

Response to Evaluation Team Report

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
Summary	p. 4 ¶ 1	<p>“First, the College self-evaluation, while complete in its description and presentation of facts, did not include <u>an accessible delineation of plans to address the needs identified in the document, causing</u> the Team and the District Team to rely more heavily on other documents and evidence to close the gap between the identified problem and the plan to correct it....</p> <p>...It is recommended as an improvement in preparing for future evaluation visits that a summary of plans to address problems identified in the college’s self-evaluation be included either in the document itself or as an addendum...”</p>	<p>Correction of Fact: Plans for Improvement were included in each associated Standard section.</p> <p>They were also included in Vol. 3 of Self Evaluation, Appendix C, labeled “2013 Planning Agenda.”</p>	No
	p. 4 ¶ 3	<p>“The effectiveness of the college’s learning centers, and similar support programs must be evaluated.”</p>	<p>Factual Errors underlying recommendation. Facts: CSM systematically evaluates its Learning Centers through program review.</p> <p>All CSM’s Learning support centers were evaluated through Learning support centers’ program review in 2009, with the exception of CSM’s Learning Center which did not exist at the time.</p>	No

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
			<p>ALL existing Learning support centers were again evaluated through Learning support centers' program review in Spring 2013.</p> <p>They are all scheduled to undergo the Learning support centers' comprehensive program review in Spring 2014.</p> <p>There are no "similar" programs at CSM.</p> <p>Please see Standard IIA and IIC for detailed error of fact correction for the College's Learning Centers.</p>	
Introduction	p.8	3 rd paragraph: "Other renovations at the time included the installation of several SMART classrooms..."	<p>Correction of Fact: Substantially <u>all</u> classrooms at the College are SMART classrooms. Recommend removing the term "several."</p> <p>Also, the College has 21 buildings, not 35.</p>	Yes
Responses to Recommendations	p.15	3 rd paragraph: "IPC has relied on institutional research, in the form of surveys and focus groups , and has..."	<p>Correction of Fact: IPC relies on a variety of institutional data, not only in the form of surveys and focus groups. These data include the Educational Master Plan, 2008 and 2012 refresh, the College Index, and others.</p>	Yes
Eligibility Requirements	pp.17-18	Administrative Capacity: The administration at the College is comprised of the President, the Vice President of Instruction, the Vice President of Student Services, the Vice President Administrative Services (vacant at the time of the visit, ..."	<p>Correction of Fact: The Vice President of Administrative Services is not a vacant position. It is a newly established position that will be filled in January, 2014.</p> <p>Update to be provided to the Commission: both the Vice President of Administrative Services and permanent Vice President of Instruction positions have been filled and both assignments will begin January 2014.</p>	No

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
Standard IA	p.26	3 rd paragraph: "The purpose of the 2008-2013 College of San Mateo Strategic Plan was to provide..."	Correction of Fact: Replace San Mateo Strategic Plan with Institutional Priorities .	Yes
Compliance w/ Commission Policies	p.24	<p>Policy on Student and Public Complaints against Institutions</p> <p>The College of San Mateo does not have an approved policy or procedure on student or public complaints against the institution. There are no directions for filing complaints directly to ACCJC.</p>	<p>Corrections of Fact:</p> <p>As noted in Volume 4, Appendix G, "Policies on Academic Progress, Integrity, Codes of Conduct, and Grievances and Complaint Procedures," the college publishes student grievance procedures in four locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • on the college website in the college policies section under "Student Grievances"; • in the Student Handbook under "Student Grievances and Appeals"; • in the College Catalog, under the heading, "Student Grievances"; and • in Board Policy 7.73, Student Grievances and Appeals. <p>Also noted in the same appendix, the college publishes directions for filing complaints directly to ACCJC on the college website in the accreditation status section. The website includes a direct weblink to the ACCJC complaint policy site.</p> <p>The college provided weblinks to all above references.</p> <p>Omissions of Additional Information:</p> <p>The college also publishes directions for filing complaints directly to ACCJC in the Accreditation section of the 2013-14 College Catalog. Under the header, "Complaint Policy," the college directs</p>	Yes

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
			<p>"[s]tudents and members of the public who desire to file a formal complaint to the Commission about one of its member institutions [to] become familiar with the requirements for doing so prior to contacting the Commission. The following is a link to the Commission's Policy on Student and Public Complaints Against Institutions along with the appropriate forms. This information will assist the user in understanding the issues the Commission can and cannot address through its complaint process." (page 5)</p> <p>A direct weblink to the ACCJC Complaint Policy site is also provided. One may access the college catalog online at http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/schedule/docs/catalogs/CSM_2013-14_Catalog.pdf .</p> <p>In addition, there is a link on the Contact CSM page to a "Complaint Form". http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/contactcsm/ This link opens to the CCCCCO site which hosts <u>both</u> the ACCJC complaint form and the CCCCCO complaint form. Our web link is misleadingly labelled "CCCCCO Complaint Form."</p>	
Standard IA	p.26	4 th paragraph: "The mission statement is reviewed every three years by the IPBC and other constituency groups (e.g. Academic Senate, President's cabinet).	Correction of Fact: President's Cabinet is not a constituency group.	Yes
Standard IA	p.26	4 th paragraph: "The mission statement is reviewed every three years by the IPBC and other constituency groups (e.g. Academic Senate, President's cabinet).	Correction of Fact: President's Cabinet is not a constituency group.	Yes

