February 3, 2017

Dr. Rajen Vurdien
Superintendent/President
Pasadena City College
1570 East Colorado Blvd.
Pasadena, CA 91106

Dear President Vurdien:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting January 11-13, 2017, reviewed the Follow-Up Report and evidentiary materials submitted by Pasadena City College and the External Evaluation Team Follow-Up Report (Team Report) prepared by the evaluation team that visited on October 19, 2016. College leadership, including the president of the governing board and the College president, certified the College’s report. The purpose of the Commission’s review was to determine whether the College had resolved deficiencies noted during the spring 2015 comprehensive review and now meets Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies (hereafter called Standards).

After considering the material noted above, the Commission finds that Pasadena City College has addressed Recommendations 1 through 8, as noted by the spring 2015 comprehensive evaluation team, corrected the deficiencies, and meets Eligibility Requirements 5, 19 and Standards I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, I.B.7, II.A.2.e-f, III.A.1.b, III.A.1.c-d, III.A.2, III.A.3, III.A.4.c, III.A.5.a-b, III.A.6, III.B.2.b, III.C.2, III.D.4, IV.A.1, IV.A.3, IV.A.5, IV.B.1.e, and IV.B.1.h. The Commission took action to remove Probation and re-affirm accreditation. The next report from Pasadena City College will be the Midterm Report due in spring 2018.¹

The Commission requires the College give the Follow-Up Report, Team Report, and this letter appropriate dissemination to College staff and to those who were signatories of the Follow-Up Report, and that these documents be made available to students and the public by posting them to the College website. Please note that in response to public interest in accreditation, the Commission requires institutions to post accreditation information on a page no more than one click from the institution’s home page.

¹ Institutions preparing and submitting Midterm Reports, Follow-Up Reports, and Special Reports to the Commission should review Guidelines for the Preparation of Reports to the Commission found on the ACCJC website at: www.accjc.org/college-reports-accjc.
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On behalf of the Commission, I wish to express appreciation for the collaborative work that Pasadena City College undertook to prepare the Follow-Up Report and to support the work of the external evaluation team. Thank you for sharing the values and the work of accreditation to ensure educational quality and to support student success. Accreditation and peer review are most effective when the College and the ACCJC work together to focus on student outcomes and continuous quality improvement in higher education.

If you should have any questions concerning this letter or the Commission action, please don’t hesitate to contact me or one of the ACCJC Vice Presidents. We would be glad to help you.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Richard Winn, Ed.D.  
Interim President
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June 29, 2015

Dr. Robert Miller  
Superintendent/President  
Pasadena City College  
1570 East Colorado Boulevard  
Pasadena, CA 92069

Dear President Miller:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting on June 3-5, 2015, reviewed the Institutional Self Evaluation Report, the Report of the External Evaluation Team that visited Pasadena City College March 2-5, 2015, and considered the opening testimony provided by President Miller and other representatives of the college leadership. The Commission appreciates the joint commitment to working together toward improvement that Pasadena College representatives spoke about.

The Commission took action to impose Probation and require the College to submit a Follow-Up Report in October 2016. The Report will be followed by a visit an external evaluation team. Probation is imposed when an institution deviates significantly from the Commission's Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, or Commission policies, but not to such an extent as to warrant a Show Cause order or the termination of accreditation. When Probation is imposed as a result of the institution’s educational quality and institutional effectiveness review, reaffirmation is delayed, but the accredited status of the institution continues during the probation period.

Pasadena City College should submit the Follow-Up Report by October 1, 2016. The Follow-Up Report should demonstrate that the College has resolved the deficiencies which led to noncompliance and that it meets the Standards. The Report should address the recommendations noted below.

**Need to Resolve Deficiencies:**

The Accreditation Standards represent practices that lead to academic quality and institutional effectiveness. Deficiencies in institutional policies, procedures, practices, and outcomes which lead to noncompliance with any Standards will impact quality at an institution, and ultimately the educational environment and experiences of students.
The Commission found Pasadena City College out of compliance with the following Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards: Eligibility Requirement 5 and 19 and Standards I.B.3; I.B.4; I.B.6; I.B.7; II.A.2.e and f; III.A.1.b; III.A.1.c; III.A.1.d; III.A.2; III.A.4.c; III.A.5.a and b; III.A.6; III.B.2.b; III.C.2; III.D.4; IV.A; IV.A.1; IV.A.3; IV.A.5; IV.B.1.e and h. The External Evaluation Report that was sent to the institution provides details of the team’s findings with regard to each Eligibility Requirement and Accreditation Standard and should be read carefully and used to understand the team’s findings. Recommendations 1 through 8 provide guidance for coming into compliance.

