

EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

**San José City College
2100 Moorpark Ave.
San José, CA 95128**

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

**This report represents the findings of the External Evaluation Team that visited
San José City College and San José Evergreen Community College District
October 10 – October 13, 2016**

**Erika Endrijonas, Ph.D.
Chair**

NOTE: this page shall be added to External Evaluation Team Report (Team Report), immediately behind the cover page, and shall become part of the final report associated with the review.

DATE: February 3, 2017

INSTITUTION: San Jose City College
2100 Moorpark Avenue
San Jose, CA 95128

SUBJECT: Commission Revisions to the Team Report

The Team Report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited San Jose City College October 10-13, 2016. It provides details of the team's findings with regard to the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies, and should be read carefully and used to understand the team's findings. Upon a review of the Team Report sent to the College, the San Jose City College Self-Evaluation Report, and supplemental information and evidence provided by College and District representatives, the following changes or corrections are noted for the Team Report:

1. The Commission removed Standard citations I.B.9, IV.A.3, and IV.A.7 from District Recommendation 1 and changed this recommendation to one to increase effectiveness wherever it occurs in the Team Report.
2. The Commission deleted District Recommendation 3 wherever it occurs in the Team Report.
3. The Commission changed College Recommendation 4 to a recommendation to increase effectiveness wherever it occurs in the Team Report.

Table of Contents

List Of College Team Members	3
San José Evergreen Community District Team Members	4
Summary Of The External Evaluation Report.....	5
Major Findings And Recommendations Of The 2016 External Evaluation Team.....	7
Introduction.....	10
Eligibility Requirements	11
Checklist For Evaluating Compliance With Federal Regulations And Related Commission Policies.....	13
Standard I.....	20
STANDARD I.A.: INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND EFFECTIVENESS	20
STANDARD I.B.: ASSURING ACADEMIC QUALITY AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS	23
STANDARD I.C.: INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY.....	28
Standard II.....	31
STANDARD II.A.: INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS	31
STANDARD II.B.: LIBRARY AND LEARNING SUPPORT SERVICES	38
STANDARD II.C.: STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES	41
Standard III	44
STANDARD III.A.: HUMAN RESOURCES	44
STANDARD III.B.: PHYSICAL RESOURCES	49
STANDARD III.C.: TECHNOLOGY RESOURCES	52
STANDARD III.D.: FINANCIAL RESOURCES	55
Standard IV	61
STANDARD IV.A.: DECISION-MAKING ROLES AND PROCESSES.....	61
STANDARD IV.B.: CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER	64
STANDARD IV.C.: GOVERNING BOARD.....	67
STANDARD IV.D.: MULTI-COLLEGE DISTRICTS OR SYSTEMS.....	71
Quality Focus Essay Feedback	75

List of College Team Members

Dr. Erika Endrijonas (Chair)
President
Los Angeles Valley College

Ms. Michelle Fowles (Team Assistant)
Dean, Institutional Effectiveness
Los Angeles Valley College

Dr. Tanya Renner
Professor of Psychology
Kapiolani Community College

Mr. Christopher Howerton
Professor of Communication Studies/ SLO
Coordinator/ Senate VP
Woodland Community College

Dr. Andrew LaManque
Associate Vice President of Instruction
Foothill College

Ms. Evelyn Lord
Head Librarian
Laney College

Ms. Sarah Shepard
Faculty, Business
West Hills College - Coalinga

Dr. Elizabeth Pratt
Dean Career and Technical Education
College of Marin

Mr. Val M. Garcia
Vice President of Student Services
Porterville College

Dr. Anthony Culpepper
Executive Vice President, Administrative
Services
Glendale Community College

Dr. Dena Maloney
Superintendent/President
El Camino College

Dr. Sherrie Guerrero
Executive Liaison Special Projects
Chaffey College

Dr. Joan Lang
Research Analyst
Los Angeles Harbor College

San José Evergreen Community College District Team Members

Dr. Erika Endrijonas (Chair)
President
Los Angeles Valley College

Dr. Bob Kratochvil
President
Los Medanos College

Dr. Dena Maloney
Superintendent/President
El Camino College

Dr. Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh
President
Grossmont College

Dr. Sherrie Guerrero
Executive Liaison Special Projects
Chaffey College

Dr. James Wright
Trustee
South Orange County Community College
District

Dr. Anthony Culpepper
Executive Vice President, Administrative
Services
Glendale Community College

Dr. Stephanie Bulger
Vice Chancellor of Instructional Services
San Diego Community College District

Summary of the External Evaluation Report

INSTITUTION: San José City College

DATES OF VISIT: October 10 – October 13, 2016

TEAM CHAIR: Dr. Erika Endrijonas

A thirteen-member accreditation team visited San José City College (SJCC) October 10 – October 13, 2016 for the purpose of determining whether the College continues to meet Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and USDE regulations. The team evaluated how well the College is achieving its stated Mission and provided recommendations to meet Standards or for improving institutional effectiveness.

In preparation for the visit, the team chair attended a team chair workshop on June 29, 2016 and conducted a pre-visit to the campus on August 22, 2016. During this visit, the chair met with the President and Vice President, who is also the Accreditation Liaison Officer, and other key personnel involved in the self-evaluation preparation process. The entire external evaluation team received team training provided by staff from the ACCJC on August 31, 2016.

The evaluation team received a hard copy of the College's self-evaluation and a flash drive with the related evidence six weeks in advance of the site visit. The team determined that the self-evaluation addressed the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission Policies, although the narrative could have been edited more closely and could have included more specific examples. The team had to request a significant amount of evidence after reviewing the document in order to corroborate the report's assertions. During the visit, the team confirmed that the College community participated in the creation of the Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER). Further, it contained three self-identified action projects for institutional improvement as part of the Quality Focus Essay.

On Tuesday morning October 11, 2016, team members visited San José City College located in San José, California. The visit began with a breakfast reception, where the team was introduced to at least 30 members of the College community and was followed by a tour of the campus.

During the evaluation visit, team members conducted approximately 60 formal meetings, interviews, and observations involving College employees and students. Team members also visited face-to-face and online classes in addition to interacting with students and staff in various offices and areas on campus. Two open forums were held, one during the day and one during the early evening, to provide community members and College personnel opportunities to meet with members of the evaluation team.

The team reviewed materials supporting the self-evaluation mostly in electronic form via provided flash drives, internal College systems (e.g. CurricuNET, Canvas, Moodle, TracDat, Colleague and CROA), and the College's public website pages. The team reviewed a broad

array of evidence including program review and student learning outcomes documents, course syllabi, College policies and procedures, enrollment information, committee minutes, and College governance structures and documents.

The team greatly appreciated the assistance of key staff members who helped the team with requests for individual meetings and other needs throughout the evaluation process. The team experienced significant challenges obtaining evidence and arranging team interviews in a timely manner in advance of the visit, but, in the end, those issues were resolved, and the visit was overall successful.

The team found the College to be in compliance with most of the Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies and Standards and USDE regulations. The team found several areas of effective programs and was especially struck by the esprit de corps across the College, which was one of several commendations that acknowledged the positive campus climate. The team also issued recommendations, both to meet the standards and to increase effectiveness.

Several members from the SJCC team joined selected members from the team visiting Evergreen Valley College on Monday, October 10 at the district office where they met with several Board members, the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, and district staff members. This district team found the District to be in compliance with the Eligibility Requirements and most of the Commission Policies and Standards. The district team made recommendations for compliance and improvement to the District along with one Commendation.

Major Findings and Recommendations of the 2016 External Evaluation Team

College Commendations

College Commendation 1

The team commends the College for its well-developed and well-documented basic skills and student equity programs for which data analyses and tracking of students are robust and clearly used as the basis for program improvements. (I.A)

College Commendation 2

The team commends the College for the innovative and cross-disciplinary approach of the Basic Skills, ESL and CTE faculty who have successfully developed non-credit CTE contextualized curriculum for Adult Education students. (II.A.4)

College Commendation 3

The team commends the College for its commitment to the professional development of all employee groups which includes a wide range of opportunities and resources that are connected to the College's strategic goals and mission. Of particular note is the development of the distance education handbook for faculty. (III.A.14)

College Commendation 4

The team commends the College for recognizing the need for innovation in business services as it moved from a manual process to an electronic tracking and more streamlined e-signing procedure for contract approval. (III.D.8)

College Commendation 5

The team commends both the Academic Senate and Administration for establishing and institutionalizing clear, ongoing, and collaborative communication. The Administration has demonstrated support for the Academic Senate's increased leadership role for the campus, while also initiating and supporting a newly formed Classified Senate. (IV.A.1)

College Commendation 6

The team commends the college for its notable esprit de corps and commitment to serving students, which is exemplified through collegial dialog, exemplary academic and support programs, a culture of inclusion, and the time, energy, and enthusiasm devoted to the participatory governance process.

College Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

College Recommendation 1 (Compliance): In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the College develop and communicate a methodology for setting institution-set standards (minimum acceptable levels) for course completion and other measures of student achievement, assess performance against the standards, communicate the results, and incorporate the information in college planning and decision-making processes. (I.A.2, I.B.3, ER11)

College Recommendation 2 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends the College implement its mission-driven integrated planning and resource allocation process in alignment with its Strategic and Educational Master plans. (I.A.2, I.A.3, I.B.4, I.B.7, I.B.9, ER19)

College Recommendation 3 (Compliance): In order to meet Standards, the team recommends that the College create and implement a process to demonstrate its substantive and collegial dialog about student outcomes and institutional effectiveness through committees, advisory committee meetings, workshops, and professional development activities. The team further recommends that the College develop and implement a process to broadly communicate this dialog to support continuous quality improvement across the College. (I.B.1, II.A.2, II.A.3)

College Recommendation 4 (Compliance): In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the College analyze disaggregated learning outcomes data, regardless of location or means of delivery, at the program and institutional levels for subpopulations of students in order to identify performance gaps and institutional barriers for achieving its mission and goals. The team further recommends that the College include this analysis in college planning and decision-making processes. (I.B. 5, I.B.6, II.A.1, II.A.3, ER11)

College Recommendation 5 (Compliance): In order to meet the standard, the team recommends the College develop a Memorandum of Understanding with the Center for Employment Training (CET) to ensure that all instructional programs offered at CET are consistent with the College's mission, course and program requirements, and that commensurate student services are provided. (II.A.1, II.C.1, II.C.3, ER15)

College Recommendation 6 (Compliance): In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that all individual course syllabi include information consistent with the approved Course Outline of Record and approved Student Learning Outcomes. (I.C.I, II.A.3)

College Recommendation 7 (Compliance): In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the College work with the District to finalize AP 4020 Program and Curriculum Development and ensure that it includes clock hour to credit hour calculations that adhere to the Department of Education's conversion formula, both in policy and procedure, and in practice. (II.A.9, ER10, 600.2, 602.16 (a)(1)(viii), 602.24(e),(f), 668.2, 668.9)

College Recommendation 8 (Compliance): In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the College provide electronic access to student support services, including tutoring, distance education technology support, and student educational plan development for online students. The team further recommends all student support programs should establish learning outcomes and complete program reviews. (II.C.3, ER17)

College Recommendation 9 (Compliance): In order to meet the standard, the team recommends the College create, implement, and assess the effectiveness of a procedure for

documenting formal student complaints, including creating and maintaining a repository of complaints available for review. (II.C.8; 602.16(a)(1)(ix);668.43)

College Recommendation 10 (Compliance): In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the College evaluate all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The team further recommends that the District evaluate the college president according to Board Policy 2436 Evaluation of the College President. (III.A.5, IV.C.3)

College Recommendation 11 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College regularly review and evaluate the on-going technology support needs for students. (III.C.4)

District Commendation

The team commends the efforts of District Police Services in conjunction with the Colleges' Safety and Facilities Committees in making positive improvements related to campus safety, security, and emergency preparedness. (III.B.1, III.D., IV.D.2, IV.D.6)

District Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

District Recommendation 1(Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District establish a clear process of integrated planning that links resource decision-making to goals developed through collegial consultation. The team further recommends that the relationship between the Board Ends Policies and the strategic plan be clearly defined in the context of resource decision-making. (I.B.9, IV.A.3, IV.A.7, IV.D.5)

District Recommendation 2 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the District complete its evaluation and revision of the current resource allocation model. (III.D.1, III.D.2, III.D.3, IV.D.2, IV.D.3)

District Recommendation 3 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District review and revise Board Policies 2511 and 4000 to eliminate the discrepancy concerning means of collegial consultation in areas of academic and professional matters. (IV.A.5)

District Recommendation 4 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the District establish a process to systematically evaluate District committees and use the results of that assessment as the basis for improvement. (IV.A.7, IV.D.7)

District Recommendation 5 (Improvement): In order to increase the effectiveness of its policies in fulfilling the District mission, the team recommends that the Governing Board fully implement a formal Board Policy review process that involves college stakeholders in regular cycle of assessment. (IV.C.7)

Introduction

San José City College is located southwest of the downtown core of the City of San José, California. The College is one of two accredited institutions governed by the Board of Trustees of the San José-Evergreen Community College District (SJECCD), which officially became an independent college District in 1963. The District, located in northeastern Santa Clara Valley and covering 300 square miles, includes all of the City of Milpitas and part of the City of San José. San José City College opened its doors in 1921 to a class of 81 students. It is the oldest community college in Santa Clara County and one of the ten oldest in California.

For past 61 years, the campus has been located in downtown San José. Through the 1960s and 1970s, the College owned more property than it does currently. The boundaries of the College stretched east from Bascom Avenue to Menker Avenue. Portions of this property were sold off for the development of Interstate 280 and traded to incorporate the current land where a multipurpose field currently resides. Bond measures in 1998, 2004, and 2010 have supported much needed facilities construction, including the Carmen Castellano Fine Arts Center, the Multidisciplinary Building in addition to the Science and Math Building. Construction of the new Kinesiology/Wellness and Athletics Building is currently underway.

In 2014, the College enrolled 9,000 students, but in the last five years, the total unduplicated headcount at San José City College has declined. In fall 2011, there were 9,930 students; in fall 2015, there were 8,496 students. At the College, Hispanic students are the largest student population (42.84% in fall 2015), followed by Asian students (20.14% in fall of 2015). In the last five years, more women have enrolled. In 2011, only 0.12 percent self-identified as “unknown” gender; in 2015 that number increased to .38 percent. In 2015, more than 31 percent of students at the College were 30 years or older.

The administration of the College is relatively new but widely supported, and recent changes to the participatory governance structure have created a very positive environment at the College.

Eligibility Requirements

1. Authority

The team confirmed that San José City College is authorized to operate as a postsecondary, degree-granting institution based on continuous accreditation by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The ACCJC is a regional accrediting body recognized by the U.S. Department of Education and granted authority through the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008.

The college meets the Eligibility Requirement.

2. Operational Status

The team confirmed that the College is operational and provides educational service to approximately 13,000 students annually, with the majority enrolled in degree applicable credit courses. Approximately thirty percent are enrolled full time. Approximately seventy percent of students are pursuing educational goals that relate to degree, certificate, or transfer.

The College meets the Eligibility Requirement.

3. Degrees

The team confirmed that the majority of courses offered lead to a degree and/or transfer. The College offers over 870 credit classes. Students can select from 47 Associate Degrees and 27 certificates.

The College meets the Eligibility Requirement.

4. Chief Executive Officer

The District's current chief executive officer is qualified for the position and has served as chancellor since January 25, 2016. Her full-time responsibility is to the District; she possesses the requisite skills and authority to provide leadership for the District.

The College President/CEO of San José City College is also qualified for the position and reports directly to the District Chancellor. The College President/CEO does not serve as a member of the Board nor as the Board president. Since the last full accreditation visit, there have been changes in both the Chancellor and College President/CEO positions, each of which were appropriately reported to the ACCJC.

The college meets the Eligibility Requirement.

5. Financial Accountability

The annually audited financial statements for the years ending 2013, 2014, and 2015 received an unmodified opinion from the Independent Auditor's, Crowe Horwath, LLP. The Auditor's noted "Emphasis of Matter" in 2013 and 2015 indicating that the institution has implemented the current Governmental Accounting Standards regulating the disclosure of pension liability within the financial documents. The Auditor's reports indicated no findings or matters that needed to be acted upon by the institution's management.

The college meets the Eligibility Requirement.

Checklist for Evaluating Compliance with Federal Regulations and Related Commission Policies

Public Notification of an Evaluation Team Visit and Third Party Comment

Evaluation Items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comment in advance of a comprehensive evaluation visit.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution cooperates with the evaluation team in any necessary follow-up related to the third party comment.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution demonstrates compliance with the <i>Commission Policy on Rights and Responsibilities of the Commission and Member Institutions</i> as to third party comment.

