

San Jose City College

Midterm Report

Submitted by:

San José City College

2100 Moorpark Avenue, San Jose, California

Submitted to:

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges,

Western Association of Schools and Colleges

October 2020

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

From: Dr. Rowena M. Tomaneng, President
San José City College
2100 Moorpark Avenue
San Jose, CA 95128

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

Signatures:

Dr. Byron Clift Breland, Chancellor Date
San José Evergreen Community College District

Wendy Ho, President Date
San José Evergreen Community College District Board of Trustees

Dr. Rowena M. Tomaneng, President Date
San José City College

Dr. Elizabeth Pratt, Vice President of Academic Affairs Date

Alejandro Lopez, President, Academic Senate Date

Joyce Lui, Dean of Research, Planning, & Institutional Effectiveness Date

Andrea Lopez, President, Classified Senate Date

Anai Avelino, President, Associated Students

Date

Table of Contents

Report Preparation

Plans Arising from Institution Self Evaluation Report

College Recommendations

District Recommendations

College Reflection on Student Learning Outcomes

College Reflection on Institutional Set Standards

Reflecting on Quality Focus Essay

Reporting on Fiscal Stability

Report Preparation

The San José-Evergreen Community College District (SJECCD) Board of Trustees approved the [College's Comprehensive Self Evaluation Report for Accreditation Reaffirmation](#) on July 12, 2016. An External Evaluation Team visited San Jose City College (SJCC) on October 10-13, 2016. SJCC's President at the time, Dr. Byron Clift Breland, received the Action Letter from the Commission on [February 13, 2017](#), reaffirming accreditation and required a Follow Up Report by March 15, 2018 addressing the team's findings on noncompliance at the campus. (Links)

The Follow-Up Report addressed eight noncompliance areas. The eight recommendations range from developing a methodology for setting institution set standards, substantive dialogue on student outcomes, develop MOU with Center for Employment Training, ensure all syllabi information is consistent with Course Outline of Record, update administrative procedures, ensure electronic access to students support services, document formal student complaints, and ensure the President is evaluated according to board policies.

The College was also given recommendations (2, 4, and 11) to improve Institutional Effectiveness.

In the reaffirmation letter on [June 13, 2018](#), the Commission acted to reaffirm the accreditation for the remainder of the cycle. The Commission found that the College had addressed all the compliance recommendations and met all standards, with no other action required other than the submission of the Midterm Report due October 15, 2020.

San José City College's Midterm Report addresses progress recommendations for improvement in the External Evaluation Team Report, Institutional Set Standards and Student Learning Outcomes (SLO). The campus also addressed the goals and outcomes of the Quality Focus Essay (QFE), which consisted of three goals:

1. Creation of mission-based Decision Making and Operational Manual that serves as a resource for all constituency groups. Improvement of institutional processes and clearer pathways to student success.
2. Use programming components of the Educational Master Plan to develop architectural framework for implementing the Facilities Master Plan. Synchronize educational and facilities master plan.
3. Creation of a transparent budget allocation model from the District to the College. 100 percent of unused funds from College funds reallocated within the College and not returned to the District.

After the QFE and Accreditation Self Evaluation were confirmed and approved, the San José City College have shifted and modified the outcomes. One of the likely reasons would be that the College administration had some turnover. Further, ACCJC provided greater clarity that the QFE should focus on improving student outcomes. In that respect, timelines had shifted to better meet the goals and the strategic plan. Additionally, another factor that may have impacted the QFE would include the changing landscape of the California Community Colleges. Thus, the QFE has evolved and the college will continue to refine efforts on improving institutional effectiveness and student outcomes.

The Accreditation Faculty Coordinator and the Dean of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness regularly met from 2017 to the present. When the Vice President of Academic Affairs joined the College in Spring 2019, she joined the meeting. By Summer 2019 and Fall 2019, the Accreditation Steering Committee would meet weekly to continue to craft the Midterm Report. Regular updates were provided to the campus. The first draft was then distributed widely throughout campus, governance committees and senates, and suggestions and edits were collected. After seeking input from the campus at large, the Midterm Report was taken through [college governance](#) and then submitted to the San Jose Evergreen Community College Board of Trustees for final approval on (Month/Day), 2020 (board agenda and minutes).

College Progress on Plans Arising out of the 2016 Self Evaluation

The following plans were originally identified in the Institution Self Evaluation Report in October 2016.

| Proposed Change | ACCJC Standards | College Leads | Timeline | Anticipated Outcome |
|---|------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| Update Participatory Governance and Planning Handbook to include process for updating the mission statement | I.B, IV.A | CAC Accreditation Steering Committee | Spring 2016 | Updated handbook |
| Fold evaluation of QFE into regular evaluation of the Educational Master Plan | I.B | Dean of RPIE | Spring 2016 | Improved Assessment Outcomes |
| Financial Aid will evaluate the impact of adding additional workshops and refine as necessary | I.B2 | Director of Financial Aid | Spring 2016 | Improved student financial literacy |

| | | | | |
|---|-----------------|--|--|--|
| Add specific questions to program review to assess performance based on institution set standards | I.B3 | PIE | change in Spring 2016 evaluation; implement in Fall 2016 | All programs will expand evaluation of progress on student achievement outcomes for their programs based on institution set standards and targets; improved assessment of outcomes |
| Classified Staffing Plan development and process incorporated into ongoing program review process | I.B3, III.A9 | VP of Administrative Services PIE | Fall 2016 | Sufficient number of support staff to more effectively support student outcomes |
| CurricUNET Implementation | IC2, IC5, IV.A4 | Academic Affairs | Fall 2017 | Seamless integration of curriculum and SIS |
| Implement the Four Cornerstones for success (expanded MMAP) | II.A6, II.C7 | SSSP Language Arts Math Science | Begin Fall 2015, and then ongoing | More rapid progression of students through basic skills to college level English and math |

| | | | | |
|---|-------|--|----------------------------------|---|
| Development of systematic process that drives data-driven decision making | II.A1 | President VP Academic Affairs VP Admin Services VP Student Affairs Academic Senate | Begin Fall 2016 and then ongoing | Clear delineation of function for college committees Established process for evaluation and review of college mission, systematic data collection, and review of employment outcomes |
| Communication plan for how decisions are communicated to the campus and relevant stakeholders of other committees is needed | II.A2 | PIE President VPs Academic Senate | Fall 2016 and then ongoing | College will be able to address targets in a meaningful way |
| Evaluation of existing degrees and certificates to delineate terminal achievements from transfer degrees | II.A3 | IPCC Academic Deans VP Academic Affairs | Fall 2016 and then ongoing | Outcomes assessment at certificate and degree level will be strengthened |
| Robust campus-based research arm that makes reliable data accessible at all levels of the college to foster data-driven decision making | II.A1 | President VP Academic Affairs VP Student Affairs | Fall 2016 and then ongoing | Accessible data that is reliable and contributes to data-driven decision making as a priority and cultural norm |

| | | | | |
|---|--------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| <p>Relating of SLO data at the course, program and GE level to statewide measure of student success and retention, as well as the college's goals of institution-set standards</p> | <p>II.A3</p> | <p>President VP Academic Affairs VP Student Affairs</p> | <p>Fall 2016 and then ongoing</p> | <p>Accessible data regarding institution set standards and college goals that will foster efforts to move the needle at the institutional level</p> |
| <p>Organizing committees to align with accreditation standards could help embed the standards more fully into College policies and procedures, thus serving as a way to document progress and to encourage more campus-wide participation and engagement in the Accreditation process</p> | <p>IV.B4</p> | <p>President VP Academic Affairs VP Student Affairs</p> | <p>Fall 2016 and then ongoing</p> | <p>Greater participation in accreditation and self-study process through embedding of accreditation standards into College policies, procedures and committee charges</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|------|---|----------------------------|---|
| Development of administrative procedures manuals that ensures changes to any institutional statements or policies made in resource document triggers changes made in other documents (eg. Academic Freedom Definitions in faculty contract, board policy, SJCC catalog) | I.C9 | District Office President VP Academic Affairs | Fall 2016 and then ongoing | Consistency of definition/ statements/ policies across all key institutional resource documents |
| Development of administrative procedure that defines frequency and participation level of review and assessment of mission statement | I.C5 | District Office District Academic Senate Colleges Academic Senates | | |

With the evolving landscape in California Community Colleges, and the leadership changes among faculty, classified professionals and administrators, some of the plans evolved. The following section of plans arising (PA) give an update on the plans arising out of the Institution Self Evaluation Report from October 2016.

