

Mt. San Jacinto Community College District

Institutional Progress Report

Submitted by

Mt. San Jacinto Community College District
1499 N. State Street
San Jacinto, California 92583

October 2007



Dr. Jon Tyler
Interim Superintendent/President

To

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents	2
Statement on Report Preparation	
Process of Report Preparation.....	3
MSJC Accreditation Progress Report Steering Committee Members and Participants	4
Response to Team Recommendations and the Commission Action Letter	
A. Recommendation #2.....	
1. Recommendation #2.1.....	6
1.A. Evidence for Recommendation #2.1.....	11
2. Recommendation #2.2.....	12
2.A. Evidence for Recommendation #2.2.....	19
3. Recommendation # 2.3	19
3.A. Evidence for Recommendation #2.3.....	22
4. Recommendation # 2.4	22
4.A. Evidence for Recommendation #2.4.....	25
B. Recommendation #3.....	
1. References and Evidence for Recommendation #3.....	32
C. Recommendation # 5.....	
1. References and Evidence for Recommendation #5.....	35, 38, 43

PROCESS OF REPORT PREPARATION

In October 2005, the Mt. San Jacinto Community College District (MSJC) Self Study Report was completed and submitted to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges (ACCJC). The Evaluation Team subsequently visited MSJC in November 2005.

On January 31, 2006, MSJC's accreditation was reaffirmed. The College, however, was required to submit a progress report which requires that the institution provide information, evidence, and analysis regarding the resolution of the issues to which it was directed by the Commission's Action Letter of January 31, 2006. The focus of this progress report is Recommendations 2, 3, and 5. On October 15, 2007, the progress report is due to ACCJC, to be followed by a visit by Commission representatives.

In January 2007, faculty, staff, students, and administrators were actively recruited for recommendation work groups, listed on pages four and five of this report. In February 2007, the Accreditation Steering Committee met to review the recommendations from the ACCJC, to review progress report guidelines, to assign work groups, and to schedule work group meetings and individual responsibilities for the semester. During the spring semester (February-May 2007), evidence was gathered by several subcommittees which then wrote, edited, and submitted drafts of the progress report recommendations for review. Subcommittees met independently, and the entire committee met monthly to report progress and coordinate. Written report drafts from the recommendation groups were completed the first week in May 2007 to assure that the Accreditation Liaison Officers had sufficient time to edit the drafts from the various subcommittees.

During May 2007, after final submissions of the subcommittees, the subcommittee chairs were interviewed by the Accreditation Liaison Officers to learn details and insight into the committees' draft reports. From June-July 2007, the Accreditation Liaison Officers wrote and edited the final progress report. From mid July to mid August, the final progress report was reviewed by the Executive Cabinet, Subcommittee Chairs/Co-Chairs, Steering Committee members, and the College community at large. Comments and corrections were then reviewed by and integrated into the document by the Accreditation Liaison Officers. The Board of Trustees received the report for review in August and September of 2007, after which it was sent for duplication and binding to the MSJC Print Shop. By mid September 2007, the revised report was completed and sent to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, to meet the October 15, 2007, Progress Report deadline.



Jon Tyler, DPA
Interim Superintendent/President

MSJC ACCREDITATION PROGRESS REPORT STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND SUBCOMMITTEE PARTICIPANTS

Accreditation Liaison Officers

Cathy Brostrand – Faculty

Rebecca Teague – Administration

Steering Committee Members

Dennis Anderson – Administration

Michael Beckham – Faculty

Bil Bergin – Faculty

Maria Boer – Student

Cathy Brostrand – Faculty

Stephanie Cason – Classified Staff

Richard Collins – Administration

Pamela Deegan – Administration

Kristi Di Memmo – Classified Staff

Rhonda Dixon – Classified Staff

Becky Elam – Administration

Kristen Grimes – Classified Staff

Susan Guarino – Administration

Carolyn Hays – Faculty

Dennis Hogan – Administration

Pat James Hanz – Administration

David King – Faculty

Jeanne O'Dell – Administration

Michelle Oja – Professional Expert

Erik Ozolins – Faculty

Angelica Rangel – Student

Bob Rockwell – Faculty

Sterling Roulette – Faculty

Richard Rowley – Faculty

Roger Schultz – Administration

Tatiana Somers – Classified Staff

Robin Steinback – Administration

Rebecca Teague – Administration

Jon Tyler – Administration

Recommendation 2.1

Rich Rowley – Faculty, Chair

Pamela Deegan – Administration

Rhonda Dixon – Classified Staff

JoAnna Quejada – Administration

Robin Steinback – Administration

Recommendation 2.2

Bil Bergin – Faculty, Co-Chair

Bea Ganim – Faculty

Donna Greene – Faculty

Laurie McLaughlin – Administration

Richard Collins – Administration, Co-Chair

Michelle Oja – Professional Expert

Erik Ozolins – Faculty

Recommendation 2.3

Sterling Roulette – Faculty, Co-Chair

Michael Beckham – Faculty

Bing Bruce – Classified Staff

Mark Dumas – Classified Staff

Kristi Di Memmo – Classified Staff, Co-Chair

Maggie Franklin – Classified Staff

Toni Silva – Classified Staff, CSEA

Tatiana Somers – Classified Staff

Recommendation 2.4

Roger Schultz – Administration, Chair

Michael Beckham – Faculty

Bing Bruce – Classified Staff

Kristi Di Memmo – Classified Staff

Mark Dumas – Classified Staff

Suzanne Gavin – Administration

Bill Marchese – Administration

Sterling Roulette – Faculty

Tatiana Somers – Classified Staff

Toni Silva – Classified Staff, CSEA

Robin Steinback – Administration

Recommendation 3

Dennis Anderson – Administration, Co-Chair

Carolyn Hays – Faculty, Co-Chair

Bil Bergin – Faculty

Marlene Cvetko – Faculty

Joyce Johnson – Administration, Co-Chair

Bob Rockwell – Faculty

Richard Rowley – Faculty

MSJC ACCREDITATION PROGRESS REPORT STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND SUBCOMMITTEE PARTICIPANTS

Recommendation 5

Dennis Hogan – Administration, Co-Chair	Susan Guarino – Administration, Co-Chair
Pat James Hanz – Administration, Co-Chair	Fred Madore – Classified Staff
Dennis Anderson – Administration	Jennifer Marrs – Classified Staff
Michael Beckham – Faculty	Sharon Myers-Durbin – Faculty
Maria Boer – Student	Barbara Oberg – Classified Staff
David Bookin – Faculty	Jeanne O'Dell – Administration
Cathy Brostrand – Faculty	Gina Oliver – Faculty
Marcus Castellanos – Classified Staff	Brian Orlauski – Classified Staff
Catalina Cruz – Administration	Robert Parker – Classified Staff
Lee Dawson – Classified Staff	Jennifer Pickens – Classified Staff
Cheryl Devenney – Classified Staff	Joanna Quejada – Administration
Kristi Di Memmo – Classified Staff	Geoffrey Reed – Administration
Kathy Donnell – Classified Staff	Sandra Robinson – Faculty
Mark Dumas – Classified Staff	John Schuler – Faculty
Becky Elam – Administration	Bahram Sherkat – Faculty
Fred Frontino – Classified Staff	Patrick Springer – Administration
Rhonda Goetz – Faculty	Robin Steinback – Administration
Keith Hanz – Faculty	Michael Tausig – Faculty
Paul Hert – Faculty	Rebecca Teague – Administration
Gail Jensen – Classified Staff	Lori Torok – Faculty
Scott Kasper – Classified Staff	Brian Twitty – Classified Staff
Camille Kraft – Administration	Suzanne Uhl – Faculty
Frank Larios – Classified Staff	Karen Watts – Classified Staff
	Donna Wilder – Classified Staff

Response to Team Recommendations from the Commission's Action Letter

RECOMMENDATION #2

The team recommends that the College develop policies, procedures, and regular practices to ensure that:

- 2.1 the various programs and services of the College engage in regular assessment of institutional effectiveness, including program review;
- 2.2 the College set priorities for implementing plans for improvement that are based in analysis of research data;
- 2.3 the College incorporate established priorities into the governance, decision making, and resource distribution processes;
- 2.4 the College develop and employ a methodology for assessing overall institutional effectiveness and progress toward meeting goals expressed through plans for improvements; and that the College report regularly to internal constituencies and the Board on this progress.

(Standards I.B., II A. 1. and 2., II.B.3.a., II B. 4., II.C.1.e. and II.C.2.; III.A.6., III.B.2.b., III.C.1. and 2., III.D.1.a., IV.A.1, 2, 3, B.2.b., and the Preamble to the Standards.)

Recommendation #2.1

The Team recommends that the various programs and services of the College engage in regular assessment of institutional effectiveness, including program review.

After reorganization and under new leadership, the College has instituted the following which will lead to regular assessment of institutional effectiveness and will be in place in the fall of 2007: Institutional Goals, fiscal 2007-2008, an Educational Master Plan, a Decision Support System, new administrative hires, a revised budget process, a revised program review, the ARCC report, the Master Plan 2004-2009 Progress Report, and the revised Shared Governance Document.

Institutional Goals

The MSJC Institutional Goals, fiscal 2007-2008, include the following: update and improve the formal planning processes to ensure ongoing planning and continuous improvement; strengthen organizational development with a focus on growth management, transparency, communication, staff development, and institutional diversity; improve student success, access, and student life by implementing assessment and outcome measures and expanding student programs; provide quality teaching and learning with a focus on basic skills, college readiness, and student goals and outcomes; expand community outreach and partnership development to increase awareness of MSJC in the communities served; and maintain fiscal stability while adhering to mandates, regulations, and requirements of federal, state, and local agencies.

Decision Support System

The Decision Support System (DSS) will plan and project current and future FTES; it is a data-driven system that is downloaded from Datatel. The DSS contains information regarding faculty

loads, productivity factors, and course and section information. The DSS will allow all college personnel to easily access information such that planning and projecting can occur. Time will be spent developing the system with appropriate personnel. Once the system is developed, extensive training will occur. The DSS is currently being developed and will be piloted in fall 2007.

Educational Master Plan

The Educational Master Plan will contain the MSJC statement of purpose, description of the community and regional context, analysis of community and regional needs, projection and analysis of future enrollment changes and economic trends and developments, description of the educational philosophy of the District, brief descriptions of the scope and emphasis of existing educational programs and related services in relationship to the District's purpose and philosophy, identification of the current and future needs of educational programs, student services, other services and activities, formulation of long term educational goals and short term objectives to meet those goals, analysis of resources available and needed to implement the objectives, and an implementation plan including tasks, timelines, and accountability mechanisms. The College is presently hiring a firm to begin fall 2007.

New Administrative Hires

New administrative hires (one full-time academic dean, an associate dean of research and planning, two associate deans of instruction, two associate deans of career education, a dean of external programs, an associate dean of student services, and an associate dean of business services) were authorized in spring 2007. The Executive Cabinet of MSJC, after reviewing and analyzing the effectiveness of the current administrative structure, determined that creating new administrative positions throughout the District would centralize the focus of administrators. The additional administrators will provide more faculty support (with separate deans to focus on full-time and adjunct faculty, on humanities and sciences and career education), important institutional research, more focus on SLOs and student achievement, more support for student success in student services, and more planning, evaluation, and assessment of the effectiveness of the performance of instructional and business sectors of the College. In short, the additional administrators are necessary to maintain and ensure that the quality of education provided by MSJC continues.

Revised Budget Process

The revised budget process mandates review and improvement of the College's business practices and planning resource allocation processes for maximum efficiency and effectiveness, and ensures that mission, planning priorities, program review, and student learning outcomes drive allocations and improvements. It will include review of resource planning to ensure systematic assessment and effective use of resources and that results are evaluated and used for improvement of business practices for efficiency and effectiveness, integration of financial resource planning with strategic planning, and integration of technology planning with institutional planning. In addition, it will mandate the development of facilities and technology that support learning by development of a Facilities Master Plan driven by the Educational Master Plan, improvement of communication in support of learning, provision of customer service training for those with direct contact with students and community, and incorporation of assessment as an evaluative measure to be used in process improvement.

The revised budget process developed broad based planning processes that encourage participation, allocate necessary resources, and lead to improvement of institutional effectiveness. It also

reorganized Business Services' structure to effectively achieve the goals and mission of the College. Finally, it established a program review calendar for all sectors of the Business Services division with a link to formal planning and assessment of administrative objectives.

