

# FOLLOW-UP REPORT

for Reaffirmation of Accreditation



Submitted to:

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



# INSTITUTIONAL REPORT

## **MT. SAN JACINTO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**

Follow-Up Report for Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Prepared and submitted by:

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

Submitted to:

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

March 15, 2013

# FOLLOW-UP REPORT – CERTIFICATION

**To:** Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges  
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

**From:**

Dr. Roger W. Schultz  
Mt. San Jacinto Community College District  
1499 N. State Street, San Jacinto, California 92583

I certify there was broad participation by the campus community and believe this Report accurately reflects the nature and substance of this institution.

**Signatures:**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. Roger W. Schultz (Chief Executive Officer) 3/14/13 (Date)

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dorothy McGargill (Chairperson, Governing Board) 3/14/13 (Date)

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mrs. Lorraine Slattery-Farrell (Executive Senate President) 3/7/13 (Date)

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Ms. Elaine Eshom (President, Classified Senate) 3/14/13 (Date)

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mrs. Rebecca Teague (Associate Dean, Institutional Effectiveness  
Planning and Grants/Accreditation Liaison Officer) 3/13/2013 (Date)

# Table of Contents

Cover Sheet .....	1
Certification of Institutional Follow-Up Report .....	3
Statement on Report Preparation .....	5
Response to the Commission Letter 2011 Recommendations .....	9
Recommendation 1: Mission Statement.....	9
Recommendation 2: Sustainability of Integrated Planning and Decision Processes .....	11
Recommendation 3: Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment .....	17
Recommendation 4: Identify and Address Gaps in Student Outcomes.....	25
Recommendation 5: Allocation of Human Resources .....	27
Appendix A: Evidence .....	31
Recommendation 1 .....	31
Recommendation 2 .....	33
Recommendation 3 .....	38
Recommendation 4 .....	41
Recommendation 5 .....	44

# Statement on Report Preparation

The Follow-Up Report reflects and documents the ongoing participation and contributions of Mt. San Jacinto Community College District's wide-ranging shared governance committees, groups, and constituencies in resolving the five recommendations set forth by the ACCJC's Action letter received in February 2012.

In response to the five recommendations identified by the Commission and Evaluation Team in the 2011 Self Study and Evaluation Team Report, Mt. San Jacinto Community College District utilized its existing shared governance structure, committees and ad-hoc groups to intentionally focus efforts on the specific elements cited in the Evaluation Report recommendations. The district tasked several specific committees and ad-hoc groups, because of their charges, to provide leadership in resolving the five recommendations. Specifically tasked were the following groups: College Council, Accreditation Steering Committee, Institutional Planning Committee, Institutional Program Review Committee, Assessment Council, Budget Committee, Research Committee, Human Resources, Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning, Institutional Research, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Student Government Association, Mission, Vision and Values Task Force, and Executive Cabinet. The Follow-Up Report authenticates the actions, progress, and outcomes that have been accomplished as a result of the concerted effort of these groups, departments and individuals to fully meet the ACCJC Standards and maintain compliance.

Since receiving the ACCJC's Action letter in February 2012, Mt. San Jacinto Community College District has convened the district's Accreditation Steering Committee on a regular basis, meeting monthly. Status updates regarding the five recommendations were provided during the monthly meetings. Additionally, a Follow-Up Report Completion timeline was developed. The Steering Committee is comprised of administrators, faculty, classified professional staff, and students whose primary responsibility and charge is to review and gather evidence for the Follow-Up Report.

In November 2012, the accreditation liaison officer collected and organized the data and updates from the field in order to compose and edit the Follow-Up Report draft. In late November 2012, the final Follow-Up Report was reviewed by the Mt. San Jacinto College Executive Cabinet, shared governance committee chairs, Accreditation 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 officer. The Board of Trustees received the report for initial review in February 2013. In March 2013, the Board of Trustees approved the submission of the Follow-Up Report to the ACCJC.

# Follow-Up Report Committee Members

## ***Accreditation Steering Committee***

Bill Vincent (Co-Chair) – Vice President of Student Services and Instruction  
Richard Sisk (Co-Chair) – Faculty, English  
Rebecca Teague – Associate Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, Planning & Grants/ALO (Co-Chair)  
Ted Blake – Faculty, Learning Resource Center Coordinator  
Marcus Castellanos – Telecommunications Network Coordinator  
Marlene Cvetko – Faculty, Learning Skills Program,  
Alex Cuatok – Faculty, Student Success Coordinator  
Becky Elam – Vice President of Business Services  
Beth Gomez – Dean of Business Services  
Fred Frontino – DSPS Alternate Media Specialist  
Kristen Grimes – Administrative Associate III  
Charles Hawkins – Associate Dean of Research and Planning  
Janet McCurdy – Coordinator, Transfer and Articulation  
Irma Ramos – Vice President of Human Resources  
Roger Schultz – Superintendent/President  
Karin Marriott – Director of Public Information and Marketing  
Teri Sisco – Associate Dean of Procurement and General Services  
Tom Spillman – Dean of Student Services, Counseling  
Richard Rowley – Dean of Instruction, Humanities  
Tatiana Somers – Faculty, Counseling  
Brian Orlauski – (Interim) Dean of Information Technology  
Carlos Tovares – Dean of Instruction, Academic Programs, San Jacinto Campus  
Pat James – Dean of Instruction, Library and Technology  
Joyce Johnson – Dean of Instruction, Career and Technical Education  
Joanna Quejada – Dean of Student Services, Student Development  
Jennifer Marrs – Executive Assistant to the Vice President of Business Services  
Jill Lanphere – Executive Assistant to the Vice President of Instruction

## ***College Council***

Roger Schultz – Superintendent/President (Chair)

Becky Elam – Vice President of Business Services  
Bill Vincent - Vice President of Student Services and Instruction  
Irma Ramos - Vice President of Human Resources  
Michael Fleming – Faculty, Communications  
Stacey Searl-Chapin – Faculty, Political Science  
Karen Cranney – Faculty, Counseling  
Elaine Eshom – Clerical Assistant III  
Dawn Bridge – Administrative Associate III  
Edward Saucedo – Campus Safety Officer II  
Cynthia Wagner - SGA President  
Kesia Crawford - SGA Vice President  
Kristen Grimes – Administrative Associate III (recorder)

## ***Institutional Planning Committee***

Roger Schultz - Superintendent/President (Chair)  
Glenn Stevenson – Faculty, Computer Information Systems  
Michael Fleming - Faculty, Communications  
John Seed – Faculty, Art  
Paul Hert – Faculty, Math  
Elaine Eshom – Clerical Assistant III  
Jared Davis – Student Services Assistant III  
Marcus Castellanos - Telecommunications Network Coordinator  
Justin Bennett – Supervisor, Network Technology  
Esmeralda Casillas - Student  
Katherine Hayes - Student  
Kenneth Prado - Student  
Bill Vincent - Vice President of Student Services and Instruction  
Carlos Tovares – Dean of Instruction, Academic Programs  
Becky Elam - Vice President of Business Services  
Rebecca Teague - Associate Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, Planning & Grants/ALO  
Charles Hawkins - Associate Dean of Research and Planning  
Brandon Moore – Faculty, Institutional Assessment Coordinator  
Irma Ramos - Vice President of Human Resources  
Brian Orlauski - (Interim) Dean of Information Technology  
Fred Frontino - DSPS Alternate Media Specialist

## ***Institutional Program Review***

Bill Vincent - Vice President of Student Services and Instruction

Paul Hert - Faculty, Math (Chair)  
 Lorney O'Connor – Faculty, Theatre Arts  
 Carlos Tovares - Dean of Instruction, Academic Programs  
 Bobby Avila – Faculty, Math  
 Tina Vandewater – Clerical Assistant IV  
 Rose Russell – Administrative Associate III  
 Rich Rowley – Dean of Instruction, Humanities,  
 Laurie McLaughlin – Dean of Instruction, Off-site Programs  
 Lynn Mann – Instructional Department Specialist  
 Joyce Johnson – Dean of Instruction, Career and Technical Education  
 Gloria Sanchez – Faculty, Accounting  
 Kaye Melsheimer – Instructional Aide II  
 Cynthia Prentice – Administrative Associate III  
 Raelene Brooks – Faculty, Nursing  
 Hal Edghill – Instructional Aide II  
 Kathleen Winston – Dean of Instruction, Nursing and Allied Health  
 Janice Levasseur – Faculty, Supplemental Instruction Coordinator  
 Maria Aquino – Tutorial Services Specialist  
 Pat James – Dean of Instruction, Library and Technology  
 Alex Cuatok – Faculty, Student Success Coordinator  
 Tatiana Somers – Faculty, Counseling  
 Ryan Marquez – Student  
 Sarah Stebbings - Student  
 Salena Paez – Clerical Assistant IV  
 Cheri Naish – Director of Enrollment Services  
 Susan Loomis – Associate Dean, Enrollment Services  
 Joanna Quejada – Dean of Student Services, Student Development  
 Diane Morales – Facilities Support Specialist  
 Fred Frontino - DSPS Alternate Media Specialist  
 Jennifer Marrs – Executive Assistant to the Vice President of Business Services  
 Betty Williams – Human Resource Analyst  
 Charles Hawkins – Associate Dean of Research and Planning  
 Marlene Cvetko – Faculty, Learning Skills Program  
 Janet McCurdy – Coordinator, Transfer and Articulation  
 Angela Seavey – Class Scheduler and Information Specialist  
 Brandon Moore – Faculty, Instructional Assessment Coordinator  
 Regina Howard – Supervisor, Institutional Effectiveness, Planning & Grants  
 Rebecca Teague - Associate Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, Planning & Grants/ALO

***Budget Committee***

Becky Elam - Vice President of Business Services (Co-Chair)  
 Michael Welden – Faculty, Math (Co-Chair)  
 Irma Ramos – Vice President of Human Resources  
 Bill Vincent - Vice President of Student Services and Instruction  
 Beth Gomez – Dean of Business Services  
 Pat James – Dean of Instruction, Library and Technology  
 Ted Blake – Faculty, Learning Resource Center Coordinator  
 Elias Escamilla – Faculty, Counseling  
 Elisabeth Anghel – Faculty, Library Science  
 Elaine Eshom – Clerical Assistant III  
 Karen Connell – Accounting Specialist  
 Christine Hefley – Administrative Associate III  
 Jennifer Pickens – Instructional Aide III  
 Kathy Ponio – Administrative Associate III  
 Steven Sanchez – Student  
 Matt Payne – Student

***Research Committee***

Charles Hawkins – Associate Dean of Research and Planning (Chair)  
 Alma Ramirez – Faculty, Reading/English  
 Alex Cuatok – Faculty, Student Success Coordinator  
 Bahram Sherkat – Faculty, Math  
 Bill Vincent – Vice President of Student Services and Instruction  
 Brandon Moore – Faculty, Assessment Coordinator  
 Brian Orlauski – (Interim) Dean of Information Technology  
 Carlos Tovares – Dean of Instruction, Academic Programs  
 Janice Levasseur – Faculty, Supplemental Instruction Coordinator  
 Joanna Quejada – Dean of Student Services, Student Development  
 Nik Mesaris – Research Analyst  
 Patricia James - Dean of Instruction, Library and Technology  
 Ted Blake – Faculty, Learning Resource Center Coordinator  
 Rebecca Teague - Associate Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, Planning & Grants/ALO  
 Debbie Grace – Administrative Associate III

***Assessment Committee***

Brandon Moore – Faculty, Assessment Coordinator  
(Chair)

Charles Hawkins – Associate Dean of Research and  
Planning

Joyce Johnson – Dean of Instruction, Career and  
Technical Education

Rebecca Teague - Associate Dean of Institutional  
Effectiveness, Planning & Grants/ALO

Richard Rowley – Dean of Instruction, Humanities

Alex Cuatok – Faculty, Student Success Coordinator

Bil Bergin – Faculty, Computer Information Systems

Evelyn Menz – Faculty, Learning Resource Center  
Coordinator

Glenn Stevenson – Faculty, Computer Information Systems

Kim Dubois-Eastman – Interim Faculty

Laura Gibson – Interim Faculty

Lorraine Slattery-Farrell, - Faculty, Child Development  
and Education

Paul Hendry – Faculty, English

Richard Kandus – Faculty, Psychology

Stacey Searl-Chapin – Faculty, Political Science

Yula Flournoy – Faculty, English

Jill Lanphere – Executive Assistant to the Vice  
President of Instruction

Kristine DiMemmo – Instructional Support  
Coordinator

Nik Mesaris – Research Analyst

Bill Vincent – Vice President of Student Services and  
Instruction

Paul Hert, Faculty, Math

Carlos Tovares, Dean of Instruction, Academic  
Programs, San Jacinto Campus

Regina Howard, Supervisor, Institutional

Effectiveness, Planning and Grants (non-voting)



# Response to the Commission Letter

## Recommendations

The team offers five recommendations for ongoing institutional improvement in light of the ACCJC Standards.

