

Standard I.B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness: The institution demonstrates a conscious effort to produce and support student learning, measures that learning, assesses how well learning is occurring, and makes changes to improve student learning. The institution also organizes its key processes and allocates its resources to effectively support student learning. The institution demonstrates its effectiveness by providing 1) evidence of the achievement of student learning outcomes and 2) evidence of institution and program performance. The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.

Description

This standard has been a major focus for Mesa College during the six years since the last self study. Mesa received several recommendations related to institutional effectiveness from the commission in 2004, and these recommendations have been thoroughly addressed at the campus level and, where appropriate, at the district level, as reported in the college's Focused Midterm Report, 2007. The first recommendation, the most comprehensive, stated that: *The College should implement a more fully integrated process for planning and resource allocation, grounded in data from program reviews (which should include data on student learning) and student learning outcomes assessment.* It also stated that the *process and outcomes should be widely communicated, and that the college should evaluate the process regularly to assess its impact on institutional effectiveness.*

Almost immediately Mesa began the work of addressing this and the other recommendations. An overview of this work is presented here and then discussed in detail in the appropriate standard I.B. sections that follow.

The role of the participatory governance group, President's Cabinet, was central to the expansion of effectiveness measures. All final decision making for planning and resource allocation is conducted by this group, which is informed by the many committees that report to it, and by the various governance groups represented there. The Cabinet's initial actions included the formation of the Educational Master Planning Subcommittee, which created a master planning process that is summarized in the Annual Integrated Planning Matrix, where each planning piece was integrated into the master plan. (I.B-1)

The annual planning matrix included implementation and review cycles for:

- the two-year cycle for reviewing the mission statement;
- the college strategic planning priorities (five year timeline);
- the college annual goals, which are tied to those priorities;
- budget planning, which is overseen by the newly formed Budget Development Committee;
- facilities master planning, which is overseen by the reformulated Facilities Planning Committee, and is a major consideration with the passage of two bond measures in the past seven years;

- faculty hiring priorities, which are overseen by a subcommittee of President's Cabinet;
- IELM Block Grant allocations;
- VTEA planning and allocations;
- Program Review, which is now fully integrated to include Instruction, Student Services, and Administration within one process; and
- The Information Technology Strategic Plan.

Upon further review in spring of 2008, and informed by the commission's Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness –Part II: Planning, it was decided that an overarching strategic plan needed to be developed in order to provide the integration needed for the educational master plan. In fall, 2008, the Educational Master Planning Subcommittee was reformulated to become the new Strategic Planning Committee. This action ultimately led to the creation of a strategic plan, now in place, that reflects the comprehensive cyclical processes consistent with continuous quality improvement planning models. The conception of this plan began at the annual President's Cabinet Retreat in April, 2008, as they reviewed the Educational Master Plan and the rubric, and then progressed during the school year. It became more fully articulated the following year at the next President's Cabinet Retreat, which was held in April, 2009. Much work has been done within this participatory governance process to refine the many practices and processes put in place with the earlier Educational Master Plan. The components of the strategic plan are consistent with those already in place; but an overarching structure now ties it all together and clearly links the cycle with measures of accountability and resource allocation. As the College developed its new mission, vision and values statements and the revised planning process evolved, its goals were revisited and revised to more accurately reflect the institution's direction and respond to and meet the needs of its internal and external communities. The new strategic planning process, including a distinct link to resource allocation was approved by the President's Cabinet in October, 2009. Following this approval, the College embarked upon a pilot program to test the new planning model.

Concurrent with the creation of the new Educational Master Plan and the subsequent creation of the Strategic Plan, was the formalization of research needs and the hiring of a Campus Based Researcher to lay the groundwork for building a culture of evidence. In February, 2007, the Mesa College Research Planning Agenda, drafted and approved by the Research Committee, was adopted by President's Cabinet, putting in place the many component research reports and practices that inform master planning, and ultimately strategic planning. The Research Planning Agenda is organized around the college mission statement and values, and directly addresses college goals. It provides the key evidence piece to the implementation and assessment cycle. Consistent with continuous quality improvement, the Research Planning Agenda was later revisited, revised, and approved by President Cabinet in December, 2008. (I.B-2) With the revision of the College's mission, vision and values statements, the Research Committee revisited its Research Planning Agenda in November, 2009. Appropriate changes were made and the revised document brought to the President's Cabinet on March 23, 2010 for final approval.

In terms of student learning outcomes and their requisite assessment cycle, the campus has made much progress over the past six years. At this point, there is a newly formed (2008) Student Learning Outcomes Subcommittee, which was created by the Research Committee, that is tasked with bringing the campus a Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle model, complete with software (TaskStream) for the college, departments, programs, and service units, to report and monitor their outcomes and progress. It has been a long process to reach this point, and has entailed much dialogue across the campus. The fact that the Research Committee chose to create a separate subcommittee for this purpose speaks to the level of importance of this work to the campus.

