, the college must complete its development of outcomes at the program and institutional levels. The college must demonstrate that it assesses the outcomes and uses them in college decision making processes to improve institutional effectiveness. The college must create venues to maintain an ongoing, collegial, self reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes. Student Services must develop and implement student learning outcomes, establish systems of assessment to make improvements in the delivery of its programs and services, and communicate to students these learning outcomes. (Standards I.B.1, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6; II.A.2.i, II.B.4; ER10.)

Modesto Junior College Recommendation 3

The team recommends the college resolve the issues of inadequate library staffing and support services on both campuses. (Standards II.C, II.C.1, II.C.1.a, II.C.1.b, II.C.1.c, II.C.2; ER14, ER16.)

Modesto Junior College Recommendation 4

The team recommends the college facilities, hours of operation, and staffing be evaluated and modified to assure equitable student access for both campuses (Standards II.C, II.C.1, II.C.1.a, II.C.1.b, II.C.1.c, II.C.2; ER14.) Note: This recommendation was also given to the college by the two previous accreditation teams.

Modesto Junior College Recommendation 5

In order to fully meet the standard, the team recommends the college strengthen and clarify the linkages and complete the cycle within the planning and budget process to ensure institutional effectiveness; engage in consistent systematic evaluation of the process; and codify, publish and adhere to the process. In addition, the college must integrate student learning outcome assessment results into the planning and budget process and strengthen the integration of technology planning with integrated planning and resource allocations. (Standards I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7; II.A, II.B; III.C.2, III.D.1; ER10.)

Modesto Junior College Recommendation 6

In order to meet the standard, the college must assess the current governance structure, review and implement changes to strengthen its infrastructure, and evaluate it on a regular basis. The team recommends the college develop a comprehensive participatory governance handbook that clearly identifies roles and responsibilities of participatory governance committees and constituent roles in the participatory process. (Standards IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.2.b, IV.A.3.)

Modesto Junior College Recommendation 7

In order to meet the standard, the team recommends the college develop and implement a distance education plan as identified in the Substantive Change Report, 2010. (Standards II.A.1, II.A.1.b, II.A.2.d.)

Modesto Junior College Recommendation 8

In order to meet the standard, the team recommends the college develop a consistent, transparent, and readily available tracking system that documents evaluations for faculty and tracks progress in order to verify performance improvement. (Standards III.A.1.a, III.A.1.b, III.A.5.a, III.A.6.)

Modesto Junior College Commendations

Overall, the team perceives the college and its community of faculty, staff, and students to be working toward solutions to longstanding problems. Specifically, the team was impressed with:

1. The college's efforts to increase opportunities for meaningful campus professional development.

2. The college's quality agriculture and fire science programs.
3. The work of the Technology Committee for creating opportunities for coordinated and centralized dialogue between the instructional and administrative units.

Accreditation Evaluation Report for
Modesto Junior College
October 24-27, 2011

Introduction

Modesto Junior College (MJC), one of the oldest community colleges in the state, was founded in 1921 to serve as the first junior college district established under a State Legislature Enabling Act. The college was established to meet the needs of the community. Today the college strives to maintain the same objective, that of dedication and service to the community.

The college began with a charter enrollment of 61 students. Through the years, registration has increased until today more than 20,000 day and evening students are enrolled. In addition, more than 9,000 community participants take advantage of the ever growing Community Education program.

To complement student growth, the campus has grown as well. The college holds the distinction of having erected the first junior college classroom building in the state. From this modest beginning, the college has grown to include two sites: the original East Campus on College Avenue and West Campus on Blue Gum Avenue in northwest Modesto. In addition to the two sites, more than 20 community sites are used to meet particular educational needs.

The area boundaries have also changed. In 1964, by action of the electorate, the boundaries were enlarged to include over 4,500 square miles, encompassing high school districts in Stanislaus and Tuolumne Counties, the Ripon High School District in San Joaquin County, Gustine and Hilmar High School Districts in Merced County and the Harney Elementary School District in Santa Clara County. The district also includes the Bret Harte Union High School District, the former Copperopolis Elementary School District, and the former Salt Springs Valley Elementary School District in Calaveras County.

A Board of Trustees was elected in 1964 to govern the affairs of the expanded district. In 1965 the name Yosemite Junior College District was selected. In 1967, the YJCD Board of Trustees acquired land in Tuolumne County and established a new campus named Columbia Junior College.

Modesto Junior College added its West Campus in 1970 when the State of California quitclaimed 116.5 acres of the former Modesto State Hospital to the Yosemite Junior College District. In 1978, the state of California deeded over an additional 30 acres to the district and this extra portion was used for District Central Services Offices and the Criminal Justice Training Center (CJTC). When the CJTC moved to a new facility (the college discontinued the training center in 2006), all of the unused hospital barracks were burned down in fire training exercises. Today Central Services offices are still located on the west edge of MJC's West Campus.

In 1977, under state promptings, the district's name was changed to Yosemite Community College District (YCCD) and in 1978, Columbia Junior College followed suit and became Columbia College.

Today, the YCCD includes two comprehensive, two-year colleges, Columbia College and Modesto Junior College, and a Central Services unit. The district includes all of two counties, Stanislaus and Tuolumne, and parts of four others -- Calaveras, Merced, San Joaquin, and Santa Clara. It stretches 170 miles across central California from the coast range on the west to the Sierra Nevada mountains on the east.

Modesto Junior College offers courses designed to meet the many diverse interests, educational needs, and vocational requirements of its students. College programs are designed to meet these same needs and may consist of one course or a series of courses leading to a certificate, an Associate's degree, or application towards the first two years of a Bachelor's degree.

Recent Accreditation History for Modesto Junior College

In January 2006, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) took action to reaffirm the college's accreditation with the requirement that the college complete a Progress Report. The Progress Report, which focused on Recommendations 4, 6 and 7, was then followed by a visit from Commission representatives in October, 2007. Following the Progress Report visit in October 2007, the Commission accepted the Progress Report and also took action to place the college on probation. The college was required to submit a Special Report, focusing on Recommendations 4 and 7, in addition to a Midterm Report by October 2008; a team from ACCJC visited the college in October 2008. In January 2009, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) reviewed Modesto Junior College's 2008 Midterm and Special Reports. The Commission took action to accept both reports and removed the college from probation.

Modesto Junior College Self Study

The self study appears to be complete and covers all topics, standards, and eligibility requirements with the exception of Standard IB.7, which was not included in the final printed document. The Vice President of Instruction mailed a Standard IB.7 addendum together with the hardbound self study report wherein she stated in her attached letter that the online version of the college's self study document is to be corrected. The college's online self study report, http://www.mjc.edu/common/general/mjc_institutional_selfstudyreport2011_standard1.pdf, contains Standard IB.7.

This self study report provides adequate and specific information about the college's history, mission, students served, and educational program and delivery strategies. Tables and data spreadsheets, as well as narrative analysis of the data, are present. Evidence of conducting a program review cycle, use of research methodologies, data on student achievement and similar information, and progress made by analyzing the college's own effectiveness is prominent and well defined (p.191). Graphs and visual depictions of the program review cycle and student data adds to the breadth and understanding of the findings (p.203).

Evidence that the college uses data on student achievement and student learning to plan and implement improvements is described in this report as a review process that has “greatly expanded college-wide participation in institutional planning, assessment, and improvement processes” (p.203). Using this data to drive planning, assessment, and decision making is stated as “the college’s priority and is central to every course, program, student service area and administrative unit on campus” (p.181).

The report indicates the college has identified Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) at the course, program, and institutional levels and that this is a dynamic and continual process (Goal 3 – MJC will develop and assess Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) used for student learning improvement at the course, program and institutional levels [p.193]); however, the college’s Institutional Learning Outcomes were not readily found in this report. There seems a lack of narrative, pictorial, or statistical evidence that shows how course, program, and institutional level SLOs are aligned with each other and with the mission and effectiveness of the college. While the college has identified SLOs and shows some evidence of designing appropriate assessments of learning outcomes, it is not necessarily clear to the reader how exactly the college uses SLOs as a means for assessment and thoughtful analysis of its educational quality. Although the report indicates upon evaluation, the college’s action plans “are designed and implemented for courses, programs, and service areas throughout the institution” (p.181), again, the report lacks a specific or defined method for implementation, and states only that “the monitoring of this process is reviewed by the college’s Assessment Work Group” (p.181).

In section I.B.1, the report discusses how the college “has created a structure wherein ongoing, collegial, and self-reflective dialog about improving student learning and institutional processes takes place” (p.193). However, there seems a paucity of evidence within this report to support this claim. Wording such as “*various groups and forums* exist for the exchange of information and experiences with the goal of making improvement” seems vague and lacks the details necessary to define a clear and established structure for ongoing dialogue that results in tangible curricular or programmatic improvement, student success, or overall institutional effectiveness. To its credit, the college self reflects in this report regarding the existing process structure and how this weakness contributed to its being put on Probation Status. There is honest language that describes the college’s need to “overhaul” and “facilitate the movement of assessment results into resource allocation.” The college admits to being unable to gain “adequate participation and feedback by constituent groups,” thereby failing to connect essential details for a fully articulated process (p.193). The report shows the institution has sufficient resources and is committed to developing and implementing sound processes (per above regarding alignment of SLOs and assessment practices) and using them effectively to achieve its educational mission.

A key concern is that the report provides descriptions of a comprehensive dialogue about institutional effectiveness, educational quality, and improvement on campus amid its constituencies, however, the processes and clearly defined structures that would indicate an in-depth and established culture of assessment are not in evidence. A second key concern is the lack of clear alignment between course, program, and institutional level Student Learning Outcomes as a means for multi-level assessment, analysis, identification of needs for improvement, and implementation of change.

Evaluation of Institutional Responses to Previous Team Recommendations

Although the following recommendations were addressed in the College's 2008 Special Report and Midterm Report, aspects of the recommendations remain unmet.

Recommendation 1: The team recommends that the facilities and hours of operation for student and learning support services programs be evaluated and modified so as to assure access to students on the East and West Campuses. (IA.1, IIB, IIB.3a, IIC.1, IIC.1c, IIIB.1, IIIB.1a, IIIB.2)

The college has not fully addressed this recommendation. The college has taken several steps since 2008 to provide access consistent with its mission. Examples of improvements in services include the development of online orientation, providing students with campus email to access personalized services, extending hours for service areas not offered at the West Campus during periods of peak student demand, services offered during evening hours the first week each semester as well as during critical enrollment periods. An intercollege shuttle service has been instituted between campuses. The completion of the East Campus student services building will further consolidate locations of student services creating more visibility and effective management of access to these support services.

Attempts to provide library services on both campuses have been difficult because there are fewer staff members, which translates into fewer hours of operation. Also, students who attend classes in the evenings, on the weekends, or on the West Campus are at the greatest disadvantage. Expanded online availability and transportation via shuttle between sites has helped somewhat.

Regarding facilities and hours of operation for student support services such as the Library, the college self study report refers to the college having "taken several steps to make its collections more current and relevant and to improve access to resources and services." One such step is "careful purchasing and withdrawing of seldom used print material" (p.166). It is not clear what the college means by "careful purchasing" or if decision making on what to purchase is being driven or informed by the library's own Unit/Program Review and Action Plan.

As a result of the budget reductions in 2010/2011, the college cut one full-time librarian and all of its part-time librarians, equivalent to one full time position. It has cut its catalog librarian and these services are no longer available.

The West Campus library is being repurposed as a learning resource center to support the CTE and GE/transfer programs offered at the West Campus. The college received a STEM grant that will be used to refurbish this space, but this will leave the West Campus without a library.

Currently, library resources are only available at the East Campus. Plans for reopening the West Campus library will include a minimal collection. The library collection will not be optimally distributed to reflect the 60/40 split of students between the two campuses.

Upon completion of the *Educational Master Plan* in 2006, the college hired **bfgc Architecture** to update its *Facilities Master Plan* (FMP) with the primary focus of efficient deployment of Measure E resources. One of the biggest challenges was to address the development of one comprehensive community college on two primary sites which are 2.5 miles apart. The FMP reorganized both campuses to improve instructional relationships and interactivities between disciplines, and provide new discipline-specific facilities. The FMP established new building locations while respecting existing structures, and improved the functionality and utilization of space. Although the intercollege shuttle service was cut back due to budget issues, the team verified that plans to increase the services have been made. (III.B.1, III.B.1.a, III.B.2.)

Recommendation 2: The team recommends that the college develop, implement, and assess student learning outcomes to ensure student success in courses, programs, certificates, degrees and services and use the assessment and analysis for the purpose of improvement. (IB.1,5,6,7; IIA.1,2,3,7; IIB, IIB.4, and Eligibility Requirements 8 and 10.)

The college has not fully addressed this recommendation. The college, in its response to developing, implementing and assessing Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) to assure student success, asserts it currently has completed all course level SLOs, has SLOs for 40 different educational programs, and plans to publish Program Level Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for 50% of its programs this academic year and complete 100% of their PLO's by the 2012-2013 Catalog (p.168). However, these statistical claims were found to be somewhat misleading. A review of the college's submitted evidence on Course Level Outcomes (CLOs) and PLOs, including reviews of Program Review, PRnet, CurricuNet, Course Outlines of Record, faculty syllabi documents, and summarized results of several hours of interviews with faculty, staff, and administrators, the institution shows that in many instances the written outcomes statements themselves more readily resembled descriptions of an activity or were course objectives rather than CLOs.

Assessment activities are ongoing as evidenced by work accomplished by the Assessment Work Groups created in 2009. Their efforts include creation of electronic data collection forms, their incorporation into program reviews for funding decisions, dialogue at division meetings, and professional development workshops offered in person and online. PRnet software will provide status on action plans and an up-to-date assessment schedule to input their quantitative and qualitative responses to statistical data results and trends analysis. The program review itself helps drive funding decisions, dialogue at division meetings, and professional development workshops offered in person and online. Deans and faculty members stated PRnet has just been implemented this year, a year later than they anticipated. Therefore, a complete cycle of program review assessment has yet to occur. Because there is less than one year of verifiable program assessment, the college has failed to create a culture of assessment that informs resource allocation and curricular, pedagogical, or program improvement. An annual report is provided by the Assessment Coordinator at an Institute Day. A May 2011 assessment report as well as presentations to the Board of Trustees indicates strong efforts at ongoing dialogue.

Furthermore, a review of Standard II evidence as well as multiple interview sessions consistently revealed that faculty members are unclear about the definitions of a robust student learning outcome statement, the collaborative process for developing CLOs, and the difference

between a course objective and a student learning outcome. While CTE programs do have advisory committees, it appears that business and industry or higher education partners were often missing as collaborative contributors to the process of developing CLOs.

SLOs exist for all courses, and they are assessed as part of the SLO, Program Review, and curriculum revision processes. However, the college has not identified and implemented outcomes measures for all of its programs, certificates and degrees. Also, the degree to which assessment and analysis of assessment results are used for the purposes of improvement is unclear.

Recommendation 3: The team recommends that the college develop a policy to require that all students be given course syllabi at the beginning of classes each term. (IIA.6.)

The college has addressed this recommendation. The college, in its response on providing students with course syllabi at the beginning of classes each term, asserts it has “measureable outcomes as enunciated by instructors in their own syllabi” (p.170).

In August 2008, the district approved “Board Policy 6225-Syllabus” which requires the chancellor to establish procedures on this. Every semester, the college’s Academic Senate President sends a memo to all faculty notifying them that a syllabus, either written or electronic, must be provided to all students. The team verified that that BP-6225 is being followed.

Recommendation 4: The team recommends that the college develop a planning initiative to address issues of staffing, support services, and programs on the East and West Campuses. (IB.2; IB.3; IB.4; IB.6; IIB; IIB.3a; IIIA.2; IIIC.1.a,b,c) Note: This recommendation was also given to the college by the previous accreditation team (prior Standard IV.A.4).

The college partially addressed this recommendation. In the *Responses to Recommendations from the 2005 Self Study*, the college outlines its response and asserts that it meets the recommendation. This team reviewed the college response to this recommendation to ensure that continued adherence to college planning is institutionalized and it examined several documents that were noted in the college response. The Introduction to Decision Making at MCJ Fall 2008-10 is now expired and interviews with college committees and personnel reveal a high level of frustration among stakeholders over current college plans to assess or reaffirm this document. The Strategic Plan 2008-2013 notes the Strategic Planning Committee as the position with planning responsibility for goals 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10. Documentation does not provide evidence that such a Strategic Planning Committee currently exists. It appears that the Accreditation Institutional Effectiveness Committee has taken on this role but there is no documentation to that effect. Goals have been completed from the Strategic Plan, and there are annual reports from the Research and Planning Office that demonstrate goal status. The *Educational Master Plan 2006-2007* was created to serve the college in educational planning for ten years. There is no evidence of the *Educational Master Plan* assessment or evaluation within current college documentation. Site visit interviews support the statement that very few college personnel know about the *Educational Master Plan* or refer to it as part of their institutional planning. Reference to the Planning and Budget Committee in the college

recommendation response notes that the committee makes recommendations to the college president regarding recommendations pertaining to the revision of the college's *Educational Master Plan*. Evidence of *Educational Master Plan* revisions was not available.