[Regulation citation: 602.23(b).]

Conclusion Check-Off:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission’s requirements.

Narrative :

The team verified that the College complies with the Commission’s requirements for timely submission of accreditation documents and the process for soliciting third party comment. The College posted drafts of the report and solicited input and comments.

Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement

Evaluation Items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance across the institution, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. Course completion is included as one of these elements of student achievement. Other elements of student achievement performance for measurement have been determined as appropriate to the institution’s mission.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance within each instructional program, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. The defined elements include, but are not limited to,

	job placement rates for program completers, and for programs in fields where licensure is required, the licensure examination passage rates for program completers.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The institution-set standards for programs and across the institution are relevant to guide self-evaluation and institutional improvement; the defined elements and expected performance levels are appropriate within higher education; the results are reported regularly across the campus; and the definition of elements and results are used in program-level and institution-wide planning to evaluate how well the institution fulfills its mission, to determine needed changes, to allocating resources, and to make improvements.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The institution analyzes its performance as to the institution-set standards and as to student achievement, and takes appropriate measures in areas where its performance is not at the expected level.

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(i); 602.17(f); 602.19 (a-e).]

Conclusion Check-Off:

<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission’s requirements.

Narrative:

The team found institution-set standards for completion and licensure in CTE programs. However, the team did not find evidence of the institution-set standards for job placement for these programs. For the successful course completion standards, the College has identified achieving the standards by ethnicity and basic skills level. Standards for program completions were established and included for the next program review in 2016-2017. Due to the recent inclusion of the standards in program review, the team did not find existing evidence of the institution-set standards being utilized in college planning and decision-making processes, but the team confirmed that the 2016-2017 cycle will include this information. (See College Recommendation 1)

Credits, Program Length, and Tuition

Evaluation Items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Credit hour assignments and degree program lengths are within the range of good practice in higher education (in policy and procedure).
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The assignment of credit hours and degree program lengths is verified by the institution, and is reliable and accurate across classroom based courses, laboratory

	classes, distance education classes, and for courses that involve clinical practice (if applicable to the institution).
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tuition is consistent across degree programs (or there is a rational basis for any program-specific tuition).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Any clock hour conversions to credit hours adhere to the Department of Education's conversion formula, both in policy and procedure, and in practice.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission <i>Policy on Institutional Degrees and Credits</i> .

[Regulation citations: 600.2 (definition of credit hour); 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.24(e), (f); 668.2; 668.9.]

Conclusion Check-Off :

<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The College's catalog states the requirements for degree and certificate completion. Students attending full-time can complete degree program requirements within two years. However, the team could not verify that the College is in compliance with federal guidelines regarding calculation of credits because Administrative Procedure 4020 Program and Curriculum Development is in draft form, and the current version does not contain any references to "clock hours" nor does it or include a calculation formula of clock hours to credit hours. Tuition is consistent across programs. (See College Recommendation 7)

Transfer Policies

Evaluation Items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Transfer policies are appropriately disclosed to students and to the public.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Policies contain information about the criteria the institution uses to accept credits for transfer.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution complies with the Commission <i>Policy on Transfer of Credit</i> .

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.17(a)(3); 602.24(e); 668.43(a)(ii).]

Conclusion Check-Off:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution
-------------------------------------	--

	to meet the Commission's requirements.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

Transfer policies are disclosed to the public and consistent with the Commission Policy on Transfer Credit.

Distance Education and Correspondence Education

Evaluation Items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution has policies and procedures for defining and classifying a course as offered by distance education or correspondence education, in alignment with USDE definitions.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	There is an accurate and consistent application of the policies and procedures for determining if a course is offered by distance education (with regular and substantive interaction with the instructor, initiated by the instructor, and online activities are included as part of a student's grade) or correspondence education (online activities are primarily "paperwork related," including reading posted materials, posting homework and completing examinations, and interaction with the instructor is initiated by the student as needed).
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution has appropriate means and consistently applies those means for verifying the identity of a student who participates in a distance education or correspondence education course or program, and for ensuring that student information is protected.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The technology infrastructure is sufficient to maintain and sustain the distance education and correspondence education offerings.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution demonstrates compliance with the <i>Commission Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education</i> .

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(iv), (vi); 602.17(g); 668.38.]

Conclusion Check-Off:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

Course offerings follow the same course outline of record and student learning outcomes regardless of the mode of delivery. The team identified institutional criteria for distance education courses to support regular substantive interaction with students in online courses.

Student Complaints

Evaluation Items:

<input type="checkbox"/>	The institution has clear policies and procedures for handling student complaints, and the current policies and procedures are accessible to students in the college catalog and online.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The student complaint files for the previous six years (since the last comprehensive evaluation) are available; the files demonstrate accurate implementation of the complaint policies and procedures.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The team analysis of the student complaint files identifies any issues that may be indicative of the institution’s noncompliance with any Accreditation Standards.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution posts on its website the names of associations, agencies and governmental bodies that accredit, approve, or license the institution and any of its programs, and provides contact information for filing complaints with such entities.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission <i>Policy on Representation of Accredited Status</i> and the <i>Policy on Student and Public Complaints Against Institutions</i> .

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(ix); 668.43.]

Conclusion Check-Off:

<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission’s requirements.

Narrative:

The team found that formal student complaints for the previous six years were not available. Campus interviews revealed an inconsistent understanding of the student complaint process. The team was unable to analyze student complaint files for any issues that might have been indicative of the institution’s non-compliance with the accreditation standards because files were not available for review. (See College Recommendation 9)

Institutional Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials

Evaluation Items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution provides accurate, timely (current), and appropriately detailed information to students and the public about its programs, locations, and policies.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution complies with the Commission <i>Policy on Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status</i> .
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution provides required information concerning its accredited status as described above in the section on <u>Student Complaints</u> .

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1))(vii); 668.6.]

Conclusion Check-Off:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The College accurately represents programs and services. The College complies with the requirements of the Commission policies.

Title IV Compliance

Evaluation Items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution has presented evidence on the required components of the Title IV Program, including findings from any audits and program or other review activities by the USDE.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution has addressed any issues raised by the USDE as to financial responsibility requirements, program record-keeping, etc. If issues were not timely addressed, the institution demonstrates it has the fiscal and administrative capacity to timely address issues in the future and to retain compliance with Title IV program requirements.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The institution's student loan default rates are within the acceptable range defined by the USDE. Remedial efforts have been undertaken when default rates near or meet a level outside the acceptable range.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Contractual relationships of the institution to offer or receive educational, library, and support services meet the Accreditation Standards and have been approved by the Commission through substantive change if required.

<input type="checkbox"/>	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission <i>Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations</i> and the <i>Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV</i> .
--------------------------	---

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(v); 602.16(a)(1)(x); 602.19(b); 668.5; 668.15; 668.16; 668.71 et seq.]

Conclusion Check-Off:

<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission’s requirements.

Narrative:

In 2011 the institution’s financial aid Title IV practices were audited. The audit resulted in two findings requiring the institution to improve its tracking of withdrawn students and reporting timeliness in accordance with Title IV Compliance 602.16(a)(1)(v). According to the SJCC Self Evaluation Report these responsibilities are shared between the District and College. The Title IV default rate has declined from 26.1% in 2010 to 17% in 2012. (III.D.15, 602.16(a)(1)(v))

All contractual obligations engaged in by the institution are controlled by Board Policy 6340. The policy has been developed using the following resources: Education Code Sections 81641 et seq.; Public Contract Code Sections 20650 et seq.; Government Code Section 5306. (III.D.16)

However, the College currently offers onsite classes to students in association with the Center for Employment Training (CET), but through interviews, the team confirmed that no Memorandum of Understanding has been developed or approved as required by the Commission Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations and by Accreditation standards. (II.A.I, 602.16(a)(1)(v), 602.16(a)(1)(x), 602.19(b), 668.5,668.15, 668.16, 668.71 et seq,

Standard I

Mission, Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, and Integrity

Standard I.A.: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

General Observations

San José City College's (SJCC) mission statement describes the broad educational purposes, type of degrees offered, and commitment to student achievement and learning. The intended student population is implicit in the mission statement, which is publicized widely in various places on the College's website and in the catalog. The mission is appropriate to a degree-granting institution of higher education. To determine how effectively the College is meeting its mission, the College tracks achievement for basic skills and transfer students. In addition, data are generated for student learning and attitudes about social justice. The general education student learning outcomes are the identified institutional learning outcomes and are assessed using self-reporting in surveys. Institution-set standards include completion of degrees and certificates, transfer rates, and course completion rates. SJCC plans to implement new software in Fall 2016 to consolidate data and address the College's expressed concern that current processes are not systematic. Alignment of programs and services with the mission is promoted and supported through the comprehensive program review process. The processes of resource allocation, decision-making, and planning are clearly delineated; however, actual practice is affected by the lack of integrated, systematic planning and the lack of data to support a mission guided process. The mission is published on the College's website and in the annual catalog.

Findings and Evidence

The mission statement is aligned with the district's mission statement in BP 1200 and the mission of the California Community Colleges. The College's vision addresses issues of opportunity, equity, creation of an exceptional learning environment, and commitment to a culture of evidence. The Integrated Planning Model provides for alignment with the District's core values and goals for student success. As shown in the catalog, the College offers associate degrees and career and technical education certificates. The intended student population is consistent with the mission and vision statements. The institution describes six types of students that comprise its intended student population: high school graduates, returning students, those pursuing CTE skills, veterans, second language learners, and life-long learners. The institution claims that all of these fit into one of three groups: those at a pre-college level of math or English, those interested in CTE, and/or those intending to pursue a bachelor's degree. The mission articulates the SJCC's commitment to student achievement, successful learning and social justice. (I.A.1, ER6)

SJCC's Annual Program Review and Comprehensive Program Review processes use a variety of data, including student learning outcomes (SLO) at the course level and achievement data to evaluate educational quality, student demand, relevancy with regard to local employment demand, and to prioritize resource allocation. The current 2016-2017 program review cycle includes data regarding the institution-set standards to analyze achievement of the standards, institutional goals and accomplishment of the mission. The

College's SLO webpage has a link to reports of the general education SLOs assessment data. The existing processes for curriculum development, assessment of learning, and program review are not integrated and lack cohesion. In the 2016-217 academic year, the College plans to migrate all of these processes to CurricuNet. Thus, the processes of assessment of course SLOs, program review, and curriculum development are not yet functional as an integrated system (I.A.2)

The agenda for the August 2015 Professional Development Day indicates that a pilot project to incorporate general education (GE) SLOs into courses was presented. The team found additional evidence of development in the GE SLO assessment. The College asserts that increases in transfers to CSU and UC institutions demonstrate mastery of the GE SLOs. While various efforts are in progress, there is not yet a systematic objective assessment of the GE SLOs, and no evidence was presented to indicate that the GE SLOs survey data is used to evaluate performance vis á vis the College's mission. The Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) are the basis for assessment of the mission statement. These are aligned with the College's strategic goals and include goals such as increasing persistence and course completion rates. Accomplishment of the Institution-Set Standards reflects a measure of the mission. (I.A.3)

According to the Program Review Handbook, program reviews are designed to align with the College's mission and goals. Comprehensive program review requires a response to, "Describe Program Goals and how they support the College's mission." A sampling of various comprehensive program review reports demonstrates such alignment. As documented in the Integrated Planning Manual, the Program Review Handbook, and the Educational Master Plan, the mission guides the integrated planning cycle and the institutional goals; the integrated planning cycle, however, has not yet been fully implemented. Based on the cycle schedule, not all units have completed the recently modified program review process. In the Quality Focus Essay, the College acknowledges the gaps and has identified Educational Master Plan and Facilities Master Plan implementation as an area of improvement. (I.A.3)

The mission is clearly shown on both the College's website and in the annual catalog. It was approved by the College Advisory Council and the Board of Trustees in spring, 2016. The mission is updated as necessary. (I.A.4, ER6)

College Conclusion

The team commends the College for its well-developed and well-documented basic skills and student equity programs for which data analyses and tracking of students are robust and clearly used as the basis for program improvements. (I.A)

The College meets Standards I.A.1, I.A.3 and I.A.4 and ER6.
The College does not meet Standards 1.A.2 and I.A.3.

College Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

College Recommendation 1 (Compliance): In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the College develop and communicate a methodology for setting

institution-set standards (minimum acceptable levels) for course completion and other measures of student achievement, assess performance against the standards, communicate the results, and incorporate the information in college planning and decision-making processes. (I.A.2, I.B.3, ER11)

College Recommendation 2 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends the College implement its mission-driven integrated planning and resource allocation process in alignment with its Strategic and Educational Master plans. (I.A.2, I.A.3, I.B.4, I.B.7, I.B.9, ER19)

Standard I.B.: Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations

San José City College has built numerous opportunities for sustained and substantive dialog into the infrastructure of the College, especially through meetings of various committees and other working groups. Discussions of academic quality, student outcomes, and continuous improvement occur during program review and curriculum processes, and in sessions of the Academic Senate. SJCC uses various channels for communicating the results of assessments and evaluations, including its website and the District's website, email, and face-to-face discussions on professional development days and within committees and department and division meetings.

SJCC has a comprehensive program review process for academic programs, student services, and administrative services that incorporates various types of data, including achievement and student learning outcomes, and requires alignment of activities and outcomes with the College's mission. Comprehensive program review achievement data are disaggregated by demographic characteristics such as gender, age, and ethnicity for retention, persistence, and success rates. Data are not disaggregated for analysis of the degree programs or mode of delivery. Learning outcomes data will not be disaggregated until spring 2017. The model for annual and comprehensive program review provides foundational information for planning and resource allocation. The adoption in spring 2015 of a budget justification template has improved alignment and transparency of resource allocation with program viability. This template became part of program review in 2016-2017.

Institutional learning outcomes are defined as the general education learning outcomes; one outcome is indirectly assessed each semester via a voluntary, self-report student survey. Students are asked to self-assess their achievement of specific learning skill prior to their time at the institution and near their completion. The results of the General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs) are reported and posted on the Outcomes website. The Institutional-level Key Performance Indicators are identified and evaluated by the Strategic Planning Committee using a wide variety of data. The Institution-Set Standards have been developed to assess overall institutional effectiveness and continuous improvement of learning and achievement and are consistent with the mission. These include standards for course completion rates, annual completion rates for degrees and certificates, and number of students who transfer to a four-year institution. The Educational Master Plan also includes a framework that lists both goals and performance regarding course completion, fiscal viability, compliance with state and federal guidelines, and accreditation status. The College has various evaluation strategies and procedures in place to review its policies and practices with respect to instructional programs, resource allocation, program viability, strategic planning, committee self-assessment, and distance education. The College's Student Equity Plan identifies performance gaps through the analysis of disaggregated achievement data and describes the innovative programs implemented to address them.