Student learning outcome assessment is administered and tracked within the individual departments, programs, and service units, and their status is reported to the college through Program Review. In addition Program Review reports on the program's curriculum review cycle for instruction, and provides a detailed plan listing its goals, the resources necessary to reach those goals, the personnel responsible for each goal, and the timelines for achieving these goals. It also requires a detailed data analysis for institutional effectiveness in the year one report and a subsequent data analysis in year three. As part of continuous quality improvement, the Program Review Committee regularly evaluates and makes changes to its process and reports. The most recent revisions occurred during the summer of 2009 when a subcommittee studied the Program Review Handbook for Instructional Programs, Student and Administrative Services using a three-pronged goal of clarification, streamlining and maximizing the benefits to the participants and the College. As part of the review, *Outcomes-Based Academic and Co-Curricular Program Review* by Dr. Marilee Bresciani, a collection of good practices and principles, was consulted. The resulting changes included the systematic integration of data into the program plans and strengthening the pivotal role of program review in the College's planning process. Members of the Program Review Committee continue to offer lead writer training sessions to assist programs and service areas with the completion of their program planning documents. Clearly Program Review has become the locus for program planning, and it is based upon this level of planning that resources are ultimately allocated.

Program Review consists of a five year cycle that includes annual review and updates. In terms of communicating this information to the college, a one to two paragraph summary presenting an overview of the plan is now required for each Year One Program Review. These summaries become part of the Year One Report presented to the President's Cabinet during the spring semester. Program Review Reports are approved by President's Cabinet, and are made publicly available for review in the Learning Resource Center. The purpose of the summaries is to provide a cogent at-a-glance overview that can be disseminated to the campus at large and to resource allocation committees. The power of the college's Program Review and its applicability to planning and resource allocation is seen in its level of integration. All three college divisions, including Instructional Programs, Student Services, and Administrative Services, are integrated into one process and fall under the guidance of a single

Program Review Committee. As evidence of the committee's commitment to continuous quality improvement, recommendations for process improvements are included in its annual report, which is approved by President's Cabinet each spring. In reviewing Mesa's Program Review process with the commission's Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness –Part I: Program Review, it clearly reaches the Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement level. (I.B-32)

Currently under review, and tied in with the new, integrated strategic planning process, is the clear relationship of how the Program Review process informs resource allocation and links it to planning. The two processes are related, but the level of integration is a work in progress, and is being addressed within the strategic plan through the institution of a pilot project conducted during the fall 2009. With the assistance of President's Cabinet, the Strategic Planning Committee completed its work on the Mesa College Integrated Planning Framework. A crucial part of this planning process involves the Program Review cycle, specifically the allocation of resources. To test and inform the process, a pilot project was developed and conducted during the fall 2009 semester. To implement this pilot, a Resource Allocation Committee (RAC) was formed with representatives from the participatory governance bodies including the three Vice Presidents, six program review members (3 Academic, 2 Student Services, and 1 Administrative Services), and 1 student. A representative sample of programs and service areas from the 2008/2009 Program Review cycle were selected with the specifications that there be at least one from the arts, the sciences, career/technical and one service area. Appropriate documentation including past program review plans, data and other pertinent information were provided to the RAC membership and those participating in the pilot. During the month of November, 2009, representatives from the selected programs and service areas presented their resource requests to the RAC. At the conclusion of the pilot, feedback from all participants concerning the process was collected and incorporated into a report to be presented to the President's Cabinet for review prior to distribution to the college for use and to inform the spring 2010 resource allocation process. The college's Academic Affairs Committee will play a pivotal role in the development of this report using feedback from a meeting held December 8, 2009 for the specific purpose of eliciting comments and suggestions for improvement from those who participated in the RAC process. In addition, a survey was developed with the assistance of the Office of Instructional Services, Resource Development and Research to collect data from the programs and service areas that participated in the pilot. During the spring 2010 semester, these findings will be assessed and evaluated by the Academic Affairs Committee. In addition to the development of an educational component for the program review lead writers, the creation of a rubric and guidelines for the implementation of the resource allocation process is planned. The goal will be to meet the needs of the planning and resource allocation model without increasing the workload of those participating in it. Upon adoption of the revised model by the Presidents Cabinet and other participatory governance bodies, the next steps will be decided.

The planning and allocation of physical resources is overseen by the participatory governance Facilities Committee, which reviews the Facilities Master Plan and makes

recommendations to the President's Cabinet. This committee is especially important in terms of the two construction bonds that were passed by the district and have direct implications for Mesa. Of note is the level of participation by the various schools in planning the structure and equipage for their new buildings. The new Allied Health Building is an example of how planning drives allocation. Because of the nature of this discipline, the faculty members were critical in designing the layout of their teaching spaces and the furnishings, fixtures, and equipment that went into them. The Math and Science Building is currently in the planning phase and has had extensive input and planning by the faculty who will teach there. They received a district grant to design a methodology for planning new buildings, and they later received funding to hire a consultant to help maximize teaching space according to square footage.

The planning and allocation of human resources is done through President's Cabinet, and the process for Faculty Hiring Priorities reveals a close relationship between planning informing allocation. The process involves an application that addresses ten principles of teaching and practice that are evaluated and ranked by a subcommittee of the Cabinet. In this way, the department puts forth its plan, as articulated against the hiring priorities, and the applications are placed in rank order of addressing these priorities. This rank ordered list is instrumental in the allocation of faculty positions. Currently, due to budget constraints, there is no new hiring, but the process remains in place for the time when funding returns. A similar process exists for the hiring of classified staff but through the Executive Staff. Like the allocation of other resources, both these processes use the Program Review plans as part of their decision-making.

