January 31, 2007

Dr. Patricia Hsieh
President
San Diego Miramar College
10440 Black Mountain Road
San Diego, CA 92126

Dear President Hsieh:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting on January 10-12, 2007, reviewed the Progress Report submitted by the college. The Commission took action to accept the report, with a requirement that the college complete a Focused Midterm Report.

All colleges are required to file a Midterm Report in the third year after each comprehensive evaluation. Midterm Reports indicate progress toward meeting the evaluation team's recommendations and forecast where the college expects to be by the time of the next comprehensive evaluation. The Midterm Report also includes a summary of progress on college-identified plans for improvement as expressed in the self study report. A Focused Midterm Report is a midterm report which must give evidence of progress on recommendations selected for emphasis by the Commission.

San Diego Miramar College should submit the Focused Midterm Report by **October 15, 2007**. The Focused Midterm Report should address all the team's recommendations with special emphasis on the concerns as noted below:

Recommendation 5: The college should focus on implement initiatives to ensure that faculty and staff increasingly reflect the diversity of their student body. (Standard III.A.4.a,b)

Recommendation 7: The college work with the district to implement a district-wide strategic plan that integrates with the college's vision, mission, and strategic plan. (Standards IV.B.1, B.1.b

In addition, the Commission requests San Diego Miramar College submit concrete evidence that the program review process has been implemented and used.

The Progress Report will become part of the accreditation history of the college and should be used in preparing for the next comprehensive evaluation. The Commission requires that you give the report and this letter appropriate dissemination to your college staff and to those who were signatories of your college report. This group should include the Chancellor, campus leadership and, the Board of Trustees. The Commission also requires that all reports be made available to students and the public. Placing copies in the college library can accomplish this.

On behalf of the Commission, I wish to express continuing interest in the institution's educational programs and services. Professional self-regulation is the most effective means of assuring integrity, effectiveness and quality.

Sincerely,

Barbara A. Beno, Ph.D.
President

BAB/tl

cc: Dr. Constance M. Carroll, Chancellor, San Diego CCD
       Mr. Peter White, Accreditation Liaison Officer
       Board President, San Diego CCD

Enclosure

December 17, 2007

Mr. Ron Manzoni
Vice President of Instruction
San Diego City College
1313 Park Blvd.
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Mr. Manzoni:

This letter will confirm our conversation about holding a Self Study Workshop for the Colleges of the San Diego Community College District on **Friday, March 14, 2008**. Dr. Terrance Burgess has agreed to extend the invitation to the CEOs of the other institutions within your district to attend on that day. Your institution will serve as the host campus.

The meeting will be a kickoff for colleges about to undertake their self study process leading to the Self Study Report. Typically, the institution's ALO, Committee and Sub Committee Chairs, and Self Study Editor should attend. The intent is not to train every individual who will ultimately participate in the college's self study, but to train a core of approximately 12 faculty and administrators who will then serve as resource persons on campus and assist the others who will participate in the process.

Approximately 35 individuals are expected to attend the all day workshop that begins at 9:00 a.m. and lasts through 3:00 p.m. We will need the following:

- ✓ A room that can accommodate up to 40 individuals, available from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. and which is suitable for viewing a PowerPoint presentation and for notetaking.
- ✓ A laptop computer capable of playing a PowerPoint presentation from memory stick.
- ✓ A projector and screen.
- ✓ Permission to send you a box of handouts and manuals ahead of the workshop to be distributed on that day.

You have graciously offered to provide coffee, juice and pastry set up at 8:30 a.m. and lunch at 12:00.

Over the past five years, the role of the Accreditation Commission has changed significantly due in large part to pressures from the Department of Education calling into question the efficacy and accountability of regional accrediting bodies. In California some significant changes include:

■Districtwide accreditation visits (not a new theme)

■Emphasis and Directives-

Standards and Not Aspirations- We cannot say that we are working on an area of have plans to improve in an area. We must "meet or exceed the standard."

The two-year rule – A recent letter from the Commission made it clear that a two-year rule is in effect within which colleges deemed out of compliance must rectify their standing. Failing to come into compliance will trigger immediate sanctions or loss of accreditation.

In November, Dr. Beno noted that the Department of Education will make determinations regarding financial aid eligibility based on whether or not courses and programs of study appear on the use at courses and programs that have been approved through the accrediting process.

■**Four Standards**
- **Six Themes**
  - Three areas of emphasis – In each case specific rubrics have been issued to let us know how we would rank based on our self study. It is important to note that these three areas of emphasis must be supported by evidence of their implementation across all standards (see attached document).

    1. Institutional Effectiveness
    2. Program Review- Significantly different from prior years

       i. Programs are defined as a series of courses or experiences that lead to a degree or certificate hence the traditional program review by discipline no longer applies. In particular General Education is now considered a

program and must be subject to the program review process.

ii.   Program Review now **extends to Student Services (not new) AND Administrative Services at both the college and District level.** A mapping of an organizational structure of administrative service delivery will no longer suffice. We must utilize the program review process to make our case.

