External Evaluation Report

San Joaquin Valley College

801 South Akers Street, Suite 150

Visalia, California 93277

A confidential report prepared for

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited San Joaquin Valley College from March 11-14, 2013

Dr. Steven M. Kinsella, CPA

Team Chair

Evaluation Team Roster

Dr. Steven Kinsella (Chair)
Superintendent/President
Gavilan College

Ms. Angie Oropeza (Assistant)
Executive Administrative Assistant
Gavilan College

Mr. Marc Beam
Director of Research and Planning
Shasta College

Dr. Rachel Mayo
Dean of Education Centers
Cabrillo College

Dr. Doug Achterman
Head Librarian
Gavilan College

Mr. Edralin Maduli
Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services
West Valley-Mission CCD

Ms. Lurelean Gaines
Chairperson, Department of Nursing
East Los Angles College

Ms. Kimberly Schenk
Dean Career/Technical Ed;& Econ. Development
Diablo Valley College

Dr. Alfred Hochstaedter
Faculty Member - Earth Sciences
Monterey Peninsula College

Dr. Melinda Womack
Professor, Communication
Santiago Canyon College

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION REPORT

INSTITUTION: San Joaquin Valley College

DATES OF VISIT: March 11, 2013 through March 14, 2013

TEAM CHAIR: Dr. Steven M. Kinsella, CPA, Superintendent/President Gavilan
                   Joint Community College District

A 10- member accreditation team visited San Joaquin Valley College for the purpose of evaluating how well the institution is achieving its stated purposes, analyzing how well the college is meeting the Commission's standards, providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement, and submitting recommendations to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the accreditation status of the college.

In preparation for the visit, team members attended an all-day training session on February 4, 2013 conducted by the Commission's staff. Team members prepared two preliminary assignments intended to familiarize team members with the College's Self Evaluation report prior to arriving at the College. Team members used Commission evaluation guides to assist them in identifying and reviewing appropriate evidence that needed to be examined during the visit. Team members studied commission materials, identified questions to ask cognizant personal during upcoming interviews and identified work that needed to be completed by team members when visiting the campus sites in California to ensure appropriate evidence was assessed to allow the team to conclude the College's compliance with Commission Standards. The team was divided into four committees, one for each of the standards.

Team members received the Self-Evaluation report about 30 days before the visit. Normally, teams receive Self Evaluation reports approximately 45 days prior to a site visit. The team was pleased to find the College had completed a comprehensive report that was appropriately supported by evidence and cross referenced to the electronic evidence files included with the report. Team members agreed the report was complete, concise, and used data in support of its assertions. Taken as a whole the San Joaquin Valley College Self Evaluation Report was considered complete and commends the College for the report's design, thoroughness, professional presentation and its usefulness as a tool the Evaluation Team could use to assess the College's compliance with Commission Standards.

March 11, 2013 was used by the team members to conduct interviews and site visits on the campus sites where at least 50% of an educational program of the College was offered. The following sites were visited by team members on March 11, 2013 as they traveled from their personal residences to Visalia, California, the home of the corporate offices of San Joaquin Valley College:

        Modesto   Hanford

Hesperia   Bakersfield
Fresno   Fresno-Aviation
Rancho Cordova   Rancho Cucamonga
Temecula

During the course of the visit, team members met with faculty, staff, administrators, members of the Board of Governors, and students. Two open forums were held to allow college community members an opportunity to meet with the Team Chair. Over the course of the two forums there were approximately twenty people in attendance, most of whom were employees and students of the college. The open forums were uneventful.

Recommendation of the 2013 Visiting Team

<u>Recommendation # 1 – 2013 Library and Learning Support Services</u>
In order to meet the Standards and to more effectively support the quality of its
instructional programs with its library collections, the team recommends that the college
create and implement a library resources development plan in order to increase the
quantity, depth, and variety of library resources (IIC.1.a).

In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the staff provide ongoing
instruction to users of library services so that students are able to develop skills in
information competency. The team further recommends that the college establish a
training program for all library personnel in the fundamental principles of information
competency (II.C.1.b).

In order to meet the Standards the team recommends that the College increase equitable
access to library materials and services regardless of their location or means of delivery
(IIC.1.c). The team further recommends that the college create a written process that
facilitates the sharing of library resources among campuses and provide a means for
students and staff to access the library catalogs of each campus (II.C.1.c).

Eligibility Requirements for Accreditation

1. **Authority.** San Joaquin Valley College is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) is a regional accrediting commission authorized to operate by the U.S. Department of Education through the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008. (ACCJC website: www.accjc.org). San Joaquin Valley College received initial accreditation in 1995. It is authorized to award Associate of Science Degrees and Certificates of Completion.

   SVJC is recognized as exempt by the California Bureau for Private Postsecondary by virtue of its institutional accreditation by ACCJC-WASC. San Joaquin Valley College is a California corporation

2. **Mission.** The SJVC mission statement reads in part: " to prepare graduates for professional success in business, medical and technical career fields". The mission statement's career technical education is an acceptable focus at the community college level. The mission statement also refers to "a balance of hands-on training and academic instruction" thereby adding a general education requirement common for Associate Degree programs of study. Additionally, the mission statement identifies that the College is committed to student learning and in providing for the educational and employment needs of the communities it serves. The Board of Governors of SJVC approved this mission statement in July 2008 and has reviewed it for continued applicability several times leading up to the date of the Self Evaluation Report (2013). The College meets the Mission eligibility requirement of the Standards.

3. **Governing Board.** The Board of Governors is an eight member body that includes six independent members representing community interests and two members; the President and Chief Executive Officer, representing the owners' interests. The six community members do not have an employment, family, or ownership interest in the institution. The Governing Board is an independent body whose actions are final and not subject to the review or approval of another entity. The President and CEO have terms that do not expire but also are not allowed to serve as the Chair of the Board of Governors. Six board members have three-year terms that can be renewed for a total of three times for a maximum amount of service time of nine years.

   Governing Board members agree to comply with the College's Conflict of Interest Code and a Code of Ethics. Board members are active in Committees of the Board and participate in board development activities including receiving training on board member participation in the college's preparation of the Self Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness for Reaffirmation of Accreditation. The college meets the Governing Board eligibility requirement of the Standards.

4. **Chief Executive Officer.** The College's two key leaders are Mark and Michael Perry. Mr. Mark Perry is the President of the College and Mr. Michael Perry is the Chief Executive Officer. Mark and Michael Perry both dedicate their full-time efforts to the institution and have been duly appointed by the Governing Board. They are both vested with the authority to administer board policies. As stated under Eligibility Requirement #3 – Governing Board, neither Michael nor Mark are eligible to serve as the Chair of the Board of Governors. The College meets the Chief Executive Officer Eligibility Requirement of the Standards.

5. **Administrative Capacity.** The organizational charts provided in the Self Evaluation Report for San Joaquin Valley College provide a detailed list of the administrators and their assignments. Interviews were conducted with the majority of the administrators during the evaluation team's visit. The College is well staffed with adequate administrative capacity to support the programs of study and the mission of the College. SJVC meets the Eligibility Requirement for Administrative Capacity of the Standards.

6. **Operational Status.** Evaluation Team members conducted site evaluations and held interviews with College faculty, staff, and students at all operating sites with the exception of the Lancaster campus and the San Diego Campus. The San Diego campus was not scheduled to open for students until April 2013; a month after the Evaluation Team's visit. The Lancaster campus had been reported by Commission staff as having been part of a Commission visit in the past twelve months and the Evaluation Team did not need to expend resources to review that location. At each of the sites specifically listed in the body of this report, the College campus was operational and students were attending classes. The College meets this Eligibility Requirement of the Standards.

7. **Degrees.** SJVC offers 27 Associate of Science degree programs and ten Certificates of Completion. The College reports that 81% of enrolled students in 2011 were pursuing Associate of Science degrees. The remaining 19% of students were pursuing a Certificate of Completion. The career programs and degrees and certificates offered are included in the College's catalog. The College meets this Eligibility Requirement of the Standards.

8. **Educational Programs**. SJVC educational programs are predominately Associate of Science degree oriented. Those programs not leading to an AS degree have a Certificate of Completion as the indicator of academic accomplishment. The programs are career oriented with student learning skills necessary for employment in business, medical, and professional service areas consistent with the Mission of the College. The College meets this requirement of the Eligibility Requirements.

9. **Academic Credit.** SJVC awards academic credit hours expressed using an hour of instruction being awarded based on students achieving student learning outcomes and coursework complete both inside and outside the classroom. An hour is defined as being equivalent to: 1) Fifteen hours of lecture/direct faculty instruction and 30 hours

of outside of the classroom work, or 2) Thirty hours of lab/application and 15 hours of outside of class learning or 3) Forty-five hours of clinical experience or externship in a course. The College references these standard calculations for an hour of instruction as being consistent with the United States Code of Federal Regulations Section 600.2 that stipulates the requirements for award of credit hour of academic instruction. The College's catalog includes this definition when calculating an academic credit hour of instruction. This method is consistent with the calculation of academic credit hour for institutions of higher education and meets the Eligibility Requirement for Academic Credit of the Accreditation Standards of the ACCJC.

10. **Student Learning and Achievement.** SJVC defines learning outcomes at the institutional, the program, and at the course level. Learning outcomes for the institutional, program and course level are included in the College catalog which is also available on-line. Course level learning outcomes are included on course syllabi and course outlines. Learning outcomes for non-instructional areas such as student services and administrative services are published on the College's website.

   Structured formal reviews of each of the associate degree programs and its corresponding general education curriculum occur every two years. The review includes an assessment of the program's educational effectiveness using student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional level. Student achievement data including retention rates, graduate rates, placement rates, and licensure examination pass rates is also used as part of the assessment review. The product of the review is a program review report that includes findings and recommended plans for improvement of areas showing a need for changes that are intended to improve student achievement.   The College meets this requirement of the Eligibility Requirements of the Standards.

11. **General Education.** SJVC has made changes in its general education component of the Associate of Science degrees to address previously reported ACCJC concerns about the "well-rounded" educational provided to students in the predominately career technical degrees offered by the College. In making changes to General Education area of degrees, the College has decided that eight general education courses totaling 24 units of credit instruction provide adequate exposure to the major areas of general education that include language, mathematics, natural sciences, humanities, and social sciences.

   The evaluation team confirmed that the CSU system has accepted SJVC courses in general education areas of study as equivalent to CSU courses. Based on the acceptance of SJVC's courses as equivalent to undergraduate credit courses accepted for a baccalaureate degree program at CSU, a conclusion can be drawn that the College meets the General Education Eligibility Requirement of the Standards. Using the external independent analysis of course work conducted by CSU in order for it to grant college credit for SJVC GE courses, it can be concluded that SJVC meets the Eligibility Requirements of General Education of the ACCJC Standards.

12. **Academic Freedom.** Faculty members and students are free to express their ideas freely within the boundaries of academic disciplines of the faculty. An environment exists where students and faculty are encouraged to engage in dialog about matters with the only constraints being good taste and socially established standards. The College meets this Eligibility Requirement of the Standards.

13. **Faculty.** SJVC reports a substantial number of full-time faculty in support of the core academic programs and support services of the College. As of November 1, 2011, the College had 295 full-time and 332 part-time faculty members employed in support of the programs of the College. In the team's opinion, there is adequate faculty with responsibility for instruction, development and review of curriculum and to assess student learning to meet this Eligibility Requirement of the Standards.

14. **Student Services.** At all sites visited by the Evaluation Team on March 11, 2013, team members found ample universal support for all students with an appropriate level of student services that offers excellent levels of support to encourage and develop student learning within the context of the Mission of SJVC. The College meets this Eligibility Requirement of the Standards.

15. **Admissions.** San Joaquin Valley College has an open admissions policy but to help ensure students are making correct choices about academic course work, students complete assessments and orientations to match each student with the right support services so students are knowledgeable of the skills they need to acquire before they can pursue occupational course work. This preliminary assessment and orientation process assists in informing prospective students of what they can expect when they enroll and is one factor of full disclosure that informs students of the cost of their educational program. The College meets this Eligibility Requirement of the Standards.

16. **Information and Learning Resources.** SJVC has invested substantial resources into data systems. Data bases that can be accessed throughout the geographic territory served by college campuses and teach faculty, staff, and students how to access these resources for use in instruction and student areas of interest including academic degree programs that are required for entry into professional vocational occupations. The College meets this Eligibility Requirement of the Standards.

17. **Financial Resources.** The campuses of San Joaquin Valley College develop program plans and request necessary resources to provide all necessary support for students to be successful as they pursue their educational objectives. In Standard III of this report, the team describes how the President and Chief Executive Officer ensure resources requested by faculty and administrators are provided to support students, faculty, and staff to ensure resources are provided in abundance so students have every opportunity to succeed. The Board of Governors approves the College's budget. The College has ample reserves well in excess of the 5% of unrestricted fund expenditures required by the Commission ~~Standards~~. Based on all available

information regarding the financial condition of SJVC it is the Team's opinion that the College meets the Financial Resources Eligibility Requirement of the Standards.

18. **Financial Accountability**. San Joaquin Valley College is audited annually by a Certified Public Accountant with the results of audits submitted to the Department of Education, the ACCJC and other agencies as required of all for-profit private colleges. The Commission provided the Team with annual financial reports prior to the Team's on-site evaluation of the College. Based on audit reports of independent Certified Public Accountants and other financial information reviewed by the Team, the College meets this Eligibility Requirement of the Standards.

19. **Institutional Planning and Evaluation.** The College systematically evaluates and makes public its student learning outcomes and program accomplishments. This evaluation process has led to improvements in planning and program review processes. The recently revision mission and the use of a Balanced Scorecard Method for development of strategic goals and objectives provides the College with a useful tool to complete data support decision making that is embraced by college personnel. The Balance Scorecard method provides timely, useful and accurate information that is available to set strategic directions and develop plans for implementation of strategies. The management information systems gather an abundance of data that is used to evaluate the effectiveness of implemented activities. The Program Review process assures that programs regularly and systematically evaluate their operations and align them with strategic/institutional goals. The results of planning and program review processes are widely available to the college and used by the governance system for resource allocation processes and improvement of the college. The College meets this Eligibility Requirement of the Standards.

20. **Public Information.** The College provides numerous venues for providing its constituencies with precise, accurate and current information. The College provides accurate information to the communities it serves. The career oriented focus of the College is a major theme when the College advertises its programs. This informs prospective students and prospective employers that San Joaquin Valley College is focused on preparing students for entry into professional jobs that requires highly specialized training. The College meets this Eligibility Requirement of the Standards.

21. **Relations with the Accrediting Commission.** San Joaquin Valley College advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies including the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. It complies with Accrediting Commission standards, policies, and guidelines, and Commission requirements for public disclosure, self-study and other reports, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes when necessary. The institution moves expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission. The College meets this Eligibility Requirement of the Standards.

Conclusions

Upon thorough review of the conditions surrounding the 21 required minimum eligibility standards necessary for accreditation the team concludes that San Joaquin Valley College meets the eligibility requirements as a necessary condition for accreditation.

Response to the Previous Team's Recommendations

Recommendation # 1

The College shall establish a written policy defining a cyclical pattern for developing the mission statement that is more inclusive for all constituencies and focuses on the perceived mission as articulated by the campus centers. [Standard IA.1, IA.3]

Reference to the March 2008 Progress Report (p. 89) indicates that the Governing Board adopted a bylaw for college-wide review of the mission every two years, and reviews were conducted April 2008, 2010, and Nov 2011 as noted in the institutional self-study survey and confirmed by team members while on site. The Mission was rewritten and published July 2008. The Governing Board reaffirmed the Mission statement again in Sept 2012 (p. 90) along with adopting Board Policy 7 (listed in evidence) which changed the mission review period from two years to three years. Board Policy 6 was also approved by the Board of Governors which stipulates that review of the College Mission include a review and analysis of institutional effectiveness data. The response is complete and refers to recent data and fully implements Recommendation # 1.

Recommendation # 2.
The College needs to expand the Master Plan to clarify how the institution's mission is central to institutional planning, decision making, and budget allocation. [Standard IA.4, IB.3, IB.4, IIA.2.f.]

Reference to the 2010 Focused Mid-term Report (p. 91) confirms that every goal and objective is aligned with the College mission; that each objective is updated with budget information, and that the report describes how each of the Master Plan's seven Critical Issues is related to mission. Procedural changes include formalized criteria and procedures for adding and removing items from Master Plan and a review and discussion of the Plan every 5-10 weeks at Senior Management/Campus Director meetings.

The second evaluation of the 2007 Master Plan "to ensure proper alignment between the mission and institutional goals and objectives" led to revisions, and the new Master Plan document was published to College community in spring 2010.

The new system for institutional planning is tied to an outcomes-based model. The Kaplan-Norton strategy management system involves a strategy map and scorecard to monitor and measure performance related to achieving institutional vision. There is a regular review and assessment of institutional data for adjustments to strategic initiatives (development and funding). Templates for program and department assessment plans "require stakeholders to describe how their program or department contributes to college mission and values." Program review reports are reviewed by the Senior Management

team, which approves proposals based on rationale and "the degree to which the change will contribute to the fulfillment of the mission and vision." This ensures that "college constituencies are continually reflecting upon program and department performance in relation to the mission and have a better understanding of the centrality of the mission to decision-making, planning, and resource allocation."

The response is complete and refers to recent data and fully implements changes that were included in Recommendation # 2.

Recommendation #3
The College needs to move implementation of student learning outcomes to the next level. The College needs to clearly identify student learning outcomes for its courses, programs and degrees, develop appropriate and authentic assessments of learning and use the results of assessment to plan and improve institutional quality. There is little evidence of program or institutional-level SLO's. Progress needs to continue in the development of course-level SLO's and student services SLO's that are fully integrated into institutional planning (II.A, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.h, II.A.2.i).