The college has in place committees and processes for program review. Evidence of improvement of the process was not available. The team notes further program review comments in the self study response. The college response to the recommendation includes a narrative stating that the program review model includes reflection on program plans for expansion, contraction, or elimination. Evidence and site visit interviews noted inconsistency in the program review process and the program discontinuance policy. The climate survey responses note that many college constituents feel disconnected from the program review prioritization process noted in the recommendation response by the college.

Recommendation 4 directs the college to “develop a planning initiative to address issues of staffing support services, and programs on the East and West Campuses” (p.161). While the report goes on to describe the newly created Planning and Budget Committee as a step towards mitigating this recommendation, a clear process delineating this committee's role in college planning and resource allocation is not included. Such a document would serve to better satisfy the quality of the institution's response to this and subsequent responses to the previous team's seven recommendations.

The college has established a planning process that includes outcomes assessment, program review, and resource allocation with annual status reports discussed at an Institutional Effectiveness Review Workshop held each summer. Data is provided by the Research Office and published in its *Institutional Effectiveness Report and Annual Status Report*. In 2007, Student Services programs began a four-year program review cycle. The 2009-10 campus restructuring of the Program Review process changed the model to an annual cycle. Data from the *2010 Climate Survey* indicated that 39% of those who responded “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” that the overall planning process effectively incorporated input from the appropriate people or groups at the college or district, leading the college to further review the process for the coming cycle. A planning agenda focused on gaining more participation from classified staff members to understand and utilize the revised allocation process and the opportunities for dialogue throughout the campus has been set in place, indicating that this is still a work in progress. (I.B.1.)

The new East Campus student services building has begun construction although it is not clear as to both the adequacy of funding for staffing, and how completely the new building will allow for centralization of student services on that campus. Student access to services since the last visit has been addressed by locating several major services on both campuses, to the extent that funding has been available. A student survey showed 70% of the 300 staff members who responded agreed that student services has met the needs of students. In addition, 3000 students who responded to the survey provided input to the accessibility, quality, communication, and support services provided. What is not apparent is the response from students who are enrolled in online courses. The self study notes, since fall 2009 all students were provided school email addresses and can access all services through the college website and via email. Online

orientation is now available, in addition to personal orientation, as it is required for all incoming students. (II.B.1.)

The college planning agenda indicate the college intends to assign a single administrative entity to oversee library and learning services. It also states a need for a broader based assessment of the overall impact of the utilization of library and learning resource services on student success.

The college has been forced to reduce staffing due to budget constraints. The college has estimated anticipated staffing expense for the new buildings completed under the Measure E bond; however, it is not clear that planning efforts will adequately be met due to budget constraints or adequate planning prioritizations. (III.A.2.)

Despite expressed concerns over inadequate staffing and limited budget to support the college's growing technology needs, the college has made strides since the last visit to integrate technology planning into its strategic planning process. The college continues to work towards integrating and streamlining processes for ensuring that technology decisions emanate from institutional needs and plans for improvement. (III.C.1.a, III.C.1.b, III.C.1.c.)

Recommendation 5: Team recommends that the college ensure that all hiring and evaluation policies and procedures are adhered to and conducted on a consistent and timely basis. (IIA.2, IIIA.1b, IIIA.3a, IVA.5)

The college partially addressed this recommendation. In the institution's response to Recommendation 5, the college states it has met this recommendation and recognizes "evaluation of employee performance is another means of assessment, one which effective institutions must use to develop personnel, to improve their skills, and hence to improve the likelihood that Modest Junior College will attain the goals it has now set for itself" (p.171).

At the time of the team visit, no clearly identified adjunct evaluation process was provided for evaluation.

The team recognizes college efforts in developing a clear, well defined, and thorough human resources policy which outlines criteria for qualified and diverse personnel, and protects their rights, in order to meet district and college mission goals. The college provides robust documentation for policies and procedures. However, the college needs to develop a documentation system to verify the regularity of employee evaluations and subsequent performance improvements as they impact student learning. (III.A.1.b, III.A.3.a.)

Recommendation 6: The team recommends that in order to best serve the needs of students, the district and the college engage in a collaborative process to ensure a transparent and equitable allocation of financial resources and that the district and the college implement a process to communicate budget issues with each other on an ongoing basis. (IIIC.1a; IIIC.1d; IIIC.2; IIID.1a,b,c; IIID.2a; IIID.2b; IIID.2d; IIID.2e; IIID.2g; IIID.3; IVB.2d; IVB.3d; IVB.3g)

The college partially addressed this recommendation. In the institution's response to Recommendation 6 on transparency and equity of district resource allocation, the college states that its "allocation of resources is directly linked to the program review process and the needs are prioritized by the three Councils of the college" (p.172).

In response to the Recommendation 6, the district and the colleges formed the District Allocation Task Force in 2007 to review the budget allocation model. The first goal of the District Allocation Task Force was to improve the foundational understanding of community college and district funding practices. This included a review of the budget calendar and the information necessary to develop a budget. To improve transparency, the district and the college each developed a website link to post state budget updates as well as district/college budget information, issues, and allocation spreadsheets. The task force also produced an *Executive Summary* of the allocation process, and posted it online. In addition, the District Administrative Council increased the frequency of its meetings from a quarterly basis to monthly basis. In 2008, the college also established a new standing committee, the Planning and Budget Committee, to make recommendations to the college president. The recommendations for the allocation of resources are prioritized based on the college's master plans, strategic goals, and program review processes. (III.D.1.a,b,c, III.D.2.a, III.D.2.b, III.D.2.d, III.D.2.e, III.D.2.g, III.D.3; MJC Accreditation Self Study p.172.)

In 2007, the district formed a Budget Allocation Task Force to review the allocation model. The Task Force produced an *Executive Summary* of the process and posted it online for district wide access. The process is transparent and gives each constituent group information on the allocation model. In addition, updated state and district budget information is reported at the College Council and Budget and Planning Committee meetings. However, the team found the allocation model that drives resources to each college and the district is not equitable.

Recommendation 7: The team recommends that the college develop and implement a strategic planning process for connecting long-term program and services planning to financial resource development, as well as to facilities, human resources, and technology planning, consistent with the mission of the college. In addition, the team recommends that to accomplish its plans, the college develop and implement a short-term cyclical process that includes (a) clear institutional goals that are achieved through tactical actions that are based on institutional data and research, allocation of resources, timelines, and primary office of responsibility, (b) a method to report accomplishments on each tactical action, and (c) measures of institutional effectiveness that document achievement of the college mission and demonstrate continuous improvement. (IA.4, IB, IIA.1, IIA.2, IIA.3, IIB, IIB.1, IIB.3, IIB.3a, IIC, IIC.1, IIC.1c, IIIA.6, IIIC.1a, IIIC.1d, IIIC.2, IVA.1, IVA.5)

The college partially addressed this recommendation. The visiting team finds ample evidence that the mission statement is annually reviewed and approved through AIE and Planning and Budget Committee, and the College Council and the Board of Trustees. The visiting team has specific recommendations to make regarding the appropriateness of the mission statement in regards to planning.

In the institution's response to Recommendation 7, the college describes its efforts to improve student learning beginning with a "comprehensive planning program" including products that provide the "framework for planning college wide" (p.164). However, the list of products in this response is missing two critical components including the college's Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO's), and its Unit or Program Reviews. The product list for informing the college's planning does include the college *Mission, Vision, Core Values Statements, Educational Master Plan,* and Strategic Plan. However, the Accreditation Standards underscore the critical importance of Program/Unit plans and their subsequent Action Plans as a key means for informing resource request and allocation in the areas of equipment, facilities, personnel, and technology.

The college's decision to integrate writing, math and tutorial labs into an Integrated Learning Resource Center as part of the East Campus library renovation project funded by Measure E, and another at the West Campus library, was based in part on ARCC data and Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) data. Completion of these projects is slated for spring 2013 and comparison data, both ARCC and CCSSE, will assess the outcomes of this initiative. (II.B.3.a.)

In 2007, the student services unit established a task force to address the concerns for program review connected to strategic planning and resource allocation and has since completed a program review covering seven Service Area Outcomes (SAOs). These outcomes are measured within all service program units and incorporate data from college-based and national surveys along with analysis from the college's Office of Research and Planning. The Accreditation/Institution Effectiveness (AIE) committee has restructured its process to include an annual review cycle and an analysis of quantitative data on performance of students who utilize student services versus those who don't. (II.B. 4.)

The Self Study Report describes a new planning process that is supposed to operate in the following manner: The program review process begins the planning and resource allocation process. The program review process and documentation were revised in 2009 by the Accreditation/Institution Effectiveness Committee. The needs identified through the process are sent to the three councils: the Instructional Administrative Council, the Student Services Council, and the newly created Administrative Council. Recently, the Technology Council was added to the group. Each council includes members representing all campus employee groups. It is the task of the councils to prioritize staffing and/or equipment needs based on criteria linked to the college's mission and strategic plan, and submit the prioritized list to the Planning and Budget Committee by October 30th of each year. The Planning and Budget Committee reviews the lists and holds a public hearing before forwarding the lists to the President by November 20th of each year. Upon completion of his/her review, the president informs the Planning and Budget Committee of the final allocation decisions for the college in writing. The president will also include an explanation for any allocation decisions not in congruence with the prioritized recommendations from the Planning and Budget Committee. The team found that this planning process is not fully implemented. (III.D.1, III.D.2)

The planning process is evaluated for its efficiency and efficacy in supporting student learning through the *Campus Climate Survey* for transparency, availability of data to support

improvements, adherence to timelines, and the appropriate sequencing in the process. In addition, the AIE Committee conducts the end of the year Assessment Workshop which evaluates the institutional effectiveness of the planning process and resource allocations. Also at the Assessment Workshop, the college assesses the program review process and progress on SLOs. The results of the Assessment Workshop are then formulated into action plans for the next planning cycle. The college mission statement, strategic plan, educational master plan, and *MJC Institutional Effectiveness Report* are also reviewed at the workshop.

The Planning and Budget Committee is primarily responsible for organizing and determining the hiring priority of both faculty and classified, using quantitative and qualitative data that ties hiring priority to program review and other data from a variety of sources and constituencies. (III.A.6.)

The college is in the process of transitioning to PRnet which provides a technology structure to review and track progress made on tactical actions from Program Reviews. Once fully implemented, the software should improve the college's ability to establish priorities in expending fiscal resources, developing allocations for staffing, and improving facilities to achieve the college's mission and demonstrate continuous improvement. (III.C.1.a, III.C.1.d.)

Eligibility Requirements

The team found that, with the exception of requirements 10, 16, and 19, Modesto Junior College is in compliance with all eligibility requirements established by the Accreditation Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. These areas of noncompliance are cited in the team's recommendations.

1. Authority

Modesto Junior College is part of the Yosemite Community College District (YCCD) and is authorized to operate as an educational institution and award degrees by the (1) Accrediting Commission of Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, (2) the California State Chancellor's Office, and (3) the locally elected Board of Trustees of the Yosemite Community College District.

2. Mission

The team confirmed that Modesto Junior College completed a review of its mission statement and it was approved by the District Board of Trustees on October 13, 2010, is published in the MJC Catalog and can be found on the college's website and the college's Strategic Plan.

3. Governing Board

The Yosemite Community College District Board of Trustees membership consists of seven individuals elected from five geographic areas within the district. Board members are elected to staggered four year terms. A nonvoting student trustee is seated annually. The team confirmed that this board makes policy for the district and exercises oversight of its operations. Board members are precluded by public law from participating in any action involving a possible conflict of interest or from realizing a financial gain from their position as a board member.

4. Chief Executive Officer

The interim Modesto Junior College president, appointed to this role by the Board of Trustees in August 2011, has full time responsibility for guiding the college. As the chief executive officer, the interim president administers board policies, manages resources, and ensures compliance with all statutes and regulations. The interim Modesto Junior College president reports to the chancellor, appointed in March 2011, who holds a full time position as the chief executive officer of the Yosemite Community College District. Neither the president nor the chancellor serves on the Board of Trustees.

5. Administrative Capacity

Current administrators possess the skills and abilities required to perform their duties at a high level. Following a long period of administrative vacancies, a permanent chancellor was selected in March, 2011, and permanent vice presidents of student services and college administrative services were selected in October, 2011. A new permanent college president is expected to be hired in January, 2012.

6. Operational Status

The team certifies with no reservations that the Modesto Junior College is fully operational with students actively pursuing degree and certificate programs.

7. Degrees

The Modesto Junior College catalog describes a variety of degrees and certificates offered by the institution. The majority of the college's courses apply to these degrees or certificates.

8. Educational Programs

The team certifies that the Modesto Junior College offers 57 A.A. degrees, 59 A.S. degrees, and 73 certificates of achievement that are consistent with the college mission, and are provided in a manner conventional to community colleges, and are consistent with the eligibility requirements.

9. Academic Credit

Modesto Junior College awards academic credit and non degree credit in a manner conventional for community colleges and consistent with generally accepted good practice and state regulations.

10. Student Learning Achievement

The college is out of compliance with ER 10. While some programs have program level outcomes, the team found that the college is still developing outcomes for programs. They intend to use PR Net to collect program data. The team noticed the college community has difficulty distinguishing outcomes from objectives. While the college has course level outcomes, the team found that they do not appear in all of the course outlines of record.

11. General Education

The team certifies that Modesto Junior College includes general education requirements in its degree programs and that writing and computational skills are reflected in these requirements. Students are introduced to some of the major areas of knowledge, consistent with the practice at accredited community colleges. Of the 60 units required for an associates degree, 18 of these units must be on the approved general education list.

12. Academic Freedom

Board Policy 6030, Academic freedom, ensures faculty members are free to examine and test all knowledge appropriate to their discipline or area of major study as judged by the academic/ educational community in general.

13. Faculty

Modesto Junior College employs 135 full time and approximately 245 part time faculty members. All of these meet or exceed state minimum qualifications. With approximately 65 percent of the credit hours of instructions taught by full time faculty, this staff is sufficient in size and experience to support the college's instructional programs.

14. Student Services

The team reviewed the size and scope of student services provided by Modesto Junior College and found them to be consistent with the needs of the student body and the college's mission. However, services are split, not duplicated, between both campus sites. Students must visit both campus sites to obtain full services. The online counseling services are not as robust as indicated in the self study nor are they equivalent to face to face counseling services.

15. Admissions

Consistent with its own mission, the mission of the California Community Colleges, and Title 5 of the California Education Code, the college maintains an open admissions policy for matriculation at large.

16. Information and Learning Resources

The team found that the library on the West Campus is in the process of being converted an integrated learning center. Books were removed and moved to the East Campus. Students on the West Campus can only access books online or by traveling to the East Campus. Although there are plans to open the library again, but there is no evidence of a staffing plan. The team also found that the level of librarian and library technician support is not adequate.

17. Financial Resources

The district demonstrates an adequate funding base and financial reserves to support student learning programs and services. The team found that available resources are not finding their way to adequately support the college's learning programs and services. Of the total budget, 95.3% goes to salaries. It should be noted that the team was told, at the time of the visit, that 97% of the total budget went to salaries.

18. Financial Accountability

The team examined recent external audits available for the college and district and verified that these audits resulted in no material findings.

19. Institutional Planning

The college and district have developed a strategic planning/program review process and makes public information about the college's characteristics and its students' success. However, the planning and budget process is not fully integrated; therefore, planning does not consistently drive budget decisions. The college is aware of the need to implement an improved and fully integrated process and is committed to these efforts.

20. Public Information

The Modesto Junior College catalog contains all of the requisite information and is available to the public in print and online.

21. Relations with the Accrediting Commission

The team did not find adequate adherence to the Accrediting Commission's eligibility requirements, standards, and policies. In addition, the Distance Education Substantive Change Proposal overstates the college's actual practices.

STANDARD I

Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

I.A. Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

Standard I.A. Institutional Mission

General Observations

The college has a broad based mission statement that identifies a diverse student population served within the context of a student centered learning community. In 2010, the college and the Board of Trustees reaffirmed the college mission which is published in several campus publications and in planning documents. (IA.1, IA.2.) The mission statement is revised annually through the Planning and Budget Committee, the Accreditation and Institutional Effectiveness Committee, with final affirmation of the mission occurring through College Council and the YCCD Board. The college identifies the mission as part of institutional planning and decision making with the creation of two new standing planning committees, the Accreditation/ Institutional Effectiveness (AIE) Committee and the Planning and Budget Committee. It is the college's stated assertion that all planning at the college is guided by the mission statement, data from the Office of College Research and Planning and active planning committee roles. (I.A.3, I.A.4.)

