

Systems Portfolio

Mid Michigan Community College

1/28/2018

1 - Helping Students Learn

1.1 - Common Learning Outcomes

Common Learning Outcomes focuses on the knowledge, skills and abilities expected of graduates from all programs. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.B., 3.E. and 4.B. in this section.

1P1: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for determining, communicating and ensuring the stated common learning outcomes, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Aligning common outcomes (institutional or general education goals) to the mission, educational offerings and degree levels of the institution (3.B.1, 3.E.2)
- Determining common outcomes (3.B.2, 4.B.4)
- Articulating the purposes, content and level of achievement of the outcomes (3.B.2, 4.B.1)
- Incorporating into the curriculum opportunities for all students to achieve the outcomes (3.B.3, 3.B.5)
- Ensuring the outcomes remain relevant and aligned with student, workplace and societal needs (3.B.4)
- Designing, aligning and delivering cocurricular activities to support learning (3.E.1, 4.B.2)
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess attainment of common learning outcomes (4.B.2)
- Assessing common learning outcomes (4.B.1, 4.B.2, 4.B.4)

1R1: RESULTS

What are the results for determining if students possess the knowledge, skills and abilities that are expected at each degree level? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

1I1: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 1R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years? (4.B.3)

Responses

1P1: PROCESSES

Aligning common outcomes (institutional or general education goals) to the mission, educational offerings and degree levels of the institution (3.B.1, 3.E.2)

The college uses several process elements to ensure alignment of common learning outcomes with the mission, educational offerings and degree levels. First, the Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee approves all credit-bearing curricular offerings. The [New Program Proposal Form](#) requires a statement on how the new program corresponds to the college mission (section 3); addresses how the new program fits with the college's other offerings (section 4), and addresses the degree level (section 8).

The second process element is the Program Review process. The Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee requires all programs to undergo a program review once every four years. As seen in the [Program Review Guide](#), the department is required to address alignment with the college's mission.

The third process element involves the college's shared governance system. This shared governance system, and the strategic planning flowing from it, maintains a close connection with the college's mission, which is to provide educational and community leadership for the development of human ability. To this end, the college provides post-secondary education and services to enable students and the community to achieve success in a global society. This mission is further instantiated in the college's four enduring goals:

1. Encouraging Student Success
2. Engaging the Community
3. Enhancing Employee Impact
4. Ensuring Institutional Effectiveness

The most relevant enduring goal for category 1 is encouraging student success. To achieve this goal, the college's governing council (College Council) assigns objectives from the college's strategic plan (Vision 2020) to each of the college governance committees. Objective 3.5 is "Advance Mid's work with the Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP) and Tuning as well as the [T-Shaped Professional](#) strategies to ensure learning intensifies across the curriculum." Additionally, College Policy, as stated in the [2017-18 Catalog](#) (pp. 19-20) requires all students receiving an associate degree to be exposed to similar educational experiences regardless of whether a student is in an occupational, technical, or transfer degree program. This common educational experience comes through a set of general or common education outcomes, which are determined by the faculty-led general education committee.

This committee is open to all faculty and administrators for input for determining the size, scope, and congruency of the courses and shared learning outcomes that make up the general education program, and has a faculty chairperson elected to a two-year term. This length of term is to assist in maintaining continuity.

The committee voted to adopt the Michigan Transfer Agreement (MTA) guidelines to determine the categories and courses which make up the general education program. The MTA requires at least thirty credits from categories of English Composition, Communication, Mathematics, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities. The committee selected lead faculty in each area to determine courses for each category and to report evaluations back to the committee.

Determining common outcomes (3.B.2, 4.B.4)

As noted, MMCC requires all associate degree recipients to have a common educational experience regardless of whether a student is in an occupational, technical, or transfer degree program. This common educational experience is provided through MMCC's general education program. The college utilizes a faculty led general education committee that is open to all faculty and administrators for input to determine the number, scope, and congruency of the courses and common learning outcomes that make up MMCC's general education.