The SLO Implementation Plan was launched in 2008 in three phases: identification, objective assessment examinations and in fall 2010, SLO assessments. Assessment Coordinators (a faculty-based Assessment Learning Community) work with department faculty to develop electronic SLO assessments for courses and programs (CLOs and PLOs) and create a repository of data.

January 2011 the College transitioned to an outcomes-based review process for instructional programs. Non-instructional and administrative departments followed an instructional model and created assessment plans and reviews by December 2012. The culture of assessment is promoted by using documented outcome assessment data to identify and plan improvements to academic programs and students and employee support services. Action items arising out of SLO assessment data in 2011 produced eight course improvement proposals, nine purchase proposals and 12 textbook proposals.

The College has fully implemented changes to meet the requirements noted in Recommendation # 3.

Recommendation #4
College needs to evaluate its decision to eliminate its developmental course program and substitute and advisory-only tutorial program by developing and implementing an assessment of the impact of this change on student performance. (Standards IIA.1.a, II.A.1.b,IIA.2.d, IIB, IIB.1, IIB.3, IIB.3.e, II.B.4)

From inception of the program in fall 2006, The College has implemented ongoing assessment by monitoring students' completion of their study plans in relation to their Mathematics and English course pass rates. The Mathematics and English pass rates

before and after implementation of the study plan program were compared on a campus-by-campus basis.

The November 2007 progress report prepared by the College and a corresponding evaluation of the College's response by a team from the Commission conducted in April 2008 resulted in the Commission making two additional recommendations to the College. The Commission's evaluation team's concluded that the College had fully addressed Recommendation #4 and that the College had made substantial progress in addressing the recommendations of the November 2007 progress report/visiting team. Data analyses showed that a significant increase in the number of students completing their study plans was occurring in addition to College students showing improvements in Mathematics and English pass rates.

The College defines and incorporates into all of its degree programs a substantial component of general education designed to ensure breadth of knowledge and promote intellectual inquiry. The general education component includes demonstrated competence in writing and computational skills and an introduction to some of the major areas of knowledge. General education has comprehensive learning outcomes for the students who complete it. Degree credit of general education programs must be consistent with levels of quality and rigor appropriate to higher education.

The College has fully implemented changes identified by Recommendation # 4.

Recommendation #5
The College needs to finalize planning and budget costs in the Master Plan and consider a process for disseminating information on major goals and budget information down to the campus centers. (IIID.2.b.)

SJVC addressed this recommendation with the implementation of the new institutional plan and the Balanced Scorecard method of Strategic Plan development and implementation. In 2011, SJVC created a new Strategic Master Plan. Under this new planning methodology, the planning documents are the "Strategy Map" which provides a visual depiction of the linear objectives required to achieve SJVC's vision and goals, and the institutional scorecard, which is used to measure SJVC's progress toward its strategic objectives and vision. The strategy map has three objectives with targets by December 2013, 2014, and 2015. The primary institutional goals are to increase graduation rates, job placement rates, and increase the number of students.

In 2013 the campuses started developing their own scorecards, with campus specific initiatives. Each strategic initiative contains information related to the duration of the project, responsible parties, and budget allocations necessary to implement strategic initiatives identified using the Balanced Scorecard approach. Reports are available across the institution via a web portal, InfoZone and the Report Dashboard Library.

The changes made by the College to disseminate information to the College Campuses using the report distribution methods described above meets the requirements of Standard III.2.d. The College has fully implemented this recommendation.

Recommendation # 6.
The administration and the Board of Governors need to complete its revision of the Handbook and Board Bylaws to incorporate a policy for handling violations of the Board of Governors Code of Ethics and to further clarify the evaluation procedures for the Board of Governors members. (Standard IVB.1.g, IVB.1.h).

The Board of Governors conducts an annual review of the Board. Forms used for the review of the President and the Chief Executive Officer were available as were completed evaluations for both individuals holding those positions. Self-evaluations prepared by each of the Board members were reviewed by the team. Additionally, each of the Board members completes an evaluation of the President and of the Chief Executive Officer. The Self Evaluation process used by the Board is prescribed in the Board of Governors Handbook, Article 4.10.12. (IV.B.1.g)

The annual reviews of the board, the president, and the chief executive officer are conducted through the use of a form that is completed by each member of the board. Each question on the form asks the evaluator to rank each of the criteria identified as evaluation areas. The scale is a standard 1 to 5 scale. There is also an area for additional comments on each form although that area did not include more than one or perhaps two sentences and comments on the forms evaluated by the team. This methodology of the evaluation satisfies the requirements of the standards and appears to meet the needs of the college. (IV.B.1.g)

Article 4.11 of the Board of Governors Handbook requires Board Members accept responsibility for the ethical integrity of the College and that they be role models in the practice of ethical conduct and behavior while serving as a member of the governing board. The Code of Ethics is included in the Handbook and includes instructions on what action is required should a Board Member be accused of unethical behavior. The board has not encountered a situation that would constitute a violation of the code of ethics and accordingly has not had to use the section on the code dealing with actions should a board member be accused of an ethics code violation. (IV.B.1.h)

Changes made in Board Policy incorporated into the Board of Governors' Handbook describes the policy in place to address any concerns the may arise from a violation of the Code of Ethics and therefore satisfies the requirements of Recommendation # 6 as stated above. The process currently used by the Board of Governors to evaluate the performance of the Board is also included in the Board of Governors' Handbook. Both elements of Recommendation # 6 are now fully implemented and Recommendation # 6 has been implemented as described.

Recommendation # 7.

The owners and the Board of Governors need to revise the Board Policy to include objective, third party persons with some fiscal expertise who are assigned responsibility for receipt and review of the annual audit to meet compliance with this Governing Board standard. (Eligibility Requirements 3, 4 and Standard IV.B.1, IVB.1.c, IVB.1.j).

The Board of Governors includes two members from the Board of Directors who act as representatives of the owners of the college. Six additional Board of Governor members are appointed to the Board to represent the interests of the community-at-large. The Board has a number of key responsibilities including setting policies for the College and for hiring the Chief Executive Officer who is expected to have sufficient delegated authority to operate the College in a manner that ensures the quality, integrity and effectiveness of student learning programs is maintained at a high level. Additionally, the Board oversees the financial operations of the College to ensure it is financial sound and stable and has adequate financial resources available to maintain high quality instructional programs (IV.B.1).

SJVC defines the role of the Governing Board in the following statement extracted from the Board of Governor's Handbook revised in November 2012:

> "The Board represents the interests of students, the business communities served by the College, and the public-at-large and is responsible for ensuring SJVC's educational quality, financial stability, ethical integrity, and the fulfillment of its mission. The Board fulfills these responsibilities by setting institutional policies and delegating authority to implement said policies to the President and Chief Executive Officer. The Board also endows the President and Chief Executive Officer with responsibility for the pursuit of the college mission." (IV.B.1.c)

Actions taken by the Board of Governors are final and not subject to review or approval by another entity. The Board is an independent entity that is responsible for all aspects of the operations of the College (IV.B.1.c.)

The President and Chief Executive Officer are co-owners of SJVC. The Board of Directors, representing the ownership interest of the College, are responsible for making recommendations to the Board of Governors on appointments or on recommendations to remove the President or Chief Executive Officer. Authority for day -to-day operations has been delegated to the President and the Chief Executive Officer as described in the Board of Governors Handbook. The Board is active in planning activities of the College and participates in setting expectations for institutional performance. Reports are regularly submitted to the Board of Governors using the College's Balanced Scorecard and dashboard indicators that provide reliable and accurate information about the performance of the College's operations. Based on interviews with members of the Board of Governors, reports provided to the Board are adequate in keeping the Board informed

of the College's progress on accomplishing goals and objectives identified through use of the Balance Scorecard method (IV.B.1.j).

The President and Chief Executive Officer are responsible to direct planning efforts and initiatives to pursue fulfillment of the college mission, meet institutional standards, and achieve the college vision. Further, the Board requires that all college employees work collaboratively toward the achievement of these goals and standards. In accordance with BP #'s 3, 5, and 6, the Board shall assess, no less than annually, the College's fulfillment of its mission and achievement of its institutional standard. (IV.B.1.j, IV.B.2)

After implementation of Board Policies included in the Board of Governors Handbook, the College fully meets the requirements of Standard IV.B and its subsections. These actions implemented by the Board of Governors implements the changes requested in Recommendation # 7 which is now considered fully implemented.

Commission Concern: Eligibility Requirement #11
The institution defines and incorporates into all of its degree programs a substantial component of general education designed to ensure breath of knowledge and promote intellectual inquiry. The general education component includes demonstrated competence in writing and computational skills and an introduction to some of the major areas of knowledge. General education has comprehensive learning outcomes for the students who complete it. Degree credit for general education programs must be consistent with levels of quality and rigor appropriate to higher education. See Accreditation Standards, IIA.3 for areas of study for general education.

The team reviewed the Commission Concern stated above and spent a considerable amount of time determining whether the there was sufficient academic rigor, and consistent levels of quality appropriate for higher education course work. A main concern was whether the outcomes of the General Education courses were at the same level of rigor as current trends in California postsecondary education. The team noted that the English 121/122 course contained elements that may not be consistent with norms in college-level classes (emphasis on instruction in grammar and syntax, selection of reading materials, depth of required analysis).

The team's primary experience was developed as a result of each team member's experience in the California public community college sector of higher education. The comparison was weighted by the experiences of the team members and caused comparisons to be made between the California State University system's requirements for transferring courses from the California community colleges into the CSU system and SVJC's courses that were also being accepted as transferrable credit courses. When stepping back and considering other factors such as the fact that the scope of the analysis was limited with most comparisons being made to two courses specifically, English 121 and 122. Since the CSU accepted the classes as equivalent transfer credit courses, the

team had to acknowledge at a minimum there is a difference of opinion among professionals within higher education on SVJC's course content for one General Education course. Consequently, the team remains unsure about the on-going quality of General Education course work and in order to improve institutional effectiveness and resolve this issue the team encourages the College to work on ensuring faculty members who teach General Education courses consistently teach the full range of course content and that textbooks used in the courses as well as the demands placed on students for production of homework and in class work products are held to the same degree of academic rigor as that taught in all other courses taught at SVJC.

The team does not have sufficient evidence to state or conclude that the College does not meet the requirements of the Standards (IIA.3) and therefore accepts the College's assertion that it meets the requirements of Standard IIA.3 when considering General Education coursework as a whole taught across the full spectrum of campuses operated by the College. The Commission does however recognize that there are instances when the instruction provided at times does not meet the same high quality standards expected of higher education courses and in order to improve effectiveness and to ensure all students receive the same high level of instructional quality that the College work closely with faculty to develop curriculum, review and select appropriate level college textbooks and require students provide homework and in-class work products as appropriate that meet the academic rigor required of college level courses. Degree credit of general education programs must be consistent with levels of quality and rigor appropriate to higher education. (Standard IIA.3)

Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

I. A. Mission

General Observations
The SJVC mission is clear, specific, well-published, regularly reviewed and central to planning and decision-making. It was revised in July 2008 and reaffirmed in 2011 using improved collaborative processes instituted since the last accreditation site visit. A cyclical review process is now in place and scheduled every three years. Dialog and input is widespread and includes staff and faculty at all levels of the institution. The institution's student learning programs and services include externships, clinical education, general education, community involvement, tutoring, library and learning resource centers, and career services. In addition, student support includes practical resources as "services aligned with its…student population."

Findings and Evidence
The Mission Statement is clear about its educational purpose which is to: "prepare graduates for professional success in business, medical and technical career fields. The mission also refers to "a balance of hands-on training and academic instruction."(I.A.1)

The College's intended students are specified in the Mission statement. Last revised in July 2008 and reaffirmed in July 2011, the Mission Statement cites the intended student population as "a diverse student population with a common interest in professional development through career-focused higher education." Students can be found in numerous locations in "...economically depressed communities and serve students with incomes and educational attainment levels below the state norm". Given the intended student population and the geographic location of campuses, the identified target student population is matched well to achieve the desired objectives of SVJC. The identified population is a reasonable match for the institution's location, resources, and role in higher education. (I.A.1)

The Mission statement states: "The College is committed to student development through the achievement of measureable learning outcomes," that it "identifies and responds to the education and employment needs…" and that it is "committed to the success of every student." The references to "education and employment needs" and "success of every student," as well as the reference to "hands-on training and academic instruction" make it clear that the College is focused on job preparation in the specified fields of business, medical and technical careers. A review of the programs offered at the College and the corresponding certificate and Associate of Science degrees awarded to students upon completion of the educational programs shows that the College's program offerings are aligned with the College Mission and as a result the College is achieving its Mission objectives through its academic program offerings (I.A.1).

The Mission Statement is published and included in the catalog, College website, and various publications intended to be distributed for use and reference by the faculty and staff. Evidence of review of the Mission is provided in the Board of Governors' meeting

minutes and results of the 2013 Institutional Self Evaluation Report. The College included a comprehensive list of the places where the Mission Statement was published or discussed to illustrate the communication methods used to advertise and distribute the Mission statement as a means in assisting in making faculty, staff and students more aware of the key elements and educational programs of the College (I.A.2).

The College reviews the Mission on a regular basis. This is done informally through a survey of stakeholders. A comprehensive institutional survey conducted every two years. Formally, it is a component of the College's Self-Evaluation process. The College uses surveys to identify and include stakeholders' interests in the development of the Mission statement. Over the years, the College Leadership has used a number of methodologies to obtain data to assess the appropriateness of its Mission statement. Surveys have emerged as the most useful method to obtain data and to and feedback from employees, students and staff (I.A.3).

Surveys have a "notes" section where participants may add comments outside of the stated questions, and in-person meetings are held at the individual campuses where campus directors gather input and pass it on in meetings at the corporate office with representatives of other campuses. Comments on surveys and comments made during campus director meetings are used to assist in the review of the Mission statement and the programs and services offered to accomplish the mission (I.A.3**).**

The College determined through its analysis that the method of developing, approving and communicating the Mission to stakeholders is effective because of the high percentage of faculty, staff and students who are familiar with the Mission statement when asked on a recent survey about employee and student knowledge of activities occurring on campus. The survey results where that 99% of faculty/staff and 79% of students agree that "SJVC's Mission Statement accurately describes the educational purpose of the college." (I.A.3).

Even though there is a high awareness among faculty about the Mission, there was concern stated by management that a higher percentage of students who were knowledgeable about the Mission statement was desired. A lack of "college constituencies' shared understanding of SJVC's purpose" appears to have prompted some changes as it was rewritten in Spring 2008 to address comments in an earlier survey that were included as part of new Board policy adopted by the Board of Governors in March 2008. The College determined that the next step in the cycle of effectiveness will be to set benchmarks for satisfaction rates for comparison purposes in the quest to continually improve institutional effectiveness and the communication process so a higher percentage of students are aware of the College's Mission. **(**I.A.3**)**

The Mission statement plays a central role in the development of the Strategic Plan. More specifically the Mission statement is broadly communicated as evidenced by survey results described about. The institutional planning activities that include course and program development rely on knowledge of the Mission statement. Additionally,

department planning, broad institutional planning and the resource allocation processes are all grounded in the achievement of the College Mission (I.A.4**).**

Conclusions.

The College meets Commission Standard I.A. and its related subsections I.A.1 through I.A.4.

The Mission is central to planning and decision making at the College. The quality of the Mission Statement is evident in terms of defining the College's broad institutional purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning. Student learning programs and services are aligned with the College's purpose, character and student population. Periodic reviews of the Mission statement occur, and input is solicited through dialogue with constituencies regarding revisions and program improvements. The College meets the requirements of Standard I.A.1 through I.A.4.

Recommendations

None.

I. B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations

The SJVC mission is clear, specific, well-published, regularly reviewed and central to planning and decision-making. It was last revised in July 2008 and reaffirmed in 2011 using improved collaborative processes instituted since the last accreditation site visit. A cyclical review process is now in place and scheduled every three years. The College's student learning programs and services include externships, clinical education, general education, community involvement, tutoring, library and learning resource centers, and career services. In addition, student support includes practical resources as "services aligned with its…student population."

Based on interviews and evidence at the site visit, the team concluded that SJVC administration, faculty and staff embrace and understand the purpose of dialogue to support institutional effectiveness. Examples were given from faculty and management on face to face meetings related to curriculum, program review, and understanding the college's new planning model. Examples of Non-Instructional Program Review for Career Services, course improvement proposal for Economics, and a purchase proposal for Respiratory Therapy all provide evidence where planning has improved instruction and student learning.

Findings and Evidence

The evidence list is thorough, organized and well presented. SJVC has structured institutional dialogue to focus on student learning and achievement. From the evidence, the college has substantially improved institutional processes and practices to produce and support student learning (I.B.1)

SJVC identifies student learning outcomes (SLOs) for all courses, programs, student support services and the institution as a whole. Instructional Program Review has been

revised to a more outcomes-based process and the Non-Instructional Program Review is also outcomes-based. In addition, SJVC has devoted technological resources to support the use of data across the institution, i.e. InfoZone and the Report and Dashboard Library. Based on interviews with members of the executive team at SJVC, there were many meetings with faculty and staff to help everyone understand the new strategic planning model that became a scorecard. Evolutions of the strategy map demonstrate the dialogue occurred college wide (I.B.1).

SJVC uses a vision statement with strategic objectives, and an institutional scorecard to inform its priorities. Evidence of the strategic objectives show communications on the "development and management" of a strategic master plan 2011 – 2015; however the document includes a timeline for implementation, rather than specific strategic objectives to improve student learning. The institutional scorecard is also in development to be implemented early 2013 – during the team site visit. The SJVC Self Evaluation states: "Key stakeholders utilize the scorecard to monitor institutional progress toward its quantified vision, and make any necessary adjustments to the strategy"[22]
Data on student achievement and student learning assessments are used in reports and communications across the institution; however the connection to the above objectives is unclear.