The college has worked very hard to address the recommendations of the previous self study, and this work is detailed in the specific responses below.

The College meets this standard.

Standard I.B.I. The institution maintains an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes.

Description

Mesa has a culture of participatory governance that encourages dialogue. The breadth of this dialogue is evidenced in the composition of committees on campus, and the depth is evidenced in the processes that Mesa follows. In the 2004 self study evaluation, it was recommended that the college strengthen its dialogue about student learning. As detailed in the Focused Midterm Report, 2007, Mesa began its dialogue on student learning with the creation of the six Student Learning Outcomes for the Associate Degree Level in 2003. In 2004, President's Cabinet approved the San Diego Mesa College Policy on the Genesis, Development and Application of Student Learning Outcomes, which clearly placed the responsibility and authority for department level SLOs with the faculty and student service units. In essence, it stated that those on the front lines of delivering instruction and services would determine their students' learning outcomes. Like many of the policies, practices, and processes affecting student learning

outcomes, institutional effectiveness, and the use of data to inform decision-making, this policy was created and approved by the college's participatory governance Research Committee. (I.B-3, I.B-4)

With authority and responsibility in place, the hard work and dialogue began. Beginning in 2005, the Research Committee, in collaboration with the Flex Subcommittee, provided workshops on outcomes, assessments, and best practices. This led to the creation of the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle (SLOAC) by the Research Committee, and the creation of a 40% reassigned time faculty position of SLOAC Coordinator. This position has served as the pivotal linchpin for ensuring dialogue and providing the necessary support for identifying department or program level Student Learning Outcomes. The position continued to be funded through the fall, 2009 semester, and the incumbent served as the co-chair for the participatory governance Student Learning Outcomes Subcommittee of the Research Committee. Due to the current state budget situation and its adverse affects on Mesa College, the reassigned time for the SLOAC coordinator has been discontinued. The SLO Subcommittee is developing a model whereby the duties and responsibilities of this individual are shared so that the work associated with SLOs/AUOs can continue. The TaskStream software has been instrumental in making the management of SLOs/AUOs easier. A liaison-type structure is being developed so assistance can be given to faculty and staff members needing help with the various aspects associated with their program/service area SLOs/AUOs. Numerous workshops in support of SLOs and assessment have been held on campus over the past five years, and the SLOAC Coordinator worked with the various programs and service areas to provide individualized support. During this time period, both Student Services and Administrative Services have developed and implemented their respective learning outcomes. Like their academic counterparts, these areas fell under the auspices of the SLOAC coordinator, benefitting from his support, and have membership on the Student Learning Outcomes Subcommittee.

The Academic Senate has been actively involved in the dialogue surrounding the creation of student learning outcomes and the assessment cycle. The SLOAC Coordinator regularly briefed the senate regarding what was happening with student learning outcomes and the continuous improvement cycle. Two major issues of concern regarding student learning outcomes have dealt with how assessment data could potentially be used in faculty evaluation and with workload in developing and implementing the cycle. Faculty evaluations are a contractual issue and are a matter between the district and the bargaining unit. There has also been much philosophical discussion regarding curriculum, instruction, outcomes, and objectives within the confines of this group. (I.B-5) With the recent purchase of TaskStream, an SLO management software system, the college now has a centralized repository for the documentation connected with the assessment cycle as well as a tool to assist the faculty and staff with the workload associated with implementation of the SLOAC cycle. Training on the use of this new software began fall, 2009 with a college-wide, general introduction. Then, specific sessions were developed for program and service areas to provide information on how to use their assessment workspaces. Offered through the

Office of Instructional Services, Resource Development and Research, this training continues and is being customized to meet the needs of programs and service areas. The college also provides assistance through the same Office through the assignment of a classified staff person, supervised by the Dean, to help with the input of SLO/AUO information into TaskStream.

As a measure of the breadth of dialogue on student learning, Instructional Programs, Student Services and Administrative Services have completed the development of their outcomes at the program/service area level. Instructional Program outcomes were published in the 2009/2010 college catalog. Student Services and Administrative Services will publish theirs as well beginning with the 2010/2011 catalog. (I.B-6)

In terms of dialogue regarding continuous improvement of institutional processes, the college has fully engaged the use of data and research to inform its decision-making. Systematic self assessment venues include Program Review, Curriculum Review, and Student Learning Outcomes. The Research Planning Agenda makes clear to the campus community the types of research available and the level of support that the Research Office can provide for departments, programs, and service units. In addition, the Guidelines for Implementing the Research Planning Agenda explains to the campus community the nature of data, levels of security for data, and application of data to decision making. (I.B-7)

And the importance of the creation of the strategic plan, with its embedded continuous improvement cycle for all practices on campus cannot be overstated in terms of dialogue. This overarching plan evolved from the Educational Master Plan 2007-2011, was fully vetted in President's Cabinet and was approved by this group October 27, 2009. The creation of the strategic plan was the subject of the 2008 and 2009 President's Cabinet Retreats, and was vetted with the participatory governance groups prior to this approval.

