



Accreditation Follow-Up Report

Submitted on March 15, 2015

By:

Evergreen Valley College

3095 Yerba Buena Road

San José, CA 95135-1598

To:

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

Western Association of Schools and Colleges

10 Commercial Boulevard, Suite 204

Novato, CA 94949

Contents

Certification of the Institutional Follow-Up Report 3

Statement of Preparation 4

Response to the Commission Action Letter 6

Evidence 9

Certification of the Institutional Follow-up Report

Date: March 15, 2015

To: Accrediting Commission for the Community and Junior Colleges,
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

From: Evergreen Valley College
3095 Yerba Buena Road
San Jose, CA 95135

This institutional Follow-Up Report is submitted for the purpose of assisting in the determination of the institution's accreditation status.

We certify there was broad participation by the campus community, and we believe this report accurately reflects the nature and substance of this institution.



Henry C. V. Yong, Ed.D.
President
Evergreen Valley College



Rita M. Cepeda, Ed.D.
Chancellor
San Jose Evergreen Community College



Wendy Ho
President, Governing Board
San Jose Evergreen Community College
District



Keith Aytch
Accreditation Liaison Officer
Evergreen Valley College



Eric Narveson
President, Academic Senate
Evergreen Valley College



Reyna Avila
President, Associated Students
Evergreen Valley College



Arthur Azevedo
President, CSEA
Evergreen Valley College



Lynette Apen
Faculty Accreditation Co-Chair
Evergreen Valley College



Keith Aytch
Administrative Accreditation Co-Chair
Evergreen Valley College

Statement of Preparation

After being removed from Warning Status in February 2013, Evergreen Valley College was placed on Probation in June, 2014 for not fully meeting Standard III.A.1.c. This specific section in question is a portion of Recommendation 2 from 2010, which calls for:

“faculty and others directly responsible for student progress towards achieving student learning outcomes should have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes.” (Standard III.A.1.c).

Like other institutions of higher learning, the faculty evaluation process at EVC is peer-driven, and the evaluation instrument is negotiated between the District and the faculty union, American Federation of Teachers (AFT 6157).

The instrument has been in use by both colleges in the district for many years, and does not have the specific language on Student Learning Outcomes since it was developed, and negotiated, prior to SLOs being accepted and used by academia in the state.

Last year, from negotiations between the district and the AFT 6157, it was agreed that the district would implement a 3-year pilot project that incorporates SLO language into the document. That was a good step in the right direction.

Since the two colleges being put on Probation, the district has continued negotiations with the AFT 6157, and an agreement was reached, and approved by the Board of Trustees on February 10, 2015. With that, the SLO component is now an integral part of the faculty evaluation instrument for all faculty in the district, which includes tenured, tenure-track, full-time categorical and adjunct faculty.

In Fall 2014, the President informed the campus during the Professional Development Day (PDD) that being put on Probation constitutes an emergency, and called on faculty to make sure that they get evaluated with the revised instrument, and to give it the utmost importance and priority. Most of the faculty responded favorably, and the evaluation process of the 2014 – 2015 cohort started in the middle of September 2014. As of today, 72% have completed their evaluations. The remaining 28% will be completed before the end of the Spring semester, i.e., in another seven weeks, Evergreen Valley College will be at 100% compliance.

Since this year’s effort represents a “catch up” of faculty evaluations, some of whom have not been evaluated for many years, the cohort is disproportionately large (approximately 75% of the full-time faculty). The 2015 – 2016 and 2016 – 2017 cohorts will be significantly smaller in size, and they are all SLO-compliant since these two cohorts are the newer faculty, who have already participated in SLOs and assessment. Even though they are SLO-compliant, they are not evaluated in this year’s evaluation cycle.

In addition, the district previously reached an agreement with the Management Supervisory and Confidential Committee (MSCC) to have SLOs included in the evaluation of academic administrators and managers. All academic managers slated for evaluation in 2014 – 2015 have been evaluated under the new standard, which includes the SLO component.

The institution has come a long way in fully meeting Standard III.A.1.c, and the effort clearly demonstrates the strong willingness of the faculty rank-and-file and academic managers to a commitment of continuous improvement in the student learning that is outcome-based.

The preparation of this special report on Standard III.A.1.c has been a collaborative process, and reflects the continuous participation of all campus constituencies in this project. In particular, a substantial number of the cohorts demonstrated their support for the process by volunteering to have their evaluations completed ahead of schedule.