From the evidence provided, it is difficult to ascertain how broadly constituents understand the goals unless we clarify what SJVC considers their goals to be. The evidence cited is an institutional survey. Items in the faculty/staff surveys that address understanding of college goals and processes are shown below with summary results.

> *Item #4 states: SJVC clearly communicates its goals and objectives for improving its effectiveness (91%/93% agrees or strongly agrees).*
> *Item #31 states: There is a process for financial planning at SJVC that supports the mission and institutional goals (55% agree or strongly agree).*

The institution is committed to following goals and SJVC has a vision statement that identifies three outcomes and target dates. It is unclear whether SJVC has identified "institutional goals" per se, but they have objectives at the institutional scorecard level that are clearly identified measurable outcomes with targets at the program and college level (I.B.2).

As stated in the self evaluation report, SJVC meets its own standards in nearly all areas. One example is the percent of programs with 75% or higher placement (employment in the field). The current scorecard reports 54% of programs meet the objective with a target of 75% by 2014. This is the first year of using the scorecard and there are no historical data to suggest a trend.

The objectives are measurable with targets and indicators of progress that can be used to assess progress on completion of objectives. SJVC uses the institutional scorecard, reports dashboard library, and Info Zone technology to share evidence within the college

and across programs. Evidence shows these are discussed and used in college meetings. The public has online access to the SJVC website and Face Book page. (I.B.2)

Prior to 2008 SJVC had a commission recommendation to clarify how the institution's mission is central to planning. SJVC now uses the Kaplan-Norton scorecard throughout the institution. The self-evaluation report and evidence suggest this is a relatively new process to which SJVC dedicated resources to provide significant technology and training to support broad participation and understanding. (I.B.2).

The college budgets resources based on census enrollments by program and campus on a rolling (annual) basis. In addition, SJVC allocates resources for capital outlay and equipment from a separate fund with approximately two million dollars Additional requests come through on an ad hoc basis, often originated by faculty to improve student outcomes. Based on interviews and examples provided during the team visit, SJVC approves most requests "when they support [improving] student learning." From interviews across the College the visiting team confirmed that SJVC has an embedded understanding of how to prioritize requests where most things that are requested for improving student outcomes are approved. This was confirmed in multiple interviews with several concrete examples; (I.B.3)

The college uses SharePoint electronic resources to create Project Central – a repository of current initiatives that support the strategic plan. Each project (or initiative) has a start date, end date, status, person(s) responsible, and a budget allocation. Projects are available for reporting and progress updates can easily be shown (I.B.4).

SJVC has a planning process that is cyclical although the strategy map is not the best demonstration of the cycle. The graphic used in a PowerPoint called the Kaplan-Norton Strategy Management System Palladium Execution Premium Process (XPP) is a better illustration of a planning cycle. There is evidence of evaluation of the process, such as surveys for training sessions, team meetings, and institutional climate. In general, the surveys are well designed and have strong participation.

There are several reports across the institution with aggregated data on student achievement and student learning outcomes. These data appear easy to understand across the institution. SJVC has implemented technology to capture student performance data at the classroom level and aggregate it into course, program, and college level results. The data are analyzed frequently by many levels (individual faculty, department managers, and executive level) although student outcomes are not disaggregated by demographic characteristics. Clearly SJVC has the capacity to produce reports disaggregated by ethnicity and gender, as verified by interviews with the SJVC team on program review. This may be a result of the institutional culture. Interviews confirm there is a philosophy that all students can succeed regardless of characteristics such as race, ethnicity, and gender. In addition, the student body is highly representative of similar students

SJVC relies on faculty for program review and has "senior management" work with "executive council" to ensure widespread involvement. Faculty and staff responsibilities

are spelled out in respective handbooks that include participation in college surveys, attendance at program reviews and curriculum conferences, as well as providing multiple venues for input. (I.B.4)

The Self Evaluation report states that necessary resources are allocated to support strategic initiatives and plans for improvement through the college's integrated planning. Approved plans that do not rise to the level of a strategic initiative are also assigned a budget with an approved purchase proposal. Initiatives are shown in an electronic resource called Project Central that includes specific resource allocations. (I.B.4)

Based on interviews of College personnel, the team noted that the College has a philosophy and business strategy that supports nearly all requests to improve student success. The campus site visits confirmed the state of equipment and actual purchase requests that were approved within the past year. Interviews confirmed there are adequate fiscal resources and a sound business practices in place, including working with those requesting resources or to make procurements to find cost effective solutions. Some examples are: in 2011 Program Reviews were conducted on 12 programs that resulted in eight course improvement proposals, nine purchase proposals, and 12 textbook proposals. Four new campuses were established in response to identified educational needs and employment trends within the service area of SJVC. New academic programs were identified to meet the needs of employers in Bakersfield and Modesto. (I.B.4)

SJVC collects assessment data on students in classrooms and online via a college-wide technology solution, or Learning Management System (LMS). Evidence examined by team members showed that reports are available for courses, programs, and college wide for aggregating student achievement and learning outcomes. Results show the expected outcome (benchmarks) and include course level outcomes, program level outcomes, and institutional learning outcomes. Data also report on the number of authentic assessments conducted.

SJVC uses electronic resources to provide many types of data to internal users such as faculty, staff and managers. The college's information technology department supports data management of assessments at the course and program level, as well as attendance, retention, and completion. There is a college wide contact management system that allows faculty and staff to track virtually all communications with a student from the recruitment to course completion and on to placement into a job in their field. Interviews confirmed there are many ways data are available and the culture at SJVC makes use of it.

Compared to the wealth of data and factual information about student performance, programs offered by the College and information about what graduates can expect when completing an SVJC program   there is less data made available to the general public. The consumer information required by Gainful Employment is found on the SJVC website in multiple places. The same information is made available in print format and is used during the recruitment and enrollment phase, in part to help students make the best choice of programs. SJVC has not identified that there had been an assessment of its

communication methods and materials provided to the public. The team reviewed communication materials prepared and distributed within the communities served by the College and found information distributed to the general public was consistent with internally communicated information. The team noted that the College surveyed students on a regular basis. (I.B.5)

The institution has invested significant fiscal and human resources to implement a balanced scorecard methodology to develop its business strategy to support institutional decision making. There has been much activity during the past two years and the college sees itself in phase three of "aligning the organization" within the implementation of the its business planning and implementation cycle. There should be time to thoroughly evaluate the complete balanced scorecard process during phase five of the cycle that is referred to as "monitor and learn." The College provided the team with a flowchart of the process currently being implemented. The flowchart was prepared by the Palladium Group and was titled: "The Kaplan-Nortom Strategy Management System-Palladium Execution Premium Process" with a copyright date of 2010. The College Chief Operations Officer described the process and how the College has rolled it out over the past two year. College personnel received specified training from the Palladium Group and were certified by Kaplan-Norton as being proficient in the use of this Balanced Scorecard strategic planning methodology. The College fosters continuous improvement and sets clear goals (I.B.6).

Because the Balance Scorecard method was different than most strategic planning processes, the College staff prepared data reports that included the typical strategic plan reports commonly used by colleges accredited by ACCJC. The reports allowed the team to identify the comparable items generated using the Balanced Scorecard methodology. The planning process was a six stage process similar to what colleges typically use to show compliance with Commission Standards for Improving Institutional Effectiveness, Standard I.B. While the methodology is different than what team members were familiar with the end products including measureable goals and objectives and specific strategies that are supported by data and demonstrate that SVJC is using a rigorous, data supported and sophisticated process to continuously improve institutional effectiveness (I.B.6 and I.B.7).

As shown in the findings and evidence described earlier, the College demonstrates an effective planning process exists and is used to refine programs offered by the College to ensure SVJC meets its mission, in part, by providing career technical education that leads to specific jobs directed to meet the needs of the students and business communities they serve (I.B.7)

The faculty can easily request equipment, curriculum changes and, with supporting data, will likely get them funded. At the same time, individual campuses have strategic objectives to support the overall institutional goals for:

- 75% graduate placement by Dec.2013
- 70% graduation rate achievement by Dec.2014

- 7,500 students being served by Dec.2015

Instructional Program Review and Non-Instructional Program Review are the primary processes used to evaluate the effectiveness of SJVC's academic programs and student support services
As mentioned earlier, SJVC uses a technology to collect assessment data in all courses. The College uses surveys to gather evidence on the quality and effectiveness of staff meetings, training, and institutional dialogue. The self evaluation report states suggestions for improvement of the program review process were a result of the evaluation in Oct 2012. The College acknowledges that the above are actionable results, this is the "benchmark year" for SJVC to begin collecting sufficient data to measure future performance. During the second cycle (2013-2014) stakeholders will collect data pertaining to program improvements. (I.B.7)

Conclusions
The College meets the requirements of Commission Standard I.B Improving Institutional Effectiveness subsections I.B.1 through I.B.7

Recommendations. None.

STANDARD II: Student Learning Programs and Services

II. A. Instructional Programs

General Observations
The College has improved student learning by utilizing multiple means and processes for measurement of outcomes and success, along with this there is a strong culture of evidence that is pervasive and is apparent at each campus location. SLOs have been developed institution-wide since the last accreditation cycle, supported by a data-heavy analytical institutional culture that is guided by senior management. The identification of student learning needs is research-based and staff development is in place to help faculty and staff be more in tuned with the needs of the student population. The College uses an online program called MyLabs. This program replaced basic skills classes in Mathematics and English.

Findings and Evidence
There is evidence that the College has made progress in developing student learning outcomes, measuring them, and using the results of measurement to plan and implement institutional improvements to the proficiency level. Evidence supports that the College has developed a culture of evidence and data driven decision making along with processes and practices that supports continuous, systematic improvement on an on-going basis. The College limits its programs of study to recognized health, technical, and business fields to stay consistent with its Mission to prepare graduates for success in professional fields in business, medical, and technical career fields. Longitudinal learning achievement data is collected via the Learning Management System (LMS), is used to "create electronic rubrics for grading and mapping the rubrics to outcomes identified as being important in measuring, assessing and making improvements in student achievement data elements (II.A.1, IIA.1.a , and II.A.2).

Assessment Coordinators "train faculty on basic assessment practices and data collection tools" and are themselves trained "with the requisite knowledge and skills to guide their programs through the assessment process." There are several transfer agreements in place with other colleges and universities and several courses are on the CSU GE Breadth Certification List (II.A.1, and II.A.1.a).

The 2011 graduation rates range from 42% to 100% for all programs; 2012 licensure pass rates range from 61% to 100%. Job placement rates are posted for each profession on the College website, however they do not show longitudinal trends for the College overall. The graduation rates reported by the Online Division indicate that success has decreased from 2009 to 2011, although success rates for A.S. degree-seeking students are higher than those for Certificate seeking students (II.A.1.b).

The College ensures that instructors are provided with a "course outline of record" which "provides instructors with a structure for each course including course description, student learning outcomes, and the unit objectives that lead to those outcomes." Students evaluate instructors through course surveys and student success data is used along with classroom observation forms to analyze the effectiveness of delivery strategies (IIA1.b).

The graduation rates and the 2012 licensure pass rates programs are systematically assessed for currency, teaching and learning strategies, and student learning outcomes through the program review process, and this is also how the institution ensures that its programs and curricula are current. The program review process provides for "collaborative dialog and analysis" that produce "initiatives for course and program improvement." (IIA.1.c)

The College states that "individual faculty members are ultimately responsible for the choice of delivery systems and teaching and learning methods appropriate for daily content delivery" and refers to the "collaborative dialogue and analysis in program review." According to interviews with faculty, department meetings and collegial resource sharing provides many opportunities for dialogue about delivery systems and modes of instruction. (IIA1.c)

The College does not offer developmental pre-collegiate, continuing or community education, study abroad, short-term training, international student or contract education programs. The College ensures that all of its instructional courses and programs are of high quality through various assessment processes that include feedback from students and longitudinal studies of student success, input from faculty and advisory committees, and continuous quality improvement processes through program review. The College sustains systematic assessment of each course, certificate, and degree programs to assure achievement of the stated student learning outcomes, currency, relevance, appropriateness, future needs, and plans. Faculty generate initiatives to improve program performance. (IIA.2)

Courses and programs are established "in recognized and emerging fields of study consistent with the College's mission statement." The institution states that "most SJVC campuses are located in economically depressed communities and serve students with incomes and educational attainment levels below the state norm." The College states that "individual faculty members are ultimately responsible for the choice of delivery systems" and that "SJVC has an online division which delivers instruction exclusively online for five certificate and degree programs." Course credit is determined "based on the traditional Carnegie Unit consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms in higher education" (IIA.2.h)

All instructional courses and programs offered in the name of the institution are included in the program review process that ensures quality. "Each academic program undergoes a curricular review alternating with the program review year. Following the curriculum conference, faculty complete a report indicating the status of approved course and program improvements, the impact of improvements in student achievement of course

and program outcomes and their impact on student learning and achievement." One example of an improvement made as a result of assessment and dialogue is the Respiratory Therapy program, which through a Program Improvement Proposal recommended restructuring the program, adding new courses and more time to courses. (IIA.2)

The curriculum department, faculty, division managers, and program directors are responsible for identifying student learning outcomes. Student Learning Outcomes are established for each course and program, and comprehensive reviews along with online discussion forums evaluate the "fit." Advisory board members also play a role in providing "essential input in identifying and assuring the fit and alignment of student learning outcomes." (IIA2.a)

The College states that "The College awards degrees and certificates based on student achievement of a program's stated learning outcomes." Also, Many SJVC programs include an externship or clinical experience where students demonstrate the learning outcomes they have mastered." "The SLOs are aligned with the technical and professional competencies which are grouped by programs with accrediting bodies and those without." (IIA2.b)

The quality of instruction is demonstrated by the ability of graduates to perform at a competent level in the field of study (demonstrated through successful completion of externships, licensure examination pass rates, and placement) and for general education, the transferability of its courses to other institutions of higher education (IIA2.b).

The biennial curriculum conferences are where the breadth, depth and rigor are decided. If an outside accrediting agency is involved, the standards for that program comply with the agency standards. For the general education component, the criteria used are those that the course be comparable to other lower division courses at community colleges and state universities. (IIA2.c)

The College serves a diverse student population, the majority of whom are classified as low income and come from families where there no parent has a college degree. The College provides evidence that it focuses attention on the professional development of its faculty and staff with regard to understanding economic class differences. Using assessment of cut scores to determine each student's preparation level for college, the College notes the majority of the College's student population is under-prepared for college-level English and math. (II.A.2.d)

The College offers on-ground, hybrid and online delivery systems of instruction. On-ground instruction incorporates a significant amount of hands on and technology of instruction. Clinical practice is integrated into those programs for which it is required as a condition of their state/national accreditation or as need for the accomplishment of learning outcomes. A Learning Management System and various technologies (simulations, SmartBoards, iClickers) are used by faculty to enhance course delivery and assessment methodologies. (II.A.2.d).

Prior to enrollment, the College uses Wonderlic SLE as a general assessment of student appropriateness to the College curricula. Differing "cut scores" on this assessment are associated with various programs. Once accepted to the college, students complete an English and math readiness assessment that was developed specifically for SJVC by Pearson Education. As a result of the assessment, students are provided with individualized, self-paced "Readiness Study Plans" that are completed online. The plans are designed to prepare students for college-level coursework. Staff indicated that the College is highly focused on the retention of students through graduation and that placement services are highly organized. (II.A.2.e)

The online division delivers instruction exclusively online for five certificate and degree programs. The decision to offer programs in the online modality is made by executive management. Program Review is conducted for every program; courses and programs within the online program are evaluated as part of the discipline-specific Instructional Program Review and effectiveness is measured by assessment of learning outcomes. Students complete an electronic survey at the completion of each course and the institutional faculty and student survey also provides feedback to the college about the effectiveness of the delivery methods. This disaggregated results of the student survey completed by online students showed no significant difference in responses from the on-ground students (II.A.2.f).

Many of the programs are accredited by external agencies such as the American Dental Association Commission on Dental Accreditation (CODA) and the Commission on Accreditation for Respiratory Care (CoARC). These accrediting agencies set the standard for curriculum, which is nationally normed. (II.A.2.i) (II.A.2.h)

There is evidence provided that seventeen courses are articulated with the CSU General Education Breadth pattern. Among these courses is the English course revised as a result of previous recommendations. Students may transfer these courses in lieu of CSU GE requirements. Student learning outcomes for courses are developed with faculty and the curriculum department staff work to refine and deepen SLOs through meetings, curriculum conferences and online discussion forums. (II.A.3)

Course Learning Outcomes are published on the course outline and integrated into all syllabi. Interviews with faculty confirmed that course learning outcomes are discussed with students. Data is gathered regarding student achievement on the assessments. Course level student learning outcomes are mapped to program level student learning outcomes. Program learning outcomes are listed in the catalog for all programs. The institution is making a considerable effort to evaluate the effectiveness of learning at each level. (II.A.3)

There is abundance of evidence that demonstrates that, not only are outcomes in place at the course, program, and institutional level, but that a sophisticated data base system is in place to both store outcome data, and to retrieve data to populate various reports such as program review reports and scorecards. In order to input data into the database, many

instructors give students electronic tests and quizzes, which immediately populate the database with outcome information. The benefit is that instructors can see, in virtually real time, the extent to which students are learning and attaining outcomes. Faculty members are adept at using the system and were able to demonstrate its utility during interviews (II.A.2.e, II.A.2.i).

