



Outcomes | Innovation | Improvement

ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR  
COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

---

## **CORE INQUIRIES**

San Diego Miramar College  
10440 Black Mountain Rd, San Diego, CA 92126

The Core Inquiries are based upon the findings of the peer review team that conducted Team ISER Review on Oct. 18, 2023

Dr. Tawny M. Dotson  
Team Chair

## Contents

Peer Review Team Roster.....	3
Summary of Team ISER Review.....	4
Core Inquiries.....	5

San Diego Miramar College

Peer Review Team Roster

**Team ISER Review**

Oct. 18, 2023

Dr. Tawny M. Dotson, Team Chair Yuba College President	Dr. Lisa Aguilera Lawrenson, Vice Chair San Joaquin Delta College Superintendent/President
<b>ACADEMIC MEMBERS</b>	
Dr. Elissa Caruth Oxnard College English Professor	Ms. Anya Franklin Mt. San Jacinto College Librarian, Associate Professor
Mr. David Hurst College of the Sequoias English Professor	Dr. Nathaniel Lorentz Los Angeles City College Professor of Geology, Department Chair
<b>ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBERS</b>	
Dr. Carlos Lopez El Camino College Vice President of Academic Affairs	Dr. Vinh Nguyen Irvine Valley College Senior Research & Planning Analyst
Ms. Theresa Tena Cosumnes River College Vice President of Administrative Services	Mr. Michael Tuitasi Santa Monica College Vice President of Student Affairs
<b>ACCJC STAFF LIAISON</b>	
Dr. Catherine Webb Vice President ACCJC	

## Summary of Team ISER Review

INSTITUTION: San Diego Miramar College

DATE OF TEAM ISER REVIEW: Oct. 18, 2023

TEAM CHAIR: Dr. Tawny M. Dotson

A 10-member accreditation peer review team conducted Team ISER Review of San Diego Miramar College on Oct. 18, 2023. The Team ISER Review is a one-day, off-site analysis of an institution's self-evaluation report. The peer review team received the college's institutional self-evaluation report (ISER) and related evidence several weeks prior to the Team ISER Review. Team members found the ISER to be a comprehensive, well-written document detailing the processes used by the College to address Eligibility Requirements, Commission Standards, and Commission Policies. The team confirmed that the ISER was developed through broad participation by the entire College community, including faculty, staff, students, and administration. The team found that the College provided a thoughtful ISER containing several self-identified action plans for institutional improvement. The College also prepared a Quality Focus Essay.

In preparation for the Team ISER Review, the team chair attended a team chair training workshop on Aug. 1, 2023 and held a pre-review meeting with the college CEO on Sept. 18, 2023. The entire peer review team received team training provided by staff from ACCJC on Aug. 30, 2023. Prior to the Team ISER Review, team members completed their team assignments, identified areas for further clarification, and provided a list of requests for additional evidence to be considered during Team ISER Review.

During the Team ISER Review, team members spent the morning discussing their initial observations and their preliminary review of the written materials and evidence provided by the College for the purpose of determining whether the College continues to meet Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and US ED regulations. In the afternoon, the team further synthesized their findings to validate the excellent work of the college and identified standards the College meets, as well as developed Core Inquiries to be pursued during the Focused Site Visit, which will occur in Spring 2024 (Feb. 26 – March 1, 2024).

Core Inquiries are a means for communicating potential areas of institutional noncompliance, improvement, or exemplary practice that arise during the Team ISER Review. They describe the areas of emphasis for the Focused Site Visit that the team will explore to further their analysis to determine whether standards are met and accordingly identify potential commendations or recommendations. The college should use the Core Inquiries and time leading up to the focused site visit as an opportunity to gather more evidence, collate information, and strengthen or develop processes in the continuous improvement cycle. In the course of the Focused Site Visit, the ACCJC staff liaison will review new or emerging issues that might arise out of the discussions on Core Inquiries.

## Core Inquiries

Based on the team's analysis during the Team ISER Review, the team identified the following core inquiries that relate to potential areas of clarification, improvement, or commendation.

### **Core Inquiry 1:**

The team would like to see an update on the new program review process and further understand how the College assesses learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services.

**Standards or Policies:** I.B.2, I.B.4

### **Description:**

The team reviewed the evidence provided in the ISER, and notes that:

- the College developed a comprehensive Program Review and Outcomes Assessment Guidebook that is foundational to the program review process;
- learning outcomes are defined and listed in the College Catalog (for programs) and course outline of record (for courses);
- assessment of course learning outcomes is supported by the "2018-2021 Instructional Course Action Plan Summary" document;
- measurements for Service Unit Outcomes for student services are identified for each outcome in the individual program review reports;
- a significant amount of training on outcomes assessment has occurred in Student Services;
- a number of areas in the Strategic Plan Assessment Scorecard 2.0 had missing data or entries identified as areas for improvement (red);
- results of assessment analysis of learning support services are not yet available

The team would like to see the College's progress on outcome assessments. In particular, the team would like to learn how program outcomes are assessed and used, and an update on assessments for student and learning support services.