Program Review

As described in the ACCJC Evaluation Report produced by the Accreditation Site Visit Team, MSJC's old program review model for instructional programs was deemed cumbersome by several faculty members interviewed by the team. As a result of the site visit and feedback from faculty members, the Program Review Committee decided to completely revise the model in favor of a streamlined, online version that will ultimately feed into an assessment and planning process for most departments.

The Program Review Committee declared a one-year postponement on reviewing programs college-wide beginning September 2005 after scheduling several meetings where faculty and members of instructional and student services administration staff discussed the process for changing the program review model.

The Program Review Committee, comprised of faculty and members of instructional and student services administration, researched and reviewed program review models from other colleges in October 2005 and approved the incorporation of student learning outcomes into the new program review model. As a result, each department will be required to include a statement about how the program is addressing student learning outcomes, including an update on what has been accomplished and program plans for the current year. Under the new program review model and the proposed Educational Master Plan, student learning outcomes, departmental learning outcomes, and institutional learning outcomes will be directly connected. All departments will be required to address how their overall program goals relate to the Educational Master Plan and Institutional Learning Outcomes.

The first draft of the new program review model was completed in November 2005. At that same time, the Program Review Committee added to its membership and included research staff (Institutional Research Analyst) to aid in informing the committee of available data/variables and data sources. Pending the hiring of a full-time Associate Dean of Research and Planning, further duties were not assigned.

In December 2005, the Academic Senate President and Program Review Committee Chair met with the Dean of Information Technology and the Supervisor, Computer Applications, to develop the online component of the new program review system. The Program Review Committee reviewed the requirements for the online system, and in summer 2006, development of the online system began. In November 2006, the online program review model was completed. For the next several months, the new online program review model sat idle due to lack of documentation (instructions for faculty to use the system). In May 2007, the Research Analyst provided the Program Review Committee with definitions of data and information which are provided to departments when they complete their review. In spring 2007, the Dean of Library and Technology inquired about the status of the online program review system. With extensive experience with web functions and designs, the Dean offered to act as the administrator overseeing the development of the documentation for the online program review system and manager of the security for the system. Currently the Dean of Library and Technology has full access to the online system, and completion of the documentation

is pending. The anticipated completion date for the documentation is fall 2007 with the commencement of a pilot for the new online program review model to be performed by the Computer Information Systems (CIS) Department in late fall 2007. The full implementation of the new program review online model is projected to roll out in spring 2008 after the completion of the pilot program. By spring 2008, all departments will be expected to participate and provide yearly updates and reports until the department's next scheduled review date.

The new program review model utilizes data that comes directly from the Instruction Office, which is verified by Business Services. Data for the program review is also derived from the California Community College Chancellor's Office data mart, including enrollment information, class size, FTE, drop rates, and student success and retention rates. Data has been selected to allow comparisons across academic programs. The Curriculum Committee also provides information about course revisions and developments for the new program review model. The intent of the new model is for its broad adoption so that the College will have comparable data from all programs. In this manner, every program will provide information related to the same criteria and provide comparable data that can be integrated.

As a result of the program review revision, several critical goals were identified for the new model: ease of use and more frequent updating; integration of program review with planning; integration of program review with allocations of resources, including staff, funds, and materials; and integration of program review with student learning outcomes. The new program review model also includes a timeline of completion of program review to be shortened to a one-year cycle.

Unlike the previous program review model, the new online version will be closely connected to institutional planning, including hiring decisions, budget allocations, curriculum development, and facilities planning. To further integrate program review into instructional planning and allocation decisions, the Program Review Committee recommended that 1) no full time tenure-track faculty position be allocated which has not first appeared as an identified need in Program Review and Educational Master Plan documents, 2) no instructional equipment purchases (over a level to be determined) be made which have not first appeared as a need identified in the Program Review and Educational Master Plan documents, 3) no new construction or refurbishment of any instructional facility be undertaken which has not first appeared as a need identified in the Program Review and Educational Master Plan documents.

The Student Services program review model has been updated and formatted to be consistent across the Division's programs' self-evaluations and to ensure that key outcome measures are addressed with each department's program review. Additionally, an updated point of service survey incorporates customer service assessment and student learning outcomes. Lastly, an updated multi-year program review schedule has been developed to ensure that all departments engage in a comprehensive program review on a routine basis.

Student learning outcomes have been established with broad input by personnel in the Student Services Departments in the division, and the areas are now moving into a phase of assessment through both program review and other systematic measures (evidenced by SLOs, updated surveys, and quantitative data).

Program review has created a comprehensive evaluation cycle as part of the new model which requires continuous feedback. After implementation of the pilot program, formal assessment will take place, and the program will be revised accordingly as part of committee dialogue after faculty participating in the pilot program take this information back to their constituencies.

ARCC Report

The Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC) provides a performance measurement system with indicators for the California Community College system and its colleges. Each of the 109 colleges covered has six pages of information to facilitate and stimulate discussions about college performance within each community. In these six pages per college, the report shows (1) the three-year trend for each of six indicators (persistence, success rates, basic skills improvement, the impact of success center access on success, the impact of following placement recommendations on success, and District participation rates); (2) the college profile (i.e., its enrollment demographics); (3) a comparison of its performance with a peer group (i.e., colleges that have similar environments that affect an indicator); and (4) a self-assessment by each college. MSJC's board and local community will use this package of information for data-based policy discussions. The first draft of the next ARCC report (2006-2007) will be available to colleges in October 2007. This is a continual cycle of data presentation and reflection to aid California community colleges in their accountability efforts. The College will submit to the CCCCCO by March 19, 2008, documentation of interaction by its Board of Trustees with the ARCC report.

Master Plan

The College continues to use its updated Master Plan 2004-2009 to drive decision-making in regards to institutional priorities and resource allocations. As outlined in the Self Study Evaluation report, the MSJC Master Plan was developed through a collaborative effort of community members, faculty, staff, and students of the College to establish district-wide goals for five years (2004-2009).

The overall purpose of the Master Plan is to provide direction for the College in its effort to serve the needs of the communities within Southwestern Riverside County. The Master Plan is reviewed at the middle point of the five-year period, and a report is developed to outline progress with achievement of the thirty-three institutional goals. Regular updates are compiled by each of the goals' respective administrative leads with input and feedback from thirty-three separate subcommittees composed of faculty, staff, and students. In December 2006, Mt. San Jacinto College completed its annual review and analysis of the master plan goals. A report detailing the progress of each of the thirty-three goals has been published and disseminated to community members, faculty, staff, and students in summer 2007.

Summary

It is envisioned that the new online program review model will act as a model for other institutional departments to utilize, including Administration, Student Services, Business Services, and Human Resources.

Program review must be coordinated and integrated. Instruction and Student Services have been working together as Instruction builds its new model. Common elements of program review need to be adopted by other areas of the College, such as Business Services and Human Resources, such that

common goals can be assessed and comparable information can be generated to coordinate efforts and allocate resources.

The College had a history of effective planning, review, and assessment for effectiveness. It was, however, disjointed and not part of an integrated system. Each of these elements has been addressed and has been emerging over the last few years. However, they have not yet been clearly identified and linked in a systematic process that integrates them across the institution as a whole. Progress toward a linked, systematic process is ongoing.

Evidence

ARCC report

Budget Committee Meeting Minutes, April 28, 2006

Curriculum Committee Minutes, May 1, 2006

Curriculum Committee Minutes, October 9, 2006, including Elaborating Program Review Policy/Procedure

Decision Support System

Educational Master Plan

Institutional Goals, Fiscal 2007-2008

Instructional Program Review Minutes, 2/19/07, an e-mail from Richard Rowley

Interview – Brian Orlauski, Supervisor of Computer Applications June 16, 2007

Master Plan 2004-2009 progress report

New administrative hires

Program Review – Looking Ahead, Notes from IPRC, 4/13, 2006, an e-mail from Richard Rowley

Program Review Annual Planning Summary, fall 2006, including Draft Outline II and Instructional Program Review List of Programs to be reviewed

Program Review Committee, Agenda and e-mail on data sets, February 9, 2006

Program Review Committee, Agenda and Summary Notes, November 14, 2005, including Draft Outline II

Program Review Committee, Agenda and Summary Notes, November 28, 2005, including revised Draft Outline II

Program Review Committee, Agenda and Summary Notes, November 7, 2005, including Draft Outline I

Program Review Committee, Agenda and Summary Notes, October 17, 2005

Program Review Committee, Agenda and Summary Notes, October 3, 2005

Program Review Committee, Agenda and Summary Notes, September 19, 2005

Program Review Committee, Agenda, March 9, 2006

Revised budget process

Revised draft shared governance document

Sample, trial run, Program Review: SJC History, Updated, 3/6/06, including graphs

Schedule

Student Services Program Review Model

Recommendation # 2.2

The Team recommends that the College set priorities for implementing plans for improvement that are based in analysis of research data.

Mt. San Jacinto College has made significant efforts, since the completion of the ACCJC Accreditation Self Study Evaluation report and the Commission Site Visit in October 2005, to gather data from a number of sources to incorporate in the College's decision-making processes. A number of activities in this area are currently in progress. The following illustrate some key college-wide activities and initiatives that are currently underway in each institutional area and are demonstrative of how the institution is presently utilizing data-driven analysis to implement plans for short-and long-term institutional improvements, including integration across the overall planning and budgetary allocation processes:

Master Plan

The College continues to use its updated Master Plan 2004-2009 to drive decision-making in regards to institutional priorities and resource allocations. As outlined in the Self Study Evaluation report, the MSJC Master Plan was developed through a collaborative effort of community members, faculty, staff, and students of the College to establish college-wide goals for five years.

The overall purpose of the Master Plan is to provide direction for the College in its effort to serve the needs of the communities within southwestern Riverside County. The Master Plan is reviewed at the middle point of the five year period, and a report developed to outline progress with achievement of the thirty-three institutional goals. Regular updates were compiled by each of the goals' respective administrative leads with input and feedback from thirty-three separate sub-committees comprised of faculty, staff, and students.

In December 2006, Mt. San Jacinto College completed its annual review and analysis of the master plan goals. A report detailing the progress of each of the thirty-three goals has been published and disseminated to community members, faculty, staff, and students in summer 2007. A new feature of the Master Plan 2004-2009 Progress Report demonstrates how each of the thirty-three goals is integrated with the California Community College Chancellor's Office's (CCCCO) strategic goals: (1) College awareness and access; (2) Student success and readiness; (3) Partnerships for Economic and Workforce Development; (4) System Effectiveness; and (5) Resource Development. By incorporating the CCCCCO strategic goals with the master plan goals, MSJC is able to demonstrate its awareness of global issues facing community colleges statewide.

The Master Plan, in lieu of the forthcoming Educational Master Plan, Decision Support System, and Facilities Master Plan, is the key driver for budget allocations, facility plans, organizational and operational change, and decision-making.

Instruction

Decision Support System

The development of a Decision Support System (DSS) for the Instruction Office is one of the ten Instructional Goals for the 2007-2008 academic year presented by MSJC Vice President of Instruction to the Executive Cabinet, and at faculty and department chair meetings as well as the

Department Chairs Academy in spring 2007. The process to develop the Decision Support System began in August 2006 with plans to hire a consultant to design the DSS, which will help administrators, faculty, and staff with data and information for a thorough integration of program review reports, campus and school planning projects, faculty and classified position requests, scheduling of classes, and proposals to either expand or contract current class offerings.

The new DSS, which is anticipated to be completed by fall 2007, will incorporate data-driven modeling to assist in planning and forecasting enrollment scheduling and demand. The system will also provide district-wide access to consistent, relevant, and timely data and information; support decision-making at multiple levels and multiple timeframes; provide data comparisons and trend analyses; and access information needed to support strategic planning, decision-making, and management.

Student Learning Outcomes

Specific information related to student learning outcomes will be presented in Recommendation #3 of the Progress Report. This section will describe the use of research and data as it relates to the student learning outcome (SLO) process. Mt. San Jacinto College is continuing its full implementation of SLOs throughout the instructional program and has made significant progress since October 2005. Faculty and administration have cooperatively developed and implemented an SLO model, and as a result, twenty courses were completed within the first year the SLO process was implemented.