Standard I.A. Institutional Mission

Findings and Evidence

In 2010, the college and the Board of Trustees reaffirmed a college mission stating broad educational purposes and service without clear identification of student population or achieving student learning (I.A, I.A.1.), although the college notes supporting documentation of student diversity and learning within the context of the *Core Values and Vision Statement*. Evidence supports college assertions that there is an annual review of the mission statement through the Planning and Budget Committee, AIE Committee, and College Council. Workshops beginning in 2010 provided opportunity for campus constituencies to review the suitability of the mission statement with subsequent review from the College Council and with Board reaffirmation October 2010. (I.A.2, I.A.3.) Program planning guided by the mission statement has been noted through the creation of several programs and committees; clear linkage to student specific assessments through the new Student Success Advisory Committee is not evidenced. (I.A.1, I.A.4.)

Review of mission statement availability is evidenced through numerous publications including the *2010 Institutional Effectiveness Report*, catalog and is on the college website. (I.A.2.)

The mission is reviewed annually in workshops open to campus constituencies, affirmed by the College Council and approved by the Board of Trustees, most recently in October 2010. (I.A.2, I.A.3.) Although the college states the revisions occur as a direct response to the character of its intended student population, the lack of specificity in the mission makes this connection unclear. (I.A, I.A.1.) Once approved, the mission is published in numerous publications, on campus posters and on the college website. (I.A.2.)

The college provided documentation of plans, assessments, and committee charges that state their commitment to aligning student learning programs and services with population needs and mission objectives. (I.A.1.) The college collects considerable data to determine student needs as detailed in the *Institutional Effectiveness Report*. Such data are meant to balance the three general program areas, general academics, precollegiate/basic skills, and career and technical education. The findings are also used to determine new program needs in emerging fields, including those involving community partnerships that prepare students for the local workforce. Documentation of this process was missing from the self study but provided when requested. (I.A.1, I.A.4.)

Data are also used to develop programs that help promote student success. (I.A.1.) For example, in 2008 after noting that the majority of new college students have below college level mathematics and English skills, the college developed an ad hoc Basic Skills Task Force. In 2010-11, a Student Success Committee was charged to address persistence, learning, and success through matching college programs and student needs as well as aligning such efforts with the college mission statement. However, college interviews determined this committee was not adopted. Instead, the Instructional Administrators' Council determines course scheduling balance by evaluating enrollment data and also uses a scheduling matrix for aligning course offerings with mission goals. The committee provided sample documentation of this process upon request. (I.A.1, I.A.4.)

The campus Assessment Work Group (AWG) committee oversees evaluation of student learning and subsequent plans for program improvement, as detailed on their website and their *Annual Comprehensive Assessment Report*. This involves setting goals for the college to complete design (or identification) of course and program student learning outcomes, with a current goal of designing outcomes for all programs by December 2011. This group also conducts training in assessment during the Academic Senate sponsored Institute Days, offered each semester. (I.A, I.A.1, I.A.4.)

Finally, the college has made many efforts to involve stakeholders throughout the college, either through one of the constituent committees or through campus workshops. However, the *Campus Climate Survey* shows that support and comprehension might not yet be campus wide; about 30% of those responding to the survey did not agree that they thought that the college used the mission to guide program development. (I.A, I.A.1, I.A.4.)

Standard I.A. Institutional Mission

Conclusions

The college partially meets the standard. The team has found sufficient evidence supporting a broad based mission statement developed and regularly reviewed by college constituents. The team also recognizes college efforts to match college learning programs and support services to student needs. Although the college committee chartered for this task was not implemented, the team found evidence that other groups stepped in to achieve this objective. The team also found evidence that the college attempts to use mission goals to drive program planning. However, the mission statement is too general to provide adequate direction; nearly any program would fit into the broad mission outline.

I.B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

Standard I.B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations

According to the self study, the college has developed and implemented an integrated program review, planning, and budget process. (I.B.4.) The self study describes a three tiered planning and budget process, which includes a program review process that culminates in the allocation of fiscal and other resources. The self study describes the resource allocation stage of the planning process as the Planning and Budget Committee prioritizing lists. Then at an open forum, those who made requests can speak to the list; the list is then amended and forwarded to the college president, who then considers the list, providing resource allocation decisions and a rationale. This section of the self study does not discuss strategies when resources to fulfill the plan are not available. The self study describes in detail the planning process, but it does not mention any changes that have occurred as a result of its implementation.

The college demonstrates a desire to produce and support student learning. However, the team observed that the college has not integrated processes, nor does the college have consistent assessment structures to inform the campus community about the institution's effectiveness. The team observed that the college has a committee structure that is intended to support program review, planning, and resource allocation process. The team observed that while the college has worked hard to design an integrated planning process, it does not include SLO assessment data into the process. In the self study and in interviews with the Planning and Budget Committee, college administrators and staff, the college provided no evidence of how SLO assessment data will be integrated into the current planning and resource allocation process.

Standard I.B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

Findings and Evidence

The team found inconsistencies between the information in the self study and the actual practices of the college in several areas. The program review planning and budget process described in the self study is inconsistent with the planning process described by the Planning and Budget Committee and other administrators and staff. While there is a committee structure intended to support an integrated program review, planning, and budget process, there is evidence the linkages are weak and the process is not followed consistently. According to the College Council and the Planning and Budget Committee, the college has a planning process that begins with program review, which generates a list of needs. This list is forwarded to one of three councils – the Dean's Council, Student Services Council, Administrative Services Council, or the Technology Committee. Each council/committee creates its own criteria for prioritizing needs. The team found no evidence that the criteria used in these committees are consistent from year to year or that they are communicated effectively to the campus community. In addition, the team observed that the college has not created an infrastructure for campus wide dialogue about continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes. (I.B.1.)

The team found that members of the campus community did not always know or follow the process outlined by the Planning and Budget Committee. In addition, the chancellor could only

describe how the college's planning and budget process connects to the district. The chancellor admitted that she does not know how the college does its planning and budget process or if it is working well.

The team found that this college does not assess its program review and planning processes consistently. This occurs partly because some of the processes are new or are not followed consistently. The AIE Committee told the team that the AIE Committee was formed to address a sanction on the institution imposed in January 2008 for deficiencies in Program Review and integrated planning. The AIE Committee is now charged with reviewing campus-wide processes. While the self study describes dialogue occurring at all stages of all processes designed to support student learning, the team found no evidence that dialogue about assessment occurs campus wide. In the self study there is a detailed description of dialogue in the planning and budget process; however, the team did not find this to be the practice. (I.B.1.) While dialogue occurs within the committees, there is no evidence that dialogue about planning and assessment is occurring across committees and departments. (I.B.1.) The self study describes a committee structure that encourages dialogue, the 2010 *Campus Climate Survey* suggests that the college community feels disconnected from the planning process. The self study suggests the college is taking steps to address this disconnect. However, the team found that plans and minutes are posted online, but there is no evidence those members of the campus community who are not on committees understand the college processes or have a venue to discuss assessment/evaluation results. In several interviews, the team was met with frustration and confusion in regard to processes. (I.B.1.) In response to the campus survey, the AIE Committee is planning to have Program Review "Parties." Unfortunately, there are no structures within the institution to support ongoing, collegial, reflective dialogue about continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes other than committees (the team received this information directly from the AIE). (I.B.1.) The team noted some of the same people serve on different governance committees.

While the self study states the college uses student achievement data, the college is not at the stage where the collection of learning outcome data is integrated into its processes or the data is used to create changes that address student learning consistently within the institution.

The self study describes the use of "key performance indicators, outcome assessment and program review to determine priorities." However, in an interview with the Planning and Budget Committee, the committee could not agree on the criteria used for prioritizing college goals. (I.B.2.) The team found there is not an understanding of the college planning and budget process in the college campus community. While the self study reflects a leadership committed to achieving the identified goals, according to the *Campus Climate Survey 2010*, the campus community feels disconnected from the planning process. (I.B.2.) In an interview with the AIE Committee, the Committee expressed commitment to address the concerns raised in the *Campus Climate Survey 2010*.

While the self study describes an institution that understands and embraces the notion of ongoing planning, the team found that the processes and policies of the college are not integrated and are not followed consistently. While the institution does assess its progress toward achieving its stated goals, the team found that the current planning and budget has only

been assessed once by the AIE Committee. (I.B.3.) The self study states the college is still transitioning into a culture of evidence. It also states, as the connection between program review, planning and resource allocation becomes clear to the campus community, the disconnections between the committee structures will be resolved. There are three themes that have emerged from campus surveys: perceived lack of communication; governance issues, namely the exclusion of some constituent groups in decision making processes; and a disconnect in the shared governance processes. The team found the college does not engage in consistent systematic evaluation of programs and services, planning, implementation and reevaluation. To address the lack of consistent systematic evaluation of programs and services, the AIE Committee has begun assessing the Program Review and the Planning and Budget process in 2010. As a result of the assessment results, changes have been implemented. According to the self study, the AIE Committee is charged with evaluation of the planning and budget process and all governance committees at the college. The AIE Committee uses a climate survey and a committee retreat to assess processes. The first cycle of assessing the Planning and Budget process has been completed. (I.B.6.)

The self study describes a committee structure, open forums, surveys, and a newsletter. The team did find this is occurring; however, the *Campus Climate Survey 2010* and interviews with staff suggest that the college community feels disconnected from major decision making processes. (I.B.4.) The team observed the institutional processes are not followed consistently. While both the Planning and Budget Committee and the AIE Committee were able to explain their processes, they could not explain how their planning process is integrated into the district resource allocation process. (I.B.4.) The team found the college does not have a process to address when resources to fulfill the plans are not available. As a result of this lack of process, the campus is still trying to recover from the cuts made during the 2010-2011 fiscal crisis. This has contributed to a lack of trust and some staff members feeling demoralized.

The self study does not mention any changes as a result of the implementation of the planning process. However, the team found there have been several major changes as a result of the planning process and the assessment of it in this first planning cycle. Nevertheless, these changes are not being documented consistently, nor is it clear that the college community is aware of them. (I.B.4.)

The self study states that the college uses student achievement data, the annual climate survey, CCSSE, and *The Comprehensive Assessment Report*. The self study states that data gleaned from internal assessment processes are shared with the public via press releases, appearances of the college president on public access television, and at service organizations. However, the team found no evidence of this. In fact, the team found that while some data is posted on the website, it is difficult to access. (I.B.5.)

Dialogue regarding improvement of institutional processes has mainly happened at the AIE Committee, a college-wide group with all shared governance bodies represented. Co-chaired by the Vice President of Instruction and the Academic Senate president, this committee is charged with institutional effectiveness and assessing college processes. Survey results from the *Campus Climate Survey 2010* provided useful information for the committee. The primary mechanism for evaluation of improving institutional effectiveness is through examining the college's

program review process. In the last three years, the AIE Committee has held assessment workshops in late spring, providing a collectively reflective opportunity for all stakeholders to examine achievements made in the previous year. Reflective dialogues on college process were also facilitated. (I.B.7.)

The college has produced four editions of the Institutional Effectiveness Report (although, at the time of the visit, the team was provided three reports), and the institutional researcher has presented and shared the results at various college wide meetings, such as the College Council, AIE Committee, Planning and Budget Committee, Academic Senate, and Classified Staff Advisory Committee (CSAC). While there is a great amount of data on the external environment, population trends, state and county economy, and student success, the effectiveness report is more like a college fact book. The college's institutional effectiveness report does not appear to include data or evaluative comments on college processes and recommendations for improvement.

Standard I.B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

Conclusions

The college partially meets the standard. The college has created a program review and a planning and budget process; however, staff is still working to integrate the process. The college still needs to create permanent venues for college wide dialogue about assessment and educational quality. The college is at the end of the Development stage and the beginning of the Proficiency stage of the ACCJC Planning Rubric. In order to reach Proficiency, the college must continue to work toward integrating college processes and linkages within the process need to be strengthened and clarified. This college is at the Development stage of the ACCJC SLO Rubric; therefore, many of the learning outcomes assessment data is not available to integrate into the planning and budget process.

Standard I. Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

Recommendations

Modesto Junior College Recommendation 1

In order to fully meet the standards for mission and effectiveness, the team recommends the college analyze community demographic and student enrollment data to more descriptively define the intended student population and emphasize their commitment to student learning in the mission statement. The team further recommends that course and program planning be explicitly linked to the defined population so the college is able to clearly assess its success in institutional planning, decision making, and meeting student needs as related to its mission. (Standards I.A, I.A.1, I.A.4; II.B.3; ER2.)

Modesto Junior College Recommendation 2

The team recommends the college attain the level of proficiency according to the ACCJC Rubric for Student Learning Outcomes by 2012. The college must ensure that faculty members differentiate between course learning outcomes and course objectives. It must also establish clear standards for assessing course learning outcomes that will inform course-level curricular and pedagogical improvement. In addition, the college must complete its development of outcomes at the program and institutional levels. The college must demonstrate that it assesses

the outcomes and uses them in college decision making processes to improve institutional effectiveness. The college must create venues to maintain an ongoing, collegial, self reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes. Student Services must develop and implement student learning outcomes, establish systems of assessment to make improvements in the delivery of its programs and services, and communicate to students these learning outcomes. (Standards I.B.1, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6; II.A.2.i, II.B.4; ER10.)

Modesto Junior College Recommendation 5

In order to fully meet the standard, the team recommends the college strengthen and clarify the linkages and complete the cycle within the planning and budget process to ensure institutional effectiveness; engage in consistent systematic evaluation of the process; and codify, publish and adhere to the process. In addition, the college must integrate student learning outcome assessment results into the planning and budget process and strengthen the integration of technology planning with integrated planning and resource allocations. (Standards I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7; II.A, II.B; III.C.2, III.D.1; ER10.)

STANDARD II

Student Learning Programs and Services

II.A. Instructional Programs

Recent severe budget reductions at the college preceded the team's site visit and dominated a number of discussions with institutional stakeholders. Cuts to course and program offerings, staffing, classroom equipment and supplies, and library services have left an indelible impression on the institution and its resources (*Self Study*, p.304). Despite such sobering events, Standard II of the college's self study demonstrates the institution's continued interest in creating a culture of evidence and assessment that leads to improvements in student learning regardless of the challenges.

In spite of the recession, the college has continued to make progress towards improving its courses and programs as well as its processes. Progress in the areas of student learning outcomes and program review is significant and measurable, though program and general education outcomes will need shepherding if proficiency is to be met by 2012.

Improved distance education options and opportunities for training are also noteworthy. Although bond funds are available to ensure new and remodeled buildings will continue to come online with a full complement of technological resources, there is a serious disconnect between initial resources, which will be provided as part of the building projects, and the continued resources needed to sustain technology and provide staffing for new facilities.

Standard II.A. Instructional Programs

General Observations

In general, the quality of the self study report on Standard II.A is comprehensive and evidentiary of changes and improvements made as a result of program review and SLO assessment. Within the self study and as a result of team visit interviews, it is apparent that faculty members and administrators take pride in the quality of their programs and are passionate about the success of their students. The AIE Committee, the Curriculum Committee, and the instructional dean's meetings, provide meaningful opportunities for reflection that includes commendable accomplishments as well as admissions of not yet having met the standard on assessment of programs (p.225).

While substantial progress has been made by the institution in developing program learning outcomes, measuring them, and using the results of measurement to plan, inform resource allocation, and implement institutional improvements, full proficiency has not yet been achieved. However, the institution has provided sufficient evidence to suggest that Proficiency stage is within reach by the 2012 deadline set by the ACCJC. Still, the full cycle of implementation of program learning outcomes and general education outcomes falls short of meeting the standard of Proficiency, and the team recommends significant attention and resources be directed to the achievement of the standard.

Standard II.A. Instructional Programs

Findings and Evidence

The college relies upon evidence collected by the Office of Research and Planning to assist with meeting the varied educational needs of its students. Types of evidence used in planning include institutional surveys to assess student satisfaction and campus climate, outcomes assessment efforts, program review reports, external reporting agencies such as the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the regional Center for Excellence (housed at the college), CTE advisory committees, student data reports, and the Data Mart--which is available through the State Chancellor's Office. The *Modesto Junior College Educational Master Plan 2006-2007* and the *Modesto Junior College Strategic Plan, 2008*, were developed to guide the college in its growth through projecting future population and enrollment trends and then setting goals to provide a clear direction for the growth and implementation of educational programs in the future. Also the Career Technical Education Advisory Committee has contributed to the ongoing development of career technical education at the college. (II.A.1.a, II.A.1.b.)