### **Topics of discussion during interviews:**

- a. Assessment of outcomes for instructional programs: methods and sample assessments for several programs.
- b. Assessment of outcomes for student services: progress to date.
- c. Assessment of outcomes for learning support services: progress to date.
- d. How the results of outcomes assessments are used.
- e. An update on the process(es) currently being used for Student Services outcomes assessment.
- f. An update on the plans for implementing the process(es) in the guidebook.
- g. How is the College using the SPAS 2.0 scorecard?

**Request for Additional Information/Evidence:**

- a. Examples of outcomes assessment for several instructional programs.
- b. Assessment results for several student service programs.
- c. Assessment results for several learning support programs.
- d. An update on how more programs and services are completing outcomes assessment.

**Request for Observations/Interviews:**

- a. Outcome assessment coordinators
- b. Program Review coordinators
- c. Faculty involved in outcomes assessment for their department / discipline
- d. Department chairs / deans overseeing student services and learning support services
- e. Institutional effectiveness / data staff

**Core Inquiry 2:** The team would like to see an update on the College’s progress on the disaggregation and analysis of learning outcomes for subpopulations of students. The team would also like to learn more about how these results are used for improvement and how they inform resource allocations.

**Standards or Policies:** I.B.6

**Description:**

The team reviewed the evidence provided in the ISER and observed that the College disaggregates and analyzes student achievement data for various subpopulations as demonstrated in the Program Review Equity Data Dashboard. The College indicated that a pilot to disaggregate learning outcomes was completed in 2017, but that data collection at the student level was challenging. In 2023, the College acquired Nuventive as its outcome assessment platform to assist with this.

The team would like to learn more about the college’s plan and progress in collecting outcomes data at the student level and learn of early successes around the use of results for improvement and resource allocation decisions.

**Topics of discussion during interviews:**

- a. Timeline, plan, and progress regarding outcomes assessment data collection.
- b. Processes for the disaggregation and analysis of learning outcomes (subpopulations, modality, or programs).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. Processes for how results will be used for improvement and resource allocation decisions.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Request for Additional Information/Evidence:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Documentation around the progress of implementation.</li> <li>b. Early successes for how results are used for early adopters.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Request for Observations/Interviews:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Staff that supports the implementation (IT, IR, Outcome Assessment Coordinators, Program Review Coordinators).</li> <li>b. Staff and faculty using the outcome assessment results.</li> </ul>

<p><b>District Core Inquiry 1:</b> The college teams would like to better understand how the district 1) regularly evaluates district systems, college roles, and decision making processes, 2) communicates these results widely, and 3) uses these results as the basis for improvements.</p>
<p><b>Standards or Policies:</b> IV.D.7</p>
<p><b>Description:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The Peer Review teams included a review of BP 2510 Participation in Local Decision-Making and the Administrative and Governance Handbook 2021 –2022, as provided in the ISER.</li> <li>b. The Peer Review teams need expansion on the ISER narratives and evidence to understand how decisions and shared governance evaluation are documented and communicated to the district and throughout the colleges. The ISER states that the Chancellor expects the Colleges to communicate governance and decision-making elements, but it is unclear how the Chancellor ensures this process.</li> <li>c. Based on what the teams read, the teams are not yet clear about the processes to evaluate district systems, college roles, and decision-making processes and how this is communicated to constituency groups.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Topics of discussion during interviews:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Process for communication for decision-making and evaluation of governance from the District to the Colleges.</li> <li>b. Impact of the new hire for Vice Chancellor of Institutional Innovation &amp; Effectiveness</li> <li>c. Connection between colleges’ Administrative &amp; Governance Handbook and the District self-evaluation of District committees in Tier 1 and Tier 2.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Request for Additional Information/Evidence:</b></p>

- a. Agendas and minutes of Tier 1 and Tier 2 meetings/committees where Chancellor shares decision-making points with College Presidents and expectation for communication throughout the colleges.
- b. Flow Chart of district and college communication process for decision-making, if available
- c. Self-evaluation of District shared governance process, timeline, & communication, including a plan for evaluation if regular evaluation is not occurring at this time, due to COVID.
- d. Updated formalized assessment method (or plan of progress) to be provided by the District VC of Institutional Innovation & Effectiveness as it pertains to college governance and evaluation – including district program review.
- e. The ISERs reference that the District Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research is working on a Climate Survey that will provide insight into decisions and how they are made, if available.

**Request for Observations/Interviews:**

- a. Chancellor
- b. Vice Chancellor of Institutional Innovation & Effectiveness
- c. Chancellor's Cabinet