As noted in the ACCJC's Evaluation Report dated February 3, 2006, "Because the College has only recently begun to address student learning outcomes, there is little evidence at this point of the Research Office becoming an active part of this process." Over the past two years, it has been a conscious and deliberate decision by the SLO Committee to not integrate the MSJC Research Office into the SLO process. The SLO Committee, comprised of faculty members, made an intentional determination to use "institutional dialogue" under the Higher Education and Evaluation Research Group (HEERG) dialogue-based model, approved by the California Community College Chancellor's Office, as the primary research and data tool that would be utilized for the development and implementation of the SLO process/cycle at the College. A role for the Research Office is seen for future planning and analysis for the SLO program, once the foundation for the process has been established.

Although the Research Office has not been integrated into the SLO process, research (assessment) related to student learning has been published for discussion or dissemination through documentation forwarded to the SLO Committee. Information regarding SLOs has been published in the SLO newsletter and disseminated during faculty department meetings.

The College is making appropriate progress in building the SLO process on dialogue-based data: numerous courses have gone through the SLO process, a local instructional SLO model is in place (complete with instructions, forms, and examples), and solid progress has been made toward creating and implementing an ongoing SLO plan, complete with integration into some of the decision-making processes at the College. Institutional structures are in place which should permit for steady improvement and future integration with the Research Office.

Educational Master Plan

In the past, the Instruction Office has had major concerns related to a well-defined and easily interpreted data set from research that supports the needs of a strategic academic planning process. Decisions that were made to improve instructional programs and services were often executed with little support or evidence regarding the impact to students or the District.

To address this concern, Mt. San Jacinto College released a request for proposal (RFP) for a consulting company to develop an Educational Master Plan in April 2007. Intended to primarily assist the District in planning for growth and change of its educational program needs over the next twenty years, the Educational Master Plan will assist in the development of a comprehensive Facilities Master Plan, including a utilities and landscape master plan that addresses the anticipated growth of the District. The District has initiated the development of an Educational Master Plan in fall 2007, with completion projected for spring 2008.

The Educational Master Plan will identify needs through the utilization and analysis of data, including analysis of community and regional needs, projection and analysis of future enrollment changes and economic trends and developments, and identification of the current and future needs of educational programs, student services and other services and activities. The Educational Master Plan will formulate the long-term educational goals and short-term objectives required to meet those goals, as well as provide an analysis of available resources needed to implement the objectives. An implementation plan will also be a part of the Educational Master Plan which will include tasks, timelines, and accountability mechanisms.

Program Review

As discussed in Recommendation #2.1 (page 6), the implementation of the new program review model is planned for fall 2007. Analysis of research is a vital component of the new model as illustrated by the Instructional Program Review Model Outline and will include consistent data sets for each program being reviewed. Data required for the new model includes the following: program resources (faculty, staff, equipment, budget); student access (enrollment at census, average class size, average fill rate, FTE rate, and drop rates in relation to gender, ethnicity, and age); and student success (success rates in relation to gender, ethnicity and age, retention rates, course success rates, grade distribution, certificates awarded and performance on identified student learning outcomes). Data will not only emerge from the MIS database, but also from research and professional literature that would be classified as “trends-in-the-field,” which will help to add dimension and perspective to the overall program review.

This introspective analysis will help inform the College’s decision-making process. The program review model is the foundation for the College’s Master Plan input. Program review has also prompted the development of departmental SLO processes and is also integrated with the development and planning for curriculum and budget.

As a result of program review, departments are holding meetings twice a term, with all full-time and associate faculty, and staff (ITS and department staff) invited to participate. These forums have included a review of textbooks and other learning resources on which each department bases decisions for the following term. The CIS Department’s program review, for example, conducted an in-depth study for the computer applications textbook series. All San Jacinto campus CIS faculty

and staff were involved in the process. In addition, input was solicited from the staff at the Learning Resource Centers. Students were also surveyed.

Career Education

In MSJC's vocational education programs, feedback from business and industry, data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), journals, and trends on curriculum development drive the curriculum for new career education programs. Specifically, MSJC seeks the participation from members in the local community to advise the College on their current needs, as well as the needs forecasts for the local economy.

Advisory Committees

Advisory committees are established for each vocational education program and comprised of community members, business and industry representatives, MSJC faculty, and staff. MSJC develops and revises curriculum in direct response to the feedback received from the Advisory Committees as well as separate community forums. For example, during recent forums, business leaders identified a shortcoming in the skill sets that the CIS Department at the College was helping students develop; students were mastering the technical skills but lacking in the communications skills. Since that forum, every curriculum offering posted by SJC/CIS has incorporated a communications component as one of its course objectives and/or recommended assignments and evaluation activities.

Programs and curriculum are developed in consideration of trends that have been forecast by the BLS. These trends have been documented in program review and are updated on a regular basis.

District Wide Efficiency Report

At the instructional and departmental levels, analysis of enrollment trends and current enrollment numbers is reported on a daily basis through the District Wide Efficiency Report. The District Wide Efficiency Report is analyzed to provide room caps for enrollment purposes and to meet room efficiency and growth target rates. The reports produced by the District are directly connected to space and facility availability. By monitoring enrollment demand on a daily basis, the College is able to quickly adjust and adapt the current schedule offerings and when the need arises is capable of responding to high enrollment demand by adding "late-start" classes to the schedule.

The Instruction Office leadership (vice president and academic deans and associate deans) use the reports as planning tools for guiding and developing the course schedule. In addition, enrollment trends from previous terms also help to guide course schedule development. The new Decision Support System will provide additional data driven analysis for developing schedules, reviewing programmatic components and analyzing taxonomies of programs, with the overall purpose of balancing and allocating resources to all components adequately.

Regular and ongoing discussions with the Information Technology (IT) Department staff help the Instruction Office with the lab setups each semester. Departments provide regular reports to the IT team identifying upcoming hardware, software, and support needs. A new program from the Instruction Office, in partnership with IT, is the Datatel information that contains enrollment trends. From Datatel, enrollment trends of three or four years are analyzed and given to the department chairs to review course drops and wait lists, and to help guide the planning of the

schedule. The College utilizes Datatel systems for analyzing program review, SLOs, VTEA, the newly revised Shared Governance Document, and learning communities.

Business Services

Annual Budget Development Process

Various models of budget processes utilized at other community colleges were studied by the MSJC Budget Development Committee during the 2005-2006 sessions. As a result of this research, a new annual budget development process was created and approved in spring 2007 by the Budget Development Committee, a shared governance committee comprised of administrators, faculty, staff and students. The annual budget development process established a new procedure for budget allocation requests which stipulates that the Budget Change Proposal (BCP) forms require that each augmentation request be tied to at least one of the annual institutional Master Plan goals and/or student learning outcomes to be considered for funding. It is at this crucial juncture that the institution-wide plans meet with the area specific plans to move the institution in the direction envisioned by master planning.

Another new feature of the budget allocation request procedure requires the requestor to identify intended outcomes of the budget request and to provide a description of how the outcomes will be measured and evaluated for effectiveness. After budget requests have been approved and the requestor has utilized the funds, he/she must provide the Budget Development Committee with a report at the end of each fiscal year to demonstrate and evaluate achievement of the outcomes.

Evaluation efforts related to budget allocations are directly connected to planning and the budget cycle with a new model of resource distribution. The new budget development process, adopted by the Budget Development Committee, blends a top-down and bottom-up paradigm to provide coherent organizational plans driven by the expertise found throughout the institution.

Research

MSJC Research Office

The visibility and appropriateness of research data for planning efforts will be expanded in the near future with the hiring of an Associate Dean of Research and Planning, tentatively scheduled for fall 2007. MSJC is committed to the hiring of an upgraded administrative research position (formerly Director of Research) to direct, conduct, and facilitate research and data analysis practices. This will include research and measurement activities related to program reviews, student learning outcomes, and institutional goals, among others.

The Director of Research position has been vacant for two years. In fall 2005, the College held employment recruitment for the vacant Director of Research position. Although five candidates were interviewed and one candidate offered employment, the position has since remained vacant due to the candidate's rejecting the employment offer. As a result, for the last two years, MSJC has had a part-time interim institutional researcher and recently, in January 2007, hired a temporary part-time research analyst to provide additional support for data and research report requests initiated by the Instruction, Student Services, and Business Offices. Data is now collected by the part-time researchers based upon specific requests, but without a full-time research administrator, analysis, and accessibility are ongoing challenges.

The Research Committee's most recent focus is to try to strengthen the SLO process, to determine what can be done with the data and how the College can begin advertising some of the products that are available to the public. Also, the College will soon create an Institutional Research Board (IRB); it is required with all of the new grants coming out with Department of Education.

The Research Office has finalized the 2006 Fact Book, which is currently utilized by many community members, faculty, and staff and is the primary source for data about the institution. The Fact Book includes a wealth of information including basic demographics for the students and faculty at MSJC, as well as information about the community that MSJC serves. The Fact Book also describes student outcomes, including course retention, course success, grade distributions, degrees, and transfer rates. The completion and dissemination of the 2006 Fact Book is anticipated for fall 2007 during convocation and faculty flex activities.

In addition, the Research Office held a district-wide data workshop which was completed in fall 2006. The training for faculty and staff featured information related to data sources for Mt. San Jacinto College, California high schools, universities, and colleges as well as county, state, and national information. The training was held at both the San Jacinto and Menifee campuses. The purpose of the training was to empower District staff and faculty to utilize data source tools to assist in facilitating institutional improvements related to instruction and student support services and programs.

The District is considering developing a comprehensive data and information clearinghouse where research and data items would be collected, stored, and placed on the intranet and web for users throughout the District to utilize for implementing planning procedures. The District is looking at a bottom-up and top-down approach to centralize all data sources and create a catalog and place it online. An adaptation of the Fact Book has been considered so that it continues to serve as both the primary data source as well as the catalog of information items. The Fact Book could potentially evolve to provide a synopsis of the campus with online links to other data sources, research projects, and suitable background materials for decision-making processes.

Student Services

The institution identifies and seeks to meet the varied educational needs of its students through programs consistent with their educational preparation and the diversity, demographics, and economy of the local communities. Regarding the local economy, the College utilizes its career advisory committees to gain input from the field and qualitative information from counselors at local high schools and other educational entities as well as from transfer institutions and four-year schools on the export side. The College is constantly in communication regarding articulation agreements and transfer requirements. In the last quarter, for example, the College signed a Smart Start Grant with UCR: significant outreach on behalf of MSJC to UCR, to serve the College's diverse community and various partnerships. Student Services hired a consultant to assist in research and a program evaluation of MSJC's marketing and customer service efforts.

The Student Services Division and its departments utilize data to assess, plan, and allocate resources based on priorities annually. Each year, the Student Services leadership team works to establish goals

for the sector as a whole and for the respective departments. Goals are tied to the College's annually established institutional goals, the Master Plan 2004-2009, and operational needs.

These plans and goals are a product of the formal program review process, operational reports and data (registration activity counts, various student traffic counts, retention numbers, community demographics and participation rates), and ongoing qualitative and other quantitative measures. In addition, future trends and external data, such as area growth projections, instructional data and reports, as well as regional demographic information, are also factored into decision-making.

Bi-weekly meetings of the Student Services leadership focus on reviewing operations and trends in an effort to continue to assess and improve services to students. Occasional meetings with other divisions or committees, such as Instruction or the Enrollment Management Team, provide opportunities to collect qualitative data to identify problems/challenges and gather additional insights to improve operations within the division.

In the spring of 2006, the College engaged a consultant and researcher to help assess the customer service and marketing issues that directly relate to access and student success. The data compiled from 400 phone surveys and focus groups allowed the College to develop plans that enhanced services and access. The information from these surveys was presented to the administration at several workshops by the consultant and was analyzed and reported on by the Research Office.

New budget allocations are discussed and prioritized by the sector leadership. These requests are tied to established Community College System, college-wide, or departmental goals. Rationale and justification for each request must be clear; otherwise, the request does not move beyond the sector for consideration. These allocation requests, when looked at with the sector's updated program review, integrate well with the College's new approach to resource allocations.

As one can see from the above efforts, the Student Services Division continues to refine and make adjustments to its planning, allocation and assessment process to ensure that a more consistent and systematic approach of these efforts integrates with the College and its processes as a whole.