Evaluation

The level of institutionalization of continuous improvement practices speaks to the extent of dialogue on college. Mesa has come a very long way in the six years since its last self study. The campus now has student learning outcomes and administrative unit outcomes for Instruction, Student Services, and Administrative Services. These outcomes have been created and are being assessed at the program or service area level across the campus. Student learning outcomes have been written and are currently being assessed at the course and service area level, which definitely reveals the level of dialogue taking place across campus. The level of implementation of student learning outcomes assessment cycle is seen in the Student Learning Outcome Survey, which was administered to the campus by the Student Learning Outcomes Committee and the college research office.

According to a comparison of the SLO Survey Report findings for 2008 and 2009, marked progress has been made in all areas of the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle (SLOAC). In 2008, 56% of units had written their SLOs, in contrast

with 100% of units in 2009. The percentage of units that had completed the step of selecting the SLO to be assessed and a way to assess it was 35% in 2008, and grew to 46% in 2009. In 2008, 20% of units had completed their assessment of at least one SLO, whereas in 2009, 39% of units had completed this step. Finally, only 26% of units had begun or were in the process of beginning another cycle of the SLOAC 2008, whereas 49% were completed or in progress with starting another full cycle of assessment in 2009.

As is to be expected, the dialogue has been extensive and sometimes heated as the college has embarked upon this effort to become learner centered and data informed. Several issues have arisen with the Academic Senate and continue to be addressed. They include faculty workload and how SLO assessment data will be used at the program and college levels. At this point, student learning outcomes for Instruction and Student Services as well as administrative unit outcomes for Administrative Services are in place and the research component of the college and the district provide data to support this effort.

The College meets this standard.

Standard I.B.2. The institution sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purposes. The institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. The institutional members understand these goals and work collaboratively toward their achievement.

Description

In the 2004 self study evaluation report, it was recommended that *the college strengthen its dialogue about student learning by articulating specific goals with respect to the educational effectiveness of the college, stating the goals and supporting objectives in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and planning for improvement can take place.* In response to this recommendation, as reported in the Focused Midterm Report, 2007, the college worked systematically to create goals and objectives at all levels of the institution, and included these in the Educational Master Plan. This process began with the creation of four college-wide strategic directions, which included: “Strengthening college support infrastructure,” “Strengthening college partnerships and collaboratives,” “Supporting professional/leadership development,” and “Emphasizing instructional support/student success.” The college’s twelve strategic planning priorities were divided among these four directions. In addition, each of the twelve strategic planning priorities had a goal, along with a timeline and identification of who had lead responsibility for it.

Following this lead, the divisions of Instruction and Student Services and each of their schools or departments created goals and objectives aligned with the college-wide strategic directions, planning priorities, and goals. In line with the five year planning

cycle of the Educational Master Plan, the goals and objectives were written for a five year timeframe, with annual review and revision as needed.

What was missing from this plan were the *measurable terms*, and this led to a reassessment of the goals and objectives as identified in the Educational Master Plan when the Strategic Plan was created in 2009. Four redefined overarching college goals were identified at President's Cabinet Retreat, 2009, and these were brought forward to the Strategic Planning Committee. These goals were revisited and revised during the summer of 2009 by members of the Strategic Planning Committee to more accurately reflect the College's vision, mission and values. (I.B-9) After review by the participatory governance bodies, the following four core goals were adopted:

- To deliver and support exemplary teaching and learning in the areas of transfer education, associate degrees, career and technical education, certificates, and basic skills
- To provide a learning environment that maximizes student access and success, and employee well being;
- To respond to and meet community needs for economic and workforce development;
- To cultivate an environment that embraces and is enhanced by diversity.

With the adoption of these goals at the October 27, 2009 President's Cabinet and then placement within the strategic plan, the schools, programs and service areas are in the process of redefining and aligning their goals and objectives in measurable terms. (I.B-10) These goals will be revisited each year during the spring President's Cabinet Retreat and then communicated to the college for use in its planning cycle. With its strategic plan in place, the College will turn its attention to the Educational Master Plan and begin to review it during the spring 2010.

Evaluation

Clearly Mesa took this recommendation seriously and began work to achieve college, school, and department/program/service unit level goals and objectives. This was reported in the Focused Midterm Report, 2007. Subsequent to that, with the reflection that was discussed in the introduction to Standard IB, it became clear that the measurable terms were not in place. There was measurement, but it was not integrated within the goals and objectives. A thorough Research Planning Agenda had been created, vetted through participatory governance, and adopted by President's Cabinet; but it was not integrated directly with the goals and objectives. As part of the college's continuous quality improvement work with the strategic plan, a decision to rewrite the college, school, and department goals and objectives in measurable terms needs to be the next step. At this point the college level goals were written and adopted in fall, 2009, and the school and department/program/service unit level goals need to follow suit. Equally as important is the review and revision of the Educational Master Plan.

The College meets this standard.

Standard I.B.3. The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.