The following individuals from Evergreen Valley College were involved in the preparation of this Follow-Up Report.

Henry C. V. Yong, Ed.S., President

Keith Aytch, Vice President of Academic Affairs, Accreditation Liaison Officer

Lynette Apen, Faculty Accreditation Co-Chair

Penny Garibay, MSC professional employee

Shashi Naidu, classified professional employee

Rita De La Cerda, classified professional employee

Respectfully submitted,



Henry C. V. Yong, Ed.S.
President

Response to the Commission Action Letter

The ACCJC Action letter of July 3, 2014, stated that during the June 4-6, 2014 meeting, the Commission took action to impose Probation on the college for not fully addressing a recommendation in Standard III.A.1.c and Eligibility Requirement 21.

STANDARD III.A.1.c

Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes.

Eligibility Requirement 21 Integrity in Relations with the Accrediting Commission

The commission notes that 2010 Recommendation 2 required the college to come in compliance with Standard III.A.1.c; however, the district and the institution only began to partially address compliance with this Standard in Spring 2014 by planning to implement a three-year pilot program. For this reason, the College is also out of compliance with Eligibility Requirement 21.

This follow up report specifically describes and provides evidence that Evergreen Valley College is in compliance with Standard III.A.1.c as well as Eligibility Requirement 21.

The college is committed to the success of its students and improving quality of instruction. As such, ensuring that faculty and administrators hired at the college share in this commitment has been an ongoing priority. Therefore, SLO development and assessment are written into the faculty job announcements ([R.10.2.1](#)), and leadership in systematic assessment of learning outcomes has been added into administrator job descriptions ([R.10.2.2](#)).

At Evergreen, the faculty and administrators are primarily responsible for assessing or leading the assessment of student achievement of learning outcomes and implementing or facilitating plans for improving instruction, programs or services provided. As such, the faculty and administrator now have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing learning outcomes that are appropriate for their role on campus.

The college, in conjunction with American Federation of Teachers (AFT 6157), has implemented an institutionalized process that delineates inclusion of participation in Student Learning Outcome (SLO) assessment and the use of data to improve instruction into faculty self-evaluation. The faculty contract language identifies faculty self-evaluation as one of the required components of the evaluation process, and the self-evaluation requirement occurs with each evaluation cycle. Through this method, all faculty, including adjunct, full-time temporary, tenure-track contract, non-tenured categorical and tenured faculty will be evaluated on a regular schedule, as outlined in the contract, and will address the following as a component of self-evaluation: ([R.10.2.3](#))

...participation in assessing student learning outcomes (SLO's) and the use of data to evaluate/improve instruction and/or program.

Due to timelines for faculty/district negotiations and member approval processes, the aforementioned faculty self-evaluation language became formally effective for all faculty on February 10, 2015, when the ratification of the Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement was approved by the District Board of Trustees (R.10.2.4). However, under the auspices of the previously negotiated 3-year pilot program- that included language on SLO Assessment participation as part of the faculty self-evaluation process- the college began evaluating, with the negotiated language, full-time faculty in fall 2014. (R.10.2.5)

Implementation of full-time faculty evaluation, including participation in SLO assessment in the self-evaluation, was initiated during the first division meetings of the fall 2014 semester. Faculty that were slotted for evaluation this academic year, identified their peer evaluation teams (per the faculty contract) and the Academic Senate voted to approve these evaluation teams at the first two meetings of fall semester (R.10.2.6). Eighty-eight of the one hundred and sixteen full-time faculty (tenured and tenure track FT) are slotted for review during the 2014/2015 academic year, with sixty-three completing evaluation by March 1, 2015 and twenty-five scheduled for completing evaluation by May 21, 2015 (R.10.2.7). All scheduled faculty are required to complete the self-evaluation, addressing participation in SLO assessment and how the data gathered facilitated improvement in instruction.