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
Conclusion	p.26	4 th paragraph...The College identified administrative services as an area for improvement...However, while the plan for improvement targets Fall 2013 as a date for revision to the administrative services program review, the visiting team found no evidence this was achieved.	<p>Correction of Fact: The intention for CSM's plan for improvement was to ensure it would be aligned with new revisions to the program review forms for instruction and student services.</p> <p>The revisions for the Fall 2014 program review cycle (program reviews are due in spring semester) were completed and posted on November 22, 2013. As the fall semester has not ended, the college is not behind schedule.</p>	Yes
Standard IB	p.28	4 th paragraph: " The College now has two ad hoc committees linked to the IPBC, the Diversity in Action Group (DIAG) and the Distance Education and Educational Technology Committee (DEETC.)	<p>Correction of Fact: DIAG and DEETC are not ad hoc committees; they are two of the college's institutional planning committees.</p>	Yes
Standard IB	p.29	4 th paragraph: "The IPBC reviews the benchmark data in the College Index annually , and revise it as needed."	<p>Correction of Fact: At a minimum IPBC reviews the College Index on a semi-annual basis; all-day retreats are held for these review sessions. The College provided evidence in the form IPBC minutes with documents this fact.</p>	Yes
Standard IB	p.30	3 rd paragraph: "In 2008-2009, ad committees of the IPBC developed and implemented the College Educational Master Plan, Enrollment Management Plan, Distance Education Plan, Diversity in Action Plan, and Technology Plan.	<p>Correction of Fact: It is the chairs/co-chairs of the institutional planning committees that developed their respective plans. The Educational Master Plan, 2008 was initially developed by PRIE, not a specific committee, and is regularly reviewed by IPBC.</p>	No

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
Standard IB	p.30	4 th paragraph: "Thereafter, the President's Cabinet, consisting of the college president and three vice presidents who supervise Instruction, Student Services, and Administrative Services review ..."	Correction of Fact: At the time of the external evaluation site visit, CSM only had two vice presidents. The vice president of administrative services is a new position that has been filled since the visit. The person selected will be her assignment January, 2014.	No
Standard IB	p.30	5 th paragraph: "Program level needs are identified and prioritized by division faculty and deans through program review."	Correction of Fact: A portion of this paragraph is referencing the new faculty hiring process in which the president of the Academic Senate participates in the discussions at the Instructional Administrators Council. The final sentence in paragraph 5 should be modified to read, "The College Council, consisting of representatives from... reviews the process used to approve program review requests for new faculty and instructional materials to ensure that the participatory governance processes were followed."	Yes
Standard IIA	p.34	5 th paragraph: The college has not met the target for external transfer rates, suggesting a need to focus on support of student transfer planning. Institution-set standards are a future agenda item for the Institutional Planning and Budget Committee (IPBC). (II.A.1.c; II.A.2.f)	Omission of Additional Information: The transfer rate goal utilizes Federal Student Right To Know (SRTK) data reporting. Although the SRTK data which forms the basis of this goal has been explicitly acknowledged as flawed by the state Chancellor's Office (http://extranet.cccco.edu/Divisions/TechResearchInfo/Sys/MIS.aspx), the IPBC nevertheless utilizes it because of its mandated reporting to the public. As an alternative, the College Index also utilizes absolute numbers of transfer students to UC and CSU as superior metrics and goals for assessing transfer effectiveness.	No
Standard IIA	p. 35	3 rd Paragraph: While the Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness Office (PRIE) mission is to " foster	Correction of Fact: This statement is false and there is no evidence provided in the <i>External Evaluation Report</i> to support this assertion. EMP data, including the College Index,	No

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
		<p>institutional effectiveness by providing a variety of information, analysis, training, research, and planning tools that support operations...”, [EMP] data are not used consistently by all disciplines, especially at the program, degree and certificate, and general education levels.</p>	<p>are an integral part of the College’s planning and program review efforts. The College has fully documented its planning system clearly showing the link between EMP and program review. The program review document itself requires faculty to rely and reference the EMP. This statement is inconsistent with findings in other sections of the <i>External Evaluation Report</i>.</p> <p>In fact, based upon a detailed review of the Spring 2013 instructional program reviews the College can demonstrate clear evidence that 40 out of 45 programs (89 percent) actively assess program SLOs and modify programs based on those assessments; 44 out of 45 programs (98 percent) analyze student success data and develop program plans to improve programs. Moreover, this statement contradicts other statements in the <i>External Evaluation Report</i>. Finally, the Commission noted in its <i>Midterm Report Action Letter</i> of January 2011 that all prior recommendations, including Recommendation #2 from the 2007 visit had been resolved. Since receiving the Commission action letter the College continues to make improvements in its use of data to improve student learning.</p>	
Standard IIA	p.35	<p>1st Paragraph: Because nearly 60 percent of students earning degrees or certificates complete at least one distance education course, the need to address the achievement gap between on-site and on-line student achievement remains a priority for the institution. (II.A.1.a, II.A.1.b)</p>	<p>Correction of Fact:</p> <p>The college actively addresses and engages the topic of distance education vs. on-site achievement. For example, a comparison of distance education and on-site achievement is a key component of the college’s instructional program review data sets provided to all departments, programs, and divisions. Furthermore, analysis and discussion of distance education compared to on-site achievement are integral to the program review template. Finally, the College submitted a <i>Substantive Change Report on Distance</i></p>	Partially Correct