Summary

As illustrated from the above activities and initiatives, college-wide planning and decision-making is increasingly based on data-enhanced information. The College has greatly improved upon the relationship between data and assessment by instituting a new Decision Support System, a revised, stream-lined program review model, improved SLO standards, an Educational Master Plan, and a planning model for facilities.

With unprecedented enrollment growth in the last eight years, the College is still fairly reactive; however, with the increased availability of research data and statistical analysis for planning and evaluation of College processes, MSJC has begun to establish an institutional culture that recognizes the value of data-driven decisions. Previously, the College did not have the capability to access accurate and timely data to assess the validity of its old systems. Data from the new systems will now be accumulated in the following academic year.

Various strategies have been considered as to how the College might further refine not only the data collection activities, but also the widespread dissemination of these efforts. As the College expands the usage of these data elements, Mt. San Jacinto College expects to refine the process and reach a consensus on the critical metrics (i.e.: success factors) for the College.

Evidence

2006 Fact Book
Advisory Committee minutes
Associate Dean of Research Job Position Flyer
Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, May 10, 2007 (SLO Board report)
Budget Development Process
Budget Development Proposal Form
CIS Study
Counting Tools for Previous Terms Guide – Research Office
Curriculum Committee website
Datatel Enrollment trends document
Decision Support System
Decision Support System RFP
District Wide Efficiency Report
Educational Master Plan RFP
Institutional Planning Matrix
Master Plan 2004-2009
Master Plan Progress Report, 2007
Program Review Outline Model
Program Review Schedule for Student Services
Research Committee Meeting Agenda and Minutes – November 17, 2006
Research Committee Meeting Agenda and Minutes – October 20, 2006
Research Committee Meeting Agenda and Minutes – September 13, 2006
Research reports <https://access.msjc.edu/inside/departments/research/index.htm#reports>
Sandra Golden & Associates Report and Data
SLO Interview with Carolyn Hays
SLO Inventory for Student Services
SLO newsletter
Student Services POS/SLO Survey
Student Services Program Review Model (updated)

Recommendation #2.3

The Team recommends that the College incorporates established priorities into the governance, decision making, and resource distribution processes.

During the period since the Self Study Evaluation Report and Site Visit, Mt. San Jacinto College has made significant progress in improving the incorporation of established priorities into the governance, decision-making, and resource distribution processes of the College.

Institutional Goals 2007-2008

In June 2007, the Board of Trustees adopted the Mt. San Jacinto College Institutional Goals for the 2007-2008 fiscal year, based on the District's 2004-2009 Master Plan goals. The development of the institutional goals was the result of a comprehensive discussion at the Executive Cabinet level with collaboration from all areas of the District including Student Services, Business Services, Human Resources, and Instruction. The six institutional goals act as part of the strategic framework through which the College functions (governance, decision-making, and resource distribution) and can be aligned in an ongoing process centered on institutional outcomes and performance.

Division Goals 2007-2008

In developing the 2007-2008 Institutional Goals, each area of the District (Student Services, Business Services, Human Resources, and Instruction) simultaneously developed individual division goals that support the priorities established and approved by the Board of Trustees. The division goals were developed in spring 2007 and will be the foundation for the decision-making at the division level.

Educational Master Plan

The College has issued an RFP for the development of an Educational Master Plan that will integrate all of the institution's plans and goals. The Educational Master Plan will become the driver for all decision-making and resource distribution processes.

Shared Governance

In addition to each division developing measurable, annual goals directly tied to the institutional priorities of the District, the College Council established a Shared Governance Review Ad-hoc Committee in fall 2006. The charge of the committee was to review the outdated 1999 Shared Governance Document and update the document to focus on incorporating the established College priorities into the overall governance structure. The committee, comprised of faculty, classified, and administrative staff members, met in fall 2006 and spring 2007 and collaboratively developed a revised Shared Governance Document draft which is pending review and approval by the College Council (anticipated for fall 2007).

The revised document draft provides a defined shared governance process that establishes vehicles for planning and decision-making. The document clearly identifies the structure and purviews of the governance committees and the administration. The revised document features elements related to the College's institutional priorities including a focus on institutional effectiveness and assessment. Currently most college-wide shared governance committees do not have a process in place for reviewing, assessing, and evaluating the committee's function or a process for integrating institutional goals into the charge or objectives of the specific committee. With the new shared governance document, shared governance committees will be required to develop annual goals, objectives, and activities that relate to the 2007-2008 Institutional Goals. In addition to developing the annual strategies, the shared governance committees will also be required to evaluate and assess the overall achievement of their objectives and goals in relation to the institutional goals. In the revised shared governance document, all constituencies will be accountable for the College community's goals.

The new revised document, once approved, will provide the institution with a substantial tool for bringing all constituencies together to formulate recommendations that make a positive impact on the institution and also provide an effective means for governance and decision-making processes.

Board Policies and Administrative Procedures

During the past academic year 2006-2007, the College confronted a number of organizational challenges related to dramatic changes in leadership due to resignations, retirements, and releases. Although the institution is highly dependent upon the leadership skills and vision of key administrators, the College has made significant progress in meeting its mission, increasing enrollments, and improving student success by developing well established, published, and well understood administrative policies and procedures.

In spring 2006, the administration and management participated in an extensive day-long retreat for establishing administrative procedures based on the approved Board Policies. The administrative team completed and published the procedures in spring 2007. Completion of the administrative procedures ensures that institutional practices are consistent with approved Board Policies. The published procedures and practices describe how the processes are intended to function and guide faculty, staff, and administrators in meeting their various responsibilities.

The Board Policies have also been reviewed and updated during several College Council meetings in fall 2006 and spring 2007, with input from all constituent groups. It is anticipated that the updated Board Policies will be approved by the College Council and Board of Trustees and consequently published on the Mt. San Jacinto College website and intranet in fall 2007.

Resource Distribution Process

The new budget development process, created by the Budget Development Committee, establishes a new process that directly ties together resource distribution with the priorities of the institution (2007-2008 Institutional Goals, division goals, Master Plan goals, Educational Master Plan, Technology Plan, and Facilities Plan).

Joint Hiring Process

Hiring faculty is the result of a shared governance process of faculty and administration working together to identify both the numbers of the faculty to be hired as well as which departments, disciplines, and sites receive new hires. The College has a history of much collegial input in hiring. The process and decision-making are based in data that examine student enrollment demand and projections as well as external influences such as transfer or career business trends. Using such data, the administration allocates resources to hire a certain number of faculty per site. At each site, the departmental deans and faculty in their role as the Academic Senate's Joint Hiring Committee then request input from disciplines to justify new hires. After interviewing faculty chairs who request additional faculty, the Joint Hiring Committee decides which disciplines will receive more instructors. Through the Academic Senate, faculty are named as co-chairs of committees, and faculty are then recruited for hiring committees which proceed to create a job description, advertise for, interview, and select candidates (to be approved by the President and Board) for the new positions.

Department Chair Restructuring and Department Chair Academy

In fall 2006, the Vice President of Instruction with the concurrence of the Academic Senate initiated a process for restructuring of the department chairs. Monthly meetings of department chairs

(Department Chair Academy) took place in 2006-2007 with the purpose of determining instructional viewpoints on issues, discussing and debating issues, codifying instructional practices and processes, training on specific issues, and increasing communication. Each department chair was given a manual which outlined his/her duties and responsibilities as chair, and the hiring processes for associate and full-time faculty. Also included were calendars, information about program review, instructional goals for the year, information about the newly proposed DSS, and proposals for restructuring of the chairs' duties and compensation.

The Chair Restructuring Task Force, a faculty committee, in conjunction with the Vice President and feedback from department chairs, has created a system which eliminates unnecessary layers of reporting and focuses on essential duties and compensation for department chairs.

Summary

In the past, with rapid growth, the College was a reactive agency, reliant upon the direction of the Instruction Office and the Student Services Office to drive the staffing needs. With the forthcoming implementation of the Educational Master Plan, planning and decision making will be proactive rather than reactive, but still within the framework of shared governance.

During the period since the Self Study Evaluation Report and Site Visit, Mt. San Jacinto College has made significant progress in improving the incorporation of established priorities into the governance, decision making, and resource distribution processes of the College.

Evidence

Administrative Procedures
Board Policies
Budget Development Process
Business Services Goals 2007-2008
Educational Master Plan
Human Resources Goals 2007-2008
Institutional Goals 2007-2008
Instructional Services Goals 2007-2008
Master Plan 2004-2009
Shared Governance (Revised) document
Student Services Goals 2007-2008

Recommendation #2.4

The Team recommends that the College develop and employ a methodology for assessing overall institutional effectiveness and progress toward meeting goals expressed through plans for improvements; and that the College report regularly to internal constituencies and the Board on this progress.

The College continues to use its updated Master Plan 2004-2009 to drive decision-making with regard to institutional priorities and resource allocations. Regular updates are compiled by each of

the goals' respective administrative leaders. The most recent formal update was published in summer 2007. The executive leadership of the College has engaged in planning activities for 2007/2008 that incorporate the Master Plan goals in a way that integrates individual sector priorities and goals into a matrix-like document that maps to the System Office's Strategic Planning Document. This allows for a "best of both worlds" approach for the College that incorporates big-picture goals along with the details from each sector. By mapping the smaller detail sector goals to the larger, more visible public goals, it becomes easier to connect these and thus communicate them to the campus community.

Open and regular communication of institutional effectiveness and planning have been intermittent and continue to be a challenge; however, they have become recognized as essential and more regular during the accreditation process. Currently, the primary vehicle to share this type of information is through the College Council, and then sporadically through smaller divisional or committee announcements, such as deans' meetings, faculty and department head meetings, and management leadership. The College has also encouraged smaller committees and divisions to utilize the intranet to post minutes and hold discussions. It is anticipated that the model introduced by the Budget Development Committee as well as the new integrated planning model being worked on by the executive team will lead to consistent communication that leads to assessment of effectiveness. The reinstatement of the Institutional Planning Committee will lead to broad dissemination to all constituencies via a neutral group's meeting minutes. Board presentations are scheduled for the coming academic year to discuss the ARCC report as well as to look at the accreditation process, inclusive with the recommendations regarding more open communication and sharing.

The MSJC Institutional Goals for fiscal 2007-2008 emphasize that the number one goal of the institution is to update and improve the formal planning processes of the College to ensure ongoing planning and continuous improvement. Other goals include a revised budget process and expanded shared governance within the College's constituencies. The College is putting those mechanisms in place to measure outcomes in effectiveness; it is at phase one. Starting next year, annual updates regarding goal attainment and assessment of effectiveness will be available and measurable. The College has committed to hiring an upgraded administrative researcher (Associate Dean of Research and Planning) to direct, conduct, and facilitate institutional effectiveness practices, including research and measurement activities related to program reviews, student learning outcomes, and institutional goals. The development of a Decision Support System for instruction has begun in order to incorporate data-driven modeling to assist in planning and forecasting enrollment scheduling and demand. Student learning outcomes are being embraced and adopted campus-wide and are becoming a focus of each department's respective evaluation activities. Student learning outcomes have been established with broad input by personnel in the departments in the division, and the areas are now moving into a phase of assessment of them through both program review and other systematic measures. A shared governance institutional planning retreat in June 2007 brought the administration, staff, and faculty constituent groups together for a meeting to discuss a workable planning model, institutional goals, and effective communication strategies to ensure that information and input are made available to all parties in the planning, allocation, and assessment process.

The institutional mindset has changed and moved into a culture of evidence, measurement, and assessment. By the end of the 2008/2009 school year, it will be possible to evaluate the progress that has been achieved. Some of that philosophy is currently being applied to the budget allocations for

next year. The budget development process has been overhauled, and budget priorities are now tied to established, measurable goals and institutional priorities. They require the identification of intended outcomes and how they will be evaluated for effectiveness. New budget allocations are first discussed and prioritized by the sector leadership. These requests are tied to established Community College System, college-wide, or departmental goals. Rationale and justification for each request must be clear. If the need does not exist or a connection cannot be made or justified, the request does not move beyond the sector for consideration. These allocation requests, when looked at with the sectors' updated program review, integrate well with the College's new approach to resource allocations.

