PROGRESS REPORT VISIT
TO
MT. SAN JACINTO COMMUNITY COLLEGE

1499 North State Street
San Jacinto, CA 92583

**A Confidential Report Prepared for the Accrediting Commission
For Community and Junior Colleges**

**This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
Mt. San Jacinto Community College
On November 7, 2007**

**Jerry Patton, Chair
Holly Beernink, Team Member**

Introduction

At its January 2006 meeting, the Commission moved to reaffirm accreditation for Mt. San Jacinto College and asked the College to submit a progress report to focus on Recommendations 2, 3, and 5. The report was submitted to the Commission on October 15, 2007. Jerry Patton and Holly Beernink conducted the progress report visit on November 7, 2007. The purpose of the visit was to validate the progress report prepared by the college and to determine if sufficient progress has been made since the reaccreditation visit in October 2005.

The team received the Mt. San Jacinto College Progress Report in time for the visit. The college was prepared for the visit and was anxious to share their accomplishments since the reaccreditation visit. Meetings with individuals and groups at the college were arranged as agreed to earlier with the team chair.

In the morning, the team visited the College and met with a variety of faculty, staff and administrators. The meeting with President Jon Tyler confirmed the reports description of the organization process and the participation of the College Community in the development of the Progress Report. He also confirmed that most all of the new faculty was enthusiastic and supportive of the planning process and the faculty with long seniority was somewhat neutral. The President described the process in place for Program Review, the development of Student Learning Outcomes at the course, program, and services level, and the integrated planning process underway at the College.

Additional visits were scheduled with the Chairs and Co-chairs of the recommendation committees. A list of the faculty, staff and administrators who met with the team follows this report. With the exception of a few faculty, the interview participants confirmed that program review, SLO development, and planning is a faculty and staff driven process that involves wide participation of the institution. Dialog has been major component of SLO development, and has in fact, been the process driving the SLO process rather than a data driven process.

All College members interviewed were able to discuss the development of the Education Master Plan, the new budget process, and the plan for a more integrated planning process by the institution, especially for facilities and IT planning. All agreed that the College has taken seriously the ACCJC Recommendations, and that significant work has been accomplished by the College to set in place the foundation and infrastructure for integrated planning to thrive. All agreed also that although the infrastructure foundation is in place, the process of implementation and college-wide and operational integration of planning and assessment is just beginning.

In the afternoon, the team met with additional groups, including faculty and students. Faculty members in this afternoon group stated that the Program Review process for academic programs and classes is currently on hold waiting for all areas to come together with an integrated planning process. These faculty members also stated that there was not a large faculty participation in the Progress Report, and that the College has gone through a great many changes and turnover that has had a negative effect on the trust and productivity of faculty toward further participation in Program Review, development of SLOs, and integrated planning. The students were enthusiastic

about their learning experiences and expressed their appreciation of the caring faculty, saying they were great, communicative and easily accessible and available.

The team reviewed evidence prepared for the visit and confirmed that much work has been accomplished on meeting the ACCJC Recommendations. Specifically, the team reviewed the Educational Master Plan (progress to date), Annual Planning agenda and summary notes from 2005 through 2007, the revised Budget Process with minutes, the SLO Manual, sample Institutional, Program and Course SLO progress reports, Program Review updated model and sample reports, and a large variety of planning meeting agendas and minutes.

The team's attention for this progress report visit was focused on the three specific recommendations made by the visiting team in October 2005. The recommendations include three major areas of Program Review to ensure overall institutional effectiveness, development and implementation of Student Learning Outcomes, and integrated planning specific to the areas of physical planning and technology planning.

The following is the Commission's specific recommendation with the team's assessment of progress at Mt. San Jacinto College.

Recommendation #2

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

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

Findings:
During the one-day visit to the College, The team interviewed faculty, administrators and staff and reviewed evidence to determine that significant progress has been made to fulfill this recommendation.

The new online model has simplified the Program Review process and will provide the College with new momentum to continue with Program Review at all levels.

The College acknowledges that program review must be coordinated and integrated with all institutional planning and the budget process. There is evidence that Instruction and Student Services have been working together as Instruction builds its new model. All faculty and administrators interviewed confirmed that various common elements of program review need to be adopted by other areas of the College, such as Business Services and Human Resources, so that common goals can be assessed and comparable information can be generated to coordinate efforts and allocate resources.

The integrated College planning process has been slow to implement. Faculty and administrators reported that the College has been effective in the past reviewing, assessing and planning on an individual department basis. Most stated that the former process was disjointed and not part of an integrated system. As discussed with various groups and confirmed by meeting minutes, policies and processes, the various planning elements have been addressed and have been emerging over the last few years. The College still has a ways to go to create a linked systematic process that integrates all planning across the institution as a whole.

Discussions with groups and review of the evidence confirm that the College has greatly improved its assessment of data process. The implementation of a new Decision Support System, a revised, stream-lined program review model, improved SLO standards, an Educational Master Plan, and a planning model for facilities has moved the process along with major achievements since the last site visit in October 2005.

Conclusion:
As stated in the Progress Report and reported by various individuals and groups during the site visit, the College has not yet met all aspects of this recommendation. It has, however, made considerable progress in all areas to create the foundation and infrastructure for rapid improvement in the near future.