Findings and Evidence

The College has numerous structures in place to promote sustained and substantive dialog about student learning and achievement, equity, and academic quality. These include regular

meetings of the Academic Senate, organizational committees, College Advisory Council, Strategic Planning Committee, Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee (SLOAC), and Program Review Committee. Additional dialog occurs during Professional Development Days, department and division meetings, and workshops. While this dialog was reported in interviews, the team found little documentation of substantive dialog from the meetings. The two groups responsible for campus-wide evaluation are the College Advisory Council and the Strategic Planning Committee; according to interviews with members of both of these groups, however, continuous improvement of learning and achievement at the institutional level is not yet discussed. (I.B.1)

The College's website and members of the Instructional Policies and Curriculum Committee (IPCC), the IPCC uses Title 5 standards and the guidelines in the CCCCO's Program and Course Approval Handbook to review and approve curricular changes. The Course Outline of Record contains student learning outcomes. Interviews and review of TracDat confirmed TracDat contains student learning outcomes for all courses, and programs, and course to program outcomes mapping. However, the current implementation does not support the disaggregation of student learning outcomes. Faculty members evaluate these results to improve instruction. In addition, SLOAC assesses one general education outcome each semester. The College plans to implement a student learning outcomes module within CurricuNet by spring 2017 and to hire a Dean of Institutional Effectiveness in fall 2016 to address the disaggregation and analysis of learning outcomes and achievement data for subpopulations of students, workshops and trainings are planned to address the disaggregation of data. (I.B.2, I.B.6)

Degree and certificate program learning outcomes are published in the catalog and results of course and program learning outcomes assessment are published in program reviews. The general education student learning outcomes (GELOs) and assessment results are published on the College's website Interviews with administrators, faculty, and committee members, including the College Advisory Council and the Strategic Planning Committee, revealed that the Institution-Set Standards for student achievement are not assessed systematically and cyclically. (I.B.2, 1.B.3, and ER11)

In compliance with USDE regulations and ACCJC standards, the College has identified institution-set standards, indicating acceptable levels of performance. The team found standards are assessed each year and published in the annual report to the ACCJC. Long- and short-term goals and results for successful course completion are published in the Educational Master Plan. However, the team found that standards and goals are not yet included in program review nor reviewed by division deans and included in action plans. In addition, institution-set standards for areas such as basic skills and distance education have not yet been determined in alignment with the mission. The institution-set standards and the goals published in the Educational Master Plan address areas such as degree completion and course completion and number of transferring students. The team could not find completion and job placement standards for the designated instructional programs. The evidence provided in the ISER and during the visit demonstrated interchangeable usage of the institution-set standard (minimum level for ensuring academic quality) with the annual goals set for the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Indicators (IEPI) Framework. The

team found inconsistencies in the explanation of the institution-set standards and minimal evidence of the analysis of the standards in support of fulfilling its mission and programmatic improvements. (I.B.3)

Interviews with administrators, faculty, and the institutional researcher confirm the College obtains data for program review from many sources, including the District, the Chancellor's Office Datamart, and its own records in Datatel. The Strategic Planning Committee and program review processes are the primary channels for incorporating these data into planning. A sampling of program reviews indicates that achievement and assessment data are reported in the comprehensive program review, with disaggregation by gender, age, and ethnicity for achievement data. The College does not disaggregate learning outcomes data by demographic subpopulations. Plans are in place to migrate from TracDat to CurricuNet by spring 2017 that will allow for disaggregated SLO data. The team found inconsistency in the analysis of the data in program review. Through interviews with administrators, faculty, and classified staff, however, it was revealed that the College does not yet systematically use these data to organize its institutional processes to support student learning and achievement at the level of institutional goals and outcomes.

(I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6)

The Student Success and Equity Committee has identified gaps in access, course completion, ESL and basic skills, degree and certificate completion, and implemented programs such as the Male Summit to address them. Interviews confirmed that additional disaggregation is needed to track other at-risk populations such as veterans and LGBTQ students. The Federal and State scorecard data are used for some analyses, such as basic skills, student equity, and persistence. While the scorecards provide some benchmarks, these data are not comprehensive and reflective of the entire student population, the College uses locally generated data to obtain a more complete understanding of student achievement and setting institutional standards. The team verified the usage of additional student achievement data such as persistence, successful course completion and basic skills improvement in establishing the Key Performance indicators (KPIs). The College has implemented the Colleague Reporting and Operating Analytics (CROA) system that includes internal data looking at specific momentum points for all students. (I.B.6)

The Program Review Handbook contains detailed procedures for the systematic review of instructional programs and services. The Instructional Policies and Curriculum Committee's website describes policies for review of programs and curricula to assure effectiveness in support of academic quality. The Integrated Planning and Resource Allocation Handbook delineates the various tasks the Strategic Planning Committee undertakes, including review of standing committees, strategic goals, and processes related to resource allocation and strategic planning. Supplemental evidence and interviews with administrators and committee members demonstrated the resource allocation processes are reviewed and revised by the Finance Committee. (I.B.7)

The accreditation webpage provides reports made to the ACCJC, including current and prior evaluation reports. The program review webpage provides access to annual and comprehensive program reviews submitted since 2012-2013. The Student Learning

Outcomes webpage provides assessments for course and program outcomes by division for 2014 and 2015, and also provides the survey results for the general education outcomes from 2010 forward. The team found multiple sources of updates on assessments and results, including emails from the President's Office (The Roar), and Strategic Planning Committee and College Advisory Council meetings. (Standard I.B.8)

Per the Integrated Planning and Resource Allocation Handbook, the primary processes for systematic evaluation and planning are program review, the educational and facilities master plans, budget development and resource allocation, and analysis and process evaluation. The educational and facilities master plans specify long-term plans. The resource allocation model begins with identification of resource needs during program review. These needs are then prioritized by deans and vice presidents, then sent to budget hearings and the Finance Committee for recommendations, then to the College Advisory Council for recommendations, and finally to the president for final approval/allocation and response. Analysis and process evaluation is conducted by the Strategic Planning Committee to evaluate both the effectiveness of planning processes and the degree to which the College is achieving its goals. The College evaluates and makes public how well and in what ways it is accomplishing its purposes, including assessment of student learning outcomes. SJCC provides evidence of planning for improvement of institutional structures and processes, student achievement of educational goals, and student learning. The College assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding improvement through a systematic cycle of program review and additional review and planning processes that are not yet fully integrated and aligned with the Strategic and Master plans. (Standard I.B.9, ER19)

College Conclusions

The College meets **I.B.1**, I.B.2, I.B.4, I.B.7, I.B.8, and **ER19**.

The College does not meet I.B.3, I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.9, and ER11.

College Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

See College Recommendation 1 and College Recommendation 2

College Recommendation 3 (Compliance): In order to meet Standards, the team recommends that the College create and implement a process to demonstrate its substantive and collegial dialog about student outcomes and institutional effectiveness through committees, advisory committee meetings, workshops, and professional development activities. The team further recommends that the College develop and implement a process to broadly communicate this dialog to support continuous quality improvement across the College. (I.B.1, II.A.2, II.A.3)

College Recommendation 4 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College analyze disaggregated learning outcomes data, regardless of location or means of delivery, at the program and institutional levels for subpopulations of students in order to identify performance gaps and institutional barriers for achieving its

mission and goals. The team further recommends that the College include this analysis in college planning and decision-making processes. (I.B. 5, I.B.6, II.A.1, II.A.3, ER11, ER 19)

Standard I.C.: Institutional Integrity

General Observations

San José City College demonstrates institutional integrity through a variety of means, including the publication of information on the web and in print such as the college catalog and the schedule of classes. Information on instructional programs, including program learning outcomes and the cost of education, is available to students and the public. Information regarding the College's accreditation status is available on the website with documentation that shows the College has maintained appropriate relationships with federal, state, and other agencies. The College strives to adhere to Commission policies, guidelines, and other requirements and is responsive to its directives. The College follows District established Board policies and administrative procedures that demonstrate its commitment to the quality of the learning environment.

Findings and Evidence

The College uses a variety of methods to inform students and the community about its mission statement, learning outcomes, educational programs, and student support services. These methods include the college catalog, website, brochures and bulletin boards. Information about the College's accreditation status is noted on the website. The College provides both print and an online catalog updated annually for students. Information on District policies is found on the Board of Trustee's webpage. The Catalog Team reviews the material annually and sends it out for departmental review to ensure accuracy and integrity. (I.C.1, I.C.2, ER20)

The College includes information on the assessment of student learning and student achievement data in its program review process though this is not easily searchable. The team found inconsistent analysis of disaggregated learning and achievement data in the program review process. However, the College has indicated plans to update the technology and support for this work through the hiring of a Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and additional professional development in fall 2016. (I.C.3, ER19)

The College describes its certificates and degrees in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, and expected learning outcomes. The catalog includes information about each certificate and degree program including degree requirements and career information for career programs. The team verified that the Catalog Team reviews catalog information annually and SLOs are reviewed on a five year cycle to ensure accuracy. The validated information between the Catalog and the Course Outlines of Record. (I.C.4)

The District has a system of Board policies and administrative procedures that guide the College. While review has taken place, as noted in the April 2016 Board minutes, the team did not find evidence that the Board has adopted a schedule of review to ensure that policies and procedures are reviewed regularly through the participatory governance process. The College regularly reviews institutional policies, procedures, and publications to assure integrity in all representations of its mission, programs, and services. The team confirmed that the process of assessing and codifying College procedures and processes is one area for improvement and is an area of focus as discussed in the Quality focus Essay. (I.C.5)

The College includes information regarding the total cost of education including tuition, fees, and other required expenses (including textbooks and other instructional materials) through the college catalog and financial aid website. (I.C.6)

The College follows District Board Policy on academic freedom and responsibility. In the Academic Freedom Policy, the College indicates commitment to supporting “the free search for the truth and its free expression; to this end, faculty and students hold the right of full freedom of inquiry and expression.” (I.C.7, ER13)

The College’s Student Code of Conduct and Academic Integrity policy is codified in Board Policies and Procedures. The team verified that this information is published on the College’s website, in the Student Success Handbook, and in the catalog. BP2715 addresses the Board of Trustees’ Code of Ethics and the consequences of violation. The faculty contract includes a statement on Academic Freedom. Curriculum processes follow established academic practices regarding faculty discourse. The College has developed specific codes of conduct for each of its primary constituent groups, faculty and staff, students, and the Board of Trustees. Through the use of Board Policy and a Professional Code of Ethics, the College demonstrates its commitment to diversity, integrity, and civility. The guidelines are communicated via the website and catalog. (I.C.8, I.C.9, I.C.10)

The College does not operate any sites at foreign location (I.C.11).

The College is guided by Board Policy and Administrative Policy 2430, which states the college president and District share responsibility for ensuring the College “strives to comply with the eligibility requirements, accreditation standards, and policies of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC).” The College website has an accreditation link on the homepage, with both current and historical communications and reports. The page appears robust, transparent and is easily accessible to interested parties. The Chancellor’s Office Student Success Scorecard is also available from the homepage. (I.C.12, ER21)

The College has advocated honesty and with integrity in its relationships with both federal and state level external agencies by complying with their regulations, statutes, and reporting requirements. The accreditation homepage chronicles a long history of transparency and information sharing with the Commission and agencies for specialized programs. The College cites several reports with both the Chancellor’s Office and the USDE that demonstrate its commitment to compliance. (I.C.13, ER21)

The College’s conflict of interest policies, planning and resource allocation processes, and student success and equity initiatives demonstrate its commitment to high quality education and student achievement. The District has a Board policy in place that clearly describes the institutions expectations around ethical conduct. The College’s resource allocation is primarily guided by its Program Review process, linking student learning directly to college spending. (I.C.14)

College Conclusion

The College meets Standard I.C and ERs 13, 19, 20 and 21.

College Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

None.

Standard II

Student Learning Programs and Support Services

Standard II.A: Instructional Programs

General Observations

San José City College (SJCC) offers a wide range of instructional programs in areas consistent with the mission to support two-year degrees and certificates, transferable general education, career technical training, basic skills courses, and English as a Second language. Programs and courses have identified student learning outcomes (SLOs). SLOs and student achievement outcomes are tracked and reported in comprehensive program reviews. The institution has recently rebranded their Institutional Outcomes to General Education Outcomes. This campus decision was supported by the Academic Senate. The campus oversight for curriculum and SLOs belong to the subcommittees of the Academic Senate: the Instructional Policy and Curriculum Committee (IPCC) and the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee (SLOAC).

The College has a delineated process for the introduction of new courses, course updates and program review. Policies require programs to be reviewed annually, and a full, comprehensive review conducted every four years. Student learning outcome and achievement data for courses and programs are routinely included and discussed as a part of program review. The general education student learning outcomes (GELOs) are assessed using student surveys of graduating/completing students. Results of the GELO survey and data from program reviews are shared with the campus community during mandatory Professional Development Days. There are opportunities for faculty and administration to discuss the data in various settings. The college does not offer continuing and community education.

In an effort to strengthen the college's data-driven decision making and integrated planning needs, the college is in the process of establishing an Office of Institutional Effectiveness with the potential hiring of a new Dean of Institutional Effectiveness.

Findings and Evidence

The team found that the College works to provide courses that meet the needs of students for transfer, two year degrees, certificates and career exploration. Students can select from 47 Associate Degrees and 27 certificates. Instructional programs are offered at the SJCC campus, on off-site locations including local high schools, and through distance education. The District maintains a current Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to provide dual enrollment classes at several local high schools.

As indicated in the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report and verified through interviews, some SJCC courses are offered at a job training site in San José through an association with the Center for Employment Training (CET). However, the team could not find documentation of the MOU or partnership with SJCC and CET. The Center for Employment Training is a national company that does not maintain regional accreditation, but is

accredited by the Council on Occupational Education. Based on interviews, students are being referred to enrollment in courses at CET that are offered both by CET and SJCC. It does not appear that SJCC student support and library services are available to SJCC students at the CET location.

In 2016, SJCC Substantive Change Proposal was approved by ACCJC to offer 46 degrees and 22 certificates at 50 percent or more via distance education. Distance education courses are developed and proposed by the faculty and are approved through the curriculum committee process and the Academic Senate. (II.A.1)

Student Learning Outcomes have been identified in programs and are the basis for determining student mastery of course content. Disciplines undergo annual program reviews every year and comprehensive program reviews every four years. The program reviews require departments to assess SLOs and provide details on how they are used to improve instruction. Additionally, SLOs in all course modalities are consistently tracked through Trackdat. Student achievement is tracked and measured through the Chancellor's Office Data Mart, Annual Perkins; Core Indicator Reports and through the CTE Outcomes Survey (CTEOS). The CTE Dean annually reviews Perkin's Core Indicators with CTE Program Coordinators. Student Achievement is also tracked in some annual and all comprehensive program reviews. The College has identified institution- set standards for state and national licensure requirements for Cosmetology, Dental Assisting, and Emergency Medical Services. (II.A.1)

In a joint interview with SJCC's IPCC and SLOAC, there is evidence that the College is committed to continuous quality improvement through regular evaluation of identified student learning outcomes. The Instructional Policies and Curriculum Committee (IPCC), which reports directly to the Academic Senate, oversees and approves the College's instructional policies and curriculum. The division deans, and faculty design and review revised curriculum in compliance with Title 5 regulations and guidelines provided by the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges. The college uses the program review cycle as the primary process to evaluate academic programs including reviewing all SLOs. The Program Review Handbook was recently revised in 2015-16 and all programs follow a schedule of an annual and comprehensive program review, completed every four years.

There was inconsistent evidence to support the institutional claim that CTE programs have comprehensive review biennially. There is evidence that some CTE programs meet with Advisory Committees twice a year to review curriculum and student learning outcomes that are relevant and current to the industry. There is minimal evidence that ties Advisory committee meeting minutes back to curriculum review and SLO review. (II.A.2)

The college offers CTE certificates and degrees, some of which require licensure exams. Employment for CTE graduates appears to be about average for California. The college has policies and procedures to ensure appropriate accommodations are made for students enrolled in programs. Counselors work with students to ensure timely completion of degree requirements.

As demonstrated in TracDat, there is evidence that the College accesses SLO's at the course, program, and institutional level on a regular basis. In a sample review of approximately 20 Fall 2016 course syllabi, the majority included course SLOs identical to the official course on record. During the review, the team noted that many syllabi did not include the number of units for the course, full and accurate course descriptions, or other expected course identifiers. In one example, three separate courses were combined on one syllabus.