The College has many ongoing systematic cycles of evaluation, integrated planning, and resource allocation, but they occur in a disjointed fashion that does not allow for the efficiencies and economies of scale that take place when all systems are truly integrated into a synergistic connection. In the model that has been proposed for 2007-2008, such cyclic, synergistic systems will be addressed. It is important to note that even as the College integrates or implements this type of process, the process itself must constantly be evaluated. Each institution is unique, complex, and dynamic.

Evaluation will be based on analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data by the Associate Dean of Research and Planning, faculty leadership, and key stakeholders. Evidence will be broader than that currently available for evaluation, which is primarily sector-driven. Solidified plans come together from sectors, but without a system in place that allows opportunities to link and creatively leverage resources in a different, broad-based way at lower levels. The groundwork for the broad-based assessment has been laid and will occur in the fall 2007 time frame. In this new model, the chairs of the respective shared governance committees, faculty and classified, as well as administrative participants, will be involved in assessment and decision making.

The College has allocated necessary resources to lead to improvement of institutional effectiveness to support the above described systems. The president will be chairing the Institutional Planning Committee, and the membership reflects the Executive Cabinet from the management side: a significant human resource dedication. Also, the College has hired a consultant to create an Educational Master Plan and a consultant to put in place a Decision Support System (DSS) to lead to measurement and assessment of the College's effectiveness. Funds have been allocated to hire the Associate Dean of Research and Planning, also. There will be an institution-wide, or cross institutional, allocation of resources based on institutional priorities, based on a needs assessment validated by research and evaluation.

The ongoing dialogue on many fronts to better analyze and put appropriate assessment systems in place is evidence that although it is not a systematic review at this time, the College is putting the systems in place now to allow implementation of systematic reviews in the fall and later.

Summary

Although the College has not met all aspects of this recommendation, it has made considerable progress in all areas to lay the necessary foundation to meet this standard. Systematic and integrated planning, program review, SLOs, measurement and a culture of evidence are emerging across the College as an expected operational norm. For an organization of MSJC's size and dynamics,

something as complicated as this standard is not easily created and implemented, nor is it done in a rushed manner. The College had a history of effective planning, review, and assessment for effectiveness. It was, however, disjointed and not part of an integrated system. Each of the elements of such a system has been addressed and has been emerging over the last few years. As evidenced by the work of the many committees, constituent groups, and leadership of the College, there has been tremendous movement across the institution toward meeting this standard. Draft integrated planning, allocation, and assessment models have been introduced and will be piloted in the coming months/year. As proclaimed in its mission statement, MSJC is committed to innovation and institutional excellence as well as to the successful launch of a synergistic model for excellence.

Evidence

Administrative Procedures
Board Policies
Budget Development Process
Decision Support System
Educational Master Plan
Institutional Goals 2007-2008
Instructional Services Goals 2007-2008
Master Plan 2004-2009
Program Review Model
Shared Governance (Revised) document
Student Learning Outcomes Reports

Recommendation #3

The Team recommends that the College develop a comprehensive plan for the development of student learning outcomes at the program and course levels, for using data about student achievement of those outcomes to assess and improve the quality and effectiveness of programs and services, and to integrate the results of the process into decision making and planning at the College.

(Standards I-A, I-B-7; II-A.1, 2, 3)

Since the completion of the Self Study Evaluation Report and ACCJC Site Visit in October 2005, Mt. San Jacinto College has made considerable progress with the creation of a comprehensive plan for the development of student learning outcomes at the program and course levels. At the time of the Self Study Evaluation Report and Site Visit, no disciplines had completed the student learning outcome (SLO) process, and the SLO effort had yet to spread throughout the College. The process for developing departmental learning outcomes (DLOs) and institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) also had yet to commence.

While the SLO process has not been fully completed, the College can demonstrate rapid progress at the course, departmental, and institutional levels, including progress on the integration of student

learning outcomes in institutional planning, program review, and in fiscal decision-making and allocations.

Mt. San Jacinto College began to directly address student learning outcomes (SLOs) in fall 2005 with the formal appointment of an SLO Site Coordinator, a faculty member who received 100 percent reassigned time to organize and coordinate SLO activities college-wide. To enhance this effort and create stronger leadership and a more visible presence on both campuses, the MSJC Academic Senate established a second SLO Site Coordinator position in fall 2006, which enabled each campus to have an active SLO Coordinator presence. College administration, including the president and academic deans, also established a monetary departmental incentive to encourage faculty participation in the three phases of the SLO process, thereby assisting in the acceleration of SLO activities college-wide during years one (2005-2006) and two (2006-2007) of the SLO process.

In fall 2005, a team of faculty representing both campuses, as well as academic, career, and support fields, attended a career education sponsored workshop on the development and integration of SLOs. The workshop presented the Higher Education Evaluation and Research Group's (HEERG) approach, a model which focuses on structuring dialogue about student performance as a reflection of learning among discipline faculty.

Following that conference, an SLO Committee was established, comprised of faculty and administrators from a wide range of disciplines. The SLO Committee has met on a regular basis since that time to provide resources and guidance for the SLO process district-wide. In May 2006, the SLO Committee was adopted by the Academic Senate, ensuring the SLO advisory structure via permanent committee status within the Academic Senate.

Some of the accomplishments of the SLO committee include the design and development of a comprehensive SLO workshop in fall 2005 for the pre-college faculty FLEX day, using the materials from the HEERG workshop. The two-hour orientation and hands-on exercises were developed to increase faculty members' understanding and awareness of SLOs as they relate to the primary level of institutional activity (course activity and direct-contact services provided by faculty). The orientation presented the purpose and value of completing SLOs. In addition, the process for completing SLOs was explained and examples of model SLOs completed by faculty were reviewed. Time was allotted for faculty to work together in groups by discipline to identify their course(s) and learning objectives for review. More than a dozen groups participated in active discussions and were successful in planning and designing their assessment activities for completing SLOs. Counselors and librarians were also invited to participate.

This orientation was then followed by two separate workshops focused on developing proposals for assessment cross-reading sessions during late fall 2005. The purpose of the workshops was to collaboratively design the SLO assessment activity for use during the consequent FLEX workshop in January 2006 as well as during departmental meetings in the spring 2006 semester. The plans emanating from this workshop were published as "Learning Outcome Workshop: September 27/October 26, 2005." Over 107 faculty members (fifty-nine full-time and forty-eight associate faculty members) participated in the workshops, representing twenty-eight disciplines and services.

Workshops were held during the fall 2006 and spring 2007 semesters. Information related to the SLO workshops was disseminated through quarterly SLO newsletters as well as postings and

announcements within departments. Additionally, SLO information was shared via the Curriculum Committee to the Academic Senate.

In addition, the SLO Committee developed a comprehensive SLO manual with an electronic input form for ease of completion which provides a simplified explanation of the SLO process. The SLO manual features (1) how faculty identify SLOs; (2) how students demonstrate their learning; (3) expectations for student performance; (4) and assessment of student performance.

With the MSJC model, dialogue between faculty members is the basic recurrent theme in the SLO process. During the past two years, faculty who teach specific courses collaborated in the selection of the one or two objectives to be targeted. Faculty reviewed the objective and determined if there were conditions under which performance must be observed. Once one or two SLOs were developed, faculty determined the types of assignments that students would use to demonstrate their achievement of the SLO. Results of this dialogue were recorded.

Expectations for student performance were also developed. Faculty teaching the preparation also determined the expectations they shared for student achievement. Faculty members collegially developed language that described a “high” performance, an “adequate” performance, and an “inadequate” performance. Associate faculty members who also taught the prep/course were drawn into the dialogue, and appropriate adjustments were made in the assignments and expectations.

Assessing student performance and reviewing faculty application of the expectations is the third and final phase of the SLO process. Although the faculty plan to incorporate assessment in the 2007-2008 academic year, initial faculty discussion of results has provided insights as to whether the expectations were being applied with general consistency and whether students were achieving the learning outcome at appropriate levels and in appropriate numbers. A guide for the assessment process and a form for recording the results has been developed and incorporated in the SLO Manual.

During the first year of implementation of SLOs, assistance was provided to individual departments on a consultative basis by the SLO Site Coordinators located on each campus. Completion reports were filed beginning in February 2006, with the last reports for the academic year filed in May 2006. At the completion of the first year of the SLO process, thirty-three associate and full-time faculty in instruction participated in the process. A total of twenty-one programs or services filed completion reports for at least one course or function during the first year of the SLO process implementation.

During the second year of the SLO process (2006-2007), numerous courses in several different disciplines were reviewed and assigned student learning outcomes; a dozen are still in process. The new SLO model was assessed and evaluated through the HEERG model by full-time and part-time faculty.

A multi-year cycle for SLOs has been developed by the SLO Committee, proposed to and approved by the Academic Senate, integrating assessment to the cycles for program review and curriculum development. The committees plan to continue working with the College community to develop a matrix reflecting the status of each course and program.

Research and SLOs

As detailed in Recommendation 2.2 and as described above in MSJC's SLO model, rather than utilize numerical data, the SLO Committee opted to focus on dialogue between faculty members as the primary source of qualitative data for the SLO process. Over the past two years, it has been a conscious and deliberate decision by the SLO Committee to not integrate the MSJC Research Office into the SLO process. The SLO Committee made an intentional determination to use "institutional dialogue" under the Higher Education and Evaluation Research Group (HEERG) dialogue-based model, approved by the California Community College Chancellor's Office, as the primary research and data tool that would be utilized for the development and implementation of the SLO process/cycle at the College. Individual instructors conduct research within their departments, and the results are conveyed to the SLO Committee. Then the SLO Committee presents that information to the Curriculum Committee, where it is made available college-wide on the Curriculum Committee website. Using the HEERG model, professional dialogue about student performance and the changes in learning design necessary to achieve improvement in student performance takes place at the departmental level.

In the future, as data accumulates, statistical data analysis will play a larger part in the assessments of student learning outcomes. Institutional structures are in place which should permit for steady improvement and future integration with the Research Office. In addition, SLOs will become a part of the job responsibilities and tasks for the new associate dean of research and planning position which opened for recruitment in late summer 2007.

Integration of SLOs in Institutional Cycles

Integration with Program Review and Curriculum Committee

The SLO process is now a part of the basic reporting in instructional program review (a three-year cycle which looks at program goals in the program overview as related to the proposed Educational Master Plan and ILOs, at performance on identified student learning outcomes as part of student success, and at departmental learning outcomes under the program content areas). From its first meeting in the 2005-2006 academic year, the Program Review Committee has been addressing SLOs. The old program review model for instructional programs had already incorporated reference to SLOs; however, the model had not indicated either the manner or the depth of that incorporation. Moreover, the old model was deemed cumbersome. Therefore, the Program Review Committee decided to overhaul the model and declared a one-year moratorium on reviewing programs.

As a result of the program review revision, several critical goals were identified for the new model: ease of use and more frequent updating; integration of program review with planning; integration of program review with allocations of resources including staff, funds, and materials; and integration of program review with student learning outcomes.

The Curriculum Committee approved the SLO model and exemplum manuals at the beginning of the 2006-2007 academic year. SLOs are expected to be conducted as part of the curriculum revision cycle, done by the department every time a course is revised (and at least once every six years). The members of the Curriculum Committee and the SLO Committee meet and exchange ideas and information regularly.

In addition, the SLO materials were given a clearly identifiable web presence via the Curriculum Committee web page. Completed studies and reports submitted by MSJC faculty, examples from other colleges, PowerPoint presentations, and forms are among the resources provided for information and assistance to faculty. After the development of SLOs and rubrics at the course level, instructors receive pertinent and standard information around which to base their instruction from department chairs. As courses are revised and approved by the Curriculum Committee, the student learning outcomes will become a standard within the course outline of record, to which all instructors are accountable.

Integration with Budget

As described in Recommendation 2.2 SLOs have been approved to be part of the administrative review process for instructional budget augmentation requests, (approved by the Board of Trustees June 28, 2007). The annual budget development process recommended a new procedure for budget allocation requests, which stipulates that the Budget Change Proposal forms require that each augmentation request be tied to at least one of the annual institutional Master Plan goals and/or student learning outcomes to be considered for funding.

Additionally, to further integrate program review into instructional planning and allocation decisions, the Program Review Committee has recommended that 1) no full time tenure-track faculty position be allocated which has not first appeared as an identified need in Program Review and Educational Master Plan documents, 2) no instructional equipment purchases (over a level to be determined) be made which have not first appeared as a need identified in the Program Review and Educational Master Plan documents, 3) no new construction or refurbishment of any instructional facility be undertaken which has not first appeared as a need identified in the Program Review and Educational Master Plan documents.