PA 1: “Update Participatory Governance and Planning Handbook to include process for updating the mission statement.” (Standard I.B, IV.A)

- Responsible Parties: Dean, RPIE | VP Academic Affairs | Strategic Plan Taskforce

- Status: On-going
- The [mission statement review](#) is part of the strategic plan. Therefore, the mission is reviewed every year using data and presented to the college, at the College Advisory Council. It will be noted in the Participatory Governance and Decision-Making Guide, which is undergoing review.

PA 2: “Fold evaluation of QFE into regular evaluation of the Educational Master Plan.” (Standard I.B)

- Responsible Parties: Dean, RPIE | VP Academic Affairs | Acting VP of Administrative Services
- Status: On-going
- The Quality Focus Essay was not folded into the evaluation of the Educational Master Plan. The Quality Focus Essay was folded into the strategic plan. For example, QFE projects 1 was folded into the strategic plan, 2.2. The QFE project #2 was folded into this portion of the strategic plan. The evaluation of the [Educational Master Plan](#) led to an addendum of the [EMP and FMP](#).

PA 3: “Financial Aid will evaluate the impact of adding additional workshops and refine as necessary.” (Standard I.B3)

- Responsible Parties: Director of Financial Aid | VP of Student Affairs
- Status: On-going
- Like all service areas, service area outcomes are part of the program review process for resource allocation. The Financial Aid Office has increased and enhanced workshops offerings over the past several years based on student needs. [FAFSA workshops](#) have evolved into FAFSA presentations and the staff disseminate flyers. Further, the Financial Aid office has [increased and enhanced workshops offerings](#) over the past several years based on student needs. Workshops include FAFSA workshops, Federal Student Loan Orientations, Federal Work Study Orientations, Satisfactory Academic Progress Workshops, and some in classroom presentations as requested by faculty. All of this information can be found: <http://www.sjcc.edu/future-students/on-campus-resources/financial-aid-scholarship>.

PA 4: “Add specific questions to program review to assess performance based on institution set standards.” (Standard I.B3)

- Responsible Parties: Program Review Coordinator | VP Academic Affairs
- Status: Completed and On-going
- Program Review Committee, with support from Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness, have retooled the program review forms to include [assessment of institution and program set standards](#). With the support of Academic Senate, the program review forms have been reviewed when changes occur. Further, the institutional set standards and goals are now part of the data analysis for all academic departments.

PA 5: “Classified Staffing Plan development and process incorporated into ongoing program review process.” (I.B3,III.A9)

- Responsible Parties: Program Review Coordinator | Classified Senate | VP Administrative Services
- Status: In Progress
- Classified positions have been incorporated into ongoing [program review](#) process. It is part of the resource allocation process. From program review, all programs (academic, student services, administrative services) highlight all staffing needs.

PA 6: “CurricUNET Implementation” (Standard I.C2, I.C5, IV.A4)

- Responsible Parties: Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Coordinator | Professional Development Coordinator | VP Academic Affairs
- Status: Completed
- San Jose City College had explored using CurricUNET. A pilot was developed and put into practice. Through feedback from faculty, academic senate chose not to shift to CurricUNET for SLO assessments. However, SJCC has started another [pilot](#) with [e-lumen](#). This pilot is on-going. Further additional conversations within SLOAC have led to further discussions about reviewing and potentially revising GESLO (General Education Student Learning Outcomes).

PA 7: “Implement the Four Cornerstones for success (expanded MMAP)” (Standard II.A6, II.C7)

- Responsible Parties: Deans, Language Arts, Maths & Sciences, and Counseling

- Status: Completed and On-going
- San Jose City College felt very strongly the importance of exploring and expanding multiple measure placement. With the [AB 705](#), placement for English and Math have shifted significantly. SJCC has now deployed a [self-placement tool](#). Further, SJCC has seen an increase in the number of students entering and passing transfer level English and Math. Although the success rate has dipped. A data dashboard has been developed by the district office for the College to continue the monitoring of student progress in [English and Math](#). Students interested in ESL have continued to go through an ESL placement process. SJCC is waiting for guidance from the CCCCCO related to ESL placement.

PA 8: “Development of a systematic process that drives data-driven decision making.” (Standard II.A1)

- Responsible Parties: RPIE
- Status: Completed and Ongoing
- The Office of Research, Planning, & Institutional Effectiveness at SJCC began in 2017 with the hiring of the Dean. Additionally, the research analyst was hired by the end of 2017. The office on average provides more than 100+ [data requests](#) each academic year. Both the Dean and research analyst are part of several participatory governance committees: College Advisory Council, Planning Institutional Effectiveness Committee, Program Review, Student Equity, and others. The Office of RPIE heavily supports the strategic plan, by providing data to 15 key performance indicators. The key performance indicators are tied to Student Equity & Achievement Program, Vision for Success, Guided Pathways, and other key statewide initiatives. Further, the Office of Academic Services provides data to the campus for [enrollment management](#). Additionally, SJCC has participated in the Strategic Enrollment Management pilot.

PA 9: “Communication plan for how decisions are communicated to the campus and relevant stakeholders of other committees is needed.” (Standard II.A2)

- Responsible Parties: President | Director of Marketing & Communications | Academic Senate | CAC
- Status: In Progress
- The President regularly provides [updates to the campus](#). One of the key pieces include “[The ROAR](#)”, which allow all employees to share information to the campus within one email., At every professional development day, there is a President’s State of the College Update. Additionally, at [College Advisory Council](#), there is a Vice President and President Update, which occurs twice a month. At all [Academic Senate](#) meetings, the Academic Senate President welcomes an update from the College President. At CAC and

Academic Senate, there are regular updates of provided by all shared governance committees.

PA 10: “Evaluation of existing degrees and certificates to delineate terminal achievements from transfer degrees.” (Standard II.A3)

- Responsible Parties: Guided Pathways | Strategic Enrollment Management & Retention | Articulation Officer | IPCC
- Status: In Progress
- With Guided Pathways being a significant part of the College Strategic Plan, the [evaluation](#) of existing degrees and certificates have become part of the College process. The articulation office and the IPCC chair routinely work with faculty to ensure programs are well thought out and ensure that degrees and certificates delineate terminal achievements from transfer degrees. Including [program review](#) process, where faculty members review the number of program awards. Additionally, the program review process requires faculty members to reflect on the number of program awards and equity gaps. Further, additional data points, such as the number of transfer students are part of the analysis. For Career Education programs, there is a statewide Career Technical Education Occupational Survey, we track how many students have taken courses in certain fields and how many of them were likely to find a job in related fields.