The college offers traditional face to face, hybrid, and online courses. In 1998, the college offered its first online class and the college's distance education offerings have increased. Today, a full 17% of all classes contain 50% or more of a distance education component. The college's fall 2010 Substantive Change report confirms that "61 degree programs, 19 certificates of achievement, 16 general education/university preparation and 8 skills recognition certificates could be completed 50% or more" through distance education at the college (p.8). As stated in the self study, the college has increased its distance education offerings to make them available to those who have time, transportation, physical, or other constraints which might preclude them from traditional educational opportunities. To ensure the integrity of distance education offerings, the college curriculum process reviews and approves distance education course proposals separately and rejects any which do not clearly meet standards for instructor/student contact and achieving course objectives. (II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.c, II.A.2.d, II.A.2.h)

To ensure that all courses provide high quality instruction as well as appropriate breadth, depth, and rigor, the college has implemented a *Student Learning Outcome: Assessment Plan for 2009-2012* so that faculty will assess student learning outcomes for all courses on a regular, cyclical basis and complete an initial cycle of review by 2012. In addition, the college is seeking to institutionalize general education learning outcomes to achieve uniformity necessary for students seeking an A.S. or A.A. degree or transfer regardless of the area of emphasis. Finally, departments which use common or standardized exams follow a process whereby discipline experts validate the exams and evaluate them for test bias. (II.A.1.c, II.A.2.d, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.g.)

Course credit, whether for face to face, hybrid, or distance education courses, is awarded according to the traditional Carnegie Unit and aligns with Title 5 and district Board Policy 6220—Standards of Scholarship, which states that one unit of course credit is awarded for each 54 hours of total student involvement in the course. This information is published annually in the college catalog and is also housed in CurricUNET which contains a Units & Hours page that automatically calculates course hours based upon units of lecture, lab, and discussion. Units values are audited during the Technical Review phase of the curriculum process as well. (II.A.2.h.)

Degrees and certificates are awarded based upon satisfactory completion of the course components of the degree and the achievement of course objectives. Many of the programs now have stated outcomes which further ensure the integrity of the degree of certificate earned. (II.A.2.i.)

The team notes all courses, and many programs, have identified and published student learning outcomes, and a process is in place for assessing the outcomes. Furthermore, the college has instituted an AIE Committee and an Assessment Work Group to oversee the processes, plan for timely review, and assist in the overall process of institutionalizing an evidence-based approach to improving student success. To achieve this end, the work group has conducted training sessions, received and reviewed assessment data, compiled two annual assessment reports and reported out to the AIE Committee. Through such endeavors, the college has managed to overcome less effective approaches that were used in the past and has moved closer to achieving the Proficiency stage for course level student learning outcomes required by the ACCJC by 2012. Although program learning outcomes are not as far along as are course level outcomes in terms of development and assessment, the percentage of programs, certificate, and degrees having created and published outcomes has increased steadily over the past year. Evidence for student learning outcome identification, development, and assessment appears in the following places: *Modesto Junior College Catalog 2010-2011*; the college's Curriculum Committee website and Curriculum Committee meeting minutes; CurricUNET Website; PRnet template; Outcomes Assessment Module; Assessment Work Group Charge and meeting minutes; and Institutional Effectiveness Reports. (II.A.1.c, II.A.1.f, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e.)

The team confirms that the *MJC Catalog 2011-12* contains the college's General Education student learning outcomes (GELOs) and the faculty-developed philosophy of the Associate's Degree and General Education. The MJC Academic Senate identified GELOs in 2009 and approved them in 2010. Then the college published them in the *MJC Catalog 2010-11*. At its February 2011 meeting, the College Council reaffirmed that the identified GELOs align with the college's mission statement, and the process for cyclical assessment is now available through CurricUNET. The philosophy of the Associate's Degree and General Education statement was reaffirmed by the Curriculum Committee in December, 2010. Currently, all of the college's degree programs include general education requirements, and students are informed of these requirements in counseling sessions and in the college catalog. The institution's general education curriculum includes courses which follow the MJC, CSU, and IGETC patterns. Degree programs include at least one area of focused study or interdisciplinary core. Courses proposed for natural science, social and behavioral science, humanities, language and rationality, and health education have been developed and reviewed by discipline faculty and emphasize cultural awareness, human understanding, aesthetic appreciation, global awareness, and social and personal wellbeing. The general education courses have been vetted in the approved curriculum process developed by the Curriculum Committee, which includes the college's faculty Articulation Officer. (II.A.3.a, II.A.3.b, II.A.3.c.)

The self study provides licensure exam pass rates for eight career and technical programs in Allied Health areas. While pass rates are above 75% for six programs, Medical Assisting posted a 58.3% pass rate and Respiratory Therapist Clinical Simulation had a 70.2% pass rate. This appears to indicate that a gap exists between program outcomes and the expectations of

licensing boards. The team verified that the college has a process in place for improvement that includes participation from advisory groups, and also verified that budget issues have affected their ability to realize improvements in the short term. (II.A.5.)

The names of external accrediting and approval bodies are listed in the catalog. These organizations provide validation of ongoing review of program integrity and alignment with industry standards, thereby supporting the college's mission. Data on job placements rates are available through the State's Perkins IV report. Data on gainful employment which includes ontime completion and job placement rates for career and technical programs can be found at <http://www.mjc.edu/prospective/resources/gainfulemployment/>. (II.A.2.b, II.A.5.)

Program pages in the catalog include a listing of degree and certificate programs offered, program descriptions, course requirements for the major, admission requirements when applicable, number of credits required, and a description of general education courses required for each degree pathway. Program learning outcomes are published for approximately half of the programs although the college has a plan to provide these for all programs with the printing of the 2012-2013 catalog. All students receive a class syllabus which includes approved student learning outcomes, and there is a process that requires monitoring by deans. District Board Policy 6225-Syllabus, approved in August 2008, ensures that all students will be provided with a syllabus during the first week of classes. (II.A.6.a.)

With the recent State Chancellor's Office approval of Transfer Major Curriculum (TMCs), mandated by SB1440, for Communications and Mathematics at the college, pathways to transfer will become clearer. Currently, eight other disciplines are developing their TMCs at the college, making transfer options clearer for students and ensuring that degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry. (II.A.4, II.A.6.a.)

Transfer credit evaluations are performed in a process that refers to the Articulation System Stimulating Inter-institutional Student Transfer (ASSIST). For courses not found in this database, the Articulation Office conducts individual determinations of equivalency in collaboration with departmental faculty. The college refers students who attended non U.S. institutions to approved foreign transcript evaluation services. Articulation agreements with other colleges are found at <http://www.mjc.edu/current/student-services/transfer/articulation.html>. (II.A.6.a, II.A.8.)

Board Policy 6020-Program and Curriculum Review provides the basis for determining program health. A Program Discontinuance Review Committee examines program data and makes recommendations on programs that should not be continued. These recommendations include assurance that currently enrolled majors have individual plans for completing the program. During the past academic year, the senate and president entered into a one year suspension agreement of this process. Given the lack of perceived involvement in the quickly implemented budget reduction, the Academic Senate and college have since participated in a facilitated process to create new criteria leading to an informed program prioritization process. (II.A.6.b.)

Printed and online publications representing the college including the catalog, student handbook, and class schedule are reviewed by several college offices to ensure accuracy. The college has had an opportunity to review its online information through a recent redesign of the main website completed in 2009. While online publications will continue to be enhanced, the recent budget cuts eliminating the Director of Marketing position will decrease the college's ability to publish printed publications. (II.A.6.c.)

Board Policy 5580 - Academic Freedom & Integrity, provides the basis for the college's academic freedom policy. Board Policy 5500 - Standards of Conduct, provides the basis for the college's policy on student conduct. Both policies are published in the catalog, student handbook, and on the website. The college does not attempt to incorporate specific world views or codes of conduct into its education. The elimination of the Office of Student Success and its director position was noted in the self study, thereby necessitating that violations of student conduct and academic integrity be addressed by the dean of counseling. (II.A.7.a, II.A.7.b, II.A.7.c.)

Standard II.A. Instructional Programs

Conclusions

The college partially meets the standard. The college is to be commended for its progress toward development of student learning outcomes at the course level. To date, all courses have identified student learning outcomes, and they are all plotted on an ongoing four year cycle of assessment and improvement. (II.A.2.i.) However, the robust quality of each written course learning outcome is inconsistent from course to course. Review of the course learning outcomes indicates some confusion among faculty members as to the difference between a course learning outcome (what students will be able to do outside of and after the conclusion of the course) and an objective (a finite goal met inside of or at the end of the course). Also, there appears to be a lack of identified key assessment points within each of the courses where each identified course learning outcome can be measured to determine whether learning is indeed taking place. Thus, the college will need to focus significant attention on course learning outcomes as well as program and general education learning outcomes and assessment of these outcomes to meet the Proficiency level by 2012. Continued training and workshops are recommended to bring the standard of robust outcome statements to meet required levels of rigor and consistency.

The college has formed the AIE Committee which chartered the Assessment Work Group and is co-chaired by the Assessment Coordinator, the Director of College Research and Planning, and the Program Review Coordinator. The work group has conducted training sessions, received and reviewed assessment data, compiled two annual assessment reports, and reported to the AIE Committee. Through such endeavors, the college has managed to overcome less effective approaches that were used in the past. Indeed, the coordination of efforts demonstrates the institution's commitment to a culture of evidence and a dialogue geared towards continuous improvement. (II.A.1, II.A.2, II.A.3.)

Recent budget cuts which led to the elimination of both the Office of Student Success and the Director of Marketing position will have negative effects on the college. It was not evident the college has an adequate plan to measure the impact of the loss of leadership in these two areas and how the college will continue to improve the areas formerly handled by these positions.

Although a Substantive Change was submitted to the State Chancellor's office stating a Distance Education Plan was being developed and would be in place by fall 2011, that plan has not materialized. While some grant money exists to help train faculty to implement changes to the current learning management system, there are no ongoing funds devoted to professional development for distance education instructors. Furthermore, there is no line item in the college budget for replacing computers and/or other equipment associated with distance education. So while units may request equipment and training through the new program review process, there is no way to ensure that requests for replacement, upgrades, or training will occur.

The team strongly suggests that the Curriculum Committee and the Assessment Work Group meet on a regular basis and provide a faculty liaison between the groups to ensure the methods and processes for the assessment of learning outcomes are understood and applied consistently across courses, programs, and degrees.

The college is to be commended for quality agriculture and fire science programs.

II.B. Student Support Services

Standard II.B. Student Support Services

General Observations

At the time of the visit, the college had just completed the hiring of the Vice President of Student Services which had been filled on an interim basis since December 2009. The team was able to confirm during this period student services had transitioned to an annual program review process that utilizes survey data in a decision making process for continuous improvement leading to student success. Overall, the report on this standard provides descriptions of student support programs and services and descriptions of their processes. However, the team noted that in many cases evaluations lack adequate data beyond what was collected from the recent *2010 Climate Survey* data.

In a meeting with college student organization leaders, two distinct pictures emerged. The students enthusiastically described student services staff as friendly and helpful and their faculty as being "hands on" and going out of their way to provide a quality learning environment in and out of the classroom. The student leaders also described overworked staff, lack of library facilities on the West Campus, lack of centralized student services, and fewer classes due to budget cuts. The students expressed a desire for their increased participation in college committees and processes through their development as a more involved and responsive student senate in recognition of the college's current situation.

As a whole, the six planning agendas in Section II.B indicate a concerted effort to meet the individual accreditation requirements. The greatest challenge appears to be in Section II.B.4, relating to transitioning to an annual program review model, establishing robust student learning outcomes, and conducting assessment of those outcomes in a process of continuous improvement.

Standard II.B. Student Support Services

Findings and Evidence

The college enrolls a diverse population of 19,671 students. The demographics and information section of the self study provides general enrollment data, the latest being fall 2009, indicating that the college experienced a 3.9% (841 students) decline from the previous year. This was the first percentage decline in five years and was attributed to state imposed enrollment caps for community colleges. The college is located on two sites, the East and West Campuses, with 55% of the student population taking classes on East Campus only, 17% on West only, and 28% attending classes on both campuses. (II.B.)

Two changes in student demographic patterns were noted in fall 2009. First, a 16.5% increase in enrollment of first time students occurred, which was offset by a 17.6% decline in returning students. Second, there is an increased trend for students to select the educational goal “to transfer with an AA/AS degree” (61% of students), while declines were evident in other educational goal choices. Data on special population students and distance learning students is not displayed in the self study. Through its Extended Opportunity Programs and Services and TRIO pre-college programs, the college actively serves local high schools and communities with programs promoting access to college. The impact of the loss of the college’s Welcome Center due to recent budget cuts has not been assessed to date. (II.B.)

Fall 2009 course success rates are at 63.5% while the number of annual degrees and certificates awarded in 2008-09 was 1485. This represents a decrease from the previous year, mostly due to a drop in the number of certificates awarded. A decline in the transfer to universities was noted in 2007-08, and follow up data was not available which would provide evidence of strengths and weaknesses within the transfer counseling program. Data is presented for the entire student population but is not disaggregated, and the opportunity for analysis of the learning needs and/or effectiveness of the student support program for high risk populations was not evident. (II.B.) The self study is incomplete in this area.

Student support services do not appear to reflect what is going on nationally in terms of increased partnerships with instructional services as is promoted through the college’s mission statement. The student services unit, through coordination with the Office of Research and Planning, has mechanisms to develop online student surveys and point of service surveys that assess program satisfaction as well as assessment of their best practice services in their own areas.

Budget cuts have resulted in longer wait times for access to counseling services and the need for improvements in tutorial services, two areas noted by the survey as needing immediate attention. The general opinion of the campus staff based on the survey was that 70% agreed with the quality of student support services. Program review reports from the 2008 cycle demonstrate the degree to which the unit is meeting service area outcomes but resource allocation requests are not clearly tied to improvements in student learning and program effectiveness. (II.B.1.)

Growth in online class offerings has resulted in increased access to online student services which can be found at <http://www.mjc.edu/current/resources/student-services/onlineservices/index.html> to meet the sustained growth in students taking part of their class load online. (II.B.1.)

The college catalog, under the oversight of the Catalog Work Group, is printed annually in February and made available to students at various campus locations, and is also available on the college website <http://www.mjc.edu/current/quickreferences/catalog-and-schedule.html>. Both the class schedule and catalog clearly designate the campus location where the classes are taught and where services are available. The mission, philosophy, and values are found in print and on the website. Student policies, academic regulations, transfer credits, and other required elements are available online and in print. Grievance procedures are available in print and are expected to be online soon. A comprehensive student handbook that contains directories and lists of services, policies, and support services is available in print and online. It is well organized, utilizing a navigation theme which steers students toward success. Although some academic programs have included expected student learning outcomes in their catalog descriptions, statements on student learning outcomes are generally missing from the other printed materials provided to students. (II.B.2.a, II.B.2.b, II.B.3.c, II.B.2.d.)

The team confirmed that the college tracks student complaints and grievances. (II.B.2.a, II.B.2.b, II.B.2.c, II.B.2.d.)

The college's commitment to providing access to all student services is a work in progress, and it does not appear that the new East Campus student services building expected to open in November will serve as a one stop shop. Current plans are that it will house services including counseling, Veterans, EOP&S, Admission, and DSPS. Financial aid and assessment will remain on the West Campus. The campus life office is located on East Campus only. Free shuttle transportation between campuses is available for students to access services singly located at one campus. (II.B.3.a.)

The college implements the CCSSE and staff have attended workshops on how results can be used to improve engagement in key student learning support measures. Analysis of the spring 2009 CCSSE data on tutoring, combined with ARCC data showing a 57.7% course completion rate for basic skills classes, was cited in the self study as forming a partial basis for the plan to consolidate writing, math and tutoring labs into an integrated skills center to be funded by Measure E. Follow up by the 2013 CCSSE data will be analyzed to assess improvements after the completion of the renovation project. (II.B.3.a.)

The college displays a commitment to providing an environment in support of student engagement and learning through the Student Life program although the team noted the 2011 budget cuts eliminated the Student Life Director position. The college demonstrates its commitment to enhance diversity through its emphasis on its 29 student clubs, direction by the Associated Students of MJC of extracurricular activities, and support of the Civic Engagement Project. Counseling programs such as EOP&S and the TRIO pre-college programs serve the diverse community population with activities embedded into their project goals and are annually assessed through required project reports. A recently awarded Title V grant is an exemplary program providing a first year experience program which integrates instructional and student services components such as supplemental instruction, peer mentoring, civic engagement, linked courses, and summer success academies. The assessment and tracking of the student success of this cohort will be captured in the program review. (II.B.3.b, II.B.3.c, II.B.3.d.)