Student Learning Outcomes are reviewed and assessed every semester through division meetings and annually through the program review. For CTE programs, Advisory committee members review SLOs and curriculum at the Advisory committees scheduled at least once per year, but there is minimal evidence that this occurs regularly. There is evidence that most comprehensive program reviews reflect analysis of program SLOs. (II.A.3)

There is evidence that the College effectively provides clear definitions that distinguish pre-collegiate coursework (Basic Skills) to college level curriculum. Per Board Policy 4020.3, pre-collegiate basic skills courses are designed to prepare students for college-level study. Nearly 70% of the student population utilizes basic skill coursework and in response to this need, faculty work closely with deans to develop pre-collegiate courses in basic skills and English as a Second Language. During course development and review, faculty select the appropriate level of student preparation according to course content and SLOs. Course requisites are established and approved through the curriculum process following Title 5 sections 55002 and 55003. The English Department is currently using Compass as an assessment tool, but will begin to use Accuplacer in November 2016, until a common placement tool is adopted by the state. The Technical Review Committee consults with Math and Language Arts Divisions to guide faculty in selecting advisory levels. The Basic Skills Initiative (BSI) and the Basic Skills Committee provide professional development opportunities to faculty to support promoting success of students. Additionally, BSI seed funding has provided opportunities for additional basic skills and ESL support through tutoring and supplemental instruction. The College has expanded non-credit CTE offerings to Adult Education students in conjunction with the Career Development and College Preparation (CDCP) associated with the Adult Education Block Grant. The non-credit curriculum is designed as "bridge" to college-level work, which contextualizes English and mathematics with career skill pathways. (II.A.4)

BP 4100.1 formally affirms the District's commitment to uphold degree requirements and Title 5 standards for associate degrees with the minimum number of 60 units, with a minimum of 12 units in the major. The college uses Title 5, Ed Code, the Program and Course Approval Handbook and the articulation policies and procedures handbook as guiding documents for the technical review committee of the IPCC. Additionally, the IPCC process of curriculum approval ensures appropriate length, breadth, depth, and rigor of curriculum. The College Catalog outlines degree programs that include general education coursework and meets requirements for IGETC and CSU breadth as well as local and state GE pathways. (II.A.5, ER12)

The college administration, in consultation with faculty, work to ensure that courses necessary to complete an Associate's degree for transfer AA-T or AS-T can be completed within a two-year cycle. The deans work with the vice president of Academic Affairs to plan the schedule and ensure that offerings support two-year completion. The College has moved to a block scheduling format to offer students more opportunity to take multiple classes without the hardship of overlapping class times. (II.A.6, ER9)

Board Policies require curriculum, programs, and services to reflect community and student need. During the visit, the team found that faculty and students expressed a strong connection and support for various learning support programs. The team verified that various campus committees such as the Distance Education Committee and the Professional Development Committee are involved in the discussion related to teaching methodologies (II.A.7)

The college uses department-wide course and program examinations. The team confirmed with the Assessment Center Director, there are five department wide evaluations that include: Cosmetology and Esthetics, Emergency Medical Services, English, English as a Second Language, and Reading. English, ESL, and Reading all use a common end-of-term final and/or portfolios in their assessment. In an effort to reduce test bias, reviewers participate in officially documented norming processes, officially (e.g. English Procedure for Norming and Evaluating ENGL 335 portfolios, ESL Norming and Grading Procedure). Holistic grading is also used. EMS and Cosmetology and Esthetics additionally rely on outside evaluating agencies such as the California Board of Barbering and Cosmetology and the California Emergency Medical Services Authority with state board examinations that ensure test bias is reduced and promote reliability of results. (II.A.8)

The College also offers credit by exam and placement testing. These processes follow Board Policy 4235 and guidelines suggested by the Academic Senate of California Community Colleges, in addition to ESL placement with writing prompts that have been approved by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (II.A.8)

There are several Board Policies that relate to the awarding of credit, degrees, and certificates (BP 4230- Grading systems; BP 4231 – Issuing of Grades; BP 4233 – Final Examination; BP 4262 Associate Degree Course Credit; BP 4262.1 – Non-Degree Credit Course; BP 4262.2 Noncredit Credit Course). SLOs are expected in every course and mapped to program and institutional outcomes. The IPCC reviews and approved courses and programs and must align outcomes. All AD-Ts include program student learning outcomes, demonstrating that achievement of these outcomes are necessary for degree achievement. (II.A.8)

Board Policies affirm that student learning outcome achievement is required for the awarding of course credit, degrees and certificates. The Team confirmed that credits awarded are consistent with the Carnegie Unit credit hour calculations, including instances where clock hours have been converted into credit hours; in fact the course credit hours match or exceed the requirement for licensure compliance. It was verified that students in the Cosmetology and Esthetics programs are required to “check in” by clock for each session they attend. However, despite the Board having approved BP 4020 Program and Curriculum

Development which directs the Chancellor to establish a procedure for using a clock-to-credit hour conversion formula to determine whether a credit hour program is eligible for federal financial aid, the corresponding AP 4020 is still in draft form and the latest draft does not include any mention of clock hours or a conversion chart as required by the Department of Education. (II.A.9, ER10)

BP4050: Articulation references AA/AS degrees but not AA-T or AS-T degrees. BP4050 does affirm the District's commitment to facilitate transfer as part of its mission. The transfer-of-credit information for SJCC is stored on ASSIST and accessible for students. Additionally, the College communicates with students about articulation and transfer on its website and College Catalog. The SJCC Transfer Center also provides opportunities for students to visit local universities for transfer opportunities and education. The college has self-identified a need to clarify the delineation of the College procedures and process of the articulation agreements. (II.A.10, ER10)

The College has established six general education outcomes (communication, critical and analytical thinking, global awareness and social justice; personal responsibility, ethics and civility; technology, and aesthetics and creativity). The College has assessed these GESLOs, which the College identifies as its Institutional Student Learning Outcomes, on an ongoing cycle since 2011. What is not included at this level of outcomes is information or quantitative competencies. The college argues that quantitative competency is built into "critical & analytical thinking;" however the team did not find adequate evidence that the college collects SLO data for quantitative competency or information competency. (II.A.11)

The SLOAC and IPCC are responsible for ensuring that SLOs are identified in program and course offerings. Program reviews require instructional programs to discuss learning outcomes and results of assessments. However, the level of analysis varies dramatically from program to program. Additional support could be provided to ensure that data in program and course assessments are disaggregated and achievement of outcomes should be considered by location and modality. (II A.11)

The College Catalog identifies all instructional programs with related SLOs listed by program.

The College follows Title 5 philosophy and criteria for degree requirements for general education, as well as the District Board policies and administrative procedures. In accordance with Title 5 regulations, the Instructional Policies and Curriculum Committee (IPCC), an Academic Senate committee, is responsible for the college's instructional policies and curriculum. Per the catalog and in accordance with BP 4021.1 Degrees Offered, the college offers Associate in Arts degrees, Associate in Science degrees, degrees that lead to transfer, and certificates in career and technical education. In accordance with BP 4025 General Education as part of the Associate Degree, the associate degrees for transfer require completion of the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum for students planning to transfer to a University of California campus, the California State University General Education-Breadth requirements for those transferring to a California State University, or the General Education pattern that is aligned with District policies. The AA

degree requires a minimum of 39 semester units from the AA degree General Education pattern and the SJCC graduation requirements of American History and Institutions, Cultural Pluralism/Ethnic Studies, and Physical Activity, and competency in reading, writing, and math. The AS degree requires a minimum of 24 semester units from the AS Degree General Education pattern and SJCC graduation requirements of American History and Institutions, Cultural Pluralism/Ethnic Studies, and Physical Activity, and competency in reading, writing, and math. The General Education pattern includes oral and written communication, physical or biological science, arts and humanities, social sciences, and lifelong learning and self-development. (II.A.12)

Per various Board Policies, and the college catalog, all degree programs include a focused area of study. The self-evaluation asserts that faculty continually review program and course SLOs and that this review identifies and monitors appropriateness of the courses for inclusion in a given area of study. Evidence in program reviews and in the processes for introducing new courses and updating existing courses via the IPCC support this claim. (II.A.13)

Some CTE programs offered by the College have a required licensure examination that students must pass in order to work in the field, including cosmetology and esthetics, emergency medical services, and dental assisting. The College demonstrates high pass rates in these areas. Additionally, licensures/certificates are also required for air conditioning and refrigeration, construction technology, and real estate. CTE employment rates as shown on the Perkins Core Indicator Reports since 2010 show that rates for CTE students at SJCC are about average for the state. (II.A.14)

The Program Viability Procedure describes policies and procedures for ensuring that students are provided for in the event of major changes to a program or elimination of a program. (II.A.15)

Per District Administrative Procedure 4020, courses must be updated at least every six years and CTE courses updated every two years. The curriculum committee is charged with publishing an annual timeline for submission of new curriculum proposals and modifications. The IPCC coordinates revision of courses every five years and the College Curriculum Coordinator alerts deans and faculty when courses need revision. An undated active course list indicates only a handful of courses are out of date.

Program review is the cyclical process used to evaluate and improve the quality and currency of all instructional programs. Program review uses a variety of data, including student learning outcomes at the course level and achievement data to evaluate educational quality, student demand, relevancy with regard to local employment demand, and to prioritize resource allocation. The Workforce Institute, which offers community and continuing education, is not directly associated with the College. (II.A.16)

College Conclusion

The College meets Standard II.A. except for II.A.1, II.A.3, II.A.7,II.A.9, ER10 and ER 11

College Recommendation for Improvement and Compliance

See College Recommendation 4 (Compliance)

College Recommendation 5 (Compliance): In order to meet the standard, the team recommends the College develop a Memorandum of Understanding with the Center for Employment Training (CET) to ensure that all instructional programs offered at CET are consistent with the College's mission, course and program requirements, and that commensurate student services are provided. (II.A.1, II.C.1, II.C.3, ER15)

College Recommendation 6 (Compliance): In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that all individual course syllabi include information consistent with the approved Course Outline of Record and approved Student Learning Outcomes. (I.C.1, II.A.3)

College Recommendation 7 (Compliance): In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the College work with the District to finalize AP 4020 Program and Curriculum Development and ensure that it includes clock hour to credit hour calculations that adhere to the Department of Education's conversion formula, both in policy and procedure, and in practice. (II.A.9, ER10, 600.2, 602.16 (a)(1)(viii), 602.24(e),(f), 668.2, 668.9)

Standard II.B.: Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations

The college provides a comprehensive array of library resources and services to students, regardless of location or means of delivery. The modern facility has ample, comfortable individual and group study space. While the library maintains a collection of traditional print and media resources, substantial electronic resources are also available via a vibrant website. Librarians continue to provide information literacy instruction in-person through traditional orientations and one-on-one research assistance, and have also expanded online through the use of library tutorials, research guides, and email reference assistance. Other learning support services, including tutoring, computers, and specialized instructional support, are centrally located on the first floor of the library building.

Findings and Evidence

The library occupies the second and third floors of the Learning Resource Center (LRC), a modern, centrally located building which opened in 2003. At the start of fall 2016, the library's open hours were Monday through Thursday, 8:30 am – 7:00 pm and Friday, 8:30 am – 2:00 pm for a total of 47.5 hours per week. In October 2016, the College extended hours to cover evenings and Saturdays for a total of 59.5 hours per week, a full restoration to the library open hours available prior to 2011. In late spring 2016, the college temporarily added a total of four additional hours on Tuesday and Wednesday evenings, which were suspended briefly at the start of fall semester due to the retirement of a librarian at the end of spring 2016. The additional library hours were reinstated in October 2016 with part time librarian assistance; a request to replace the vacant librarian position has been ranked through the faculty prioritization process for fall 2017. Library staffing has been challenged by the recent retirement of a librarian, leaving just two full-time librarians. To make up for this loss, the College has provided partial replacement hours (12.5 hours/week) with an hourly librarian. Library collections include books, audiovisual media, periodicals, textbooks and a wide range of electronic resources, including both databases and ebooks. In addition to Wi-Fi, the library provides students access to 22 individual computer workstations and six laptops. Six viewing stations for audiovisual materials are available, and the library offers printing, scanning and copying services. There is study space for approximately 300 students, including individual carrels, tables and ten group study rooms. (II.B.1, ER17)

Librarians provide both individual and group information literacy instruction. Although the library's online course *LIB 015: Electronic Research and the Internet* was discontinued after fall 2013 due to low class enrollment, demand for library orientations remains robust, and the number of students served has increased. The library electronic research lab is equipped with 30 seats and a SmartSync classroom management system that allows librarians to focus student attention and conduct efficient assessment during one-shot orientations. Although formerly reserved for library orientations, the room has recently become available for other college purposes. This has created some disruption to the instructional program as a few orientations have had to be relocated to an alternative location with fewer seats and without the SmartSync software. In alignment with the college's system of read/write advisories, the library has developed checklists containing the "top ten" instructional literacy learning outcomes for library orientations. (II.B.1, ER17)

The library has developed electronic resources and services to serve students regardless of location. The library provides remote authenticated access to 75 online databases and more than 500 electronic books. Additionally, the library offers a virtual library tour and online tutorials in library research and searching the online catalog. The library's mobile-friendly website also provides contact information for librarian assistance via email or phone. The online library catalog, upgraded in 2013, features a sophisticated discovery search interface and engaging images of retrieved content. All of these resources are accessible from the college home page via a direct link to the library under Quick Links. (II.B.1, ER17)

Several learning support centers occupy the first floor of the Learning Resource Center building. In addition to an open computer lab, there is a Tutoring Center, an ESL Lab, a Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSP&S) Computer Lab and a Reading and Writing Center. Hours for these services are Monday-Thursday, 8:30 am to 7 pm and Friday, 8:30 am to 2 pm. Additional tutoring is available in the library when the LRC is closed Monday through Thursday, 7 to 9 pm and Saturday, 11 am to 3 pm. The LRC uses a peer tutoring model and many tutors complete tutoring coursework. The Reading and Writing Center has received Level 1 Tutor Training Program Certification through the College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA). The Tutoring Center is seeking the same certification. Additional group and classroom-embedded tutoring is available through the METAS program. Although the college maintains an Online Learning and Resources website that includes useful links for distance students, including an Online Academic Support Services compilation, online tutoring services are limited to students enrolled in select online classes. (II.B.1, ER17)

Librarians partner with discipline faculty to identify library materials appropriate to the library collection. Each librarian is assigned responsibility to work with departments and professional literature in developing a collection that supports the curriculum. The Curricunet system includes a form for discipline faculty to recommend additions to the collection. The library also solicits recommendations for the collection via email. Librarians keep faculty informed of new acquisitions via a subject-arranged *What's New* listing on the library website. The library has a policy for *Selection of Books and Other Materials*. While not explicitly stated as part of the library selection policy, librarians have proactively identified materials suitable for a range of reading levels, in both print and electronic formats, in alignment with the college curriculum. (II.B.2)

The library has a mission statement, a program learning outcome for information literacy, a service outcome for collections and a service outcome for access. The library conducts program review according to the college calendar and has received "proficient" ratings in the college validation process. Librarians recently developed a three-tiered list of learning outcomes designed to correspond with the needs of library orientations based on course level. Librarians collaborate with discipline faculty in English and ESL to assess student learning in library orientations and to make improvements in their instruction based on analysis of the results. The library uses surveys, usage statistics, and feedback from targeted outreach to assess the service collections and access outcomes. Improvements made on the basis of these

assessments include reallocation of funds from periodicals to databases and a temporary increase in evening library hours. (II.B.3)

Both the Reading and Writing Center and the Tutoring Center conduct regular program reviews. Both centers survey students to assess satisfaction with services, and ratings are high. As a result of the program review process, the Reading and Writing Center sought and received Level 1 Tutor Training Program Certification through the CRLA. (II.B.3)

The college relies on a number of vendors to provide specialized services for the library, such as Innovative Interfaces (online library system), OCLC (bibliographic records for the library catalog), Midwest Book supply (book jobber) and ITC (print management). The college also has had a contract with San José State University (SJSU) that allows SJCC students to use the SJSU library for extended hours during finals. The college maintains records of these contracts and reviews services regularly for effectiveness. (II.B.4, ER17)

Conclusion

The college provides excellent library collections and services for students. Although substantial electronic resources and information literacy services are accessible via the library website, it is difficult for students to find this critical college resource without multiple clicks or extensive scrolling. The Learning Resource Center is a modern and attractive facility that provides valuable instructional support to students. The recent restoration of library hours coupled with a schedule that is consistent throughout the year will improve access. The librarians' collaborative work with other college faculty strengthens the college and has resulted in innovative approaches to assessment. The college provides high quality on-campus peer tutoring. Online tutoring for distance students is available via NetTutor, but the service is limited by faculty recommendation through the online classroom.

The College meets Standard II.B.

Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

None.

Standard II.C.: Student Support Services

General Observations

The College provides a wide variety of student services both in-person and online, with a number of programs that reflect a strong effort by the college to create a culture of inclusion. The services provided are comprehensive and traditional for a public community college in California. The College has been very focused on the implementation of Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) and Equity programs. Additionally, the college has implemented support programs that are reflective of purpose of these statewide and Federal Title V grant initiatives. Student support services at SJCC appear to be inclusive and appear to be available to all students regardless of location or means of delivery. The college assesses student support services through faculty and staff dialog, program review, and surveys. The College and District have high standards for the confidentiality, maintenance, release, and destruction of student records that adhere to state and federal law.