SLO Progress for Student Services

The Student Services department has made significant progress in implementing SLOs and developing a culture of assessment. This has been a dramatic change from its traditional measurement of contacts and interventions. At present, discussions focused upon how Student Services affects students—aiding in better educational decision-making and how to measure such results. This effort represents the core of what can be achieved through SLOs: a shift to assessing how particular services make a difference in students' lives.

After completing program review in 2003-2004, Student Services Leadership Council launched the SLO effort in Student Services in September 2004. A generalized model that had been used with success at various colleges in Southern California was used as a means to initiate, focus, and capture the discussions in each sector that emanated from this effort. A resource binder was assembled for each participant in the development of Student Services SLOs.

In a series of orientations and departmental meetings, student learning outcomes were identified for each major Student Services function that delivers educational or educational support programs or services. Each identified outcome was associated with one of the sector's six learning outcomes, as adapted from the Nichols' model. This effort was completed in May 2005.

At the start of the new academic year, Student Services faculty participated in the fall 2005 SLO workshop, reviewing work completed in the previous year and determining whether the outcomes previously identified would support assessment and whether that assessment would actually focus on the value of intervention by Student Services faculty. Thus, they selected SLOs, assessment methods, and standards related to the effort of 2004-2005, but they also began examining the SLO challenge with a new perspective. Student Services departments are well ahead of most other areas in the development of SLOs. In many cases, standard surveys and “through put”-model assessments have been initiated or continued to support the assessment of the “big six” Student Services outcomes. Finally, in some areas, notably those where faculty are assigned, further discussion has been engendered by the fall 2005 SLO Workshop, which may result in the actual assessment and redesign of one or more functions in Counseling and/or Guidance to better serve students.

The SLO effort for the Student Services Division continued into 2006 and 2007 with the following programs’ reviewing their SLOs and assessment methodologies as they prepared to implement the assessment phase: Enrollment Services, Financial Aid, DSPS, EOPS/CARE, Counseling, Learning Skills, Career Services, Title V grant (Student Success Task Force), Articulation/Transfer, Talent Search, Upward Bound, and Matriculation.

A focus of the Student Services SLO measures has been to go beyond just aggregate number measures (i.e., number of students filing a FAFSA electronically) and to begin, when possible, to assess the desired behavioral change outcomes of students (i.e., comfort and functional competence with technology and likelihood of future access and use of online services).

In the spring of 2006, the College engaged a consultant and researcher to help assess the customer service and marketing issues that directly relate to access and student success. The data and findings compiled from 400 phone surveys and focus groups allowed the College to develop plans that enhanced services and access. The information from these surveys was presented to the administration at several workshops by the consultant and was analyzed and reported on by the Research Office.

Progress on Departmental Learning Outcomes

Discipline or departmental learning outcomes implementation, first proposed by faculty in fall 2005, was resumed in spring 2007. Although significant progress was not made for the 2006-2007 academic year, the Curriculum Committee decided that DLOs will become part of the process for “course proposal/revision,” so that each course will be connected to the approved departmental/discipline/program learning outcomes. DLOs will be part of the regular curricular proposal and review process at the level of the Curriculum Committee. SLOs are expected to be conducted as part of the curriculum revision cycle, done by the department every time a course is revised (and at least once every six years).

Progress on Institutional Learning Outcomes

In late fall 2005, the Curriculum Committee responded to a request from the SLO Site Coordinator and appointed a working ad-hoc committee to develop an instructional ILO proposal. Personnel who had been working on ILOs from the instructional perspective were gathered by the Dean of

Instruction to discuss how the effort would unfold. The Curriculum Committee's ad-hoc group began work in the first week of September 2005, having both the materials from the previous spring and policy statements from state and local levels to guide their work. They created a draft of institutional learning outcomes, incorporating faculty contributions from the previous spring and the work done by the faculty resource coordinator. The resulting draft went to the Curriculum Committee in September 2005. Feedback from the Curriculum Committee and the workshop sessions resulted in a final proposal that was presented to the Curriculum Committee in October 2005 for a first reading. The draft was approved at the committee level and forwarded to the Academic Senate, along with the ILO proposal drafted by the Student Services Department. The Academic Senate had the responsibility of aligning the two documents into a proposal for College Council. The blended ILO statement was reviewed and approved by the Executive Academic Senate in April 2006. Approval at College Council took place in fall 2006. Board approval occurred in spring 2007, as part of the continued institutional commitment, and as evidence for the update report to the Accreditation Commission.

The MSJC Board of Trustees has taken actions which have helped to accelerate the SLO process. In summer 2005, the Board approved a new mission statement, derived from the community/College Master Plan. Secondly, it has approved Chapter 3 of the Board Policy, which provides further insights into institutional values and priorities. Together, these documents assisted the SLO Committee, the Curriculum and Student Services Committees, and the Academic Senate in developing a proposal for College Council and Board regarding institutional learning outcomes. In addition, in fall 2005, the Board of Trustees participated in an orientation on the impact of SLOs, which featured information regarding the new ACCJC standards, a description of how SLOs function within the standards, and the Board's relationship to SLOs in establishing District priorities. In spring 2007, the MSJC Board of Trustees unanimously approved the institutional learning outcomes, which will ultimately help to direct faculty regarding expectations for students in general education programs and student services and which provide the Board a means of placing emphasis on one aspect or another as its focus sharpens due to institutional assessment and planning.

Summary

With strong faculty leadership, administrative support, and broad-based institutional involvement, the College is making excellent progress in addressing this recommendation. To date, dozens of courses across a wide range of disciplines have identified and evaluated student learning outcomes; library programs have gone through the first round of SLO analysis; there is a local instructional SLO model in place (complete with instructions, forms and examples); and solid progress has been made toward creating and implementing an ongoing SLO plan, complete with integration into some of the decision-making processes at the College.

In addition, Student Services appears to be migrating from a "processing" model to an "impact" model (i.e., "How do student choices or decisions improve as a result of student services?").

Since the first academic year of the SLO process, faculty and administration have collaboratively completed the following: developed and implemented an SLO model, including activities to orient all full-time faculty and incorporate the full-time and associate faculty from a strong cross-section of courses in SLO development, implementation, and assessment (i.e., completion); developed a local

SLO procedures handbook, and a booklet of examples; integrated SLOs into instructional program review and student services program review (in educational and educationally supportive services); developed preliminary DLOs for the majority of the instructional programs and some of the Student Services programs, more as an orientation exercise than as “result”—with final development to occur at such time as ILOs were approved; and developed and proposed to the College Council a series of institutional learning outcomes, which have been given Board approval. SLOs are expected to be conducted as part of the curriculum revision cycle, done by the department every time a course is revised (and at least once every six years); departmental learning outcome review will be part of the regular curricular proposal and review process at the level of the Curriculum Committee; SLO progress has been agreed to as part of the administrative review process for instructional and instructional services budget augmentation requests. With the institution of the online program review, SLOs will be reviewed there, also, every six years or with every revision to a course outline. A multi-year cycle for SLOs has been developed by the SLO committees and proposed to the Senate, integrating SLO assessment to the cycles for program review and curriculum development

Approval of the institutional learning outcomes communicates the Board of Trustees’ expectations for educational programs to the College’s various constituencies. As a result, faculty will have to bridge the gap between outcomes that were previously developed for individual courses and the district-wide statement as well as how each departmental learning outcome contributes to achieving the institutional learning outcomes and how each course’s student learning outcomes contribute to the department’s outcomes.

In addition, approval of ILOs will allow decision makers to weigh alternatives among educational programs in terms of what they will contribute to learning outcomes, especially those decisions that are made within the context of integrated planning and development. ILOs will permit faculty and administration to establish goals and objectives that are student-outcome related. The ILOs will allow the College to refocus on the educational results of the students.

The culmination of activities of the past two academic years shows significant progress and steady improvement toward institutionalizing development of student learning outcomes and using data about student achievement to assess and improve the quality and effectiveness of programs and services at the College. Goals have been developed for 2007-2008 that reflect the ongoing nature of the SLO effort in instruction and renewed emphasis on mapping progress.

Evidence

(Documents: Curriculum Committee minutes; ILO Document, Draft 1—Sept. 19, 2005; Memo to the Curriculum Committee re: Institutional Learning Outcome Proposal)

(see meeting notes, Core Competencies)

2005-2006 End of Year Report – Learning Outcomes at MSJC

Academic Senate Minutes – approving second SLO site coordinator

ACCJC 2006-2007 Annual Update on Student Learning Outcomes

Board meeting minutes, May 10, 2007

Board Presentation for May 10, 2007, R. Rockwell, SJC SLO Coordinator

Curriculum Committee website

Institutional Learning Outcomes

Learning Outcome Workshop: September 27/October 26, 2005

SLO Manual

Student Services Leadership Council launched the SLO effort in Student Services in September, 2004 (see minutes)

Student Services SLOs (updated)

Student Services SLOs/Customer Services Surveys

Recommendation #5

The Team recommends that the physical planning and technology planning processes be integrated with, and supportive of, the implementation of the District Master Plan, the strategic plan, program plans, and budget development process, and that the processes provide for participation of stakeholders.

(Standard III –B.1; B.2; and C.2; D.2)

Technology – Information Technology

Mt. San Jacinto College has worked diligently to integrate the College's technology planning and evaluation processes with the implementation of the Master Plan, program plans, and budget development processes. Currently, all technology plans and improvements emanate from the five-year institutional Master Plan and other departmental and program plans.

Once the new Educational Master Plan is developed and finalized (spring 2008), all technology and facility plans and improvements will derive from this new district-wide planning document. In addition, as the new program review model finishes its pilot program (fall 2008) and student learning outcomes complete the final assessment stage (spring 2008), technology plans will also become integrated into both processes.

The Information Technology Department (IT), working with the Information, Communication and Technology Committee (ICTC), and all constituent groups has developed an outline of a plan for the technology master plan and has begun developing a strategy for implementation. It is anticipated that this plan will be launched campus-wide in fall 2007 to evaluate current IT services and thus will be ready to integrate with the Educational Master Plan in spring 2008. It is the intention that once SLOs are fully developed district-wide, that MSJC will be able to coordinate physical and technology planning more effectively. In addition, the technology plan will also be driven by program review.

To be consistent with the new planning model approved by the Board of Trustees in spring 2007, the SLO and Program Review Committees will forward their technology recommendations and needs to the Instruction Office and Curriculum Committee, which then funnel the information to ICTC and the Budget Committee and, finally, to the Executive Cabinet for formal approval. In addition to SLO and Program Review Committees as well other District areas' making recommendations for technology needs, the IT Department is actively working with Instruction to make recommendations on the use of technology resources.

The College analyzes growth patterns to determine the need to deploy additional resources to grow the infrastructure to support growing distance education and student services programs. In addition, technology infrastructure planning is accomplished by performing an extensive growth and needs analysis which takes into consideration technical readiness, funding, need for faculty tools, and administrative and staffing requirements.

In cooperation with the Facilities Planner, the IT Department works closely during the planning of new facilities and renovation of existing facilities to meet the technology needs of the District. Within the last three years, MSJC has had two buildings constructed and one in the initial planning phase. In addition, numerous renovations have taken place. All of the new buildings and renovations of existing facilities have gone through an extensive formalized technology-driven planning process that works in conjunction with facility infrastructure needs.

The IT Department has completed a comprehensive program review that is directly tied to institutional goals developed by the Executive Cabinet and approved by the Board of Trustees. The program review includes an assessment of the outcome of past departmental goals, a staff analysis, a budget analysis, quality of service targets and review, and customer evaluations. The program review is in development for completion in December 2007. An annual update for the program review will be completed each December as a precursor to budget development and requests for funding for new projects.

Technology planning for each fiscal/academic year is an integral part of the ongoing institutional budget and goal development process. Technology initiatives are developed with the input of the ICTC. When IT develops its annual budget, the associated Master Plan goals are clearly identified with each specific initiative. When an initiative is proposed from one of the District's areas (Instruction, Human Resources, Business Services, and/or Student Services), an initial budget is developed for planning purposes. Technology initiatives are then presented to the Budget Development Committee on a monthly basis. After review and recommendation by the Budget Development Committee, the initiative is forwarded to the Executive Cabinet for final review and approval. When the initiative is approved, a detailed budget is developed.