Description

One of the recommendations from the 2004 self study evaluation report was to *develop and implement a plan to meet current and future needs for institutional research that is accurate, timely, and actionable...Toward this end, the college should consider how institutional research is positioned in the college so that it may support the entire institution from a fair, unbiased and informed stance, thereby strengthening various planning and institutional improvement efforts.* The college and district were also advised to *foster a culture of evidence and cooperate in the development of an enhanced research function with both strong district and strong college components.* The college has made a great deal of progress in responding to these recommendations.

The college has an extensive planning cycle in place. As described in I.B, Program Review has reached the most mature level as identified in the commission's rubric for institutional effectiveness. Department and program level curriculum review is conducted on a cycle such that all courses are evaluated over a six year period. Curriculum balance is discussed and planned at the administrative, department, and program levels and is thoroughly reviewed by the Curriculum Review Committee. Resource allocations, including those of the Budget Committee, the Dean's Council for IELM funding, the VTEA Committee, Facilities Committee, and Faculty Hiring Priorities are planned and recommended at the committee level, and then adopted by the President's Cabinet.

What had been missing from Mesa's extensive planning processes was twofold: integration of the plans and systematic assessment of those plans. This was addressed initially by the Educational Master Plan, 2007-2011, and then even more extensively by the Strategic Plan approved in October, 2009. The strategic plan brought together all of the individual plans under one overarching college plan, and it integrated systematic, cyclical assessment into the process in the form of performance indicators.

Of key importance to meeting the 2004 recommendations, and fostering a culture of evidence, was the creation of a new position that would integrate district research with campus research. The position of Campus Based Researcher was created and filled in 2006. This position serves the needs of the college, while working in conjunction with the district for purposes of integration. The Campus Based Researcher reports directly to the Dean of Instructional Services, Resource Development, and Research, who oversees the research needs for the college. Concurrent with the creation of this position was the reformulation of the campus Research Committee tasked with student learning outcome assessment and institutional effectiveness assessment. Both the

Dean and the Campus Based Researcher are active members of the Research Committee. (I.B-11)

As discussed in the introduction to IB, concurrent with the Educational Master Plan, was the development of the assessment piece for the campus. The first Research Planning Agenda was created by the Research Committee in 2007, updated in 2008 and 2009, had its own (i) Goals, (ii) Strategic Initiatives, and (iii) Supporting Evidence, Indicators, and Measures. It informed planning at all levels. However, the relationship was not clearly institutionalized in terms of performance indicators at the planning level. These measures have now been integrated within the strategic plan to form the college level core indicators of effectiveness. They include numerous measures within the following indicators: Equity/Access; Engagement/Retention; Persistence; Success; and Institutional Effectiveness. The intent is to have program level indicators that mirror these college level indicators developed for the Program Review level. A college-wide pilot to test the relationship between planning and resource allocation was undertaken during the fall, 2009. The results of this pilot have been reported previously as part of IB, page 4.

Evaluation

The college has been focused upon addressing this standard and the recommendations made by the evaluation team in 2004. Integration of planning with resource allocation, and the creation of a systematic assessment cycle has been in forefront of the college's institutional effectiveness efforts and was tested during the fall, 2009 in the form of a pilot project. But the process has been one of growth. There has been the development of an Educational Master Plan and Research Planning Agenda, both of which were thought to be the answer. However, upon reflection and informed by the commission's rubric and by the literature, the college returned to the plans to fully integrate them in an overarching strategic plan with integrated performance indicators that are systematically assessed, analyzed, and acted upon. Although this has taken a lot of effort, it is to be expected in terms of a change this large. It probably had to be sequential and evolutionary as the college moved toward a higher level of institutional effectiveness.

To address the integration of its planning processes as well as linking planning to resource allocation, Mesa first created its Educational Master Plan, 2007-2011. However, the College recognized that this direction required some revision and worked in earnest to produce an integrated planning framework. Using the college's existing Program Review process and program plans, an integrated planning cycle and resource allocation model was designed. A pilot project to link planning and resource allocation tested the new model. The College has entered a continuous quality improvement cycle using the findings from this pilot to develop, discuss and then, implement the next stages during the spring, 2010.

The culture of evidence that has been created at Mesa following the 2004 self study is probably the most telling in terms of change. First, there is the formal Research Planning Agenda that is tied to the vision, mission, and values statements, that states what we do and how we measure it. That this agenda was revisited and revised

eighteen months after it was created speaks to the continuous improvement effort to assess, analyze, and act upon data. The creation of the Guidelines for Implementing the Research Planning Agenda is also an important milestone, as it clarified for all campus stakeholders the nature of the research agenda, including levels of data sensitivity, data access, security, use, and dissemination. End users go through training to understand the ramifications of data.

Student learning outcomes are now in the process of being assessed and acted upon, which is clearly part of the culture of evidence that now exists at Mesa. Program Review includes data reporting and analysis. Administration, departments, and programs make use of crucial enrollment data to inform decision making regarding efficiency while ensuring breadth and commitment to the curriculum. The Basic Skills Initiative has brought a whole level of inquiry with it. The Basic Skills Committee meets on a regular monthly basis and conducts an annual assessment and then meets to evaluate the resulting data used to make decisions in their programs and courses. The college is changing the way it operates. If anything stakeholders are becoming even more demanding in their need for data and the office of research is working to meet this need. (I.B-12)

To ensure college-wide, fair, unbiased access to research, the Dean of Instructional Services, Resource Development, and Research reports directly to the President for matters of research. To ensure full integration with the district, the dean meets regularly with the district Director of Institutional Research and Planning and sits on the District-wide Research Committee. There is a decided effort to provide Mesa with the data and research that it needs. To ensure that everyone has access to workshops on how to use data in their various applications, the dean, Campus Based Researcher, and numerous faculty and staff members have developed and provided numerous professional development activities.

