Action Plans	Related Standards	QFE	Improvement Recommendation(s)	Responsible Party
Review and revise the College's Mission Statement in fall 2018 to better align with Standard language.	I.A.1			PIEC
Consider how the College wants to address and communicate its commitment to distance education through its mission and planning efforts.	I.A.1			VPI and Distance Education Subcommittee
Review and revise the Strategic Plan during the next scheduled comprehensive review to incorporate elements of the Loss/ Momentum Framework (LMF) phases and Student Learning/ Service Unit Outcomes Assessment.	I.A.2, I.B.3, II.A.3	X		PIEC
Streamline all operational plans and develop a process for ongoing collection and analysis of action plans from all planning documents.	I.A.2	X		PIEC & Content Matter Leads
Review and revise the Educational Master Plan to more clearly describe link to the Strategic Plan Goals and to consider identified action plans from all Division/Operational Plans.	I.A.3	X		PIEC
Perform a comprehensive evaluation of all planning efforts/ documents to ensure consistency that decision-making in human resources, technology, scheduling, diversity, and annual resource allocation are being made in consideration of program review; are effective and optimized for timely implementation; and are focused on student achievement and learning.	I.A.3, I.B.9, II.A.3	X	3	Vice Presidents
Evaluate efficiency of structures to manage college-wide learning outcomes and assessment work and coordination of efforts.	I.B.1	X		PRIELT Dean & Outcomes Assessment Facilitator
Revise and update guides on development of SLO statements and assessment practices to include current advances in the field. Integrate information from resources such as the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA) and the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U).	I.B.2	X		Outcomes Assessment Facilitator
Provide more robust support to faculty and staff through the PR/SLOAC Committees and additional workshops for improved development, implementation, analysis, and use of SLO assessment.	I.B.2, II.A.3	X	2,4, & 6	Vice Presidents, PRIELT Dean & Outcomes Assessment Facilitator
Investigate potential strategies for additional levels of SLO disaggregation to identify subgroups in need of improvement.	I.B.2, I.B.4, I.B.6	X	2	VPI, VPSS, Outcomes Assessment Facilitator
Evaluate efficiency and consistency of the Budget and Resource Development Subcommittee (BRDS) annual resource allocation process and identify strategies for improvement.	I.B.4	X		VPA and BRDS
Examine ways to evaluate how the Action Plans arising from Program Review are aligned with Action Plans arising from Division/ Operational Plans and other college-wide forums.	I.B.5	X	3	Vice Presidents & Content Matter Leads
Improve communication strategy to effectively share SLO assessment best practices, gaps identified through the assessment process, and successful strategies implemented to improve student learning.	I.B.6	X		Vice Presidents & Outcomes Assessment Facilitator