Technology procurements are driven by assessment of growth and emerging technologies. Technology purchases are prioritized departmentally and administratively. All purchase analysis includes a connection with the Master Plan goals. Every purchase order and purchase requisition related to technology requires the approval of IT for usability requirements.

Nearly all of the goals established in the 2004-2009 Master Plan have a technology component. Master Plan Goal #13 broadly recognizes that continuous analysis and review is necessary to implement innovative and effective technology. Yearly technology plans are evaluated on an annual basis with the completion of year-end status reports. Examples of technology-driven initiatives that have come from planning to implementation include voice-over-IP, direct dial, student and associate faculty email, a student web portal, single authentication between online student services, an upgrade in the WAN, implementation of a clustered server environment and a SAN-solution, some secure and authenticated wireless access points, and a redesigned College web presence. These specific initiatives were implemented in an effective manner that included planning and systematic process-oriented implementations.

MSJC has processes in place to determine the technology needs for both staff and students. For the last four years, the IT Department has developed an annual obsolescence plan which details the software/hardware that has become obsolete and the plan for replacement. This list is distributed to all administrators communicating the workstations that need replacement. In summer 2007, the IT Department commenced a district-wide computer leasing program that works to replace most of the outdated computers for faculty, staff, and students (Eagle Access Centers, Assessment, LRC).

Effectiveness of technology is evaluated on how well the College is meeting student and faculty demand for services. Surveys have been developed and distributed to staff and faculty members to identify needs specific for individuals and departments as part of the department program review. Surveys will be ongoing, and with the survey results, IT will strategize departmental operations and goals.

Effectiveness of the College's technology is also evaluated by participation in regional and national user groups, i.e., 3CDUG and DUG, where MSJC gains knowledge regarding best practices at other two-year institutions. MSJC is a technology leader among community colleges and often receives requests from other colleges to share expertise and processes developed by the College.

MSJC, like other community colleges in the state, had budget allocations for technology training in the Telecommunications and Technology Infrastructure Program in 2001-2002 and 2002-2003. During this time, the IT Department purchased self-directed training packages, hired training consultants, and internally hired employees in District supported software. This funding, however, was eliminated in 2003-2004. Since that time, the College has largely been unfunded for these training opportunities. To meet this distinct need for training, IT has purchased and distributed quick-start guides and has held internal training sessions during staff development days, faculty FLEX and "How Do I...days." Staff is sent to technology training with base budget funds or TTIP funding that can be used in any funded category. Training provided has included a full-coverage subscription to TechEd events, participation in regional and national software user groups (3CDUG, DUG), and participation in @One Academies. Effectiveness is measured with a train-the-trainer approach. Those who attend training are encouraged, and in some cases required, to share knowledge gained. For example, attendees of DUG are required to come back and share information with the Datatel support group. The user communities are served with "module leaders" who are departmental resident experts regarding the Datatel software. The module leaders are charged with maintaining software parameters and training departmental staff. When these module leaders attend training, they are responsible to come back and share information with their department and with the Datatel community.

The District has invested in a web content management system (WCMS) that is scheduled to go live in fall 2007. Advantages of a WCMS include the fact that web content stakeholders have ready access to update content on their web pages, without requiring the expertise to know web programming languages. The District expectation is that the dissemination of information via the web will be more current and timely, and thus provide a better web presence to serve the College's community. (MSJC website <http://www.msjc.edu>)

Evidence

2006-2007 Budget Change Proposals for Technology Initiatives

2006-2007 Goals and Master Plan Update
2007-2008 Budget Change Proposals for Technology Initiatives
2007-2008 Goals and Master Plan Update
Accomplishments under the Technology Master Plan
Administrative Procedures
Annual Goal Setting
Annual Obsolete Lists
Bandwidth and Network Management Analysis
Budget Committee Agenda
Budget Expenditures for Training
Budget Expenditures for Training from Base
Budget proposal for Systematic Mainframe Upgrade on cycle
CAST Minutes showing DUG/3CDUG Reports
Cost vs. Use
Cost/Growth Analysis
HP9000 Specifications
ICTC Minimum Standards
ICTC Minutes
ICTC Minutes and Agendas
ICTC Minutes showing How Do I Day/FLEX participation
ICTC Showing TECH Ed Support
IT Staff Analysis
IT Survey for Program Review
Lease Analysis for desktop computing
Master Plan Goal 13 Update for Management of Technology
Master Plan Goal 14 Update for Records management
Network Monitoring
Ongoing Initiatives
Program Review, including Survey
Report to BOT
Technology Master Plan Update
TTIP Budget Expenditure Documents
Uptime Statistics

Technology – Instructional Technology Support

Assessing and prioritizing the needs of the Instructional Technology Support (ITS) team is a collegial process. The Educational Technology Committee (ETC), a shared committee consisting of administration, faculty and staff, is responsible for gathering information and accepting reports and requests pertinent to ITS and planning accordingly. Discussions and feedback to the ETC also come from instructional administrative meetings, instructional deans' meetings, faculty meetings, and College Council. The plans and requests from the ETC are forwarded to and approved by the Budget Development Committee and then the Executive Cabinet, where final responsibility for decisions lies.

Budgets for Instructional Technology Support are generally reviewed in collaboration with the IT Dean each semester to avoid redundancy and enhance cost reduction through bulk purchasing. A

revision of the technology plan (devised in 2001) is on the goals list for the 2007-2008 Educational Technology Committee. There is now a permanent dean (the Dean of Library and Technology) over the Instructional Technology Support area, which has been led by an interim for the past two and a half years, allowing for the completion of the plan in 2007-2008.

In the spring of 2007, a five-year staffing plan for ITS was developed; it is based on the additional needs that will arise as a result of the addition of three new classroom buildings in the next five years. Technology purchases are prioritized through regular inventory review and through determining the needs of the students. Technological equipment that is used in the classrooms is the first priority - online education needs are included in first prioritization - labs and ancillary needs are second priority. In the ITS Office, tracking systems for most of the purchases and personnel costs have been established.

Evaluation of ITS occurs in several ways. Currently, ITS uses a special comments email address within its Blackboard portal to evaluate instructional use of course management technology, and it reviews technology inventories on a regular basis to determine regular replacement and repair schedules. The ITS Departmental meetings occur prior to each semester to anecdotally evaluate prior semesters' problems and successes and create goals for improvement for the new semester. Preventative maintenance on all smart classrooms is performed prior to each semester. An end-of-year survey was deployed college-wide to assess the effectiveness of ITS' technology services. The College has improved staffing strategies, including increased hours and regular staff meetings with administration. It has also created an ITS and Distance Education (DE) Staffing Plan for 2007-2011 according to enrollment and new building needs (as reflected in 2007-08 BCP process). Additionally, the College determines the effectiveness of technology training provided to College constituents/students by counting numbers of participants in training activities, by assessing success and retention rates of DE students over a six-year period, and by researching individual instructors' success/retention rates based on participation or not in the academy programs. Indicating the success of the @MSJC Academy are completions since 1999: fourteen sessions of training were held for a total of forty-three days (258 hours) with approximately 470 participants, averaging thirty-four people in attendance per session. An assessment of DE success and retention rates for the six year period 2000-2006 shows an increase from twenty to 203 sections online; an enrollment growth from 558 to 4420, a success rate growth from 51% to 57% for DE students, and a retention rate growth for DE students from 67% to 79%.

Also, a focus on training faculty throughout the development of online programs has produced results. ITS has developed a set of peer evaluation guidelines for evaluation of faculty who teach online. Also, the gap between success and retention in the College's DE and face to face (FTF) programs is getting smaller. There are many variables; however, student skill levels in taking online courses are improving. To determine why students are dropping online courses, DE has established a digital exit interview for students who drop a course.

The following ITS goals in the MSJC 2004-2009 Master Plan have been completed. Eagle Access Centers have been established on both campuses: they provide students with access to Eagle Advisor, class schedules, catalog of courses, and general College information. The centers are staffed with personnel who provide assistance to students for accessing College web services. Expanded services are provided in other on-campus lab areas during peak registration times prior to and at the beginning of each new semester. Access to computers has been expanded across the College by the

addition of a variety of student use labs as follows: Increased computer workstations in both libraries and learning resources (doubled since 2004) and computer labs and workstations were established in several career education areas including nursing, automotive, computer science, and child development centers. Kiosk-style computers and actual registration computers also exist in the registration areas. In addition, short term courses have been added that introduce students to the uses of technology that they will need to be successful students.

The email components of these goals are completed, with all associate faculty and students joining full-time faculty and staff in receiving campus-based email accounts. Ongoing baseline funding has not yet been established for the continuation and development of the online College. The notion of a “virtual campus” is in progress: there has been a substantial addition of online services and classes over the past few years. MSJC’s Distance Education program has been recognized statewide for its high quality course offerings. The online infrastructure and training opportunities continue to improve. Additional staff have been added in all areas of technology. The need for additional personnel in IT and ITS will continue throughout the coming years with the addition of services and as the College brings new buildings into service on the Menifee site. A baseline Distance Education budget has not been established, but funding has been appropriated from a variety of one-time funding sources. Further progress in the College’s online services and course offerings will definitely be dependent on the establishment of a budget that exists outside of the Budget Change Proposal process.

The College has a technology obsolescence plan in place to keep technology infrastructure current. It is a three-year lease plan that is organized by IT in collaboration with ITS. Also, faculty, administration, and staff meet on a regular basis during budget planning to assist with specification determination and bulk purchases. The Dean of Library and Technology participates in regular faculty meetings and Curriculum Committee meetings and is the co-chair of the Educational Technology Committee. The program review process has been digitized and will run its first program through in fall of 2007. This review process will be used to assist the ETC and departments to select and purchase new equipment. Currently, technology decisions are based upon the collaborative process described above in regular departmental meetings; however, the new program review process will improve upon this approach.

Evidence

Master Plan Goal Status Report # 6, Mar 2007

Master Plan Goal Status Report # 11, Mar 2007

Physical Resources

The District plans its physical resources in a variety of ways: submission of five-year capital outlay plans including Initial Project Proposals (IPPs) and Final Project Proposals (FPPs); submission of five-year scheduled maintenance/special repair plans; involvement of the Facilities Committee, which includes members from Information Technology/Instructional Services; use of Budget Change Proposals (BCPs) requiring internal project review for alignment with District Master Plan goals, institutional goals, and student learning outcomes (SLOs); revisions and updates to the Educational Master Plan; revisions and updates to the Facilities Master Plan; and meetings with stakeholders and others to review needs on a project by project basis.

The submission of the five-year capital outlay plan is completed using a multi-faceted approach. A review of the current and future FTES and FTEF enrollment projections is completed using data provided by the Chancellor's Office and by the District's Information Technology database. The enrollment projection is reviewed by TOPS code in order to determine the type of facilities/spaces required to support the District's growth.

In addition, District leadership is consulted to determine priorities for projects. The District, using the Chancellor's Office published Space and Utilization Standards and in concert with the Chancellor's Office Facilities Specialist, determines viability of projects and develops the Initial Project Proposal (IPP) request. Once a project need has been identified based on review of data and approval of the IPP, the appropriate stakeholders are consulted to determine specific programmatic needs. The District with the assistance of a consultant, if required, prepares the Final Project Proposal (FPP) and submits to the Chancellor's Office for review and funding.

The submission of the five-year scheduled maintenance/special repair plan (SM/SR) is completed under the leadership of the Maintenance & Operations Department. Consideration is given to the needs of the instructional program as well as any health/safety items requiring correction. Data used to submit the five-year SM/SR plan is compiled using historical knowledge as well as the results of a facilities condition analysis.

The facilities condition analysis consists of periodic surveys of the District's facilities to review for unsafe conditions, routine maintenance, and scheduled maintenance requirements such as the condition of the roofs, building structures, building infrastructures, finishes, mechanical systems, etc. The results of the facilities condition analysis are entered into the FUSION database (FUSION is a database program that allows for electronic submission of FPP's, IPP's, space inventories, etc. that allows data to be readily accessible to the Chancellor's Office) where they are reviewed and updated. The results are then used to determine remaining useful life of the facilities and assist with establishing priorities for obtaining funds.