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
			<i>Education (Report)</i> to the Commission on February 2013, which provides a detailed analysis of its Distance Education with respect to student achievement, planning, and capacity. The Commission acted to accept the <i>Report</i> and issued a commendation on the "clarity and comprehensiveness of the proposal". http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/accredinfo/ACCJC%20Letter_03_22_13.pdf	
Standard IIA	p. 35	3 rd Paragraph: "...Electronics 111 course outline has 14 student learning outcomes, which also serve as the course objectives."	Correction of Fact: This statement follows a sentence that states: "...there is uncertainty as to whether or not all outcomes are being assessed." The implication is that the SLOs in Electronics 111 are not being assessed. According to TracDat, Electronics 111 has 7 student learning outcomes and assessment was entered into TracDat on Sept. 25, 2013. Thus, all SLOs in ELEC 111 were assessed.	Yes
Standard IIA	p. 35	3 rd Paragraph: "Chinese 121 indicates no outcomes, and the document appeared to be in an outline format from 1987."	Correction of Fact: The official course outline of CHIN 121 is in CurricuNet which shows that this course was updated in 2010 and includes SLOs.	Yes
Standard IIA	p. 35	4 th Paragraph: The visiting team found that assessment of the integration of the learning centers with instructional programs is not robust, relying solely upon student surveys with a low response rate."	Correction of Fact: The College's learning centers are all under <u>direct control</u> of the appropriate discipline faculty (i.e., science faculty manage the Integrated Science Center, math faculty manage the Math Resource Center). Thus, it is an error to state that "integration of learning centers is not robust" The College does not understand the intent of this statement because the centers are deliberately designed to meet student needs at a <u>departmental level</u> . For instance, it would make very little sense to "integrate" the Accounting Lab with the Integrated Science Center.	No

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
			<p>At the same time, all departmental level centers are integrated with the Learning Center primarily through the Learning Support Centers Coordinators Committee, an active committee comprised of faculty leads from all centers on campus. This committee coordinates resources and integrates various activities, ensuring the link between the centers and instructional programs.</p>	
Standard IIA	p. 35	<p>4th Paragraph: "The visiting team found that assessment of the integration of the learning centers with instructional programs is not robust, relying solely upon student surveys with a low response rate."</p>	<p>Correction of Fact: The assessment of the integration of the learning centers with instructional programs does not rely solely upon student surveys.</p> <p>As noted in Standard II.A.2.f, systematic evaluation of the learning support centers begins with completion of an annual program review. That discipline faculty complete the learning support center program reviews supports the integration of learning centers with instructional programs.</p> <p>Learning support center program review datasets provided by PRIE are not confined to student surveys. Program review datasets include a demographic and academic profile of learning support center users, including overall term-related success rates, with collegewide comparisons.</p> <p>The categorical statement regarding "low response rate" is incorrect. Not all student surveys have low response rates.</p> <p>Response rates by themselves are poor indicators of</p>	No

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
			<p>survey quality. The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR), a leading public opinion and survey research association, has concluded that “consumers of survey results should treat all response rates with skepticism, since these rates do not necessarily differentiate reliably between accurate and inaccurate data. Instead, consumers should pay attention to other indicators of quality that are included in reports and on websites, such as insignificant levels of bias, low levels of missing data, and conformity with other research findings.” (Source: http://www.aapor.org/Response_Rates_An_Overview1.htm#.UqDkjcRDtn8)</p> <p>Omission of Additional Information: An assessment of the integration of the learning support centers with instructional programs occurs in the annual program review, where learning support centers are required to assess SLO alignment, and specifically, “how Center SLOs support Program SLOs” and “how Course and/or Center SLOs support Institutional/GE SLOs.”</p> <p>The 2012-13 Learning Support Center Program Review form is published online at http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/programreview/docs/forms/ProgReviewFormInstructionSp2013Cycle11-27-2012.docx .</p>	
Standard IIA	p. 36	2 nd Paragraph: “ Nevertheless, student learning outcomes discrepancies are evident between the traditional and distance modes in some areas. A plan to narrow the achievement gap is needed. For example, in Math 110 there is a 63.9 percent retention rate	<p>Correction of Fact: Since 2008, the college has been monitoring and reporting on disparities in success and retention for distance education compared to on-site courses, utilizing data spanning 8 fall semesters. The college’s distance education modality comparison datasets are an integral part of the Instructional Program Review</p>	Partial Correction

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
		<p>in the distance mode, while the traditional mode has a 76.7 percent retention rate. Likewise, in the same course there is a 16.5 percent success rate in the distance mode and a 56.5 percent success rate in the traditional mode. (It must be noted that there are three sections in the distance mode and 22 in the traditional mode; n=133 in the distance mode, and n=790 in the traditional mode.) In Music 202, there is a 55.7 percent success rate in the distance mode and an 83.8 percent in the traditional mode. Adequate student support and student services need to be enhanced. In addition, the team reviewed Basic Skills outcomes data and noted a sharp drop in student success and retention. This is an area for the PRIE office to investigate. (II.A.2.a, c, d, e)"</p>	<p>model and required in all Program Review assessments. In addition, the Distance Education Substantive Change Reports submitted to the ACCJC have explicitly addressed the overall gap in success and retention rates.</p> <p>The team report selectively highlights a few courses with very large gaps in success and/or retention. The College acknowledges gaps in these specific courses and will continue to work actively to narrow the gaps. However, the report fails to mentions the many distance education courses that have greater success and/or retention rates than on-site courses. Moreover, the report does not mention the narrowing and virtual elimination of the <u>overall gap</u> in success rates (from - 11.0 points to -0.1points) for all distance education courses college-wide.</p> <p>Topic of Basic Skills outcomes data addressed below.</p>	
Standard IIA	p. 37	<p>1st Paragraph: "...since CSM has defined SLOS for 97.5 percent of all courses, and ongoing assessment is demonstrated for 67.9 percent of the 1010 courses listed in the 2012-13 Catalog, and 69.4 percent of its certificated and degree programs, the institution does not yet completely award credit based on student achievement of the course and program stated outcomes."</p>	<p>Additional Information: This is not an error in fact. However, the College will provide supplemental information to the Commission to provide the most up-to-date information on assessment percentages.</p>	N/A