Develop the ISLO assessment process to include direct and indirect measures of learning and identify foci for improvement.	I.B.6	X		Vice Presidents, Deans, Department Chairs, Outcomes Assessment Facilitator
Develop and implement the "College Governance Assessment Tool" to evaluate governance committees. Analyze results and implement improvement strategies as needed.	I.B.7, I.C.5, IV.A.1, IV.A.7	X	8	College Governance Committee (CGC)
Continued development of the College's research capabilities to provide program-specific data disaggregated by student population, as well as division-specific data, which align with Strategic Plan Goals.	I.B.9	X		Research and Planning Analyst, Research Subcommittee
Integration of the SPAS institution-set standards and identified gaps with Operational and Division plans to inform activities and improvement strategies (i.e. "closing the loop").	I.B.9	X		College President, Vice Presidents, Content Matter Leads
Evaluate and improve process for ongoing, comprehensive review of official College communications, including the College Website.	I.C.1			CGC, Outreach and Marketing Committee
Develop a set of standard information to be included on webpages for respective departments, units and divisions, to ensure consistency.	I.C.1			PRIELT Dean, Web Design Office, Deans, Department Chairs
Improve the quality of College research reports and include more targeted analysis of data by program or service area, with detail appropriate to the specific constituency.	I.C.3			Research and Planning Analyst, Research Subcommittee
Continue dialogue and investigate mechanisms to efficiently communicate Program Review reports at the program and service-unit level with detail appropriate for the various constituencies.	I.C.3			Vice Presidents, IPR/SLOAC Subcommittee, Student Services Program Review Subcommittee, Administrative Services Program Review Committee
Develop a standard set of programmatic information that should be available on each program's webpage.	I.C.4			Vice Presidents, Department Chairs, and PRIELT Dean
Establish a process for the regular review of website content for accuracy, alignment with the College Catalog, and updates to accommodate any changes.	I.C.4, I.C.5			Vice Presidents, PRIELT Dean, Deans, Department Chairs
Investigate process for committee responsibility of Accreditation Standards, creating a sustainable mechanism to provide continuous improvement and adherence to Standard requirements.	I.C.12, IV.B.4	X		College Governance Committee (CGC)
Perform assessment of textbook selection process and survey faculty use of Online Educational Resources (OER).	II.A.2			VPI and Academic Senate President
Create a Resource Team at the College to provide guidance to faculty and departments on how to structure use of course materials in a way that can be evaluated with regard to its effectiveness on student access, equity, and success	II.A.2			VPI and Academic Senate President
Evaluate courses that have modified their course material accessibility and content and assess improvements in student success	II.A.2			VPI and Instructional Deans
Work with District offices to optimize process for extracting SLO statements from Taskstream and for the regular upload of SLOs into CurricUNET, in order to capture changes that might occur due to improvement strategies.	II.A.3	X		Outcomes Assessment Facilitator

Task	Standard				Responsible
Develop two-year course sequence chart for all programs (i.e. degrees and certificates). Course sequencing charts will be published on program webpages and be shared with the Counseling Department for maximum student exposure.	II.A.6			5	VPI, VPSS, Instructional Deans, Department Chairs, Counselors
Modify ISLO (i.e. GE SLOs) assessment tools to include direct assessment of learning.	II.A.11	X			Outcomes Assessment Facilitator, IPR/SLOAC Subcommittee, Student Services Program Review Subcommittee, Administrative Services Program Review Committee
Build the infrastructure necessary to support CTE program growth, improvements and recruitment (Year 1).	II.A.14				VPI, Instructional Deans, Department Chairs
Focus efforts on expansion of existing programs, including increasing program capacity within CTE specific programs; equipment replacement and enhancement; exploring new program development possibilities that will afford students certificates and degrees leading to living wage jobs; expanding career services; and building a sustainable marketing plan (Year 1).	II.A.14				VPI, Instructional Deans, Department Chairs
Focus on new program development and implementation and continued program enhancements across CTE programs (Year 2).	II.A.14				VPI, Instructional Deans, Department Chairs
Implement Year 2 new and continuing program development activities and program improvements, to address Strong Workforce Taskforce recommendations and outcome metrics (Year 3).	II.A.14				VPI, Instructional Deans, Department Chairs
Complete the plan for Program Discontinuance at San Diego Miramar College, with input and support from college governance committees and groups and with ultimate approval from the College Executive Committee.	II.A.16	X			VPI, Instructional Deans, Department Chairs, Academic Senate
Investigate mechanisms to better communicate learning support services available to students.	II.B.1				Instructional Support Services Workgroup
Conduct additional research to identify potential reasons for the mixed results regarding tutoring services and student success as described in the Legislative Office Analyst Visit Presentation report.	II.B.1			2	Liberal Arts Dean & Faculty Coordinator
Implementation of California Online Education Initiative's (OEI) tools. Discussions are in progress with each department to address this initiative and demo dates have been scheduled for the California OEI to provide information and respond to concerns. As the population for San Diego Miramar College continues to grow both on site and DE, this is a gap that needs to be addressed.	II.C.2				VPI & Distance Education Subcommittee
Develop a BRDS information page to supplement the current website content, providing more detailed information on how various financial planning processes intersect to create the annual Miramar College Adopted Budget.	III.D.2	X			VPA & BRDS
Update the fall Continuous GFU Discretionary Resource Allocation model documents to include a direct link to the College Strategic Plan Goals.	III.D.2, III.D.11	X			VPA & BRDS
Institutionalize assessment of college governance system to ensure ongoing improvement.	IV.A.1, IV.A.7	X			College Governance Committee (CGC)