The Facilities Committee is involved in the planning of the physical resources by assisting with the review of individual program needs. The committee consists of invited members including faculty, staff, and administrative representatives. There are representatives on the Facilities Committee from both the Information Technology and the Information Technology Support Departments who ensure that technology planning is integrated into facilities planning. The committee reviews the facilities modification request form which requires that each submitting department justify the requested facilities modification in concert with the SLOs, and Master Plan Goals, as well as ability to increase utilization and capacity of the spaces.

Budget Change Proposals (BCP) are submitted each year by the Maintenance & Operations Department and Facilities Planner as necessary to support the SM/SR program as well as other institutional priorities. BCPs are submitted to request funds to assist with the implementation and completion of Master Plan goals and student learning outcomes which are related to facilities.

Revisions to the Educational Master Plan will be made annually based on changing programmatic needs as identified by the Instruction Office. The revisions will be used to continue to determine

priorities for the five-year capital outlay plan as well as to assist with ensuring that District projects are prioritized based on SLOs, Master Plan goals, institutional goals, etc.

The District has hired a full-time facility planner to coordinate planning and program applications in concert with the five-year capital outlay plan, the SLOs, the institutional goals, etc. The Facility Planner coordinates project/program needs with Instruction, Student Services, Business Services, and others to assure that District needs and priorities are included in all projects.

An inventory of the District's capital assets is completed annually by the Facilities Planner to ensure that the District's facilities are in line with space allocations in accordance with the Chancellor's Office Space and Utilization Standards. The results of the space inventory are entered into the FUSION database during the open reporting period in September of each year. In addition, the Facilities Planner publishes utilization reports to District leadership which will assist in identifying areas for improvement as well as areas that require modernization in order to obtain better utilization. The areas identified as requiring modernization will be reviewed in concert with the five-year capital outlay plan and with the District's priorities as established by SLOs, institutional goals, etc.

Revisions to the Facilities Master Plan are made on an as-needed basis in concert with revisions to the Educational Master Plan, the five-year capital outlay plan, the institutional goals, the student learning outcomes, and the priorities of the District leadership.

Examples of projects currently in design follow (Stakeholders were involved in the design and programming of the General Classroom I building as evidenced by meeting minutes.): general classroom I – MVC (design phase); general classroom II – MVC (review for funding); proposed Banning campus (planning phase); proposed Wildomar campus (planning phase); renovations to Building 100 – MVC (design phase); renovations to Building 200 – MVC (planning phase); replace boilers and underground piping – MVC (bid phase); electronic entrance sign marquee – MVC (design phase); parking lot expansion – MVC (bid phase); and replace cooling tower – library – SJC (bid phase).

The District builds its physical resources in a variety of ways, including use of a construction manager with multiple prime method; a design/bid/build method; in-house staff; temporary labor; use of capital outlay funds through general revenue bond allocations; District funds through operating expense budget; and scheduled maintenance/special repair funds.

The District ensures that all facilities are constructed in accordance with all applicable local, county, state, and federal regulations including Title 24, Title 5, Title 19, Title 8, California Building Code, National Electric Code, National Plumbing Code, National Mechanical Code, etc. Plans are currently reviewed by the Division of the State Architect (DSA) to ensure compliance with codes specifically related to access compliance, structural, and fire/life safety. Comments received from DSA are incorporated into the final plans prior to construction. Independent constructability reviews are also completed prior to finalization of plans and comments incorporated prior to bid on all major capital outlay projects.

Oversight of projects completed by contractors and service providers is accomplished by Maintenance & Operations/Facilities Planning through the use of in-house staff in concert with special inspection/testing consultants, DSA Inspectors, and others as needed.

Examples of projects currently under construction or completed since the last accreditation follow (Stakeholders were involved in the design and programming of the Learning Resource Center and the Technology Building as evidenced by meeting minutes): Learning Resource Center – MVC (warranty phase); Technology Building – MVC (construction); modular classroom/faculty offices – MVC (construction); modular classroom/faculty offices – SJC (construction); install footings and lifts – Auto Shop – SJC (construction); Child Development Teacher Education Center – SJC/MVC (completed and occupied); new bookstore – MVC (completed and occupied); Athletic Center including soccer field, locker room and staff offices – MVC (completed and occupied); Wellness Center – SJC GYM (completed and occupied); renovations to Microbiology Lab – MVC (completed and occupied); installation of water well – SJC (completed and functioning); amphitheater modernization – SJC (completed and occupied); installation of directional and informational way-finding signs – SJC/MVC (ongoing); replacement of twenty-six HVAC Units – SJC/MVC (completed and functioning); installation of xeriscape landscaping – SJC/MVC (ongoing); installation of automatic doors – accessibility improvements – SJC/MVC (completed and functioning); installation of shade structures and outdoor seating areas – MVC (completed and occupied); and installation of access ramp/walkway – baseball bleachers – SJC (completed and occupied).

The District maintains its physical resources in a variety of ways, including routine maintenance; scheduled maintenance, preventive maintenance; facilities condition analysis; space inventory; and annual certifications and inspections of building systems, including elevators, fire marshal inspections, gas pumps, Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD), South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), risk management, health department, air compressors, etc., as required by the various regulatory agencies.

The condition of the facilities is reviewed and space is inventoried annually. Upgrades and repairs are completed based on results of condition inspections, space inventories, service requests/ work orders, requests from the Facility Committee, requests from the Safety Committee and daily reviews by the custodial and maintenance staff. Recommendations for repairs are prioritized based on health/safety/code requirements, impact on the instructional programs (related to SLOs), and needs of the support service areas. Recommendations for improvements to facilities are made based on the results of the space inventory. Recommendations for improvements are prioritized based on space type and ability to generate FTE or increase capacity (related to SLOs).

The Maintenance & Operations (M&O) Department, under the leadership of the Director of Maintenance & Operations, maintains District grounds and facilities through the management of custodial, grounds, building maintenance, HVAC, electrical, and plumbing staff. In addition, the M&O Department has developed a Structural Maintenance and Repair Team (SMART) which will be dedicated to minor construction and maintenance projects such as painting, ceiling tile replacement, floor tile replacement, etc., ensuring that the SLOs can be supported in a timely and efficient manner. M&O staff provides service to a total of 359,155 outside gross square feet of facilities and 210 acres of grounds.

Steps that have been taken to implement the above items include an RFP issued to procure a computerized maintenance management system, including key control and an RFP issued to procure vendors to assist with updating the Educational Master Plan, which is step one of a four-step process to completing an integrated District Master Plan. Step two is the District Facilities Master Plan; step three is the District Utilities Master Plan; and step four is the District Landscape Master Plan. Also, an RFP is to be issued to procure a new energy management system, and an RFP is to be issued to procure a new fire alarm system. IPPs and FPPs are updated to ensure that program needs are considered which best assist the District with meeting the SLOs and space needs. The District has procured radios to assist with response to life and safety emergencies and other support needs such as emergency maintenance requests (lights out, water overflowing, too hot/cold, etc.).

In addition to the above steps, a customer satisfaction survey was issued to faculty and staff to determine the level of satisfaction with the District's facilities and services provided by Support Services and Maintenance & Operations. The District Master Plan Goals 24 (College Environment) and 33 (Campus Identification) have been implemented with way-finding signage in order to support SLOs and the Institutional Strategic Plan.

To assure the feasibility and effectiveness of physical resources in supporting institutional programs and services, the District plans and evaluates its facilities and equipment on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account. Long range capital plans support institutional improvement goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment. Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of physical resources and uses the results of the evaluation as a basis for improvement.

A Facilities Condition Analysis (FCA), consisting of periodic surveys of the District's facilities to review for unsafe conditions, routine maintenance and scheduled maintenance requirements such as the condition of the roofs, building structures, building infrastructures, finishes, mechanical systems, etc., is completed by District staff. The results of this analysis are entered into the FUSION database, where they are reviewed, updated, and then used to determine the remaining useful life of the facilities and assist with establishing priorities for obtaining funds.

Long range capital plans support institutional improvement goals by continually reviewing, revising and updating the Educational Master Plan and the Facility Master Plan based on changing programmatic needs as identified by the District. The revisions are used to determine priorities for the five-year capital outlay plan as well as to assist with ensuring that District projects are prioritized based on SLOs, Master Plan goals, institutional goals, etc.

Review of the Educational Master Plan and the Facility Master Plan is completed by analyzing enrollment trends and projections within the District boundaries and by self comparison with other Districts and service areas. Based on the trend analysis, the long range capital plans are modified as required to support the institutional improvement goals.

Long range capital plans reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment by performing life cycle cost analysis during the planning phase of the project. The life cycle cost analysis reviews such items as building envelopes, HVAC systems, and electrical systems, including lighting. The analysis includes projections of the initial cost of systems, the energy costs to

run the buildings, maintenance and custodial costs to service the buildings, the life expectancy of the buildings, replacement costs (if applicable) and total cost of ownership over fifty years. This information is then used by the District when making a decision as to how to proceed with the design of the facility.

The District assesses the effective use of physical resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis of improvement in a variety of ways. The District requires that all BCPs, including request for facility improvements or related items, provide a measurement device for determining the success of the investment.

Summary

Since the Self Evaluation Study of 2005, MSJC has made progress in the integration of the physical planning and technology planning processes with the implementation of the District Master Plan, the institutional goals, program plans, and the budget development process. Currently, the IT Department coordinates its planning, purchases, and installations of hardware in accord with the five-year Master Plan and other departmental and program plans, including the master technology plan, as does the ITS Department with its software installations and trainings to support faculty, students, distance education, and student services programs. Similarly, physical resources' planning is coordinated with IT and ITS through shared goals of the Master Plan and institutional goals, program plans, reliance on the budget development process, and several shared governance committees.

By the end of 2008, the IT and ITS Departments and the Facilities Department will coordinate with other departments in keeping with the mandates of the Educational Master Plan, the data derived from the DSS, the revised budget process, the revised program review plans, and requirements of student learning outcomes, in addition to compliance with the broader institutional goals and Master Plan.

The current processes provide for participation of stakeholders via shared governance committees, input from faculty through department chairs to deans of instruction, student services, and business services, and decision making by the executive cabinet. Plans for future participation include increased shared governance in the Institutional Planning Committee, the Budget Development Committee and the Facilities Committee, all of which will have a larger role in decision-making (per the BOT's approval of the revised budget process and institutional goals in spring of 2007) before final budgetary decisions are taken by the Executive Cabinet.

Evidence

[2004-2005 Scheduled Maintenance Plan](#)

2004-2008 Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan

2005-2009 Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan

2006-2010 Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan

2007-2011 Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan

2007-2008 Scheduled Maintenance Plan

Budget Change Proposal Spread Sheet, M&O/Facilities Planning, May 2007

Budget Committee Reports

Capital Outlay Final Project Proposal, Budget Year 2000-2001
Capital Outlay Final Project Proposal, Budget Year 2004-2005
Capital Outlay Final Project Proposal, Budget Year 2006-2007
Development & Support Services, Customer Satisfaction Survey, April 2007
Disaster Plan
Draft Initial Study (Banning Learning Center)
Education/Facilities Master Planning Through Year 2020
Educational Master Plan (existing and updated)
Facilities Committee Reports
Facilities Condition Analysis from FUSION showing annual updates
Facilities Modification Request Form
Facilities Update and Financing Options, 3/24/05
Facilities Update and Financing Options, 1/20/05
Facilities Update and Financing Options, Power Point Presentation
General Obligation Bonds, 1/20/05
General Obligation Bonds, 7/8/03
IPPs and FPPs for Capital Outlay Projects
Life Cycle Cost Analysis, General Classroom 1, MVC
MSJC Child Development Center, SJC
MSJC Child Development Center, MVC
MSJC Proposed Education Center Site, Banning
MSJC Master Plan 2000-2005
MSJC Master Plan 2004-2009
MSJC Safety Program
MSJC Sign Program
MVC Technology Center, Meeting Minutes
Programming Meeting Minutes – General Classroom 1, MVC
Project List/Spread Sheets
RFP for Computerized Maintenance Management System
RFP for Educational Master Plan
RFP for Electronic Marquee Entrance Sign, MVC
RFP for Energy Management Controls System
RFP for Fire Alarm
Safety Committee Reports
Space Inventory from FUSION showing annual updates