PA 11: “Robust campus-based research arm that makes reliable data accessible at all levels of the college to foster data-driven decision making.” (Standard II.A1)

- Responsible Parties: RPIE
- Status: Completed and Ongoing
- The Office of Research, Planning, & Institutional Effectiveness at SJCC began in 2017 with the hiring of the Dean. Additionally, the research analyst was hired by the end of 2017. The office on average provides more than 100+ [data requests](#) each academic year. Both the Dean and research analyst are part of several shared governance committees: College Advisory Council, Planning Institutional Effectiveness Committee, Program Review, Student Equity, and others. The Office of RPIE heavily supports the strategic plan, by providing data to 15 key performance indicators. The [key performance indicators](#) are tied to Student Equity & Achievement Program, Vision for Success, Guided Pathways, and other key statewide initiatives.

PA 12: “Relating of SLO data at the course, program and GE level to statewide measure of student success and retention, as well as the college's goals of institution-set standards.” (Standard II.A3)

- Responsible Parties: Accreditation Team | SLO Coordinator | PD Coordinator

- Status: In Progress
- Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee have been working on bridging SLO data to success data outcomes. In particular, there are robust conversations within e-lumen pilot to better connect program review to SLO assessment. Further, there is a robust dialogue related to improving the linkage between mission, vision, and values. Further, as the College continues with the pilot from e-lumen, the SLO Coordinator with the support of Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness can better utilize SLO data to tie to institutional set standards and student outcomes.

PA 13: “Organizing committees to align with accreditation standards could help embed the standards more fully into College policies and procedures, thus serving as a way to document progress and to encourage more campus wide participation and engagement in the Accreditation process.” (Standard IV.B4)

- Responsible Parties: Accreditation Taskforce | President | VP Academic Affairs | Dean RPIE| Academic Senate President
- Status: In Progress
- The College has completed some work to tie the accreditation standards to College policies and procedures. For example, the strategic planning process, accreditation standards were taken into account. Additionally, there has been and continues to be a SWOT analysis of the accreditation standards at the Deans meetings. In the next year, the Accreditation Taskforce will do a gap analysis and present the findings to the College leadership, including academic senate.

PA 14: “Development of administrative procedures manuals that ensures changes to any institutional statements or policies made in on resource document triggers changes made in other documents (eg. Academic Freedom Definitions in faculty contract, board policy, SJCC catalog).” (Standard IC.9)

- Responsible Parties: President | VP Academic Affairs | VP Student Services | VP Admin Services
- Status: On going
- The College is creating an operations guide to better document processes for standard operating procedures and to ensure continuity. As this is one of the quality focus essay projects, more will be discussed in that section. However, the College highly values documenting resource allocation, IPCC manuals, and all of this work is highlighted in the [strategic plan](#).

PA 15: “Development of administrative procedure that defines frequency and participation level of review and assessment of mission statement.” (Standard I.C5)

- Responsible Parties: Strategic Planning Taskforce | Accreditation Taskforce | Professional Development
- Status: Ongoing
- In the [Strategic Plan](#), the review of the mission is one of the key performance indicators. Thus, the administrative procedure is to review it once a year. Additionally, each year, the college presents a state of the college presentation to the Board of Trustees. This presentation will include enrollment and success trends to assess the mission. Currently, the Planning & Institutional Effectiveness Committee is reviewing the mission and my make recommendations to College governance committees to revise the mission to be more global.

Institutional Reporting on Quality Improvements
Response to Recommendations for Improvements
College Recommendations

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

This Compliance recommendation was addressed comprehensively in the [Follow Up Report](#) in March 2018 and later confirmed in a letter from the commission on [June 13, 2018](#), which stated, “The Commission finds that San Jose City College has addressed Compliance Recommendation 1, corrected deficiencies, and meets Standards I.A.2, I.B.3.

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)

Actions Taken to Respond to Recommendation 2:

The College has improved the mission-driven integrated planning and [resource allocation process](#) in alignment with Strategic and Educational Master Plan. Within the program review process, all programs are asked to [align their program with the mission of the college](#). Additionally, the [budget request template](#) includes bridging the priorities and goals from the strategic plan. Further, all of the scheduling is aligned with the campus budget allocated from the district resource allocation. The division deans follow strategic enrollment goals based on [budget allocation](#).

The next step is for the college to plan on expanding our efforts to bridge resource allocation and professional development to be more mission driven. As part of the review of the mission, Planning & Institutional Effectiveness have started to discuss revising the mission, vision, and values.

Further, within the participatory governance process, more discussions with various constituency groups to develop a more cohesive resource allocation discussion. Currently, we are exploring models that may better highlight department needs, including classified professional staffing and technology resources. Additionally, the last few years, the California Community Colleges have seen an influx of funding from the State Chancellor system. Although each grant has a robust allocation process, to truly leverage the resources, the College will continue to explore ways to be more transparent with categorical funds.

College Recommendation 3 (Compliance)

In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the College create and implement a process to demonstrate its substantive and collegial dialogue regarding 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 dialogue to support continuous quality improvement across the College. (Standards I.B.1, II.A.2, and II.A.3)

This Compliance recommendation was addressed comprehensively in the [Follow Up Report](#) in March 2018 and later confirmed in a letter from the commission on June 13, 2018, which stated, “The Commission finds that San Jose City College has addressed Compliance Recommendation 3, corrected deficiencies, and meets Standards I.B.1, II.A.2, and II.A.3.

College Recommendation 4 (Improvement)

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)

Actions Taken to Respond to Recommendation 4:

The College has incorporated SLO assessment into [program review](#). Further, there has been more work done by SLOAC committee to disaggregate general education learning outcomes. The Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee is working on to ensure there is more documentation in aligning SLO, to program learning outcomes, to general education learning outcomes. One of the many ways we disaggregate learning outcomes is comparing face to face to online modality. Additionally, we utilize CCSSE (Community College Survey of Student Engagement) to disaggregate relevant learning outcomes data.

In conjunction between SLOAC and the Accreditation Taskforce, there will be further analysis of GE learning outcomes and greater levels of disaggregation. In Fall 2020, there will be a greater analysis on program development and there will be significantly more professional development on learning outcomes assessment and the bridge between SLO, PLOs, and GESLOs. Additionally, the pilot of e-lumen allows for further disaggregation of SLO. Should the academic senate support the use of e-lumen, all faculty members could further disaggregate SLOs.

College Recommendation 5 (Compliance)

In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the College develop a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Center for the Employment Training (CET) to ensure that all

instructional programs offered at CET are consistent with the College's mission and course and program requirements, and that the commensurate student services are provided. (II.A.I, II.C.1, II.C.3, and ER 15)

This Compliance recommendation was addressed comprehensively in the [Follow Up Report](#) in March 2018 and later confirmed in a letter from the commission on June 13, 2018, which stated, "The Commission finds that San Jose City College has addressed Compliance Recommendation 5, corrected deficiencies, and meets Standards II.A.1, II.C.1, II.C.3, and ER 15.

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 (COR) and approved Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). (I.C.1, and II.A.3)

This Compliance recommendation was addressed comprehensively in the [Follow Up Report](#) in March 2018 and later confirmed in a letter from the commission on June 13, 2018, which stated, "The Commission finds that San Jose City College has addressed Compliance Recommendation 6, corrected deficiencies, and meets Standards I.C.1, and 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. (Standards II.A.9, ER 10, 600.2, 602.16 (a)(1)(ix), and 668.43)

This Compliance recommendation was addressed comprehensively in the [Follow Up Report](#) (link) in March 2018 and later confirmed in a letter from the commission on June 13, 2018, which stated, "The Commission finds that San Jose City College has addressed Compliance Recommendation 7, corrected deficiencies, and meets Standards II.A.9, ER 10, 600.2, 602.16 (a)(1)(ix), and 668.43.