### **Recommendation 1: Mission Statement**

In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the college institutionalize the regular review and revision of the mission statement and assess how well the institution meets its mission for all parts of the community. The team recommends that the college adopt a calendar to ensure the annual review and assessment of the mission and use data comparing the demographics of the district with the demographics of the MSJC students and graduates to determine the extent to which the district is meeting its mission and identifying any gaps and disparities in service or success rates. (I.A.3, I.A.4, II.A.1)

The Evaluation Team reported that the most recent mission statement was approved by the Board of Trustees in September 2009. The revision of the mission statement was prompted by a recommendation in the ACCJC's action letter following the October 2005 comprehensive visit. Additionally, the Evaluation Team identified that Mt. San Jacinto College had developed a timeline for review of the college's mission, vision, and values statements every three years on a rotating basis for each statement. There is intentionality in the three year cycle so that it 1) coincides with the district's three-year comprehensive program review cycle, 2) each mission statement element is reviewed twice within each six year period and 3) links to revision timelines of the major master plan and Strategic Plan documents.

The college is currently in its second year of review with the mission statement under review and the vision statement being developed in the 2012-2013 academic year. A review of the college's values statement is scheduled to take place in academic year 2013-2014.

Although the timeline for regular review had been developed at the time of the comprehensive visit, the team recommended the college document the institutionalization of the review process in the college's Board Policies. At the time of the 2011 comprehensive visit, the Mt. San Jacinto College Board Policy 1200 – Mission Statement - stated that the mission statement was to be evaluated and revised, as needed, on a regular basis. The team found that Board Policy 1200 did not offer enough specificity regarding definitions of timelines for “regular” review and assessment and as a result recommended that Mt. San Jacinto College develop a companion Administrative Procedure (AP) to Board Policy 1200.

Mt. San Jacinto College is a member of the Community College League of California (CCLC) and subscribes to the Policy and Procedure service that provides regular updates and template revisions for Board Policies and Administrative Procedures for all California Community Colleges.

As part of the college's normal Board Policy and Administrative Procedure update processes, the college contacted the CCLC regarding guidance and template language for a new Administrative Procedure 1200 – Mission Statement. Based on the recommendations from the CCLC, an Administrative Procedure 1200 is not encouraged or recommended; rather an adjustment to Board Policy 1200 is suggested.

Based on this guidance, Mt. San Jacinto College augmented the existing Board Policy 1200 – Mission Statement to reflect additional specificity regarding the college's three-year timeline for review and evaluation. The updated Board Policy 1200 was first revised during the college's Annual Policy and Procedure Retreat in summer 2012 and then updated by the President's Office. Executive Cabinet (comprised of the President/Superintendent and the vice presidents of instruction/student services, business services and human resources) reviewed and recommended approval to College Council. The College Council reviewed, approved and forwarded the final policy to the Mt. San Jacinto College Board of Trustees for review and approval at the March 2013 Board of Trustees meeting. Once approved, the revised Board Policy will be announced and disseminated to all college constituents via the Mt. San Jacinto College Board Policy Manual, the college's website, the Weekly Round Up email and the monthly MSJC Links newsletter.

#### *Assessment of Mission Statement*

As evidenced in the mission statement and in various planning documents, including the college's Educational Master Plan, the college has a full range of programs and services aligned with its purposes, its character, and the diverse needs of its student population. Wide-ranging student educational goals, and identified student and community needs, drive the establishment and development of academic, vocational, student learning support services and programs that are supported through institutional resources. Differences in student populations across the college's service area are utilized to guide program and service planning.

As outlined in the Evaluation Report, the team reported that the mission statement of Mt. San Jacinto College is central to institutional planning, decision-making, and is incorporated into the development of campus-wide annual goals and priorities. The team also cited that the college has established a strong linkage between the college's mission statement and the program review process. The college functions on a three-year comprehensive program review cycle with annual program assessments. The purpose of program review at Mt. San Jacinto College is to provide continual assessment of institutional functionality and effectiveness. Program review assesses whether (1) the college fulfills its mission, (2) educational and support programs promote student success, and (3) the college's planning and resource allocation processes are effective and efficient.

As the instructional programs, student services programs, and administrative units prepare their program reviews and annual program assessment reports, staff, faculty and administration examine relevant demographic, labor market, and other institutional data in order to determine the suitability of programs for the learner populations, their needs, and the mission of the district. Program review requires the developer to answer a number of questions concerning alignment with the mission statement, program goals, program performance, and strengths and weaknesses of the program. In this regard, a system has been implemented in the annual planning calendar to

revisit and reaffirm the mission statement on a three-year basis. This process is intrinsically tied to student learning outcomes and assessment cycles, as well as the annual program planning and review processes.

The college streamlined the program review process during the 2011-2012 academic year by creating a comprehensive Performance Data Warehouse that disaggregates student success data by campus site, academic discipline, and course. The disaggregated data within the program review allows for patterns, trends and other important information related to course completion and student success to be uncovered, discussed by faculty, staff and administrators, and used to inform changes and adjustments for improvement at the course, program and institutional levels. In order to accurately measure, compare and assess whether the college is meeting its mission, the college also uses data from a variety of other sources including the Student Equity Plan, Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC), CalPass, and the Chancellor's Office DataMart.

Through this robust, comprehensive, and data-driven program review process, Mt. San Jacinto College provides an institutionalized method to ensure that an annual review of the institution's mission is taking place. Additionally, program review at Mt. San Jacinto College ensures that the college is using institutional data, local district demographics, and student outcome data to determine the extent to which the district is meeting not only its mission but is also identifying gaps and disparities in service or success rates.

Program review acts as only one assessment tool in Mt. San Jacinto College's collection of institutional mechanisms to improve student outcomes and success. Another method Mt. San Jacinto College utilizes to evaluate and assess the mission statement and promote dialog regarding gaps and disparities in service or success rates among key stakeholders and constituent groups is the college's Institutional Planning Committee (IPC). In a committed effort to regularly and systematically review, evaluate, and assess institutional processes, including the mission statement, Mt. San Jacinto College reestablished the Institutional Planning Committee in 2009. The IPC is a shared governance committee that oversees and coordinates district-wide planning and effectiveness. The Institutional Planning Committee analyzes data that is then used for analysis of internal and external trends. Simultaneously, the committee reviews the results of department program reviews, unit and division plans, and assessments from all sectors that contribute to the development of the college's multi-year planning goals and resource allocations. Updates are provided annually to the Institutional Planning Committee and College Council outlining the specific data elements that assess and validate the efficacy of the mission statement.

## **Recommendation 2: Sustainability of Integrated Planning and Decision Processes**

In order to meet the standard and ensure that the college progresses toward the Continuous Quality Improvement level for the ACCJC rubric for planning, the team recommends that the college use its

published processes, including resource allocation, to improve student learning and achievement. (I.B.1, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7, III.B.2.b, III.D.3)

The Evaluation Team cited that a pervasive system of integrated planning was successfully inaugurated at Mt. San Jacinto College in which goals drive plans, plans drive allocations, and program reviews allow for identification of institutional improvements. Additionally the team found evidence to support that the college integrated planning and that it is explicitly linked to the budget process (the Resource Allocation Proposal (RAP), Prioritization Allocation Rubric (PAR), program review and annual program assessments).

The team commended the district on establishing a culture, that given time and continued effort, had the capacity to reach the level of Sustainable Quality Improvement as defined in the ACCJC planning rubric. The team found evidence of the college's improvement of institutional structures and processes, student achievement of educational goals, and student learning. At the time of the site visit, the team found a number of the processes to be either new or newly revised and that while there were assessments, program reviews, and priority rankings of requests for allocations, the college had chosen not to fund any allocation requests due to budget cuts caused by the state's worsening economy. Thus, the team recommended continuous effort to fully implement and evaluate the improvement cycles as designed and adopted. The college has garnered significant commitment to complete these processes on a regular schedule and use the outcomes of those processes to set priorities and allocate resources.

#### *Planning Model: Continuous Quality Improvement Overview*

In the year since receiving its recommendation from ACCJC, Mt. San Jacinto College has strengthened, sustained and fully operationalized its integrated planning and budgeting process that began four years ago and is updated annually. Mt. San Jacinto College's integrated planning and effectiveness model merges the institution's mission, research/data, resource allocation, and program review with its shared governance structure which includes members of Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Student Government Association, administration, and the President's Executive Cabinet to continually refine its key planning processes to improve student learning.

Mt. San Jacinto College completed a three-year Strategic Plan that establishes set institutional priorities, goals, objectives, and measurable outcomes that directly support the college's mission statement in spring 2011. Proposed goals and objectives within the Strategic Plan are based on both internal and external data and research thereby advancing the college's initiative to be more data-driven. Strategies identified within the plan are tied to measurable, time specific outcomes and are linked to performance indicators and evaluation criteria so that the institution can determine the degree to which goals and objectives have been met. The college is currently in its second year of the three-year Strategic Plan with the evaluation and assessment results relative to the college's annual institutional goals presented to the faculty during the fall 2012 Convocation and to the Mt. San Jacinto College Board of Trustees during the Board workshop in January 2013.

Shared governance committees continue to employ similar corresponding protocols used by the institution to incorporate and integrate institutional priorities within local decision-making bodies.

Shared governance committees, outlined in the Shared Governance document, build committee goals, priorities and objectives for each fiscal and academic year based on the approved Strategic Plan institutional goals adopted by the Superintendent/President, Executive Cabinet, Institutional Planning Committee and the College Council. Just as Instruction, Student Services and Administrative Services are required to evaluate and assess institutional effectiveness in achieving specific departmental goals linked to institutional goals and priorities, all Shared Governance committees are required to report on committee progress relative to the goals that each committee establishes each year. Shared Governance committees report evaluation data via the Shared Governance Report Out form that documents committee progress and effectiveness in achieving stated charges, goals, and outcomes each year. The form also serves to inform the college community regarding recommended changes for improvement of processes and practices to enhance the governance structure and efficacy. The reports are posted on the Shared Governance website to allow the Mt. San Jacinto College community an opportunity to review. During the site visit, Mt. San Jacinto College was in the middle of this planning and evaluation cycle and as such, many of the reports demonstrating evidence of this evaluation and assessment were unavailable at the time of the site visit. To date, the college has participated in two full iterations of the Shared Governance committee and evaluation process, with committees submitting academic year 2011-2012 end-of-year reports in June 2012, and mid-year reports for academic year 2012-2013 in January 2013.

Dialog about institutional effectiveness at Mt. San Jacinto College is ongoing, robust, and pervasive with data and analyses widely distributed and used throughout the institution. Mt. San Jacinto College has structured mechanisms to actively engage college constituents in formal and informal dialog about institutional planning, learning, teaching, and assessment of learning outcomes. A comprehensive overview of the college's dialog using institutional data can be found in the response to Recommendation #3 (Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment) and Recommendation #4 (Identify and Address Gaps in Student Outcomes).

