Accreditation Work Group #1 Mission -- Progress Form

Work Group Leaders: Please complete and submit this form to Gohar Momjian (gmomjian@ccsf.edu) and Grace Esteban (mesteban@ccsf.edu) via email by Thursday, August 16.

Recommendation number and topic:
Recommendation #1 Mission Statement

Full recommendation text:
To improve effectiveness of Standard I.A Mission, the team recommends that the college establish a prescribed process and timeline to regularly review the mission statement and revise it as necessary. The college should use the mission statement as the benchmark to determine institutional priorities and goals that support and improve academic programs, student support services and student learning effectively linked to a realistic assessment of resources (I.A.3).

Related standards:
Financial & Academic Planning: #2 Planning, #10/11 Finances, #3 Program Review, #4,5,6 SLO
Resources: #7 Staffing, #8 Physical Resources, #9 Tech Res.
Decision Making: #12/13/14 Gov./Ldr./Board

Work group members:
Pamila Fisher; Jorge Bell, Steve Spurling, Ted Alfaro, Athena Steff, Pam Mery, Nancy Mackowsky, Karen Saginor, John Carrese, Greg Keech, Edgar Torres, Shannell Williams, Diamond Dave Whitaker, Anita Grier

Provide the dates and times of all meetings held to date. For each meeting, please briefly describe the primary focus of the discussion that took place (1-2 sentences per meeting).

July 27, 2012 – At the first meeting, the Chancellor who is the workgroup chair explained the role of the workgroup. The team reviewed the accrediting commission recommendation, reviewed the accreditation standard, reviewed other college mission statements, discussed shortcomings of our own mission statement, and assigned homework to the workgroup members. Homework assignments included gathering data, proposing revised language, conducting employee/student survey.

August 3, 2012 – At the second meeting, the workgroup reviewed proposed language for the mission statement which emphasized student learning, assessment, resource allocation; reviewed the survey for employees and students; and reviewed external/internal demographic data to help inform the mission statement. The group also discussed ways to help facilitate a board meeting on the mission statement.

August 9, 2012 – At the third meeting, the workgroup reviewed the results of the employee survey; determined that the student survey data was faulty and results would not be used during the board meeting; reviewed the California Education Code on the mission of community colleges; discussed how to prioritize the mission statement by including language indicating primary mission goals and when supplementary programs/services could be offered; talked further about ways to facilitate the board meeting.
August 15, 2012 – The fourth meeting of the workgroup took place after the board held a special meeting to review data and discuss the mission statement as part of its annual review process. Feedback from the board was incorporated in the final proposed mission statement which will be considered as a 1st policy reading during its August 23, 2012 regular board meeting. Note that the student members were added to the workgroup and were able to participate in this last meeting only.

Describe your plans for addressing the recommendation. Include a brief paragraph describing each activity included on your timeline along with key dates for accomplishing those activities.

The purpose of the workgroup was to draft a proposed mission statement for the board’s review. The workgroup plans to address the recommendation are described below.

1. Discuss shortcomings of the current mission statement – The workgroup reviewed the accreditation standard and recommendation to better understand what changes were necessary. In its discussions, the workgroup conveyed the need to better focus on student learning, achievement, and assessment, link to planning and resource allocation, and explicitly state in policy that the board will review the mission statement on an annual basis. (Completed on 7/27/12)

2. Draft new statement without priorities – The workgroup focused its initial review of the statement by adding language in the introductory and concluding section to incorporate the concepts to meet the accreditation standard, e.g. focus on student achievement, learning, assessment, link to institutional planning and resource allocation. New language was added to explicitly state the board’s role in conducting a regular annual review of the mission statement. (Completed on 8/3/12)

3. Collect and review internal and external data – The workgroup reviewed internal and external data to inform and help facilitate the board discussions on the mission statement. This data included: San Francisco trends on population, ethnicity/race, age, foreign born populations, legal immigration, and educational attainment by age group. City College trends the work group reviewed included for both credit and noncredit students: headcount, age distribution, ethnic group distribution, educational goal, awards and certificates, Basic Skills English, Math and ESL enrollment. Credit and noncredit FTES was also considered. (Completed on 8/3/12)

4. Collect input on priorities through online survey – The college distributed a survey to all of its employees asking them to prioritize the nine areas explicitly bulleted in the current mission statement. In addition effort was made to reach out to the student body of spring, summer, and enrolled in fall. However technical difficulties did not allow for a complete survey to the students. Over 1200 employees responded (out of approximately 2500). Respondents included faculty, department chairs, administrators, classified, and students. The responses indicated the following top four priorities: Preparation for transfer; Achievement of Associate Degrees; Acquisition of career skills; English as a Second Language. (Completed 8/9/12)

5. Plan a Board workshop to review the mission statement – The workgroup discussed the various ways to conduct and facilitate a productive board workshop. It decided what kinds of documents and data would be presented, as well as brainstormed the agenda for the workshop. (Completed 8/9/12)

6. Revise the mission statement -- Most important, the workgroup in its own review of the data and survey discussed how to consolidate the specific nine bullets and list them as primary mission items (e.g. basic skills includes ESL), and to specify other programs and services the college offers when resources allow. (Completed 8/9/12)
7. Conduct a Board workshop – On August 14, 2012 the Board held a special meeting to review the mission statement. Board members reviewed the workgroup matrix (workplan), California Education Code on the mission of the community colleges, reviewed the internal/external demographic data, FTES data, online survey data, and finally the proposed mission statement. They provided their input and feedback on the proposed survey, expressing the need to highlight the importance of transitional studies as part of the primary mission, and then need to highlight the importance of closing the achievement gap. (Completed 8/14/12)

8. 1st reading of board policy on the mission statement – The workgroup will make final revisions to the mission statement during its third meeting on 8/15/12. This final revision will be formatted as a board policy and the resolution will be discussed at the August regular board meeting. (Scheduled 8/23/12)

9. 2nd reading of board policy on mission statement – The board will review the mission statement as a second policy reading and hopefully adopt the mission statement. (Scheduled 9/11/12)

Summarize your progress to date on carrying out the activities described above where applicable. If you have completed any of these activities, please note the date on which it was completed and append the evidence or any products relating to the activity.

The attached material represents the agenda, data, and proposed mission statement that the board discussed at its August 14, 2012 special meeting. Resolutions and actions on the board policy on the mission statement will be included after the board meetings occur on August 23 and September 11.

List any challenges you have encountered or anticipate facing with respect to addressing the recommendation.

The challenge will be in the implementation of looking to the mission to help with decision making at all levels (Board, Planning, Program Review, Resource Allocation). The activity of the workgroup were fast-tracked since the mission statement influences and guides many of the other recommendations, namely related to planning, program review, finances, and resources. The proposed mission statement does not significantly reduce the scope of activities. The proposed mission statement addresses the recommendation by establishing a prescribed process and timeline to regularly review the mission statement and revise it on an annual basis. The role of the mission statement is explicitly spelled out that it should be used as the benchmark to determine institutional priorities and improvement, and that is linked to planning and resource allocation. The mission statement delineates primary focus areas, specifically transfer, degrees, certificates/career skills, basic skills including ESL & transitional studies. These four major bullets (down from 9 bullets in original mission statement) are a general reflection of the California Education Code. Other programs and services will be offered only when resources allow, and/or in collaboration with community based organizations when possible. The merits of adding the word “only” was discussed at length. Some felt that it was unnecessarily prohibitive, others felt that it was absolutely necessary.