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 review. (Standards II.C.3 and ER 17).

This Compliance recommendation was addressed comprehensively in the [Follow Up Report](#) in March 2018 and later confirmed in a letter from the commission on June 13, 2018, which stated,

“The Commission finds that San Jose City College has addressed Compliance Recommendation 8, corrected deficiencies, and meets Standards II.C.3 and ER 17.

College Recommendation 9 (Compliance)

In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the College create, implement, and assess the effectiveness of a procedure for documenting formal student complaints, including creating and implementing a clear process and maintaining a repository of complaints for review. (Standards II.C.8, 602.16(a)(1)(ix) and 668.43).

This Compliance recommendation was addressed comprehensively in the [Follow Up Report](#) in March 2018 and later confirmed in a letter from the commission on June 13, 2018, which stated, “The Commission finds that San Jose City College has addressed Compliance Recommendation 9, corrected deficiencies, and meets Standards II.C.8, 602.16(a)(1)(ix) and 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 the District evaluate the College President according to Board Policy 2436 Evaluation of the College President. (Standard III.A.2, and IV.C.3)

This Compliance recommendation was addressed comprehensively in the [Follow Up Report](#) in March 2018 and later confirmed in a letter from the commission on June 13, 2018, which stated, “The Commission finds that San Jose City College has addressed Compliance Recommendation 10, corrected deficiencies, and meets Standard III.A.2, and 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).

Actions Taken to Respond to Recommendation 11:

The district ITSS and the campus CTSS have worked hard to improve response time to student needs. For example, both the district and the college have developed robust [plans related to technology](#). Technology serves as a core element in the district strategic priorities and the college strategic plan.

One of the improvements in technology is that all requests are tracked through an online technology request process (Team dynamics). This help desk portal can document needs and verify if issues are ongoing or one time. Further, students can also submit requests.

Additionally, one of the strategic goals of includes continuous campus improvements, which focuses on improvements for better wifi. The District Office did do a district wide wifi

improvement project and upgraded all phones. There are more wifi access points, such as the library. There were additional charger machines to provide more technology to students.

Further, the College and the District Office have clearly delineated functions map to improve communication and identify core responsibilities related to technology. Additionally, the campus technology supervisor serves on the [district wide technology committee](#).

District Recommendations

District Recommendation 1 (Improvement)

In order to increase effectiveness, 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's Ends Policies and the strategic plan be clearly defined in the context of resource decision-making. (Standard IV.D.5)

Actions Taken to Respond to Recommendation 1:

District Committee structures and decision-making processes ensure robust collegial consultation in policy and resources-allocation decisions. Multiple and integrated mechanisms are in place at the colleges and District to increase constituency engagement in planning and the allocation of resources with the intent of maximizing the impact of those funds to support of the mission of the District. These efforts have been conducted in different settings using the established, integrated processes with collegial consultation at District Council (DC), District Budget Committee (DBC), Academic Senates, finance committees at the colleges and the Chancellor's Cabinet meetings.

Committee members are charged with bringing information back to their constituencies in order to provide feedback to their respective committees. By this process, stakeholders from all constituency groups have multiple opportunities and venues to provide input into policies and ultimately, decide on the processes for resource-allocation.

Examples of these efforts include: DBC's budget preparation process, updates to the Board of Trustees on quarterly expenditures and the Board Budget Study Sessions, and the multiple [meetings](#) related to the [Resource Allocation Model \(RAM\)](#), which ties [funding](#) to specific outcomes linked to District goals.

Through discussions with different Chancellors over time, the need for reviewing the allocation of resources assigned to the District Services and District-wide efforts led to the hiring of Harvey M. Rose Associates, LLC to complete a performance evaluation audit on those funds and functions. A complete report was submitted to the Chancellor in November 2019. Through this effort, information was compared in support of activities and efforts of each of the centrally managed functions to benchmark them against other districts with similar functions to check for consistencies in staffing and district cost of operations. The DC received a copy of the [full report](#) at the January 30, 2020 meeting. This is the beginning of a process to review expenditures to determine patterns outline recommendations of how to best align resources effectively to support the District's operation.

The relationship between the Board's Ends Policies and the Strategic Priorities are clearly defined in the document "San Jose-Evergreen Community College District 2018-2025 Strategic

Priorities”. They provide a foundation for the District’s Strategic Priorities. Each Strategic Priority has Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) which align with the metrics in the Board’s Ends Policies. These metrics are periodically reviewed by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Educational Services for alignment with the strategic priorities, system-wide initiatives (e.g., Vision for Success metrics) as well as alignment with the RAM model. As the RAM moves into the implementation phase, we will see an increased role for metrics of student success and program effectiveness to guide resource allocation.

The RAM model allows for colleges to consider cost centers and the physical plant needs of programs as well as innovation funding to increase student success and institutional effectiveness. As the RAM model matures and evolves, the district will adjust and align the metrics it uses to evaluate progress on the Ends Policies and Strategic Priorities.

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. (Standards III.D.1, III.D.2, III.D.3, IV.D.2, IV.D.3)

Actions Taken to Respond to Recommendation 2:

For the past three years, the organization has gone through multiple efforts to review its RAM through the empowerment of various participants and shared governance groups. As a basic need District, we are mindful of our responsibility to effectively use our financial resources to achieve our mission, provide financial resources that are sufficient to support student learning programs, and to improve academic quality and institutional effectiveness. Throughout this process the teams have met to discuss and continue to work on the definition of a RAM that will provide flexibility and clarity on how the revenue for the District will be distributed amongst different entities for its operation and planning.

The RAM has been discussed and presented to the District Budget Committee, District Council and at multiple Governing Board meetings. During the deliberations we have taken input from different constituency groups, and we also now have received a [Performance Audit Report](#) for both the District and District-wide functions and expenses. The information in the report will guide additional discussions on how the allocation of these critical expenses in support of the colleges’ operations would need to take place. At the May 14, 2019, Governing Board Meeting, the Board was presented a first reading of the draft RAM and recommendations were made during the meeting. On July 8, 2019, the Chancellor met with the Academic Senates to review the RAM and agreement was made to the final adaptations. The [final RAM](#) was approved by the Board at its August 27, 2019 meeting. Subsequent to the approval of the process and elements of funding allocation outlined in the RAM flowchart, the DC has been working with administration in the establishment of a RAM implementation framework. To this end on January 30, 2020, the DC voted to approve the latest version of the framework, which includes an operational [task](#)

[force](#) with full representation of the District's constituency groups, including students, and the outline of working groups that will focus on the [implementation](#) of the RAM manual. This effort will be led by fiscal officers located at each college as well as the District Office. The collective RAM work will be presented for review to the DC; and, after consultation, it will be submitted as a recommendation for a mutually agreeable decision to be made by the Academic Senates and the Chancellor.

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. (Standards IV.A.7, IV.D.7)

Actions Taken to Respond to Recommendation 4:

There are three District Committees which report to the District Council: District Budget Committee, District Technology Planning Committee, and the District Institutional Effectiveness Committee. District Council is a primary mechanism through which information is exchanged between District Committees, the Colleges, the Academic Senate and the Classified Staff.

The District Council and District Technology Planning Committee have administered the annual self-evaluation surveys to their respective committee members at the end of the academic year. These surveys have been distributed in May and the results are reviewed by the respective committees in the following fall. Results are used to inform changes in committee processes and activities/goals.