The College meets this standard.

Standard I.B.4. The institution provides evidence that the planning process is broad-based, offers opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.

Description

The Mesa College strategic plan provides the overview for all planning on campus, as all planning at the micro level informs the macro level, and vice versa. It is through this relationship that goals and objectives are established, and integrated plans, such as the Educational Master Plan, Information Technology Strategic Plan, and Program Review are created. These plans are implemented and assessed in order to inform the established performance indicators in the greater plan, which informs institutional effectiveness. At question here is how this occurs in a manner where participation is broad-based, resource allocation is informed by planning, and the result is improved institutional effectiveness.

The breadth of involvement in planning is clearly evidenced in the participatory governance model of decision making at Mesa College. As stated previously, the nexus for strategic planning and decision making is President's Cabinet, which is a participatory governance group with representation from all governance bodies. In addition, the Academic and Classified Senates and the Associated Student Government provide broad participation within their governance groups and committee memberships.

Within each of the three divisions and eight schools on the campus there is internal planning as well. In the Student Services Division, as with all divisions, planning begins with Program Review. The Student Services Leadership Team's two deans, the director of EOPS/STAR/CARE, and the Program Activity Manager of Disability Support Programs and Services work with their faculty and staff to review their plans and identify funding needs, which become the basis for their annual budget requests. Approval for the requests is done by the Vice President, Student Services, who then forwards it to the President for final approval. The Mesa Student Services Council meets regularly and provides input for decisions related to strategic planning and resource allocation. Each spring the Council participates in an all-day planning retreat which includes brainstorming strategies for evaluating services and identifying any recommendations for changes to resources. To assure the process, Student Services created the Categorical Allocation Funding Manual in 2008-2009. The purpose was to: (a) create a transparent budget allocation process for categorical funds; (b) seek broad input regarding projects/activities to be funded; (c) create a process that was streamlined and comprehensive; and (d) link every dollar to their outcomes and plans. (I.B-13)

Within the Instructional Division, planning and resource allocation begins at the department/program level. This academic planning starts with the Program Review process. Under the leadership of the Dean, who works with appropriate department chair, lead faculty writers as well as other interested faculty and staff members, departments and/or program funding priorities are identified. These resulting requests are supported by college and department/program data provided by the campus' Research Office and program review findings. The Instructional Deans' Council meets on a regular basis to review and discuss these funding priorities. During these meetings, the nine deans and the Vice President of Instruction make funding recommendations based upon the documented needs of the departments/programs in the individual schools. Through their program plans, these requests are then forwarded to the appropriate college-level participatory governance committee, such as IELM, VTEA, RAC and eventually the President's Cabinet where these requests are evaluated from a campus perspective; then, resource allocations are made.

Another important facet of planning and resource allocation occurs in the development of the college's schedule of classes. Starting at the District level, the Executive Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services, the Vice Chancellor of Instruction and the Vice Chancellor of Student Services meet with the college Vice Presidents to make recommendations on FTEF allocation based upon district and college data. These

recommendations are then forwarded to the Chancellor's Cabinet where a final decision is made. Each college is then allocated their respective FTEF for the specific semester. At the college level, the FTEF allocations are discussed at the President's Cabinet and based upon established principles, including the use of campus data and program review plans, to plan and develop the schedule. Input from all college areas but primarily from the Vice President of Instruction and the Instructional Deans' Council is considered during this participatory decision-making process.

The Basic Skills Success and Retention Committee has effectively used integrated planning, resource allocation, and evaluation to inform its actions. (I.B-14) At its retreat in 2009, the committee evaluated data on courses and worked in teams to assess implications and future actions. (I.B-15) In fall, 2009, the college had its Basic Skills briefing, including both college and district researchers, and received the 2009 Basic Skills Report, which is a lengthy document reporting on the success of each Basic Skills course, and analyzing the various interventions. (I.B-16) The Basic Skills Initiative provides a central point for administering the program, including the Basic Skills Action Plan, which is informed by assessment. (I.B-17, I.B-18)

With the passage of Bonds S and N and the new facilities being built, there has been significant participation in planning and resource allocation by constituents. Although this is discussed at length in III.B, it is also applicable here. In each case, the school or division administrators, faculty, and staff have had a primary role in designing the facility to serve the instructional or service related purpose. In fall, 2009, the Allied Health Building opened with state of the art technology and instructional design. The building and learning spaces were designed by the faculty to meet the needs of the curriculum. Fixtures, Furnishings, and Equipment (FF&E) allocation decisions were prioritized by the dean and faculty to assure that these needs were met.