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
Standard IIA	p. 38	2 nd paragraph: "To assess the associate degrees, transfer General Education pattern/Institutional Learning Outcomes, the Student Campus Climate and Satisfaction Survey is utilized for program level assessment and Institutional Learning Outcomes, which also serve as general education outcomes. Only 10 percent of students responded in 2012. (II.A.2.f; II.A.3)"	<p>Correction of Fact: By noting that "[o]nly 10 percent of students responded in 2012," the team report implies that a survey's response rate is directly correlated with its validity and accuracy. This implication is inaccurate and, and is rejected by survey research professionals. (Citation: American Association of Public Opinion Research.) The college student campus climate survey response rates have ranged from 10% - 16%, which are widely recognized as acceptable in the field of applied social research. Moreover, the profile of survey respondents is representative of the overall student population of the college in terms of age, gender, ethnicity, and employment status. Finally, it is a mathematical fact that one can draw a conclusion about an entire population with a high degree of confidence with a small representative sample. In other words, an "n" of approximately 800 that is representative of the college population is more than sufficient and yields a very high confidence interval regarding findings for the entire population of students.</p>	Yes
Standard IIA	p. 39	2 nd paragraph: "CTE programs also meet with an Industry Advisory Council at CSM."	<p>Correction of Fact: This statement suggests that there is a single Industry Advisory Council. All CTE program have established Industry Advisory Councils.</p>	No
Standard IIA	40	2 nd paragraph: "CSM's methodology for assessing certificate, program, and Institutional/GE Learning Outcomes yields data from a small, unrepresentative sample of the total student population."	<p>Correction of Fact: GE SLO Assessment is not based on a 'small' sample. The survey does not employ a sampling methodology. All enrolled students are surveyed. As noted above, the respondent population is in fact representative of the total student population, the response rate is acceptable, and the data yield accurate information on the college population as a whole.</p>	No

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
			<p>While in many cases Program SLO reports for specific degree and certificate programs are, in fact, based upon small numbers of survey respondents, this is frequently due to the very small numbers of students earning degrees or certificates in specific programs. Within the context of such small degree/certificate populations, the response rates are in fact frequently very high. For example, of the four students who earned an Architecture AS degree, three students completed the Program SLO self-assessment representing a 75% response rate.</p>	
Standard IIA	p. 40	<p>2nd paragraph: "For example, one student responded to the English Department's SLO assessment in summer-fall 2012, and only four students responded to the Biology: Pre-Nursing AS degree program in the same period."</p>	<p>Omission of Additional Information: English Department Program SLO assessment had an 'n' of "1." However, only 2 students completed the Degree requirements for English in that time period. That yields a response rate of 50%. In the case of Biology: Pre-Nursing Program, there were 12 total degree recipients. Of these, 4 completed the Program SLO Assessment. This is a 33.3% response rate.</p> <p>The team report appears to confound "survey response rate" with "survey response." The report provides only the English and Biology: Pre-Nursing survey responses (n=1 and n=4, respectively) to support its assertion of small response rates. However, the fact of an n=1, for example, yields no response rate without knowledge of the size of the population that is surveyed.</p>	No
Conclusion	pp. 39-40	<p>"However, although the College has made commendable efforts in data gathering and has increased the size and scope of PRIE, it is unclear as to</p>	<p>Correction of Fact: PRIE provides data specific to, and detail for every department annually, These data are used in <u>every</u> department program review to improve student</p>	No

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
		<p>how data are used in improving student learning and success.”</p>	<p>learning. The College has fully documented its planning process and its use of data at the program and the institutional level. This statement is an opinion and is not supported by any evidence. In fact, based upon a detailed review of the Spring 2013 instructional program reviews the College can demonstrate clear evidence that 40 out of 45 programs (89 percent) actively assess program SLOs and modify programs based on those assessments; 44 out of 45 programs (98 percent) analyze student success data and develop program plans to improve programs. Moreover, this statement contradicts other statements in the <i>External Evaluation Report</i>. Finally, the Commission noted in its <i>Midterm Report Action Letter</i> of January 2011 that all prior recommendations, including Recommendation #2 from the 2007 visit had been resolved. Since receiving the Commission action letter the College continues to make improvements in its use of data to improve student learning.</p>	
<p>Conclusion</p>	<p>p. 41</p>	<p>“These efforts [supplemental instruction for math and the summer bridge program] are commendable, but not supported by data or research as to the cause of student attrition and/or drop in success.”</p>	<p>Correction of Fact: The College has actively reviewed its student achievement data, identified gaps in achievement, and has <u>proactively</u> developed an institutional response to student achievement gaps. Community Colleges have very diverse populations and to attempt to attribute causality to such a varied population is not the best use of the College’s research resources. This is not what the standard calls for. Our approach is to identify achievement gaps, develop programs based on best practices to address achievement gaps, pilot those programs, assess results and then institutionalize successful pilot programs.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
			Both the summer bridge program and math supplemental instruction were implemented as pilot programs and are based on documented best practices from other institutions; data was collected and analyzed on student performance; the assessment data indicate there was significant increases in student success for students participating in these programs and now both programs are under consideration for permanent funding. Evidence was provided to the team regarding these facts.	
Standard IIA	p. 41	1 st paragraph: "Regarding Student Success and Retention in Basic Skills, over a three-year period, student success has dropped by an average of 26.8 percent in basic skills areas (College Index). According to the Dean of PRIE, this is due to a change in state-mandated metrics and is not reflective of the actual shift in success in Basic Skills."	Correction of Fact: In a phone interview with a Visiting Team member, the Dean of PRIE explained that the apparent 'drop' in basic skills success reported in the College Index was due to a change in the CCCCO metrics: ARCC 1.0 vs. Scorecard. The dean further noted in the interview that use of this indicator would be revised in light of the change in methodology employed by the CCCCO. (This is also explicitly noted in the College Index itself.)	No
Standard IIA	p. 41	1 st paragraph: "Currently, the College has no data on shifts in student success in Basic Skills over the last several years."	Correction of Fact: Vol 1, pages 47 – 48, Table 33, presents a 5-year trend analysis (2007 – 2012) of (1) basic skills successful course completion rates, and (2) basic skills course improvement rates. Appendix D, Student Achievement Data, Tables 4.8 through 4.15, also detail 5 years of course success, withdraw, and retention, and term-to-term persistence, of basic skills students from 2007-08 to 2011-12, both college-wide and disaggregated by demographics and target populations. In addition, the college provides yearly data reports to the BSI Committee which include trends in basic skills placement and success rates.	Yes