Findings and Evidence

Student support services evaluate the effectiveness of their programs, services, and delivery methods. The college utilizes the program review process and student satisfaction surveys to gain an understanding of student need and trends. For example, evidence shows that the “pop-up” counseling services were implemented during the first two weeks of each semester for counselors to answer students’ questions and direct students’ to their classes to meet students’ need as reflected in the program review. While the institution has made progress in developing and accessing program outcomes and instituted a program review process, the team did not find evidence to support a robust or consistent method for using assessment results. (II.C.1, ER15)

The College identifies and assesses learning support outcomes for its student population and works through the participatory governance process, where faculty and staff identify Program SLOs (PSLOs) for the area. The college provides appropriate support services and programs. PSLO’s have been developed for most programs and most have completed the program review cycle. (II.C.2)

The College offers an array of services available to students. The College offers assessment testing at the service area high schools and in large group settings. Additionally, an outreach team stays in contact with students throughout their matriculation through various outreach events. Lastly, the college disseminates all information regarding the college’s support services via email, the college website, a student newsletter, and various informational fliers. The team noted that the College does not make Student Educational Plans (SEP) available to online students electronically. (II.C.3, ER15)

The college has an associated student body that is student driven and which assists in developing opportunities for students to participate in campus activities. The Department of Student Life offers learning opportunities for its diverse student population which include: training and advising for student government; promotion of safety; and the promotion, investigation, and adjudication of student conduct.

The College maintains co-curricular and athletics programs which are suited to the college's mission. The college is a member of several athletic conferences (Coast Conference except for football, a member of the Northern California Football Association and golf, a member of the Big 8 Conference based in Sacramento). The College noted that it has no control of their conference placement, stating that the CCCAA is the deciding body. The College supports and promotes an active student government which encourages participation and dialog amongst its members to support the college's efforts to provide a complete college experience. Associated Students' funds are deposited and disbursed by the College President or designee and are subject to an annual audit. (II.C.4)

The College provides counseling and academic advising programs to support student development and success. The program orients students to understand the academic requirements and information about graduation and transfer. The College assists student success through various components such as counseling and advising, orientation, and guidance courses. Additionally, students are provided with various opportunities to attend workshops that provide additional support to the college efforts to help students navigate the students' educational pathway. Counseling and advising programs ensure students understand the requirements related to their programs of study and receive timely, useful, and accurate information about relevant academic requirements, including graduation and transfer policies. Lastly, the College appears to continuously provide professional development opportunities in order to ensure staff are prepared and responsible for the advising functions and to serve as a representative of the College. (II.C.5)

The District has admissions policies consistent with its mission and state regulations. These policies include special admission of part- and full-time K-12 students, noncitizens, and persons who do not possess a high school diploma or equivalent. The college adheres to these policies when admitting students. These policies are published in catalogs and class schedules, as well as available on websites. The College advises students on clear pathways to complete their educational goals, including transferring to a university, through its counseling services and has increased the number of students who complete abbreviated and comprehensive educational plans. (II.C.6, ER16)

The College evaluates admissions and placement instruments and practices to validate their effectiveness. The Admissions and Records (A&R) office regularly evaluates admissions practices using various methods including Program Review. The A&R Office Program Review includes self-assessments, surveys, questionnaires, and feedback from students. A&R also solicits feedback from external sources that include students, community members, and auditors and internal users including faculty and staff. The college's assessment center follows guidelines established by Title 5 regulations for placement in English, English as a Second Language, and mathematics. The assessment center also provides students with disabilities with the appropriate accommodations when necessary. The college has adopted COMPASS as its assessment instrument with the cut score having been provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. The District evaluates placement assessment on a regular basis and has employed the use of Multiple Measures during the placement process. (II.C.7)

All official student records are maintained in the Office of Admissions and Records under the supervision of the Director of Admissions and Records. These records consist of a complete listing of all coursework attempted at the College (Permanent Record), placement test scores, transcripts from other schools and colleges, application forms and supporting documents, and Change of Record forms. The college uses the Oracle-based Colleague/Datatel system (Colleague) with servers located in the District ITSS offices. The system uses role-based security to ensure that employees have access only to data necessary to their work. The Catalog contains a statement on the policy for the use and release of student information. Release of any information requires written permission of the student, except as provided by law. In case of the closure of the College, responsibility for records would pass to the State Chancellor's Office.

Review of the evidence and interviews with staff did not demonstrate an accurate implementation of the required student complaint policies and procedures. Furthermore, formal student complaint files were not kept in a centralized area and/or did not exist. (II.C.8)

College Conclusion

The College meets Standard IIC except II.C.3, II.C.8, ER17, 602.16 (a)(1)(ix), 668.43

College Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

See College Recommendation 5 (Compliance)

College Recommendation 8 (Compliance): In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the College provide electronic access to student support services, including tutoring, distance education technology support, and student educational plan development for online students. The team further recommends all student support programs should establish learning outcomes and complete program reviews. (II.C.2, ER17)

College Recommendation 9 (Compliance): In order to meet the standard, the team recommends the College create, implement, and assess the effectiveness of a procedure for documenting formal student complaints, including creating and maintaining a repository of complaints available for review. (II.C.8; 602.16(a)(1)(ix);668.43)

Standard III Resources

Standard III.A.: Human Resources

General Observations

The Human Resources functions are centralized at the district level, with primary responsibility for personnel records and evaluations assigned to the College. College practices for hiring faculty and staff are clearly articulated in Board policies and procedure manuals. The College employs sufficient numbers of administrators, faculty, and staff to support the mission and effective educational, technological, physical, and administrative operations of the institution and ensures that they are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience. All personnel are scheduled for evaluation and most are evaluated in a timely manner. The District and College uphold a written code of professional ethics for all of its personnel, which includes consequences for violation. The College plans for and provides all personnel with opportunities for continued professional development consistent with the institutional mission and based on evolving pedagogy, technology, and learning needs. The College systematically evaluates professional development programs and uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement. The College makes provision for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. Each employee has access to his or her personnel records in accordance with law. All Human Resource functions are compliant with regards to distance education (DE). (ER8, ER14)

Findings and Evidence

The team noted that the District has established Board policies that outline hiring processes which ensure that all personnel hired are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support programs and services that facilitate successful student learning. More specifically, Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 7120 (Recruitment and Hiring Policy) detail the processes for the identification of positions to be filled and the processes used to create job descriptions and job announcements for all employee groups. Additionally, the District trains hiring committees on these processes through the use of a Screening Committee Orientation program. The team found that the delineation of shared responsibilities between the district Human Resources and the College seems to be working well yet some evaluations have not been carried out or are late. (III.A.1)

Applicants for faculty positions are required to conform to the minimum qualifications established through the statewide Academic Senate and the Chancellor's Office. Student learning outcomes, curriculum development, and college-level committee requirements are included in responsibility expectations when developing full-time faculty job descriptions. The District's Human Resources unit verifies that all candidates meet the established minimum qualifications. The involvement of faculty on hiring committees ensures that candidates demonstrate expertise in their discipline and excellent teaching skills. The College has an established process for determining equivalences for faculty applicants who may not possess the established minimum requirements, and this process includes the involvement of faculty members approved by the Academic Senate and the area dean on the

equivalency committees. The team found that the Academic Senates from both San José City College and Evergreen Valley College have formed a District Academic Senate. During interviews, members of the Academic Senate and Human Resources personnel reported that the District Academic Senate is charged with streamlining and aligning the two Colleges with respect to equivalencies for minimum qualifications and ensuring that a single Senate voice is represented in any revisions of faculty evaluation processes. (III.A.2, ER14)

Administrator and classified candidates must also meet specific minimum qualifications which are communicated through detailed job announcements. Hiring Committees adopt appropriate questions and conduct interviews for staff and administrators. Activities in the interview include demonstrations, skill, or other simulated job duties relevant to the position to assess the applicant's qualifications and academic quality. Through the hiring process, copies of official transcripts are submitted and reviewed to ensure they are from accredited institutions. (III.A.3, III.A.4)

The District has established a system of performance evaluation for faculty, staff, and administrative personnel. The evaluation processes are dictated by individual collective bargaining units, and the District maintains a webpage where all pertinent forms and District policy can be found. According to the collective bargaining units, employees are evaluated at the following intervals:

- Tenure track faculty – first, third, fifth, and seventh semesters
- Tenured faculty – every three years
- Administrators – annually
- Classified – annually
- Part-time – first semester and every sixth semester afterwards

The team requested reports which included the last evaluation dates of all employees, separated by category (faculty, classified, and administrators). In reviewing the lists, the following was noted:

- Faculty – 17% were late, with the oldest dating back to 2003
- Classified – 6% were late, with the oldest dating back to 2000
- Administrators – 2% were late, with the oldest dating back to 2013.

In addition to reviewing the lists above, the team randomly selected a sampling of evaluation files for review in the Human Resources Office in order to verify that the evaluations were contained within the personnel files. More specifically with faculty, this review was conducted to verify that the new forms with SLO language (adopted in February 2015, see III.A.6) were, in fact, being used. In all cases, the evaluations were present and the proper forms were being used. The team concluded that while the College is following its respective evaluation processes, gaps still exist which has resulted in late or delayed evaluations in each employee group including the President. (III.A.5)

The College includes, as a component of the evaluation, consideration of how administrators and faculty use the results of the assessment of learning outcomes to improve teaching and

learning. The administrator evaluation includes the following language: “The administrator participates in student learning outcome assessment by effectively leading those directly responsible for student progress.” Since the College uses a 360 form of evaluation for administrators, faculty, staff, and peers can provide feedback on the administrator’s effectiveness in this regard. The collective bargaining agreement for faculty requires that faculty address both “participation and assessment of student learning outcomes” and “the use of data to evaluate/improve instruction and/or program.” Like the administrator evaluation process, faculty evaluations include the solicitation of feedback from supervisors, peers, and students. The College has been using the new evaluation language since February, 2015. The team found that the evaluation committee is required to validate that the student learning outcomes discussion is documented in the self-evaluation. (III.A.6)

The College maintains sufficient numbers of qualified full- and part-time faculty. The College’s Academic Senate is involved in determining the vacancies which need to be filled. Factors that are considered in the decision of which faculty positions to fill include program review, engagement in student learning outcomes, enrollment patterns, emerging occupations, and institutional initiatives. The College is also compliant with the Full-Time Faculty Obligation Number established by the Chancellor’s Office. Through interviews, the team found that the Academic Senate has established a robust process for vetting requests for new faculty that includes the use of a rubric. The resulting list is shared with and supported by the College President. (III.A.7, ER14)

Orientation for part-time faculty is outlined in Article 5.13.2 of the District’s collective bargaining agreement with the AFT. New part-time faculty members are paid two hours for attending orientation training which includes information on syllabi and SLO requirements, enrollment processes, student services, and professional development opportunities. Part-time faculty are regularly evaluated according to the collective bargaining agreement. The District distinguishes part-time faculty into three distinct groups: those who have seniority for rehire, those in the process of achieving seniority, and those who work less than 33 percent, which is the required load to be considered for seniority rehire preference. With respect to professional development, part-time faculty are eligible to receive six hours of pay by participating in designated activities held on Professional Development Days. Part-time faculty are also integrated into the operations of the College by serving as faculty coordinator positions and on College committees. (III.A.8)

The College employs a sufficient number of classified employees and 1,800 part-time or temporary workers. The team found that the District ensures that staff who are hired possess the necessary qualifications to perform their duties. The College administration performs an analysis of current staffing needs based on integrated planning and the resource allocation model (III.A.9, ER8).

The College employs administrators who meet the minimum qualifications established by the Chancellor’s office. The College follows the Redesign Report and its revised version to ensure there is a sufficient number of qualified administrators. (III.A.10, ER8)

Written personnel policies and procedures are available online for information and review. Established processes ensure that constituent groups participate in relevant matters. The District HR office also provides training to employees on core policies and maintains records of each employee's training history. (III.A.11)

The District follows Equal Employment Opportunity practices in its hiring procedures, including a commitment that successful candidates demonstrate sensitivity to and ability to work with diverse colleagues and students. Presently, the College's employee demographics are 47% white, 20% Latino, 20% Asian, and 7% African American. Faculty and staff who were interviewed indicated that both the College and the District have a strong commitment to increase the diversity of all employee groups. When asked about formal programs, practices, or services that specifically support diverse employees, many of the individuals interviewed commented that this occurs informally. More specifically, they described grass roots efforts by different ethnic groups to support and mentor colleagues. The College previously had a Diversity Advisory Committee that provided support to diverse employees; however, that committee no longer meets. Some interviewees believed this group could be used to more formally honor and celebrate cultural celebrations for faculty, staff, and students. The team was provided evidence that the District regularly assesses its record in employment equity and diversity. (III.A.12)

The College adheres to a clearly defined code of professional ethics which includes consequences for violation. A number of Board Policies complement the code of ethics and address topics of non-discrimination, consensual relationships, drug-free environment, nepotism, political activity, and whistleblower protection. The College investigates any suspected violations and takes the appropriate action. (III.A.13)

Faculty and staff participate in professional development programs to enhance teaching strategies, technology, and the needs of students. Professional development also focuses on improving institutional effectiveness by providing training on administrative procedures, personal development, and workplace issues. The Professional Development Committee (PDC) maps workshops and training to the College's strategic plan and uses rubrics to determine the allocation of funding for conference attendance and other paid opportunities. The work of the PDC is supported with funding from Basic Skills, Student Success and Support Program, and the President's Office. Conference attendees are required to report on their experiences in a number of ways, including presenting a workshop on the topic or writing an essay describing the manner in which they have applied new knowledge to their regular work. Through interviews and the review of documents, the team learned that the PDC determines the needs of its faculty and staff by regularly conducting evaluations of its programming and systematically soliciting feedback from prior sessions. Of particular note is the College's development of a faculty handbook for distance education. (III.A.14)

The College also maintains a Professional Development Center that serves as a hub for career opportunities and personal and professional growth. The College is also a member of the Bay Area Community College Consortium which expands the professional development resources available to faculty and staff. The team reviewed evidence of training sessions held during Professional Development Days, the Deans Academy, Classified and Supervisor

Leadership trainings, and activities and resources in the Professional Development Center. (III.A.14)

The District provides security and access safeguards in the confidentiality of personnel and employment records. Access to confidential electronic personnel data is monitored and limited to authorized employees. Collective bargaining agreement language is in place to provide employee access to his/her personnel records. (III.A.15)

College Conclusion

The College effectively uses its human resources to achieve its mission and to improve academic quality and institutional effectiveness. It demonstrates that personnel policies and procedures are clearly articulated and well documented. Hiring processes roles and responsibilities are coordinated between the College and the District. It has established policies and procedures for fair and equitable practices in hiring and maintaining its staff. Earnest attempts have occurred to diversify its faculty and staff. The District reinforces the importance of the code of ethics. Faculty job descriptions and evaluations include attention to assessment of SLOs.

The team commends the College for its commitment to the professional development of all employee groups which includes a wide range of opportunities and resources that are connected to the College's strategic goals and mission. Of particular note is the development of the distance education handbook for faculty. (III.A.14) The College meets the standard, except III.A.5.

College Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

College Recommendation 10 (Compliance): In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the College evaluate all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The team further recommends that the District evaluate the college president according to Board Policy 2436 Evaluation of the College President. (III.A.5, IV.C.3)

Standard III.B.: Physical Resources

General Observations

San José City College is the oldest community college in Santa Clara County and is located on 59 acres in downtown San José.

Bond measures in 1998, 2004, and 2010 have supported robust growth in campus facilities including the Cesar Chavez Library, Parking Garage, Career Technology, Technology Center, Multi-Disciplinary, Fine Arts Center, Student Center, as well as renovations to several existing buildings. Additionally, the college is currently building a new Kinesiology/Wellness and Athletics Building. Although there is construction on campus, the grounds and facilities are clean and well maintained. College pride in the campus was evident throughout and facilities promote a welcoming and inviting space. Beginning in the spring of 2017, San José City College will open a college extension in Milpitas. The extension is in collaboration with the Milpitas Unified School District.

Findings and Evidence

The College and District work together to provide a safe, secure, and healthful learning environment. Although the College currently has space for its employees and services, areas for collaboration and student interaction remain in demand. The College has approximately 500,000 square feet of assignable space to serve nearly 13,000 students annually. A variety of entities work collaboratively to maintain and manage the college's physical resources. The College Facilities and Safety Committee is charged with providing recommendations to the College Advisory Council on a variety of physical resource matters such as emergency preparedness, campus maintenance, and the Facilities Master Plan. (III.B.1)

Through interviews, the Team learned that since the Self Evaluation Report was written, the Facilities and Safety Committee broadened its charter to include technology as it relates to the successful operation of campus facilities. Beginning October 2016, the committee will guide and manage classroom and workspace technologies. The College anticipates that the merging of responsibilities will result in even greater efficiency and responsiveness to user needs.

The San José Evergreen Community College District operates its own Police Department. All District Police Officers have full law enforcement authority throughout California and the District maintains a mutual aid policy through a MOU with the San José Police Department. The team confirmed that the District is in discussions with the Milpitas Police Department to provide services for the new extension center. The Vice President of Administrative Services acts as the safety officer on campus and collaborates with the Chief of Police on matters of safety and security. The campus has taken several steps to enhance campus safety around lighting, campus phones, security cameras, and access control.