It is clear that the College has made great progress with its systematic and integrated planning, program review, SLOs, measurement and a culture of evidence. The fragmented and disjointed planning process of the past has been replaced with an integrated system for each program, service and department

The faculty and staff interviewed may not fully understand the full significance of master planning but they are firmly convinced there is an emerging culture that advocates institutional effectiveness and assessment to improve student success. The College is aware of the vast amount of work ahead that will be required to implement the planning process into the daily fabric of the institution.

Recommendation #3

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

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

Findings:
During the site visit, the team had many opportunities to discuss the development of Student Learning Outcomes with academic departments, services departments, and other College departments. Review of these meetings as well as review of the evidence presented confirms that the College is making progress in addressing this recommendation. The College has strong faculty leadership and administrative support to assist with this process. Many resources have been implemented to assist with the development and assessment of SLOs. The new Decision Support System is expected to provide additional support as the SLO process moves from a dialog system of analysis to a data driven system of analysis.

At the time of the visit the team was able to view many courses across a wide range of disciplines that have identified and evaluated student-learning outcomes. The services departments, especially the library, have gone through the first round of SLO analysis and plans for improvement are underway.

The College has made significant progress with the implementation of SLOs across the institution. As stated in the Program Report, and confirmed by interviews, the College has created full-time faculty positions to help with the implementation and assessment of SLOs across the curriculum and throughout the institution. The development of an SLO Handbook, SLO assessment examples, and the "fact book" has greatly improved the process. The SLO committees have developed a multi-year cycle for SLOs and the intent is to integrate the SLO assessment cycles with Program Review and curriculum development.

Institutional Learning Outcomes have been completed and approved by the Board of Trustees. Approval of the institutional learning outcomes communicates the Board of Trustees' expectations for educational programs to the College's various constituencies. As confirmed with various groups, approval of Institutional Learning Outcomes will allow decision makers to better assess the needs of the institution as a whole, and allow the establishment of goals and objectives, as well as planning objectives, to be made based on student learning throughout the institution.

Conclusion:
The College has made significant progress with the development and implementation of Student Learning Outcomes throughout the institution. While the College has not yet reached the "Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement" stage of SLOs, it is well into the Development stage. The evidence of activities over the last few years shows significant progress and steady

improvement toward institutionalizing development of student learning outcomes and using data about student achievement to assess and improve the quality and effectiveness of programs and services at the College. The completion and implementation of the Educational Master Plan will provide additional value to the assessment, planning and improvement phase of Student Learning throughout the College.

Recommendation #5

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

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

Findings:
As discussed in the Progress Report, MSJC has made progress in the integration of the physical planning and technology planning processes with the implementation of the District Master Plan, and the revised budget development process.

Discussions with several administrators within the Business and IT departments indicated that the planning process is working and has been integrated with the District Master Plan and the strategic plan.

Interviews with the Chair and Co-Chairs of Recommendation 5 confirmed the plan to coordinate the IT Department and the Facilities Department plans into the Educational Master Plan by the end of 2008. The budget planning process will integrate all planning at the department level into the institutional planning level.

It was reported that participation by all departments is still limited at this stage of implementation. All agreed that the infrastructure is in place for integrated planning and budgeting to be effective. While some faculty members reported that the budget process is still very much a "top down" process, they did confirm the infrastructure was in place and they reported discussions about future plans for wider participation in the Institutional Planning Committee, the Budget Development Committee, and the Facilities Committee.

It was confirmed by many of the faculty and staff interviewed, including the College President that all budget request items for new faculty, instructional equipment purchases over a specific amount, new or refurbishment of instructional facilities and other budget allocations must be first identified as a need in Program Review and Educational Master Plan documents prior to approval; they acknowledged this as a significant achievement in process for strategic planning. Furthermore, it was confirmed that the integration of IT and facility needs will be integrated in the department planning across the institution. The Budget Committee will be tasked to review all budget requests, and to prioritize these requests.

Conclusions:

As with the progress made toward fulfilling the other recommendations, a significant amount of work has been completed to meet Recommendation 5. The physical planning and technology planning process has accomplished much in meeting this Recommendation. With the completion and implementation of the Educational Master Plan, the facility Master Plan and the IT Master Plan will be integrated into one Master Plan. It will be easier for each department to see where resources need to be allocated based on trends, community needs, student needs, and the College Mission. Priorities and justifications will be related to the Educational Master Planning process, which will integrate all departments into one strategic plan based on student and institutional outcomes.

Meetings were held with the following individuals and groups:

College President
Dr. Jon Tyler

Accreditation Liaison Officer
Cathy Brostrand, Faculty

Recommendation 2 Chairs and Co-Chairs
Rich Rowley, Faculty
Bil Bergin, Faculty
Sterling Roulette, Faculty
Roger Schultz, Administration
Kristi Di Memmo, Classified Staff

Recommendation 3 Chairs and Co-Chairs
Dennis Anderson, Administration
Joyce Johnson, Administration
Carolyn Hays, Faculty

Recommendation 5 Chairs and Co-Chairs
Dennis Hogan, Administration
Pat Hanz, Administration
Susan Guarino, Administration

Drop in session
Four randomly selected faculty members
Three randomly selected students