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
			These points were mentioned in the phone interview with a Visiting Team member.	
Standard IIC	p. 46	3 rd paragraph: "Assessment of SLOs is weak for library services and all learning centers. Program reviews are present, but assessment rests primarily on student satisfaction and perception of: 1) whether the students are aware of and know how to use the centers, and 2) whether the centers were "helpful".	<p>Correction of Fact: Learning Support Center Program Review template and assessment components are comprehensive and contain a multi-dimensional analysis of all aspects of the Learning Support Centers. The 2012-13 Learning Support Center Program Review form is published online at http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/programreview/docs/forms/ProgReviewFormInstructionSp2013Cycle11-27-2012.docx .</p> <p>The library and learning support center program review assessments do not rest primarily on student satisfaction and perception of 1) whether the students are aware of and know how to use the centers, and 2) whether the centers were "helpful." Program review data for the library and learning support centers include student self-assessment of SLOs.</p> <p>Learning support center program review datasets provided by PRIE include a demographic and academic profile of learning support center users, including overall term-related success rates, with collegewide comparisons.</p> <p>To describe the programs reviews as resting "primarily on student satisfaction and perception" is a mischaracterization. Program review assessments include "plans and actions to improve student success." For example, the Integrated Science Center plans to improve faculty participation "to address the</p>	No

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
			first and second Institutional Priorities: to improve the academic success of all students (including course completion, retention and persistence), and the second: to promote academic excellence (and improve transfer rates)." Additionally, both the Math Resource Center and the Learning Center plan to increase tutoring services.	
Standard IIC Conclusion	p. 47	5 th paragraph: "Student satisfaction with the library and library services in the annual satisfaction surveys is high, with 92-93% agreeing the resources are adequate and reflect the needs of the students. Student satisfaction with most learning centers is also high, but the sample size is extremely small in some cases. The College does not fully meet the standard."	Correction of Fact: Issue of small sample size (again); addressed above, including the fact that some LSC's have response rates above 30%. These response rate levels are extremely high for voluntary online survey participation. Clarification: it is "response rate" not "sample size." This is a basic and core distinction in institutional research. How these are conflated suggests either imprecision or a lack of professional knowledge.	No
Standard IIB	p. 44	3 rd paragraph: "Response rates remain low."	Correction of Fact: See comments regarding total student responses – Standard IA, pg 38 above.	No
Standard IIIA	p. 50	4 th paragraph: "It is not clear that these prioritization and allocation processes are themselves evaluated for effectiveness, nor are there specific criteria used in the latter processes that relate explicitly to the mission or strategic priorities."	Additional Information: All position requests are first identified in Program Review and must tie directly to mission and institutional priorities. Replace "strategic" with "institutional."	No

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
Standard III C	pp. 54-56	See last section, pp. 21-30.	For CSM's Responses to Standard III C in the ACCJC report, see last section below, pp. 21-30.	See last section
Standard III D	p. 61	Paragraph 2: "allocates \$400,000 to each college for a five year period"	Correction of Fact: The district allocates \$400,000 annually.	Yes
Standard III D	p. 60	3 rd paragraph: "The planning and budget process follows and subscribes to the College Educational Master Plan, the College Instructional Program Plan and the College Student Services Program Plan. "	Correction of Fact: We do not understand this statement- there is no "College Instructional Program Plan" or "College Student Services Program Plan". Planning is carried out through program review and institutional planning.	Partial Correction
Standard IV A	p. 64	1 st paragraph: "For example, the review process resulted in... and the College Planning Committee..."	Correction of Fact: Edit: Replace College with "Institutional"	Yes
Standard IV A	p. 65	4 th paragraph: "Examples include the Task Force to improve student success in basic skills math...the Safety Task Force, the Structured Training for Online Teaching (STOT) Task Force.... "	Correction of Fact: There is no Safety Task Force; rather it is a college committee. STOT is a training program coordinated at the district.	Yes
Standard IV A	p. 65	5 th paragraph: "Despite the lack of clear documentation and details about the College's governance structures and processes..."	Additional Information: The team was provided with ample evidence describing the governance structures and processes. At the pre-team visit, the team chair and assistant were informed the College Council was in the process of revising its mission and purpose. This was also articulated when members of College Council met with a team member. A draft of the College's new	Yes

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
			<i>Planning and Decision Making Manual</i> was also provided to the team.	
Standard IV	p. 67	1 st paragraph: "However, based on the evidence presented and interviews with the College President and the Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness staff, it appears there is no documentation defining the structure, schedule and conditions that would trigger a special review of the College's planning and decision making and governance processes. This lack of documentation about the meta- and committee-review of the College's governance and decision-making structures suggests that the College needs to carefully document and communicate the processes it uses to regularly review and modify (as needed) its governance and planning and decision-making processes."	Correction of Fact: The College has ongoing assessment of the planning process and evidence to support that ongoing process—(e.g. the Planning Calendar) which was included in the Self Evaluation. The College provided ample evidence of the changes made to the College planning processes since the last accreditation visit. This is detailed in the College's <i>Self Evaluation Report</i> . Finally, the statement made here contradicts statements made in Standard I.	No
Standard IV	p. 74	2 nd paragraph: "However, it appears that the 2013 document has not yet been officially adopted by the Chancellor's Council, due to concerns about the mapping at one or more of the Colleges.	Correction of Fact: It is correct that the Delineations of Function Map has not been officially adopted. It is not, however, due to concerns about mapping at one or more of the colleges.	Yes
Standard IV.A	p. 63	2 nd paragraph: "Strategic committee membership.....	Correction of Fact: This should read "Strategic Planning Committee membership.	Yes