Validation of placement scores is conducted on a five year cycle to coincide with course review through the curriculum process. The Director of Institutional Research works effectively with faculty to ensure the process. The college utilizes approved assessment instruments which are extensively tested to assure that the instrument is without test bias. (II.B.3.e.)

The college is able to provide secure access for admission and records files given the two campus locations, and current plans indicate that a centralized storage space will be established once the new student services building on the East Campus is opened. Data is currently stored in file cabinets, a Matrix electronic filing system, and electronic databases maintained through security access levels based on employee classification levels determined by a dean. An offsite system also provides for security against loss of records and is backed up on a regular basis. (II.B.3.f.)

All student services units conducted their program reviews during the 2007-08 academic year based on a process determined by a faculty, staff, and administrative task force. Data was collected from a 2008 survey that examined areas of student need as identified by a previously administered CCSSE survey in 2006. Seven service area outcomes were identified as the base of each unit's program review and data supported they currently achieved better than a 75% approval rating on its programs and services. The team noted student learning outcomes are not currently established or assessed despite having a process that supports their development. (II.B.4.)

Standard II.B. Student Support Services

Conclusions

The college partially meets the standard. The college offers a range of support services programs that retain and engage students through their college experience. There appears to be increased use of survey results, although it is strongly recommended for longitudinal tracking of student success rates for cohorts to be part of counseling program reviews. The college's use of nationally benchmarked surveys such as CCSSE will increase the availability of data for analysis and planning. (II.B.)

The college desires to address the issues of consistency of services regardless of location and delivery. The completion of the construction and renovation projects on both campuses will provide more efficient access to services as well as result in improved opportunities for faculty and staff communication within the various departments in student services. It is recommended the unit do the necessary planning to provide adequate counseling and financial aid support on both campuses as a means to increase student educational planning resulting in increases in college completion for its students.

The team strongly suggests the college revisit the elimination of the Office of Student Success and the Director of Marketing positions. These actions could have long lasting negative effects on the college. It was not evident from the self study that the college has an adequate plan to measure the impact of the loss of leadership in these two areas, nor is it clear how the college will manage and continue to improve the areas formerly handled by those positions.

II.C. Library and Learning Support Services

Standard II.C. Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations

The college library evaluates its services through the review of student learning outcomes, student and faculty surveys, annual data surveys to the state, library website and database usage and the use of circulating materials, and the college wide climate survey. Student learning outcomes and evaluations are used for research methods classes, and faculty and students provide informal feedback. Focus groups have been used for specific projects such as library renovations. Statistical data are used to track patterns that result in budget requests including equipment, collection development, database purchases, website design, and other resources. The library regularly completes a program review, which describes and evaluates the library as it contributes to the college mission. (II.C.2.)

Standard II.C. Library and Learning Support Services

Findings and Evidence

The college has two libraries, one on the East Campus and one on the West Campus. The size of the collection at each library is not clear from the report. Upon investigation by the team, it appears that the total collection consists of approximately 52,000 print books, 20,000 eBooks, 201 print periodical subscriptions, over 3,000 textbooks and videos in the reserve collection, and 10,000 full text periodicals via 47 subscription databases. Round-the-clock access to electronic materials is available through the library's website. Databases can be accessed from off-campus using a college ID number and DOB. East Campus is the primary library with the most services, while the West Campus library, which opened in 2002, has a smaller collection, fewer hours of operation with minimal staffing. (II.C, II.C.1, II.C.1.a, II.C.1.c.)

The East Campus library maintains 75 computers, including two disability stations, plus scanners and printers in two labs. The *MJC Catalog 2011-2012* is available on four workstations near the reference desk and four laptops in the stacks. West Campus library has 39 computers, laser printers and a scanner, plus one disability station. Wireless Internet access plus VHS and DVD players are available at both campuses and East Campus has a microfiche viewer. (II.C.1.a.)

Library technical support is provided by the Media and Technology Services Department. Technology maintenance is managed with Track-It! and phone support is available via a support desk, although it is not clear which campus houses the support desk. IPVCR provides video conferencing with internet access. MJC has a four-year computer replacement cycle.

Information competency includes assisting faculty by providing 50 to 80 library use sessions for students, although it is unclear how many of these are tied to specific course assignments or course outcomes. Due to budget reductions, the library has cut its library research courses to 45% of its pre-2011 load. This loss has been augmented by internet tutorials. (II.C.1.a, II.C.1.b.)

The West Campus library is closed nights and weekends with a librarian present up to 16 hours per week. It is not clear if the loss applies solely to the East Campus but the library has lost 1.6

classified positions and one librarian not replaced due to budget reductions, causing the library to reduce its hours of operation. (II.C.1.c)

Effective maintenance is provided by the college janitorial services, and the libraries are locked and alarmed when closed and routinely checked by campus security officers. Antivirus software and workstation protection programs are utilized (II.C.1.d).

The college library is a member of the Online Computer Library Center, Inc. and contracts for interlibrary loan services, allowing for access to materials not housed at MJC. SirsiDynix Corp. provides maintenance of the Integrated Library System. The online electronic resources are mostly purchased via the Community College Library Consortium cooperative, which offers substantial discounts to members. (II.C.1.e.)

Standard II.C. Library and Learning Support Services

Conclusions

The college partially meets the standard. The West Campus library has closed and all of the books and periodicals have been removed. Plans are to refurbish this space and return to it the resources that will support the programs offered at West Campus including CTE and GE/transfer programs. The library space will also house a learning resource center. The college received a STEM grant that will be used to refurbish this space.

There is no evidence of a staffing plan for this facility, which will require a line of sight, discipline-specific learning resource specialist and a librarian at all times that the facility is open.

At this point, library resources are only available at the East Campus. Plans for reopening the West Campus library will include a minimal collection. The library collection will not be optimally distributed to reflect the 60/40 split of students between the two campuses.

As a result of the budget reductions from 2010/2011, the college cut one full time librarian and all of its part time librarians, equivalent to one full time position. It has also cut its catalog librarian and these services are no longer available, leaving the library without enough certificated library faculty.

Standard II. Student Learning Programs and Services

Recommendations

Modesto Junior College Recommendation 1

In order to fully meet the standards for mission and effectiveness, the team recommends the college analyze community demographic and student enrollment data to more descriptively define the intended student population and emphasize their commitment to student learning in the mission statement. The team further recommends that course and program planning be explicitly linked to the defined population so the college is able to clearly assess its success in institutional planning, decision making, and meeting student needs as related to its mission. (Standards I.A, I.A.1, I.A.4; II.B.3; ER2.)

Modesto Junior College Recommendation 2

The team recommends the college attain the level of proficiency according to the ACCJC Rubric for Student Learning Outcomes by 2012. The college must ensure that faculty members differentiate between course learning outcomes and course objectives. It must also establish clear standards for assessing course learning outcomes that will inform course-level curricular and pedagogical improvement. In addition, the college must complete its development of outcomes at the program and institutional levels. The college must demonstrate that it assesses the outcomes and uses them in college decision making processes to improve institutional effectiveness. The college must create venues to maintain an ongoing, collegial, self reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes. Student Services must develop and implement student learning outcomes, establish systems of assessment to make improvements in the delivery of its programs and services, and communicate to students these learning outcomes. (Standards I.B.1, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6; II.A.2.i, II.B.4; ER10.)

Modesto Junior College Recommendation 3

The team recommends the college resolve the issues of inadequate library staffing and support services on both campuses. (Standards II.C, II.C.1, II.C.1.a, II.C.1.b, II.C.1.c, II.C.2; ER14, ER16.)

Modesto Junior College Recommendation 4

The team recommends the college facilities, hours of operation, and staffing be evaluated and modified to assure equitable student access for both campuses (Standards II.C, II.C.1, II.C.1.a, II.C.1.b, II.C.1.c, II.C.2; ER14.) Note: This recommendation was also given to the college by the two previous accreditation teams.

Modesto Junior College Recommendation 5

In order to fully meet the standard, the team recommends the college strengthen and clarify the linkages and complete the cycle within the planning and budget process to ensure institutional effectiveness; engage in consistent systematic evaluation of the process; and codify, publish and adhere to the process. In addition, the college must integrate student learning outcome assessment results into the planning and budget process and strengthen the integration of technology planning with integrated planning and resource allocations. (Standards I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7; II.A, II.B; III.C.2, III.D.1; ER10.)

Modesto Junior College Recommendation 7

In order to meet the standard, the team recommends the college develop and implement a distance education plan as identified in the Substantive Change Report, 2010. (Standards II.A.1, II.A.1.b, II.A.2.d.)

STANDARD III

Resources

III.A. Human Resources

Standard III.A. Human Resources

General Observations

The college and district have developed a systematic and well organized human resources policy in response to Recommendation 5 from the 2005 accreditation visit. The self study cites and documents policies outlining ethical treatment, systematic evaluations, and diverse hiring efforts. By design, human resources planning is integrated with institutional planning and incorporates input from all personnel constituencies. The college provides many opportunities for professional development at all levels and has implemented an evaluation process to analyze and improve effectiveness. Although the policies are documented, the self study does not provide widespread evidence of the plan in practice.

Standard III.A. Human Resources

Findings and Evidence

The college follows district human resources guidelines on hiring qualifications and process. Full time and part time faculty hiring requirements follow the Minimum Qualifications (MQs) set by the state Academic Senate, with an Equivalency Policy developed by the Academic Senate and approved by the Board of Trustees for those not meeting initial MQs. Constituents are involved in the hiring process, both faculty and classified employees are included when a potential new position is routed for approval. For example, when hiring faculty, two faculty from the disciplines and one faculty from the division must serve on the hiring committee; this committee then contributes skill preferences to the announcement, and presumably, links the criteria to the college mission, although there was no evidence of this link in practice. Requirements for classified personnel are based upon “specific, job-related skills and duties prior to advertisement” and are updated regularly as required by Board Policy 4204. The qualifications of managers, however, are not addressed or documented in the self study or on the district Human Resources (HR) website. Appropriate documentation is provided for all policies except for those of managers. The Planning and Budget Committee is primarily responsible for organizing and determining hiring priority of both faculty and classified, using quantitative and qualitative data that ties hiring priority to program review and other data from a variety of sources and constituencies. Minutes from committee meetings provide evidence that the committee reviews the process and recommends improvements for the coming year. (III.A, III.A.1, III.A.1.a, III.A.6.)

The district HR website provides salary schedules, evaluation forms, and California Ed Code information for all constituent employee levels, and policies are based on the Community College League of California’s Policy and Procedures Service, a legally reviewed subscription service. Similarly, the district HR office ensures confidentiality through a thorough documented policy that adheres to Ed Code 87031. To ensure that the hiring process follows policy guidelines, the district HR office oversees the general process by approving the job announcement, the screening committee membership, the screening forms, the interview questions, the interview rating form, and the applicant selection. In conjunction with the

Academic Senate, the HR office reviews applications to ensure that the applicant meets required qualifications. Those applicants with degrees from non U.S. institutions must submit their transcripts to an outside agency for analysis and verification. According to team interviews, all documents generated from the hiring process are submitted and stored at the district HR office. The committee chair and/or committee members do the reference checks. (III.A, III.A.1, III.A.1.a, III.3.a, III.3.b.)

Faculty and classified negotiated contracts define the timing and content of their evaluations. Employee evaluations are negotiated through their respective contracts and Board Policy 4020 refers to the fairness of evaluations, and all processes have a specified routing process that provides more than one evaluator, thus decreasing the likelihood of unfair or prejudicial treatment by an individual supervisor or evaluator. The office of the Vice President of Instruction tracks faculty evaluations on a spreadsheet, and then notifies the appropriate dean when a full time tenured faculty member is due for an evaluation. Faculty evaluation criteria were renegotiated effective 2008 and include peer observation, student evaluation, performance, respect for students, continued inquiry, and professional development. The new criteria also include a self evaluation form and faculty may include their personal assessment of their own progress in meeting SLOs in their courses. SLO progress is incorporated into criteria for evaluation for full- and part-time faculty by management and thus a part of personnel files, though there is a lack of explicit and robust evaluation criteria suggesting that SLO progress is not a major part of faculty evaluation. During the site visit, the team was unable to obtain verification from faculty evaluations or evaluation schedules, although requested, from the Office of the Vice President of Instruction. Respondents to the spring *Campus Climate Survey* shows almost 70% agreement that the college tries to assess the success of learning, and a similar percentage agreed that the college consciously tried to improve students learning, presumably based on assessment data. Although some campus interviews stated that evaluations can be compared to show performance improvement, there is no evidence that evaluation results are used to improve either individual performance or institutional effectiveness. Historically, part time evaluations are conducted through the divisions and in some areas have been inconsistent. The self study asserts that a new part time process was initiated in fall 2011, but no evidence is yet available to verify that the new progress is successful. (III.A.1.b, III.A.1.c, III.A.3.a.)

Managers are evaluated every three years, in a process started in fall 2008 in response to noted deficiencies in manager evaluations. According to a documented process, managers are evaluated in a three year cycle that includes confidential comments one year by selected associates then two annual evaluations by their immediate supervisor. Documentation of improvements resulting from evaluations was not provided. Classified evaluations also follow a cyclical pattern and are tracked by the office of Vice Chancellor of HR who sends a notice to managers within 90 days of evaluation due date. A schedule of evaluations is maintained but was not provided. (III.A.1.b.)

Ethical standards for personnel and students are well documented and available in relevant employee handbooks and, for students, the *MJC Catalog*. One of the *MJC 2008-2010 Strategic Plan* goals is for campus leadership to create a climate that empowers employee engagement and encourages respect, trust, and integrity. The college outlines policies for fair and equitable

treatment of personnel and students in the *Strategic Plan* and Board Policies 4000-Commitment to Diversity and 4017-Sexual Harassment. However, the *Campus Climate Survey* shows that almost 40% of employees do not agree that they are treated equitably. Campus interviews provided possible reasons for this, including a lack of respect for classified staff participation in decision making and hindrances to classified participation in development activities. Relevant committees have addressed some of these issues but it is not clear if a unified effort toward a consistent climate of respect is successful. Grievance procedures for employees are negotiated and student grievances are processed through the office of the Vice President of Student Services. (III.A.1.d, III.A.4.c.)

The college has been forced to reduce staffing due to budget constraints. In spite of limited staff, the college states that all student needs are met due to the college's increased efficiency, reaching a seat fill rate of 99.85%. Similarly, the college strives to reach the State FTO 75/25 ratio and did indeed reach its target goal of 65/35 in 2009. The college has estimated anticipated staffing expense for the new buildings completed under the Measure E bond; however, it is not clear that such needs will be adequately met due to budget constraints or adequate planning prioritizations. The self study provided one example of determining a hiring need based on an employee plus student increase — the process for identifying security officers. However, in campus interviews some constituents expressed concern that planning was not adequate to provide the essential staffing for the new buildings. (III.A.2, III.A.6.)

A district and college goal is to reflect the diversity of their target population in their staff, including, but not limited to, ethnicity. Through extensive labor market, Center of Excellence and other data the college has determined that the ethnic profile of the surrounding community population is changing but these changes are not yet reflected in the college staff in spite of multiple campus diversity activities. To increase applicant diversity, the college includes a *Beyond Tolerance* statement on college brochures, identifies itself as an EEO employee on classified job announcements, provides EEO training for all hiring committee participants, tries to balance hiring committees, and advertises in multicultural and diverse media. Human Resources tracks ethnicities and gender hiring, although women are hardly minorities in community college hiring, and compares percentages over past five years. Female hiring remains a majority of hires; ethnic minority hiring has risen steadily but slightly (from 19% in 2004-2005 to 23% in 2008-2009). It is not clear if the Ethnic Minority category is predominately Hispanic, the fastest growing service area ethnic group. (III.A.4.b.)

The college provides many opportunities for personnel professional development for all constituents, often including diversity activities: managers receive a professional education program (PEP), faculty can apply for sabbaticals, leaves of absence, banked leaves, and classified employees can apply for professional development activities. The district provides some fee reimbursement to classified employees for pursuing appropriate coursework, especially if it includes aspects of diversity. Other development opportunities include technology training, grant acquisition procedures and protocol, and mini grants for professional activities. The Title V grant provides funding for staff development and a new, multi-constituent Staff Resource Advisory Committee (SRAC) was formed that communicates development opportunities to the campus and is developing a plan for continued funding after the grants expire. Staff development activities are assessed to determine their effectiveness and

data are used to improve the process. For example, SRAC campus communications emails were a direct response to classified concern that they were not notified in time to participate in development activities. Staff response is reasonably positive; those responding to the spring 2010 *Campus Climate Survey* showed a 77% agreement that college promotes understanding and concern for diversity. (III.A.4.a, III.A.5.a, III.A.5.b.)

