

Follow-Up Report

Modesto Junior College
435 College Avenue
Modesto, CA 95350

A Confidential report prepared for the Accrediting Commission
For Community and Junior Colleges
This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited

Modesto Junior College
on
November 14, 2013

Dr. Glenn R. Roquemore, Team Chair

Modesto Junior College
Follow-Up Report

Visiting Team Members

November 14, 2013

Dr. Glenn R. Roquemore, PhD (Chair)
President, Irvine Valley College

Dr. J. Laurel Jones
President, Mission College

DATE: December 13, 2013

TO: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

FROM: Glenn R. Roquemore, PhD, Team Chair

SUBJECT: Report of Follow-Up Visit Team to Modesto Junior College, November 14, 2013

Introduction

An External Evaluation team visit was conducted to Modesto Junior College (MJC) and the Yosemite Community College District Offices, in October 2011. At its meeting of January 12, 2011, the Commission acted to require MJC to submit a Follow-Up Report followed by a visit. The visiting team, Dr. Glenn R. Roquemore, and Dr. Laurel Jones, conducted the site visit to MJC on November 14, 2013. The purpose of the team visit was to verify that the Follow-Up Report prepared by the college was accurate through examination of evidence, to determine if sustained, continuous, and positive improvements had been made at the institution, and that the institution has addressed the recommendations made by the External Evaluation Team, resolved the deficiencies noted in those recommendations, and meets the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies.

In general, the team found that the college had prepared well for the visit by arranging for meetings with the individuals and groups agreed upon earlier with the Team Chair and by assembling appropriate documents in the meeting room used by the team. On November 14, 2013, the team met with the Chancellor of the District, one member of the Board of Trustees, president of the college, the Accreditation Liaison Officer, the Academic Senate President, Classified Senate leader, and the Student leader, SLO Coordinator and respective support personnel, the Research team, and the DE Counselor and support personnel.

The Follow-Up Report and Visit were expected to document resolution of the following recommendations.

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.)

District Recommendation 3: The team recommends the District and Board of Trustees develop policies on the delegation of authority to the college president. (Standard IV. A.2.a, IV.B.3.e.)

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)

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).

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.)

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.)

College Responses to the 2012 External Evaluation Team Recommendations

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.)

Findings and Evidence: In response to District Recommendation 2, Yosemite Community College District (YCCD), Columbia College, and Modesto Junior College (MJC) convened open and participatory meetings/workshops to review their mission statements, course offerings,

and programs in relation to their budgets. MJC clarified and strengthened the linkage between the three institutional mission statements within the district.

Meeting minutes demonstrate that Columbia College and MJC have aligned course and program offerings with the college mission through the curriculum approval process. Curriculum review now requires that the role of the course in supporting the college mission be demonstrated.

The Resource Allocation Council at MJC developed a new structure for resource allocation recommendations in periods of growth and reduction. The Resource Allocation Council develops a college budget recommendation to the College Council each spring as part of the annual budget development process. It is now clear that the resource allocation process links budget and resource requests to the college mission, goals, learning outcomes, and student success.

Conclusion: The District and the colleges have reviewed and updated their mission statements with the consideration of course offerings. YCCD has developed a process to appropriately adjust course offerings in response to budget fluctuations.

This recommendation has been addressed, deficiencies resolved, and Accreditation Standards met.

District Recommendation 3: The team recommends the District and Board of Trustees develop policies on the delegation of authority to the college president. (Standard IV. A.2.a, IV.B.3.e.)

2011 Visiting team finding: Recommended that a singular Board Policy be developed that outlines the role of the college president. The team finds that the current revised Policy 7430, that relies on the interpretation of “CEO” as a means to define the role of the president, falls short of the intent of the recommendation.

2012 Visiting team finding: The Recommendation called for delineating the delegated roles and responsibilities to the college president by developing a Board Policy specific to the college president. The team finds that this recommendation has not been met.