Recently, the District established a Safety and Facilities Committee to coordinate with the college on a variety of issues, including police services. The college's innovation and energy around facilities management was the impetus for this new committee. The team confirmed

through interviews that the committee was formed to leverage the college's holistic approach to facilities management and duplicate some of the successful initiatives that San José City College has started.

The college monitors and adjusts space utilization to manage the total space constructed to be within the guidelines of the California Community College Chancellor's Office (CCCCO). Program reviews provide faculty input around facilities and equipment needs. Additionally, the Vice President of Administrative Services (VPAS) works closely with the Vice President of Academic Affairs to ensure facilities are supporting students. (III.B.1)

Under the direction of the Facilities and Safety Committee, the College works collaboratively to meet the needs of its faculty and students and to effectively utilize physical resources. The team confirmed that the VPAS will launch a survey this fall to evaluate physical resources. The survey results will be used to establish a baseline for facilities, safety, and technology evaluations in the future. Although mostly positive, the current feedback around physical resources is mostly anecdotal. (III.B.2)

The Maintenance and Operations department uses the School Preventative Maintenance Management System to manage user-identified facility repair and maintenance needs. The team did not identify any problems or issues with the effectiveness of this system. (III.B.2)

The Vice President of Administrative Services is responsible for campus operations through participation on various campus committees and informal conversations, the VPAS assures that physical resources are supporting instructional needs. Departments use Program Review to highlight space needs. The District and College work together to plan and evaluate facility utilization. The District annually submits a Space Inventory Update, 5-Year Scheduled Maintenance Plan, and 5-Year Construction Plan to the CCCCCO. (III.B.3)

The College provided the team with the Educational Master Plan and Facilities Master Plan as evidence to support long-range planning through 2030. The Board of Trustees adopted the FMP on January 12, 2016. The team reviewed the plans and found them to be comprehensive and thorough. The FMP provides a framework for future campus development and improvement, with a focus on enhancing the student experience. The College is anticipating the passage of a \$748 million bond in fall of 2016 to implement several of the projects identified in the FMP.

The District covers the costs of utilities and maintenance in the current budget model. The District Facilities and Planning Department calculated the total cost of ownership for current and planned facilities at \$7.11 per square foot. The total cost of ownership is used in the Facilities Master Plan. (III.B.4)

College Conclusion

The college meets the Standard.

District Conclusion

The team commends the efforts of the District Police Services in conjunction with the Colleges' Facilities and Safety Committees in making positive improvements related to campus safety, security and emergency preparedness. (III.B.1, III.D., IV.D.2, IV.D.6)

District Recommendations for Improvement and Compliance

None.

Standard III.C.: Technology Resources

General Observations

College and District technical staff work collaboratively to provide a technological infrastructure that supports the administrative, instructional and support service needs of the college community. The District has made substantial investments in the technology infrastructure, including new wired and wireless networks, upgraded systems and new data support facilities. Substantial technical training resources are available for faculty and the College has established policies and procedures on the use of technology.

Findings and Evidence

Both the College and District provide technology support, and their respective roles are clearly delineated. College and District IT managers meet on a monthly basis. The Campus Technology Support and Services (CTSS) is made up of five staff who provide direct technology support to classrooms, labs and offices. CTSS technology support primarily includes computer installation, maintenance, software upgrades, repairs, audiovisual services and webpage assistance. (III.C.1)

The District Information Technology Services & Support (ITSS) is responsible for hardware and software technology that supports district operational functions, including the Ellucian Colleague administrative database, student and employee web portals, SharePoint web platform, Office 365, Moodle, CCCApply, Sierra library system, networks, phone systems, server maintenance and District office employee technology support. ITSS also provides technology support coordination through a help desk. Help desk services are available for all SJECCD employees and students. The help desk can be contacted by phone, email and a Track-It work order form, although that form is currently not accessible for off-campus users. Track-It allows ITSS to route support requests to appropriate staff, including CTSS staff. Requestors receive a copy of the service ticket and, after the request has been resolved, a satisfaction survey. (III.C.1)

The team found that both employees and students are generally content with technology resources. The user satisfaction surveys issued by the help desk show high satisfaction ratings for support and recent student and employee surveys indicate that both groups are generally pleased with technology resources. However, while employees and distance education students generally indicate that they have adequate technical support, only 29.6% of DE students agree that they get the technical support they need in class. Nearly 75% of students also indicate they would like improved access to technology resources. Fifty percent of students identify longer hours as way to improve access. (III.C.1)

The College's program review process includes a section dedicated to technology needs and informs the technology priorities of the Strategic Information Technology Plan. The District Technology Planning Group (DTPG) was formed in April 2015 and is charged, in part, with ensuring alignment with the District Technology Plan, District Strategic Goals and College Technology Plans. The District Strategic Information Technology Plan was written in 2012 and updated in 2014. It includes a tactical component, the Technology Master Plan Project List, which is regularly updated and monitored by the DTPG and the District and College IT

management team. The current SJCC Master Technology Plan covers 2010-2015. However, in spring 2016, the DTPG recommended and received approval for a “request for proposals” to develop three new integrated Strategic Technology Plans for the two colleges and the District by December 2016. Based on a recommendation from the Distance Education Committee and Academic Senate, the District will also be migrating to a new learning management system, Canvas, in 2016-17. (III.C.2)

Since the last comprehensive self-evaluation, the College and District have made significant investments in technology infrastructure, including a new district Data Center and a Main Distribution Facility (MDF) located on the Evergreen campus. Additionally, six major district-wide systems have been upgraded. In 2011, the College adopted TracDat, a web-based planning and assessment tool. In 2012, the college contracted with Remote-Learner to host the Moodle learning management system, allowing for improved integration of instructional support plug-ins and better reliability. The District upgraded the library system to Sierra and added a discovery platform. College and District websites were upgraded in 2013-14. The Microsoft Exchange email system was migrated to Office 365. The Ellucian Colleague hardware and software has been completely overhauled and updated, including the implementation of a new Ellucian reporting system. Bond Measure G-2010 provided for the Ellucian project as well as funds to upgrade the District and College networks (wired and wireless) and replace college computer equipment. (III.C.2)

The College ensures reliable access to network and online technology resources primarily through the systematic use of redundancy and UPS backup power generators. A few resources (e.g. Moodle, Canvas, CCCApply) have external hosts who are responsible for accessibility, backup and recovery. Almost all technology resources require password protected logins. One exception is the wireless network which currently does not require authentication. The wireless network was recently upgraded with new firewall and security applications, and based on this upgrade, plans are now underway to organize the wireless network into three security regions with corresponding levels of authentication. The district is currently taking steps to use the Microsoft Active Directory (AD) accounts for students to create a single sign-on system with self-service password reset functionality. A number of safety technology systems are in place, including emergency notification, classroom speakerphones, emergency blue phones, security cameras and a police radio dispatch system that is slated for upgrade to a digital system. (III.C.3)

Technical support is available for all employees and students via the ITSS Help Desk. There are also numerous technology training opportunities for staff throughout the year. The new District Office building has a computer lab dedicated to employee technology training. Faculty who teach online are required to complete at least one annual professional development training related to online instruction and more stringent requirements will take effect in spring 2018. In Spring 2016, the ACCJC Committee on Substantive Change approved the College’s Substantive Change Proposal to offer 46 degrees and 22 certificated at 50 percent via distance education. Students are supported through online tutorials on the web, Help Desk support, the My Web portal and by DE faculty. However, survey results indicated that students are not always able to get quick and consistent IT support for DE and often seek faculty help for course technical issues. (III.C.4)

The College has policies and procedures that guide the use of technology. Program Reviews for all areas have a section that is used to evaluate technological needs. Additionally, the Campus Technology Committee and Distance Education Committee have developed policy and procedure handbooks. (III.C.5)

Conclusion

In spring 2016, the College Academic Senate passed a motion to support DE professional development training to assist in the migration from Moodle to Canvas. Teacher training requirements were established that included a minimum level of professional development. The requirements included completing at least four courses of online teaching from @ONE Teaching Certification Program and participating in at least one DE professional development training per semester. The current SJCC Master Technology Plan covers 2010-2015. However, in spring 2016, the DTPG recommended and received approval for an RFP to develop three new integrated Strategic Technology Plans for the two colleges and the district by December 2016. A vendor was selected and is coordinating work with the College and District to develop an integrated strategic technology plan which is scheduled to be completed in December.

The College meets the Standard and ER17.

College Recommendation for Improvement and Compliance

College Recommendation 11 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College regularly review and evaluate the on-going technology support needs for students. (III.C.4)

Standard III.D.: Financial Resources

General Observations

The SJECCD has a standing District Budget Committee that determines the expenditures and monitors the financial condition of the District and the College. The District appears to have a collaborative methodology used to compile the financial information as indicated by various members of its constituency being involved in the budget development process. The College appears to have been thorough in its presentation of the evidence to support III.D as demonstrated by its inclusiveness of several different constituencies in its preparation of the documentation.

Findings and Evidence

The financial resources of the District and the College adequately support the student learning programs and services at San Jose City College. The District uses the Chancellor's Office Sound Fiscal Management Self-Assessment Checklist as a benchmark for reviewing the financial condition of the institution. Board policies ensure that these practices are normalized throughout the District and at the College. The District reserve is currently 17.78%.

The audited financial statements prepared by the independent accountants indicate an unmodified opinion. This opinion is an indication from an external review that the financial statements are free from material misstatement. During this review the College's and the District's operations are reviewed for conformity to Generally Accepted Accounting Principles.

The Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services is primarily responsible for ensuring the financial stability of the District. At the College, the President has delegated responsibility to his Vice President of Administrative Services to establish sound fiscal practices and to ensure fiscal stability. The Vice Chancellor and the Vice President work together to ensure that funds are dispersed to the College appropriately through the current allocation formula. All District budget preparation and management is overseen by the Vice Chancellor, who prepares quarterly reports on the budget in consultation with the College. These reports are shared by the Vice President with the College Finance Committee, which utilizes this information as part of its resource prioritization and allocation process. Program review drives resource allocations, which are divided into five categories, some of which are categorized as non-discretionary because they are critical for operations or necessary to maintain quality services. Discretionary categories include requests to improve student outcomes and to promote innovation. Four years ago, the District became community supported (basic aid), which ensures apportionment higher level of District funding than the College would have received from state apportionment, despite decline in the College's enrollment. The College continues to make strides in improving its productivity through enrollment management practices. Additionally, while the College is encouraged to generate additional revenue through activities such as Civic Center/Facility rentals, in the ISER and through interviews, the College articulated its desire to control all additional revenue generated. For example, although the Cosmetology program generates revenue, it does not retain the funds to benefit the program specifically; that revenue only returns back to the College through the District Allocation Model as discretionary income. (III.D.1, ER 18)

The annual financial statements (i.e. CFS311) indicate that the College had access to cash balances that range from \$14.8M in 2013 to \$39.5M in 2016. These cash balances indicate that resources are available to address unanticipated deficits.

In several meetings with the Vice Chancellor, Vice President of Administrative Services, Director of Business Services, and the College's Budget/Finance Committee, the College's integration of financial planning with its mission and vision was discussed. Prioritization discussions incorporate the six college goals: promoting student success; expanding partnerships with our external communities; enhancing employee development; fostering cultural competence; increasing campus safety; and expanding resource development. The Vice President joined the College last year. His discussion concerning the strategic plan goal of expanding resource development indicated his awareness of the need to control and manage the approximate 3% of discretionary funding that remained after the College's labor and benefit expenditures were encumbered. Use of these discretionary funds were discussed as a part of the College's Finance Committee meetings. Discretionary budget reports including year-to-date actuals, year-to-date encumbrances, and the available balance are regularly distributed and illustrate the College's commitment to communication and effective management of resources.

Interviews confirmed the Vice Chancellor, in collaboration with the Vice President, are focused on effectively managing categorical funding and securing additional funding sources. Evidence of this includes increased oversight by Administrative Services of the various restricted funding programs under academic departments.

The College's Finance Committee is a cross-functional team consisting of various constituency members and is primarily responsible for collaborating on the various departmental budget plans. The department heads work with their teams to develop a budget for their specific areas. Once those budgets have been completed, the Committee reviews, analyzes, and aggregates the data before forwarding the budget projections to the District Office for review and consideration. The College's Finance Committee is chaired by a College administrator. The team confirmed that this structure allows the College to engage the participatory governance while ensuring that expenditures are linked to the educational activities as expressed in the mission and vision of the College. This linkage of effective management and control of the College's fiscal resources is illustrated by the collaboration between the Finance Committee the College Advisory Council. The two committees use an assessment tool with five categories to determine budget prioritization.

Once the various departmental budget requests had been prioritized, the collaborative process includes the President of College as the approver of the departmental budget allocations.

As a multi-college district, the financial information is filed as an aggregate disclosure. The Annual Financial Statements indicate fund reserves growing from \$11.2M in 2013 to \$17.8M in 2016. These reserves are an indication of the financial resources available to the District. During meetings with the Vice President the team verified that budget deficits generated by the College are covered by these reserves. These available resources have allowed the College to participate in the Self-Insurance that covers the costs of dental and vision for

active employees and retirees. Other insurance costs are covered by the College as a benefit to the employees as members of Blue Cross and/or Kaiser.

Since the College is a part of a community supported district, its revenue resources are primarily received from ad valorem tax. The College receives an allocation from the District to cover its budgeted expenditures. In addition, the financial statements indicate that the District used short-term Tax and Revenue Anticipation Note (“TRAN”) loans in 2013, 2014, and 2015 to support short term cash flow needs. No long-term borrowing (i.e. Cash Operating Profit) is shown in the financial statements for the past 3 years. However, there are two General Obligation Bonds; \$185M in 2004 and \$268M in 2010. (III.D.2)

The District Budget Committee is a cross-functional group consisting of college and district representatives. This group collaborates to ensure resources are distributed in effective ways to support the operational needs of all parts of the institution. Meetings with the Budget Committees and Administrative Services representatives revealed that while the budget committees at the District level and at the College they do review and provide feedback on the College’s budget and expenditures on a regular basis, the College does not view itself as having the ability to change the basic budget allocation, or specifically, the reallocation of additional funds. Both in the ISER and in interviews, the College expressed its desire for an updated allocation model in order to ensure greater control over end-of-year balances. To address this concern, the District hired a third party consultant to help the District review its allocation model, which the Team confirmed through interviews. (III.D.3)

In 2011, the Board of Trustees adopted a 7% unrestricted Fund 10 reserve balance principle after the previous 3 years (2008-2010) trended downward from a high of 14.8% to a low of 6.22%. The period of 2011- 2016 shows a gradual return to the 16% high. The unrestricted Fund 10 reserve is projected to be 14.8% for 2016-2017. Fund balance and cash on hand exceeds the Chancellor’s Office threshold of 5%. The District appears to realize the uncertainty of future resource availability and has intentionally maintained higher than required unrestricted reserves that will support the stabilization of the organization in the event of an economic downturn. (III.D.1, III.D.4, III.D.5, III.D.9, ER18)

The annually audited financial statements for the years ending 2013, 2014, and 2015 received an unmodified opinion from the Independent Auditor’s, Crowe Horwath, LLP. The auditor’s noted an “Emphasis of Matter” in 2013 and 2015, indicating that the District has implemented the current Governmental Accounting Standards regulating the disclosure of pension liability within the financial documents. The auditor’s reports indicated no findings or matters that needed to be acted upon by the District or College. (III.D.5, III.D.6, III.D.7, ER5)

The internal controls of the operations were discussed during a meeting with Finance-Business Process Review Meeting. The District appears to have strong process gap resolution practices. The Business Services representatives at the College and District meet in order to discuss the various services that may not be working effectively. The members of the review team shared that two significant accomplishments have resulted from these collaborations. The first is the development of workshops and training opportunities at the College that

directly addresses the gaps in the operations while additionally supporting new colleagues as they settle in to their roles. (III.D.8)

The District circulates quarterly financial information to various stakeholders to ensure the internal controls are being monitored to maintain the integrity of the budget and operational expenditures. Also, the District Budget Committee maintains a website that includes an overview of the budget, agenda, discussions, meeting dates, and the mission/vision of the committee. (III.D.8)

The financial statements for fiscal years ending 2013, 2014, and 2015 indicate an upward trend of non-current long term debt of \$366M, \$515M, and \$566M respectively. This shows an increase of 55% since 2013. It should be noted that approximately 75-80% of the long term liabilities are attributed to general obligation bonds which are to be repaid by ad valorem taxes collected by the county treasury. (III.D.14)