Building upon past successes for continuous improvement, a more [systematic process](#) was developed in fall 2020. The District Council will oversee the self-evaluation process for itself and each of its sub-committees – this process includes the development of annual goals, implementation of a [self-evaluation survey](#), and a brief annual report from each committee. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success (IESS) will administer the standardized self-evaluation survey to the members of each district committee on the second to last meeting of the academic year (April). IESS will provide the results to the district committee chairs as soon as possible prior to their last meeting of the academic year (May). District committees will review the results of their self-evaluation survey and make recommendations at their last meeting. Committee chairs will write a brief annual report of the committees' activities (including achievement of goals, self-evaluation results, and recommendations) and submit it to the District Council. The District Council will review the district committee annual reports at its first fall meeting and make recommendations, if needed. At the second fall meeting each district committee will review the previous year's annual report as well as feedback from the District Council.

This process of self and peer evaluation ensures broad-based input into the evaluation of the effectiveness of District Committees and makes committees accountable to major stakeholders to implement continuous improvement.

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 the regular cycle of assessment. (Standard IV.C.7)

Actions Taken to Respond to Recommendation 5:

To fully address the concerns outlined in District Recommendation 5 (Improvement), the Board of Trustees charged the Chancellor to establish a consistent [policy review process](#) that is well documented and [includes participation by all constituency groups at both the district and college level](#). The responsibility for the policy review process and documentation has been delegated by the Chancellor to the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services.

The Chancellor's District Council (DC) [advisory group](#), containing constituency group representatives from faculty, staff and administrators at the colleges, is the main body for the review and approval of all Board policies. To assist in the constituency review process, all documentation provided at DC meetings is posted on the District Council SharePoint site, including the policy [status report](#) and [review](#) packets. The review of Board policies is now an agenda item at every meeting. The DC meeting minutes document the policy materials distributed, the discussions of recommended policy revisions and the votes to approve or not approve the recommended policy changes.

In FY 2019, a [BP/AP Review Process Flowchart](#) was developed and distributed to the DC. This flowchart clearly outlines the process, levels of responsibilities and the key role the colleges' constituency groups has through every step of the process. It shows there are two review processes: CCLC legally required/recommended updates review and cyclical review. As a member of the Community College League of California's (CCLC) Policy and Procedure Service, the district receives legal and recommended updates in both Fall and Spring. Concurrently, to ensure the policy chapters have a consistent review process, the 3 year cyclical review for each chapter has been assigned to various District Services Offices. These Offices ensure that policy updates are conducted in addition to the CCLC updates. College constituency groups have ample time to review proposed updates with their members, and each constituency group determines its own internal review process. Some groups form committees; others assign those members with policy expertise to conduct the review and make recommendations to the DC. All recommendations and inquiries are then brought to the District Council for discussion.

Reflection on Improving Institutional Performance: Student Learning Outcomes

Strengths of the Process to Improve Teaching & Learning

Instructional departments have ownership of their own assessment process. Departments are free to design assessments, and the current system allows fluidity in the reporting process. The deadlines are consistent across campus. All Student Learning Outcome Assessments are due six weeks into the following term. For example, all Fall 2019 assessments are due six weeks into the Spring 2020 term. Only one outcome per course is assessed per cycle. This allows departments to focus on one outcome, rather than rushing through all the outcomes per cycle.

The institution has an effective Program Review Process that allows departments to reflect on their successes and challenges. Assessment data is pivotal to SJCC's Program Review Process.

Departments use the assessment data to make informed decisions. The Program Review Form is now on SharePoint, which allows departments to easily access the materials. Student success and program statistics are provided in advance, so individual departments do not have to create their own.

The Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee (SLOAC) meets monthly to discuss Student Success at San José City College. The goal is to have representation from all divisions in order to help disseminate the information. Another challenge the committee is working to resolve is how course, program, and institutional assessment correlate. The SLOAC is responsible for piloting eLumen. The SJCC Accreditation Task Force and the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee are working in conjunction to create a culture of assessment.

San José City College has a very active and thriving Academic Senate. The senate meets on a consistent basis with representation from various divisions within the college. The SJCC Academic Senate is an advocate for all faculty including adjunct faculty. San José City College has a systemic shared governance process in place, and the Academic Senate is an integral part of the governing process.

In particular, California state education code stipulates eleven areas in which faculty through their senates are to be "consulted with collegially," if not "relied on primarily," in setting policy and district goals and objectives. Rely primarily upon the Senate for:

1. Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines
2. Degree and certificate requirements
3. Grading policies
4. Educational program development
5. Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success
6. District and college governance structure, as related to faculty roles
7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation process, including self-study and annual

reports

8. Policies for faculty professional development Consult collegial with the Senate for:
9. Process for program review
10. Process for institutional planning and budget development
11. Other academic professional matters as mutually agreed upon between the Governing Board and the Academic Senate.

The Instructional Policies and Curriculum Committee (IPCC) is tasked with reviewing and approving curriculum and programs. The committee is guided by Title 5 Standards as well as state and federally regulated standards and policies. The IPCC meets a minimum of five times a semester with representation from the administration, faculty, and classified professionals. The committee is also responsible for disseminating this information to SJCC constituents.

The San José City College Instructional Policies and Curriculum Committee is responsible for:

- Course Outline of Record: title, description, content, SLOs, methods of instruction and evaluation, grading, assignments, textbooks, and articulation if appropriate
- New and revised credit and non-credit courses
- Credit Hours: Carnegie Unit
- Prerequisites, Co-requisites, and Advisories
- Distance Education
- Course Repetition
- CSU-GE Breadth and IGETC courses
- Graduation, degree, and certificate requirements
- General education requirements

Refining the Authentic Culture of Assessment

The institution currently utilizes TracDat to store Student Learning Assessment Data. Each department is responsible for updating their Student Learning Outcomes each cycle, but there is not consistency across the divisions. There isn't an opportunity to disseminate the strengths and weaknesses outside of program review. The current system does not make it easy for Adjunct Faculty to participate in the process. There is an option to create reports in TracDat, but this feature is not being utilized. Inputting data at the end of each cycle is tedious and does not adequately close the assessment loop.

The Student Learning Assessment Committee is piloting eLumen as an alternative to TracDat. A more practical system will help guide faculty and adjunct faculty in the assessment process. The newly formed Accreditation Task Force is also prioritizing fostering a culture of assessment. One solution is to highlight departments that are demonstrating Student Success through Student Learning Assessment. The Communication Studies Department, The Chemistry Department, The Early Childhood Department, and The Medical Assisting Department have been identified by The Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee.

The Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee is also creating strategies to improve Student Success by encouraging divisions and departments to discuss their assessment strategies during meetings. The Humanities Division piloted a survey that can be used by department coordinators and all faculty to discuss and review all SLOs two times per semester. The pilot [Student Learning Outcome Survey](#) requires faculty to review their current Student Learning Outcomes and to show alignment with [departmental Program Learning Outcomes](#).

The Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee is revising a pragmatic way to assess teaching effectiveness. The Student Learning Outcome Process will be added to the Curriculum Handbook. Currently, the college does not provide tools or examples of effective assessment. The faculty and adjunct faculty may need professional development in understanding effective assessment.

Examples of Improvements on Outcomes Assessment

The institution celebrated an overall campus success rate of 71.13 percent for Fall 2018. Departments that are deficient collaborate with their respective deans to improve their success rates. Departments that are experiencing inadequacies in specific assessments are strategizing plans to implement. For example, English 1A students are collectively scoring 60 percent on the essay portion of the assessment. The English Department is using the assessment data to create additional opportunities like tutoring and preparatory courses in lieu of AB705.