The College maintains an electronic curriculum repository, in which instructors can find all aspects of course materials from syllabi, to power points to use during specific weeks of the class, to outcomes, and to Common Mastery Assessments. The system enables new instructors to easily become versed with the expectations of the course, and to ensure comparable outcomes for students attending a particular course across multiple campuses. Course learning outcomes (CLOs) and program learning outcomes (PLOs) are mapped to specific assessments for all courses and programs. Investigation of the Curriculum Repository reveals that mapping and identification of assessment for the outcomes has occurred for the vast majority of courses and all the programs.

Institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) have been identified, and cover what can generally be called "soft skills." They include such qualities as communication, citizenship, professionalism, and confidence. The value of the ILOs and their relationship to the institution's core values has been communicated to the campus community as well as external stakeholders, through image of a tree that relates the ILOs (in the branches) to the institution's values (in the soil from which the tree grows). Evaluation of ILOs occurs regularly, although the methods used are not yet as standardized as the CLOs and PLOs.

The College offers most of it programs in a sequence of 5 week modules. Some programs are offered in a linear model. The College plans for students to complete their programs in a timely manner. Once students enroll, a contract is initiated between the college and the student which requires the college to deliver all courses required for graduation as scheduled. Data indicate that on time graduation rates are generally over 70%.

The College offers on-ground, hybrid and online delivery systems of instruction. On-ground instruction incorporates a significant amount of hands on and technology of instruction. Clinical practice is integrated into those programs for which it is required as a condition of their state/national accreditation or as need for the accomplishment of learning outcomes. A Learning Management System and various technologies (simulations, SmartBoards, iClickers) are used by faculty to enhance course delivery and assessment methodologies. (II.A.2.d).

Interviews with the Online Program Manager indicated that an assessment of student learning styles is part of the college orientation course, whether the student takes the course online or on ground. The results of the survey are reviewed with the student by an advisor during the educational planning phase of the admissions process.

Interview with faculty confirmed that information on student learning styles is part of professional development provided during faculty orientation. Faculty members use a combination of lecture and laboratory to ensure student learning. They are encouraged to

use a variety of teaching methodologies and are supported to acquire supplies that they need "whatever is good for the students." The subjects require "hands on" experience and this gives them a great deal of latitude to incorporate theory and practice. Courses include multiple ways of assessing student learning. Quizzes, tests, projects and practical assignments can all be found as assessment vehicles across many course outlines. Faculty determine which delivery modes are most effective, with an emphasis on practical experience to reinforce theory.

The College uses lecture and laboratory formats as well as clinical experiences as teaching methodologies. Faculty discuss the hours of instruction and type of instruction required to achieve student learning outcomes as part of Program Review and/or the Curriculum Conference. Proposals to change teaching methodologies are part of the outcomes of these processes are must target improvement of student learning.

Student learning outcome and course completion data is provided at the course level. This allows a comparison of courses that are offered in differing modes (online vs. on-ground). Online courses have significantly highly attrition rates than on-ground courses and graduation rates are lower (Evidence: Online Division-Longitudinal Characteristics and Measures-2013). (IIA2.d)

Institutional Scorecard track the impact of learning outcomes on the strategic goals of the college. (IIA2.e)

There is substantial evidence that the institution understands and embraces the notion of ongoing planning. Program review results in plans for course and program improvement. Proposals for course and program improvement can also be submitted for approval at any time in the cycle. The Curriculum and Assessment Department conducted a review of the Program Review process in October 2012 and developed a 10-item Department Improvement Plan. Vast quantities of institutional data are available and used in the program review and planning processes. Data are provided in chart and table form for use by the college community during their Program Review and at the conclusion of each course. Ad hoc reports can be pulled from the Data and Research Library. (IIA 2.f)

The institution does not use departmental course and/or program examinations. (IIA2.g) The SJVC policy regarding Definition of a Credit Hour was revised effective with the 2012-2013 College Catalog Supplement. The policy aligns with the Carnegie Unit formula; the hours are a minimum standard for the award of the unit. The 2012-2013 Catalog indicates discrepancies in the award of units based on the hours of instruction. For example, VN112, Nursing Fundamentals Skills Lab. indicates that it is 1 unit for 80 hours. This is not in line with lab (30 hours) or clinical (45). An evaluation of the hours-to-units relationship for all courses is advised. Further, to create better transparency of hours requirements for students, it would be advisable to distinguish the requirements for lecture and lab hours for each course in the catalog. (IIA 2.h)

The catalog presents the philosophy of General Education. An interview with the Curriculum Specialist confirmed that a faculty focus-group created the philosophy

statements contained in the catalog. Based on interviews with faculty and staff, one criterion with which general education courses are developed is the applicability of assignments, exercises, course materials and methodologies to subsequent coursework and employment. "General Education courses tie directly, and are mapped, to the institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) of the College. The College ILOs state that all graduates shall be professional, confident, skilled, educated citizens and communicators." Over 90% of students surveyed agreed that their courses inspired personal and professional growth, greater communication skills, and "a curiosity for learning beyond the classroom." (II.A.3, II.A.3.c)

The College requires 24 units of general education across the four major areas of knowledge. There are relatively few general education courses and all degree programs require substantially the same courses. Proposals for general education courses are a result of program review and are forwarded for approval through the Curriculum Specialist. Final approval is the purview of Executive Management. Course development is the purview of faculty. General Education courses have CLOs, but the College does not consider GE a formal program although GE completes a program review and holds curriculum conferences. The General Education Assessment Learning Community was constituted to provide faculty oversight for the improvement of general education. The Curriculum and Assessment Department Review Report indicates that the GEFLC will be continued with the selection of a replacement GE Assessment Coordinator (II.A.3.a).

The College does not offer a comprehensive selection of courses that meet General Education requirements; rather, for most programs there is one course per GE area that meets the requirement. Recognizing that general education was a Commission Concern arising from the previous accreditation cycle, the team closely reviewed the general education program at the College. It conducted after interviews with general education instructors, particularly those that teach in English, that there is a difference between the team's assessment of the level of the General Education course(s) and what was accepted by a public California university system as transferrable academic credit. Because of the differences in opinion of the level of GE course work, the team noted its concern and requests that the College conduct a detailed review and make changes as necessary to ensure GE courses provided are college level courses (II.A.3.a).

The academic rigor and breadth of general education courses has previously been expressed as a concern by ACCJC to SJVC. The College is a member of the Northern California Intersegmental Articulation Council (NCIAC) whose membership is open only to regionally-accredited colleges and universities. NCIAC's by-laws state in part: "The purpose of the Council shall be to meet, discuss, and resolve transfer, articulation, and curricula issues, and to facilitate the students between and among the segments of postsecondary education in California." The College notes that as of October 2012 it is current on the CSU General Education-Breadth Agreement. The agreement allows SJVC students and graduates to transfer GE courses to baccalaureate degree-granting institutions in the CSU system.

The team had a concern related to the level of rigor, depth, and breadth of Course Learning Outcomes for one English course within the General Education list of courses. For that class, the team had concern that the class may not reach commonly accepted outcomes of courses that typically satisfy the graduation requirements of Associate Degree-granting institutions. The College provided the team with verification that its GE courses were accepted as equivalent to a public California university system and that this system grants transfer credit for these courses (II.A.3).

Interviews with SJVC personnel, from the faculty to middle management, through the highest levels of senior management, reveal that a tightly held value of the College is the high quality of its academics, including the granting of an AS degree that is equivalent in meaning and value to AS degrees granted elsewhere. The College is encouraged to continue to stress the importance of the academic rigor of its general education courses to assure that the depth of the coursework and the complexity of textbooks is consistent with the collegiate levels.

The team felt that since the question about the academic rigor of General Education coursework had previously been expressed as a concern by the Commission that the College should again be asked to focus on ensuring the academic rigor of all General Education coursework meets the level required of college level courses. The team found just one example in an English course where the issue of academic rigor was raised. The team did not find evidence of this concern in any other General Education area.

The rationale for general education is communicated via the College Catalog. The general education philosophy is reflected in the mapping of individual GE courses major areas of knowledge as well as skills and competencies that the college has identified as required of program graduates (II.A.3.a).

The College catalog specifies the eight general education courses required for the degree. The College relies on the expertise of the faculty to determine the basic content and methodology of the areas of knowledge in general education. The General Education Assessment Learning Community provides faculty oversight for the improvement of general education. Proposals for course revision as a result of program review or curriculum conferences are prepared by faculty and submitted through program review for approval. The assessment of CLOs for general education courses, indicate that the majority of students are achieving the stated learning outcomes. Faculty are required to use the course outlines and recommended texts as provided by the College. Syllabi are reviewed by program directors and academic deans for consistency and adherence to the course outline. (IIA3.a)

General education course outcomes specify mastery of these abilities. There are no program learning outcomes for general education per se. General education outcomes are reported to be linked to ILOs. The 2012 General Education program review indicates that the linking of GE course outcomes to ILOs is not complete. Assessment of ILOs from General Education courses is an assigned task as an outcome of this review. SJVC students are required to complete a Humanities course in Ethics as a requirement of their

degree completion. The college catalog specifies the requirements for each degree, including one area of caucused study plus general education requirements. (II.A.3.c, II.A.4)

Nine of SJVC's degree/certificate programs prepare students for licensure/certification by external agencies. Licensure/certification pass rates are published for eight of the nine programs and serve as evidence that students are prepared for licensure and for certification by external agencies, along with the completion of externships in the chosen field. These measures also serve as evidence that students meet employment competencies. All other programs demonstrate technical and professional competencies through the evaluation of course and program student learning outcomes, which are developed and revised based on input from faculty, advisory boards and employers. Based on an interview with an advisory board member, frequent feedback is given to the institution regarding the quality of graduates in terms of their skills, knowledge, training and professional preparation. (IIA.5)

All course outlines and syllabi are housed in the Online Curriculum Repository. Syllabi are posted to the LMS for each course. Program Directors and Division Managers have access to the LMS and review the syllabi to ensure inclusion of the course level SLOs (IIA6).

The College Catalog, page 3, comments on how students are expected to adhere to program requirements that exist as of the time of admissions in order to qualify for certificates and degrees. It also notes that students who change educational programs or fail to maintain continuous enrollment may be required to follow catalog and student handbook requirements at the time a student changes his or her educational program objective. (II.A.6.)

The College publishes its transfer of credit policy in the College Catalog and maintains information through the college portal, InfoZone on the articulation and transfer process, including a current list of all institutions with which SJVC maintains articulation agreements. SJVC has developed a CSUGE Breadth certification list that includes 17 courses certified as eligible for transfer. Interviews with the Curriculum Specialist indicated that there is no systemic process to review and update college policies. Policies are changed as needed based on broad action or changes to practice. Catalog sections are sent to departments to update based on catalog publishing deadlines. (II.A.6.a)

The College assigns responsibility for the development, implementation and evaluation of articulation agreements to the Director of Research and Development. As a private, for –profit institution, SJVC enters into a contract with each student upon admission. When program requirements are changed or programs are eliminated, plans are made to accommodate each student and students are counseled regarding the change to their program. This process results in a "teach out" where students in a program area that are provided with classes that are necessary to complete their programs of study (IIA6.a, IIA6.b).

The Marketing, Admissions and Public Relations Department is responsible for the College's print and electronic dissemination of information. The catalog is updated based on the outcomes of program review and curriculum conference outcomes (program and course descriptions) and policies and procedures whenever they require change as a result of regulatory or procedural changes (II.A.7).

The College publishes a Student Consumer Guide-the most recent year being 2012. The Guide contains Placement Statistics for graduates during 2009-2010 and 2010-2011. Retention rates are provided for the fall 2010 cohort. Graduation rates are provided for the fall 2008 cohort and are broken down by ethnicity and gender. Student body diversity statistics and percentage enrollment of Pell Grant recipients are provided for the full-time enrollees of fall 2011. The College Catalog presents a policy on academic freedom. The same section of the catalog describes the expectations for Academic Honesty, what constitutes a violation and what penalties may be exacted (II.A.7.b, II.A.7.c).

The College's policies on academic freedom and student honesty are published in the college catalog and reproduced in the faculty handbook and student handbook respectively. The College notes that academic freedom is the right of faculty and students to express their ideas verbally or in writing, free from political, religious, or institutional restrictions. The Self Evaluation Report states that the College is dedicated to maintenance of academic freedom in the classroom and in co-curricular activities. Policies articulated in the college catalog and the faculty handbook require faculty to clearly distinguish between personal opinions and accepted views of the discipline. (II.A.7.a).

The College does not offer any courses or academic programs in foreign locations (II.A.8).

Conclusions
SJVC has met the requirements of Standard II.A and the subsection standards II.A.1 through II.A.8.

Recommendations
There are no recommendations for Standard IIA.

Commendations
SJVC is commended for its' system wide comprehensive individualized team approach to meeting students personal, professional, and psychosocial needs to achieve their goals and objectives.

II B. Student Support Services

General Observations

The consistent and substantial commitment to student success is evident throughout SJVC's student support services. The College on research to identify and provide comprehensive support services to meet the unique needs of its diverse population. In 2010/2011 the institution created and implemented formal policy and procedures governing evaluation of its non-instructional departments that provide student services. The policy requires each non-instructional department to conduct a program review at least once every two years.

The institution has implemented methods to support students' needs and improve services offered from the time of recruitment to completion. The primary documents used in this process are the "Student Support and Advising Activities on Campus – 2011," and "Results of the 2011 Institutional Self Study Survey."

The College has taken thorough steps to research, analyze, implement and adjust the findings to guide admissions policies and procedures. At the time of application, each student is assessed of skill levels the College deems necessary for successful completion. Applicants for on-ground courses are required to complete an assessment. On-line applicants are not. Based on interviews with the Director of Admissions, the reason for this is that the on-ground assessments do not apply to on-line students. Evaluation of available instruments is currently in process. These assessments are aimed at identifying occupational and educational history, commitment, and investment in education.
From this assessment, students are directed to the Dean of Student Services via a Transfer of Care (TOC) if there is a need for support in childcare, employment, family support, housing, transportation, and tutoring. Academic preparedness is assessed using the Wonderlic SLE. Students are provided student advising which primarily consists of interventions with at-risk students and providing referrals to appropriate academic and personal resources. For students having unmet basic needs, the College maintains a food pantry, offers grocery gift cards, references for assistance with payment with rent, child care and utilities. Lists of students willing to carpool along with gas and bus vouchers are available. Referrals to crisis intervention facilities are available. Tutoring is made available through individual instructors, a Student Center Coordinator, and the development of personal training and studying plans based on assessment examinations

Findings and Evidence:

Systematic assessment is conducted to understand student access, progress, learning and success being met via student services. Every student service department participated in the Non-Instructional Program Review (NIPR) in January 2011/2012. Data collection and program outcomes are measured. In addition, the Colleges report and dashboard library contains data on attendance and grades. Also data are collected on SLO success rates, study plan completion, retention, graduation, and employment placement rates. The evaluation report claims that these data are "collected and reviewed regularly at specific junctures in the educational process by faculty, academic administrators, support service

providers, and other college personnel to pinpoint student learning needs and provide appropriate services and programs"(Comprehensive Evidence List #IIB.9.a.,.b, and .c). The College provides a catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information concerning all the required categories of the standard (II.B.2.a, 2.b and 2.c)

The Admissions Office delivers two services aimed at student learning and mission fulfillment. The first service is providing essential information to applicants for use in their decision-making for their educational plan. Second, identification of and references for self-identified students in need of academic and support services. These students are referred to the Transfer of Care (TOC) process and to the Dean of Student Services. Evidence in support of the success of these two services is provided in the "Admissions Audit-October 2011" and the "Results of the 2011 Institutional Self Study Survey." The audit was repeated in 2012, after advisor training, and evidence showed that 17 admissions advisors at ten campuses demonstrated increased accuracy of information presented (II.B.1.a, .b, and .c).

The results of the survey indicate 89 percent of student respondents agreed that they received accurate information from the advisement received. This survey also showed that the outcome students will know to whom they should go to with specific issues was achieved by 78 percent. The third service is to provide new student orientations before coursework begins. The focus of the orientation is to:

- introduce students to the available support service
- meet administrators and staff
- emphasize the importance of higher education
- student responsibilities
- campus policies and procedures
- study skills
- time management
- goal setting
- adapting to college life.

The catalog is current, complete, clear, easy to understand, easy to use, and well-structured. This and other support documents are reviewed on a cyclical basis by content specialists while revisions are made as needed. The catalog information on-line is identical to the printed version. The InfoZone intranet site is a comprehensive location for access to policy documents for student (II.B.2.d).

The College has conducted significant and comprehensive data collection especially with regards to retention and success rates as related to use of student services. On campus accessibility is during normal operation hours. During normal operating hours campus faculty and staff are available to students and visitors (II.B.2.a and 2.b).

Both the public website and the InfoZone intranet provide general information regarding start and end dates, information regarding tuition, requirements, and links relevant to student progress and success. When requesting information on the public website, with the exception of campus locations, the visitor is asked to complete a personal information survey before being supplied the information. The InfoZone provides access to general

information, eCourses and the LIRN. Interactive services are available for on-line students: admissions, financial aid, student services, and tutoring (II.B.2.a and 2.b)

The College Campus Constituency Group process, the Mid-Point Assessment process, the Academic Progress Plans, and the training of faculty and staff all contribute to the design, maintenance, and evaluation of counseling and/or academic advising. The "Mid-term Advisory Activities September 2011-September 2012" report, the "Academic Probation Progress Plan" form, and the "Mid-term Milestone Assessment" form indicate well planned instruments and strategies to move the student toward success while taking responsibility for said success. (II.B.3.)