ACCJC Eight Recommendations for Improvement and Quality Focus Essay Action Projects

ACCJC Improvemet Recommendations	Description	Divisions/Area	Lead	Committees/Subcommittees/Workgroup
Recommendation 1	In order to increase effectiveness and better determine whether its mission directs institutional priorities, the ACCJC team recommends that the College engage Administrative, Instructional Support, and Student Services programs in program review to address how well program missions align with the College mission.	Administrative Services	Vice President of Administrative Services	Administrative Services Program Review Committee
		Instructional Support Services	Dean of PRIELT	Instructional Support Services Workgroup
		Student Services	Vice President of Student Services	Dean of Student Affairs, Martin Moss, Kandice Brandt, Joan Thompson, Rick Cassar, Truongson Nguyen, Mona Patel, Naomi Grisham, Judy Patacsil, Joyce Allen
Recommendation 2	In order to increase effectiveness, the ACCJC team recommends that the College analyze learning outcomes assessment results by meaningful disaggregation of data by subpopulations of students, instructional and tutorial delivery methods, learning support services, and locations to enhance dialogue and prompt appropriate action.	Instructional Services	Vice President of Instructional Services Dean of Liber Arts	IPR/SLOAC Subcommittee, Outcomes Assessment Facilitator, Academic Success Center Personnel
		Student Services	Vice President of Student Services	VPSS, MaryAnn Guevarra, Kandice Brandt, Dana Stack, Tonia Teresh, Donnie Tran, Dean of Student Affairs
Recommendation 3	In order to increase effectiveness, the ACCJC team recommends that the College develop a procedure for evaluating its program review processes for student services, administrative services, and instructional services to assure their effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of the mission.	Administrative Services	Vice President of Administrative Services	Administrative Services Program Review Committee
		Instructional Services	Vice President of Instruction	IPR/SLOAC Subcommittee
		Student Services	Vice President of Student Services	Student Service Program Review Subcommittee
Recommendation 4	In order to increase effectiveness, the ACCJC team recommends that the College identifies and regularly assesses learning outcomes for all courses, programs, certificates and degrees using established institutional procedures.	Instructional Services	Vice President of Instruction	Instructional Deans, VPI, Department Chairs, Outcomes Assessment Facilitator, IPR/SLOAC Subcommittee
Recommendation 5	In order to increase effectiveness, the ACCJC team recommends the College publish two-year course sequence charts in the College catalog.	Instructional Services	Vice President of Instruction	Instructional Deans, VPI, Department Chairs, VPSS, Counselors
Recommendation 6	In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College improve assessment for all Student Support Services and implement annual assessment tools in addition to the three-year student feedback surveys to document support of student learning for demonstrating continuous quality improvement.	Student Services	Vice President of Student Services Dean of Liberal Arts	Student Service Program Review Subcommittee, All Student Services Units, VPSS, Tonia Teresh, Dean of Student Affairs Academic Success Center personnel
Recommendation 7	In order to improve effectiveness, the ACCJC team recommends that the College aligns its plans for technology support staffing needs with its capital improvement projects.	School of Planning, Research & Institutional Effectiveness, Library and Technology	Dean of PRIELT	College Technology Committee, District IT Committee (when it is officially formed)
Recommendation 8	In order to increase effectiveness, the ACCJC team recommends that the College follow through on its Actionable Improvement Plans and Action Project to better assess and improve its shared governance procedures and practices as delineated in the Quality Focus Essay (QFE).	Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee, College Governance Committee	• PIEC Co-chairs • CGC Chair (Academic Senate Vice President)	Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee (PIEC), College Governance Committee (CGC)
Quality Focus Essay Action Project 1: Student Learning/ Service Unit Outcomes Assessment	To improve integration, consistency, and quality of student learning/service unit outcomes assessment, in order to provide a functional, consistent process for faculty and staff to assess student learning and use the results for continuous improvement.	All areas of the college	• Collegewide Outcome and Assessment Facilitator • Vice President of Instruction • Vice President of Student Services • Vice President of Administrative Services • Dean of PRIELT • Dean of Liberal Arts	IPR/SLOAC Subcommittee, Student Service Program Review/SLOAC Subcommittee, Administrative Servcies Program Review Committee, Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee (PIEC) , Academic Success Center personnel
			*Per Accreditation Self-Evaluation Report	
Quality Focus Essay Action Project 2: Institutional Effectiveness, Evaluation and Review	*To evaluate and review the integrated planning and resources allocation efforts, maximizing efficiency of planning efforts on campus and ensuring functional alignment of plans with the College mission and strategic goals. *To evaluate and review the functionality and effectiveness of participatory governance processes and groups, in order to ensure that implementation of changes designed to improve student achievement, learning, and success are being done in a timely manner; with proper participation and communication; and in support of the College mission	All areas of the college	• College President • Academic Senate President • Classified Staff Senate President • Dean of PRIELT • Vice Presidents	Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee, Budget and Resources Development Subcommittee, Research Subcommittee, College Governance Committee, Dean's Council
			*Per Accreditation Self-Evaluation Report	