The Communication Studies Department Coordinator and Assessment Coordinator collect the data after each cycle. As a department, they identified the Persuasive Speech Assignment in Coms 020 as a weakness. Students failed to meet the collective 70 percent. The department strategized options to improve the student's success rate in that area. The faculty documented the discussion in the [COMS meeting minutes](#) and discussed how to ameliorate the success rate. Some of the options included adjusting the assessment requirements and instruction, creating a shared rubric, and offering more assistance outside of office hours. [Students are achieving 70 percent or above on the persuasive speech.](#)

[Medical Assisting Students collectively achieved 70 percent in the Spring 2019 Semester.](#) The coordinator has analyzed and made changes to the testing materials. The department has also revised how instructors teach specific concepts. San Jose City College also serves as a testing

site for the Medical Assisting Students. The coordinator has established industry partnerships with Kaiser, Centra, and El Camino.

Student Learning Outcome Assessment in physiology courses revealed two key issues: Lack of material retention over time and a lack of deeper understanding of higher order concepts. The solution was to implement the Flipped Classroom. Instructors reported a 15 percent increase in Exam One Scores and more student engagement.

College Assessment Schedule

The Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee, Distance Education Committee, and the Accreditation Task Force are actively seeking ways to track student success across traditional and distance educational means. Currently, there is not an effective procedure for comparing modalities. Individual departments may be collecting this data, but the data is not being disseminated institutionally. It is important for the committees to gather and utilize this data for AB705 and Guided Pathways Initiatives. The administration is analyzing all programs who are offering distance educational options, so the administration can guide future online program offerings.

The Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee in conjunction with the SJCC Administration discussed the intersectionality of Student Learning Outcome Assessment and equity. The SJCC Program Review Process includes [questions](#) about equity in regards to success rates, retention rates, and graduation rates. The data is disaggregated into categories based on gender and ethnicity.

The Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee identified TracDat utilization as a weakness. The recommendation from the SLOAC is to adopt eLumen as an accessible repository for Student Learning Outcome Data. The SLOAC Coordinator [piloted](#) eLumen with faculty from various divisions. The faculty completed a survey that the SLOAC Coordinator stored and presented to the Academic Senate. Individuals who tested the eLumen software also presented their findings to the Academic Senate. The academic senate will be discussing and potentially voting whether or not to move forward with eLumen.

In the Spring of 2020, the Student Learning Outcomes Committee is working with the Professional Development Committee to provide training on Student Learning Outcome Assessment and alignment with Program Learning Outcomes and Institutional Learning Outcomes. The VPAA office is working collaboratively with the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee and the Professional Development Committee to provide opportunities for training including training for adjunct faculty.

Reflection on Improving Institutional Performance: Institution Set Standards

This section uses [2020 ACCJC Annual Report](#) to discuss the college's trend data on institution-set standards for course completion rate, certificate completion, degrees and transfer. The college's commitment to improving these student achievement outcomes reflect its [mission](#) "to serve our students and the community by offering high quality, relevant, and innovative instruction for basic skills, career pathways, university transfer, and life-long learning."

Floor Institution Set Standards

The discussion of trend data below will be limited, because, at the time of writing this report, FY18/19 data was not available for course completion, certificates and transfer from the data source the college uses Student Success Metric. The college's floor institution-set standards will also be missing for FY18/19 because they are set by taking 90% of the three-year average.

Course Completion Rate

The college has met its institution-set standards for course completion in FY16/17 and FY17/18. The trend indicates that the course completion rate is improving.

Certificates

The college has met its institution-set standards for certificates in FY16/17 and FY17/18. The trend indicates that the certificate completion has decreased. However, the college has maintained its floor standard and looks forward to reviewing the most recent data.

Associate Degrees

The college has met its institution-set standards for associate degrees in the past three years. The three-year trend indicates that the associate degree completion points is increasing.

Transfer

For the transfer metric, the college uses the number of students that earned Associate Degree for Transfer to align with Vision for Success. The college has met its institution-set standards for certificates in FY16/17 and FY17/18. The trend indicates that the transfer number has remained steady.

Table 1: Institution Set Standards for Student Achievement (2020 ACCJC Annual Report)

| | | FY16/17 | FY17/18 | FY18/19 |
|------------------------|--------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Course Completion Rate | Institution-Set Standard | 65% | 65% | N/A |
| | Stretch | N/A | N/A | 74% |
| | Actual | 73% | 74% | N/A |
| Certificates | Institution-Set Standard | 371 | 410 | N/A |
| | Stretch | N/A | N/A | 512 |
| | Actual | 544 | 473 | N/A |
| Associate Degrees | Institution-Set Standard | 422 | 446 | 441 |
| | Stretch | N/A | N/A | 516 |
| | Actual | 468 | 502 | 501 |
| Transfer | Institution-Set Standard | 119 | 146 | N/A |
| | Stretch | N/A | N/A | 186 |
| | Actual | 175 | 172 | N/A |

Stretch Goals

In FY19/20, the college established its stretch goals for the first time in each of the four areas of student achievement for FY18/19 and beyond. The goal setting process began in the [Planning and Institutional Effectiveness](#) committee in Spring 2020. Stretch goals recommended by the [committee](#) were presented to [constituency groups](#) for input and endorsement. The goals will be embedded into the strategic plan to further integrate goals with college activities.

Unfortunately, full evaluation of stretch goals is not possible at this time due to missing FY18/19 data, except for the Associate Degrees metric. For the Associate Degrees metric, the college has not met its stretch goal, but the gap is small (15 more degree completers) and the data is trending upward. The data suggest that the college is on its way to reaching its stretch goal in the future.

Initiatives

Initiatives the college is undertaking to improve its outcomes include: Guided Pathway reform; developmental education reform (AB705); tuition-free program for first-time, full-time students (San José Promise); and Jaguar Commitment and Jaguar Market, which offers additional assistance to students at no cost. With the Guided Pathway initiative, the college has started to map program pathways and organize them under meta-major clusters. Mapping and clustering of pathways will enable students to enter a pathway with more clarity and complete them more efficiently. The developmental education reform, San José Promise Program and Jaguar Market builds on the Guided Pathways reform and work to reduce known barriers to student success. Under the developmental education reform, the college has not only expanded access to transfer-level gateway courses in [Math and English](#) (nearly 80-85% of introductory course offerings in Math and English are transfer-level), but also provided multi-faceted support to students, including co-requisite courses, free textbooks, supplemental instruction.

San José Promise Program builds on an existing cohort- based academic support program (METAS) that specifically targets historically underrepresented students. In addition to covering tuition, the program offers instructional, counseling and peer support to help students transition from high school to college and navigate beyond their first year. The college launched Jaguar Market in Fall 2019 to help alleviate the food insecurities among our students, a factor known to negatively affect student success. Based on the [Real College Survey 2019](#), 51 and 64% of students face food and housing insecurity, respectively.

Informing Constituencies

The Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) committee informs the college constituencies about the institution set standards and how well the college is meeting them via annual oral report in Spring. The report is provided to the [College Advisory Council](#) (CAC), the [Academic Senate](#), the Classified Senate, and the Associated Student Government.

Reporting on Quality Focus Essay

San Jose City College had developed three projects for the Quality Focus Essay prior to the direction of having the QFE focus on student learning and achievement. Therefore, the projects are not focused on improving student learning or achievement. No data points were established in developing the three projects.

Project # 1: Creation of mission-based Decision Making and Operational Manual that serves as a resource for all constituency groups. Improvement of institutional processes and clearer pathways to student success.