Team members evaluated services offered at each of the College campuses visited as they travel from their homes to Visalia where the Corporate Office of SVJC was located. During site visits the campuses were assessed on the student service processes and support systems available to help students succeed in college. Team members noted that each campus had universal access to a number of packaged services that were accessible through a web based portal known as InfoZone. Additional services that promoted equal access to support services include interactive services including these core functions:
> Admissions
> Financial Aid
> General Student Services that covers another range of specialized support
programs for students in certain low income categories who are entitled to additional financial assistance.
> Tutoring
Through application of technology and a cultural strength that promotes a philosophy of doing whatever it takes to help students succeed, SVJC has been able to establish processes and methodologies that assures equitable access to all students regardless of location. (II.B.3.a)

The College has purposefully structured the practices, programs and services to instill achievement from the first day of instruction. This plan includes the admissions process, new student orientation, a student center, career services, program curriculum, community involvement, clubs and organizations and student recognition (IIB.3.b).

The College provides an environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students. The report indicates that this process begins with the initial admissions process through program completion and career/job placement. (IIB.3.b)

The College has designed and evaluated a comprehensive student services program. The campus consistency groups identify students in need of the advising services that support their success. The groups are comprised of student center coordinators, admissions advisors, and faculty. Each program housed in student services is responsible for submitting and evaluating program reviews which are required to link their goals and plans to institutional and program outcomes. The report indicates that faculty and staff

are trained to maintain the program and advise students as needed. This includes the both academic and personal advisement. (II.B.3.c)

The College designs and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support and enhance student understanding and appreciation of diversity. The creation of the Institutional Diversity Committee has provided a process through which a broad scope of events and information are provided via curriculum, community projects, student clubs and organizations, internal and external events to educate students, staff and members of the community on benefits and practice of diversity. (II.B.3.d)

The report claims regular evaluation of admissions and placement instruments and practices to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases. The College maintains and secures student records permanently in accordance with the "SJVC Records Retention Policy." FERPA guidelines are followed regarding the releasing of student records. (II.B.3.e, II.B.3.f)

Education preparedness is assessed through the MyLabs software program. This program measures a student's readiness for college-level math and English. Tracking students since 2006, the "MyLabs Study Plan Completion and English and Math Pass Rates-2009 March 2012" reports the data collected has shown a marked increase in pass rate from 78 to 84 percent in math, and from 82 to 89 percent in English. (II.B.2 and .3)

The advising function of student services "primarily exists of interventions with academically at-risk students and providing those students with referrals to appropriate academic and personal resource services to support the achievement of their educational goals." The College claims that faculty and staff are trained in order to help students who are either academically or personally in need of help. There is not sufficient evidence to support the claim of personal advising training beyond an introduction. The same comment is made regarding the training for DSPS and ADA identification, referral, and accommodation. There can be a critical gap between becoming aware of a problem and then finalizing a referral. There is a wide range of psychological troubles. The lack of evidence indicates that the well-being and success of a student may be in jeopardy without more extensive training (II.B.4.).

An average response time of 21.39 hours has been measured for submission of Help Desk service request tickets.

The "College Catalog," the "Student Handbook Rev. 2012", the "Substance Abuse Prevention Program 2012-2013," the "Campus Security Report and Safety Procedures Manual", and the "Student Disability Accommodation Policy Rev. March 2012" documents are complete as per the standard and are readily available.

The support and enhancement of student understanding and appreciation of diversity is the focus of the Institutional Diversity Committee. This outcome has been achieved by means of a variety of internal and external activities to educate staff, students, and members of the community on the benefits and value of understanding the concepts and

practice of diversity. In addition, field trips, campus professional development, multicultural fairs, and monthly celebrations of cultures provide the experience to understand and appreciate diversity. (II.B.3.d)

Since 2006, the Wonderlic Scholastic Level Exam has been the measure for assessing a prospective student's training potential and cognitive abilities. This has been the primary entrance exam. In 2009, SJVC reviewed the predictability success rates and found them to be valid. The findings presented in the evaluation report are contained in the "Wonderlic SLE Validation Study-July 2009." The instrument, however, was deemed ineffective for on-line students. While the Wonderlic SLE remains in place for on-ground students, the College is actively searching for a more appropriate instrument for the on-line students (III.B.1 and .2).

In 2011 and 2012, SJVC focused considerable attention on the key variables for retention of first term students. Key variables were identified. The College worked with Eduventures, Inc., to develop a plan of assessment through the identification of those key variables. Student interviews were also conducted with those who had dropped out of or terminated from a program (II.B.3.e).

The "Records Retention Policy" clearly states the procedure for securing and maintaining student records permanently, securely, and confidentially in accordance with the FERPA guidelines (II.B.3.f).

The key variables for success were found to be proficiency in English and math, as well as the establishment of a relationship with the faculty and instructional experience. From these findings, the edition of the MyLabs English and Math assessment software and an interview rubric were brought in. The MyLabs English and Math have proven to be valid predictors of student success. The findings are found in the "Admission Assessment Pilot for Conditional Enrollment Study October 2011-May 2012," the "Summary Faculty Input-Admissions Selectivity," and the "Input from Individual Faculty members-Behavioral Study" reports (II.B.4).

Other data supporting student performance statistics generated by the College to assess student performance were included in the Self Evaluation Report and reviewed by team members in support of activities conducted to support and evaluate a wide range of student support services being provided to students to encourage and promote student success. The additional detail is voluminous and has not been included in this report other than by general reference and in providing the team ample data to conclude that the College complies with the requirements of Standard II.B.4.

Conclusions
The College has diligently developed a comprehensive student services program through planning, assessment of institutional and program outcomes. Dialogue and continued efforts for improvement are apparent from the narrative and evidence provided in the Self Evaluation Report. Interviews and on-site observations reveal a consistent, deliberate,

and excited climate of student success. The College meets the requirements of Commission Standard II.B and subsections II.B.1, .2, .3 and .4 as described above.

Recommendations
None.

II. C. Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations
Instructional support is provided through its Library and Learning Resource Centers (LLRC) and Student Centers at its thirteen campuses. Configurations of these centers varies based on site-specific needs, including physical space, student population, and staffing. Student Center Coordinators are an early point of contact for students, supporting them through their MyLab modules, providing ongoing orientation to the College's online resources and learning environment, tutoring in general coursework, and referring students to other College personnel for additional support.

The LLRC collection includes a very modest print collection spread throughout its campuses with very little sharing of those resources across libraries. While there are mechanisms in place for faculty input for recommended purchases and assessment of the collection, these do not satisfy the College's charge to determine whether it has sufficient depth and variety of materials to meet the learning needs of its students, particularly in light of what appears to be an inadequate print collection and a nearly non-existent e-book collection.

Institutionally, instruction is provided in some basic information literacy competencies, particularly locating information and evaluating sources for credibility. Library staff expertise in information competency skills and instruction varies greatly from campus to campus, however, indicating a need for library staff training to expand and deepen its understanding of information competencies, with the goal of providing better information competency instruction to students.

Findings and Evidence
Decisions for purchase of educational equipment and materials to support student learning are made with input from faculty, students, program directors, division managers, student center coordinators, and library staff. Each campus provides substantial networked computer access for its students, and some programs provide laptops to students upon entry to the College. There is a variety of mechanisms utilized to gather input, including student suggestion boxes, and College-wide program review process that specifically addresses resource needs, and a newly instituted faculty feedback form that solicits suggestions for eliminating or adding resources to the collection.(II.C.1.a)

High priority is given to programmatic accreditation mandates for materials. Although each campus builds its collection based on the needs of students at that site, the Corporate Library and Learning Coordinator has developed core collection lists to support most of the programs. All campuses offering a particular course of study, therefore, have in their library collections essential materials to support that program. Sixty percent of surveyed faculty agreed that the quantity and selection of resources provided by the library are acceptable, and sixty-four percent of faculty agree that the overall quality of the resources is acceptable. This leaves approximately 40% of the faculty do not believe Library resources are adequate. The evaluation team also has concerns about the lack of stack or hard book collections and the sharing of resources from campus to campus in light of the

technical skill training requirements and General Education courses that must also be supported by these campus library spaces. (IIC.1.a).

While materials selection is predominantly driven by student need in support of specific curriculum, the team noted that there is no collection development policy that would build a robust, balanced collection of library resources to support the College's existing technical specialties currently offered by the College campuses. Additionally, the College does not have sufficient library resources to support its General Education courses or the programs of study currently offered by San Joaquin Valley College (II.C.1.a).

To give some Based on average collection sizes for Western U.S. two year, associate degree public and private colleges, a comparison practice recommended by the Association of College and Research Libraries (a principal professional organization for college libraries), the print and e-book collection meets the needs of only 20% of the average for the student population of the College (IIC.1.a).

At new student orientations, library or student center representatives provide a tutorial introduction to the use of library resources, including library-produced guides to sources and online databases. Distance Education (DE) students are supported by student advisors and receive a comparable orientation to online resources. All faculty complete a skills assessment related to use of online database resources so that instruction in use of these resources may also take place in the classroom. Library staff provides bibliographic instruction in classroom visits, in library orientations, and in one-on-one help with students. Library-produced guides on citation and formatting conventions, academic vs. popular sources, and basic use of online databases are available to all students, both face to face and DE, through the college intranet (II.C.1.c).

All DE courses include a box highlighting library resources, including links to online databases and support tutorials. Data about frequency of such instruction and interactions is not consistently available from each campus, although because DE students are supported by their student advisors, each contact with a student is logged and academic progress is monitored. (II.C.1.c).

The level of expertise and experience among library staff varies greatly from campus to campus. Some staff responsible for library resources on campuses possess an unclear understanding of the key concepts of information competency, reflecting a widespread lack of formal training in librarianship. Through the program review process, library staff, instructors, and key campus-level administrators have agreed to focus on three key areas of information competency: use online tools to locate materials for coursework; evaluate sources for reliability, authority, and bias; and encourage lifelong learning by fostering curiosity for information and resources beyond coursework. Each campus was not represented in the creation of program review, and awareness of these objectives is not uniform among library staff (IIC.1.b).

Based on program review documentation, there is some evidence of information competency skills instruction embedded in courses across the curriculum, including use

of standardized formatting and citation conventions and a focus on location of and evaluation of reliable sources for research. A formalized process for measuring and evaluating information competency outcomes is in development; 82% of students surveyed say they are learning how to locate, critically evaluate, and use information effectively, and 68% of students surveyed say they use library resources to help improve their grades on course assignments (IIC.1.b).

Many campuses have a Student Center staffed by a Student Center Coordinator. These coordinators support students through their English and math tutorials – MyWritingLab, MyMathLab, and MySkillsLab – and help orient new students to the online environments of InfoZone and eCourses. For continuing students, Student Center Coordinators offer tutoring across the curriculum to support students in their coursework. These coordinators also act as a key first contact with students and help identify at risk students and make recommendations about students' readiness to enter English or Mathematics courses after completion of their MyLab modules. In some locations, this position is combined with the LLRC coordinator position. In Distance Education, the Student Center and LLRC coordinator positions have been folded into the student advisor position. Currently four student advisors support this program, each with a case load of approximately 100 students (IIC.1.b).

Library and Learning Resource Centers (LLRC) and/or Student Centers are open and staffed for at least 50 hours per week, Monday through Friday. Some campus LLRC's are open up to 61 hours per week. Students, faculty and staff have access to a collection of databases to serve research needs. There is no e-book collection, although preliminary explorations of e-book options are underway. Because there is not universal access to a library catalog and no formal provisions for sharing resources across campuses, and because there is a limited number of e-books in the collection, neither students nor staff have equal access to resources. Campuses have vastly different levels of print collections; some campuses have virtually no print resources, while larger campuses may have up to 5,000 titles in their collections. Distance Education students are not informed of other campus collections and, because they do not have access to the library catalog, have no way of knowing what resources are available without visiting the campus. These factors contribute to the inequity in access to resources (II.1.C).

The level of training and expertise among library support staff varies greatly from campus to campus, as well. Some staff communicate regularly with the Corporate LLRC director, while others do not. Some employees charged with supported the library program have had little or no formal training; therefore, the quality of interventions in support of information competency goals also varies greatly. Some staff limit those interventions to pointing out resources and helping with citation and formatting conventions. Others assist in developing research strategies that include consideration of the scope of resources required, development of a suitable research question, and application of sophisticated search strategies to narrow or refine searches. The difference in the quality of these interventions represents a different kind of inequity in access to resources (II.1.C).

There is sufficient evidence of security and other learning support services, both physical and virtual. LLRC facilities are always supervised by college personnel; there is a policy never to leave these spaces unsupervised when open, and the level of staffing required for supervision is adequate. Some LLRC facilities include motion-detection alarms, but this is not universal across campuses. The Fresno campus is piloting an RFID tag system for securing books and other resources. Such systems are an effective deterrent to theft and assist in management of collections. Secure logins are used to verify permissions to access LIRN and InfoZone. Regular maintenance occurs at all facilities and there is a request tracker/service desk reporting system to notify appropriate staff of maintenance needs. Maintenance staff is by all accounts extremely responsive; issues are addressed within 48 hours, and typically more quickly . A similar service desk system is used to report trouble with hardware or software, and responses to these requests is equally quick and effective. The College survey indicates that a large majority of faculty, staff and students agree the facilities and buildings are well maintained and in good condition (IIC.1.d).

The college maintains contracts with Follett to provide a cataloging, circulation and inventory integrated library system. Destiny is proven software provided by a company with a long history of reliable performance, although it is not commonly used in academic libraries. The College provides access to online databases through the Library and Information Resources Network (LIRN), a nonprofit consortium of educational institutions formed in the 1990s with the purpose of sharing access to information resources. Through LIRN, the college offers a package of databases found in many academic libraries. Print periodical publications are provided through EBSCO, an industry leader in such services, and contracts are also maintained to maintain photocopying equipment. With the exception of print periodicals, usage statistics are gathered regularly by the Corporate LLRC Director. Each of these contracts is reviewed at least annually as part of one of the LLRC quarterly meetings. In the case of the databases, new competing products are evaluated on an ongoing basis and discussed as part of this review (IIC.1.e).

Institutional survey data indicate 68% of students use LIRN resources to help improve course grades; 64% of faculty rate the overall quality of library resources, including LIRN databases, to be adequate, while 60% rate the quantity and selection of those resources to be adequate (IIC.2).

Beyond survey data, usage of library resources is evaluated through gate counts at individual library sites; collection statistics for physical resources (i.e., print, CD ROM, video, etc.), and global usage statistics from LIRN databases. Although the LIRN data can be disaggregated by database, such statistics have not been utilized to evaluate the usage of particular databases within the LIRN package (IIC.2).

Through its program review, the LLRC has identified department and service outcome objectives to further evaluate the effectiveness and value of the resources and services provided. As this is a new process, the data collected from the past year met goals set but is baseline data for future assessment. Library staff, instructors, technology coaches, and

the Corporate LLRC Director are developing new measurements to identify student outcomes in information competency as part of their ongoing curriculum conference and program review cycle. The Student Center's department assessment plan sets targets and examines data specifically around student performance with MyLab modules. The plan creates concrete measures of the Student Centers' role in student success college-wide (IIC.2).

Conclusions

Student Center coordinators play a vital role in supporting the College's instructional programs in their regular contact with students. Library and Learning Resources Centers and/or student Centers are open for extended hours at most campuses. Library services are, however, unevenly delivered from campus to campus, depending upon the expertise and training of library staff and materials available onsite. The collection development policy does not address the disparity in resources that was apparent from site to site, the online catalog is not being used to facilitate intra-campus sharing of materials. The College does not meet the requirements of Standard II.C Library and Learning Support Services for the following reasons:

1. Library resources at campus sites are inadequate to support the mission of the College's broad range of technical education oriented courses and General Education course currently offered at SVJC. (II.C, II.C.1.a)
2. Personnel have varying ranges of knowledge of library science practices and procedures resulting in varying degrees of service being provided to students at the various campus of the College (II.C.1.b).
3. The College lacks a Library Resource Development Plan or other form of planning document to address concerns identified by the team and widely acknowledged as concerns by campus personnel at campus sites. A plan to bring all campus Library Resources up to a level that will support current technical educational programs and the General Education curriculum can serve as a roadmap for accomplishing an objective of ensuring students at each campus location will receive comparable access to Library resources and can expect to learn information competency skills necessary to work in today's highly technical work environment (II.C.1.c).

Recommendations

Recommendation # 1 – 2013 Library and Learning Support Services

In order to meet the Standards and to more effectively support the quality of its instructional programs with its library collections, the team recommends that the college create and implement a library resources development plan in order to increase the quantity, depth, and variety of library resources (II.C, IIC.1.a).

In order to meet the Standards, the team further recommends that the college establish a training program for all library personnel in the fundamental principles of information competency (II.C.1.b).

Additionally, in order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College increase equitable access to library materials and services regardless of their location or means of delivery. The team further recommends that the college create a written process that facilitates the sharing of library resources among campuses and provide a means for students and staff to access the library catalogs of each campus (II.C.1.c).

Standard III: Resources

III. A. Human Resources

General Observations
SJVC policies and procedures govern the recruitment, retention and evaluation of all college employees. SJVC uses numerous techniques to assure that jobs are widely advertised to appropriate populations through the most effective means. Qualifications to support SJVC's mission exist for every position at SJVC. The faculty and staff qualifications charts provide an overview of the education, skills, experience, certifications, and licensures required for instructional, administrative, and support staff functions.

If the applicant possesses the necessary qualifications for a vacant position at SJVC, the applicant's credentials and previous work experience are verified through a screening process. The hiring process may include one or two interviews. For faculty, the second interview includes a teaching demonstration to an experienced team of evaluators. SJVC evaluates all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The evaluation process begins with an initial evaluation with 90 days of employment, followed by an annual evaluation thereafter.

Findings and Evidence
SJVC employs qualified personnel to support student learning programs and services wherever offered and by whatever means delivered. Policies and procedures pertaining to the hiring process are published in the Manager's Guide to the Hiring Process. This guide assures the consistent application of the hiring process. SJVC's strategic plan initiatives and evolving business needs creates the need for new positions (III.A).