Additionally, the college adopted the Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP) as a framework and language for defining the learning outcomes for all credit-bearing programs. This DQP framework is used for both the program specific and the common or general education outcomes. MMCC's general education program is customized to fit two different kinds of degrees: the applied degrees and the transfer degrees. Both iterations teach and assess the same set of DQP proficiencies. The difference is in the course requirements for different degrees:

- **Associate in Applied Science (A.A.S.) Degrees:** These degree programs prepare students to enter the workforce. General education courses in these degree programs are more interdisciplinary, and students have more limited options. The requirements consist of a first level of courses: English 111, Speech 101, and a Math course chosen by the program faculty. They also include a technology competency that is either satisfied by CIS 100 or course work defined by the program faculty. The second level consists of interdisciplinary courses in Science (SCI 200), Social Science (SSC 200) and the Humanities (HUM 200).
- **Associate in Arts (A.A.) and Associate in Science (A.S.) Degrees:** These degrees are designed for students who intend to transfer to a four-year institution. Accordingly, the options in these degrees are more varied and allow students to pick courses specific to the transfer institution and the major of their choice. In addition, the 30 credit hour block Michigan Transfer Agreement (MTA) partially defines the set of courses in which the Gen Ed Committee ensures the common learning outcomes occur. The MTA guarantees students up to 30 credits of transferable course work, primarily toward their general education requirements at the receiving Michigan public university.

The determination of common learning outcomes, then, for all general education designated courses, align with the following DQP Intellectual Skill proficiencies:

1. **Analytic Inquiry:** Student will, in a variety of settings and contexts, demonstrate the ability to “frame a problem or question” and “distinguishes among elements of ideas, concepts, theories, or practical approaches to the problem.” As with all the skills listed here, this skill is taught in multiple courses, disciplines and contexts.
2. **Use of Information Resources:** Student will find and use information “either in a specialized field or in respect to a general theme in the arts and sciences.” S/he will cite these sources and learn to evaluate their value and validity.
3. **Engaging Diverse Perspectives:** Student will develop the ability to “describe how knowledge from different cultural perspectives might affect interpretations of prominent problems,” as well as understand “his or her own perspective on selected issues.”
4. **Ethical Discourse:** Student will “describe the ethical issues present in prominent problems,” and engage in dialog that sharpens their understanding of their ethical positions and those of others in the dialog.
5. **Quantitative Fluency:** Student will present “accurate interpretations of quantitative information” in a variety of contexts and applications and “create and explain graphs and other visual depictions.”

6. **Communicative Fluency:** Student will communicate “orally or in writing” to “general and specialized audiences” in ways that are “cogent, coherent and substantially error free.” This includes discussion and the ability to listen.

Faculty in each area determine which proficiencies are met by a specific course. [A sample map](#) (p. 3) shows how the common outcomes are covered by MTA designated courses.

Articulating the purposes, content and level of achievement of the outcomes (3.B.2, 4.B.1)

In 2016, the General Education Committee led a project to establish Master Course Proficiencies for every course that are tied back to the framework of the DQP. It is through this process that the purposes, content, and level of achievement of the outcomes are articulated. The attached [syllabi](#) demonstrate how faculty implement these proficiencies in their courses.

The general education committee typically holds four meetings per semester. All faculty are encouraged to attend general education meetings. The committee chair emails meeting minutes and agendas to the faculty, as well as posts them on the college’s website. Information regarding MMCC’s general education program learning outcomes are listed on the college General Education website, making it available to all faculty, staff, and students. The general education committee monitors assessment of proficiencies on a semester basis. Specific tasks and projects of the general education committee are dealt with by subcommittees. These subcommittees are formed as needed from volunteers within the general education committee.

Incorporating into the curriculum opportunities for all students to achieve the outcomes (3.B.3, 3.B.5)

In 2014, the college joined Cohort 1 of the Michigan Guided Pathways project. The goal of the Pathways project was to create clearly defined and structured course sequences for students to follow from entry through degree completion. As part of this process, instructional Deans led faculty in developing pathways and tying them back to the DQP proficiencies to ensure that through the collection of coursework on each individual pathway, students had the opportunity to become proficient in each of the DQP proficiencies. An example can be seen in this map of the [Physical Therapist Assistant program](#).