Findings and Evidence: In an effort to meet District Recommendation 3, the YCCD policy committee created two separate policies: one previously existing policy that delegates authority to the chancellor (Policy 2430), and another policy that delegates authority to the college presidents (Policy 2430.1), which was Board approved on August 14, 2013. In addition, the job descriptions for the chancellor and presidents were updated to clearly state delegation of authority from the Board of Trustees to the college presidents via the chancellor.

Conclusion: YCCD has produced separate Board Policies that delegate authority to the chancellor and to the college presidents.

This recommendation has been addressed, deficiencies resolved, and Accreditation Standards met.

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)

2011 Visiting Team finding: 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; ER 2)

2012 Visiting team finding: “.....thorough integration of the new mission with documents budget and planning processes has not been demonstrated.” (ACCJC letter Feb. 11, 2013)

Findings and Evidence: MJC has taken steps to review and analyze demographic and student enrollment data to ensure that its mission statement accurately reflects the students served. Integration of the mission into budget and planning is also demonstrated in program review with program mission tied to college mission. The college’s faculty postponed the hiring of fulltime permanent instructors, to continue to work with the data on institutional need and demand as well as assessed program need that meets institutional mission. This ranking of positions is documented as being based on the specific needs of the college in workforce and student success. Also, the college revised its mission statement to include core institutional elements linked to its defined population; thereby allowing for cleaner linkage to mission decision making and planning. Strategic goals linked to college mission informs learning outcomes, assessment and planning, and documented alignment of the college mission, goals and planning is also noted as a guiding principle for Instruction Council.

Conclusion: MJC has completed significant work on the integration of the mission statement into college planning and resource allocation. The college has worked holistically to create institutional acceptance of the revised mission, mission integration, and mission specific planning and is continuing in its response with newly hired permanent faculty representative of the institutional mission.

Evidence found in interviews, documentation of working models, and constituent minutes allows the team to state that this recommendation has been thoroughly reviewed and implemented.

This recommendation has been fully addressed, deficiencies resolved, and Accreditation Standards met.

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).

2011 Visiting team finding: 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 program 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)

2012 Visiting team finding: While the college believes they have achieved proficiency, the evidence shows that while their new Resource Allocation Process is in place (fall, 2012), the assessment data that is to inform program review was also developed in the Fall Flex day 2012, so from this year forward program reviews will be informed by assessment data in a consistent manner. However data collection is not coordinated. Who uploads assessment data is not clear. Faculty uploads assessment data for CLOs, but there was no consistent answer from the college community about who uploads PLO and ILO assessment data. It is not clear how the college

assessment efforts are linked to the assessment efforts of the district or how assessment results inform district planning and resource allocation. (ACCJC letter December 5, 2012)

Findings and Evidence: MJC has coordinated data entry with specific job responsibilities assigned to a new job developed as a result of the site visit. The responsibility of this job is to work with faculty and staff on the consistency in assessment data integration for course learning outcomes, program learning outcomes, and institutional learning outcomes. Documentation and validation of assessment timelines, scheduled assessments, and program plans exist for all college constituencies. Included is documentation of learning outcomes assessment for student services as well as program outcomes specific to non-instructional areas. The college has implemented a clear cycle for all course learning outcomes, program learning outcomes, and institutional learning outcomes. The 2013 Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Handbook identifies all outcomes, examples of assessment and cycles. Assessment for college outcomes are informed through the planning and resource allocation model created by the college and supported by district planning. The college has clearly delineated process and planning for post assessment budget requests documented by the Program Review Resource Request ranking and through the Resource Allocation Council recommendations for funding presented to the College Council. The college has completed a full cycle of program planning/integration as requested by the site visit team. District integration of planning and resource allocation is documented in administrative procedure related to board policy 6200 and is guided through the YCCD District Council in the Statement of Principles and dialogue and decision making in the committee. Integration of planning is documented in the updated Executive Summary of the YCCD Strategic Plan (Spring 2011) with the district recently supporting college planning with limiting its own resource allocations to the district to more fully allocate to the college.