The creation of a mission-based decision making, and operational manual was crucial. However, as work began on developing this manual, the changing administration led to multiple starts and stops. However, the manual should be divided into three manuals: Planning and Resource Allocation Manual, Participatory Governance & Decision-Making Manual, and an operation manual. All three manuals may overlap but it is best to keep them separate.

The Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness is responsible for the Participatory Governance Manual in collaboration with the Office of the President and Vice President of Academic Affairs, executive members of constituency groups. The Planning & Resource Allocation Manual is documented by the Finance Committee, with support from Program Review Committee, SLOAC, and Planning & Institutional Effectiveness Committee. Lastly, the operations manual is owned by all managers and supervisors who have policies and procedures across the campus. In the Spring 2020, there is an effort to delineate functions between the college and the district office.

Timeline

| | Planning & Resource Allocation Guide | Participatory Governance & Decision-Making Guide | Operations Guide |
|-------------------------|---|--|--|
| Lead & Key Contributors | VP Administrative Services Finance Committee Program Review Committee Planning & Institutional Effectiveness Committee (PIE) | President VPAA Dean, RPIE Academic Senate Classified Senate Associated Students College Advisory Council (CAC) | Supervisor, Academic Affairs Director, Administrative Services Director, Admissions & Records |

| | | | |
|----------------|--|--|---|
| Key Components | Program Review Process Integrated Planning & Resource Allocation Process Scheduling Consistent reviews of EMP and FMP | Representation in Participatory Governance Guidelines for Generating Consensus College Org Charts Committee Structure Committee Description Sheets | Delineations of functions and forms Students Faculty Classified Professionals “How To” at SJCC |
| Summer 2020 | Virtual Retreat | Drafting | Drafting |
| Fall 2020 | Drafting | Participatory Governance Process: CAC, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Associated Students | Ongoing |
| Spring 2021 | Participatory Governance Process: CAC, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Associated Students Develop review process | Develop review process | Ongoing |

Project #2: Use programming components of the Educational Master Plan to develop architectural framework for implementing the Facilities Master Plan. Synchronize educational and facilities master plan.

In the Spring 2020, the Vice President Academic Affairs is creating an addendum to the Educational Master Plan. This will have a significant impact on the Facilities Master Plan addendum. As the following timelines indicate, the Educational Master Plan and Facilities Master Plan will be synchronized.

Timeline

| | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Expedient (Addendum for 2015) | Educational Master Plan | Facilities Master Plan |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|

| | | |
|-------------|--|--|
| Spring 2020 | Complete addendum Garnering support from college constituency groups | Complete addendum Garnering support from college constituency groups |
| Summer 2020 | Board Approval | Approval |

| | | |
|-------------|--|--|
| Holistic | Educational Master Plan | Facilities Master Plan |
| Fall 2020 | Comprehensive Needs Assessment Develop a Shared Campus Vision | Comprehensive Needs Assessment Develop a Shared Campus Vision |
| Spring 2021 | Develop, Test-fit, & Iterate Options Shared Governance Process | Develop, Test-fit, & Iterate Options Shared Governance Process |

Educational Master Plan will be regularly reviewed by College Advisory Council. In addition, the Facilities Master Plan will be regularly reviewed by Facilities, Safety, and Technology Committee and an update will be given at CAC. Both plans are in the process of being approved within the shared governance process. [The plans will be attached once approved by the college].

Project #3: Creation of a transparent budget allocation model from the District to the College. 100 percent of unused funds from College funds reallocated within the College and not returned to the District.

In consultation with the district office, this is the update on project number 3. This was also highlighted in district recommendation 4.

For the past three years, the district has gone through multiple efforts to review its Resource Allocation Model (RAM) through the empowerment of various participants and shared governance groups. As a basic need District, we are mindful of our responsibility to effectively use our financial resources to achieve our mission, provide financial resources that are sufficient to support student learning programs, and to improve academic quality and institutional effectiveness. Throughout this process the teams have met to discuss and continue to work on the definition of a RAM that will provide flexibility and clarity on how the revenue for the District

will be distributed amongst different entities for its operation and planning while keeping in mind the importance of being financially sustainable and organizational effective.

The RAM has been discussed and presented to the District Budget Committee, District Advisory Council and at multiple Governing Board meetings. During the deliberations we have taken input from different constituency groups, and we also now have received a Performance Audit Report for both the District and District-wide functions and expenses. The information in the report will guide additional discussions on how the allocation of these critical expenses in support of the colleges' operations would need to take place. The RAM now considers different elements including business rules, innovation fund, accountability, base allocation, performance and program-based incentives, process and ongoing expense management. At the May 14, 2019, Governing Board Meeting, the Board was presented a first reading of the draft RAM and recommendations were made during the meeting. On July 8, 2019, the Chancellor met with the Academic Senates to review the RAM and agreement was made to the final adaptations. The final RAM was approved by the Board at its August 27, 2019 meeting. To this end on January 30, 2020, the DC voted to approve the latest version of the framework, which includes an operational task force with full representation of the District's constituency groups, including students. This effort will be led by fiscal officers located at each college as well as the District Office. The collective RAM work will be presented for review to the DC; and, after consultation, it will be submitted as a recommendation for a mutually agreeable decision to be made by the Academic Senates and the Chancellor.

Fiscal Reporting

General Information

| # | Question | Answer |
|----|---|---|
| 1. | Confirm the correct college's report | Confirmed |
| 2. | District Name: | San Jose Evergreen Community College District |
| 3. | a. Name of College Chief Business Officer (CBO) | Marilyn Morikang |
| | b. Title of College CBO | Interim, Vice President of Administrative Services |
| | c. Phone number of College CBO | 408-288-3119 |
| | d. E-mail of College CBO | marilyn.morikang@sjcc.edu |
| | e. Name of District CBO | Jorge Escobar |
| | f. Title of District CBO | Interim Vice Chancellor, Administrative Services |
| | g. Phone number of District CBO | 408-270-6426 |
| | h. E-mail of District CBO | jorge.escobar@sjeccd.edu |

District Data (including single college organizations) Revenue

| | | (Source: Unrestricted General Fund, CCFS 311 Annual, Revenues, Expenditures, and Fund Balance) | | |
|----|---|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| | | FY 16/17 | FY 17/18 | FY 18/19 |
| 4. | a. Total Unrestricted General Fund Revenues | \$ 108,405,881 | \$ 116,972,577 | \$ 134,284,775 |
| | b. Other Unrestricted Financing Sources (Account 8900) | \$ 602,885 | \$ 1,013,091 | \$ 282,459 |
| | | (Source: Unrestricted General Fund, CCFS 311 Annual, Revenues, Expenditures, and Fund Balance) | | |
| | | FY 16/17 | FY 17/18 | FY 18/19 |
| 5. | a. Net (Adjusted) Unrestricted General Fund Beginning Balance | \$ 17,761,833 | \$ 17,417,246 | \$ 17,815,022 |
| | b. Net Unrestricted General Fund Ending Balance, including transfers in/out | \$ 17,389,728 | \$ 17,815,022 | \$ 25,979,329 |