At the date of this report seventy-two percent of the full-time faculty slotted for evaluation this year have completed the evaluation process, including documenting self-evaluation on assessment practices. By the end of spring 2015, one hundred percent of the full-time faculty scheduled for evaluation this year will complete the evaluation process. The remaining full-time faculty have been placed on an evaluation timeline cycle, as noted by the faculty contract, and will complete the self-evaluation process per the contract language. By May 15, 2015, ninety (90), one hundred percent, of adjunct faculty identified for evaluation (per contract timelines) will have utilized the new self-evaluation instrument per the contract language approved by the District Board of Trustees on February 10, 2015. The president also will review each regular contract faculty evaluation to ensure that self-evaluation of SLO assessment is addressed. (R.10.2.8)

Although the faculty evaluation process is confidential, there are clear indications of how the inclusion of assessment dialogue and the effectiveness in producing learning outcomes will facilitate college continuous quality improvement. The clearest method is accountability for those directly responsible for achievement of student learning, which inclusion in the evaluation processes addresses. However, more importantly, the conversations generated in the evaluation process provide an opportunity for dialogue regarding sustaining a sufficient achievement of student learning. During these conversations, faculty can share how data from SLO assessment was used to improve the instructional process. Peers involved in the evaluation team can offer insights to support assessment efforts and best practices in improving educational effectiveness through closing the loop of assessment. Conversely, the faculty completing the self-evaluation can also share his/her best practices in assessment and lessons learned regarding effective teaching strategies. For the administrator facilitating the evaluation process, he/she can not only identify best practices in assessment that, with permission, would be shared with the division or campus wide, but also identify any general patterns for discrepancies in assessment work that would lead to staff development training opportunities. (R.10.2.9)

The District, in consultation with the Management, Supervisory and Confidential Council (MSCC), has also modified the previous administrators' evaluation to include the following language.

The administrator participates in student learning outcome assessment by effectively leading those directly responsible for student progress. (R.10.3.0).

This updated evaluation measure has been adopted and distributed. It has been implemented in fall 2014 and used by one hundred percent (n=16) of the administrators scheduled for evaluation this year.

By modifying the administrator evaluations and the faculty contract language on faculty evaluation, the college has institutionalized and implemented an ongoing evaluation process inclusive of the effectiveness in producing learning outcomes for faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated Student Learning Outcomes. This component of accountability for student learning adds to the campuses already successful SLO process where effectiveness at every level of its organization is measured.

Evergreen Valley College meets Standard III.A.1.c. and is now fully compliant with Eligibility Requirement 21.

Evidence

R.10.2.1	Faculty Job Announcement	http://www.evc.edu/AcademicAffairs/Documents/R.10.2.1-Transfer%20Career%20Counselor.pdf
R.10.2.2	Administrator job description using SLO language	http://www.evc.edu/AcademicAffairs/Documents/R.10.2.2-Dean%20of%20Language%20Arts.pdf
R.10.2.3	Faculty Contract language from articles 19, 20, 21 & 22	http://www.evc.edu/AcademicAffairs/Documents/R.10.2.3-Articles.pdf
R.10.2.4	February 10, 2015 – Governing Board Meeting Agenda	http://www.evc.edu/AcademicAffairs/Documents/R.10.2.4-Feb%2010.2015%20Governing%20Board%20Meeting%20Agenda%20item.pdf
R.10.2.5	Negotiated Pilot language with AFT from March 2014	http://www.evc.edu/AcademicAffairs/Documents/SLO%20Pilot%20Program%202014%202017.pdf
R.10.2.6	Academic Senate meeting minutes for September 2 and September 16, 2014	http://www.evc.edu/AcademicAffairs/Documents/R.10.2.6-AC_SEN_2014_Sep_%202_DraftMin.pdf
R.10.2.7	Faculty evaluation spreadsheet	http://www.evc.edu/AcademicAffairs/Documents/R.10.2.7-Faculty%20Evaluation%20Data_Accred%20Evidence.pdf
R.10.2.8	Tenured contract faculty evaluation	http://www.evc.edu/AcademicAffairs/Documents/R.10.2.8-Tenured%20faculty%20evaluation.pdf
R.10.2.9	Academic Division meeting agenda and minutes, August 28, 2014 & emails to Counselors regarding the evaluation process	http://www.evc.edu/AcademicAffairs/Documents/R.10.2.9-Academic%20Division%20meeting%20agenda%20and%20minutes,%20August%2028,%202014.pdf
R.10.3.0	Revised Academic Administrators' Evaluation	http://www.evc.edu/AcademicAffairs/Documents/R.10.3.0-Email%20memo%20to%20Vice%20Chancellor%20Garcia.pdf