Evaluation

Mesa College has a long history of broad-based inclusive planning. There are numerous venues for planning at the program or service area level, the school level, and the college level. All plans and resource allocations are approved by the participatory governance council, President's Cabinet. Regardless of funding source, resource allocation is informed by planning, with Program Review providing the primary input at the program or service area level. Evaluation of planning and resource allocation occurs through the college's performance indicators, listed in I.B.3.

The creation of the overarching, integrated strategic plan over the past two years has been inclusive; it was of primary importance at the 2008 and 2009 President's Cabinet Retreats. The way in which planning informs resource allocation was well established, in that allocations were based upon Program Review, but it was not always clearly so. With the integrated planning and resource allocation model within the strategic plan, it is the process of becoming more clearly articulated.

The College meets this standard.

Standard I.B.5. The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.

Description

The college uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies. These include a wide array of measures, such as: (1) Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC), which is required by the state and reports longitudinal performance in Basic Skills, success, and completion measures; (2) Student Equity Report, which is made available to all stakeholders and provides the breakdown of student performance according to age, gender, and ethnicity by department; (3) Mesa College Fact Book, which provides annual data, broken down by age, gender and ethnicity, for persistence, success, retention, GPA, awards conferred, and transfer; and (4) Mesa College High School Pipeline Report, which provides longitudinal data on student performance for those students coming through the area feeder schools. (I.B-19, I.B-20, I.B-21, I.B-22) Other assessments include: (1) the annual Student Learning Outcomes Survey, which tracks the progress made at the department level in completing the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle; (2) the Community College Survey of Student Engagement, which measured the level of engagement students had in their learning experience at the college; (3) Point of Service Surveys, which measure the level at which various college services are meeting the needs of students and employees; and (4) Employee and Student Surveys, which measure the perception and level of satisfaction that the constituencies have with services, instruction, resources, governance, and other practices. (I.B-23, I.B-24, I.B-25, I.B-26, I.B-27) The college has many other assessments as well.

The college is committed to transparency and makes public its assessments through the District Institutional Research website and the college website, various committee, task force and forum meetings, and in print for general distribution. (I.B-28, I.B-29) In the case of the Employee Perception Survey and Student Satisfaction Survey, the college held public briefings for constituents to attend. (I.B-30, I.B-31) The same was true for the Basic Skills Report. The college publishes an annual report that is made available in print and via the college website. In addition, the President, Vice President of Instruction, and the Vice President of Student Services provide regular reports and monthly updates of activities to the campus community. The President sends a weekly email update to the college, which is also uploaded to the website and archived. In it she discusses various reports and other actions taken by President's Cabinet, and various activities on campus. President's Cabinet is the venue for central decision making and is open to all college constituents.

The college Public Information Officer works to assure that campus publications convey to the college and the community information about institutional quality. In addition, the President is active on a number of community committees, including San Diego Imperial Counties Community Colleges Association, San Diego Drop-Out Task Force, and San Diego Workforce Investment Board. In addition, many of the programs at the college

have advisory boards, particularly in the vocational programs, and information about effectiveness is communicated to the public in this way.

Evaluation

The college does an effective job of disseminating documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.

The College meets this standard.

Standard I.B.6. The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts.

Description

The College assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, those parts of the cycle using institutional and research findings. As described in I.B, to test the implementation of its new planning model, the College developed and conducted a pilot project during the fall, 2009. Two sources of information will be used to improve the process. First, the feedback collected from all participants will be compiled. Next, the results of a survey developed to collect input from the programs and service that were a part of the pilot will be generated. This information will be used by the Academic Affairs Committee during the spring 2010 semester to establish principles and guidelines for the next steps in the process.

Evaluation

The College applies the concept of continuous quality improvement to assure the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes.

The College partially meets this standard.

Standard I.B.7. The institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services.

Description

The institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services using a variety of approaches. A major evaluation mechanism for the areas of instruction, student and learning support services is the college's program review process. Another vehicle is the recent acquisition of TaskStream that will assist these areas with the management and generation of student learning outcome assessment reports. The collection and use of data from many parts of the college provides yet another way to measure institutional effectiveness. Some

examples include enrollment management data, student response forms in the Tutoring Centers, CCSSE and CCFSSSE results as well as comments cards used the LRC. Faculty evaluations, guided by the current contract, are also a barometer of teaching effectiveness and on-going faculty professional development. Classified staff development is informed by an annual needs assessment to design and offer a two-day, on-campus conference. Finally specialized accreditations/certifications assess the effectiveness of the college's career-technical programs.

Evaluation

Mesa College has effective mechanisms in place to evaluate the effectiveness of its instructional programs, student support services and library and other learning support services.

The College meets this standard.

Planning Agenda for Standard IB: IMPROVING INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

This standard has been and continues to be a major area of focus for the College. Since the previous self study and the Focused Midterm Report, Mesa has devoted significant time and effort to respond to the recommendations received relative to institutional effectiveness. An overarching new strategic planning process was developed to provide the integration needed as well as link planning to resource allocation. To test this new model, a pilot was done during the fall, 2009. The results of this pilot will guide the next steps in the planning process.

The college's program review process has matured into an integrated approach and now encompasses Instruction, Student Services and Administrative Services. Program review will continue to be the locus of campus planning and resource allocation. Student learning outcomes (SLOs) have followed a similar path with programs and service areas making good progress. TaskStream, a software SLO management package, will continue to assist with the implementation of the SLOAC cycle.