Faculty and staff qualification charts provide an overview of the education, skills, experience, certifications and licensures required for instructional, administrative and support staff functions. An applicant is deemed well qualified if he/she has successfully gone through the screening and interview process. For faculty, the second interview includes a teaching demonstration. This is used to evaluate the applicant's effectiveness in the classroom as well as scholarship. Faculty are involved in the applicant interview and teaching demonstration process (III.A.1).

Turn-over rates are one way to evaluate the effectiveness of the faculty selection process, which includes the teaching demonstration rubric. In 2012 the turnover rate for faculty was 8% for 2012, 20% for 2011, 31% for 2010, and 30% for 2009. SJVC verifies the applicant's credentials and previous work experience through its screening process. This includes the applicant's transcripts from an accredited college. For degrees from non-US colleges, SJVC checks for the equivalency of degrees through the International Research Foundation. The equivalency report is compared to the minimum qualifications of the position to ensure applicant qualification (III.A.1.a).

The minimum qualifications for a TECHNICAL faculty position is an Associate Degree. However, this may be waived through the Justification Report process, with the approval

of the Vice President of Academic Affairs. In addition a contractual agreement with the faculty is made for the faculty to attain an Associate Degree by an agreed timeline (III.A.1.a).

SJVC assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The evaluation process begins with an initial evaluation within 90 days of employment and consists of 20 hours, followed by an annual evaluation thereafter. SJVC has adopted a competency-based approach to evaluating its employees. The key competencies for each position were aligned to the duties and responsibilities reflected in the job descriptions. On May 1, 2012, SJVC launched an automated evaluation system, eAppraisal, that supports assessing employee performance, identifying opportunities for training and development, and cultivating talent pools. The automated system allows the tracking of employee performance (III.A.1.b).

Classroom observations are conducted on a regular basis by the academic dean or other members of college administration. One of the areas in which faculty are evaluated is the alignment of curriculum to student learning outcomes. The evaluator rates the instructor during an on-going classroom instruction. After the observation, the faculty member meets with the academic dean to discuss the results of the observation (III.A.1.).

SJVC has created an electronic dashboard to collect and display outcome statistics for course, program, and institutional learning outcomes. The dashboard provides the student learning outcome success rate, total number of outcomes assessed, total number of courses assessed, and number of students assessed. The data can be filtered by individual instructors to get a snapshot of their students' success rates. Faculty members are evaluated on how well students are meeting student learning outcomes expectations as well as additional student specific performance indicators like class attendance and student retention in classes (III.A.1.c).

SJVC upholds a written code of professional ethics for all of its employees. The Code of Ethics and Standards of Conduct are published in the 2012 Employee Handbook. SJVC maintains ethical behavior in its employees by investigating immediately any suspected violation and taking appropriate action (III.A.1.d).

SJVC maintains a sufficient number of full time faculty, administrators and staff to support SJVC's mission, goals, and objectives. The average faculty to student ratio averaged 1:14 for the years 2007 through 2011. For administrators and staff, SJVC averaged 1:10.66 in November 2011(III.A.2).

SJVC administers its personnel policies and procedures consistently and equitably. It adheres to Equal Employment Opportunity guidelines. It provides its employees the opportunity to report any inconsistencies in the application of policies and procedures through the Fair Treatment and Dispute Resolution process. There were eight complaints in 2011 that were resolved successfully (III.A.3.a).

SJVC provides for the security and confidentiality of personnel records through a third party administrator's database, eBridge. Employees may access their personnel records at any time by making a written request to their campus director or to a member of the Board of Directors. Human Resources processes these requests (III.A.3.b).

SJVC demonstrates through policies and practices an understanding of equity and diversity issues. Training is provided to all employees to ensure their awareness of these policies, and their rights and their responsibilities in upholding them. Diversity related activities are spearheaded by the Corporate Diversity Committee and the Campus Diversity Sub-Committees. In the most recent College survey, 95% of faculty and 97% of staff respondents agreed that SJVC is a caring community that respects the cultures of all students, faculty, and staff. Likewise, 91% agreed that, "SJVC is a caring community that respects the cultures of all students." (III.A.4.a and 4.b)

SJVC creates and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services to support its diverse personnel. These include: Diversity Program, Employee Assistance Program, Educational Assistance, Tuition Assistance, Wellness Program, and Credit Union. Results from the November 2011 survey indicate that 82% of faculty and 87 % of staff agree that Human Resources does an effective job in offering services to meet the needs of SJVC employees. Programs and services are evaluated quarterly by an independent consultant to promote fair and equitable treatment of all personnel of the College (III.A.4.c).

SJVC plans and provides professional development opportunities to meet the needs of its personnel. All new faculty participate in a rigorous two-day training program facilitated by the Director of Instruction. In 2011, a total of 65 internal and 23 external professional development opportunities were provided. Examples include:
- Three day retreat in November 2011 for Academic Deans on the topic of effective instruction.
- Two day conference in March 2012 for Division Managers, Program Directors, and Enrollment Services Directors on the topic of Effective Supervision.
- One day math professional development: Making Mathematics Instruction Matter.
Participants provide feedback on professional development opportunities, to improve the training materials, presentation, and environment (III.A.5.a and III.A.5.b).

Human Resources decisions are developed from program review results, College needs and plans for improvement. These emanate from strategic initiatives and business needs. (III.A.6)

Conclusions
The College employs qualified personnel to support student learning programs and services wherever offered and by whatever means delivered. SJVC creates and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services to support its diverse personnel. SJVC plans and provides professional development opportunities to meet the needs of its personnel.

Human Resources decisions are developed from program review results, College needs and plans for improvement. In summary, the College meets the requirements of Commission Standard III.A. and subsections III.A.1 through III.A.6.

<u>Recommendations</u>
None.

Standard III. B. Physical Resources

General Observations:
Physical resources, including facilities, equipment, land and other assets to support student learning programs and services as well as improve College services are a top priority for this College. Physical planning is integrated with College planning. Physical resources are consistent across the multiple campuses. The Corporate office provides all campuses with a clear process for determining needs or deficiencies through to correction or implementation via purchasing, repairing, or in whatever means necessary to ensure safe and sufficient physical resources. Each campus adheres to these policies and procedures.

The College relies on input from scheduled inspections, faculty input, student survey and Help Desk data. Members of Senior Management review every proposed capital improvement project to ensure that the proposal supports achievements of College goals and objectives. Each proposal contains total costs, implementation timelines, human resource implications and student learning outcomes. The process is clearly delineated in the "Physical Resource Planning and Workflow" document. The flow begins with the Master Plan Project Initiative and ends with the Senior Management Review every five weeks. The process encourages and ensures wide-spread shared dialog

The College plans, builds, maintains, and upgrades or replaces its physical resources in a manner that assures effective utilization and the continuing quality necessary to support its programs and services. All needs are considered and prioritized by establishing the relationship of the requests to quality student instruction, the mission, safety and security.

Based upon the "2011 Institutional Self Study Survey," the various tracking forms, and interviews with faculty and staff, College needs for equipment are met. Every academic program has a faculty-approved list of program equipment and supplies that support learning outcomes. (III.B.1.a)

All campuses employ safety officers, either through outside contract or within the College. Based on safety reports, there have been no "high risk" threats on any of the campuses. The security officers are on campus approximately two hours before and three hours after students, faculty and staff occupy the campus. (Evidence III.B.1.b)

The Student Disability Policy provides policies for the providing and maintenance of access to facilities. In addition, procedures for requesting access are provided. All campuses are accessible in accordance with the Federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. The SJVC Safety Committee conducts quarterly campus and off-site inspections. There is a consistent follow-up procedure on the Facilities Service Desk ticket generation (III.B.1.b).

Evidence and Findings
Physical resource planning is integrated with College and program planning through the implementation of both instructional and non-instructional program reviews, which are

linked to a specific program. The "Purchasing and Facilities Program Review" monitors and plans for the various processes for which it is responsible in order to realize the individual program reviews, through institutional and service outcomes. The College has in place specific policies and procedures for requests, purchasing, repairing and quality assurance of the physical resources. These polices are reflected in the "Policy on Facilities Inspection and Report Record Retention" document, the "Facilities 80-Point Inspection Report" form, and custodial schedules. Based upon the "2011 Institutional Self Study Survey," and the various tracking forms, institutional needs for equipment are met (III.B.1.a).

The College is committed to providing a campus community that is free of threats and acts of violence. Protection of students and employees is a priority. Periodic training on workplace violence is provided to employees. In addition, as part of the New Faculty Orientation, training is provided in these areas. Of concern is that students are not provided with equitable training. In place are the Injury and Illness Prevention Program (IIPP) and Emergency Action plans, guided by Cal-OSHA. (III.B.1.b)

Emergency plans provide for escape routes, emergency procedures, phone numbers, approved medical referrals, and disaster survival measures. During each module, there is at least one unannounced fire drill. Only security knows of the day and time of the drill. The effect is that everyone assumes the alarm to be real. There is no clear evidence of earthquake preparedness drills. Based on interviews with three campus directors, training drills/simulations for threats from an armed and dangerous individual are not in place. There is no clear evidence of regular drills/simulations other than the unexpected fire drills. (III.B.1.b)

Campus safety has been recorded in the "Campus Security Report (2012/2013)." This report reveals that all campuses are safe for students, faculty, staff, and visitors because when incidents have been reported, this has generated action on the part of the College to correct and protect. Faculty and staff have access to the "Campus Safety Procedures Manual (revised July 2009)." All students, faculty and staff must wear photo identification tags whenever on campus. Training is provided through the Illness and Injury Protection Program and "Emergency Action Plan Training" materials. The "College Catalog" and "Student Handbook" contains emergency information but is difficult to find and limited in scope. The College posts safety and emergency signs visible to employees but not necessarily to students and visitors. (III.B.1.b)

The College plans, builds, maintains, and upgrades or replaces its physical resources in a manner that assures effective utilization by implementing requests through program reviews, the Help Desk tickets (which are the formal initiation of the request), and suggestion boxes. The "Purchasing and Facilities Program Review" lists outcomes ensuring quick turnaround (24 to 72 hours) for approval of service ticket requests and new purchase requests. In addition, outcomes include all facilities infrastructure. Non-program equipment is compliant with federal, state, and local regulatory requirements as well as the Illness and Prevention Program facilities and repairs. Further this program review sets the standard to ensure that all new students (enrolled in both on-ground and

on-line courses) receive curriculum specified textbooks on or before the service survey response messages are process within 24-48 hours. (III.B.2)

Long-range capital plans support College improvement goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment. Long-range planning and implementation are driven by the Purchasing and Facilities Program Review in addition to all relevant constituent program reviews. Members of Senior Management review every proposed capital improvement project to ensure that the proposal supports achievements of College goals and objectives. Each proposal contains total costs, implementation timelines, human resource implications and student learning outcomes (III.B.2.a)

The process is clearly delineated in the "Physical Resource Planning and Workflow" document. The flow begins with the Master Plan Project Initiative and ends with the Senior Management Review every 5 weeks. The process is built so that the process is shared and necessitates dialogue. SJVC includes the following elements when defining "total cost of ownership" when making decisions about facilities and equipment:
- Initial purchase, acquisition, installation and construction of costs.
- Utility expenses
- Operation, maintenance, and repair costs.
- Capital replacement costs
- Residual values of a system or component
- Finance charges, taxes, and non-monetary benefits or costs.
- Life-cycle costs.

When considering campus migration and relocation, new programs, and new campuses, detailed discussions center on the mission and needs for student and program success. All discussions point to mission, College outcomes, program, and student outcomes (III.B.2.b.)

Conclusions:
The College has carefully developed and implemented thorough policies and procedures for maintaining the physical resources for all facilities. The "Purchasing and Facilities Program Review" establishes and plans for a process ensuring resource requests for repair, purchase, distribution and readiness are completed in an effective and timely manner. Safety is a priority for the College. All campuses have safety plans in place. Training for employees is provided. Students are instructed as to the emergency procedures. Security officers are available before and after hours of operation. All buildings are safe and accessible to everyone. The College has a formal and institutionalized Safety Committee and Emergency Response Team.

The College meets the requirements of Commission Standard III.B including subsections III.B.1 and III.B.2.
Recommendations
None

III.C. Technology Resources

General Observations
Robust technology resources and services support student learning and programs to improve the College's overall College effectiveness. Faculty, staff and students play a substantive role in identifying technology needs and priorities. The program planning process provides a significant foundation for ongoing assessment and planning of technology change and growth.

Findings and Evidence
The College identifies technology needs through a variety of mechanisms, both formal and informal. When new hardware or software is introduced across the College, the Director of Curriculum and Assessment initiates system-wide training for affected students and staff. These trainings are assessed, refined, and institutionalized for new faculty, staff and students. The "Training and Help" tab on InfoZone provides links to quick tutorials to address a wide array of user issues related to equipment, software, operating systems, platforms, connectivity, and learning management systems (LMS) (III.C.1).

As with the trainings, some of these quick helps are proactive in anticipation of routine questions many users will have while learning new software or hardware. Other tutorials are a byproduct of a help desk/ticketing system whose use has been integrated into the fabric of day to day operations. Students, faculty and staff who have technology questions or struggles use the Help Desk for support. Help Desk staff point users to tutorials as applicable, provide real-time support when possible, and even use remote computer support software to take control of user desktops temporarily to apply fixes. The ticketing system allows Information Services (IS) to identify persistent needs and create solutions, or, when appropriate, to refer the issue to the Director of Curriculum and Assessment to be resolved through large-scale training (IIIC.1.a)

At the campus level, technology coaches act as liaisons to IS managers, observing faculty, staff, and student user issues and communicating them to IS as part of regularly scheduled meetings with IS management. Campus directors also communicate technology needs that arise out of day to day operations, new initiatives, or unforeseen complications with hardware or software that rise to the level of more than a one-time fix. Campus Improvement committees identify additional needs and propose and initiate technology-related solutions. Although the program review process does not specifically address technology, it contains a section that addresses new purchases to support a course or program. This part of the review includes estimating costs, explaining the benefits of the new resource, and estimating maintenance and continuing costs. IS uses this information to anticipate needs and respond proactively (IIIC.1.b)

The College uses a range of metrics to evaluate the effectiveness of its technology. In terms of infrastructure and system-wide technologies, IS closely monitors page visits to the College intranet portal (InfoZone), the LMS (ANGEL being phased out, D2L being phased in), and the public web portal. Network uptime is closely monitored through data provided by two third-party groups, Dotcom Monitor and SolarWinds, as an indicator of

the system's reliability. Help tickets generated and resolved provide additional information about needs met and persistent issues that require additional levels of attention and support. Data from student and staff satisfaction surveys measure effectiveness of Help Desk support and acceptable resolution times. These metrics are part of the program review plan IS uses to measure effectiveness of technology in meeting the College's needs. While many of these feedback mechanisms have been in place for some time, this is a baseline year; targets have been set but data has not yet been added to the review (IIIC.1.c).

Program reviews are used to examine program-specific technology use and connect it to productivity or student learning outcomes. Non-instructional program reviews include collection of data to measure how technologies improve institutional effectiveness. Technology coaches on the campuses maintain personal contact with instructors, providing support, coaching, and feedback to instructors to help leverage technologies toward greater student achievement. The technology coaches meet monthly with the Director of Curriculum and Assessment and hold ongoing conversations about how to continue developing best practice around instructional technology. Technology coaches also do classroom observations and provide detailed written communication with Campus Directors about instructors' strengths and specific suggestions for improvement in instructional technology use. Data collection around this assessment has not been standardized to examine effective instructional technology use College-wide; however, such feedback to Campus Directors and instructors offers a meaningful avenue for assessment and improvement (IIIC.1.d).

As with needs assessment, several mechanisms are in place to facilitate decision-making about technology services, facilities, hardware and software. Technology purchases under $1,000 are made at the campus level, ultimately through approval by the Campus Director. Technology proposals by programs may be generated through program review, ensuring broad representation in the creation of the proposal and a connection of that technology use to student outcomes or institutional effectiveness. Such proposals can also be submitted outside the program review process. For example, programs that have new mandated requirements or faculty that have discovered new software or hardware that will make a significant impact on student outcomes, submit proposals for approval by the Technology Steering Committee, which includes the Chief Operations Officer, the Chief Financial Officer, the Director of Information Management, the Director of Network Operations, a curriculum specialist, and two technology coaches. Proposals reaching this committee are already well-vetted for connection to institutional mission and department, service, or student learning outcomes (III.C.2).

When large-scale technology applications have a direct impact on one or more programs, a large representative group is typically assembled to investigate options and develop a proposal through consensus, even if the original need was identified by IS or senior management. When a need to change the LMS arose, for example, a committee of approximately twenty people was assembled, including representatives from most instructional programs, technology coaches, key IS staff and curriculum specialists. A rubric was developed to evaluate competing LMS products, and a clear consensus choice

for a new product emerged. This consensus recommendation was forwarded to senior management which approved the decision. When the IS team recognized a need for a more robust infrastructure, it researched options and developed a proposal and made a proposal directly to senior management. Because this was a back-end decision that had little impact on day to day technology use, and because the decision making required significant technical expertise, the decision-making process was confined to a small group. The recommendation to senior management to proceed with Unified Computing System implementation was based on several factors: increased capability for redundancy, speed and scalability; as well as more efficient and less intrusive hardware maintenance. While the decision-making process involved a decidedly smaller group, all stakeholders who could provide meaningful input were included (III.C.2).

