Grossmont College Accreditation Midterm Report

Due: October 15, 2023

Action Plan/Timeline

Key Dates: Governing Board Agenda for Approval: September 12, 2023

Full Draft Ready for President's Cabinet: August 15, 2023

College Council Review & Feedback May 2023
College-wide Review & Feedback April 2023

Academic Senate, Classified Senate,

Administrator's Association

First Draft Presented to PIEC March 17
First Draft Completed March 15

Accreditation Steering Committee Meets Week of February 13 (meeting not yet calendared)

Perspective: Most reports are between 25 and 45 pages in length

Section #	Section Title & Content Needed	Responsible Person(s)	Status a/o	Notes
1-4	Cover Sheet, Certification Page, Table of Contents, and Narrative Describing Report Preparation	Sr. Dean of CPIE		
5	Plans Arising from the Self-Evaluation ProcessThis section provides an update on the self-identified plans to strengthen alignment with Standards outlined by the college in its most recent Institutional Self-Evaluation Report (ISER). Colleges should describe their progress on these plans and resulting outcomes. A chart format can be used for this section of the report if appropriate. Any plans that have not yet been fully implemented should be clearly identified, and an update of the specific timelines and responsible parties in place to support completion should be provided.	Sr. Dean of CPIE, SLO Coordinator, SSO Coordinator, Deans, VPAA, VPSS		The Improvement Plans from the Fall 2019 ISER include the following Standards: IB—ISER p. 59 IIA—ISER p. 102 IIIA—ISER p. 149 IIID—ISER p. 191

6A	Response to Recommendations for Improvement This
	section of the report addresses any recommendations for
	improvement to increase institutional effectiveness noted
	in the Commission Action Letter following the most recent
	comprehensive peer review. (If no improvement
	recommendations were noted in the Action Letter, this
	section is not required.) The college should refer to the
	Peer Review Team Report for further information and
	context for each improvement recommendation. The
	narrative for this section should explain the manner in
	which each recommendation to improve was considered,
	and what, if anything, the college did as a result. The
	narrative should also note any outcomes or increases in
	effectiveness resulting from these improvements.

Sr. Dean of CPIE, SLO Coordinator, SSO Coordinator, Instructional Design Tech Specialist, OTL Committee Chairs, Academic Senate President, Deans, VPAA, VPSS, District HR

ACCJC Action Letter dtd 1-27-20 contained the following compliance requirements that were addressed in two subsequent follow-up reports:

- 1. Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education: In order to meet the policy, the Commission requires the College ensure that all distance education courses demonstrate regular and substantive interaction as defined by the College.
- 2. Standards I.B.2, 11.A.3, 11.A.16 (College Requirement 2): In order to meet the standards, the Commission requires that the college fully implement the assessment, collection, and use of student learning outcomes for all courses, programs, and units.
- 3. Standards 11.A.3 (College Requirement 3): In order to meet the standards, the Commission requires that the College ensure that, in every class section, students receive a syllabus that includes SLOs consistent with the officially approved course outline of record.
- 4. Standard 111.A.5 (District Requirement 1): In order to meet the Standard, the Commission requires that the District ensure that all classified and management employees are systematically evaluated at stated intervals.

			1
6B	Reflection on Improving Institutional Performance: Student Learning Outcomes and Institution Set StandardsThis section of the report provides an institutional reflection on institutional performance in two areas: 1) student learning outcomes, and 2) institution-set standards. Colleges should respond to the specific prompts listed below and provide evidence to support the information and narrative. 1. Student Learning Outcomes (Standard I.B.2): ACCJC Standard I.B.2 states: "The institution defines and assesses student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services." Reflect on assessment processes since the last comprehensive peer review: • What are the strengths of the process that help the college to improve teaching and learning? • What growth opportunities in the assessment process has the college identified to further refine its authentic culture of assessment? • Provide examples where course, program, or service improvements have occurred based on outcomes assessment data. • In those areas where assessment may be falling behind, what is the college doing to complete the assessments per the college's schedule?	Sr. Dean of CPIE, SLO Coordinator, SSO Coordinator, Deans, VPAA, VPSS, Accreditation Steering Committee, Academic Senate President, PIEC	
	Evidence: Provide evidence to support the information and narrative described above.		
	2. <u>Institution Set Standards (Standard I.B.3):</u> ACCJC Standard I.B.3 states: "The institution establishes institution-set standards for student achievement, appropriate to its mission, assesses how well it is		

	achieving them in pursuit of continuous		
	achieving them in pursuit of continuous		
	improvement, and publishes this information."		
	Using the most recent Annual Report, reflect on trends		
	in data for institution set standards on course		
	completion, certificate completion, degrees awarded,		
	transfer, licensure examination pass rates, and		
	employment rates for career and technical education		
	(CTE) students:Has the college met its floor standards?		
	 Has the college achieved its stretch (aspirational) 		
	goals?		
	 What initiative(s) is the college undertaking to 		
	improve its outcomes?		
	How does the college inform its constituents of this		
	information?		
	Evidence: Provide the most recent Annual Report		
	used for this reflection.		
6C	Report on the outcomes of the Quality Focus Projects	Sr. Dean of CPIE,	
OC	The Institutional Self-Evaluation Report (ISER) includes a	SLO Coordinator,	
	Quality Focus Essay in which colleges identify two to three	SSO Coordinator,	
	quality focus projects they will implement to improve	Deans, VPAA,	
	student learning and achievement. This section of the	VPSS, CPIE,	
	Midterm Report provides a progress update on the goals,	Research &	
	outcomes, and data identified for each quality focus	Planning Analyst,	
	project and details any changes in student learning and	SSE Dean, PD	
	student achievement that resulted from the projects. If	Coordinators	
	appropriate, the narrative should also comment on any	Coordinators	
	next steps, such as further expansion or replication of		
	projects. In the event that a project did not achieve the		
	desired results, the college should provide information		
	about factors that contributed to that outcome and reflect		
	on what was learned during the process.		
6D	Fiscal ReportingThis section of the Midterm Report	VPAS/President	
טט	provides an update on fiscal conditions at the college.	VFA3/FIESIUEIIL	
	Colleges must provide a copy of their most recent ACCJC		

	Annual Fiscal Report (AFR) as evidence. In addition, colleges must provide narrative responses in response to the following conditions: • If any of the areas of the most recent Annual Fiscal Report indicate that the college is not meeting its goals (e.g., high loan default rates, unmet liabilities, and/or projected deficits), please describe any plans for improvement. • If the institution is on enhanced fiscal monitoring, please provide narrative describing progress on the institution's improvement plans. If the conditions above do not apply, a narrative response is not required to supplement the copy of the Annual Fiscal Report.		
7	AppendicesAll Midterm Reports should include appropriate evidence to support the information and narrative in the report. Colleges should provide a list of all evidence cited as an appendix to the Midterm Report, as well as providing appropriate links throughout the report. (See "Evidence Format" above.)	Sr. Dean of CPIE	