ACCJC

ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES
WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

Guidelines for Preparing Institutional Reports to the Commission

Table of Contents

Background

Institutions must meet the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies (hereafter called Standards) at all times. Comprehensive evaluation teams visit every seven years to verify that institutions meet these requirements. However, other reports and visits may be required to verify that colleges have resolved deficiencies noted by evaluation teams and continue to meet the Standards. Institutional reports to the Commission can occur at any time.

A **Midterm Report** is required of all institutions midway between comprehensive evaluation visits (in the third or fourth year). A **Follow-Up Report** is required when an institution must provide evidence that demonstrates it has addressed recommendations, resolved deficiencies identified in evaluation team reports, and meets Standards.

When the Commission receives information that raises significant concerns about an institution, a **Special Report** may be required to provide information about the institution. The Commission will identify the information it is requesting in a formal letter. All reports to the Commission must provide evidence that supports the information in the report and the claims made by the institution.

While not covered in these Guidelines, a Show Cause Report is required when an institution must demonstrate to the Commission why its accreditation should not be withdrawn and that it is in compliance with the Standards. The requirements for the Show Cause Report will be noted in the Commission action letter.

Helpful resources include the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, Commission policies, and the *Guide to Evaluating and Improving Institutions.*

The Commission reviews institutional reports at its next regularly scheduled meeting and notifies institutions in an action letter as to what further action, if any, the institution must take.

Information for Preparation of All Reports

Presentation of Reports

The institution is required to submit one electronic copy (including evidence) of its reports to the Commission. Colleges may be asked to provide hard copies to accommodate special needs. The electronic version of the report is required to be submitted in MS Word. The report should include an appendix of evidence supporting the narrative statements made. The evidence listed should be included in the Table of Contents under Appendices. All evidence submitted with reports must be in electronic format (e.g., on a clearly labeled flash drive/USB stick, or using active hyperlinks within the body of the report).
Send the report and the evidence to:

        ACCJC
        10 Commercial Blvd. Ste. 204
        Novato, CA 94949

Unnecessarily long reports can be difficult to follow. A report should concisely state the institution's resolution of any deficiencies and its current and sustained compliance with Standards). If additional work remains for the future, concrete details, plans, timelines, and outcomes for that work should be included in the report.

If there is a visit by Commission representatives planned in connection with the report, team members must be provided with an electronic copy of the report and evidence in advance of the visit. A roster of the evaluation team members will be sent to the institution, and the institution must send an electronic copy of the report to each team member.

Evidence

Evidence should be provided that clearly supports the institution's claim that it has resolved the deficiencies noted and meets Standards. Citations to large documents, without links to the sections that are supportive of the institution's claims, make it difficult to determine specifically what the institution wishes to have noted. Institutions should carefully select relevant evidence to support the elements of compliance stated in the report narrative.