The LMS adopted serves every student across all delivery formats, so students share a uniformly supported system in terms of training, troubleshooting, and technical assistance provided. Software to enhance web conferencing is utilized by Distance Education and face-to-face instructors, and student advisors provide tutoring support through a clever adaptation of telephony, remote assistance technology, and tablet computing, which provides a kind of shared whiteboard experience for DE students. Students and staff in DE learning programs and courses also utilize the Help Desk, submitting tickets and receiving support through direct communication, referral to prepared tutorials, and hardware and software fixes via remote assistance software. Technology available to support distance learning is well-leveraged (III.C.2).

 Ample provisions are made for reliability, disaster recovery, privacy, and security. Virtual server technology has increased redundancy; contracts with two external companies monitor service availability and abnormal network activity and events that may impede reliability. The college uses an efficient identity management system with a proven record of effectiveness to protect privacy of users, and network security is maintained with the help of applications that scan web traffic for unauthorized sites, detect malware and virus activity, and provide real-time views of the security of devices on the network (IIIC.1.a).

Need for technology training is partially assessed through data about Help Desk tickets submitted. The Director of Information Management reviews this data and initiates new training when a need is evidenced through the Help Desk requests. The creation of the technology coach position grew out of a need for more training as a result of this process. The technology coaches offer another level of on-the-ground assessment of training needs, particularly in regards to instructional technology. Technology coaches meet with the Curriculum and Assessment Director monthly to examine technology training needs for students and staff, and the program review process provides an opportunity to examine technology training needs within a specific program (IIIC.1.b).

Establishing a culture in which technology help is initiated through the Help Desk actually requires training in and of itself. New students and staff receive in-person training before their first semester; they learn how to navigate InfoZone and the LMS, and locate the resources in LIRN. This training is fairly substantial, requiring several

hours out of a two-day orientation schedule. Technology coaches and other trainers may conduct follow-ups as campus directors and division managers determine need. Some campuses provide refresher training to certain technologies on a regular basis (IIIC.1.b).

Individual training documents have been created to address a variety of issues that might come up in the LMS and CampusVue, in which a student may check his own student record. Similarly, training documents are available through InfoZone and the library resource folders there for a variety of faculty and staff needs. The technology coach also works with instructors to employ teaching technologies such as Smart Boards and i-clickers. Technology coaches and other technologically savvy staff regularly provide training around program-specific software and hardware. The Help Desk is available for ongoing technical support, and this is staffed six days a week. The Help Desk responds with in-person visits, remote assistance, or referral to a help document already available (III.C.1.b).

Much technology training is faculty-driven, based on student needs in particular courses. It is common for instructors to provide technology training to student in the first few days of rolling out program-specific, content-specific, or institutionally ubiquitous software (Evidence IIIC.1.b).

Feedback from faculty and students indicate that a large majority know how to access the College's technology resources, and students are able to access Academic Info to access their admissions records and accounts. Faculty and students also agree by a large majority that the Help Desk resolves issues in a timely manner. Classroom observations by curriculum specialists and technology coaches are relayed to academic deans and Campus Directors. Program reviews provide further opportunity to assess the efficacy of technology training. Survey data indicate a large majority of students feel they are learning how to use technology as part of their coursework, that it helps them do better in their classes, and that they enjoy and are engaged by such instructional technologies as Smart Boards and i-clickers. 70% of instructors surveyed say they use such technologies in their instruction; 72% believe such technologies are effective in increasing student interest and engagement. According to some who observe instructional technology practices in the classroom, follow-up on those observations may increase effectiveness, and other measures need to be developed to determine the effectiveness of both technology training and the effectiveness of educational technologies employed in the classroom (III.C.1.b).

The College maintains contracts with a variety of software providers (including ANGEL LMS, InfoZone,Microsofts Live@EDU e-mail, and Destiny library software) and receives data about usage and stability of those platforms regularly. Unified Computing System (UCS) is used, providing over 150 virtual servers that run the Virtual Desktop Infrastructure, allowing the IS team to update and push changes to software without having to visit individual computers. UCS also simplifies backing up data and removing or modifying computer configurations easy and quick (III.C.1.c).

Weekly meetings between the Director of Network Operations and the Network Administrators include review of the technology infrastructure. The Director of Network Operations submits a formal plan proposal for significant new technology requests to the Chief Financial Officer, who, in consultation with other senior management, decides whether or not to approve the Director's request. Clearly delineated roles among IS personnel improves the efficacy of the management of technology systems and infrastructure. Significant infrastructure provides for backup of data, redundancy in its systems, and a monthly uptime of over 99% (III.C.1.c).

Needs are communicated through informal, regular monitoring by the IS department, help tickets, and input to the technology steering committee. In addition, program review examines resource needs, and instructional need for technology is reviewed formally during that process (Evidence IIIC.1.d). Decisions about classroom technology tools to enhance teaching and learning are typically campus-driven or program-driven. If a change or acquisition of a technology by an individual program is proposed, attention is paid by IS and other institutional level administrators about whether its adoption will affect the whole College. If a department identifies a need, a proposal detailing how the new technology will improve student learning or institutional effectiveness is a major consideration for approval. Budget considerations infrequently override these two criteria (III.C.1.d).

Security, reliability and disaster recovery systems are in place to assure service, as documented in reference to Standard IIIC.1.a above. In the maintenance and reliability of the wireless network, college-issued laptops, the IS Management Director says IS is aggressive in making sure student technology needs are met (IIIC.1.d).

The college regularly commits 5% of its budget, or $1,049 per student, to purchase, maintenance, operations and support of technology. A cycle of equipment obsolescence and replacement is being developed, and the actual lifetime cost of nearly all technology items on campus has been factored into budgets (III.C.1.d).

A thorough review process by a representative college-wide group preceded selection of the LMS used in both face-to-face and DE course. All online instructors use a conferencing software program for at least one online interaction with students. Student advisors effectively use remote computer support software and a tablet as a kind of DE interactive whiteboard. Instructors who express a technology need in support of their courses, whether DE or not, are more often than not able to acquire the tools they request (Evidence IIIC.1.d).

Use of the institutional scorecard allows for mapping an alignment between an employee's goals and the college's goals. Technology proposals formally connect to institutional goals and mission; program reviews likewise connect technology plans to institutional goals (III.C.2).

The program review process provides an avenue for communicating instructional and programmatic needs for additional technology resources, although this is not explicit

within the program review handbook. Systematic decision-making processes are in place to ensure inclusion and to consider priorities and concerns from all points of view. A technology steering committee reviews input from help desk requests and IS Department staff to consider major technology priorities (III.C.2).

Institutional surveys indicate that students and faculty largely feel that technology needs in program and service areas are met effectively. Survey data indicate student and faculty awareness about how to access the College's technological resources, and a large majority of both groups agree that the help desk resolves issues in a timely manner. Survey data from the institutional survey report students seeing a benefit from the use of such technologies as Smart Boards and iClickers, but there is no data about frequency of use. The institutional survey also suggests faculty use this type of technology to enhance learning, but there are no specific data collected to corroborate this. The program review process is driving a search for other metrics to inform this assessment, particularly as they relate to student outcomes (III.C.2).

Program reviews are used by Senior Management to help decide priorities. Plans and recommendations for improvement are labeled as operational or strategic (or both). Plans aligned to support one of the strategic objectives are generally approved for implementation; plans that are more operational are reviewed by appropriate decision-makers. Equipment purchases are also examined in light of the cost of ownership; the initial cost, ongoing maintenance, labor costs, and planned obsolescence of equipment factors into planning for technology purchases. The technology steering committee, corporate and campus directors, program directors and senior management receive substantial input from faculty and staff about technology needs. An array of formal and informal mechanisms for prioritization and approval of technology purchases exists, including, but not limited to the program review process. The College's strategy map lists the objective to "recognize and deploy computer systems need for success." Three measures are being developed for this objective. A document that lists all of the technology being used to address institutional effectiveness is categorized by purpose (e.g., technology infrastructure, student records, finances, human resources, etc.) and shows evidence of long-range planning in the implementation of technology to support College goals (III.C.2).

There is widespread evidence of technology use to support instruction, learning, and institutional effectiveness. The program review process and other mechanisms assure regular review and offer avenues for considering new technology use. Survey data suggest students and staff feel technology support is effective, and InfoZone usage data supports widespread technology use. Classroom observations of instructional technology use provide anecdotal evidence that technology use is somewhat effective in supporting teaching and learning, but that there is significant room for improvement. Again, the program review process is a catalyst in the search for other measurements of technology efficacy (III.C.2)

Conclusion

Overall, technology use is pervasive and support is robust. Decision-making about technology priorities is broadly shared, with significant input from all sectors of the College. Program reviews offer a regular process for examining levels and quality of technology use and planning for future use, and are already generating dialogue about how to better measure effectiveness in light of student learning and College mission. The College meets Standard III.C. and subsections III.C.1 and 2.

<u>Recommendations</u>
None

III.D. Fiscal Resources

General Observations

Financial resources are sufficient to support SJVC's student learning programs and services. SJVC demonstrates this commitment through its allocation of funds. SJVC spends approximately 25% of its budget on instructional salaries and 13% on direct instructional expenses. Additionally it allocates approximately 4% on direct support services (III.D.1.a).

As a private, for profit junior college, SJVC's revenue is derived from student tuition. The audited net income for the past three years was verified to the certified public accountant's audit report. Dollar amounts for revenues and expenditures were also verified and then, because this is a private college, removed from this report to safeguard confidential and proprietary data. Financial resource planning is integrated with College planning at both the corporate office and the campus centers. SJVC operates on a rolling budget system, which is updated monthly. College and campus budgets are developed based upon student enrollment projections (III.D).

The most recent institutional survey was conducted in November 2011. In this survey: 86% of faculty and 92% of staff agreed that, "I have sufficient resources to do my job." However, only 55% of faculty and 70% of staff agreed that, "There is a process for financial planning at SJVC that supports the mission and institutional goals of the College." Further, only 49% of faculty found the budget process in program review effective. Likewise, only 40% of faculty found the budget process at curriculum conferences effective. In spite of the views of certain faculty members being unsure of the budget process used by the College there is ample evidence that resources are allocated consistent with established College plans (III.D.1.b).

Findings and Evidence

Financial planning is integrated with and supports SJVC's College planning. Annually, SJVC develops an operating budget and a capital budget. The current year College budget is a rolling budget which is updated monthly. The capital budget includes individual items costing more than $1,000 and have greater than three years useful life. These budgets are based on current and anticipated student census, historical and anticipated spending, strategic initiatives, and program review information. All budgets are developed and updated by the CFO and accounting staff with input from other departments and campuses. (III.D.1.a)

Financial documents, including the budget and independent audit have a high degree of credibility and accuracy, and reflect appropriate allocation and use of financial resources to support SJVC's student learning programs and services. Approximately 42% of annual expenditures support SJVC's student learning programs and services (III.D.1.b).

Financial audits for years ending December 31, 2009; December 31, 2010; and December 31, 2011 have not identified any deficiencies in internal controls that would be considered a material weakness. There are no open financial audit findings that need to

be addressed. The annual audit is reviewed by an Audit Review Committee comprised of two members of the Board of Governors and an independent third-party with financial expertise. In Fall 2012 the scope of the committee was expanded and is now referred to as the "Finance Committee." (III.D.2.a and 2.b, III.D.3.h).

SJVC maintains cash reserves and an operating line of credit to maintain stability and for contingency planning. Its cash reserves, as a percentage of the annual operating budget, amounts to 9% for 2012, 13% for 2011, and 13% for 2010. SJVC's cash reserves are sufficient for emergencies. (ACCJC 2012, 2011, 2010 Financial Report) In addition, SJVC has a line of credit with Comerica Bank. (III.D.2.c)

SJVC has sufficient insurance to cover its needs. It uses a third party brokerage firm for its general liability and workers compensation insurance. SJVC is self-insured for health benefits with reserves sufficient to fully funded anticipated claim costs (III.D.2.c).

SJVC is also audited for compliance with specified requirements applicable to student financial aid. Almich & Associates audit report dated June 11, 2012 showed that SJVC complied in all material respects with the requirements for student financial aid for the year ending December 3, 2011. There were no audit findings (III.D.2.d and 2.e).

SJVC has no obligations for post-retirement health benefits. However, it offers employees a 401(k) profit sharing plan that is fully funded annually. With respect to vacation time, SJVC has accrual limits of 175%. If an employee reaches that limit, they will stop accruing vacation time (III.D.3.c, III.D.3.d).

On an annual basis, SJVC assesses and allocates resources for the repayment of any locally incurred debt instruments that can affect its financial condition. For 2011, SJVC had what the evaluation team considered to be a manageable amount in total debt financing. SJVC uses Comerica for its long-term debt financing. (III.D.3.e)

SJVC monitors and manages student loan default rates, revenues and related matters to ensure compliance with federal regulations. The 2012 Financial Report for ACCJC show SJVC's student loan default rate of 12.9% for FY 2007, 9.9% for FY2008, and 10.3% for FY2009 (III.D.3.f).

SJVC's financial planning is integrated with institutional planning. Institutional planning process uses program review as the primary source for program improvements and educational resource planning. Supplemental processes like those listed below are available to submit improvement proposals for consideration year-round:
- Course improvement proposal
- Program improvement proposal
- Purchase proposal
- Textbook improvement proposal
(III.D.4)

Conclusions

SJVC's financial resources are sufficient to support student learning programs and services. It has adequate cash reserves for emergencies. Additionally a line of credit is available from Comerica. Faculty and staff overwhelmingly agree that they have sufficient resources to do their job.

The College has sufficient resources to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness.

The College meets the requirements of Commission Standards III.D and subsections III.D.1 through III.D.4. Because of the confidential and proprietary nature of the financial performance of this for profit College, evaluation team members confirmed the actual financial results from operations to ensure the College meets the requirements of Standard III.D but did not include that information in this report which will become available to the general public and could damage the College if competitors had accessed to this College's financial results of operations.

<u>Recommendations</u>
None

Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations

The mission statement clearly states the intended population and communities served with a focus on career technical education and employment needs. SJVC has strategic objectives identified in the new scorecard that appear to be the college goals. The strategy map also has three objectives with targets by December 2013, 2014, and 2015 (p. 137 of Self Evaluation Report). The main College goals are to increase graduation rates, job placement rates, and increase the number of students. Placement rate is probably the most important indicator of quality for a place like this. Current graduation and placement rates are posted on the website under each program as consumer information; however there is very little information on placement rates on a longitudinal plot. All the appropriate components are present in the Vision Statement and Strategy Map (Comprehensive Evidence List # IVA.3).

Findings and Evidence

The college has core value statements available to faculty, staff, and students that further illustrate the educational purpose (Self Evaluation Report p.116). The 2011 faculty/staff surveys show that 90%/95% of employees agree or strongly agree that SJVC's mission statement guides decision-making and improvement efforts at the college. (IV.A.1)

Graduation rates and placement rates are posted on the SJVC web site under each program. Evidence for Standard IIB had lots of printouts or screen shots of various course-level, program-level, and institutional level metrics. SLOs are written and present and are used to inform planning and improve educational quality. Within the past year, the College has made more data available to faculty and staff on course and program performance, as well as implementing an institutional scorecard that shows measures on selected indicators across the college's eleven campuses (IV.A.1).

Staff and faculty can log into a secure website to view data, reports, and communications about performance of their program(s). SJVC has provided training to support staff in using these data in various planning activities. Assessment data are entered during every module and are used in quarterly meetings. Program reviews and curriculum conferences are biannual, and occur in alternating years so that some type of review occurs every year. Institutional surveys are given every two years (IV.A.1).

Data are current and easily available for faculty and staff. Based on the evidence of the self-evaluation report, these data are being used in dialogue and decision-making. Reports are available across the College via a web portal, InfoZone and the Report Dashboard Library. The survey (evidence IVa.9) provides generally favorable results. (IV.A.1)

Instructional and Non- Instructional Program Review are the primary process for improving student learning. Faculty can submit program improvement proposals, course improvement proposals, purchase proposals, and textbook improvement proposals through the planning process. Program Review Action Items are tracked and used in decision-making. Faculty seems to have academic freedom in the classroom and in designing programs. Faculty and staff have the chance to provide input to local planning through the program review and curriculum conference processes. (IV.A.1)

Faculty and staff participate in planning via program review, curriculum conferences, and periodic Executive Council (EC) solicitation of input from members of the college community (Self Evaluation Report pg. 348). The evidence cited was in terms of wide, College wide input into the development of goals and plans (Comprehensive Evidence List #IVA.5, 6, and #IV.A.7). In the minutes of an EC meeting cited with IVA.6, there is no evidence of any input from those other than the EC attendees. Evidence IVA.7 is titled "Strategic Master Plan 2011 – 2015: Development and Management", but it is really a collection of other documents and a PowerPoint presentation from meetings. (IV.A.1)

There are clear published policies addressing employee processes and procedures packaged as employee handbooks for faculty, administrators and employees in all job categories (Comprehensive Evidence List # IVA.10, 11, 12). There are statements in the employee handbooks that comment on how employees can submit ideas or recommendations for improvement to respective managers. Team members did not encounter any documentation addressing decision making process input by students of the College (IV.A.1).

SJVC provides written policies for faculty participation in college governance, as well as a statement of faculty responsibilities. The policy states faculty is expected to participate in program review, curriculum conference, College surveys, and submit ideas for improvement directly to a division manager, campus dean, campus director, or the director of instruction (SJVC Faculty Handbook). The SJVC Employee handbook has a similar statement on participation in program reviews, campus meetings, institutional surveys, and submitting recommendations for improvement directly to campus management or the executive council (IV.A.2.a).

The SJVC Board of Governors Handbook has a page on duties and responsibilities of the Board. All stakeholders have a "substantial voice" in the program review process and its

connection to program-level resource allocation and changes to curricula. Sections from the student, faculty, and employee handbooks are specific. For example, in the section called "Venues and Channels for Constituent Participation" p. 351-352, Purchase Requests and Capital Budget Requests are listed as two of the channels. "Requests that directly support students' attainment of SLOs are approved and implemented as soon as reasonably possible." Generally good results were obtained in their faculty and staff survey (IV.A.2.b).