Ensuring the outcomes remain relevant and aligned with student, workplace and societal needs (3.B.4)

The curriculum approval process requires [a statement of how the program will meet the needs of students and community \(section 2\)](#). This element of the process initially addresses the concern of relevancy. To ensure the selected common learning outcomes remain relevant and aligned with student, workplace, and societal needs, the college relies on input from advisory committees and feedback from universities. The advisory committees for the occupational programs meet twice per year and provide faculty with specific information for determining just what the intellectual skills referenced earlier should look like for the particular program discipline. In other words, the DQP proficiencies are general statements of skills (e.g., Engaging Diverse Perspectives). The advisory committee input provides information on the application of these skills to the faculty so they can tune this general statement to meet the specific needs of the discipline. [Excerpts from Advisory Committee meetings](#) show this interaction and input informing program faculty. Feedback to the Physical Therapist Assistant program regarding cultural content and child/adult domestic violence is a good example of this process for gaining relevant input.

Transfer institution feedback works in much the same way, and this feedback flows through the college's Transfer Advisor, who maintains regular contact with representatives from the universities. MMCC has also begun a series of regional faculty symposiums that bring together faculty from two and four-year colleges and universities to discuss transfer issues and curricular alignment. [Minutes from a symposium meeting](#) indicate how this provides input on transfer issues. This process started with Psychology and has since been expanded to include Business Studies, Criminal Justice, and Biological Sciences.

Designing, aligning and delivering co-curricular activities to support learning (3.E.1, 4.B.2)

MMCC provides [study abroad opportunities](#), which expose students to culturally diverse situations. As a requirement of SSC 200, which is a required general education course for occupational/technical students, [students participate in a service learning project](#). For additional co-curricular activities, the college sponsors approximately 20 student activity clubs each year. These clubs engage in various projects such as the [PTK Honors Society activities](#), which provide student leadership opportunities. Student leadership opportunities are also available through the college's shared governance system by having student representatives on 14 of the college's 21 governance committees.

Recognizing the limited opportunities for students to demonstrate mastery of course proficiencies, a group of faculty developed the Student Showcase. Through this project, students from all academic programs have the opportunity to design and present course/program projects to the entire campus community. This helps align co-curricular activities with our academic learning outcomes.

Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess attainment of common learning outcomes (4.B.2)

Selection of the DQP as a framework and language for defining and assessing attainment of common learning outcomes occurred through the leadership of academic administrators working with the faculty. The VP of Academic Services presented the DQP at an all faculty meeting, and followed this with a discussion at the Academic Council and the Assessment Committee. Finding adequate support from the faculty, the college then joined a national effort by Community College Consortium to examine and research the Degree Qualifications Profile. Following this, the college brought in a DQP/Tuning Coach through NILOA. Once the DQP framework was in place, selection of assessment methods and specific tools and rubrics were determined by the faculty led committees of Assessment and General Education, with input from various departments to ensure program specific needs were considered.

Assessing common learning outcomes (4.B.1, 4.B.2, 4.B.4)

Faculty from the General Education Committee collaboratively developed a common [rubric](#) for assessing the Intellectual Skills proficiencies. Furthermore, as part of regular departmental meetings, faculty engage in norming exercises to maximize consistency between faculty in assessing outcomes. Results are provided to the General Education Committee, and are distributed during regular program reviews to the campus community. These program reviews are conducted on a four-year cycle.

Specifically for the Humanities, which spans across two departments and six disciplines (Humanities, Religion, Philosophy, Music, Literature, and History), faculty meet annually to read random samples (5th and 10th student on class rosters) from each of those disciplines. Since 2014, assessments focused on one specific Gen Ed proficiency from the DQP—Ethical Discourse. To norm the assessment activity, faculty communicate the common learning outcomes through a [norming rubric](#) which participants fill out using six objectives related to ethical discourse:

- Recognizing other's point of view
- Analysis of multiple perspectives
- Using multiple frames
- Academic sensativity
- Aesthetic sensativity
- Rhetorical sensitivity

The rubric also includes three categories in which to rate these objectives:

- Assignment analysis (major, minor, not mentioned)
- Student's performance (comments)
- Competencies shown (yes, no, not applicable)

There were 10 different assignments assessed from three disciplines (Humanities, Philosophy, and Literature). Because these outcomes may look different in different disciplines, the norming aspires to assess common learning outcomes across different disciplines and assignments.