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
Standard IV.A.2.b	p. 65	2 nd Paragraph: "All recommendations regarding student learning programs and support services rely on faculty and academic administration through the Academic Standards and Professional Development Committees	Comment: The College leadership is not sure what this means. This appears to be an error. All recommendations regarding academic matters come from the Academic Senate; the Academic Senate works in collaboration with the administration however.	Yes
Standard IVB	p. 69	Discussion of administration	Additional Information: The College has selected a permanent vice president of instruction and a permanent vice president of administration since the accreditation visit. We will provide this as supplemental information to the Commission.	N/A
Standard IV.B.2.b	p. 73	2 nd paragraph "However there is no documentation about the process and timelines for the regular assessment of the planning and participatory governance process....."	Additional Information: The College has created a comprehensive annual planning calendar which was provided as evidence to the team. This calendar clearly documents the timelines for assessment of the participatory governance process.	Yes
Standard IV.B.2.e	p. 74	1 st paragraph "serving on the San Mateo Chamber of Commerce"	Fact: This should be "serving as a board member on the San Mateo Chamber of Commerce."	Yes

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
---------------------	---------	--	--	------------------

Standard IIC Technology Resources: Pages 54-56 in ACCJC’s Report

Note: Lack of consultation with key college and district personnel during the site visit removed opportunities for CSM’s visiting team to corroborate facts regarding technology, correct errors, fill in gaps in information, receive additional documentation, and validate hypotheses, assumptions, and conclusions. The result is a recommendation that is a faulty conclusion based multiple distortions of the evidence.

No one from CSM’s visiting team requested interviews with any Information Technology Services (ITS) staff. In contrast Skyline and Canada Colleges’ visiting team members met with ITS’ most senior executives, the Chief Information Officer and the Chief Technology Officer. These ITS senior staff also participated in one 30-minute meeting at the district office in which a dozen visitors attended. It is unclear whether the visitors included any teams members assigned to CSM. The ITS staff provided the other visiting teams with a variety of information, including the results of ITS’ own evaluation of its services.

In addition, CSM’s vice presidents, who are key drivers of technology planning at the college did not meet with the team regarding any technology issues. The now-retired Vice President of Instruction (VPI) and acting VPI joined the tail end of an interview with two visiting teams members in which technology was briefly addressed. The meeting included the co-chairs of CSM’s Distance Education and Educational Technology Committee (DEETC) and the Coordinator of Planning. The now-retired VPI and current VPI did not engage in the discussion regarding total cost of ownership, for example, a topic raised during that meeting.

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
III-Resources General Observa-tions	p. 54 ¶ 1	First sentence: Acronym, SMCCCD Last sentence: “Technology needs are identified through program review and through prioritization in the <i>District Strategic Plan for Information Technology 2012-2016</i> .”	Correction of Fact: Incorrect acronym for San Mateo County Community College District (SMCCCD) Facts: Technology needs are identified through program review at the college level and through the many districtwide committees in which the colleges and ITS jointly participate. <i>The District Strategic Plan for Information Technology 2012-2016 (District IT Plan)</i> is a strategic plan that includes descriptions of technology services; goals and strategies; processes which support technology; and	No

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
			<p>technology services' assessments, among other areas. As a document, it <u>does not</u> "prioritize" technology needs.</p> <p>[<u>Examples</u> of joint college/district committees are described on page 2 of the <i>District IT Plan</i>]</p>	
" "	p. 54 ¶ 2	First sentence: Acronym, SMCCCD	<p>Correction of Fact: Incorrect acronym for San Mateo County Community College District (SMCCCD)</p>	No
" "	p. 54 ¶ 2	"Upgrades include expanding the wireless network, a new telephone system, some SMART classrooms, infrastructure, and learning centers computers."	<p>Corrections of Fact: Facts: While bond-measure funding has supported the upgrade of "some" classrooms, <u>all</u> CSM classrooms are currently SMART classrooms.</p> <p>The upgrading of technology and systems is not solely underwritten by bond measure funding. It has been also supported by district general funds as well as other sources from the State along with external grants.</p>	Yes
" "	p. 54 ¶ 3	"The program review process allows requests for new, upgrade, replacement, maintenance, or repair of technology."	<p>Omissions of information: The statement is true, but program review is not the sole process through which CSM identifies programmatic needs for technology.</p> <p>As described on page 2 of the <i>District IT Plan</i>, examples of venues in which there is joint college and District ITS participation <u>and</u> where program needs are identified include: Chancellor's Council; District Research Council; Enrollment Services Committee; Business and Finance Officers Group; Financial Aid Advisory Committee; Distance Education Advisory Committee; Facilities, Planning and Operations; District, Safety and Security Committee; District Matriculation Committee;</p>	No

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
			Network Advisory Group; and Technology Planning Committee, among others.	
"	p. 54 ¶ 4	"Planning for technology seems to occur primarily at the district level, as evidenced in the <i>District Strategic Plan for Information Technology 2012-2016</i> ." [emphasis add]	<p>Corrections of Fact: Planning for technology does, in fact, occur at the district level. However, it simultaneously occurs collaboratively with the colleges at all levels through multiple venues as described directly above and in CSM's <i>Self-Evaluation</i>.</p> <p>Much of the time of ITS' senior staff is dedicated to technology planning done in collaboration with the colleges. They include Chief Technology Officer and the ITS Director of Administrative Systems, Director of Web Services, Director of Administrative Services, and Director of Technical Support Services.</p>	No
"	p. 54 ¶ 4	"A Long-Range Instructional and Institutional Equipment Planning Team was formed to meet quarterly to review technology replacement needs and establish funding."	<p>Corrections of Fact: This is partially correct; it was created to determine equitable allocations to the colleges for bond-measure funding. However, it omits key information and local college prioritization efforts resulting from program review and other processes.</p>	No
"	p. 54 ¶ 4	"The Distance Education and Educational Technology Committee (DEETC) is credited with working to integrate institutional planning and technology."	<p>Corrections of Fact: DEETC is one of the institutional planning committees that participates in integrated planning at CSM. It is not, however, a technology committee as it previously existed at CSM. Its charge is to ensure integration between distance education and educational technology. The integration of institutional planning and technology</p>	No

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
			also occurs through the many joint college/district committees described above as well as the program review process.	
" "	p. 54 ¶ 4	"The Institutional Planning and Budget Committee is identified as the body to recommend resource allocation for high priority plans and initiatives, including technology."	Corrections of Fact: This is a single committee.	Yes
Findings and Evidence Standard III-C	p. 54 ¶ 1	"Technology resources are used to support student learning programs and services at CSM. High quality, current technology is in evidence in some classrooms, many learning centers, and labs."	Corrections of Fact: High quality, current technology exists in virtually <u>all</u> classrooms, learning centers, and labs."	No
" "	pp. 54-55 ¶ 1	The effectiveness of technology needs is primarily evaluated through faculty, staff, and student satisfaction surveys.	Corrections of Fact/Omissions: 1) CSM does assess technology needs through the annual Campus Climate and Satisfaction surveys conducted of faculty, staff, and students. <u>It is, however, only one of several means of assessments.</u> 2) ITS also last year conducted a customer service survey of all district employees, and made the findings available to the visiting teams for the District, Skyline, and Canada which requested meeting with ITS staff. It is posted online: http://www.smccd.edu/accounts/smccd/its/files/2012_ITS_Survey_Results_Summary.pdf <u>Results of this assessment</u> led to many short-and long-range outcomes which included, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased Banner training • WebXtender training and improved indexing • DegreeWorks training 	No

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducting student survey on IT tools such as student email, WebSMART, webschedule, etc... • Create an online system for users to give us feedback on wireless reception • Work with Security and Facilities on the public address system • Work with DEAC on the long-term strategy for our Course Management System • Improve the ITS website by adding more tutorials and making it a resource for our users • Provide better information to employees about connecting to the facstaff wireless network • Researching and Implementing a new mailing list and survey tool • More clearly define the roles and responsibilities of SARS/eSars <p>3) ALL ITS technology support/HelpCenter contacts are evaluated by an online feedback survey inviting college and district staff to assess the effectiveness of the service.</p> <p>4) The <i>District Strategic Plan for Information Technology 2012-2016</i> also contains a summative evaluation of technology services. One section in particular, "Assessment of Support and Services," summarizes findings, pp. 24-26.</p> <p>5) CSM assesses technology planning at the college level via the IBPC. As described extensively in the Self-Evaluation, the results of assessing the role of CSM's Technology Planning Committee as well CSM's <i>Technology Plan: 2007-2013</i> led to the merging of Technology Committee with Distance Education and the establishment of Distance Education and Educational Technology Committee (DEETC). (See Self-Evaluation, Standard I and III.)</p>	

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
" "	p. 55 ¶ 1	"According to the Self-Evaluation Report, the merged distance education and educational technology committee (DEETC) was working on a plan for fall 2013, but there is no evidence this committee is meeting. The last DEETC agenda is from May 2013."	Omission of Information: When the co-chairs of DEETC met with two visiting team members, they were NOT asked about their DEETC meetings or absence of agendas. While the committee officially last met in May, the co-chairs have been actively working on the development of the new Distance Education plan and have had with numerous meetings with the Coordinator of Planning. They have also met regularly with the Vice President of Instruction.	No
" "	p. 55 ¶ 1	"A draft Distance Education plan 2013-2017 was provided to the teams at the time of the visit. The plan appears to be an update of the previous plan."	Corrections of Fact: The draft plan is indeed an update that conforms to CSM's template for institutional plans. It is not a simple replication of the previous plan as implied here. It includes extensive analysis of pertinent data and details linkages to other key institutional planning documents. It will not be formally reviewed and adopted by IBPC until the start of spring 2014.	No
" "	p. 55 ¶ 1	"Committee members reported that their focus is Distance Education and they don't plan for other educational technology."	Corrections of Fact: Committee members reported (with the Coordinator of Planning also present) that their focus was indeed Distance Education <u>and</u> that they provided expertise related to the use of appropriate educational technologies. This is consistent with the mission articulated for DEETC: http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/institutionalcommittees/deetc.asp	No
" "	p. 55 ¶ 2	"Technology needs are identified through program review and then following the planning process are forwarded to IPBC."	Corrections of Fact: Technology needs are also identified (pg. 66, Vol 2) through institutional plans. As noted above, ongoing and emerging technology	No

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
			needs are also identified through the multiple joint college and district operational groups as detailed above.	
"	p. 55 ¶ 2	"CSM has relied on funding from a variety of sources to meet technology needs, primarily bond funding."	Corrections of Fact: Bond measure funding has supported <u>new</u> upgrades to equipment and <u>new</u> initiatives. The vast majority of funding to support the ongoing technology infrastructure is sourced directly from district general funds. The District resource allocation ensures appropriate support. Salaries for all ITS employees, for example, are from general operational funds.	No
"	p. 55 ¶ 2	"ITS developed a <i>District Strategic Plan for Information Technology 2012-2016</i> ; however, in looking at the plan appendices, most items end by 2013 and one project is listed to do a 4-year update of the Plan in 2012; which appears not have occurred at all which the team could not ascertain if it had occurred at all.	Omission of Information: The plan's appendices do indeed have gaps for the dates of some activities. Such gaps occurred, in some cases, because the exact dates for new software releases could not be determined when the plan was initially published in 2012. The plan was updated and revised in April 2013. An updated schedule/workplan of items would have been made available to the team, if requested. Many activities are completed or currently underway, such as upgrades to WebAccess 2.0 and Sharepoint.	Partial Change
"	p. 55 ¶ 2	"A Long-Range Instructional and Institutional Equipment Planning Team was formed to meet quarterly to review technology replacement needs and establish funding support. There is no record of this district level team found in the listings of district of college committees."	Corrections of Fact: While agendas and meeting minutes have not been posted, this group has had numerous meetings since inception; further documentation would have been made available if requested by the visiting team.	No

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
" "	p. 55 ¶ 3	"Bond Measures C and A have allowed the District to improve infrastructure, wireless connectivity, the telephone system, and create and advance web-based applications such as WebSMART."	Corrections of Fact: Bond measure funding has supported enhancements to technology and new initiatives; it does not underwrite ongoing costs.	No
" "	p. 55 ¶ 3	"A high degree of satisfaction from the staff, faculty, and administrators is evident from 2012, which seems to be the main form of technology assessment."	Corrections of Fact: The college and the district use multiple means of assessing of technology effectiveness and above: see above, pp. 4-5, for examples.	No
" "	p. 55 ¶ 4	"The district revised its <i>District Strategic Plan for Information Technology 2012-2016</i> in July 2012. The plan has an equipment replacement strategy for 2012-2013 to replace older computers in selected classrooms across the district. There is no evidence of a replacement plan past that date at either the district or the college level. It is unclear whether a technology obsolescence/ replacement schedule exist; it does not seem to be part of the <i>District Strategic Plan for Information Technology</i> . While the district ITS determined replacement costs of computers at the various campuses in the district, there does not seem to be a technology specific total cost of ownership analysis."	Corrections of Fact: The equipment replacement strategy for 2012-13 cited in the <i>District Strategic Plan for Information Technology 2012-2016</i> was intended as an illustration. There are multiple examples of cost of ownership analyses conducted and replacement obsolescence/replacement schedules, which would have been made available to the visiting team upon request from the VPI or ITS staff. For example, most recently in fall 2013, an updated inventory and assessment of student labs at CSM was conducted by ITS staff and college personnel. The assessment yielded a recommendation for prioritizing equipment for replacement based on age in which the instructional administrators participated; included in the inventory and recommendations are classroom projectors and printers in the student labs. A purchase plan was developed to ensure that immediate	No

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
			<p>replacements would be available if equipment failed. This process will ensure continual service with virtually no down time. A multi-year commitment from the district has ensured a systemic refreshing of lab equipment.</p>	
" "	p. 56 ¶ 1	<p>... "Such real costs could include, in addition to the replacement costs, the cost of consumables (e.g. batteries and toners), personnel cost of maintaining technology, infrastructure, and the replacements costs associate with peripherals (e.g keyboards and mice.)"</p>	<p>Corrections of Fact: Costs of consumables, which include keyboard and mice, are covered through the operational budgets of the affected program areas and draw from general funds. Costs for personnel maintenance of technology and to support the infrastructure are built into the ITS operations budget which is supported by general funds. SMCCCD and college-level budget allocation processes ensure these costs are accurately estimated and underwritten.</p> <p>Further documentation, if requested, would have been made available to the visiting team.</p>	No
" "	p. 56 ¶ 1	<p>"Planning coordination between the college and district is attributed to the Long Range Instructional and Institutional Equipment Planning Team. There is no evidence of agendas and minutes from the planning team."</p>	<p>Additional Information: While no "evidence" of agenda and minutes has been posted publically, this group has been convened and is active. Additional evidence would have been available upon request by the team.</p> <p>Planning coordination is not solely the purvey of this group. As indicated above and on page 2 of the <i>Strategic Plan for Information Technology 2012-2016</i>, there is extensive coordination between ITS, the District, and the college through multiple operational committees and groups.</p>	No
" "	p. 56 ¶ 1	<p>"In interviews, the team was informed that technology communication</p>	<p>Corrections of Fact: <u>Extensive</u> coordination between the district ITS staff,</p>	No

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
		between the district and the college occurs at instructional administrators meetings. However, no evidence was found to support that."	and the college occurs at instructional administrators meetings. Agenda and meeting minutes are not posted as this is a confidential venue. Additional pertinent evidence would have been available upon request by the team.	
"	p. 56 ¶ 2	" ...Eleven million dollars has been 'set aside' by the District for technology funding over the next five years using bond measure funding. There appears to be no evidence for planning or funding past 2016-2017.	Corrections of Fact: The planning horizon for the "set aside" is five years—which is long-range. The five-year planning horizon is not evidence of no planning or funding. Budget allocation processes are well-established, systematic, and ensure general-fund support for the ongoing operations of ITS and the technology infrastructure that sustains administrative functions, instructional programs, and student support services.	No
"	p. 56 ¶ 3	" ...(DEETC) is credited with working to integrate institutional planning and technology; however, there is no evidence that the committee is currently meeting."	See above.	No
"	p. 56 ¶ 3	"In the draft <i>Distance Education Plan 2013-2017</i> , presented to the team upon arrival at the college. There are four goals listed to integrate technology in institutional planning."	Corrections of Fact: The <i>Distance Education Plan 2013-2017</i> is in draft form only, and it has not been formally reviewed and accepted by IBPC. It was made available to the team in response to a request.	Yes
"	p. 56 ¶ 3- p.57 ¶ 1	"There appears to be no evidence beyond student and staff/faculty satisfaction surveys that technology planning is evaluated....Assessment of technology plans and processes is based on satisfaction surveys."	Facts: Faulty conclusion. The college and the district evaluate technology planning in several ways. See above for examples.	No

Section or Standard	Page #s	Excerpts(s) of Relevant Text from Report	Corrections of Fact, Omissions of Additional Information	Error Corrected?
---------------------	---------	--	--	------------------