Working with the Campus-Based Researcher, the Research Committee will continue to address issues pertaining to program review, student learning outcomes and planning. The training of the committee membership to act as liaisons to the college will assist in the building of Mesa's culture of inquiry.

The College has identified three areas to address within the scope of this standard and recommends:

1. reviewing, developing and implementing the findings from the pilot to link planning and resource allocation;
2. revisiting, updating and revising the Education Master Plan;
3. exploring mechanisms to integrate the three measures of institutional effectiveness; planning, program review, and student learning outcomes.

Standard IB Evidence
Version Dated 2/3/10

I.B-1	Educational Master Plan 2007-2011: http://www.sdmesa.edu/instruction/accreditation/emp.cfm
I.B-2	Research Planning Agenda: http://www.sdmesa.edu/instruction/research/pdf/research-planning-agenda.pdf
I.B-3	San Diego Mesa College Policy on the Genesis, Development and Application of Student Learning Outcomes: http://www.sdmesa.edu/instruction/slo/pdf/GenesisSLO.pdf
I.B-4	Focused Midterm Report, 2007: http://www.sdmesa.edu/instruction/accreditation/pdf/2-MesaCollege-Focused-Midterm-Report07.pdf
I.B-5	Academic Senate Minutes: http://www.sdmesa.edu/academic-senate/minutes.cfm
I.B-6	Mesa College Catalog: http://www.sdccd.edu/catalogs/mesa
I.B-7	Guidelines for Implementing the Research Planning Agenda: http://www.sdmesa.edu/instruction/research/pdf/DataSensitivityGIRPALatest3-08.pdf
I.B-8	SLO Survey –see # 23
I.B-9	Mission, Vision, and Values Statements: http://www.sdmesa.edu/mission-statement/index.cfm
I.B-10	Strategic Plan: http://www.sdmesa.edu/president/pdf/102809-strategic-framework.pdf and http://www.sdmesa.edu/president/pdf/102809-integrated-planning.pdf
I.B-11	Research Committee Minutes: http://www.sdmesa.edu/instruction/research/minutes.cfm
I.B-12	Research Office Research Request Log
I.B-13	Categorical Allocation Funding Manual, 2008-2009
I.B-14	Basic Skills Success and Retention Committee: http://www.sdmesa.edu/governance/committees/basic-skills.cfm
I.B-15	Basic Skills Retreat Data, 2009: http://www.sdmesa.edu/institutional-research/pdf/BSI-retreat09.pdf
I.B-16	Basic Skills Report, 2009: http://research.sdccd.edu/Include/Student%20Outcomes/Basic%20Skills/Mesa%20College%20BSI%20Report%202009_final.pdf
I.B-17	Basic Skills Initiative: http://www.sdmesa.edu/basic-skills/index.cfm
I.B-18	Basic Skills Action Plan: http://www.sdmesa.edu/basic-skills/pdf/ActionPlan.pdf
I.B-19	Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges: http://research.sdccd.edu/Include/Accreditation/Mesa%20Self%20Assessment%2009.pdf
I.B-20	Student Equity Report: http://research.sdccd.edu/Include/Program%20Data/Student%20Equity/EQUITY_REPORT_FINAL_2008_MESA.pdf
I.B-21	Mesa College Fact Book: http://research.sdccd.edu/Include/Research%20Reports/College%20and%20District%20Fact%20Books/

	Mesa%20College%20Fact%20Book%202009%20v6.pdf
I.B-22	Mesa College High School Pipeline Report: http://research.sdccd.edu/Include/Student%20Profiles/High%20School%20Feeder%20Reports/HS%20Pipeline_Mesa%20College_final_v2.pdf
I.B-23	Student Learning Outcomes Survey, 2008, and 2009: http://www.sdmesa.edu/institutional-research/pdf/SLO-SurveyReport08.pdf
I.B-24	Community College Survey of Student Engagement
I.B-25	Point of Service Surveys: http://research.sdccd.edu/pages/225.asp
I.B-26	Employee Perception Survey: http://research.sdccd.edu/Include/Accreditation/2009%20Surveys/Employee%20Perception%20Report%202009_MESA_v5.pdf
I.B-27	Student Satisfaction Survey: http://research.sdccd.edu/Include/Accreditation/2009%20Surveys/Accreditation%20Student%20Survey%20Report%20_Mesa_v4.pdf
I.B-28	SDCCD Institutional Research website: http://research.sdccd.edu/pages/1.asp
I.B-29	Mesa College Institutional Research website: http://www.sdmesa.edu/institutional-research/index.cfm
I.B-30	Employee Perception Survey 2009 Briefing to the College: http://research.sdccd.edu/Include/Accreditation/2009%20Surveys/Mesa%20College%20Employee%20Perception%20Survey_Briefing.pdf
I.B-31	Student Satisfaction Survey 2009 Briefing to the College: http://research.sdccd.edu/Include/Accreditation/2009%20Surveys/Mesa%20College%20Student%20Satisfaction%20Survey_v2.pdf
I.B-32	2009 Program Review Handbook