IR1: RESULTS

Summary results of measures and Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Examples of results from assessing common learning outcomes:

- [Math course assessments of Quantitative Fluency and Analytic Inquiry](#)
- [SOC 101 assessment](#)
- [CIS 100 assessment](#)
- [ENG 111 assessment](#)
- [Humanities assessment](#)
- [Speech Communications assessment](#)
- [Transfer GPAs](#)

After searching for national data on DQP proficiency mastery, we were unable to locate external comparable data. Therefore, we focused on our internal benchmark which was set at 78% of students demonstrating proficiency. In the section above, we provided sample proficiency data from a variety of General Education Courses. Reviewing data from CIS.100, MMCC failed to reach the 78% benchmark in only one proficiency (Engaging Diverse Perspectives) and for only one semester (2017 spring). Given that spring was the lowest enrolled semester for CIS.100, it is possible outliers impacted the average.

The numbers of SOC.101 were significantly lower with only 40% demonstrating proficiencies (Analytical Inquiry, Engaging Diverse Perspectives, Communicative Fluency) using the 78% benchmark. For Math, we evaluated two general education courses. For one (MAT.114), proficiency ranged 55% to 100% at or above the benchmark for Quantitative Fluency and 44% to 100% for Analytic Inquiry. However, the enrollment was minimal for this class. For MAT.212, proficiency for Quantitative Fluency ranged from 68% to 94% and from 64% to 92% for Analytic Inquiry with only one semester being below the benchmark for both proficiencies. For SPE, 82.32% demonstrated proficiency in Communicative Fluency. For ENG, our DQP proficiency percentage was just under

75%. We realize that having external comparative data would help set our targets levels for these proficiencies.

We learned from the Humanities data set that students are overwhelmingly "competent" or "above competent." We attribute this, but do not limit it to, a couple of important factors. First, there are two prerequisites that help ensure expectations for writing, interpersonal communication, and public speaking, all of which are at the core of the curriculum of the course. Second, most students are close to graduation in their field when they take the 200-level humanities course, which means they should be at a level of sophistication such that they have been exposed to and had opportunities to practice the proficiencies assessed here.

We also learn from the results of the [norming activity](#), that most of the assignments cover all six Ethical Discourse areas as major components/outcomes of the assignments and that since these elements are a major part of the curriculum, it is clear that all students have the opportunity to meet the proficiencies. In addition, for the random sample of papers reviewed, with the exception of "Using Multiple Frames," students predominantly showed competency. With Multiple Frames it was even: 11 were judged competent and 11 were not competent.

Comparing MMCC's transfer student performance to the performance of native students of our three largest university partners, MMCC student performance as measured by GPA is comparable.

Interpretation of results and insights gained

In reviewing our data, we realize there are areas of strength and areas where improvement is needed.

In some instances (SOC.101), the department itself recognized the need for more norming sessions to ensure consistency. Additionally, the SOC department evaluated in pairs, leaving many "split" decisions that were not reconciled by a deciding party. This is something the department will improve on. Sociology and Speech assessment is also in its infancy, with DQP assessment only beginning in 2015. And in instances where we fall far short of the 85% benchmark, most of those occur in lower enrollment semesters, which are more heavily impacted by outliers.

In terms of transfer data, while the comparable data from university partners is beneficial, we recognize the need for more precise measures.

III: IMPROVEMENT

To better align co-curricular activities to the strategic plan and to the educational mission of the college, student support services have begun establishing learning outcomes and assessment plans for their operations. An outside consultant was brought in during the summer of 2017 to assist with this endeavor. Learning outcomes for each operation were due by December of 2017, with review and implementation slated for the winter semester of 2018.