The auditor's report for the 2014 fiscal year indicates that the District has adopted Governmental Accounting Standard No. 68 which states

“requires governments providing defined benefit pensions to recognize their long-term obligation for pension benefits as a liability for the first time, and to more comprehensively and comparably measure the annual costs of pension benefits. The Statement also enhances accountability and transparency through revised and new note disclosures and required supplementary information (RSI). This Statement is effective for the District's fiscal year ending June 30, 2015. Management expects this GASB statement to have a material impact on its financial statements.” (p.26) (III.D.10, III.D.13)

Also, the District adopted Governmental Accounting Standard No.71 which states

“relates to amounts associated with contributions, if any, made by a state or local government employer or non-employer contributing entity to a defined benefit pension plan after the measurement date of the government's beginning net pension liability. This Statement amends paragraph 137 of Statement No. 68 to require that, at transition, a government recognize a beginning deferred outflow of resources for its pension contributions, if any, made subsequent to the measurement date of the beginning net pension liability. Statement No. 68, as amended, continues to require that beginning balances for other deferred outflows of resources and deferred inflows of resources related to pensions be reported at transition only if it is practical to determine all such amounts. The provisions of this Statement are required to be applied simultaneously with the provisions of Statement No. 68 and are effective for the District's fiscal year ending June 30, 2015. Management expects that this GASB statement along with GASB statement No. 68 will have a material impact on its financial statements.” (p. 27) (III.D.12)

The financial documents indicate that the fiscal stability of the District has not been challenged by the Chancellor's Office. (III.D.7)

The District administers a postemployment benefit plan (the “Plan”). The 2015 audited financial report states that the District provides postemployment health care benefits to eligible employees who retire from the District and their spouses. The Post-Employment Benefit Plan (the "Plan") is a single-employer defined benefit healthcare plan. The Plan is administered by the District. In May 2009, the District issued OPEB Taxable Bonds for the purpose of financing the Plan. There are no required funding rates to the Plan. Through interviews, the team determined that the planning for Other Post-Employment Benefits is an indication of its awareness of the increasing risk exposure of retirement costs that plagues this particular sector of higher education. (III.D.11, III.D.13)

Further, health plan information indicates that the institution participates in a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) in cooperation with the Bay Area Community Colleges Districts (BACCD) and Northern California Community College Pool (NCCCP). On behalf of the College, the District pays annual premiums to cover its property and liability, health, and workers’ compensation coverage. It is noted in the 2015 financial statements “There have been no significant reductions in insurance coverage from coverage in the prior year. Settled claims resulting from these risks have not exceeded insurance coverage in any of the past three years.” (p. 57) (III.D.11)

Other benefits, such as vacation time are accrued on an annual basis and recognized as a liability at year end. As compensated absences, vacation time total costs increased by approximately \$500,000 between fiscal years 2014 and 2015 and by approximately \$100,000 between 2013 and 2014. Board Policy 7340 addresses the Leaves. The vacation time accrual regulation is included in the collective bargaining agreements. The agreements for faculty and classified are posted on the College’s website. The Managers, Supervisors, and Confidential Employees vacation time accrual regulation is contained in the Employee Handbook. (III.D.11)

The College annually receives approximately \$11 million in categorical (grant) funds from federal, state and local sources including the sub-contracts of workforce grants from the District’s Workforce Institute. The Business Services Supervisor works closely with grant managers, Deans and the Vice Presidents to ensure that the categorical expenses are reported in a timely and accurate manner. In the past four years, there have been no audit findings on the categorical funds. The Business Office provides on-going training to department administrative assistants and deans to ensure categorical grant monitoring and reporting is effective. (III.D.14)

In 2011, the College’s Title IV financial aid practices were audited. The audit resulted in two findings requiring the institution to improve its tracking of withdrawn students and reporting timeliness in accordance with Title IV Compliance 602.16(a)(1)(v). These responsibilities are shared between the District and College. The Title IV default rate has declined from 26.1% in 2010 to 17% in 2012. (III.D.15, 602.16(a)(1)(v))

All contractual obligations engaged by the District and College are controlled by Board Policy 6340. The policy has been developed using the following resources for its

development: Education Code Sections 81641 et seq.; Public Contract Code Sections 20650 et seq.; Government Code Section 5306. (III.D.16)

College Conclusion

The College is to be commended for recognizing the need for innovation in business services as it moved from a manual process to an electronic tracking and more streamlined e-signing procedure for contract approval. (III.D.8) The College meets the Standard.

District Recommendation for Improvement and Compliance

District Recommendation 2 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the District complete its evaluation and revision of the current resource allocation model. (III.D.1, III.D.2, III.D.3, IV.A.3, IV.D.2, IV.D.3)

Standard IV Leadership and Governance

Standard IV.A.: Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations

The San José-Evergreen Community College District has a seven-member Board that presides over two colleges serving more than 26,000 students each year. The SJECCD Board of Trustees establishes policies that are consistent with its mission statement and exercise oversight of the colleges by means of its Board policies, Ends Policies and Guiding Principles. The Chancellor of the District executes policies and procedures and presides over the daily operations of the colleges. The College president reports to the Chancellor of the District.

There is a clear hierarchical organizational structure for communication. Per Board policy and the College governance structure, the Academic Senate maintains primary responsibility for academic and professional matters, including curriculum, distance education, basic skills and learning outcomes and assessment. Information about College governance committees is easy-to-find on the College website. A process for committee self-evaluation is in place with broad participation.

Findings and Evidence

The College formally recognizes all constituent groups in its participatory governance decision-making structure. The College leadership recognizes formal representative groups for various constituencies including: the College Academic Senate, Associated Student Government (ASG) and the newly formed Classified Senate and their roles in decision-making processes. The Classified Senate constitution and the Academic Senate constitution clearly outline the responsibilities and roles of these groups. According to the College Advisory Council website, the membership of the College Advisory Council (CAC) includes five faculty members (four appointed by the Senate and one appointed by American Federation of Teachers), five administrators (one Vice President of Academic Affairs and four others appointed by the President), five classified staff appointed by CSEA, and five students appointed by the ASG. (IV.A.1)

SJCC has established and implemented various Board Policies and procedures (BP 2510, BP 2511, BP 2512, and BP 2430) authorizing administration, faculty and staff participation in the decision-making process. Additionally, the recognition of the Associated Student Government and the established ASG constitution allow for and encourage student participation in various decisions that affect student interest. (IV.A 2)

There are established committees and participatory decision making groups that have faculty, administration, staff, and students listed in membership. Within the past year, the College has gone through some organizational changes, and there has been an improvement in respect and collegial interactions. (IV.A.3)

BP 2511 and BP 2512 outline responsibility for recommendations about curriculum and student learning. SJCC has established an Instructional Policies and Curriculum Committee (IPCC) and a Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee (SLOAC) that have clearly identified charge statements. The charge statements for IPCC and SLOAC outline the responsibility for recommendations about curriculum and student learning. Other established committee structures include both administrative and faculty membership and report to both the CAC and the Academic Senate. (IV.A.4)

Board agendas allow time for public comment, as well as a separate agenda item for oral constituency reports. Per Board Policy 4000, the SJECCD Board of Trustees consults collegially with the Academic Senate by either relying primarily on the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate or through mutual agreement in academic and professional matters. BP 2511 and BP 4000 both identify the academic areas delegated for “relying primarily on” or “mutual agreement,” but the Board policies conflict in how they are assigned. Between the two board policies, program review is designated for both types of collegial consultation. Committees with a charge that falls within the purview of academic and professional matters (e.g. Basic Skills, Distance Education, Instructional Policies and Curriculum, Program Review and Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment) report directly to the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate reviews college plans that address areas under its purview before such plans are forwarded to the Board. (IV.A.5)

Information about college governance committees is mostly centralized in a convenient website that includes charges, memberships, meeting schedules, and agendas and minutes for each committee, but there is not a clear delineation as to which committees report to which governance structure in all cases. The College Advisory Council, Academic Senate, Classified Senate and Associated Student Government all have current websites, but in some instances, the membership of each committee is unclear because there are numerous vacancies. Although there are periodic open forums and email communiqués, the process for decision-making and communication is unclear. With the current governance structure, there is potential to increase dialog and input in campus decision-making, though. (IV.A.6)

College governance committees conduct an annual self-evaluation which is submitted to the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) the end of the academic year. In turn, the SPC returns the form with feedback to the governance committee at the start of the next academic year. In addition, the Academic Senate holds a yearly retreat with an agenda item assessing the work of the senate and seeking ideas for improvement. (IV.A.7)

College Conclusion

The team commends both the Academic Senate and the College administration for establishing and institutionalizing clear, ongoing, and collaborative communication. The administration has demonstrated support for the Academic Senate’s increased leadership role for the campus, while also initiating and supporting a newly formed Classified Senate. The College meets the Standard.

District Conclusion

The SJECCD has clearly defined roles and responsibilities of the District and the colleges, as well as the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, and the college presidents. The District meets the Standard, except IV.A.5.

District Recommendation for Improvement and Compliance

District Recommendation 3 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District review and revise Board Policies 2511 and 4000 to eliminate the discrepancy concerning means of collegial consultation in areas of academic and professional matters. (IV.A.5)

Standard IV.B.: Chief Executive Officer

General Observations

The Chief Executive Officer of San José City College provides effective leadership of the college. Since becoming Interim President in May 2014, the President has provided three years of stable leadership. Prior to that, the College had seven CEOs over a ten-year period.

The College president reports to the Chancellor and is responsible for all aspects of San José City College including student learning, fiscal management and institutional effectiveness. Board Policy 2430 defines the responsibility of the District Chancellor and delineates the authority of the Chancellor to delegate responsibility to the president whose primary responsibility is to lead the college.

Board policies established by the District guide the president in establishing administrative procedures which are designed to advance the college and support student success. The president is an effective leader who sets the vision and leads the staff in the accomplishment of institutional goals established through a collaborative, collegial process. He is also an effective communicator who meets regularly with staff, faculty, and administrators to encourage all College constituents to be engaged in the mission of the college.

Findings and Evidence

The president has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution. The president provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness. In recognition of the disruption caused by frequent changes in leadership, the president ensures effective communication through weekly meetings with the senior executive team, consisting of the vice president of Academic Affairs, the vice president of Student Services, and the vice president of Administrative Services. On a monthly basis, the president meets with the administrative team. Further, the president communicates with other campus constituents through bi-weekly meetings with classified staff, the faculty association, the management/supervisory/confidential group, and the executive team of the Academic Senate.

The president has established a variety of strategies for improving transparency and trust within the institution. He has created opportunities for expanding communication by developing ROAR, a weekly campus newsletter. He holds open office hours, regularly attends Academic Senate meetings and visits various College departments to share information and engage in dialog with campus constituents. The president is the link between the College and the District office, bringing information from the District back to the College, and sharing information with the District from the College.

The president leads a planning system which begins with Program Review. Improvement initiatives are identified through the Program Review process. The Finance Committee prioritizes resource requests needed to support the improvement initiatives. These requests are further evaluated by the Strategic Planning Committee before they are presented to the president. The president delegates authority for day-to-day budget management to the vice president of Administrative Services. As the intermediary between the College and the

District, the president presents the College's concerns to District officials and to the Board, most notably the concern with the budget allocation process as detailed in the Quality Focus Essay Action Project 3 (IV.B.1, IV.B.5)

The president's responsibility for leading the College is further defined by his role as the Ex Officio leader of the College Advisory Council, the primary participatory governance committee at the College. While the Self Evaluation Report indicates that the college has a newly reconfigured organizational system for displaying the operational and governance responsibilities for the institution, no evidence was provided to clearly illustrate this new system. Further, the Self Evaluation Report notes that the president relies on qualitative and quantitative data to evaluate the college governance structure. The report references survey data on the access, use and satisfaction with the new organizational system for governance, but evidence provided by the College did not support the assertion of increased access, use and satisfaction with the new organizational system for governance. (IV.B.2)

The president is responsible for guiding institutional improvement in teaching and learning. This is to be accomplished by establishing a collegial process for setting goals; ensuring the College sets institutional performance standards for student achievement; and ensuring a process of research-based, integrated planning and evaluation which links resource allocations to planning. The president established a collegial process for goal setting by using the Professional Development Day in 2014 and again in 2015 for planning. In 2014, the campus community engaged in a process of establishing strategic planning priorities and Key Performance Indicators. Priorities relating to student success and campus safety were established as planning goals. The following year, specific strategies to achieve the Key Performance Indicators (KPI) were identified.

The integrated planning process is based on the Program Review. Initiatives stemming from Program Review are forwarded for resource consideration and evaluated by the Finance Committee and the Strategic Planning Committee prior to being forwarded as recommendations to the president.

The College establishes standards for student achievement through the curriculum process in the creation, assessment, review and revision of Course SLOs, Program SLOs and Institutional SLOs in the Course Outline of Record. During the team visit, interviews indicated that student achievement standards were set by an ad hoc committee. The College recognizes the need for a more formal, institutionalized process for establishing institution-level standards for student achievement. (IV.B.3)

The president has the primary leadership role for accreditation, with faculty, staff, and administrative leaders of the college sharing in the responsibility for assuring compliance with accreditation requirements. The vice president of Academic Affairs serves as the Accreditation Liaison Officer for the College, and works closely with the president on accreditation matters. Both the president and the ALO work to ensure that the College's participatory governance structure supports shared responsibility for ensuring accreditation standards are met. The development of the Self Evaluation Report utilized a tri-chair structure so that faculty, classified and administrators collectively led the effort. The

evidence provided by the College verified that there was ample opportunity for feedback and input from the campus community during the writing of the self-evaluation. The College demonstrates a commitment to institutional effectiveness and a continuous cycle of improvement to support student learning. (IV.B.4)

The president assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing Board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies, including effective control of budget and expenditures. The president uses Board policy to guide the development of local procedures to support the mission of the college. The president is a member of the District Council and provides two-way communication between the District, the Board, and the College. The president brings policy recommendations to the District Council and participates in the creation of District policy. The president works closely with the vice chancellor of Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success to support the College's access to data and research needs.

The president supervises the vice president of Administrative Services, who is responsible for ensuring effective budget development and management of expenditures. The current resource allocation model used by the District is a concern to the college and is reflected in its Quality Focused Essay #3 project. (IV.B.5)

The president currently serves on the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU) Commission on International Education. He also serves as the Area 4 Representative on the CEO Board for the Community College League of California. (IV.B.6)

College Conclusion

The College meets the Standard.

College Recommendation for Improvement and Compliance

None.

Standard IV.C.: Governing Board

General Observations

The Board of Trustees (Board) of the San José-Evergreen Community College District provides effective leadership for its system of two colleges. The seven-member Board of Trustees has worked with the Chancellor to delineate lines of authority at the College and District levels.

Findings and Evidence

The responsibilities of the Board are specified through Board Policy, Administrative Procedures, and the Ends Policies, and Guiding Principles which specifically address the Board's role in upholding the academic quality, integrity, effectiveness of learning programs and services, and financial stability. Board Policies 2010 (Board Membership) and 2200 (Board Duties and Responsibilities) clarify the composition of the Board and their roles and responsibilities. Additionally, in 2014, the Board created the "Ends Policies and Governing Principles" document which includes a list of strategic priorities: student success, work environment, workforce and economic development, organizational effectiveness and sustainability, technology, and communication. The Ends Policies document also includes Board expectations concerning career development, transferability, college readiness, institutional excellence, student success, and college experience.

The Global Requirements principle in the Ends Policies document recognizes that the Chancellor will ensure that the district complies with applicable Board policies and District administrative procedures and clearly articulates the District's use of the Community College League of California's model policies. However, after reviewing the evidence provided and conducting interviews during the visit, it is not clear how the Ends Policies relate to Board Policies, and specifically, the team found that relationship between the Ends Policies and integrated planning, along with resource decision making, could have been better articulated. (IV.C.1, ER7)

Board Policy 2715 (Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice) and Guiding Principle *Unity of Control* provide evidence that the Board is expected to work as a collective entity. Board Policy 2715 includes the statement that "Trustees recognize that authority rests with the Board majority in legal sessions and not with individual members." Similarly, Guiding Principle *Unity of Control* includes the following paragraph:

"Decisions or instructions of individual Trustees, officers, or committees are not binding on the Chancellor except in rare instances when the Board has specifically authorized such exercise of authority. Trustees recognize that authority rests with the Board majority in legal sessions and not with individual Trustees." (IV.C.2)

Board Policy 2431 (Selection of the Chancellor and College Presidents) states that the Board "shall establish a search process to fill the vacancies. The process shall be fair, open, and comply with relevant regulations. It shall include input from students and constituency groups." No administrative procedure exists that explains the selection process however. The criteria to search for a Chancellor exists as evidenced by minutes from the May 26, 2015

Board meeting at which the Board members discussed some of the desired qualifications. Through interviews, it was explained that the Board Subcommittee on the Chancellor Search Process plans to survey the Chancellor Search Committee members to ascertain their satisfaction with the search process. Once feedback is gathered, the Board Subcommittee will bring forward a recommendation to the full Board which will be the foundation for the development of an Administrative Procedure to accompany Board Policy 2431.