Conclusion: The assessment responsibilities and coordinated data input are implemented by the college. The college has fully integrated its assessment, program review planning into a resource allocation cycle with funding recently allocated to programs based on assessment and planning. Evidence was provided through constituent interviews, documented allocation funding, assessment personnel interviews and college/district minutes.

This recommendation has been fully addressed, deficiencies resolved, and Accreditation Standards met.

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.)

2011 Visiting team finding: 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)

2012 Visiting team finding: The college has recently created a resource allocation process that integrates learning outcomes assessment data into the program review process; however, the entire process still needs to be written and shared with the campus community, and it needs to show the linkages between assessment, program review, and the different college councils. (ACCJC letter Feb. 11, 2013)

Findings and Evidence: The visiting team found that MJC has strengthened and clarified the linkages in the planning and budget process to ensure institutional effectiveness. MJC has also completed one planning cycle that demonstrated that they adhere to its process for budget development and resource allocation. The new highly collaborative and transparent process incorporates student learning outcomes assessment to inform spending and is reviewed annually to ensure effectiveness of institutional process.

Conclusion: MJC has clearly identified linkages within the planning and budget process. They are evaluating and following the planning process. Student learning outcome assessment now has a role in the planning and budget process.

This recommendation has been fully addressed, deficiencies resolved, and Accreditation Standards met.

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.)

2011 Visiting team findings: 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)

2012 Visiting team findings: While the college has developed a handbook, the handbook has not been adopted by all the constituent groups, and planning agenda for recommendation 6 notes: *“During spring 2014, the handbook will be reviewed, assessed, and evaluated....”* (ACCJC letter Feb. 11, 2013)

Findings and Evidence: The team found that the college follows its process for participatory governance and is now adopted by all constituent groups. The new governance structure, and the six councils, were implemented to improve MJC’s processes and practices, and to promote continuous quality and efficiency of the college. Each council self-assessed its processes and charge in spring 2013, and forwarded minor modifications to College Council on April 22, 2013. The Academic Senate worked with the college president to make revisions to Engaging All Voices: MJC Participatory Decision Making Handbook, which the Senate then endorsed on September 5, 2013. The College Council approved the revised document on September 9, 2013.

Conclusion: The comprehensive participatory governance handbook has been adopted by all college constituents and is being evaluated and revised on a regular basis.

This recommendation has been fully addressed, deficiencies resolved, and Accreditation Standards met.

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 IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.2.b, IV.A.3.)

Visiting team finding fall 2011: 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 IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.2.b, IV.A.3)

Visiting team finding fall 2012: The College is still working to deploy student services software for online access to counseling. (ACCJC letter Feb. 11, 2013)

The college has developed a Distance Education Plan in 2012 and is updating its completion and its next steps annually. The Distance Education Advisory Council and the General Counseling Unit Meeting participants have worked together on meeting this recommendation. The Distance Education Advisory Council reviews all elements of the Distance Education Plan at each meeting. In addition, the college has employed student services software for two semesters that provides online access to counseling. The software has been included as a permanent option for online services identified through the Substantive Change standards and the visiting team as one of the important counseling connections to online students. Implementation of this software is a primary factor in the deployment of student services to online students. Finally, the college has provided a Counseling Departmental Procedure that provides process for booking online appointments that all general counseling can use. The department provides online counseling on a weekly basis.

Conclusion: The college has begun the implementation of its five year Distance Education Plan. Evidence of this was presented in interviews and documentation. The success of the online student services component was documented through a team member's "hands on" online counseling session during the visit. JoinMe is a powerful tool that provides the recommendation's immediate response and also has great potential for the implementation of the Student Success Act.

This recommendation has been fully addressed, deficiencies resolved, and Accreditation Standards met.