Additionally, we intend to build a database whereby we can download grade files collected by the State of Michigan for all Michigan colleges and universities and gather more precise data on how MMCC students are performing in specific courses or sets of courses once enrolled at one of our university partners.

Finally, the Humanities data offer fairly granular areas on which to improve. These include discussion and attention to what faculty are doing in the area of "Using Multiple Frames" in a course that is designed to be interdisciplinary. In addition, this data exposed the need to continue to norm since some of the data was somewhat unreliable due to inconsistencies in rating on the rubrics. Some used

what is shown in the tables while others added more specifics to their answers regarding competencies being demonstrated in the writing.

Sources

- _2017 AIRreport (Final)
- Advisory Committee feedback
- Advisory input on outcomes
- CIS 100 DQP Assessment
- Common Learning Outcomes
- Data Gen Ed Humanities Fall 2012-Winter 2017
- ENG 111 Outcomes
- English 112 Syllabus
- Gen Ed Review 2017
- Gen Ed Rubrics DQP Int Skills
- Map of DQP Proficiencies for PTA Program Courses
- Math Assessments
- New Program Proposal Form
- Norming for Humanities Courses_ Proficiency in Ethical Discourse Winter 2015
- Program Review Guide
- PTK involvement
- Regional Faculty Symposium
- Service Learning
- SOC 101 W'17 Assess
- SPE 101 Gen Ed DQP Proficiency Assessment
- Study Abroad Participants
- Transfer GPA
- WHAT IS THE T

1.2 - Program Learning Outcomes

Program Learning Outcomes focuses on the knowledge, skills and abilities graduates from particular programs are expected to possess. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.B., 3.E. and 4.B. in this section.

1P2: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for determining, communicating and ensuring the stated program learning outcomes and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Aligning learning outcomes for programs (e.g., nursing, business administration, elementary teaching, etc.) to the mission, educational offerings and degree levels of the institution (3.E.2)
- Determining program outcomes (4.B.4)
- Articulating the purposes, content and level of achievement of the outcomes (4.B.1)
- Ensuring the outcomes remain relevant and aligned with student, workplace and societal needs (3.B.4)
- Designing, aligning and delivering cocurricular activities to support learning (3.E.1, 4.B.2)
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess attainment of program learning outcomes (4.B.2)
- Assessing program learning outcomes (4.B.1, 4.B.2, 4.B.4)

1R2: RESULTS

What are the results for determining if students possess the knowledge, skills and abilities that are expected in programs? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P2. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Overall levels of deployment of the program assessment processes within the institution (i.e., how many programs are/not assessing program goals)
- Summary results of assessments (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of assessment results and insights gained

1I2: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 1R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years? (4.B.3)

Responses

1P2: PROCESSES

Aligning learning outcomes for programs (e.g., nursing, business administration, elementary teaching, etc.) to the mission, educational offerings and degree levels of the institution (3.E.2)

As noted in 1P1, the college uses several process elements to ensure alignment of program outcomes with the mission, educational offerings and degree levels. The first starts with the Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee. This committee approves all credit-bearing curricular offerings. The [New Program Proposal Form \(section 3\)](#) requires a statement on how the new program corresponds to the college mission. [Section 4 of the proposal](#) addresses how the new program fits with the college's other offerings, while [section 8](#) addresses the degree level.

The second process element is the Program Review process. The Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee requires all programs to undergo a program review once every four years. As seen in the [Program Review Guide](#), the department is required to address alignment with the college's mission. Examples of this process being followed can be seen in the first section of the [Drafting/CAD](#) and on page three of the [Art/Graphic Design](#) program reviews.

The third process element involves the college's shared governance system. This shared governance system, and the strategic planning flowing from it, maintains a close connection with the college's mission, which is to provide educational and community leadership for the development of human ability. With this mission serving as a guiding principle, faculty at MMCC determined the learning outcomes in each program with the goal of developing student knowledge and skills to the Associate Degree level for each program. The College uses the framework of the Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP) to align program-specific and common learning outcomes with the result of a meaningful degree.