With respect to evaluation of the Chancellor, Board Policy 2435 (Evaluation of the District Chancellor) documents the expectation that the Chancellor will be evaluated at least annually in alignment with the Chancellor's job description and it shall include input from the Chancellor and constituency groups. Administrative Procedure 2435 (Evaluation of the District Chancellor) notes that the Chancellor is also evaluated on whether she has met the expectations the Board has outlined in the Ends Policies and Guiding Principles, as well as achieving the district's strategic priorities.

In 2015, the evaluation process was revised by an ad hoc Board committee who worked with the district Human Resources department. During the team visit, the Chancellor indicated she received an informal 6-month evaluation in June 2016, and will receive a formal evaluation in spring 2017. The Chancellor shared her goals for the period July 2016 – June 2017. The Chancellor also provided the "Chancellor Evaluation Process" as described in the board's Ends Policies document, which states in part, "The Board will view the Chancellor's performance as identical to organizational performance, so that organizational accomplishment of Board-adopted Ends Policies and compliance with Executive Requirements will be viewed as successful Chancellor performance."

Board Policy 2436 Evaluation of the College President details the process used for evaluating the College president. The President of San José City College has not been evaluated for a number of years due to turnover in the District Chancellor position. The President confirmed that he is now working with the Chancellor to review his goals, which will be the foundation for his evaluation in the 2016-2017 academic year. (IV.C.3)

Board Policy 2010 outlines the membership requirements of the Board. Each Board member represents a unique area of the district's service area. The Board holds regularly scheduled meetings that allow for public comment on general and specific agenda items. One example was provided of a Board decision that respected the voice of the community involved the development of surplus property at Evergreen College. SJECCD is still fully pursuing the General Plan Amendment of 27 acres, as the District has demonstrated through the Educational Master Plan and Facilities Master Plan that the College has adequate land to support its future needs. (IV.C.4, ER7)

Board Policies are available on the District website, as are the Ends Policies and Guiding Principles. Both sets of documents establish the Board's role in establishing policy with the acknowledgement that it has the ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity. The Board regularly reviews reports on student achievement data and metrics demonstrating the District's progress in meeting the Ends Policies. The Board also reviews resource allocation reports. In February 2016, the Board established Board Budget

Principles to ensure the budget validates a student-centered approach and maintenance of a 7% minimum reserve fund. While not required by the Standards, the process by which the Board Budget Principles were developed is unclear and whether such development was done in concert with collegial consultation input is also unclear. As well, it was difficult for the Team to determine whether there was dialog on how the Board Budget Principles are related to Board Policies 6200 and 6250. (IV.C.5)

The Board consists of seven members elected at-large for terms of four years. Elections are held every two years, alternating with three members being chosen in one election and four members in the other election. The president and vice president of the Board of Trustees are elected by the Board for one-year terms at a regular meeting each December. A student trustee is elected annually by students for a one-year term beginning each June 1st. The student trustee has an advisory vote on actions with the exception of personnel-related and collective bargaining items. (IV.C.6)

The board has established Board Policies, Ends Policies, and Guiding Principles. Additionally, Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 2410 (Board Policies and Administrative Procedures) outline the processes used for the regular review of policies and procedures. In 2015 the District conducted a review of all Board Policies. A new policy review process timeline has been developed which will provide for a review of all policies over a three-year cycle. Through interviews, the Team noted a perceived lack of opportunity for participation at the college level in the policy review process. (IV.C.7)

The Board regularly reviews key indicators of student learning and achievement. The district's Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success provides regular monitoring reports on the Ends Policies and the Student Success Scorecard. Several members of the Team attended a Board meeting where the Board received a quarterly update on specific metrics relating to student success and how such metrics related to the Board's Ends Policies. (IV.C.8)

Board Policy 2210 (Officers) states the Board President shall develop and conduct an orientation for each new trustee. Evidence provided during the team visit confirmed that the Board schedules an orientation for new members, holds Board workshops, participates in training, and has memberships in statewide as well as national organizations. The Team also confirmed the Board's self-identified goal of improving their orientation and professional development efforts. (IV.C.9)

Board Policy 2745 (Board Self-Evaluation) requires that an annual self-evaluation be conducted by the Board. The Board has a Standing Self-Evaluation Committee that coordinates the process. Two examples of self-evaluations were provided for 2012 and 2015. During the team visit, the district provided evidence that the Board conducted a self-evaluation in May 2016 in conjunction with a Board planning session, which was facilitated by an outside consultant. (IV.C.10)

Board Policy 2715 (Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice) outlines the Board's code of ethics and includes clearly stated procedures for addressing violations of the code. Board Policy

and Administrative Procedure 2710 (Conflict of Interest) articulate expectations for Board member conduct. The Ends Policies and Guiding Principles document provides further assurance that trustees comply with all Board policies. (IV.C.11, ER7)

The Board sets policy with the delegation of responsibility to the Chancellor and college presidents for the execution of policies and procedures as well as day-to-day operational control of the District. The Board's Ends Policies detail the limits of executive authority of the Chancellor. Additionally, Board Policy 2430 (Delegation of Authority to the District Chancellor) notes that "the Board of Trustees delegates to the District Chancellor the executive responsibility for administering the policies adopted by the Board and executing all decisions of the Board requiring administrative action. These policies include the Board's Ends Policies and Governance Principles which prescribe the organizational ends to be achieved and executive requirements for the District Chancellor's exercise of his or her authority to manage the District's affairs, allowing the District Chancellor to use any reasonable interpretation of these policies and principles." (IV.C.12)

The Board is informed about eligibility requirements and accreditation standards and receives regular updates from the Chancellor, College Presidents and from the Colleges' Accreditation Liaison Officers. Evidence provided during the team visit included minutes from Board Study Sessions in addition to interviews with three Board members, all of whom confirmed their understanding of ACCJC accreditation standards and eligibility requirements. (IV.C.13)

District Conclusion

The District meets the standard, except for IV.C.3.

District Recommendation for Improvement and Compliance

See College Recommendation 10.

District Recommendation 3 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District review and revise Board Policies 2511 and 4000 to eliminate the discrepancy concerning means of collegial consultation in areas of academic and professional matters. (IV.A.5)

District Recommendation 5 (Improvement): In order to increase the effectiveness of its policies in fulfilling the District mission, the team recommends that the Governing Board fully implement a formal Board Policy review process that involves college stakeholders in regular cycle of assessment. (IV.C.7)

Standard IV.D.: Multi-College Districts or Systems

General Observations:

The San José-Evergreen Community College District is a multi-college system consisting of a district office led by a District Chancellor, two separately-accredited community colleges, and the Workforce Institute. The Workforce Institute which is located on the SJCC campus and is the entity that provides contract education for the district. The San José- Evergreen Community College District encompasses more than 300 square miles, and includes the areas served by Milpitas and San José Unified School Districts, together with the East Side Union High School District. San José City College is the oldest community college in Santa Clara County and was established in 1921. Evergreen Valley College was established in 1975. The Workforce Institute was established in 1988 and is focused on workforce development courses, also known as contract education courses, to meet the needs of business and industry.

The Chancellor joined the District in January 2016. The Chancellor provides leadership in setting and communicating expectations of educational excellence and is responsible for assuring support for the effective operations of the colleges. The Chancellor works with the colleges to establish clearly defined roles, authority and responsibility between the colleges and the District.

Findings and Evidence:

In the short time the current Chancellor has led the District, she has established an organizational and communications structure that supports the operation of the colleges and the District overall. The structure includes the Chancellor's Cabinet, focused on district programs, operations and finances, while the Executive Leadership Team, consisting of the Chancellor, the Vice Chancellors, and the Presidents/Vice Presidents of the colleges, focuses on operations and functions in communications, government relations and the budget. The District Leadership Team is responsible for meeting the strategic priorities for the district.

To clarify the roles, authority and responsibility of delineation of the functions between the District and the colleges, the District created a functional map. The process included a survey in 2013, which provided the foundation for updating the map in 2015, in addition to further review and discussion by the District Leadership Team and their campus constituents. (IV.D.1)

The District is responsible for management and allocation of resources, including planning and budgeting. To assure that the colleges receive adequate and effective district-provided resources, the district office developed a Program Review Process in 2012. The District Program Review process is based on a two-year cycle of evaluation, analysis and continued improvement. (IV.D.2)

Board Policy 6200, the District Budgeting Principles, and the District Resource Allocation Model form the foundation for the District's support of the operation and sustainability of the College. To facilitate communication between the District and the colleges, a Business Process Review practice has been in place since 2014. This consists of a monthly meeting

between the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services, the College business services office personnel, College and District administrative assistants, and the District fiscal services office staff. All District and College administrative assistants are invited to each meeting as the “customers” to review what is working efficiently and what can be improved to better streamline systems and processes. The District also instituted a Roles and Responsibilities Committee to define workflow, expedite service, and improve communications between the district office and the College. In addition, the District holds monthly meetings to improve communications with the fiscal officers (Fiscal Officers Meetings), the business officers (Business Officers Meetings), and staff in the financial aid area.

A report by consultant Roy Stutzman dated August 18, 2016 detailed an analysis of the District resource allocation process. The report was based on feedback from the Chancellor’s Cabinet and meetings with constituent groups to date. The report cited observations of the limitations of the current model for resource allocation, noting that colleges appear to “lack control over the entire budget, have not been encouraged to accept full responsibility, have not been granted authority, and have not been held fully accountable.”

San José City College has expressed concern with the District allocation model and has included a project in its Quality Focused Essay regarding a new resource allocation model. During the team visit, the Team confirmed that the District is investigating the establishment of a more transparent, data-driven resource allocation model. (IV.D. 3, IV.D.4)

Board Policy 2436 Evaluation of the College President, details the process used for evaluating the college president. During the visit, the team noted that the President has not been evaluated for a number of years due to changes in leadership in the District Chancellor position. The President confirmed that he is now working with the Chancellor to review his goals, which will be the foundation for his evaluation this academic year. (IV.D.4)

District planning and college planning are guided by Board Policy 3250 Institutional Planning, which was updated in May 2016. The District Strategic Plan was developed in 2012 and consists of six goals. The Strategic Plan is monitored for effectiveness by the District Balanced Scorecard, which annually tracks metrics linked to the goals of the plan. Upon examination of the Balanced Scorecard, however, it is not clear that all six goals of the Strategic Plan are linked to Scorecard Metrics. (IV.D.5)

The Board Ends Policies and Governance Principles provide an additional layer of complexity to the District’s approach to integrated planning and evaluation to improve student learning, achievement and institutional effectiveness.

In 2013, the Board of Trustees engaged the services of Mariam Carver to conduct training on the Carver Policy Governance model. The training included a Board workshop and several special meetings of the Board. As stated in the San José-Evergreen Community College District Board of Trustees Ends Policies and Governance Principles, the Ends Policies and Governance Principles establish how the Board will govern to achieve its visionary objectives. It also lays out the framework for the management authority that the Board delegates to the Chancellor to run the affairs of the district, along with the requirements for

the Chancellor's exercise of that authority. The Board formally approved its Ends Policies and Governance Principles on May 13, 2014.

The relationship between the Board's Ends Policies and the strategic priorities of the District, as well as the process of allocating resources linked to district planning processes, is not clear. While the College noted in its Self Evaluation Report that the District Leadership Team sets the strategic priorities for the District, the only evidence the Team could find to substantiate their role was in undated notes from a "Leadership Retreat" which did not identify the meeting participants.

In the Forward section of the Ends Policies and Governance Principles document, the Board states "the Board establishes a clear vision, values and strategic priorities, for the district." During the team visit, an interview with the Board indicated that the Board establishes the priorities, and delegates to the Chancellor how these priorities are to be achieved.

The Ends Policies and Governance Principles document also ties the board's Ends Policies to resource decision making. Under the heading Executive Requirements: Financial Planning and Budgeting, the Ends Policies states "The Chancellor shall create budgets, which he/she recommends to the Board, that prioritizes funding that supports the accomplishment of the Board's Ends Policies. [The Chancellor shall] report on the relationship between funding priorities and progress on achievement of the Board's Ends Policies."

It is not clear how the Ends Policies relate to integrated planning at the college or the District, and how the Ends Policies relate to existing Board policies and procedures. The District can improve its integrated planning process by demonstrating how the Ends Policies guide district planning, evaluation, and resource allocations and are part of a holistic approach to integrated planning. (IV.D.5)

Communication between the colleges and the district is supported through the District Council, the Chancellor's Cabinet, the Chancellor's weekly Friday letter to the Board, and a monthly newsletter. Communication is a goal in the 2013-17 Strategic Plan for the District. To support communication and the use of data, the district has implemented the new College Reporting and Operational Analytics (CROA) software. (IV.D.6)

The District has developed a regular cycle of evaluation of district operations through a bi-annual program review process, but the District only occasionally conducts evaluations of its governance committees. The Team could find little evidence that the results of committee evaluations for effectiveness were shared with District or College constituents. (IV.D. 7)

District Conclusion

The District meets the Standard, except IV.D.5.

District Recommendations

See District Recommendation 2 (Improvement).

District Recommendation 1 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the District establish a clear process of integrated planning that links resource decision-making to goals developed through collegial consultation. The team further recommends that the relationship between the Board Ends Policies and the strategic plan be clearly defined in the context of resource decision-making. (I.B.9, IV.A.3, IV.A.7, IV.D.5)

District Recommendation 4 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the District establish a process to systematically evaluate District committees and use the results of that assessment as the basis for improvement. (IV.A.7, IV.D.7)

Quality Focus Essay Feedback

San José City College's Quality Focus Essay (QFE) describes three separate Action Projects (AP); all three are designed to improve institutional effectiveness and promote financial stability. The College's newly launched 2021 Scholars Program figures prominently in the first two APs, although the self-evaluation narrative made little mention of this initiative prior to the QFE.

The APs relate to Accreditation Standards, and the first two definitely align with the observations of the visiting team who found the College community quite sincere in its dedication to improving institutional effectiveness, student learning and student achievement. In an effort to support the College's commitment to achieving the goals of these APs, the team offers the following observations and feedback for consideration.

The first AP represents an overarching effort of the College to improve its institutional processes through the development of a Mission-based Decision Making Operational Manual. In recent years, the College has made strides in its participatory governance environment, which is reflected in a visiting team commendation for expanded involvement of the Academic Senate and the creation of a Classified Senate. While the Team concurs that establishing an Office of Institutional Effectiveness and hiring a Dean will support this goal, the Team recommends that the College focus its efforts on revitalizing the committee structure and functions first and memorializing these efforts in a manual only after the new structure is in place and has been evaluated.

The second AP, which will be especially important should the District's November 2016 Bond pass, is vital to ensure that any new facilities built reflect the needs of the current Educational Master Plan. Each plan was developed according to a separate timeline, and this AP will focus the College on aligning the goals of each plan, especially as those goals relate to achieving the 2021 Scholars Program outcomes. Should the Bond not pass, the College will still need to align both plans to ensure that both meet the College's mission and long-term goals.

The third AP is problematic because it is only secondarily about the College. Primarily, it requires the District to change its current allocation model, which would also impact SJCC's sister institution, Evergreen Valley College. Throughout the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report, the College laments the current allocation model and suggests that changes to the model are necessary in order for the College to meet its institutional effectiveness and student success goals. However, discussion with District personnel and, specifically the Chancellor, revealed that the College's concerns about the allocation model do not include accountability measures regarding budgeting. The College repeatedly references the need to keep year-end balances as a way to bolster its classified staffing levels, but little mention is made of instances of budget over-runs that have no consequences in the current budgeting model. Concerns about the fairness of budget allocation models are common to multi-college districts, even those that are community-supported (basic aid); however, the Team strongly suggests that the College look at its own role in managing its budget, especially as it relates to maximizing revenue through strong enrollment management and strict budget controls.