**Recommendation #1**
In order to meet the Standards, and as noted in Recommendations #1 and #2 (2009), the team recommends that the College systematically evaluate and improve all of its planning processes, including full integration of program review (instructional, student services, and administrative services) into the planning processes, and the use of program review and the planning processes to determine the allocation of resources and to make decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness. (Standards I.B.3; I.B.4; I.B.6; I.B.7; II.A.2.e and f; III.A.6; III.B.2.b; III.C.2; III.D.4 and Eligibility Requirement 19)

**Recommendation #2**
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College create and implement a plan to ensure the regular evaluation of all employees based upon intervals consistent with College policies. (Standard III.A.1.b)

**Recommendation #3**
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College standardize its performance evaluation process for adjunct faculty, and that the College include assessment of student learning outcomes in its performance evaluations of adjunct faculty, staff, and management employees who are directly responsible for student progress toward achieving those learning outcomes. (Standard III.A.1.c)

**Recommendation #4**
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College constituents follow their approved codes of ethics and that all constituent groups embrace and demonstrate compliance with Board Policy 2715-Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice, AP 3050-Professional Ethics of Faculty, AP 3060-Professional Ethics of Management, and AP 3070-Professional Ethics of Classified Staff. (Standards III.A.1.d; III.A.3; III.A.4.c; IV.A and IV.B.1.e and h)
Recommendation #5
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College focus on stabilizing its administrative organizational structure and complete the selection processes to fill the interim, acting and vacant administrative positions with permanent appointments. (Standard III.A.2; Eligibility Requirement 5)

Recommendation #6
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College, through participatory governance, develop and implement a comprehensive, coordinated professional development program for all personnel, regularly assess the effectiveness of the program, and use the assessment results as the basis for continuous improvement. (Standards III.A.5.a and b)

Recommendation #7
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that institutional leaders use transparent participatory processes; follow Board policies for soliciting input from all constituent groups for institutional decision making; and model collegial communication specifically among the Board, President and Academic Senate, for the goal of working together to demonstrate an environment of empowerment, innovation and institutional excellence for the good of the institution. (Standards IV.A.1; IV.A.3 and IV.B.1.e)

Recommendation #8
In order to meet the Standards, and as noted in Recommendation #6 (2009), the team recommends that the institution regularly and systematically evaluates organization structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness, communicates those evaluations to the College, and uses the results of those evaluations as a basis for improvement. (Standard IV.A.5)

Improving Institutional Effectiveness:

In its report, the team identified needs for improving institutional effectiveness and provided Recommendations 9. This recommendation does not identify current areas of deficiency in institutional practice, but highlights areas of practice for which College attention is needed. The Commission requires that institutions address recommendations for increasing institutional effectiveness as an aspect of maintaining compliance with Standards and engaging in continuous quality improvement. The Commission therefore requests Pasadena City College to include its response to Recommendation 9 in its October 1, 2016 Follow-Up Report.

Recommendation #9
In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that all Student Affairs departments and service programs conduct annual outcomes assessments, and that a regular program review cycle be clearly established and communicated to all student service programs. (Standard II.B.4)
Additional Information:

Under U.S. Department of Education regulations, the Commission is required to take immediate action to terminate the accreditation of an institution which is out of compliance with any Standard. In the alternative, the Commission can provide the institution with additional notice and a deadline for coming into compliance that is no later than two years from when the institution was first informed of the noncompliance. With this letter, Pasadena City College is being provided with notice of the Standards for which it is out of compliance and is being provided time to meet the Standards.

In its self evaluation process, Pasadena College also identified improvement plans it intends to undertake. These improvement plans should be linked to Pasadena College’s ongoing evaluation and improvement work.

The guidance and recommendations contained in the External Evaluation Report represent the best advice of the peer evaluation team at the time of the visit, but may not describe all that is necessary for Pasadena College to come into compliance. While an institution may concur or disagree with any part of the Report, Pasadena City College is expected to use the External Evaluation Report to improve educational programs and services. In addition, the College has the responsibility to accept the Commission’s action and to uphold the integrity of the accreditation process by accurately portraying it and helping institutional constituencies to understand the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies pertinent to the Commission action.

I have previously sent you a copy of the External Evaluation Report. The Commission requires that the College give the Institutional Self Evaluation Report, the External Evaluation Team Report, and this letter appropriate dissemination to College staff and to those who were signatories of the College Self Evaluation Report. This group should include the campus leadership and the Board of Trustees. The Commission also requires that these documents be made available to students and the public by placing a copy on the College website. Please note that in response to public interest in disclosure, the Commission now requires institutions to post accreditation information on a page no more than one click from the institution’s home page.

Public Disclosure Notice and Institutional Response

Federal regulations require the Commission to post a Public Disclosure Notice (PDN) for institutions placed on Probation. The PDN is used to inform the public of the reasons for such a sanction. Attached you will find a sheet entitled About the Public Disclosure Notice, as well as the proposed PDN for Pasadena City College.
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The Commission will post the PDN on the College’s entry in the Directory of Accredited Institutions online at www.accjc.org. The institution is permitted to post a response to the PDN, and your comments are invited. Please provide the College’s response for posting, if any, by July 31, 2015.

On behalf of the Commission, I wish to encourage your continued work to ensure Pasadena College’s educational quality and to support students’ success. Professional self-regulation is the responsibility of an accredited institution and the accredits. Thank you for sharing in that responsibility.

If you should have any questions concerning this letter or the Commission action, or require assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Barbara A. Beno, Ph.D.
President
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Enclosures:
About the Public Disclosure Notice
Pasadena City College Public Disclosure Notice

\(^1\)Institutions preparing and submitting Midterm Reports, Follow-Up Reports, and Special Reports to the Commission should review Guidelines for the Preparation of Reports to the Commission found on the ACCJC website at: (http://www.accjc.org/college-reports-accjc).