Determining program outcomes (4.B.4)

Program learning outcomes are determined by the full-time faculty from each program. In 2014, the college joined a statewide endeavor, the Guided Pathways project, which stresses the importance of student progression through a degree program within a two year academic period. Incorporating this project into the learning outcome process, faculty reviewed where the program learning outcomes exist within the program's course sequence. For example, the Computer Information Systems (CIS) program has rewritten some course learning objectives and renumbered courses to clearly indicate if they are first or second year courses in the program.

Once faculty have developed their program outcomes, all course learning outcomes must be approved by the Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee. The committee consists of the Vice-President of Academic Services, six administrative staff members appointed by the President, nine faculty members appointed by Faculty Senate, and three students. All faculty proposals are reviewed by the appropriate Academic Dean and the Registrar (where appropriate). If approved by the full committee, the proposal goes to the Vice President of Academic Services for final approval. The General Education requirements for each program are also determined by the requirements set forth by the General Education Committee (1P1).

Articulating the purposes, content and level of achievement of the outcomes (4.B.1)

Utilizing the DQP framework and language provided the college the means to clearly state the learning outcomes for all degree programs in common terms. To demonstrate this, on all [syllabi](#) (pp. 1-2), the college has tied learning outcomes for all courses across the taxonomy to the appropriate DQP proficiency. Examples of the [Physical Therapist Assist, Business \(pp.11-12\)](#), and [Drafting/CAD \(pp.3-4\)](#) programs show several ways in which the program outcomes are articulated.

Assessment processes are described in more detail below. Additional examples of assessment of these outcomes can be seen in degree programs which have licensure or third party certification exams. Faculty must align levels of achievement to adequately prepare students to succeed on these exams. Nursing students must have course content that aligns with the State Board of Nursing requirements for licensure. In the Computer Aided Drafting and Design and the Computer Information Systems (CIS) programs, students are learning content at a level that aligns with third party certification exams. In some cases the purposes of the outcomes are listed in the course syllabus, or in the course description. In the case of the CIS program, [the course descriptions](#) articulate the third party certification exam with which the course content aligns.

Ensuring outcomes are relevant and aligned needs (3.B.4)

The program outcomes for AAS degrees and certificates are aligned, when applicable, with external accreditation standards, thereby keeping current with workplace and societal needs. Where external accreditation is not applicable, occupational and technical programs at MMCC have advisory boards consisting of local industry professionals. The advisory boards provide input to the program faculty regarding workplace needs and expectations of students entering the workforce after graduation. The advisory board meets with faculty twice per year and on an ad hoc basis. For example, as a result of finding areas of concern in the guided pathway for the CIS program, the faculty believed that some courses should be removed from the program and new electives may be needed. The faculty surveyed the advisory board for their input. This survey guided the faculty in creating new elective courses in cybersecurity and programming. Other examples of the process for receiving feedback from external sources can be found in [excerpts from Advisory committee meetings](#), where program faculty receive direct feedback from the committee.

For transfer programs, faculty annually review the transferability of courses by using the Michigan Transfer Network (MTN). Courses that do not transfer, or transfer only as elective credit, are evaluated for relevancy. This has led to several changes.

- The Math faculty found that the development of two new courses would be beneficial for transfer students.
- MMCC's existing Business Mathematics, was no longer relevant for students intending to transfer to the business program at Central Michigan University. Students needed a similar, but more general, course in college algebra. Consequently, the Math faculty developed a new College Algebra course.
- The Michigan Transfer Agreement provides for a quantitative reasoning course, which did not exist at MMCC, so the Math faculty developed a new course, Mathematical Reasoning, to provide transfer students with another option.

Furthermore, MMCC has taken the lead on developing regional faculty partnerships that bring together two and four-year college and university faculty to discuss transferability and curricular alignment. Psychology was the first program selected by a committee consisting of several regional community colleges and universities. Due to its popularity, additional programs of Business Studies, Biological Studies, and Criminal Justice will be looked at next. These three additional programs were selected by a committee consisting of representatives from all 28 Michigan community college and all 15 public universities. [Minutes from a symposium meeting](#) indicate how this provides input on transfer related issues.