Evidence should accompany each copy of the college report and should be submitted in electronic format (e.g., flash drive/USB stick, or via active hyperlinks within the body of the report). Links to web pages should be "frozen" at the time of the evaluation visit and checked to ensure they are active. The *Manual for Institutional Self-Evaluation* and the *Guide to Evaluating and Improving Institutions*, provide further guidance about selection and presentation of evidence associated with Standards and areas of institutional practice. The best evidence is meaningful to an institution's constituents and used in the institution's ongoing assessment, planning, decision-making, and improvement practices.

Midterm Report

Institutions are required to submit a Midterm Report midway between comprehensive evaluation visits. The Midterm Report includes a report on the work accomplished in response to the improvement recommendations made by the previous comprehensive evaluation team, an update of how improvement plans arising out of the institution's self-evaluation were integrated into the institution's ongoing planning and implementation processes, and analysis of longitudinal trend data. Institutions that underwent comprehensive visits after spring 2016 will report on the progress and outcomes from the action projects that were identified in the institution's Quality Focus Essay as described in the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report.

Requirements and Format for Midterm Reports

The following elements are required in a Midterm Report:

1. **Cover Sheet** (Appendix A)

    The Cover Sheet identifies it is a Midterm Report and includes the name and address of the institution and the date of submission.

2. **Certification Page** (Appendix B)

    The Certification Page certifies there was broad participation in the preparation of the Report and the Report is an accurate reflection of the nature and substance of the institution. The college Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Chair of the Governing Board, and other college personnel as appropriate, sign this certification attesting to the preparation and review of the Report.

3. **Table of Contents**

    The Table of Contents is a listing of the contents of the Report, including appendices.

4. **Report Preparation**

    This section describes the process used to prepare the Report and identifies those who were involved in its preparation.

5. **Plans Arising out of the Self-Evaluation Process**

    This section reports on the self-identified Improvement Plans from the institution's comprehensive self-evaluation process. The institution should describe how these improvement plans were integrated into the appropriate ongoing planning and implementation processes and report on the outcome of those plans. A chart format is appropriate for this section of the report. Any plans still pending for action should be clearly identified with specific timelines for completion and responsible parties.

6. **Institutional Reporting on Quality Improvements**

    For Institutions That Underwent Comprehensive Visits prior to Spring 2016

    6.A   Response to Team Recommendations for Improvement

    Describe the institutional response to the recommendations of the comprehensive evaluation team meant to increase institutional effectiveness (recommendations to improve). The institution should explain the manner in which each recommendation to improve was considered, and what, if anything, was done by the institution as a result of the recommendation.

6.B **Data Trend Analysis**

Provide the institution's data and analyses of trends from the Annual Reports and Annual Fiscal Reports for the years subsequent to the comprehensive evaluation visit. A Data Reporting Form is provided to facilitate this analysis. Access the form here. Please note you must download the form to your computer in order to use it. The form will not work in an internet browser.

For Institutions That Underwent Comprehensive Visits after Spring 2016

6.A **Response to Team Recommendations for Improvement**

Description of the institutional response to the recommendations of the comprehensive evaluation team meant to increase institutional effectiveness (recommendations to improve). The institution should explain the manner in which each recommendation to improve was considered, and what, if anything, was done by the institution as a result of the recommendation

6.B **Data Trend Analysis**

Provide the institution's data and analyses of trends from the Annual Reports and Annual Fiscal Reports for the years subsequent to the comprehensive evaluation visit. A Data Reporting Form is provided to facilitate this analysis. Access the form here. Please note you must download the form to your computer in order to use it. The form will not work in an internet browser.

6.C **Report on the outcomes of the Quality Focus Projects**

The Quality Focus Essay in the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report identified quality focus projects to improve Student Learning and Achievement. The Midterm Report will identify the Goals and Outcomes identified for each quality focus project and the changes in Student Achievement and Student Learning that resulted from the projects. Of particular interest, if appropriate, is commentary on further expansion of the projects, the potential and intent to expand those projects to other areas of the College, and the ability to replicate these projects. The institution should also identify which, if any, projects did not achieve the desired outcomes and provide information as to the factors that contributed to that outcome.

7. Appendices

All Midterm Reports shall include appropriate evidence to support the information provided in the Report.

Follow-Up Report

The Commission may require a Follow-Up Report at any time between comprehensive evaluation visits. This report includes a narrative analysis and evidence that describes the resolution of deficiencies identified in the Commission action letter; verifies that the Standards are met; and affirms that the institution will sustain the changes/improvements.

Requirements and Format for Follow-Up Reports

The following elements are required to be included in a Follow-Up Report:

1. **Cover Sheet (Appendix A)**

   The Cover Sheet identifies it is a Follow-Up Report and includes the name and address of the institution and the date of submission.

2. **Certification Page (Appendix B)**

   The Certification Page certifies there was broad participation in the preparation of the Report and the Report is an accurate reflection of the nature and substance of the institution. The college Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Chair of the Governing Board, and other college personnel as appropriate, sign this certification attesting to the preparation and review of the Report.

3. **Table of Contents**

   The Table of Contents is a listing of the contents of the Report, including appendices.

4. **Report Preparation**

   This section describes the process of report preparation and identifies those who were involved in its preparation.

5. **Response to the Commission Action Letter**

   Each deficiency identified by the Commission in its action letter must be resolved. The Report must provide a narrative analysis and evidence that demonstrates the institution has addressed each recommendation and resolved the associated deficiencies. It must also demonstrate that the Standards are met and affirm that the institution will sustain the changes/improvements.

6. **Appendices**

   The Follow-Up Report shall include appropriate evidence to support the information provided in the Report.

Special Report

As provided for in Commission policy,[1] the Commission may require a Special Report when it receives information that raises significant concerns about an institution's compliance with the Standards. The specific requirements of a Special Report will be contained in a letter from the Commission to the institution.

Requirements and Format for Special Reports

The following elements are required to be included in a Special Report:

1. **Cover Sheet (Appendix A)**

   The Cover Sheet identifies it is a Special Report and includes the name and address of the institution and the date of submission.

2. **Certification Page (Appendix C)**

   The Certification Page certifies that the report is an accurate reflection of the nature and substance of the institution. The college Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and the Chair of the Governing Board, and other college personnel as appropriate sign this certification attesting to the preparation and review of the report.

3. **Table of Contents**

   The Table of Contents is a listing of the contents of the report, including appendices.

4. **Report Preparation**

   This section describes the process of report preparation and identifies those who were involved in its preparation.

5. **Response to the Commission Letter**

   Each issue identified by the Commission in its letter to the institution must be addressed in the Special Report.

6. **Appendices**

   The Special Report shall include appropriate evidence to support the information provided in the Report.

_____

[1] Policy on Student and Public Complaints against Institutions
  Policy on Rights and Responsibilities of ACCJC and Member Institutions
  Policy on Commission Good Practice in Relations with Member Institutions

Appendix A
Institutional Report - Sample Cover Sheet

SAMPLE

_____

Appendix B
Midterm Report or Follow-Up Report – Sample Certification Page

(To be inserted in the Midterm/Follow-Up Report following the Cover Sheet)

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

From:

_____
(*Name of Chief Executive Officer*)

_____
(*Name of Institution*)

_____
(*Address*)

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

Signatures:

_____
(*Chief Executive Officer*)   (Date)

_____
(*Chairperson, Governing Board*)   (Date)

_____
(*Name, Title, Representing*)   (Date)

_____
(*Name, Title, Representing*)   (Date)

_____
(*Name, Title, Representing*)   (Date)

_____
(*Name, Title, Representing*)   (Date)

Appendix C
Special Report – Sample Certification Page

(To be inserted in the Special Report following the Cover Sheet)

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

From:

_____
(*Name of Chief Executive Officer*)

_____
(*Name of Institution*)

_____
(*Address*)

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

Signatures:

_____
(*Chief Executive Officer*)   (Date)

_____
(*Chairperson, Governing Board*)   (Date)

_____
(*Name, Title, Representing*)   (Date)

_____
(*Name, Title, Representing*)   (Date)

_____
(*Name, Title, Representing*)   (Date)

_____
(*Name, Title, Representing*)   (Date)