Roles and responsibilities were generally well understood, except in the area of financial planning. The College has identified an Improvement Plan in this area. The improvement plan objective is to "Increase faculty and staff awareness of SJVC's financial planning process from 58% and 74% respectively, to at least 85% (IV.A.2).

Records and documents examined on site reveal that faculty and staff participation in program review, curriculum conferences, and resource allocation requests is widespread and vibrant. The result of this participatory system is that classrooms are full of up-to-date and functional equipment. Additionally, with resources allocated for any reasonable request to mprove student learning the faculty and staff appear to be constantly involved in efforts to improve student learning because they have seen their voices are important and resources flow to allow innovative practices and procedures to be implemented and evaluated. The site visit confirmed wide-spread knowledge of the Institutional Self Evaluation Report, with many employees acknowledging that they knew about the self-study and had opportunities to review the document and provide feedback (IV.A.3).

Further evidence that there is widespread involvement in the dialogue and creation of the Self Evaluation Report is seen in the program review and curriculum conference processes. For example, Item #IVA.18 in the Comprehensive Evidence List of the Self Evaluation Report is a detailed, data-rich program review document for nursing with lots of student achievement data. Interviews at the college reveal abundant dialog within the various programs about the program review data. This dialog occurs during the formal biannual program review and curriculum conference sessions, and within program meetings at the various campuses. This dialog about the assessment data leads to action plans that will lead to improvement of student learning. Interviews reveal that management carefully reviews the larger requests for resource allocation (IV.A.3).

The SJVC Faculty Handbook contains statements of faculty responsibilities and participation in the college governance system. The Employee Handbook also has a statement on employee participation in the college governance system (IV.A.3).

The most significant avenue for faculty participation in the planning process is the Program Improvement Procedures, as articulated in the Program Review Handbook. Examples from the Emergency Services and Safety Management program show

exemplary data-based proposals. An example of a Program Improvement Proposal from Aviation shows efforts to better assess PLOs and adjust PLOs to better describe the intent of the instruction in this program. This example shows that SJVC is serious about their culture of assessment and is dedicated to collecting accurate data (IV.A.3).

In another example showing the importance of data based decision making comes from a Course Improvement Proposal Procedure from Administrative Health Care Management. This proposal shows excellent examples of outcomes-based rationale and evidence of discussion. Non-Instructional Program Review is also data-rich and outcomes based, as shown by an example from the Library listed on the Comprehensive Evidence List Item # IVA.25. In this example, program review is pervasive throughout the campus. Reports generated by the institution show that all programs regularly participate in program review and that all of them endeavor to improve based on their completed or in-process action plans. There are a number of additional examples available but the examples cited demonstrate the College's compliance with the Standards (IV.A.3).

SJVC has venues for staff and faculty to participate in governance. There are fewer opportunities for students. Constituency groups meet at regular times (annually, quarterly, monthly, and weekly) to provide a forum to review longitudinal trends in data and reflect on the state of the institution. Evidence includes meeting minutes and emails as well as a list of modalities staff use: videoconferencing, online meetings, learning management system (LMS), meeting workspace, InfoZone, social media and text. Forms documenting the role of SLOs are in most resource allocation processes. The SJVC Faculty Handbook (Nov 2012) clearly states faculty are responsible for curriculum, teaching and learning, assessment of learning, academic and professional development, with responsibilities to their program (for quality), and the service departments for student support and the overall campus (IV.A.3).

Interviews with staff and faculty found strong participation by appropriate groups in all of the College's processes. All personnel worked actively and in a collaborative manner to improve student learning through appropriate, established processes (IV.A.3).

The College publishes a wide variety of forms, policies, and processes. Many of these are referenced in the Faculty and Staff Handbooks. Additional places where institution personnel can go to find more information include the New Faculty Orientation Handbook, the Program Review Handbook, the Process Guide for Assessment of Student Learning, and the SLO Toolkit. All of these examples, and more are listed in the College's Comprehensive Evidence List in the back of the Self Evaluation Report (IV.A.3).

Interviews with faculty and staff revealed a broad familiarity with the College's goals and objectives. The College has made a great effort to educate its faculty and staff about

institutional initiatives such as its strategic map and institutional outcomes. In addition, an attitude and a culture of excellence was prevalent throughout the College (IV.A.3).

In January 2008 ACCJC issued a warning to SJVC due in part to a missing section in the Colleges' progress report. The college responded immediately with a letter to the Commission and followed with a complete progress report in March 2008. The warning was removed in June 2008. The institution's only sanction resulted from what appeared to be and was noted by the College as an honest mistake, which was cleared up within six months (IV.A.4).

The College communicates effectively with the public through its web page. Consumer information is presented via a prominent button on each program's web page. The Student Consumer Guide provides information about retention, graduation, and job placement rates, as well as diversity and Pell grant information. The first few pages of the document explain how the data was derived and provide context for the data (IV.A.4).

The Self Evaluation Report discloses consumer information such as tuition, median debt of graduates, on-time completion rate, graduate placement rate, and links to the department of labor occupational profiles. Disclosures were found on the SJVC website as required by Department of Ed. The evidence cited in this section is a two-page list of program approval status, including one program on probation. This information is disclosed on the SJVC website, under accreditation. The SJVC Student Consumer Guide contains the above consumer disclosures for placement, graduation, and demographic data of the student body. The college Face Book site contains photos of students, faculty and administrators (IV.A.4).

Self-evaluations exist for both the board of governors and the board of directors. These evaluations are conducted regularly. In 2010, the senior management was evaluated. The process resulted in several promotions and creation of new positions (IV.A.5).

The college has identified an improvement plan in this area to "Implement policy and procedures for disseminating integrity and effectiveness evaluation results to the college community". There is a two-page survey used with a five-point likert scale on 18 items to be completed and signed by a board member. Evidence provided on site confirms an evaluation occurred recently (Jan-Feb 2013). No communications to faculty, staff or the public is available. As identified in the Self Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Quality and Institutional Effectiveness for Reaffirmation of Accreditation, p. 368, SJVC intends to implement a policy for disseminating evaluation results to the College community by Dec 2013 (IV.A.5).

SJVC exerts that formal evaluation of decision-making process occurs on a regular basis The most recent evaluation took place in Oct 2012 which resulted in a new outcomes-

based decision making framework. The College is in the process of conducting another formal review (IV.A.5).

<u>Conclusions</u>
The college meets the all subsections A.1 through A.5 of Standard IV.A and in total meets the Commission's Standard IV.A, Decision Making Roles and Processes.

<u>Recommendations</u>
None There are a number of additional examples available but the examples cited demonstrate the College's compliance with the Standards (IV.A.3).

<u>Commendations</u>
None

Standard IV: Leadership and Governance
B. Board and Administrative Organization

General Observations

The Board of Governors includes two members from the Board of Directors who act as representatives of the owners of the college. Six additional Board of Governor members are appointed to the Board to represent the interests of the community-at-large. The Board has a number of key responsibilities including setting policies for the College and for hiring the Chief Executive Officer who is expected to have sufficient delegated authority to operate the College in a manner that ensures the quality, integrity and effectiveness of student learning programs is maintained at a high level. Additionally, the Board oversees the financial operations of the College to ensure it is financial sound and stable and has adequate financial resources available to maintain high quality instructional programs (IV.B.1).

A review of the biographical information available on each board member indicates many of them are business owners and are excellent representatives for the businesses and the communities served by the College. Board members are well-informed about the college's educational programs and overall operations. Minutes of the meetings conducted by the board indicate the board works well together and are knowledgeable about the requirements of the Commission's accreditation standards

Findings and Evidence

By Law Article 4.3 -Responsibility for Managerial Oversight requires under Section 4.3.1 that the Board of Governors should "With substantial input from the Board of Directors, select the President and the Chief Executive Officer." The President and Chief Executive Officer have heard their positions for a number of years. (IV.B.1.a)

SJVC has eight members on the Governing Board. Two members are owners and the senior management of the College. The remaining six board members come from the public. The biographic information of board members show that they represent the community served by the College and are also excellent representatives for the career technical programs area of emphasis that the is a core element of the mission of San Joaquin Valley College. In the team's view the composition of the Board of Governors provides the College with excellent industry representation assisting with the oversight of this important educational provider that provides a trained workforce to professional fields. (IV.B.1.a)

The College uses its By Laws and the Board of Governor's Handbook to serve as policy directives for the operation of the College. The By Laws have four articles with several subsections that establish the policy directives of the Board of Governors. The four articles are named:
        Article 1.   Purpose of the Board

The By Laws are reviewed regularly and when necessary changed to reflect an identified need for policy direction for the College. The Board reviewed its By Laws in March, and October in 2011 and 2012. The Board also reviewed its By Laws in February 2012. By Law Article 4.10.11 requires the Governing Board to regularly evaluate its procedures, bylaws, policies and codes and revise them as necessary. No specific dates are given for reviews of the By Laws although past reviews have occurred twice a year for the years 2011 and 2012. (IV.B.1.b)

SJVC defines the role of the Governing Board in the following statement extracted from the Board of Governor's Handbook revised in November 2012:

> "The Board represents the interests of students, the business communities served by the College, and the public-at-large and is responsible for ensuring SJVC's educational quality, financial stability, ethical integrity, and the fulfillment of its mission. The Board fulfills these responsibilities by setting institutional policies and delegating authority to implement said policies to the President and Chief Executive Officer. The Board also endows the President and Chief Executive Officer with responsibility for the pursuit of the college mission." (IV.B.1.c)

Actions taken by the Board of Governors are final and not subject to review or approval by another entity. The Board is an independent entity that is responsible for all aspects of the operations of the College (IV.B.1.c.)

The Board of Governors Handbook identifies the obligations of the Board and includes By Laws, the policy on Conflict of Interest and a Code of Ethics. Additionally the Handbook includes the Mission of the College and responsibilities of the President and Chief Executive Officer. (IV.B.1.d)

The Board of Governors totals eight members including the President and Chief Executive Officer. The President and CEO have terms that do not expire. Six board members have three year terms that can be renewed for a total of three times for a maximum amount of service time of nine years.(IV.B.1.d)

A review of the minutes from the Board of Governors meetings for 2012 show that the Board acts in concert with its policies and bylaws as described in the Board of Governors Handbook. The Board of Governors reviews its policies three to four times a year. The previous reviews were noted as occurring in July, October and most recently in February. The policies have been reviewed consistently since 2010. (IV.B.1.e)

The College's code of conduct requires board members know of and support the mission and philosophy of the college and to have knowledge of the legal and fiscal responsibilities of the college and finally board members are responsible for supporting the college in the community. In order to adequately fulfill the responsibilities that the board members have the college offers regular professional development training in a range of subjects including student learning and achievement, college operations, student support and learning services and accreditation. (IV.B.1.f)

The Board of Governors conducts an annual review of the Board. Forms used for the review of the President and the Chief Executive Officer were available as were completed evaluations for both individuals holding those positions. Self-evaluations prepared by each of the Board members were reviewed by the team. Additionally, each of the Board members completes an evaluation of the President and of the Chief Executive Officer. The Self Evaluation process used by the Board is prescribed in the Board of Governors Handbook, Article 4.10.12. The Board of Directors, evaluates the performance of Senior Management. (IV.B.1.g)

The annual reviews of the board, the president, and the chief executive officer are conducted through the use of a form that is completed by each member of the board. Each question on the form asks the evaluator to rank each of the criteria identified as evaluation areas. The scale is a standard 1 to 5 scale. There is also an area for additional comments on each form although that area did not include more than one or perhaps two sentences and comments on the forms evaluated by the team. This methodology of the evaluation satisfies the requirements of the standards and appears to meet the needs of the college. (IV.B.1.g)

Article 4.11 of the Board of Governors Handbook requires Board Members accept responsibility for the ethical integrity of the College and that they be role models in the practice of ethical conduct and behavior while serving as a member of the governing board. The Code of Ethics is included in the Handbook and includes instructions on what action is required should a Board Member be accused of unethical behavior. The board has not encountered a situation that would constitute a violation of the code of ethics and accordingly has not had to use the section on the code dealing with actions should a board member be accused of an ethics code violation. (IV.B.1.h)

Article 4.8 of the board of Governors handbook identifies the need for board members to know about the college's accreditation process, the eligibility requirements for accreditation, and for knowledge of the accreditation standards. This article also requires an institutional self-evaluation be conducted but it is mainly identifying responsibilities related to the college's accreditation (IV.B.1.i).

Each member of the Board of Governors has completed the ACCJC course on Accreditation 101. Board Members participated in training provided by College staff. Training was conducted initially as part of the Board member's orientation and then to remain current on matters that Board Members may have to address in the future. Minutes of the board meetings recorded several months prior to the submission of the college's self-evaluation report to the accrediting commission, show that the Board received regular updates on the College's preparation of the Self Evaluation Report. Finally, the Board approved the Self Evaluation Report prior to its submission to the Commission. (IV.B.1.i)

Interviews with members of the governing board revealed the active participation of Board Members in the two standing committees of the Board. The Board has an Academic Oversight Committee that is responsible for the educational quality of the academic programs of the College. The second standing committee is the Finance Committee that is used as technical experts who receive information from the College's external financial auditor on the financial performance of the College and the financial condition of the College at the time of the annual audit (IV.B.1.i).

The President and Chief Executive Officer are co-owners of SJVC. The Board of Directors, representing the ownership interest of the College, are responsible for making recommendations to the Board of Governors on appointments or on recommendations to remove the President or Chief Executive Officer. Authority for day -to-day operations has been delegated to the President and the Chief Executive Officer as described in the Board of Governors Handbook. The Board is active in planning activities of the College and participates in setting expectations for institutional performance. Reports are regularly submitted to the Board of Governors using the College's Balanced Scorecard and dashboard indicators that provide reliable and accurate information about the performance of the College's operations. Based on interviews with members of the Board of Governors, reports provided to the Board are adequate in keeping the Board informed of the College's progress on accomplishing goals and objectives identified through use of the Balance Scorecard method (IV.B.1.j).

The President and Chief Executive Officer are responsible to direct planning efforts and initiatives to pursue fulfillment of the college mission, meet institutional standards, and achieve the college vision. Further, the Board requires that all college employees work collaboratively toward the achievement of these goals and standards. In accordance with BP #'s 3, 5, and 6, the Board shall assess, no less than annually, the College's fulfillment of its mission and achievement of its institutional standard. (IV.B.1.j, IV.B.2)

The President and the Chief Executive Officer are responsible for the academic quality of the college. As co-owners of the college they share duties and responsibilities and collectively serve as the principal leaders of the college. The Chief Executive Officer is

responsible for internal operations of the college while the president represents the college to the communities served by the college (IV.B.2.a).

The senior management team consists of vice presidents of functional areas including information technology administration, academic affairs, enrollment and graduate studies, and student financial services. The senior management team also includes the chief financial officer and the chief operations officer. All members of the senior management team are well qualified for the positions they hold. During interviews with employees the team learned that the college frequently promotes from within. It was common for employees to have worked in several positions as they gained experience and were trusted with additional responsibility.(IV.B.2.b)

San Joaquin Valley College has campus locations in 12 different sites in California. Those sites are located in Southern California, Central California, and in Northern California. Communicating with all sites consistently and providing resources equally throughout the sites operated by the college requires effective use of technology and establishment of consistent policies and processes. The College has been effective in establishing a positive culture focused on supporting students as they work to achieve an education that will allow them to enter technical professions (IV.B.2.b).

The extensive data management system described earlier is one tool used to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts. This data management system also provides campus directors with relevant data to evaluate student learning. Campus directors also receive a campus scorecard that provides them information about that individual campus. The president and chief executive officer have access to the performance data from each of the campuses and are able to monitor performance regularly (IV.B.2.b).

The president and the chief executive officer insure compliance with a wide range of regulations including those that govern career training programs through application of established board policies, established processes and procedures designed to provide accurate and reliable transaction processing, and an effective management team knowledgeable of laws and regulations applicable to the career training programs offered by the college (IV.B.2.c).

The president receives regular financial reports and campus specific data that allows him to monitor revenues and expenditures over the course of the year. The balance scorecard planning method used by the college provides measurable goals and objectives that receive financial resources for faculty and management to implement action plans intended to achieve stated objectives. In the interviews with personnel at each of the sites visited by the team employees felt that resources were provided generously as long as

appropriate data analysis was conducted to show the need for resources to accomplish a specific objective (IV.B.2.d).

The president and the chief executive officer are active in community events and organizations. The college's Self Evaluation Report identifies several recognition awards that have been received by either the president or the Chief Executive Officer. Both of these executives maintain close connections with community leaders in areas served by the college. They are quick to establish training programs in communities where their research shows a need exists. In addition to maintaining connections with community leaders the president and the chief executive officer also meet informally with their employees and with students (IV.B.2.e).

Conclusions:

The Board of Governors sets the policies of the College through its By-Laws, Code of Ethical Conduct, and Conflict of Interest Code. It conducts regular self-evaluations and evaluates the President and the Chief Executive Officer annually. The Board of Governor members are assigned for three year terms with a total time of service to the College limited to nine years. The biographic information on the current members of the Board indicates that Board members represent the businesses and the communities served by the College.

The president and the chief executive officer are responsible for quality instruction at the College. They provide effective leadership in planning, organizing, and utilizing the balanced scorecard methodology that enhances institutional effectiveness. The College has an established practice of promoting employees to higher-level positions within the organization. This practice is an indication of how the executive management develops existing employees with proven performance to take on additional responsibilities. Employees can look forward to internal promotional opportunities as the needs of the College allows.

The team concluded that the College meets the requirements of Standard IV.B.1 and IV.B.2.

Recommendations
None

Commendations
None