Designing, aligning and delivering co-curricular activities (3.E.1, 4.B.2)

In academic year 2016-17, faculty created Master Course Description and Proficiency (MCDP)

documents for each course in their program. The course learning outcomes (proficiencies) are listed in their appropriate DQP category for each course. Faculty ranked each proficiency relative to the emphasis each proficiency receives in the course. The ranking scale was a three point scale with one being a minor component, two being a moderate component, and three being a major component of the course. The program faculty are now taking the numeric data from each course MCDP and using the DQP framework to see how well the proficiencies align in their program courses. This process has stimulated significant discussion amongst the faculty and provided a basis for several sessions at the college's professional development days. The process also pushes faculty to examine the cross curricular and co-curricular activities that take place within their degree program.

As part of our overall stakeholder feedback process, Advisory Boards suggested the need for more practical experience for our students. The Curriculum Committee, along with program faculty, re-designed our internship program for all technical and occupational programs. These experiences allow students the opportunity to bring together proficiencies learned in their general education AND program specific courses. This combination of the general education, or common learning outcomes, with the program specific outcomes results in students developing into [T-Shaped Professionals](#). That is, they master a broad range of common skills and proficiencies, as well as master a depth of skills and proficiencies in their particular field. Examples of internship/externship syllabi show this alignment of outcomes: [Business Information Systems](#), [Medical Assistant Office Externship](#), [Art & Design Internship](#).

Selecting tools, methods and instruments for assessing attainment of program learning outcomes (4.B.2)

Program faculty members are responsible for selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess attainment of program learning outcomes. The college continues to have a faculty driven student assessment process that provides academic departments with "local" control over their curriculum and assessment of student learning. Individual faculty and their departments direct student assessment at the course level, departments direct assessment at the program level, and the General Education Committee directs assessment at the general education level. Professional Development days provide opportunities for faculty to discuss tools, methods, and assessments across departments. The faculty have adopted the DQP framework as a method to categorize and structure their assessment activities.

The Assessment Committee created an online repository for each program to store their assessment documentation. Every program has created a Master Course Description and Proficiency (MCDP) document for each course and stored these documents in the Moodle (Learning Management System) repository. The repository is available to faculty. The faculty driven process of student assessment occurs at three primary levels: 1) course level assessment, 2) program level assessment, and 3) general education outcomes. Course assessment is most prominently promoted through the Curriculum Committee process for new courses or major modification to existing courses. During the proposal review process the faculty member bringing the proposal must include an assessment plan. The proposal writers will discuss with the Curriculum Committee how students will be evaluated and how the course will be assessed. Prior to submitting their Curriculum Committee proposal, the proposal writers are encouraged to work with the Assessment Committee to determine the most appropriate methods to assess particular courses. The proposals need to include a statement, list, or diagram that relates the course goals and student learning outcomes and their categorization within the DQP. The primary academic committees and the administration at the College provide opportunities to train and develop assessment skills. In 2016-17 there were professional development sessions on creating and tuning the MCDP. In 2015 and again in 2017, the College held faculty workshops with a DQP Tuning Coach from the Lumina Foundation. These activities coupled with norming through the MCDPs

which are aligned to the DQP, departmental meetings, and standard syllabi, are promoted and encouraged across campus.

Assessing program learning outcomes (4.B.1, 4.B.2, 4.B.4)

Program level assessment is addressed routinely as part of the program review process, which is overseen by the Curriculum Committee. All programs are reviewed on a four year cycle with four to five programs reviewed per year. One key tenet of the program review process is program quality. As assessment is a faculty driven process at MMCC, each program is responsible for ongoing assessment and evaluation of their curricula and program. The program review is designed to be a report to the Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee that provides qualitative and quantitative data which document the ongoing assessment and evaluation of the program. For purposes of program review, MMCC historically defined a program as a subject area that granted a degree or certificate.