Expenditures/Transfers (General Fund Expenditures/Operating Expenditures)

| | | (Source: Unrestricted General Fund, CCFS 311 Annual, Revenues, Expenditures, and Fund Balance) | | |
|----|--|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| | | FY 16/17 | FY 17/18 | FY 18/19 |
| 6. | a. Total Unrestricted General Fund Expenditures (Including account 7000) | \$ 109,380,871 | \$ 117,587,892 | \$ 126,402,927 |
| | b. Total Unrestricted General Fund Salaries and Benefits (accounts 1000, 2000, 3000) | \$ 92,680,264 | \$ 100,257,485 | \$ 109,843,166 |
| | c. Other Unrestricted General Fund Outgo (6a - 6b) | \$ 16,700,607 | \$ 17,330,407 | \$ 16,559,761 |
| | d. Unrestricted General Fund Ending Balance | \$ 17,389,728 | \$ 17,815,022 | \$ 25,979,329 |

| | | FY 16/17 | FY 17/18 | FY 18/19 |
|-----|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| 7. | Did the District borrow funds for cash flow purposes? | No | No | No |
| 8. | Total Borrowing | | | |
| | a. Short-Term Borrowing (TRANS, etc) | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 |
| | b. Long Term Borrowing (COPs, Capital Leases, other long-term borrowing): | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 |
| 9. | a. Did the district issue long-term debt instruments or other new borrowing (not G.O. bonds) during the fiscal year noted? | No | No | No |
| | b. What type(s) | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | c. Total amount | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 |
| 10. | Debt Service Payments (General Fund/Operations) | \$ 2,441,967 | \$ 2,471,304 | \$ 2,484,380 |

Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEBs)

| | (Source: Most recent GASB 74/75 OPEB Actuarial Report) | FY 18/19 |
|-----|---|---|
| 11. | a. Total OPEB Liability (TOL) for OPEB | \$ 34,383,314 |
| | b. Net OPEB Liability (NOL) for OPEB | \$ -10,596,307 |
| | c. Funded Ratio [Fiduciary Net Position (FNP/TOL)] | 131 % |
| | d. NOL as Percentage of OPEB Payroll | -30 % |
| | e. Service Cost (SC) | \$ 124,454 |
| | f. Amount of Contribution to Annual Service Cost, plus any additional funding of the Net OPEB Liability | \$ 0 |
| 12. | Date of most recent GASB 74/75 OPEB Actuarial Report - use valuation date (mm/dd/yyyy) | 6/30/2019 |
| 13. | a. Has an Irrevocable trust been established for OPEB liabilities? | Yes |
| | b. Amount deposited into OPEB Irrevocable Reserve/Trust | FY 16/17: \$ 0, FY 17/18: \$ 0, FY 18/19: \$ 0 |
| | c. Amount deposited into non-irrevocable Reserve specifically for OPEB | FY 16/17: \$ 0, FY 17/18: \$ 0, FY 18/19: \$ 0 |
| | d. OPEB Irrevocable Trust Balance as of fiscal year end | FY 16/17: \$ 45,726,800, FY 17/18: \$ 44,979,621, FY 18/19: \$ 44,720,185 |

Cash Position

| | | FY 16/17 | FY 17/18 | FY 18/19 |
|-----|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| 14. | Cash Balance at June 30 from Annual CCFS-311 Report (Combined Balance Sheet Total accounts 9100 through 9115) | \$ 29,111,921 | \$ 34,094,038 | \$ 39,220,906 |
| 15. | Does the district prepare cash flow projections during the year? | Yes | | |

Annual Audit Information

| | |
|-----|--|
| 16. | |
|-----|--|

4/29/2020

REVIEW ACCJC Annual Fiscal Report

| | | |
|---|----------|--|
| Date annual audit report for fiscal year was electronically submitted to accjc.org, along with the institution's response to any audit exceptions (mm/dd/yyyy) | | 12/31/2019 |
| <p>NOTE: Audited financial statements are due to the ACCJC no later than 4/3/2020. A multi-college district may submit a single district audit report on behalf of all the colleges in the district.</p> | | |
| Summarize Material Weaknesses and Significant Deficiencies from the annual audit report (enter n/a if not applicable): | | |
| 17. | FY 16/17 | N/A |
| | FY 17/18 | (1) Form 700 not timely filed by one executive staff and two MSC members. (2) Cash collections at SJCC not controlled/documentated with a pre-numbered receipt. Monthly reports not provided to departments for purposes of reconciliation. (3) Office of Academic Support employees have access to add new adjunct employees in Colleague, as well as to input the payroll. |
| | FY 18/19 | (1) Office of Academic Support employees have access to add new adjunct employees in Colleague, as well as to input the payroll. |

Other District Information

| | | | | |
|--|---|----------|----------|----------|
| | | FY 16/17 | FY 17/18 | FY 18/19 |
| 18. | a. Final Adopted Budget – budgeted Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES) (Annual Target) | 11,352 | 11,913 | 12,245 |
| | b. Actual Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES) from Annual CCFS 320 | 11,352 | 11,913 | 12,245 |
| | | FY 16/17 | FY 17/18 | FY 18/19 |
| 19. | Number of FTES shifted into the fiscal year, or out of the fiscal year | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20. a. During the reporting period, did the district settle any contracts with employee bargaining units? | | Yes | | |
| b. Did any negotiations remain open? | | Yes | | |
| c. Describe significant Impacts of settlements. If any negotiations remain open over one year, describe length of negotiations, and issues | | None | | |

College Data

| | | | | |
|---|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 21. | | FY 16/17 | FY 17/18 | FY 18/19 |
| a. Final Adopted Budget – budgeted Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES) (Annual Target) | | 5,098 | 5,399 | 5,492 |
| b. Actual Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES) from Annual CCFS 320 | | 5,098 | 5,399 | 5,492 |
| | | FY 16/17 | FY 17/18 | FY 18/19 |
| 22. | Final Unrestricted General Fund allocation from the District (for Single College Districts, use the number in 4a.) | \$ 41,448,915 | \$ 44,512,343 | \$ 47,140,079 |
| | | FY 16/17 | FY 17/18 | FY 18/19 |
| 23. | Final Unrestricted General Fund Expenditures (for Single College Districts, use the number in 6a.) | \$ 39,578,411 | \$ 44,285,684 | \$ 45,124,141 |
| | | FY 16/17 | FY 17/18 | FY 18/19 |
| 24. | Final Unrestricted General Fund Ending Balance (for Single College Districts, use the number in 6d.) | \$ 17,389,728 | \$ 17,815,022 | \$ 25,979,329 |
| | | FY 16/17 | FY 17/18 | FY 18/19 |
| 25. | What percentage of the Unrestricted General Fund prior year Ending Balance did the District permit the College to carry forward into the next year's budget? | 2 % | 2 % | 3 % |
| 26. | | Cohort Year 2014 | Cohort Year 2015 | Cohort Year 2016 |

| | | | | |
|-----|---|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 26. | USDE official cohort Student Loan Default Rate (FSLD) (3 year rate) | Cohort Year 2014 20 % | Cohort Year 2015 17 % | Cohort Year 2016 21 % |
| 27. | <p>Were there any executive or senior administration leadership changes at the College during the fiscal year, including June 30? List for the College or for Single College District</p> <p>Please describe the leadership change(s)</p> | <p>Yes</p> <p>President: Vacant, effective 7/1/19 (former President, Byron Breland, moved to Chancellor position at District Office) Acting President: Jorge Escobar, effective 7/1/19-12/31/19 Acting President: Roland Montemayor, effective 1/22/19-12/31/19 Acting Vice President, Student Services: Jane Harmon, effective 1/2/19-5/31/19 Acting Vice President, Administrative Services: Marilyn Morikang, effective 3/13/19 Vice President, Academic Affairs: Elizabeth Pratt, effective 2/20/19</p> | | |

Appendix A: Acronyms

CAC: College Advisory Council

CCCCO: California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office

DC: District Council

DBC: District Budget Council

FAST: Facilities and Safety Technology Committee

IPCC: Instructional Policies & Curriculum Committee

PIE: Planning & Institutional Effectiveness Committee

RPIE: Research, Planning, & Institutional Effectiveness

SLOAC: Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee