

January 27, 2020

Dr. Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh, President
Grossmont College
8800 Grossmont College Drive
El Cajon, CA 92020

Dear Dr. Abu-Ghazaleh:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting January 15-17, 2020, reviewed the Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER) and evidentiary materials submitted by Grossmont College. The Commission also considered the Peer Review Team Report (Team Report) prepared by the peer review team that conducted its onsite visit to the College September 30 to October 3, 2019.

The purpose of this review was to determine whether the College continues to meet ACCJC's Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and Accreditation Standards (hereinafter, the Standards). Upon consideration of the written information noted above, the Commission acted to **Reaffirm Accreditation for 18 months and Require a Follow-Up Report**, due no later than March 1, 2021, followed by a visit from a peer review team.

Commendations

The Commission recognizes the exemplary performance of Grossmont College in the following areas. Commendations signify practices for which the Commission believes the institution has exceeded standards.

Commendation 1: The Commission commends the College for its equity-focused mission statement, and for ensuring that college programs, services, and practices are aligned with the college mission. The College's deep commitment to equity is manifested in their efforts to infuse equity in everything they do, and a part of everyone's responsibility. The College's mission guides institutional planning, decision-making, and resource allocation as well as informs institutional goals for student learning and achievement (I.A.3).

Compliance Requirements

The Commission also determined that the College must demonstrate compliance with the following Standards, as identified in the College and District recommendations. This demonstration must be addressed in the required Follow-Up Report.

Standard III.A.5 (District Requirement 1): In order to meet the Standard, the Commission requires that the District ensure that all classified and management employees are systematically evaluated at stated intervals.

Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education (College Requirement 1): In order to meet the policy, the Commission requires the College ensure that all distance education courses demonstrate regular and substantive interaction as defined by the College.

Standards I.B.2, II.A.3, II.A.16 (College Requirement 2): In order to meet the standards, the Commission requires that the college fully implement the assessment, collection, and use of student learning outcomes for all courses, programs, and units.

Standards II.A.3 (College Requirement 3): In order to meet the standards, the Commission requires that the College ensure that, in every class section, students receive a syllabus that includes SLOs consistent with the officially approved course outline of record.

In accordance with federal regulations, compliance requirements must be addressed and the institution must demonstrate that it aligns with Standards within two years¹.

Modifications to Recommendations

In taking its action, the Commission modified the team's recommendation(s) as follows:

College Recommendations 2 and 3 are changed from improvement recommendations to compliance requirements. The Commission also determined that the wording of the recommendation 2 should be revised as follows:

Original Recommendation 2 (Improvement): In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that the college standardize and strengthen the assessment, collection, and use of student learning outcomes for courses, programs, and units (I.B.2, II.A.3, II.A.16).

Revised Requirement 2 (Compliance): In order to meet the standards, the Commission requires that the College fully implement the assessment, collection, and use of student learning outcomes for all courses, programs, and units (I.B.2, II.A.3, II.A.16).

Recommendations for Improving Institutional Effectiveness

The Team Report noted Recommendation 4 for improving institutional effectiveness. This recommendation does not identify current areas of deficiency in institutional practice, but consistent with its mission to foster continuous improvement through the peer review process, the Commission encourages institutions to give serious consideration to the advice contained in the peer reviewers' recommendations. The Commission anticipates that you will bring them and the team's full report to the attention of your institution for serious consideration. In the Midterm Report, the College will include actions taken in response to the peer review team's improvement recommendations.

¹ For more information, refer to the Commission policy on "The Two-Year Rule and Extension for Good Cause" on the ACCJC website at <https://accjc.org/eligibility-requirements-standards-policies/>.

Next Steps

The Team Report provides details of the peer review team's findings. The guidance and recommendations contained in the Report represent the best advice of the peer review team at the time of the visit but may not describe all that is necessary for the college to improve or to come into compliance. A final copy of the Team Report is attached.

The Commission requires that you disseminate the ISER, the Team Report, and this letter to those who were signatories of the ISER and that you make these documents available to all campus constituencies and the public by placing copies on the College website. Please note that in response to public interest in accreditation, the Commission requires institutions to post current accreditation information on a Web page no more than one click from the institution's home page. In keeping with ACCJC policy, the Commission action will also be posted on the ACCJC website within 30 days of the date of the Commission's action.

On behalf of the Commission, I wish to express appreciation for the diligent work and thoughtful reflection that Grossmont College undertook to prepare for this evaluation. These efforts confirm that peer review can well serve the multiple constituencies of higher education by both ensuring and encouraging institutional quality and effectiveness.

If you have any questions about this letter or the Commission's action, please feel free to contact me or the vice president that has been assigned as liaison to your institution.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Richard Winn". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "R" and "W".

Richard Winn, Ed.D.
President

RW/tl

cc: Dr. Lynn Neault, Chancellor, Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District
Dr. Catherine Webb, Accreditation Liaison Officer

Attachment