

January 27, 2022

Mr. Daniel Peck
President
Mission College
3000 Mission College Blvd
Santa Clara, CA 95054

Dear Mr. Peck:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting January 12-14, 2022, reviewed the Follow-Up Report and related evidentiary materials submitted by Mission College. The purpose of this review was to determine whether the College has addressed the deficiencies identified by the peer review team during the spring 2020 comprehensive visit and demonstrated compliance with the Standards cited in the Commission's June 29, 2020, Action Letter.

Upon consideration of the information noted above, the Commission acted to **Reaffirm Accreditation for the remainder of the cycle**. The Commission finds that Mission College has addressed the compliance requirements, corrected deficiencies, and meets Standards I.B.6, III.A.5, and III.C.2. The Commission requires the College to disseminate the Follow-Up Report and this letter within the institution, including by posting them on the College's website.

The next report from the College will be the Midterm Report¹ due on March 15, 2024. The institution's next comprehensive review will begin with Team ISER Review in the fall term of 2026 and conclude with a Focused Site Visit in the spring term of 2027.

On behalf of the Commission, we wish to express appreciation for the diligent work and thoughtful reflection that Mission College undertook to respond to these requirements. These efforts confirm that peer review can serve well the multiple constituencies of higher education by both ensuring and encouraging institutional quality and effectiveness.

¹ Institutions preparing and submitting Midterm Reports, Follow-up Reports, Special Reports, or Teach-out plans/agreements to the Commission should review *Guidelines for Preparing Institutional Reports to the Commission*, found on the ACCJC website at <https://accjc.org/guides-and-manuals/>.

If you have any questions about this letter or the Commission's action, please feel free to contact Dr. Cindy Miles or the vice president assigned as liaison to your institution.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Cindy Miles".

Cindy Miles, Ph.D.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Sonya Christian".

Sonya Christian, Ed.D.

cc: Mr. Bradley Davis, Chancellor, West Valley-Mission Community College District
Ms. Lorrie Ranck, Accreditation Liaison Officer

June 29, 2020

Mr. Daniel Peck, President
Mission College
3000 Mission College Blvd
Santa Clara, CA 95054

Dear Mr. Peck:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting June 10-12, 2020, reviewed the Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER) and evidentiary materials submitted by Mission College. The Commission also considered the Peer Review Team Report (Team Report) prepared by the peer review team that conducted its onsite visit to the College March 9-12, 2020.

The purpose of this review was to determine whether the College continues to meet ACCJC's Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and Accreditation Standards (hereinafter, the Standards). Upon consideration of the written and oral information noted above, the Commission acted to **Reaffirm Accreditation for 18 Months and require a Follow-Up Report, due no later than October 1, 2021.**

Commendations

The Commission recognizes the exemplary performance of Mission College in the following areas. Commendations signify practices for which the Commission believes the institution has exceeded standards.

Standard I.B.3, II.A.15 (College Commendation 1): The Commission commends Mission College for its implementation of the program revitalization process to ensure continuous quality improvement when programs fall below institution-set standards and/or program review standards so that students can complete their education in a timely manner.

Standard II.C.1 (College Commendation 2): The Commission commends Mission College for their use of the Front Door Experience data to holistically improve the quality of student services and enhance the accomplishment of the college mission.

Standard IV.A.1 (College Commendation 3): The Commission commends Mission College for developing a culture of equity and inclusion to support administrators, faculty, staff, and students in taking initiative for improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved.

Standard III.A.12 (District Commendation 1): The Commission commends the District for its creation of processes, programs, and services to increase faculty equity and diversity, consistent with its mission, including implementation of the Faculty Diversity Internship Program (FDIP) and EEO planning.

Compliance Requirements

The Commission also determined that the College must demonstrate compliance with the following Standards, as identified in the requirements below. This demonstration must be addressed in the required Follow-Up Report.

Standard I.B.6 (College Requirement 1): In order to meet the Standard, the Commission requires that the college implement procedures for the disaggregation, analysis, and evaluation of learning outcomes.

Standard III.A.5 (District Requirement 1): In order to meet the Standard, the Commission requires that the District systematically evaluate all personnel at stated intervals in accordance with college policies.

Standard III.C.2 (District Requirement 2): In order to meet the Standard, the Commission requires that the District continuously plan technology updates and replacements with the colleges to ensure that quality and capacity of technology are adequate to support the College's mission, operations, programs, and services.

In accordance with federal regulations, compliance requirements must be addressed, and the institution must demonstrate that it aligns with Standards within two years¹.

Modifications to Recommendations:

In taking its action, the Commission modified the team's recommendation(s) as follows:

District Recommendation 2 is changed from an improvement recommendation to a compliance requirement. The Commission also determined that the wording of the recommendation should be revised as follows:

Original Recommendation 2 (Improvement): In order to improve quality and ensure that capacity of technology is adequate to support the College's mission, operations, programs, and services, the District should continuously plan and coordinate technology updates and replacements with the colleges. (III.C.2)

Revised Recommendation 2 (Compliance): In order to meet the Standard, the Commission requires that the District continuously plan technology updates and replacements with the colleges to ensure that quality and capacity of technology are adequate to support the College's mission, operations, programs, and services. (III.C.2)

The Commission added the following Improvement Recommendation:

College Recommendation 2 (Improvement): In order to increase effectiveness, the Commission recommends the college review and revise processes to ensure that every

¹ For more information, refer to the Commission policy on "The Two-Year Rule and Extension for Good Cause" on the ACCJC website at <https://accjc.org/eligibility-requirements-standards-policies/>.

syllabus includes the current and correct SLOs and published information regarding degree applicability of courses is accurate. (II.A.3)

Recommendations for Improving Institutional Effectiveness

The Team Report includes narrative pertinent to the Commission added College Recommendation 2 for improving institutional effectiveness. This recommendation does not identify current areas of deficiency in institutional practice, but consistent with its mission to foster continuous improvement through the peer review process, the Commission encourages institutions to give serious consideration to the advice contained in the peer reviewers' report. The Commission anticipates that you will bring the recommendation and the team's full report to the attention of your institution for serious consideration. In the Midterm Report, the College will include actions taken in response to the improvement recommendations.

Next Steps

The Team Report provides details of the peer review team's findings. The guidance and recommendations contained in the Report represent the best advice of the peer review team at the time of the visit but may not describe all that is necessary for the college to improve or to come into compliance. A final copy of the Team Report is attached.

The Commission requires that you disseminate the ISER, the Team Report, and this letter to those who were signatories of the ISER and that you make these documents available to all campus constituencies and the public by placing copies on the College website. Please note that in response to public interest in accreditation, the Commission requires institutions to post current accreditation information on a Web page no more than one click from the institution's home page. In keeping with ACCJC policy, the Commission action will also be posted on the ACCJC website within 30 days of the date of the Commission's action.

On behalf of the Commission, we wish to express appreciation for the diligent work and thoughtful reflection that Mission College undertook to prepare for this evaluation. These efforts confirm that peer review can well serve the multiple constituencies of higher education by both ensuring and encouraging institutional quality and effectiveness.

If you have any questions about this letter or the Commission's action, please feel free to contact Dr. Stephanie Droker or the vice president assigned as liaison to your institution.

Sincerely,



Stephanie Droker, Ed.D.
ACCJC President



Ian Walton, Ph.D.
ACCJC Chair

cc: Mr. Bradley Davis, Chancellor West Valley-Mission Community College District
Dr. Leandra Martin, Accreditation Liaison Officer

Enclosure