3. Student Learning Objectives

Timelines

- Error in scheduling. Originally City and Mesa had scheduled visits for Spring 2010 while Miramar had Fall 2010. This discrepancy has been brought up to the Commission and they have rectified the error. **We are all now scheduled for Fall 2010.**
- A timeline that works backward from this date is necessary to ensure that:
- College self study processes are completed in tandem
- District self study requirements are aligned
- Board of Trustees presentations are scheduled to permit time for review, revision and approval as necessary (May/June 2010)

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

Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part I: Program Review
(See attached instructions on how to use this rubric.)

Levels of Implementation	Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Program Review *(Sample institutional behaviors)*
Awareness	• There is preliminary investigative dialogue at the institution or within some departments about what data or process should be used for program review. • There is recognition of existing practices and models in program review that make use of institutional research. • There is exploration of program review models by various departments or individuals. • The college is implementing pilot program review models in a few programs/operational units.
Development	• Program review is embedded in practice across the institution using qualitative and quantitative data to improve program effectiveness. • Dialogue about the results of program review is evident within the program as part of discussion of program effectiveness. • Leadership groups throughout the institution accept responsibility for program review framework development (Senate, Admin. Etc.) • Appropriate resources are allocated to conducting program review of meaningful quality. • Development of a framework for linking results of program review to planning for improvement. • Development of a framework to align results of program review to resource allocation.
Proficiency	• Program review processes are in place and implemented regularly. • Results of all program review are integrated into institution- wide planning for improvement and informed decision-making. • The program review framework is established and implemented. • Dialogue about the results of all program reviews is evident throughout the institution as part of discussion of institutional effectiveness. • Results of program review are clearly and consistently linked to institutional planning processes and resource allocation processes; college can demonstrate or provide specific examples. • The institution evaluates the effectiveness of its program review processes in supporting and improving student achievement and student learning outcomes.
Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement	• Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement. • The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness. • The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning.

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

Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part II: Planning
(See attached instructions on how to use this rubric.)

Levels of Implementation	Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Planning *(Sample institutional behaviors)*
Awareness	• The college has preliminary investigative dialogue about planning processes. • There is recognition of case need for quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in planning. • The college has initiated pilot projects and efforts in developing systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning and implementation (e.g. in human or physical resources). • Planning found in only some areas of college operations. • There is exploration of models and definitions and issues related to planning. • There is minimal linkage between plans and a resource allocation process, perhaps planning for use of "new money" • The college may have a consultant-supported plan for facilities, or a strategic plan.
Development	• The Institution has defined a planning process and assigned responsibility for implementing it. • The Institution has identified quantitative and qualitative data and is using it. • Planning efforts are specifically linked to institutional mission and goals. • The Institution uses applicable quantitative data to improve institutional effectiveness in some areas of operation. • Governance and decision-making processes incorporate review of institutional effectiveness in mission and plans for improvement. • Planning processes reflect the participation of a broad constituent base.
Proficiency	• The college has a well documented, ongoing process for evaluating itself in all areas of operation, analyzing and publishing the results and planning and implementing improvements. • The institution's component plans are integrated into a comprehensive plan to achieve broad educational purposes, and improve institutional effectiveness. • The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes. • The college has documented assessment results and communicated matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies (documents data and analysis of achievement of its educational mission). • The institution assesses progress toward achieving its education goals over time (uses longitudinal data and analyses). • The institution plans and effectively incorporates results of program review in all areas of educational services: instruction, support services, library and learning resources. • Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement.
Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement	• The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning. • There is dialogue about institutional effectiveness that is ongoing, robust and pervasive; data and analyses are widely distributed and used throughout the institution. • There is ongoing review and adaptation of evaluation and planning processes. • There is consistent and continuous commitment to improving student learning; and educational effectiveness is a demonstrable priority in all planning structures and processes.

·Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part III: Student Learning Outcomes
(See attached instructions on how to use this rubric.)

Levels of Implementation	Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Student Learning Outcomes *(Sample institutional behaviors)*
Awareness	• There is preliminary, investigative dialogue about student learning outcomes. • There is recognition of existing practices such as course objectives and how they relate to student learning outcomes. • There is exploration of models, definitions, and issues taking place by a few people. • Pilot projects and efforts may be in progress. • The college has discussed whether to define student learning outcomes at the level of some courses or programs or degrees; where to begin.
Development	• College has established an institutional framework for definition of student learning outcomes (where to start), how to extend, and timeline. • College has established authentic assessment strategies for assessing student learning outcomes as appropriate to intended course, program, and degree learning outcomes. • Existing organizational structures (e.g. Senate, Curriculum Committee) are supporting strategies for student learning outcomes definition and assessment. • Leadership groups (e.g. Academic Senate and administration), have accepted responsibility for student learning outcomes implementation. • Appropriate resources are being allocated to support student learning outcomes and assessment. • Faculty and staff are fully engaged in student learning outcomes development.
Proficiency	• Student learning outcomes and authentic assessment are in place for courses, programs and degrees. • Results of assessment are being used for improvement and further alignment of institution-wide practices. • There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results. • Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward improving student learning. • Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned. • Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed on a regular basis. • Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes. • Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled.
Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement	• Student learning outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic and used for continuous quality improvement. • Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive and robust. • Evaluation and fine-tuning of organizational structures to support student learning is ongoing. • Student learning improvement is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the college. • Learning outcomes are specifically linked to program reviews.

JP;DB: cg 8/2007