#### *Planning Model: Program Review/Annual Program Assessment*

Program review processes at Mt. San Jacinto College are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement. Per Accreditation Standards, Mt. San Jacinto College has established a three-year program review cycle. Comprehensive program reviews, and the associated unit and division plans, are required every three years. Annual program assessments, as well as unit and division plan updates, are submitted each of the ensuing two years. An Institutional Planning and Assessment Calendar outlines a completion schedule for program review, goal development, resource and budget development, and assessment that is used district-wide and adhered to by all college divisions.

Each fall semester the program review or annual program assessments are due, depending on the cycle. Program reviews or annual program assessments are submitted to the responsible unit dean and the Institutional Program Review Committee for technical review and to ensure completeness. The dean subsequently assimilates the information from each program review or annual program assessment in their unit plan which is due February 28. To complete the unit plan, the dean prioritizes Resource Allocation Proposals (submitted by faculty/staff) and identifies unit goals.

After conferring with department chairs, the unit plan is archived and posted on the office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning website.

Completed unit plans are forwarded by the dean to the vice president. Every year, by March 31, the vice president assimilates the unit plans to create a division plan. To complete the division plan, the vice president prioritizes Resource Allocation Proposals (RAPs) and adopts division goals. After conferring with the deans, the completed division plan is forwarded to the Institutional Planning and Budget committees, archived and posted on the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning website.

Mt. San Jacinto College completed its first annual program assessment cycle in 2010-2011 which included prioritization of Resource Allocation Proposals (RAPs) based on planning and program review data using the Prioritization Allocation Rubric (PAR). Mt. San Jacinto College had full participation from all college divisions including Instruction, Student Services and Administrative Services. Unit and division plans were also developed to support and prioritize resource requests contained within the annual program assessments. All annual program assessment documents, including unit and division plans were placed on the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning website for access by the college community. Due to the budget constraints affecting all community colleges at the time, the district's Institutional Planning Committee elected to not disburse funding for "new" proposals during the annual program assessment cycle in 2010-2011; however, a prioritized list of resource allocation proposals was developed and disbursed to college constituencies. Based on the institutional needs identified in the resource allocation proposals, Mt. San Jacinto College submitted proposals for external grant funding and was successfully awarded a \$4.2 million STEM grant through the United States Department of Education.

At the time of the site visit in fall 2011, Mt. San Jacinto College was at the mid-point of its three-year comprehensive program review cycle. The three-year comprehensive program reviews were submitted from all college divisions (Instruction, Student Services, And Administrative Services) after the site visit had concluded in October 2011. Unit and division plans were developed during the spring 2012 semester prioritizing resource allocation requests supported by institutional data and research outlined within the program reviews. The prioritized resource allocations were scored, ranked and recommended for funding by an ad-hoc task force of the Institutional Planning Committee and Budget Committee. A comprehensive overview of the college's resource allocation is found in the following section of Recommendation #2 (*Planning Model: Resource Allocation and Prioritization Process*).

Prior to the commencement of the 2012-2013 program review cycle, the annual program assessment forms were modified based on assessment and recommendations from faculty and staff members' experiences with the three-year program review cycle. Additional data and research information was included in the annual program assessment, as was information pertinent to the ACCJC's Proficiency Report. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning also worked with each Career and Technical Education dean, and Nursing and Allied Health, to develop specialized addendums that addressed specific data sets required for each CTE area (licensure rates, job placement, NCLEX pass rates, Advisory Committee membership, labor market data, etc.) to further enhance analyses and recommendations for improvements.

Extensive trainings were held during the Mt. San Jacinto College Teaching and Learning Academy and fall Convocation forums in order to provide faculty, staff and administrators an opportunity to review the annual program assessment and the new data resources. The most widely used method of disseminating information regarding the program review/annual program assessment cycle included one-on-one meetings with individual faculty, department and committee meetings.

Formal trainings were also held to inform and increase awareness of the available data and research and how to analyze the data for use in the annual program assessment process. The Performance Data Warehouse provides detailed statistical data and research that disaggregates student outcomes by student demographics, modality of instruction, time of day and location. A comprehensive overview of the college's Data Warehouse can be found in the response to Recommendation #4 (Identify and Address Gaps in Student Outcomes).

As of the completion of this Follow-Up Report all divisions have participated in the annual program assessment process. Faculty submitted annual program assessments throughout the fall semester for each program/department as well as all 18 units within the Student Services division. Administrative Services, including the President's Office, Business Services (and its subsidiaries), and Human Resources have also completed annual program assessments. Currently, instructional deans and the vice president of instruction/student services are completing unit and division plans to prioritize resource requests for the resource and budget development process in April 2013.

#### *Planning Model: Resource Allocation and Prioritization Process*

The Evaluation Team found that the planning and budget processes at Mt. San Jacinto College were clearly defined in the integrated strategic and master planning processes and that various shared governance committees participate in these processes. Additionally, processes were in place to coordinate financial resource planning efforts with other institutional planning processes. Due to the fiscal constraints limiting the district during its initial resource allocation and planning cycle in 2010-2011, the team determined that the integrated resource allocation process was fairly new and therefore the team was unable to see evidence of an entire cycle of financial resources planning that utilized the fully integrated process to allocate financial resources.

Mt. San Jacinto College fully operationalized the resource allocation and planning processes that were previously established in past planning cycles.

During the 2011-2012 planning cycle Mt. San Jacinto College experienced its full iteration of the planning process linking resource requests (Resource Allocation Proposals) to the annual program assessment and institutional priorities and goals, ranking the requests using a rubric (Prioritization Allocation Rubric) and tracking the prioritized requests through the process until funding decisions were cycled through the Institutional Planning Committee, the Budget Committee, Executive Cabinet, and the Superintendent/President. A total of 19 resource allocation proposals (RAPs) were submitted, scored and ranked by an ad-hoc task force during this cycle using the Prioritization Allocation Rubric (PAR). Five (5) of the submitted RAPs were funded. Awardees of funds were required to submit a Utilization and Assessment Report at the end of the 2011-2012 academic year documenting the use of funds and the impact on student learning, achievement and institutional

effectiveness as a result of the allocation. To date, Mt. San Jacinto College has received four of the five Utilization and Assessment Reports outlining the improvements garnered as a result of the funding. The Budget Committee reviewed and posted the reports on the Budget Committee website.

During the 2012-2013 planning cycle Mt. San Jacinto College experienced its second full cycle of the planning process linking resource requests (Resource Allocation Proposals) to the three-year program review and strategic plan priorities and goals, ranking the requests using a rubric (Prioritization Allocation Rubric) and tracking the prioritized requests through the process until funding decisions were cycled through the Institutional Planning Committee, the Budget Committee, Executive Cabinet, and the President/Superintendent. As a result of creating a well-defined transparent planning and allocation process, over 150 RAPs were submitted during the budget development process in April 2012 by all divisions and units. In order to better score and rank the RAPs, the Institutional Planning Committee recommended that (1) only one time funding RAPs would be considered for scoring, (2) no personnel would be supported as the district was in a hiring “frost”, and (3) no ongoing funding would be supported due to the volatile budget projections.

Due to the overwhelming number of RAPs submitted, the Institutional Planning Committee and Budget Committee determined that it would be more efficient for a prioritized batch of RAPs to be resubmitted by each division. Instruction and Student Services each forwarded the top ten (10) prioritized RAPs for their respective divisions, Business Services submitted their top five prioritized RAPs and the President’s Office and Human Resources divisions opted to not forward any RAPs. The ad-hoc task force convened during the end of the spring 2012 semester and used the Prioritization Allocation Rubric to score the 20 prioritized RAPs. The scores of the RAPs were then submitted to the Budget Committee and the Institutional Planning Committee for recommendation. As a result of the scoring and ranking process, a total of nine (9) RAPs were funded for the 2012-2013 academic year. Awardees were contacted and provided instructions for disbursement of funds and requirements to complete the Utilization and Assessment Report at the conclusion of the 2012-2013 academic year regarding the use of funds and impact of the allocation on student learning and achievement. Those RAPs that were scored but not awarded funds were contacted and provided feedback regarding areas for improvement.

The remaining 130 RAPs were scored over the summer 2012 by a large group of volunteers from each division as well as broad representation from all constituent groups. Each volunteer received training on scoring, using the rubric, and providing feedback to the RAP authors. All scored RAPs were posted to the Budget Committee website where the RAP authors could view the score and receive comments/feedback regarding the score. The transparency in the process allowed for the RAP authors to gain additional information to strengthen future RAP submissions.

As a result of completing several cycles the college was able to close the loop and fully assess the resource allocation process. The evaluation of the complete resource allocation cycle included a review of the existing processes, a comprehensive review of the rubrics, and an informal survey regarding planning, assessment and resource allocation which all resulted in improvements to the process. Specifically, the RAP and PAR templates were reviewed and assessed by an ad-hoc committee of the Budget Committee. Minor revisions were made to simplify the form and more



closely align both documents to each other as well as to other district planning documents. The revised RAP and PAR was reviewed and approved by the Budget Committee and the Institutional Planning Committee. The revised form was made available to faculty, staff and administrators for use during the Annual Program Assessment cycle currently underway.

Additionally, based on recommendations from the scoring ad-hoc task force, a timeline was developed to ensure that the resource allocation process was initiated earlier in the semester so that scoring took place before budget development. The district's budget development calendar for 2012-2013 was amended to include all of the elements of the RAP and PAR cycle. The budget development calendar for 2013-2014 includes all of the elements as well as published dates to keep the college community informed of important deadlines in the process.

Prior to the start of the fall 2012 semester, workshops and special work sessions were held during convocation to outline and detail the components of the budget development process, its integration with the college's overall planning processes, and the submission of RAPs. Mt. San Jacinto College is currently in its third full cycle of the planning process for the 2013-2014 academic year. The college community is participating in the annual program assessment and will follow the updated timeline outlined by the Budget Committee.

### **Recommendation 3: Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment**

In order to meet the standard and achieve the Commission's goals for 2012, the team recommends that the college should act immediately to:

- Complete all Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for all courses and programs (II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a and e, II.B.4)
- Distribute the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) to students (II.A.6)
- Distribute the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) to associate faculty (I.B.5)
- Assess all levels of outcomes, including course, program, General Education (GELOs) and Institutional Outcomes (ILOs) (I.B.7, II.A.2.a and e, II.B.4)
- Document improvement in student learning (II.A.1.c, II.B.4)

Mt. San Jacinto College documented its progress relative to student learning outcomes and assessment over the past several planning cycles in the 2011 self study. The Evaluation Team confirmed that Mt. San Jacinto College developed a comprehensive plan for the development and assessment of student learning outcomes at the course, program and institutional levels. The team also acknowledged that the institutional framework was in place to use the student outcome data in program review, planning, resource allocation, and decision-making processes for the purposes of improving student learning, programs and services. At the time of the site visit, the team found that the cycle of student learning outcome and assessment had not yet been fully implemented. As such, many of the processes were too new and the data was not available to allow the team to determine if the college's student learning outcome and assessment processes were effective in improving student learning or if they were sustainable.

Mt. San Jacinto College has continued its annual cycle of student learning outcome and assessment and has taken significant steps to fully comply with the ACCJC standards and rubrics. As will be demonstrated in the following response, the college has made advances in: development of student learning outcomes for all courses and programs; assessment of student learning outcomes at all levels of the institution (course, program, general education, and institutional); distribution of outcomes to students and associate faculty; and, documenting evidence of student improvement.

The college has apportioned appropriate and necessary resources to assist faculty in developing strategies for launching routine assessment of student learning outcomes. The college transitioned from a 100 percent reassigned faculty member to a full-time, permanent, tenure-track Institutional Assessment Faculty Coordinator in fall 2011 to reinforce and strengthen student learning outcomes and assessment as an institutional priority. The college's Strategic Plan also has *Institutional Assessment and Planning* as one of its five institutional priorities. A Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Lifecycle is in place (complete with instructions, forms, and examples) and is integrated with institutional program review, planning, resource allocation, and decision-making processes.

Additionally, the Assessment Council, an ad-hoc task committee of the Institutional Planning Committee was formed in summer 2010, and continues to act as a critical body in sustaining institutional assessment practices. The Assessment Council is chaired by the Assessment Coordinator and is comprised of faculty, classified staff, and administrators. The committee functions as a body that guides assessment policies, provides leadership training, and coaches colleagues to perform assessment, and provides a quality assurance mechanism for the institution.

In 2011, Mt. San Jacinto College adopted eLumen as the institution's clearinghouse tool for tracking student learning outcomes and assessment. Over the last two years, the college worked to train faculty, staff, and administrators to use the new system, incorporate the outcome data into annual program assessment reports, and assess and share data through the college's integrated planning and budget allocation process, various shared governance committees, departments and units. All program review and annual program assessment reports continue to include student learning outcome assessment data and analysis, alignment of goals with assessment outcomes and institutional data, and identifying and justifying resource allocation requests using the data.

Through extensive facilitation, training, software implementation and integration with existing organizational planning and resource allocation structures, Mt. San Jacinto College has resolved the five areas highlighted in the recommendation and is confident that student learning outcomes and assessment processes are ongoing, systematic and used for continuous quality improvement.

#### *Learning Outcomes for Courses and Programs*

Mt. San Jacinto College has established a comprehensive institutional framework for defining student learning outcomes and has built the process on institutional data and research. For the last five years, faculty, classified staff, and administrators have been engaged in student learning outcome development. Mt. San Jacinto College has a systematic process in place to create, apply, and assess student learning outcomes at the course, program and institutional levels. Student

learning outcomes are faculty driven, assessed at the course, departmental and institutional levels, and results are used to make improvements. All student learning outcomes are reviewed during the curriculum and program review process by the Curriculum Committee and the Assessment Coordinator.

At the time of the site visit, the Evaluation Team determined that the institution was close to completing student learning outcomes for all courses. In the self study the college reported that approximately 95 percent of all courses offered had identified student learning outcomes. This represented less than eighteen unique courses that had not defined course learning outcomes. In the twelve months since the site visit, Mt. San Jacinto College worked diligently to ensure that the college was in full compliance with this (sub) recommendation. As of fall 2012, 100 percent of all active courses (586) in the college catalog that are offered through the schedule in some regular rotation have defined student learning outcomes. Student learning outcomes are mapped to both program and institutional learning outcomes through the college's eLumen database.

As was presented to the Evaluation Team and cited in the team report, all instructional programs, degrees, certificates, and employment concentrations have identified learning outcomes at the program level in 2011. Program learning outcomes are published in the college catalog to ensure that students, faculty, and the community are aware of the particular outcomes for each of the 52 academic and career and technical education programs supported by the college.

The institution's non-academic divisions, Student Services and Administrative Services have fully participated in the student learning outcomes and assessment processes since 2011. Faculty, classified staff and administrators from Student Services and Administrative Services are also members of both the Assessment Council and Institutional Program Review Committee to ensure that all divisions of the college are provided with opportunities for direct communication and direction regarding student learning outcomes, assessment, program review, resource allocation, and planning processes. Additionally, student learning outcome, assessment, and program review training workshops have been extended to all three divisions over the last several planning cycles throughout the semester and during the Teaching and Learning Academy. Individual sessions were also offered to meet the range of schedules within the service areas.

All student learning outcomes for the Student Services and Administrative Services divisions are created by one of the following methods: the goals and objectives of the unit, mission and vision of the unit, or discussion of direct services to students.

The Student Services Division is comprised of 18 individual program units including such programs as Enrollment, Counseling, Financial Aid, Matriculation/Outreach, DSPS, EOPS, Student Government Association, etc. Learning outcomes have been established for all 18 of the Student Services units. In Student Services, student learning outcomes are created through the services provided to students.

Each of the following Administrative Services have also created learning outcomes for their units: Business Services, Information Technology, Facilities and Maintenance Operations, General Procurement and Services, Foundation, Human Resources, President's Office, Public Information and Marketing, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness.

Learning outcomes at the student, program and institutional level are available on the college's website, published on departmental web pages, recorded in eLumen and CurricuNET, and incorporated into program review and annual program assessment reports. Faculty members publish learning outcomes in their course syllabus as required by the Academic Senate. Program and institutional learning outcomes are also published in the college catalog.

Additionally, non-academic divisions such as Student Services and Administrative Services post learning outcomes for their particular units on the Office of Institutional Effectiveness web page, and integrate the outcomes into program review and annual program assessments. The college has yet to incorporate learning outcomes for non-academic units into eLumen, as academic programs were a priority for the college. The college has plans to include learning outcome data for the non-academic units in eLumen during the 2013-2014 planning cycle.

#### *Distribution of Student Learning Outcomes to Students*

Mt. San Jacinto College ensures that students have a clear and concise description of program and course learning outcomes through several different methods.

Learning outcomes (program and institutional learning outcomes) are posted and accessible on the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning website for faculty, staff, students, and the public. Institutional learning outcomes and program learning outcomes are also outlined in the college catalog which students can access both online and in hard-copy format.

During the 2011-2012 academic year, the Academic Senate approved a new process to require that all course syllabi include student learning outcomes. Documents pertaining to syllabus development, such as the Syllabus Checklist, were updated to reflect this change and were electronically distributed to full-time and part-time faculty, were made available online, and discussed during the associate faculty orientation and full time faculty convocation. In every class section students receive a course syllabus that specifies learning outcomes consistent with the institution's officially approved course outline. The new process ensures that students understand the student learning outcome expectations of the course. These expectations are determined by the department and based on various performance indicators embedded in each course outline of record.

Several departments have also utilized Blackboard to post information pertaining to student learning outcomes for easy access for students and faculty. Other departments have created websites for their programs in which students can access course and program information including student learning outcomes.

Mt. San Jacinto College uses eLumen as its central clearinghouse for all student learning outcomes and assessment results and data. Currently only faculty and other key administrators and staff have access to the online system; however, the institution is planning to open access for students to use eLumen. Access to eLumen will create yet another opportunity for students to view learning outcomes for their specific course and enable them to view the results for all course assessments they have completed. It is anticipated that this access will be available to students during the 2013-2014 academic year.

Students from the Student Government Association serve on many key shared governance committees focused on institutional planning, resource allocation, program review, and assessment. Specifically, students are represented on the following shared governance committees: Institutional Planning Committee, Budget Committee, College Council, and the Institutional Program Review Committee. As a result of their participation on these committees, students are exposed to a variety of information related to key planning processes and structures. As representatives of the Student Government Association, students provide reports and updates regarding all committee activities and actions. As a result, students disseminate critical information regarding the planning structure at the institution, including student learning outcome and assessment data to the Student Government Association members.

#### *Distribution of Student Learning Outcomes to Associate Faculty*

Associate faculty receive information on program and course learning outcomes through a variety of institutional sources.

All learning outcomes (program and institutional learning outcomes) are posted and accessible on the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning website for faculty, staff, students, and the public. Institutional learning outcomes and program learning outcomes are also outlined in the college catalog which associate faculty can access both online and in hard-copy format.

During the 2011-2012 academic year, the Academic Senate approved a new process to require that all course syllabi include student learning outcomes. Documents pertaining to syllabus development, such as the Syllabus Checklist, were updated to reflect this change and were electronically distributed to full-time and part-time faculty, were made available online, and discussed during the associate faculty orientation and full time faculty convocation. The new process ensures the associate faculty understand the importance of student learning outcomes at the course and program levels.

Department Chairs maintain open communication with associate faculty within their department. Chairs use departmental meetings, emails, and announcements as additional ways to disseminate the learning outcome information to associate faculty who may or may not frequent the campus due to their teaching schedules. Department Chairs are responsible for ensuring that associate faculty within their department are (1) aware of student learning outcomes and assessment, (2) participate in the development of new course learning outcomes and assessment rubrics, (3) participate in the assessment of course learning outcomes, (4) upload assessment data in eLumen, and (5) include the course and program learning outcomes in course materials.

Several departments have also utilized Blackboard to post information pertaining to student learning outcomes for easy access for students and faculty. Other departments have created websites for their programs in which associate faculty can access course and program information including student learning outcomes.

Mt. San Jacinto College uses eLumen as its central clearinghouse for all student learning outcomes and assessment results and data. Currently faculty (including full and part time), other key administrators and staff have access to the online system.

*Assessment of all Outcomes (Course, Program, General Education and Institutional Learning Outcomes)*

Assessment of learning outcomes at the institution was informally performed at the time of the site visit with only a handful of instructional departments (Math and English) collecting and using data and completing the assessment cycle. Although assessment at the program and institutional levels had begun prior to the self study, data was not yet available to demonstrate institutionalization and full integration with the college's planning and resource allocation processes. With little formal documentation available at the time of the site visit the Evaluation Team was challenged to find evidence to support sustainability of institutional-wide assessment efforts and the depth at which the assessments were taking place throughout all levels of the institution.

Mt. San Jacinto College has significantly advanced the level of assessment taking place at the institution, with all levels of the institution participating in assessment of learning outcomes. Specifically, assessment is occurring at the course, program, General Education and Institutional levels with assessment reports and data documenting results and actions. Additionally, assessment of learning outcomes continues to take place in non-academic divisions (Student Services and Administrative Services).

Mt. San Jacinto College's entire planning cycle is based on a six-year cycle consisting of two three-year cycles. The planning cycle coincides with not only the college's Educational Master Plan (which is a six-year planning document), but the Strategic Plan, which outlines institutional priorities and goals for a three-year period. Mt. San Jacinto College's program review and student learning outcome and assessment practices are integrated in the college's three-year planning cycles with all programs undergoing an extensive and comprehensive program review every three years, program assessment reports completed annually along with resource allocation requests and prioritizations. Assessment at the course levels is also on a three-year cycle, with each course offered being assessed at least once every three years, or twice every six years. This ensures that student learning outcome data is available and used for the comprehensive program review cycles and can be incorporated into each Strategic Plan iteration every three-years.

Since the college is on a three-year cycle with all courses offered undergoing assessment at least once during that planning period it is expected that only approximately 33 percent of all courses offered will assess in any given year. This cycle assures that 100 percent of courses offered will be assessed in a three-year period. As of fall 2012, the college's first year of its planning cycle, 170 out of 586 courses offered (29 percent) assessed learning outcomes. This percentage is just a few percentage points shy of the college's 33 percent annual course learning outcome assessment target. Mt. San Jacinto College is utilizing eLumen to capture data and evidence relative to student learning outcome assessments. It is important to note that faculty are assessing at the course level but many have not yet input assessment results into eLumen and as such, the percentage of courses assessed is slightly lower than the annual target because faculty members are still receiving training on eLumen and integrating the assessment data into the database. Although there is a gap in database entry, faculty are using data from their course and program student learning outcomes to make improvements to student learning through course curriculum, teaching methodologies,

and strategies and are integrating the data into their program reviews and annual program assessment reports.

Assessment at the program level is significantly higher than during the site visit with 67 percent of academic and career and technical education programs participating in assessment of learning outcomes. The college has a total of 52 academic and career and technical education programs with 36 participating in assessment at the program level. Of importance is the fact that the 36 departments participating in assessment represents over 86 percent of the total FTES generated by the institution. This is critical in that assessment is occurring with the highest FTES generating disciplines. The Assessment Coordinator is currently working collaboratively with the deans of instruction and faculty within the World Languages, Sociology, and Physical Education programs to complete their assessment cycles this semester because the addition of these three programs would not only increase the percentage of programs assessing student learning outcomes to 75 percent, but would also substantially increase the percentage of FTES supported through assessment to 96 percent.

The Evaluation Team found that all instructional areas aligned learning outcomes to one or more of the six Institutional Learning Outcomes defined by the college; however, assessment of the Institutional Learning Outcomes had not been completed at the time of the site visit. At the time of the site visit, the college was using an indirect assessment tool to measure Institutional Learning Outcomes. The Graduate Survey is one instrument that Mt. San Jacinto College uses to assess student progress and achievement through degree, transfer, general education, career and technical education certificates, and employment outcomes. The survey also identifies students' perceptions about the Institutional Learning Outcomes, student services in general, and job related education achieved while attending Mt. San Jacinto College. The Graduate Survey has been deployed the last three academic years to students who are approved for graduation and/or transfer from Mt. San Jacinto College. The Graduate Survey is deployed via email to all students graduating and/or transferring. A total of 233 students participated in the survey in 2010 and 306 students participated in the survey in 2011. This represents approximately 15 to 20 percent of the students that graduate and/or transfer from Mt. San Jacinto College. Data from 2012 is currently being tabulated.

Understanding that the Graduate Survey was an indirect measure and assessment of Institutional Learning Outcomes, the Assessment Council began researching other potential measurement tools that would perform a direct assessment of the college's Institutional Learning Outcomes. Through recommendations from the Assessment Council, Institutional Program Review Committee, and the Institutional Planning Committee, the college employed a direct and authentic assessment of the Institutional Learning Outcomes in the 2012-2013 academic year. This direct assessment also coincided with the district's transition from General Education Learning Outcomes to Core Competencies which are represented in the six Institutional Learning Outcomes (Communication, Critical Thinking, Aesthetic Awareness, Social Awareness, Responsibility, and Scientific Awareness).

In 2012-2013 Mt. San Jacinto College assessed five of the six Institutional Learning Outcomes using the Critical Assessment Test (CAT) tool that was acquired by the college. The CAT Test is a unique tool designed to assess and promote improvement of critical thinking and real-world problem

solving skills. The test takes the form of a one-hour short answer essay test given twice within a semester that is scored and validated by a group of faculty members. Over 160 students, in three separate courses (Algebra, Statistics, and English) participated in the initial Institutional Learning Outcome assessment for Mt. San Jacinto College.

As part of the test deployment, Mt. San Jacinto College supported three faculty members to attend an extensive training at a train-the-trainer workshop where they received the CAT instrument and were given support for leading and conducting scoring workshops at the college. The three faculty trained an additional 15 faculty, staff and administrators and held two separate scoring sessions where faculty scored the tests based on detailed scoring guides and rubrics. Faculty scoring allowed for an increase in faculty awareness of student weaknesses and improved faculty members' awareness of efficient teaching practices which will lead to improvements in student learning. To date, all 320 tests have been scored and have been sent back to the CAT organization for further analysis and reporting. It is anticipated that the full results will be available for integration into the next planning cycle beginning fall 2013. The college intends on expanding the use of this authentic assessment of Institutional Learning Outcomes to additional courses and sequences that lead to degree and program completion. Institutional Learning Outcomes are scheduled for assessment on an annual basis.

For the past two years, all non-academic divisions including Student Services and Administrative Services have fully participated in assessment of learning outcomes. Learning outcomes for Student Services and Administrative Services are assessed on an annual cycle during each academic year. The units include all assessment related data within the three-year comprehensive program reviews and/or the annual program assessment reports depending on the cycle.

#### *Document Improvement in Student Learning*

Evidence of improvements in student learning was challenging for the Evaluation Team to judge given the newness of the student learning outcome and assessment processes and practices implemented at the time of the self study evaluation. Mt. San Jacinto College has invested leadership and resources to develop and sustain an institutional infrastructure that promotes the use of assessment results to make improvements. Results of assessment are systemically embedded in program review and are used to prioritize resource allocations based on linkage to institutional planning, goals, and mission. Student learning improvement is a visible priority at Mt. San Jacinto College with nearly all planning practices and structures focused on student success.

Given the tremendous increase in assessment of learning outcomes at the course, program and institutional levels (29 percent of courses, 67 percent of programs, 5 out of 6 ILOs) in the first year of the college's three-year planning cycle, the college now has formal documentation and institutional records of the assessments and how the assessments led to improvements.

Evidence to support and document improvements in student learning are found in the following institutional structures: (1) annual program assessment reports completed by program faculty, (2) comprehensive program reviews completed every three years, (3) Resource Allocation Proposal Utilization Reports, and (4) the eLumen database. Improvements in student learning are also



reported at various shared governance committees including the Institutional Planning Committee, Assessment Council, Budget Committee, and Institutional Program Review Committee. Recent specific examples of assessment analysis dialog leading to improvements in student learning include: curriculum revisions in the Music program to address improvisation skills deficiency found in students' performance ensembles; revising learning outcomes in the Learning Center to address flaws in previous assessment measures that were unable to capture critical instructional components; adjustments with learning materials, modalities, formats and instructors to help improve student performance in the Business Program; and utilization of new and varied teaching modes in the Dance program to increase student success on group research projects.

Dialog at the faculty level is another way that Mt. San Jacinto College documents improvements in student learning. Faculty dialog regarding assessment results and student improvements frequently takes place during one-on-one, departmental, or campus-wide meetings; however, capturing evidence to document this dialog has been problematic for the institution as this is typically, informally discussed during a meeting and acted upon without any formal record. To address this lack of documentation, the college is working through the Academic Senate to formalize a process for taking minutes during faculty department meetings so that information pertaining to actions related to program review, planning, student learning outcomes development and assessment, improvements in student learning, teaching and pedagogy are captured. The concept has been presented to both site councils and is moving forward for further development. It is anticipated that this effort will be implemented by the fall 2013 planning cycle so that adequate training and forms can be developed and distributed.

#### **Recommendation 4: Identify and Address Gaps in Student Outcomes**

In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the college disaggregate student outcome data by student demographics, modality of instruction, time of day, and location to determine comparability of outcomes, identify and address any gaps. (II.A.1.a, II.A.2.d and e)

From the documents cited in the self study and verified by the Evaluation Team, Mt. San Jacinto College provides extensive reporting on data and analysis to a broad spectrum of campus functions through its Institutional Effectiveness and Institutional Research websites as well as through various campus electronic formats. The Research and Effectiveness Offices provide campus data in multiple formats and for varying purposes and are an important and successful link in the communication of campus quality measures including planning, resource allocation, evaluation and assessment.

The use of data continues to play an increasingly significant role as part of Mt. San Jacinto College's overall decision-making structures. In 2011-2012, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research, in consultation with faculty leadership and administration, developed a comprehensive Performance Data Warehouse. The Data Warehouse provides detailed statistical data and research that disaggregates student outcomes by student demographics, modality of instruction, time of day and location. Specifically, the warehouse features the following data components: (1) FTES

generation by district, modality, and academic program by campus site ; (2) student success rate by district, modality, academic program and course by campus site (3) retention rate by district, modality, academic program and course by campus site; (4) withdrawal rate by district, modality, academic program and course by campus site; (5) graded seats by district, program and course by campus site; (6) awards by district and academic program; (7) student demographics (ethnicity and gender) by district and campus site; and (8) time of day by district.

The college integrated this data resource tool into the 2012-2013 annual program assessment and resource allocation cycle. In early fall 2012, training regarding the functionality of the data warehouse took place during the Teaching and Learning Academy, individual department and unit meetings, and one-on-one with faculty/staff by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research leadership team. Presentations promoting the data warehouse also took place during various shared governance and ad-hoc committee meetings, including College Council, Institutional Planning Committee, Assessment Council, Research Committee, Institutional Program Review Committee, CTE, monthly faculty meetings, Deans Council, Academic Senate, and Executive Cabinet. Faculty and staff received guidance on reviewing and interpreting the data in the warehouse and were provided assistance in developing assumptions and recommendations based on the analysis of the data.

As a result the program review/annual program assessment process was enhanced and included student outcome data specific to each of the four campus sites and modalities (Meniffee Valley, San Jacinto, Temecula Education Complex, San Gorgonio Pass, and Online). The disaggregation by site enabled decision-makers at each location to use more appropriate and relevant data that is focused on the targeted student population served by each campus entity. Although the annual program assessment cycle is at its mid-point with prioritization and resource allocations scheduled to be made in late spring 2013 after the full cycle has completed, the district anticipates that the specificity in the data will allow for greater efficiencies and improvements specific to location, program and course. As a result of the increase in the role that data plays in the district's decision-making process, it was determined that subject and course fill rates would also be useful data elements for the Performance Data Warehouse and were incorporated beginning spring 2013.

The data warehouse augmentation has significantly improved institutional dialog between campus sites, academic program/department heads, faculty (full and part time) and administration since data is available not only at an institutional level but by site allowing for comparisons and discussions regarding gaps in achievements to be made. One example of this increased dialog, as a result of the disaggregated data, took place in fall 2012 during the district's preparation for potential proposition 30 workload reductions (section reductions). In spring 2012, the district established a Section Reduction Task Force comprised of key faculty and administrative leadership to determine a strategy for creating the spring 2013 schedule should proposition 30 fail triggering a reduction of 900 FTES. During initial meetings of the task force, faculty, staff and administration discussed potential data sources to utilize for determining the section cuts. The Performance Data Warehouse was in part designed as a result of the initial data needs outlined by the task force. By fall 2012, the data warehouse had been developed and the task force used the warehouse along with other institutional data resources to develop an institutional rubric that outlined a method to

identify courses that would have the greatest student impact, increasing student access and success. Faculty and administration collaborated in various joint campus meetings where they discussed and offered course recommendations for prioritization and selection in the 2013 spring schedule. In addition to using the data sources to plan for section contractions, the faculty and administration used the data to prepare for potential increases in course sections should additional funds be received from the State of California.

## **Recommendation 5: Allocation of Human Resources**

In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the college develop guidelines for determining the minimum numbers of faculty and staff required for a sufficient core in various areas of the college to meet its mission and quality standards. (II.A.2.c, II.B.1, II.C.1, III.A.1, III.A.2, III.A.6)

In the Evaluation Report, the team cited that Mt. San Jacinto College had not performed an analysis of whether current staffing levels were sufficient to support the district's high quality programs and services. Additionally, the team examined the district's faculty composition (full time status) and questioned whether the district employed a sufficient number of faculty to adequately support educational programs.

The team also identified that human resource planning at Mt. San Jacinto College is integrated with institutional planning through the program review process, in which programs identify their staffing needs in accordance with program goals. These processes provide for in-depth department-level and unit-level planning. This planning is based on (1) analysis of data, (2) review of current and future goals and objectives, and (3) identification of necessary resources. The program review documents, including the annual program assessments (APAs) have a place to assess the sufficiency of staffing. Specifically, program review includes current and projected minimum and optimum staffing levels for full-time faculty, associate faculty, administrators, classified staff, and confidential and supervisory staff over a three-year period. Mt. San Jacinto College develops human resource planning through the district's collaborative shared governance structure and strategic planning process through the Budget Committee and the Institutional Planning Committee. Currently program review documents serve as the primary tool for assessing the effective use of human resources. Program review data and information contained within the Educational Master Plan establish the core numbers of faculty and staff required for effective operation. It is through these processes that the institution derives its priorities and ensures their alignment with college-wide priorities and plans.

Requests for additional personnel are made within the budget request process. During the budget development process, program managers submit their classified personnel needs as part of their annual budget development. In the resource allocation process, Resource Allocation Proposals (RAPs) are created to request additional staffing. The staffing requests are validated and supported through the institutional research and data contained within the program review/annual program assessments. These needs are prioritized and evaluated through the Institutional Planning

Committee Prioritization Allocation Rubric (PAR) which is based upon planning elements and program review.

The processes for faculty needs are handled through the joint hiring process. Each year the joint hiring process is started when the Superintendent/President and the Executive Cabinet determine the feasible number of new full-time hires that are to be made for the following year. This number of hires is based on the analysis of the Faculty Obligation Number (FON), 50 percent law compliance, 75/25 compliance, the local budget, larger economic trends, anticipated FTES generation/funded growth, and over projected enrollment.

The Joint Hiring Committee recommends the number of faculty for each campus/area of the college (San Jacinto, Menifee Valley, Counseling, Career and Technical Education). The ratio of new faculty positions between the San Jacinto Campus and Menifee Valley Campus is derived by numerous measurements including, but not limited to, the FTES by site. Other variables that are included in determining positions include replacement hires (due to resignations/retirements), state mandates, counselor to student ratios, and other student indicators.

The faculty and department chairs are notified about the deadlines for submitting a proposal for new full-time faculty member and provided with the forms. Relevant data needed to complete the proposal form has traditionally been coordinated and distributed through the Office of Instruction; however, much of this data is now openly available through the Office of Institutional Research Data Warehouse, the Decision Support System (DSS), Program Review, and CalPass.

The Joint Hiring Committee is currently revamping the faculty hiring process to include a more formalized data-driven model to determine recommendations for future faculty hiring priorities. The new process will strengthen the linkages to institutional planning and will take the form of a Faculty Hiring Rubric. The Joint Hiring Committee has met over the course of the last two years and identified both qualitative and quantitative measures that will be used in the design of the Faculty Hiring Rubric. Once the measures were preliminarily identified, the Joint Hiring Committee established an ad-hoc task force to further develop the rubric. It is anticipated that the Joint Hiring Committee will continue with the development of the rubric and formalize an adopted model for implementation during the 2013-2014 academic year to coincide with the district's planning and resource allocation cycle. The rubric will assist the faculty in creating an annual prioritized faculty hiring list to be used during planning and resource allocation.

### *Staffing Plan*

In order to provide a more formalized and coordinated staffing approach, the college committed to developing an operational planning document focused on staffing. The purpose of the Staffing Plan is to identify current and future staffing levels and to recommend future staffing priorities that support the college's mission and integrate data from program review and the Educational Master Plan. To expedite the development of a comprehensive Human Resources Staffing Plan, Mt. San Jacinto College hired an external consultant to act as the primary lead on the initial draft of the master plan document. The consultant was hired in fall 2011 after the completion of the Self Study and finalized the first draft of the plan in fall 2012. Over the course of the 2011-2012 academic year,

the consultant worked closely with the Human Resources department and gathered relevant institutional data and information regarding evaluation of services, the district's mission, goals and staffing needs, staffing inventories per the three-year comprehensive program review, and the overall growth of the college.

Several drafts of the Staffing Plan were developed and will be shared with college constituent groups including College Council, Institutional Planning Committee, college divisions and departments for vetting, feedback and approval in the spring 2013 semester. The Staffing Plan takes into consideration the emphasis placed in the Educational Master Plan, Strategic Plan, and the other ancillary but vitally important master plans (Technology, Distance Education, and Facilities) on the minimum staffing needs of the college.

The plan begins with a historical overview of the college's planning, including challenges and opportunities related to staffing obligations. The Staffing Plan in its simplest form outlines (1) current/baseline measures, (2) influences, impacts and constraints, (3) priorities, optimum levels and future needs, and (4) process and evaluation. The plan continues with a recounting of the recruitment, selection, and evaluation processes and concludes with recommendations for addressing the identified staffing issues.

Optimal staffing level thresholds are defined by several influencing factors. The influences or drivers start with the mission statement of the college. These drivers further include mandates or guidelines such as the 75/25 rule, the 50 percent law as well as state or system-wide initiatives and priorities that may emerge (i.e. student success initiative). Staffing levels are also informed by the colleges planning efforts and documents such as the Educational Master Plan, the Technology Plan, the Student Equity Plan, college goals, as well as division and unit plans. In addition, human resource issues, such as staffing levels and effectiveness, are assessed in the program review process. Program reviews identify appropriate or insufficient staffing areas, and allow managers to develop a planning agenda to address the shortfall. Another measure is through a market basket approach, in which departments compare their respective areas to regional or similar peer colleges to identify significant gaps, differing practices, or areas that Mt. San Jacinto College excels or may have an abundance of staffing in a particular area.

Specifically, the plan outlines the following key components that serve as the foundation for the analysis and projection of current and future staffing needs:

- Number of successful recruitments by location and employee category
- Current staffing levels by location and employee category
- Multi-year trends in FTES and student headcount by location
- Projections of potential staffing needs
- Full time/part time faculty ratios, statutory faculty obligations, and district status related to the 50 percent law
- Projected changes in college enrollments
- Multi-year trends in the number of full-time employees by location and employee category
- Program offerings, enhancements, growth, expansion, and discontinuance
- Position justification, funding source, impact and work load distribution for prioritization

- Budgetary cycle considerations
- Program review and planning
- Governing board policies and administrative procedures
- Other district plans and priorities

Minimal staffing levels are established by local unit managers, deans and division vice presidents. Minimum staffing levels take into account student and staff needs relative to the mission and safe, effective operation of the college. Other factors that are taken into consideration include available staff, staff workload, available fiscal resources, technology to assist in completing tasks or providing services, as well as relevance to the goals of the unit, division and college.

During periods of prolonged contraction due to reduced enrollment or budget cuts, unit managers, in consultation with their supervising administrators, may reduce staffing down to a level that minimally meets the respective department's mission. With reduced staffing levels, services may be limited, reduced or suspended if it is not a critical function of the college's mission. Student needs that support learning and their safety are two leading influences on staffing. Data is used to meet student needs with available staff resources. An example of this staffing resource allocation can be seen in the college's move to limiting general campus operations to a 4-9-4 schedule (Monday through Thursday - 9 hour days and closing at noon on Fridays) during the primary terms with off-site locations closed on Fridays. These "new" hours of operation are based on studying and reviewing student traffic data and needs during these periods and directing resources to scheduling patterns when students are engaging in campus face-to-face services. Expanded technology delivered information and services has also enabled student s needs to be met and are factored into scheduling decisions.

Since the college is currently in the middle of its annual planning and resource allocation cycle, the institution determined that full implementation of the strategies and models within the Staffing Plan will not be fully implemented until the 2013-2014 academic year to coincide with the college's full planning cycle. The college will use the rest of the 2012-2013 academic year to examine, discuss and fine-tune the Staffing Plan to ensure that the needs of the entire district including its multiple off-site locations are met.

# Appendix A: Evidence

## Recommendation 1

1. [Mission Statement](#)
2. [Revised BP 1200](#)
3. [Institutional Planning & Assessment Timeline](#)
4. [MSJC Planning and Accreditation Timeline 2011-2018](#)
5. [Closed Loop Model](#)
6. [College Council Minutes, November 5, 2012](#)
7. [College Council Agenda, November 5, 2012](#)
8. [Institutional Planning Committee Website](#)
9. [Institutional Planning Committee Agenda, November 27, 2012](#)
10. [Institutional Planning Committee Minutes, November 27, 2012](#)
11. [College Council Minutes, December 10, 2012](#)
12. [College Council Agenda, December 10, 2012](#)
13. [College Council Agenda, January 22, 2013](#)
14. [College Council Minutes, January 22, 2013](#)
15. [Vision-Values-Mission Task Force Minutes, September 17, 2012](#)
16. [Vision-Values-Mission Task Force Minutes, April 27, 2012](#)
17. [Vision-Values-Mission Task Force Agenda, February 17, 2011](#)
18. [Vision-Values-Mission Task Force Minutes, February 17, 2011](#)
19. [Vision-Values-Mission Task Force Agenda, March 17, 2011](#)
20. [Vision-Values-Mission Task Force Minutes, March 17, 2011](#)
21. [Vision-Values-Mission Task Force Agenda, September 16, 2010](#)
22. [Mission, Vision, Values Six-Year Review Cycle Visual](#)
23. [Mission, Vision, Values Review Cycle Schedule](#)
24. [Vision Statement Draft](#)
25. [Vision Marketing Flyer](#)
26. [Educational Master Plan](#)
27. [Strategic Plan](#)
28. [Board of Trustees Agenda, January 31, 2013](#)
29. [Convocation Agenda, August 17, 2012](#)
30. [Convocation Presentation, August 17, 2012](#)
31. [Institutional Program Review Manual](#)
32. [Administrative Unit Annual Program Assessment Report Website](#)
33. [Instruction Annual Program Assessment Report Website](#)
34. [Instruction – CTE Annual Program Assessment Report Website](#)
35. [Student Services Annual Program Assessment Report Website](#)
36. [Program Review](#)
37. [Instructional Unit Plans](#)
38. [Instruction Annual Program Assessment Report Template](#)
39. [Instruction Unit Annual Program Assessments – Academic](#)

40. [Instruction Unit Annual Program Assessments - CTE](#)
41. [Instruction \(CTE\) Addendum to Annual Program Assessment Reports](#)
42. [Instruction \(Nursing\) Addendum to annual Program Assessment Reports](#)
43. [Student Services Unit Program Review](#)
44. [Student Services Unit Annual Program Assessments](#)
45. [Student Services Annual Program Assessment Report Template](#)
46. [Administrative Unit Program Review](#)
47. [Administrative Unit Annual Program Assessments](#)
48. [Administrative Unit Annual Program Assessment Report Template](#)
49. [Administrative Unit Program Review Template](#)
50. [Student Services Unit Program Review Template](#)
51. [Instructional Services Program Review Template](#)
52. [Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges \(ARCC\) Report, 2012](#)
53. [Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges \(ARCC\) Indicators, 2012](#)
54. [Student Equity Plan](#)
55. [Performance Data Warehouse](#)
56. [Student Equity Report Data Definitions](#)
57. [District-Wide Student Equity Report Data](#)
58. [Menifee Valley Campus Student Equity Report Data](#)
59. [Distance Education Student Equity Report Data](#)
60. [San Geronio Pass Campus Student Equity Report Data](#)
61. [San Jacinto Campus Student Equity Report Data](#)
62. [Temecula Education Complex Student Equity Report Data](#)



## Recommendation 2

1. [Institutional Planning Committee Website](#)
2. [Institutional Planning Committee Agenda, October 18, 2011](#)
3. [Institutional Planning Committee Minutes, October 18, 2011](#)
4. [Institutional Planning Committee Agenda, November 15, 2011](#)
5. [Institutional Planning Committee Minutes, November 15, 2011](#)
6. [Institutional Planning Committee Agenda, December 13, 2011](#)
7. [Institutional Planning Committee Minutes, December 13, 2011](#)
8. [Institutional Planning Committee Agenda, February 21, 2012](#)
9. [Institutional Planning Committee Minutes, February 21, 2012](#)
10. [Institutional Planning Committee Agenda, April 17, 2012](#)
11. [Institutional Planning Committee Minutes, April 17, 2012](#)
12. [Institutional Planning Committee Agenda, September 18, 2012](#)
13. [Institutional Planning Committee Minutes, September 18, 2012](#)
14. [Institutional Effectiveness and Planning Website](#)
15. [Institutional Planning & Assessment Timeline](#)
16. [MSJC Planning and Accreditation Timeline 2011-2018](#)
17. [Integrated Planning Schematic](#)
18. [Closed Loop Model](#)
19. [Educational Master Plan](#)
20. [Strategic Plan](#)
21. [Board of Trustees Agenda, January 31, 2013](#)
22. [Board of Trustees Strategic Plan Status Update Report \(Instruction/Student Services\)](#)
23. [Board of Trustees Strategic Plan Status Update Report \(Business Services Division\)](#)
24. [Board of Trustees Strategic Plan Status Update Report \(Human Resources Division\)](#)
25. [Board of Trustees Strategic Plan Status Update Report \(Institutional Effectiveness\)](#)
26. [Convocation Agenda, August 17, 2012](#)
27. [Convocation Presentation, August 17, 2012](#)
28. [Shared Governance Website](#)
29. [2012-2013 Shared Governance Committee Membership and Meeting Schedule Report](#)
30. [Shared Governance Report-Out Completed Forms](#)
31. [Shared Governance Report-Out Template](#)
32. [College Council Agenda, January 22, 2013 \(Shared Governance Report Out\)](#)
33. [College Council Minutes, December 10, 2012 \(Shared Governance Report Out\)](#)
34. [Shared Governance Committee Handbook](#)
35. [Shared Governance Committee Reports](#)
36. [Shared Governance Committee Training](#)
37. [Teaching and Learning Academy Course Description \(Show Me the Data/APA\), Fall 2012](#)
38. [Teaching and Learning Academy Schedule \(Show Me the Data/APA\), Fall 2012](#)
39. [Teaching and Learning Academy Schedule and Course Description \(Show Me the Data/APA\), Spring 2013](#)
40. [Student Learning Outcome Development and Assessment Cycle](#)

41. [Institutional Assessment Council Agenda, May 17, 2012](#)
42. [Institutional Assessment Council Minutes, May 17, 2012](#)
43. [Institutional Assessment Council Website](#)
44. [3-Year Course Learning Outcome Assessment Schedules – Academic Programs](#)
45. [3-Year Course Learning Outcome Assessment Schedules – CTE Programs](#)
46. [Two Year Course Offering Schedules – Academic Programs](#)
47. [Two Year Course Offering Schedules – CTE Programs](#)
48. [Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Website](#)
49. [Institutional Program Review Manual](#)
50. [Institutional Program Review Committee Agenda, February 2, 2012](#)
51. [Institutional Program Review Committee Minutes, February 2, 2012](#)
52. [Institutional Program Review Committee Agenda, March 1, 2012](#)
53. [Institutional Program Review Committee Minutes, March 1, 2012](#)
54. [Institutional Program Review Committee Agenda, March 29, 2012](#)
55. [Institutional Program Review Committee Minutes, March 29, 2012](#)
56. [Institutional Program Review Committee Agenda, September 20, 2012](#)
57. [Institutional Program Review Committee Minutes, September 20, 2012](#)
58. [Institutional Program Review Committee Agenda, November 15, 2012](#)
59. [Institutional Program Review Committee Minutes, November 15, 2012](#)
60. [Joint Institutional Program Review Committee and Assessment Council Agenda, December 6, 2012](#)
61. [Administrative Unit Annual Program Assessment Report Website](#)
62. [Instruction Annual Program Assessment Report Website](#)
63. [Instruction – CTE Annual Program Assessment Report Website](#)
64. [Student Services Annual Program Assessment Report Website](#)
65. [Program Review](#)
66. [Instructional Unit Plans](#)
67. [Instruction Annual Program Assessment Report Template](#)
68. [Instruction Unit Annual Program Assessments – Academic](#)
69. [Instruction Unit Annual Program Assessments - CTE](#)
70. [Instruction \(CTE\) Addendum to Annual Program Assessment Reports](#)
71. [Instruction \(Nursing\) Addendum to annual Program Assessment Reports](#)
72. [Student Services Unit Program Review](#)
73. [Student Services Unit Annual Program Assessments](#)
74. [Student Services Annual Program Assessment Report Template](#)
75. [Administrative Unit Program Review](#)
76. [Administrative Unit Annual Program Assessments](#)
77. [Administrative Unit Annual Program Assessment Report Template](#)
78. [Administrative Unit Program Review Template](#)
79. [Student Services Unit Program Review Template](#)
80. [Instructional Services Program Review Template](#)
81. [Unit and Division Plan Website](#)
82. [Institutional Research Website](#)

83. [Research Committee Minutes, February 28, 2012](#)
84. [Research Committee Agenda, March 27, 2012](#)
85. [Research Committee Minutes, May 22, 2012](#)
86. [Research Committee Minutes, September 25, 2012](#)
87. [Research Committee Minutes, October 23, 2012](#)
88. [Research Committee Minutes, November 27, 2012](#)
89. [Student Equity Plan](#)
90. [Performance Data Warehouse](#)
91. [Student Equity Report Data Definitions](#)
92. [District-Wide Student Equity Report Data](#)
93. [Menifee Valley Campus Student Equity Report Data](#)
94. [Distance Education Student Equity Report Data](#)
95. [San Geronio Pass Campus Student Equity Report Data](#)
96. [San Jacinto Campus Student Equity Report Data](#)
97. [Temecula Education Complex Student Equity Report Data](#)
98. [Bus Survey \(Institutional Effectiveness, Planning, Program Review, SLO, RAP\)](#)
99. [2011-2012 1st Principal Apportionment Presentation, March 15, 2012](#)
100. [2012-2013 Brown Bag Presentation, February 21, 2012](#)
101. [2012-2013 Budget Update Board Presentation, January 19, 2012](#)
102. [2011-2012 Budget Committee Mid Year Report](#)
103. [2011-2012 Prioritization Allocation Rubric \(PAR\)](#)
104. [2011-2012 RAP Utilization Report Form](#)
105. [2011-2012 RAP Process Presentation, October 17, 2011](#)
106. [2011-2012 Received RAP Proposal Utilization Reports](#)
107. [2011-2012 Resource Allocation Proposal \(RAP\)](#)
108. [2011-2012 Budget Committee Year End Report](#)
109. [2012-2013 Budget Calendar with RAP & PAR](#)
110. [2012-2013 Budget Committee Mid-Year Report](#)
111. [2012-2013 Prioritization Allocation Rubric \(PAR\)](#)
112. [2012-2013 RAP PAR Process, Institutional Planning Committee Presentation, May 29, 2012](#)
113. [2012-2013 Resource Allocation Proposal \(RAP\)](#)
114. [2013-2014 Budget Calendar with RAP & PAR](#)
115. [2013-2014 Prioritization Allocation Rubric \(PAR\)](#)
116. [2013-2014 Resource Allocation Proposal \(RAP\)](#)
117. [RAP PAR Ad Hoc Committee Agenda, May 14, 2012](#)
118. [RAP PAR Ad Hoc Committee Agenda, May 3, 2012](#)
119. [Resource Allocation Process 2011 - 2012](#)
120. [Resource Allocation Process 2012 - 2013](#)
121. [Update Charge for Budget Committee](#)
122. [Adopted Budget Presentation, June 28, 2012](#)
123. [Business & Operations Leadership Team \(BOLT\) Meeting Departmental Updates](#)
124. [Board of Trustees Five Year Construction Plan, May 10, 2012](#)

125. [Budget Committee Agenda, February 16, 2012](#)
126. [Budget Committee Minutes, February 16, 2012](#)
127. [Budget Committee Agenda, March 29, 2012](#)
128. [Budget Committee Minutes, March 29, 2012](#)
129. [Budget Committee Agenda, May 17, 2012](#)
130. [Budget Committee Minutes, May 17, 2012](#)
131. [Budget Committee Agenda, June 21, 2012](#)
132. [Budget Committee Minutes, June 21, 2012](#)
133. [Budget Committee Agenda, September 20, 2012](#)
134. [Budget Committee Minutes, September 20, 2012](#)
135. [Brown Bag Lunch Presentation, October 9, 2012](#)
136. [Budget Committee Agenda, October 18, 2012](#)
137. [Budget Committee Minutes, October 18, 2012](#)
138. [Budget Committee Agenda, November 18, 2012](#)
139. [Budget Committee Goals 2012-2013](#)
140. [Budget Committee Post Election Budget Update](#)
141. [Budget Watch Web Site-Latest News](#)
142. [Business Services Department Meeting to Review APA, October 19, 2012](#)
143. [Business Services Division Institutional Goals](#)
144. [Business Services Program Review](#)
145. [Business Services Student Learning Outcomes & Administrative Unit Outcomes](#)
146. [Business Services Update - All Hands on Deck](#)
147. [Facilities Update - All Hands on Deck](#)
148. [Faculty Convocation Budget Update, August 17, 2012](#)
149. [Information Technology Update - All Hands on Deck](#)
150. [Message to Students - Budget Crisis](#)
151. [Physical Resource Committee Agenda, September 9, 2011](#)
152. [Physical Resource Committee Minutes, September 9, 2011](#)
153. [Physical Resource Committee Presentation, September 9, 2011](#)
154. [Physical Resource Committee Agenda, March 19, 2012](#)
155. [Physical Resource Committee Minutes, March 19, 2012](#)
156. [Physical Resource Committee Handouts, March 19, 2012](#)
157. [Physical Resource Committee Presentation for 5 Year Construction Plan](#)
158. [Physical Resources Committee Charge](#)
159. [2012-2013 Physical Resources Committee Goals](#)
160. [President Budget Update, October 12, 2012](#)
161. [Procurement & General Services Update - All Hands on Deck](#)
162. [Sample eLumen Reports](#)
163. [Basic Skills Initiative State Reporting](#)
164. [2012-2013 RAP Requestor Notification Memo](#)
165. [Student Learning Outcome and Assessment Lifecycle](#)
166. [Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Home Website – Program Review](#)

167. [Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Home Website – Learning Outcomes and Assessment](#)

## Recommendation 3

1. [Institutional Assessment Council Website](#)
2. [Institutional Assessment Council Agenda, December 8, 2011](#)
3. [Institutional Assessment Council Minutes, December 8, 2011](#)
4. [Institutional Assessment Council Agenda, February 9, 2012](#)
5. [Institutional Assessment Council Minutes, February 9, 2012](#)
6. [Institutional Assessment Council Agenda, March 8, 2012](#)
7. [Institutional Assessment Council Minutes, March 8, 2012](#)
8. [Institutional Assessment Council Agenda, April 26, 2012](#)
9. [Institutional Assessment Council Minutes, April 26, 2012](#)
10. [Institutional Assessment Council Agenda, September 6, 2012](#)
11. [Institutional Assessment Council Minutes, September 6, 2012](#)
12. [Institutional Assessment Council Agenda, November 1, 2012](#)
13. [Institutional Assessment Council Minutes, November 1, 2012](#)
14. [Institutional Assessment Council Agenda, December 6, 2012](#)
15. [Institutional Assessment Council Minutes, December 6, 2012](#)
16. [Institutional Assessment Council Agenda, February 7, 2013](#)
17. [Institutional Assessment Council Minutes, February 7, 2013](#)
18. [Course Learning Outcome Inventory](#)
19. [Course Learning Outcome Assessment Report](#)
20. [Institutional Assessment Report](#)
21. [Program Assessment Report](#)
22. [Critical Assessment Test \(CAT\) Faculty Email, November 6, 2012](#)
23. [Critical Assessment Test \(CAT\) Scoring, December 14, 2012](#)
24. [Mapping of Course Learning Outcomes to Program Learning Outcomes \(Sample\)](#)
25. [Critical Assessment Test \(CAT\) Scoring, January 2013](#)
26. [Instruction Department Learning Outcomes \(DLO\)](#)
27. [Academic Programs Student Learning Outcomes \(SLO\)](#)
28. [Student Services Learning Outcomes \(SLO\)](#)
29. [Program Learning Outcomes](#)
30. [MSJC Institutional Learning Outcomes Website](#)
31. [Mt. San Jacinto College Core Competencies \(Draft\)](#)
32. [Institutional Learning Outcome with CAT Test Outcomes](#)
33. [Student Learning Outcome Development and Assessment Cycle](#)
34. [Closed Loop Model](#)
35. [Institutional Planning & Assessment Timeline](#)
36. [MSJC Planning and Accreditation Timeline 2011-2018](#)
37. [3-Year Course Learning Outcome Assessment Schedules – Academic Programs](#)
38. [3-Year Course Learning Outcome Assessment Schedules – CTE Programs](#)
39. [Two Year Course Offering Schedules – Academic Programs](#)
40. [Two Year Course Offering Schedules – CTE Programs](#)
41. [Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Website](#)

42. [Syllabus Checklist](#)
43. [Executive Senate Agenda, November 22, 2011](#)
44. [Executive Senate Minutes, November 22, 2011](#)
45. [Course Syllabi Sample \(History\)](#)
46. [Course Syllabi Sample \(Math\)](#)
47. [Course Syllabi Sample \(English\)](#)
48. [Course Syllabi Sample \(Child Development and Education\)](#)
49. [Course Syllabi Sample \(Chemistry\)](#)
50. [College Catalog](#)
51. [2011-2012 Prioritization Allocation Rubric \(PAR\)](#)
52. [2011-2012 RAP Utilization Report Form](#)
53. [2011-2012 RAP Process Presentation, October 17, 2011](#)
54. [2011-2012 Received RAP Utilization Reports](#)
55. [2011-2012 Resource Allocation Proposal \(RAP\)](#)
56. [2012-2013 Prioritization Allocation Rubric \(PAR\)](#)
57. [2012-2013 RAP PAR Process, Institutional Planning Committee Presentation, May 29, 2012](#)
58. [2012-2013 Resource Allocation Proposal \(RAP\)](#)
59. [2013-2014 Prioritization Allocation Rubric \(PAR\)](#)
60. [2013-2014 Resource Allocation Proposal Template](#)
61. [Institutional Program Review Committee Website](#)
62. [Joint Institutional Program Review Committee and Assessment Council Agenda, December 6, 2012](#)
63. [Joint Institutional Program Review Committee and Assessment Council Minutes, December 6, 2012](#)
64. [Program Review Manual](#)
65. [Institutional Program Review](#)
66. [Instruction Program Review Website](#)
67. [Instruction – CTE Program Review Website](#)
68. [Student Services Program Review Website](#)
69. [Administrative Unit Program Review Website](#)
70. [Annual Program Assessment Report Template](#)
71. [Instruction Annual Program Assessment Report Website](#)
72. [Instruction – CTE Annual Program Assessment Report Website](#)
73. [Student Services Annual Program Assessment Report Website](#)
74. [Administrative Unit Annual Program Assessment Report Website](#)
75. [Unit and Division Plan Website](#)
76. [Music – Annual Program Assessment Report](#)
77. [Dance – Annual Program Assessment Report](#)
78. [Business – Annual Program Assessment Report](#)
79. [Learning Center – Annual Program Assessment Report](#)
80. [Institutional Program Review](#)
81. [Institutional Program Review Committee Membership](#)
82. [Institutional Planning Committee Membership](#)

83. [Institutional Planning Committee Agenda, February 21, 2012](#)
84. [Institutional Planning Committee Minutes, February 21, 2012](#)
85. [Institutional Planning Committee Agenda, April 17, 2012](#)
86. [Institutional Planning Committee Minutes, April 17, 2012](#)
87. [Institutional Planning Committee Agenda, May 29, 2012](#)
88. [Institutional Planning Committee Minutes, May 29, 2012](#)
89. [Institutional Planning Committee Agenda, September 18, 2012](#)
90. [Institutional Planning Committee Minutes, September 18, 2012](#)
91. [Institutional Planning Committee Agenda, October 16, 2012](#)
92. [Institutional Planning Committee Minutes, October 16, 2012](#)
93. [Institutional Planning Committee Agenda, November 27, 2012](#)
94. [Institutional Planning Committee Minutes, November 27, 2012](#)
95. [Institutional Planning Committee Agenda, February 19, 2013](#)
96. [Budget Committee Membership](#)
97. [College Council Membership](#)
98. [2012-2013 Student Government Association Committee Representatives](#)
99. [Performance Data Warehouse](#)
100. [Institutional Assessment Coordinator Job Announcement](#)
101. [Convocation 2012 Agenda](#)
102. [Teaching and Learning Academy Schedule and Course Description \(Show Me the Data/APA\), Fall 2012](#)
103. [Teaching and Learning Academy Schedule and Course Description \(Show Me the Data/APA\), Spring 2013](#)
104. [Graduation Survey 2010](#)
105. [Graduation Survey 2011](#)
106. [Academic Senate San Jacinto Campus Site Council Agenda, March 4, 2013](#)
107. [Department Chair Procedures](#)
108. [2011- 2012 Faculty Handbook](#)
109. [Associate Faculty Handbook](#)
110. [Spring 2013 Associate Faculty Orientation Agenda](#)
111. [Curriculum Best Practices Handbook](#)
112. [Curriculum Committee Email re: GELOs in Area F](#)
113. [Curricunet](#)
114. [eLumen Data Warehouse](#)
115. [eLumen Website](#)
116. [Educational Master Plan](#)
117. [Strategic Plan](#)
118. [Mapping of Course Learning Outcomes to Institutional Learning Outcomes \(Sample\)](#)
119. [Sample eLumen Reports](#)



## Recommendation 4

1. [Performance Data Warehouse](#)
2. [Institutional Research Website](#)
3. [Student Equity Plan Report](#)
4. [Student Equity Report Data Definitions](#)
5. [District-Wide Student Equity Report Data](#)
6. [Menifee Valley Campus Student Equity Report Data](#)
7. [Distance Education Student Equity Report Data](#)
8. [San Geronio Pass Campus Student Equity Report Data](#)
9. [San Jacinto Campus Student Equity Report Data](#)
10. [Temecula Education Complex Student Equity Report Data](#)
11. [Institutional Effectiveness and Planning Website](#)
12. [Teaching and Learning Academy Course Description \(Show Me the Data/APA\), Fall 2012](#)
13. [Teaching and Learning Academy Schedule \(Show Me the Data/APA\), Fall 2012](#)
14. [Teaching and Learning Academy Schedule and Course Description \(Show Me the Data/APA\), Spring 2013](#)
15. [Instruction - Annual Program Assessment Report Template](#)
16. [Instruction \(CTE\) Addendum to Annual Program Assessment Report](#)
17. [Instruction \(Nursing\) Addendum to Annual Program Assessment Report](#)
18. [Student Services Annual Program Assessment Report Template](#)
19. [Administrative Unit Annual Program Assessment Report Template](#)
20. [Instruction Annual Program Assessment Report Website](#)
21. [Instruction – CTE Annual Program Assessment Report Website](#)
22. [Student Services Annual Program Assessment Report Website](#)
23. [Administrative Unit Annual Program Assessment Report Website](#)
24. [Institutional Assessment Council Agenda, May 17, 2012](#)
25. [Institutional Assessment Council Minutes, May 17, 2012](#)
26. [Institutional Program Review Committee Agenda, February 2, 2012](#)
27. [Institutional Program Review Committee Minutes, February 2, 2012](#)
28. [Institutional Program Review Committee Agenda, March 1, 2012](#)
29. [Institutional Program Review Committee Minutes, March 1, 2012](#)
30. [Institutional Program Review Committee Agenda, March 29, 2012](#)
31. [Institutional Program Review Committee Minutes, March 29, 2012](#)
32. [Institutional Program Review Committee Agenda, September 20, 2012](#)
33. [Institutional Program Review Committee Minutes, September 20, 2012](#)
34. [Institutional Program Review Committee Agenda, November 15, 2012](#)
35. [Institutional Program Review Committee Minutes, November 15, 2012](#)
36. [Joint Institutional Program Review Committee and Assessment Council Agenda, December 6, 2012](#)
37. [Institutional Planning Committee Agenda, February 21, 2012](#)
38. [Institutional Planning Committee Minutes, February 21, 2012](#)
39. [Institutional Planning Committee Agenda, April 17, 2012](#)

40. [Institutional Planning Committee Minutes, April 17, 2012](#)
41. [Research Committee Minutes, February 28, 2012](#)
42. [Research Committee Agenda, March 27, 2012](#)
43. [Research Committee Minutes, May 22, 2012](#)
44. [Research Committee Minutes, September 25, 2012](#)
45. [Research Committee Minutes, October 23, 2012](#)
46. [Research Committee Minutes, November 27, 2012](#)
47. [Enrollment Management Committee Website](#)
48. [Schedule Reduction Task Force Website, Spring 2013](#)
49. [Instructional Services/Student Services Joint Dean's Meeting Agenda, September 5, 2012](#)
50. [Instructional Services/Student Services Joint Dean's Meeting Minutes, September 5, 2012](#)
51. [Instructional Services/Student Services Joint Dean's Meeting Agenda, September 19, 2012](#)
52. [Instructional Services/Student Services Joint Dean's Meeting Minutes, September 19, 2012](#)
53. [Instructional Services/Student Services Schedule Reduction Meeting Agenda September 26, 2012](#)
54. [Instructional Services/Student Services Schedule Reduction Meeting, September 26, 2012 \(Courses\)](#)
55. [Instructional Services/Student Services Schedule Reduction Meeting, September 26, 2012 \(Departments\)](#)
56. [Instructional Services/Student Services Schedule Reduction Meeting, September 26, 2012 \(Programs\)](#)
57. [Instructional Services/Student Services Schedule Reduction Meeting, September 26, 2012 \(Worksheet – Courses\)](#)
58. [Instructional Services/Student Services Schedule Reduction Meeting, September 26, 2012 \(Handout- Reduction Expansion Worksheet – Department\)](#)
59. [Instructional Services/Student Services Schedule Reduction Meeting, September 26, 2012 \(Handout- Reduction Expansion Worksheet – Programs\)](#)
60. [Instructional Services/Student Services Schedule Reduction Meeting Minutes, October 3, 2012](#)
61. [Instructional Deans Meeting Agenda, October 26, 2012](#)
62. [Instructional Deans Meeting Minutes, October 26, 2012](#)
63. [Spring 2013 Reduction Task Force Agenda, August 30, 2012](#)
64. [Spring 2013 Reduction – 3900 FTES Exhibit](#)
65. [Spring 2013 Reduction – FTES Reduction Criteria Exhibit](#)
66. [Spring 2013 Reduction – FTES Calculation Exhibit](#)
67. [Spring 2013 Reduction – Percentage of Cap Exhibit](#)
68. [Spring 2013 Reduction - Show Me the Data Exhibit](#)
69. [Spring Reduction Task Force Meeting Minutes, May 30, 2012](#)
70. [Vice President of Instruction Email – Spring 2013 Schedule](#)
71. [Spring 2013 Program Restoration Planning Guide](#)
72. [Department Chair Academy Agenda, October 19, 2012](#)
73. [Department Chair Academy Handouts, October 19, 2012](#)
74. [Department Chair Academy Minutes, October 19, 2012](#)

75. [Department Chair Academy Agenda, May 11, 2012](#)
76. [Department Chair Academy Handouts, May 11, 2012](#)
77. [Department Chair Academy Minutes, May 11, 2012](#)

## Recommendation 5

1. [Mt. San Jacinto College Staffing Plan](#)
2. [Joint Hiring Committee Agenda, October 6, 2011](#)
3. [Joint Hiring Committee Minutes, October 6, 2011](#)
4. [Joint Hiring Committee Agenda, December 15, 2011](#)
5. [Joint Hiring Committee Minutes, December 15, 2011](#)
6. [Joint Hiring Committee Agenda, September 25, 2012](#)
7. [Joint Hiring Committee Minutes, September 25, 2012](#)
8. [Joint Hiring Committee Agenda, October 30, 2012](#)
9. [Joint Hiring Committee Meeting Notes, November 17, 2012](#)
10. [Staffing Matrix – Program Review](#)
11. [Institutional Planning Committee Agenda, October 16, 2012](#)
12. [Institutional Planning Committee Minutes, October 16, 2012](#)
13. [Institutional Planning Committee Agenda, November 27, 2012](#)
14. [Institutional Planning Committee Minutes, November 27, 2012](#)
15. [Institutional Planning Committee Agenda, February 19, 2013](#)
16. [Fall 2012 Faculty Obligation Report](#)
17. [Institutional Program Review](#)
18. [Instruction Program Review Website](#)
19. [Instruction – CTE Program Review Website](#)
20. [Student Services Program Review Website](#)
21. [Administrative Unit Program Review Website](#)
22. [Annual Program Assessment Report Template](#)
23. [Instruction Annual Program Assessment Report Website](#)
24. [Instruction – CTE Annual Program Assessment Report Website](#)
25. [Student Services Annual Program Assessment Report Website](#)
26. [Administrative Unit Annual Program Assessment Report Website](#)
27. [Unit and Division Plan Website](#)
28. [2013-2014 Resource Allocation Proposal Template](#)
29. [Resource Allocation Proposal \(Communications Program Director -Staffing Sample\)](#)
30. [Resource Allocation Proposal \(SI Clerical Support - Staffing Sample\)](#)
31. [Staffing Resource Allocations – Hours of Operation Executive Cabinet Discussion](#)
32. [Educational Master Plan](#)
33. [Strategic Plan](#)
34. [Staffing Plan Influences and Decision-Making Process – Flow Chart Draft](#)
35. [Executive Cabinet - Classified Recruitment Tracking Sheet 2012-2012](#)
36. [Draft Considerations for Faculty, Classified, and Administrative Positions](#)