Standard III.A. Human Resources

Conclusions

The college does not fully meet the standard. The team recognizes college efforts in developing a clear, well-defined, and thorough HR policy that outlines criteria for qualified and diverse personnel, and protects their rights, in order to meet district and college mission goals. The college provides robust documentation for policies and procedures. However, the college needs to develop a documentation system to verify the regularity of employee evaluations and subsequent performance improvements as they impact student learning. The college deserves commendation for their efforts to increase opportunities for meaningful campus professional development and develop a centralized system that will continue when grant funding expires. These and other programs, as available to the surrounding community, also serve as outreach and enrichment to the benefit of the college and students. The college is encouraged to continue exploring ways in which to increase the diversity of applicants and also strengthen the perception of all levels of employees that they are respected, valuable contributors to the college community.

III.B. Physical Resources

Standard III.B. Physical Resources

General Observations

The college is located in Stanislaus County in the San Joaquin Valley. The college enrolls approximately 20,000 students. Established in 1921, Modesto Junior College has the distinction of having erected the first junior college building in California. It is one of two colleges in the Yosemite Community College District (district), with the other college being Columbia College.

Currently, the college maintains three sites: East and West Campuses and Beckwith Ranch. The East and West Campuses are 2.5 miles apart, and separated by State Highway 99. The East Campus is the original site of the college and is situated on 54 acres. The East Campus includes the Administration Building, the Art and Music facilities, the Science complex, the Student Center, the Library/Learning Resource Center, and the Physical Education and Athletic facilities, which comprise over a third of the campus. The West Campus is sited on 167 acres, and includes the Yosemite Community College District offices, Academic Halls, the Child Development Center, the Regional Fire Training Center, maintenance facilities, and the agricultural units and fields. The Beckwith Ranch property consists of 62 acres and is utilized for satellite agricultural purposes.

In 2004, the voters in the district approved a \$326 million general obligation bond, Measure E. The bond measure provides funding for the repair, renovation, and new construction for the facilities at both colleges in the district, as well as for the expansion of the district's educational

sites. Modesto Junior College received an allocation of \$220 million, about two thirds of the bond funds, and the remaining funds were split between Columbia College which received \$52 million and the district's Central Services which received \$53.5 million. To date, 6 out the 16 projects of the Modesto Junior College bond construction program have been completed. Another five projects are in the construction phase, while the remaining five projects are in various stages of planning.

Standard III.B. Physical Resources

Findings and Evidence

After passage of Measure E in 2004, the college commissioned **Educational Planning Associates** to prepare a new *Educational Master Plan (EMP)* to assist the college in planning for changes for its program and services over the next ten years. The *EMP* was created with the philosophy that the educational programs and services needed by the current and future students should drive the type, size, and location of the college's facilities. *Chapter 4: The Linkage between Educational and Facilities Master Plans* acknowledged the relationship and listed a comprehensive set of recommendations for facilities planning. Because State standards determine the extent to which colleges may qualify for capital and operational dollars, data for the facilities analysis was collected for Weekly Student Contact Hours (WSCH), Full Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF), and Assignable Square Feet (ASF). This data enabled the college to develop a comprehensive facilities plan by combining possible capital funding opportunities with Measure E building projects. In addition, there was a strategy recommended for the development of off campus sites. The *EMP* was accepted by the Board of Trustees on February 21, 2007. (III.B.)

The Campus Safety Department is responsible for all safety and security operations. Both campuses are patrolled 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. There is a central dispatch station which monitors security and fire calls, also on a 24/7 basis. Each year the Campus Safety Department publishes statistics on crime and fire in the *Annual Security Report*, which meets all the federal and state reporting requirements. The *Annual Security Report* is available on the campus safety website, and, in hard copy, at various locations on campus. The Campus Safety Department adheres to a community policing model and is well received and respected by the students and staff. (III.B.1.)

The Campus Safety Department is responsible for the college's emergency preparedness. In 2009, the college developed the *Comprehensive Emergency Operations Plan (CEOP)*. Evacuation drills and personal safety workshops are conducted each semester. There are crisis response boxes in strategic locations on both campuses. All college management personnel have completed the National Incident Management System (NIMS). The college participates in the AlertU system and emergency phones have been placed in all classrooms. The college is currently installing a public address system for use in an emergency. (III.B.1.)

The district Facilities/Operations has the responsibility for insuring the safety of campus buildings. Each year the district and the liability insurance provider conduct an inspection to identify safety concerns. Every two years, the liability insurance provider conducts a comprehensive risk management inspection. In the 2009 district wide biannual review, the college needed to update and improve its Chemical Hygiene Program, Confined Space Entry

Program, Hazardous Energy Program, Fire Prevention Plan, Slip Trip and Fall prevention, and Respiratory Protection Program (VIPJPA Biennial Inspection). The college does have acceptable programs for illness and injury prevention, ergonomics, athletics, security, emergency operations and many others. The college and liability insurance provider conduct numerous safety trainings for the staff throughout the year. (III.B.1.)

A *Space Inventory* is conducted annually by the Facilities Department to reveal where college departments and/or divisions may be overbuilt or underbuilt. This information also was beneficial in the development of the *Facilities Master Plan* to determine areas of need and improvement. The district regularly submits data to the State Chancellor's Office FUSION website. (III.B.1.)

All off site facilities which are used for instruction are leased. These facilities are inspected to insure that the same safety and security standards for regular college facilities are met. Maintenance of the offsite facilities is the responsibility of the property owner. (III.B.1.)

The planning documents that guide the building of a new facility or the renovating of an existing facility are the *Educational and Facilities Master Plans*. Both plans were the result of a highly collaborative and interactive process that began with user groups and committees guided by the planning and building consultants. The information that is provided by the individual project user group committees are forwarded to the college's Facilities/Capital Construction Advisory Committee, the President's Cabinet, and the YCCD Measure E Committee before accepted by the Board of Trustees. (III.B.1.a.)

Smaller facilities and equipment requests are articulated through the college's program review process in which each department reports its needs. These requests are forwarded to the college's Planning and Budget Committee for prioritization and recommendation to the president. (III.B.1.a.)

The district Facilities/Operations Department updates the *Facilities Assessment Report*, *Space Inventory Plan*, and *Scheduled Maintenance Report* on an annual basis. Routine maintenance is handled through a local work order system. (III.B.1.a.)

Both the college and the district have placed a high priority on ensuring a safe and healthful learning and working environment. There is Board Policy 4001-Safety, and in addition, *safety* was listed as one of the special Board of Trustees special priorities for 2010-11. According to the *2010 Modesto Junior College Climate Survey*, 70% of those surveyed "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that the facilities are constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, security, and a healthy learning and working environment. Also, the survey results showed that 50% of those surveyed believe that the "interiors of the classrooms, offices, and restrooms are adequately maintained." The district Facilities/Operations Department reports that, according to state standards, the district is 50% understaffed in the Operations Department. The college has made the understaffing issue a planning agenda item recognizing the exacerbation of the problem as more bond funded facilities come online. (III.B.1.b.)

All buildings are constructed in compliance with the Field Act of 1933 and to Division of the State Architect standards. The college has an Americans with Disabilities Act Committee to highlight accessibility issues. Due to its age, the East Campus had many accessibility compliance issues. With the passage of Measure E, the college has been able to address barriers to access and to plan for accessibility in its new buildings and renovations on both campuses. Although it is the responsibility of the property owner, the college has worked collaboratively with the property owners of leased facilities to ensure a safe, secure, and accessible site for students. (III.B.1.b.)

The college plans and evaluates its facilities and equipment on a regular basis. The program review process, the annual updates to the *Five Year Construction Plan*, *Space Inventory Report*, and the *Computer Replacement Plans* ensure that the facilities and equipment are evaluated on a regular basis. Equipment needs, both instructional and operational, are identified, prioritized, and funded through the college's planning and resource allocation processes. (III.B.2.)

Since the 2005 accreditation site visit, the college has made two significant changes in its long range planning. First, the college's program review process is now linked to the *EMP* and all the other of the college's planning processes. The second change is that the college has developed a *2008-13 Strategic Plan*, which connects the *Educational and Facilities Master Plans*. As a result, the college has long range capital plans that accurately reflect the needs of both instructional and student service departments, and, importantly, are effectively linked with its assessment of student learning. (III.B.2.a.)

The college is keenly aware of the total cost of ownership, and is currently in the process of formulating a multiyear funding plan that addresses the total cost of ownership for existing, renovated, and newly constructed facilities. Discussions are under way with the district to develop a funding plan as part of the overall total cost of ownership funding model for the district. The maintenance department has developed an operations plan which includes shift changes and "crew" cleaning to address the immediate needs for the cleaning of the new buildings. (III.B.2.a.)

The college has made significant progress in linking physical resource planning with the general institutional planning processes. In the program review process, physical resources are evaluated each cycle. Recommendations for improvement are forwarded through the campus planning and funding processes. The self study did not mention any other assessment tools or data for the evaluation of physical resources, although questions addressing facilities will be included on the annual climate survey. (III.B.2.b.)

Standard III.B. Physical Resources

Conclusions

The college meets the standard. The new *Facilities Master Plan* is well conceived and linked to the *Educational Master Plan*. The planning for *Facilities Master Plan* was interactive and collaborative and was driven by the current and future student needs of the college's programs and services. It enhances student learning and services by consolidating similar disciplines into adjacent buildings, by providing a central location for student services, and by developing both the East and West Campuses. Due to the recent leadership changes, the long range vision for the

two campuses has changed and there is some disparity as to each campus providing comprehensive services or each campus being unique and separate campuses of one college. The college will need to assess the effectiveness of the new facilities and to identify resources to maintain the new facilities.

III.C. Technology Resources

Standard III.C. Technology Resources

General Observations

In the summer of 2010, the president charged a Technology Task Force with gathering information about the state of campus technology. The *MJC Campus Climate Survey Spring 2010* of faculty, staff, and administration was conducted in order to determine how many people use technology and what kinds of technology people need. The Technology Task Force is striving to establish a culture in which minimum technology standards are identified and met, technological innovation is supported, and technology, overall, continues to be an integral part of the Program Review and budget allocation processes. Information Technology and Media Services conduct annual surveys of students, staff and faculty to assess and improve technology at the college. Technology initiatives are evaluated through Program Review. Measures used in the evaluation process include college satisfaction surveys, helpdesk query trends, and discussions in technology related committees such as the Instructional Technology Committee, the Datatel Steering Committee, and the College Council.

Standard III.C. Technology Resources

Findings and Evidence

The college provides technology resources to support student learning. Multiple state of the art computer labs provide students access to the web, online tutorials, library materials, and tutoring opportunities. A variety of technologies exist in classrooms across both campuses, providing instructors with opportunities to implement multiple teaching modalities and sample options for future “smart” classrooms. (III.C.1.a.)

Distance education instructors have access to upgraded technology resources such as BlackBoard 9.1, online-instructor training, and Distance Education support. The college supports its curricular commitments to distance learning programs through its contracts with Blackboard and Turnitin, and through providing continuous access to library information and materials. At this time, the college has the technology and does provide telecourses and web-based classes. According to members of the Distance Education Advisory Committee, the college offers a full 17% of its course offerings in the distance education modality. This includes any course that is delivered more than 50% via distance education. (III.C.1.a.)

Library services are available 24/7 through the college library website which gives students, faculty, and staff access to information resources and the library's electronic databases as well as the college's online catalog of the library's print, electronic, and audio visual collection. Library access is provided from on-campus without a log in system and from off-campus via a log in system. (III.C.1.a.)

As of September, 2011, instructional units have completed their first round of Program Review using PRnet, an online Program Review module of CurricUNET. PRnet replaces an older Program Review model that included a detached technology addendum. Now technology needs are integrated into the Program Review process and funneled to the appropriate constituency groups for consideration. There is a clear process for making requests for technology, for ranking the requests, and for vetting the requests in survey and assessment results. (III.C.1.c, III.C.2.)

The Campus Technology Survey, 2011, which was conducted by the Technology Task Force, provides evidence that the institution bases its technology decisions on the results of evaluation of program and service needs. Also, the Program Review process requires units to evaluate their program and service needs by identifying concerns or problems with technology and by presenting an action plan accompanied by a resource needs list. (III.C.2.)

Technology support occurs through the district's IT Department and college's Instructional Media and Information Technology Services. (III.C.1.b.)

The Distance Education Advisory Committee exists to coordinate the college's distance education policies, priorities, funding, resource allocation, planning, and implementation. It "serves as a single point of contact for communicating status of issues related distance education" at the college. It also represents college on all distance education task groups whether at the college or district. (III.C.1.d.)

The college and district IT provide technology training through regular staff development and flex activities. Technology Institutes are provided by district IT and address technology training needs across the district. A Title V grant awarded to the college in 2009 has allowed the college to assess educational technologies for implementation at the college. (III.C.1.b.)

The Distance Education Coordinator offers the Faculty Online Learning Academy several times each year. The Academy provides faculty with information on course design and pedagogy for teaching hybrid and online courses. It also offers information on using Blackboard and connecting to student support services. Over the course of eight years, more than 100 faculty have completed this training which is packaged as a hybrid course. In addition, the Instructional Resource Center exists to assist faculty in creating and maintaining their online and hybrid courses. The college supports faculty who teach distance education classes by maintaining a faculty Coordinator of Distance Education. This is a 100 percent faculty reassigned position dedicated to supporting faculty and staff in the use of Blackboard. (III.C.1.b.)

Students receive training through credit course work. Students interested in engaging in online learning take a self assessment for online readiness through the college's Online Services website. Students who are enrolled in hybrid or online classes or who are learning to use Blackboard may seek help via the Online Help Desk provided by the Distance Education office. This service provides answers to basic questions about how to use the Blackboard system, for example, and is open 53.5 hours/week the first two weeks of the semester and 40 hours/week thereafter for the remainder of the semester. (III.C.1.b.)

The management, maintenance, and operation of technological infrastructure and equipment are guided by the district IT Departments' *Information Technology Strategic Plan 2008* and the college's *Technology Plan* in its most current iteration. The district provides oversight for the enrollment management system Datatel. It also licenses and hosts the Blackboard Learning Management System. The 2004 Measure E bond funds support the short term and long range infrastructure goals for the district and the college. For example, the bond has funded a learning resource center that will be housed in the remodeled East Campus library. In addition, a 2009 Title V grant has enabled the college to evaluate and implement new educational technologies. (III.C.1.c, III.C.1.d.)

Disaster recovery mechanisms are in place to protect information during short term power outages. The district has developed an *Information Technology Disaster Recovery Plan* that serves as a unifying umbrella plan for protecting local and district information technologies. (III.C.1.d.)

Members of the Distance Education Advisory Committee have expressed concern about ongoing technology support as there is no line item currently in place for technology replacement, nor is there a plan for supporting existing and future technology staffing needs as new buildings come online. Furthermore, while mentioned in the self study (p.349) as something under construction, no *Distance Education Plan 2011-12* has been created. (III.C.1.c.)

While having made some strides in the use of technology resources to improve institutional effectiveness, the college has not yet fully integrated technology into its strategic planning and decision making processes as stated in the self study, nor has the institution fully integrated technology planning with institutional planning. (III.C.2.)

Faculty report because of the recent due date for Program Review, September 2011, the process has not yet been assessed. They also report the college is working through technology glitches associated with moving to the new online system. (III.C.1.d.)

While a culture of awareness exists about the importance of planning and assessing needs, the college has also recognized the lack of a sustainable planning and replacement cycle for current and future technology. The *Fall 2011 MJC Technology Plan* intends to address the issue of sustainability and appears to have representation from a number of constituencies. The plan has been developed “to address the significant gaps that exist between technology needs and technology funding,” “create an atmosphere of technology innovation,” and “establish minimum standards for instructional and non-instructional technology in order to assure that newly constructed and renovated buildings are fully capable of deploying currently used technologies as well as being capable of adapting to future needs” (p.3). (III.C.1.d.)

Faculty and staff appear to have access to multiple types of technology training, an onsite Distance Education Coordinator, and an Instructional Resource Center. Yet the concern remains that such training is “sporadic” and “fragmented” as noted in the *2011 MJC Technology Plan, Goal 1*. The development of an effective needs assessment may be the first step towards developing a coordinated approach to this training. (III.C.1.b.)

There has been a long standing lease agreement with Dell computers which is being phased out in favor of a less expensive direct purchase approach. There are between 400-500 computers that are unable to run up-to-date systems and, therefore, are becoming obsolete. The college has a Deployment Plan in place that has led to a massive memory upgrade for up to 1,000 computers. The upgrading, updating, and/or replacing of outdated computers appears to be of imminent concern. However, funds from the 2009 Title V grant and Measure E bond have been earmarked for providing adequate infrastructure and necessary upgrades. Still, financial constraints have kept the college from instituting a Virtual Desktop Infrastructure. To streamline access to the various campus technology systems used by faculty, staff, and students, the college needs to develop a single sign-on or campus portal. (III.C.1.c.)

Standard III.C. Technology Resources

Conclusions

The college meets the standard. Despite expressed concerns over not fully integrating technology planning with institutional planning, the college continues to work towards integrating and streamlining processes for ensuring that technology decisions emanate from institutional needs and plans for improvement. The college has given sufficient consideration to the equipment selected for distance education, and the Program Review and ranking procedures for technology/equipment requests ensure that technology is distributed equitably. Before new and remodeled facilities funded through Measure E are completed, staffing assessments need to be conducted and a process for upgrading and/or replacing aging technology needs to be institutionalized.

The college is to be commended for the work of the Technology Committee for creating opportunities for coordinated and centralized dialogue between the instructional and administrative units.

III.D. Financial Resources

Standard III.D. Financial Resources

General Observations

At the time of the team visit, the team found that the district manages its financial resources very prudently and efficiently. For the fiscal year 2010-11, the district had a beginning balance of \$18.6 million. At the end of the year, the district added over \$4.7 million to the fund balance for a total \$23.4 million. The budget savings were accomplished mainly through a hiring freeze and planned deficit reductions. The large fund balance helps to offset the \$6.7 million loss in revenues and the \$2.5 million increase in expenditures for 2011-12.

Modesto Junior College earns over 85% of the apportionment revenue for the district, but is allocated only 55% of the budget. For 2011-12, Modesto Junior College has been budgeted \$2.4 million less than previous year's budget, while both Columbia College and the district Central Services budgets remain the same. Historically, the percentages of the unrestricted budget have been 58% for Modesto Junior College, 15% for Columbia College, and 27% for the district Central Services. For 2011-12, Modesto Junior College has lost 3%, with Columbia College gaining 0.5%, and the district Central Services gaining 2.5%. The 2011-12 budget for Modesto Junior College is \$48.3 million dollars.

The district has set an FTES target of 16,391. Modesto Junior College is expected to earn 14,119 FTES including 179 FTES, the district's entire over CAP amount. This year's state funded FTES level of 16,212 FTES represents a 6.15% reduction and is below the district's state funded level in 2005-6.

For 2011-12, the district has increased its designated reserve from 5% to 7.5% for a total of \$8.6 million. It has budgeted an additional \$1.2 million for possible midyear cuts and \$2 million for accrued vacation liability. The projected General Fund ending balance for 2011-12 is \$18.9 million.

Although primary responsibility of the budget development remains with the district's Fiscal Services Department and the District Council, the college plays an important role of ensuring that the budget allocations are directly linked to the institutional planning process and that the financial resources are spent on agreed goals and priorities. The college is also tasked with monitoring expenditures.

Standard III.D. Financial Resources

Findings and Evidence

The Yosemite Community College District *Mission/Strategic Plan 2007-2015* and the Modesto Junior College *Mission/Strategic Plan 2008-2013* (III.D.2.) serve as the central documents for planning and budgeting. The college's mission statement, vision, core values, and strategic goals were reaffirmed in 2010. (III.D.1, III.D.2.)

The program review process begins the planning and resource allocation process. The program review process and documentation were revised in 2009 by the AIE Committee. The needs identified through the process are sent to the three councils: the Instructional Administrative Council, the Student Services Council, and the newly created Administrative Council. Recently, the Technology Council was added to the group. Each council includes members representing all campus employee groups. It is the task of the councils to prioritize staffing and/or equipment needs, based on criteria linked to the college's mission and strategic plan, and submit the prioritized list to the Planning and Budget Committee by October 30th of each year. The Planning and Budget Committee reviews the lists and holds a public hearing before forwarding the lists to the president by November 20th of each year. Upon completion of his/her review, the president informs the Planning and Budget Committee of the final allocation decisions for the college in writing. The president will also include an explanation for any allocation decisions not in congruence with the prioritized recommendations from the Planning and Budget Committee. (III.D.1, III.D.2.)

The Modesto Junior College Technology Plan 2007 is a comprehensive and well written document which listed many recommendations with resource allocation implications. The technology plan should be reviewed, assessed, and updated in light of the advances in technology, the expansion of distance education, the new Facilities Master Plan, the progress of Measure E construction projects, and the current budget situation of the California community college system. (III.D.1, III.D.2.)

There has been an increased effort by the district and the college to inform the campus community of how colleges are funded, the budget calendar, and the financial conditions of the state, district and college through meetings and information on line. All members of the Planning and Budget Committee are well informed and have a realistic assessment of the financial resources available. In addition, budget and expenditure information is available to all staff of the college on the Fiscal Services website. Each manager has access to run budget reports from the Datatel system. The college Vice President of College and Administrative Services also provides monthly fiscal reports to the president's cabinet. (III.D.1.b.)

Salary and benefits costs comprise 97% of the college budget. The remaining 3% is developed through a zero based budgeting process. With so little flexibility and with the small probability for significant new money from the state over the next several years, the college has begun discussion of the possibility of reallocating current base budgets. The reallocation of base budgets would allow the college to effectively address the challenges that lie ahead by shifting monies from low priority needs to high priority institutional needs. This would be a significant departure from the incremental approach that has characterized budget decision making at the college. (III.D.1.b.)

The district made its first contribution to funding its other post employment benefits (OPEB) liabilities in 1998. Since that time, the account has grown to \$17.2 million, which represents over 45% of its total projected liability of \$36.4 million. The district makes a yearly contribution and anticipates that the full liability will be funded in 2028. An actuarial study is conducted every two years. (III.D.1.c.)

The district has established an account in the restricted general fund for faculty banking. To date the account has a 9.8% reserve. The district has not and does not plan to borrow against the faculty banking account. (III.D.1.c.)

The district maintains a minimum 5% reserve in the general fund as directed by the Board of Trustees. For the 2011-12 fiscal year, the district has budgeted a 7.5% reserve. (III.D.1.c.)

At the end of the 2010 fiscal year, the district had a \$3.5 million liability for vacation accrual. The district is finalizing a procedure to reduce accrued vacation liability over the next three years. The district has posted \$2 million for accrued vacation liability in the 2011-12 budget. (III.D.1.c.)

The district has clear guidelines and processes for its financial planning and budget processes, as described in Board Policy 3100-Fiscal Responsibility and Board Policy 3200-Budget Planning. (III.D.1.d.)

Board Policy 3100 states, "The overall management of the fiscal affairs of the District shall be the responsibility of the Chancellor. The general management of the budgeting and accounting program for the District shall be the responsibility of the Executive Vice Chancellor. The State Budget and Accounting Manual is the regulatory authority." (III.D.1.d.)

Board Policy 3200 states, “A budget calendar will serve as a guide for the Board and the administration so that the budget may be developed in an orderly manner. The college presidents will provide an opportunity for consultation with the classified and certificated employees in budget development.” (III.D.1.d.)

Since the last accreditation site visit, the college has become more transparent in its budget development and more inclusive in its resource allocation process. The college has made budget development and fiscal information available to all staff via the web, realigned its committee structure, and increased representation on the committees. (III.D.1.d.)

The district uses the Datatel integrated software application to manage its financial resources. The system allows for online budget inquiry and the creation of specialized reports. Managers and support staff have access to financial information on the Datatel system to assist in making sound financial decision. As reported in the annual audits, there are no internal control issues. Financial information is available to the entire district on the district’s Fiscal Service’s webpage via an intranet connection. (III.D.2.)

The district is timely and current with all its state fiscal reporting. The tentative budget, adopted budget, CCSF-311Q, CCSF-320 are all submitted to and approved by the Board of Trustees with sufficient time for transmittal to the State Chancellor’s Office. In addition, the district is in full compliance with state laws and regulations regarding the Fifty Percent Law, Gann limit, apportionment for instructional services agreements, the state general apportionment system, use of categorical funds, enrollment fee reporting, residency determination, and concurrent enrollment. (III.D.2.a.)

In accordance with OMB Circular A-133, the district undergoes an annual audit by an external auditing firm, Matson and Isom. For the past three years, the district has received an unqualified opinion on its financial statements. During the past three years, the district has had three findings: 1) the overstating of 1.87 FTES, 2) late filing of Return to Title IV monies, and 3) an unclear policy on requiring students to provide various types of instructional materials. The district implemented corrective action plans within a year for each of the findings. The annual audit includes the Modesto Junior College Foundation, the Great Valley Museum Foundation, Auxiliary Services, and a performance audit on Measure E funds. The annual audit is reviewed by the Board of Trustees and is posted on the Fiscal Services website. (III.D.2.a.)

Information on the district budget, allocation formula, annual audits, quarterly reports, and more are found on the Fiscal Services website. Information for the college’s planning and budget process is located on the president’s web page. For state budget information, there are links on the College Administrative Services web page. Agenda and minutes of the Planning and Budget Committee are also posted online. (III.D.2.b.)

The district tracks cash flow on a weekly basis in all funds. Monthly deposits and expenditures are recorded, summarized, and reconciled to the district’s cash funds held with the Stanislaus County Treasury and in district bank accounts. Most of the district’s cash is deposited with the County of Stanislaus. The district staff and the county staff meet annually to discuss cash flow

issues. Including the general obligation bonds, as of June 30, 2010, the district had on deposit with the Stanislaus County Treasury approximately \$270,000,000. (III.D.2.c.)

The district is well positioned to issue short term debt should it become necessary to do so. However, even with the increased amount of state deferrals, it is not likely that district will experience cash flow shortages. (III.D.2.c.)

The district is a member of the Valley Insurance Program Joint Powers Agency (VIPJPA), which has recently affiliated with ASCIP. The VIPJPA is a pooled approach to insurance coverage. The VIPJP is well capitalized with over \$10 million in net assets. In addition, the VIPJPA purchases excess insurance for catastrophic events coverage. (III.D.2.c.)

Both the district and the college practice effective oversight of their finances. There are well established procedures that require specific approvals for expenditures and transfers. The College Administrative Services Office must approve all budget transfers, expenditures, payroll claims, and travel claims. The executive vice chancellor reviews and signs all contracts. (III.D.2.d.)

There is a district Grants Office that oversees the project managers, fiscal reporting, and compliance. There is a Foundation Finance Committee that oversees foundation funds. The Citizen Bond Oversight Committee is fully appointed. The Financial Aid Director is responsible for all financial aid reporting and awards. The Business Services Office performs the accounting for auxiliary funds. Any internal control issues or findings from the annual audits of the district, college, foundations, or the bond program are corrected in a timely manner. (III.D.2.d.)

There are investment policies for the foundation funds. (Board Policy 3320) (III.D.2.d.) There are established procedures to review grant applications, fund-raising efforts, and auxiliary services. The district has fiscal oversight and monitors the Bookstore, food services programs, and the Business Office. There is a district Grants Office that oversees all grants for compliance. The College Administrative Services Office oversees fundraising activities on campus, and monitors the budgets of the categorical programs. All financial resources are used with integrity and are consistent with the mission of the college. (III.D.2.e.)

The governing board of the district has policies in place that identifies the authorized signatories for official documents and contracts. Contracts initiated on the campus must be approved by the college president before being sent to the district for determination of risk exposure and liability by the risk management specialist. The executive vice chancellor conducts the final review and the official approval. Legal counsel reviews contracts on an as needed basis. (Board Policies 3340 and 7420; III.D.2.f.)

The annual audit ascertains the validity and reliability of the district's accounting information as well as providing an assessment of the district's internal controls. The Internal Auditor tests the district's procedures for compliance with district policies and regulations, and applicable codes and laws, such as Title 5. Payroll disbursements are audited on a regular basis. Findings and evaluations are used to improve the district's management systems. (III.D.2.g.)

The Planning and Budget Committee evaluates the use of fiscal resources through the program review process and makes recommendations for improvement. (III.D.3.)

The self study mentions that there are assessment processes in place but does not identify the processes. The self study also mentions that there is an analysis of productivity figures but does not describe the type of analysis or define the productivity figures. The college should develop a systematic assessment of the use of its financial resources and use the results of the assessment as a basis for improvement. (III.D.3.)

Standard III.D. Financial Resources

Conclusions

The college meets the standard. The district manages its financial resources very prudently. The district and the college have sufficient resources to support the student learning programs and services. The district and the college manage its financial affairs with integrity and with compliance to all laws and regulations. All reporting is done in a timely manner. To ensure financial stability, the district has increased the reserves to \$8.6 million and set aside \$1.2 million for midyear cuts; should the cuts be triggered. This should leave the district in a sound financial position for the next few years. Financial resource planning is transparent, collaborative, and integrated with the college mission. In order to implement the Technology Plan, the college must continue to make improvements in the integration of technology planning connected to resource allocations. Further, the college will need to develop metrics to assess the use of their financial resources.

The college and district are to be commended for the prudent management of fiscal resources.

Standard III. Resources

Recommendations

Yosemite Community College District Recommendation 1

In order to fully meet the standard and improve the effectiveness of its human resources, the team recommends the systematic evaluation of all personnel at stated intervals with appropriate documentation. (Standards III.A, III.A.1.a.)

Yosemite Community College District Recommendation 2

In order to fully meet the standard, the teams recommend that the district and the colleges review institutional missions and their array of course offerings and programs in light of their current budgets. (Standards III.D, III.D.1, ER17.)

Yosemite Community College District Recommendation 4

The team recommends the district develop policies that clearly define, and follow, the process for hiring and evaluating the college president. (Standards III.A, III.A.1, III.A.3; ER3, ER5.)

Modesto Junior College Recommendation 5

In order to fully meet the standard, the team recommends the college strengthen and clarify the linkages and complete the cycle within the planning and budget process to ensure institutional effectiveness; engage in consistent systematic evaluation of the process; and codify, publish and

adhere to the process. In addition, the college must integrate student learning outcome assessment results into the planning and budget process and strengthen the integration of technology planning with integrated planning and resource allocations. (Standards I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7; II.A, II.B; III.C.2, III.D.1; ER10.)

Modesto Junior College Recommendation 8

In order to meet the standard, the team recommends the college develop a consistent, transparent, and readily available tracking system that documents evaluations for faculty and tracks progress in order to verify performance improvement. (Standards III.A.1.a, III.A.1.b, III.A.5.a, III.A.6.)

STANDARD IV Leadership and Governance

IV.A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

Standard IV.A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations

According to the self study, the institution recognizes that ethical and effective leadership throughout the organization enables the institution to identify institutional values, set goals and achieve goals, learn and improve. (IV.A.1.)

The self study describes two board policies, the Planning and Budget Committee, and *The Introduction to Decision Making at Modest Junior College* document as evidence that it has established and implemented a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in the decision making processes. The *Introduction to Decision Making* document dated 2008 to 2010 is being revised and used to improve the understanding of the shared governance process. (IV.A.2.)

Section IV.A of the self study is silent on the issue of whether the staff knows where to find the mission and values statement. A climate survey indicates that the college community feels disconnected from the integrated planning process. (IV.A.1.)

The self study describes the shared governance committees, but it does not articulate whether staff can describe their own roles in helping the institution achieve its goals. The team noted that in the forums and in some interviews, the Classified Staff was silenced. It does mention that all areas of the institution are invited to participate in the assessment processes as they relate to their specific areas. The self study indicates that faculty, staff, and administrators have access to information that informs the college of its institutional effectiveness and SLOs through a variety of mediums: websites and newsletters, emails, and the intranet. Further, the evaluation of the institution's performance is made available to all staff. (IV.A.1.)

The self study indicates that institutional planning processes provide opportunity for appropriate staff participation and describes a committee structure and planning and budget process that allow individuals to bring forward ideas for institutional improvement.

Although the self study indicates the *Introduction to Decision-Making at Modesto Junior College* (2008-2010) articulates the responsibilities of individuals to develop ideas for improvements in their areas of responsibility, this was not evident in the document.

The self study describes several ways that individuals and groups at the institution use the governance process to enhance student learning. It describes the function of shared governance committees as determining the college's mission, vision, and goals. Planning and budget committees use assessment data to address the needs of the institution to support and enhance learning. The self study indicates that college committees are empowered to work to improve offerings and services to students. (IV.A.1.)

The self study identifies two Board Policies, BP6020 and BP4103, that delineate the official responsibilities and authority of the faculty and of academic administrators in curricular and other educational matters. In addition, the self study states that, "Through its governance structure, MJC relies primarily upon the recommendations from faculty on all student learning programs and services. The standing committees of the Academic Senate inform the campus community of curriculum, student learning outcomes, and assessment of student learning." The self study describes a source of contention between the Academic Senate and the administration originating with a failure to agree on program elimination. While Board Policy 6020 states that faculty will have appropriate involvement "in the development and review of all curricular offerings ...including modification or discontinuance." Prior to the elimination of instructional programs in the spring of 2011, the Academic Senate had in place a Program Viability Procedure that was determined to be inadequate to address the severe budget shortfall in a timely manner. The Academic Senate agreed to an MOU for determining program elimination. (IV.A.2.b.)

The self study describes written policies on governance procedures that specify appropriate roles for all staff and students and the academic roles of faculty in the areas of student educational programs and services. (IV.A.2.a.)

The self study documents the past accreditation history of the institution, including its response to a commission sanction. (IV.A.4.)

The self study states that the college's communications of institutional qualities or effectiveness to the public are accurate. It does not address the college's track record with the Department of Education (DOE). It has submitted a Substantive Change proposal to comply with DOE regulations concerning Distance Education. (IV.A.4.)

According to the self study, the college uses a committee structure to evaluate the institution's governance and decision making processes and widely communicates the results to the campus community. The self study states that the college community engages in various evaluation efforts related to institutional planning and implementation efforts. It states that it evaluates the program review and integrated planning process annually. (IV.A.5.)

Standard IV.A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

Findings and Evidence

The self study indicates there is tension among classified staff, administrators, and the Academic Senate over roles in the decision making processes. The basis of the confusion seems to be the result of a conflict between the *Introduction to Decision-Making at Modesto Junior College* document and the Academic Senate rules, which are included in the same document. The college has a plan to resolve the discrepancy by using the document revision process as an opportunity to discuss roles and responsibilities and come to consensus. (IV.A.2.)

The MOU process for program elimination and reduction implemented spring 2011 did not list any criteria to determine which programs would be reduced or cut. The MOU did not mention the use of program review data or the integrated planning and budget process and/or other data used to make reductions and eliminations. (IV.A.2.b.)

The conflict between administrators and faculty described in the self study demonstrates several themes in the study.

1. Data collection and its use in making resource allocation decisions are at times vague.
2. Program Review linkages to the planning process and budget process are vague.
3. The integration of learning outcome data into the planning and resource allocation process is vague.
4. The declaration in the self study that the college is transitioning into a culture of evidence demonstrates that the college is still learning how to use outcome data in its institutional processes
5. The perceived lack of communication and exclusion from institutional decision making processes identified in the *Campus Climate Survey* is evident among classified staff and faculty.
6. The self study is vague about how often policies are reviewed and who reviews them. (IV.A.3.)

While the self study indicated that the college has policies that define the role of staff and students, the *Campus Climate Survey* indicated that some groups feel disconnected and underrepresented in the decision making processes at the college. The self study articulates in several areas that the college plans to address this by using the review of the *Introduction to Decision-Making at Modesto Junior College* document to dialogue about this issue. In spite of the confusion and tension between the Academic Senate, the self study describes some positive changes.

The results from the *Campus Climate Survey* indicate that staff at the college may not know essential information about institutional efforts to achieve goals and improve learning, even though the self study reports that all policy documents and meeting minutes are available on the campus intranet. The *Campus Climate Survey* and Focus Group Analysis indicate that there is a low awareness of the evaluation of the college's processes and decision making. (IV.A.5.)

Standard IV.A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

Conclusions

The college partially meets the standard. Although the institution recognizes that leadership enables the institution to set and achieve goals, confusion about the shared governance process contributes to a lack of understanding about institutional processes and decision making. (IV.A.1.)

While there is evidence throughout the self study that the shared governance committees represent all constituent groups, the self study and observations of the team from site interviews indicate that there has been erosion in the "environment for empowerment." The confusion about the Academic Senate's role in shared governance is cited as well as budget decisions made outside the process. Faculty and staff mentioned in interviews that participatory governance is problematic in light of the inconsistent application of processes and the intervention of leadership perceived as fiat.

IV.B. Board and Administrative Organization

Standard IV.B. Board and Administrative Organization

General Observations

The district has a seven member elected Board of Trustees. The YCCD Board Mission statement denotes its commitment to serving the needs of the diverse community through excellence in teaching, learning, and support programs. The board acts in a manner consistent with this mission statement and in accordance with the laws, regulations, board policy and accreditation standards. Site visit interviews noted the pride taken by the board members in their respective colleges, as well as the member's commitment to representing their communities. Board policies are consistently reviewed and vetted through the appropriate institutional bodies. The board has been participating in board workshops and trainings specific to their role within the governance structure. The board has approved a YCCD Strategic Plan and has been active in the oversight of the Measure E bond activities.

The chancellor of the district has accomplished a great deal in a short time. The chancellor delegates the management of the college to the college president. Recent lack of leadership in the college's president position has caused a great deal of college conflict and lack of trust. The current president is serving in an interim capacity. This interim president succeeds a recent resignation wherein the president stayed ten months. The president reports directly to the chancellor and is responsible for the overall operations of the college and is responsible for leading the college to achieve its mission.

The district Central Services provides many of the services to the college and these have been delineated through the *Function Map* found in the self study.

The college has had six college presidents since the last accreditation visit. Since 2006, of the six different presidents, three have been interim presidents, one has been acting president, and the last permanent hire left the college after ten months of employment. The college has experienced extreme duress due to the lack of presidential leadership over the last six years. Some duress has been caused by the transitory nature of different leadership styles and goals. Other duress has been caused by decision making conflicts that have arisen during institutional budget crisis. Inconsistent leadership has had a detrimental effect on college morale, college process and college constituent communication and culture building. With six different college presidents, there has been little opportunity for consistent primary responsibility for the quality of the institution. Nor has there been consistent leadership in effective planning, organizing, budgeting, and assessing institutional effectiveness. Turmoil has been a constant variable amongst most of the college constituency and although optimism has been noted by many in light of future plans and possibilities, continued concern over future leadership continues to promote wariness for action.

Clearly defined delegation of responsibilities for the president of the college appears to be lacking in board policy. Combined with the presidential turnover, this has resulted in well intentioned but sporadic and inconsistent planning.

Standard IV.B.1. Board and Administrative Organization

Findings and Evidence

Yosemite Community College District is made up of two colleges, Modesto Junior College and Columbia College, with a Central Services operation that serves Modesto Junior College. This is in the Delineation Chart found in the self study. (IV.B.1.) There are seven members of the Board of Trustees, each elected from a specific geographic region. Each serves a term of four years. (IV.B.1.) Evidence of recent redistricting mandates demonstrates the district's acknowledgment of the impact of the voter's right act compliance. The district process for redistricting is available to the public through a website. (IV.B.1.a.)

Evidence demonstrates that the board reviews its own policies on a consistent basis. Board policy and draft procedures are found on the district website. Each policy and procedure has a current revision date listed. Participation by appropriate constituency group, as noted in the self study. (IV.B.1.e.)

The YCCD Strategic Plan, 2007-2015 demonstrates the board's commitment to program quality, integrity of actions and effectiveness of student programs. The *District Strategic Plan* has integrated elements of the *MJC Strategic Plan* imbedded within it. (IV.B.1.i.) The Modesto Junior College *Strategic Plan Flowchart* noted within the *District Strategic Plan* does not reflect the practice of the college and is not followed consistently.

Board policy dictates the selection of the chancellor by the board however the policy allows for the exemption from usual district personnel selection procedures and practices. (IV.B.1.i.j.) Interview responses during the team visit demonstrate concern over the transitory nature of leadership in general at the college. Although the rationale for exemption is provided, the college and district need clear process delineation for all CEO hires, and review of policy is warranted given the history of leadership at the college. Selection of the college president is not noted in the descriptive summary for Standard IV.B.1.j. Neither does the evidence support a clear delegation of authority to the president. Board Policy 7430 states that the chancellor may delegate any powers and duties entrusted to him or her by the board, including the administration of colleges and centers. (IV.B.1.j.) There is no corresponding policy that clearly defines the delegation of authority to the president. The continued challenges faced by the revolving door of college presidents add to the lack of consistency of duties as leadership rotates in and out of the college. (IV.B.2.)

The Board Policy 7710 provides conflict of interest mandates that are submitted annually. YCCD Board Policy 7405, 7715 detail the Board Responsibilities and Code of Ethics respectively. (IV.B.1.c.) These include fiscal oversight, and legal matters. Strategic Goal 9 has also been developed as part of the fiscal oversight. Board size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures are noted in Board Policies 7010-Board Duties and Responsibilities and 7405-Board Structure and Policies and Procedures are published on the district website. Board member term of office is provided in Board Policy 7100. (IV.B.1.c,d.)

Board Development and new member orientation is documented through rotating attendance at Community College League of California Trustee Workshop and Legislative Conference, annual League conferences and American Association of Community Colleges National

Legislative Seminar. (IV.B.1.f.) Study sessions, retreats and workshops occur throughout the year. Accreditation training and information is disseminated to the board through workshops and study sessions facilitated by ACCJC. (IV.B.1.i.)

The board self-evaluates performance by the process noted in Policy 7745. This is an annual evaluation. What is not noted in the self study response is whether or not identified weaknesses noted in the self evaluation become part of the board goals in the following year or how the data is addressed. (IV.B.1.g.) The code of ethics is part of Board Policy 7715 along with Standards of Practice 7717. (I.B.1.h.)

Chancellor evaluation is codified in Board Policy and Procedure 7435 and is done on an annual basis. A 360 review is also implemented, although it is unclear in the self study how often this occurs. All results go to the board's closed session. (IV.B.1.j.) College updates are given through board reports as well as requests for information.

The self study states that even with the rotation of presidential leadership the college still provides effective oversight for staffing and organizational oversight. With an interim president it is difficult to find any notation of primary responsibility that leads to a consistent quality institution. Much of the workings of the college have been delegated to vice presidents or other administrative personnel. In student services, the last permanent hire left in December 2009. With an interim in place, the college has just hired its permanent replacement two weeks before the accreditation team site visit. The Vice President of College Administration is also a recent permanent hire beginning October 1, 2011. Before that, there was a one year interim. The Vice President of Instruction is the only upper management employee who has had consistent leadership status during the six years of self study creation and response. Although the administrative team has had time to be built up as of 2010/2011, budget reductions, and other institutional challenges have necessitated large delegation of institutional oversight to deans, directors and grant funded positions. (IV.B.2.a.)

The self study states that the president guides the institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment through key governance committees, the Office of College Research and Planning and through various evaluation efforts. The *Campus Climate Survey Analysis* states only 50.7% of classified staff members have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance. There is concern regarding the level of effective participation throughout the Institution. (IV.B.2.c.)

The number of presidents impaired the compliance to Standard Four direction for the president to guide the institutional improvement due to the changing vision and strategic direction brought in by each incoming president. Such continued change in direction was not conducive to the needs of consistent presidential guidance. (IV.B.2.b.)

The self study assures that the president is responsible for statutes, regulations, and governing board policies. With assistance from various institutional councils, executive cabinet leadership and district administrative council, the changing leadership appears to be able to assure this standard outcome. However, the policy noted in the *MJC Decision Making Document*, created

under the Dr. Rose presidency is no longer in place due to the expiration of the document. (IV.B.2.d.)

The self study notes conflicting evidence and response to the standard language centered around the president working and communicating effectively with the communities served by the institution. Much of the self study and many of the comments from team interviews support the president's successful role in the external community. However the college self evaluation does not recognize this as meeting the standard because the last permanent president did not work well within the internal community. (IV.B.2.e.) This response further demonstrates what has been previously noted in the General Observation section of Standard Four. The change in presidential leadership has created turmoil in several areas of Leadership and Governance.

The college has as guidance clearly delineated and communicated operational responsibilities and district versus college function charts of central services and a *Function Map*, which shows the distribution of responsibilities as they pertain to accreditation standards. When queried about how they viewed the delineation and flow of district to college/college to district communication and clarity of areas of functional responsibility, the Instructional Administrative Committee, approximately eight deans from instruction and student services were present during this interview, the deans all indicated these duties are well defined and a positive relationship overall exists between the district and college under the current chancellor and interim president's leadership. One dean indicated that past relations between the two entities in comparison the current executive level leadership is, "like night and day, now it's day." (IV.B.3.) Consistency for functions related to the college president's role needs documentation and communication with the college at large.

District services appear to be imbedded at the college, given the proximity of the district location to the college campuses. The effectiveness of HR services related to evaluation of personnel is one area the visiting team identified as not being effectively supportive of the college mission and function. Continued efforts with consistent utilization of the college *EMP* needs to occur to ensure effective mission and planning. This includes increased understanding and utilization of this document on the college campus as well as the integration of planning and services with the district. The college indicates there is a lack of oversight on the part of Educational Services due to the position being eliminated three years ago, resulting in reduced communication and functionality in the above noted areas. Interviews during the visit gave evidence of one particular breakdown in the area of evaluation of faculty, staff, administrators, the chancellor, and the Board of Trustees. (IV.B.3.b.)

The district manages its financial resources very prudently and efficiently. For the fiscal year 2010-11, the district had a beginning balance of \$18.6 million. At the end of the year, the district added over \$4.7 million to the fund balance for a total \$23.4 million. The budget savings were accomplished mainly through a hiring freeze and planned deficit reductions. The large fund balance helps to offset the \$6.7 million loss in revenues and the \$2.5 million increase in expenditures for 2011-12. (IV.B.3.d.)

The district office has primary responsibility for budget development and the budget allocation model. The Executive Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Services is responsible for the general

management of the budget, while the college president is responsible for the operation of the college budget. The district use the Datatel financial system for controlling expenditures, and for the past several years has had clean audits with no adverse findings. (IV.B.3.d.)

Even with the increased State apportionment deferrals, the district is in a strong cash position and it will not be necessary to issue temporary revenue anticipation notes (TRANS). For the 2011-12 fiscal year, the district has increased its reserve to 7.5%, up from 5%. The district has also budgeted \$1.2M in anticipation of the possible midyear cuts. The district is in a strong fiscal position for the next few years. (IV.B.3.d.)

The chancellor gives full authority to the college presidents to implement and administer the district policies. Each president is held accountable for this responsibility through an annual performance evaluation. (IV.B.3.e.)

Although the delegation of authority from the chancellor to the college presidents is the current practice, the Board Policy 7430 which addresses this issue is not definitive, and should be examined. (IV.B.3.e.)

The self study notes that full responsibility and authority is given to the president of the college to implement and administer district policy and the president is accountable for the operation of the colleges. This authority is given through the chancellor. Team interviews spoke to additional need for transparency of delegation of authority, documented oversight of that written delegation of authority and clearer communication regarding the evaluation of the president and opportunities for college feedback. (IV.B.3.e,f,g.) Although the self study notes increased chancellor engagement in college issues, the team interviews demonstrated positive response to the chancellor's oversight, especially with continued presidential turnover at the college. The self study indicates the college's Strategic Planning Committee met with the current chancellor in consultation with a professional facilitator who was hired to assist the college and district in designing plans to update the district's Vision 2010 to a revised document that will stretch to 2015. This collaborative work resulted in slight changes to the college's *Mission, Vision, and Core Values* and seems to have assisted in strengthening communication and functionality between college and district.

Evaluation of district services and committees was not readily available to the visiting team, although mention of 360 opportunities was provided in the descriptive summary for Standard Four. (IV.B.3.g.)

Standard IV.B. Board and Administrative Organization

Conclusions

The college partially meets the standard. The board and administrative organization have positive response from the college at large with the hire of the new chancellor. Strides in district oversight, planning and leadership have been well received by college constituents. In addition, the Board of Trustees is noted as an effective and consistent governing body that has ensured the success of the district as a whole.

The team visit validates the college concerns that revolve around the role and responsibilities of the college president, and the relationship of transitory leadership within the construct of effective guidance and leadership of mission, college operations, and consistency throughout the Standard mandates.

Evaluation of district services by constituents, along with district committee evaluation is one thread that needs to be reviewed by district leadership as part of the accountability to college mission, planning, hiring and role delineation.

The college is to be commended for its efforts to increase opportunities for meaningful campus professional development.

Standard IV. Leadership and Governance
Recommendations

Yosemite Community College District Recommendation 3

The team recommends the district and Board of Trustees develop policies on the Delegation of Authority to the college president. (Standards IV.A.2.a, IV.B.3.e.)

Modesto Junior College Recommendation 6

In order to meet the standard, the college must assess the current governance structure, review and implement changes to strengthen its infrastructure, and evaluate it on a regular basis. The team recommends the college develop a comprehensive participatory governance handbook that clearly identifies roles and responsibilities of participatory governance committees and constituent roles in the participatory process. (Standards IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.2.b, IV.A.3.)