1R2: RESULTS

Overall levels of deployment of the program assessment processes within the institution

All programs are assessing programs proficiencies through the Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee curricular review process. This is a four-year cycle whereby all programs submit proficiency data.

Summary results of assessments (include tables and figures when possible)

- Samples of [licensure and certification exam results](#) from the following programs:
 - Nursing
 - Radiography (population size: 2012 - 18; 2013 - 19; 2014 - 11; 2015 - 14; 2016 - 17)
 - Physical Therapist Assistant (population size: 2011 - 17; 2013 - 14; 2015 - 19)
 - Certified Medical Assistant (population size: 2012 - 16; 2013 - 15; 2014 - 19; 2015 - 16; 2016 - 11)
 - Drafting/CAD (population size: 2013 - 15; 2014 - 12; 2015 - 13; 2016 - 17; 2017 - 4)
 - Heating, Refrigeration & Air Conditioning (population size: 2012 - 21; 2013 - 17; 2014 - 15; 2015 - 13; 2016 - 15)
 - Computer Information Systems
 - Networking Fundamentals (24 students)
 - Security Fundamentals (17 students)
- sample program assessment plans: [Radiography](#), [Physical Therapist Assistant](#)
- sample program reviews with assessment results [Drafting/CAD](#) (pp. 4-5), [Medical Assistant](#) (pp. 11-14)
- Transfer program outcomes are measured by comparing MMCC [transfer students' gpa](#) after transfer to the gpa of the native student population at our top three transfer destination universities.

Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

The certificate or licensure pass rates of MMCC Health Professions graduates are examined in light of the national and/or State pass rates. To demonstrate this level of monitoring, a comparison for MMCC graduates in Nursing (RN), Radiography, Physical Therapy Assistant, and Certified Medical Assistant exams with the national and/or State pass rate (where available) over the past five years is attached. MMCC's Health Professions programs typically have an external benchmark of a pass rate of "at or above" the national and state mean.

In several occupational areas, certification exam data is also compared to national and/or state figures. Although in some cases, as in SolidWorks exam rates, national or state comparison data is not available. Additionally, the Computer Information Systems program has begun using Microsoft certification exams as a means to assess program level outcomes in two areas: Security Fundamentals and Networking Fundamentals. Since this was initiated in fall of 2017, national and state comparisons are not yet available.

For transfer students, MMCC collects data off first semester performance at the transfer institution as compared to the native students of MMCC's top transfer destinations during the same semester.

Interpretation of assessment results and insights gained

While the Nursing program has generally hovered around the national and state averages over the past 5 years, they have only exceeded both in one year (2015). But these figures may be a bit misleading as recently the Nursing program underwent a significant restructure that resulted in a reduction of required credit hours from 92 credits in 2012-13 to 71 credits in 2013-14 and then to 65 credits in 2017-18. Additionally, Radiography underwent a change in leadership and instructional staffing in 2014. In speaking with the Radiography department, there was a timing issue with the licence exam which led to students taking the exam at an earlier date than anticipated. A majority passed on the second test administration, but those scores were not reflected in the attached data. The department has been exploring better test prep software for students, and the scores appear to be moving back up towards the national average after a brief dip. Other programs like Physical Therapy Assistant and Medical Assistant are significantly above the national average.

In the Drafting program, the department utilizes an exam to measure competency; SolidWorks. Results from the SolidWorks report four out of five years the pass rate was above 90%. The other two years, the pass rate was above 80%. The department is working toward setting an appropriate internal benchmark since no national data are available. As mentioned earlier, Microsoft certification information is not yet available for 2017 fall. This fall is the first semester MMCC is offering Security and Networking Fundamentals, so trend data is not available.

112: IMPROVEMENT

The Assessment Committee has just begun a project whereby course shells in MMCC's Learning Management Software (Moodle) will be set up to align individual assignments with the DQP master course proficiencies thereby allowing for a more robust data collection process. Additionally, the most recent version of the Faculty Master Agreement specifies that faculty will be required to open a Moodle course shell for ALL courses. So the proficiency data collection will be more detailed and disbursed across campus.

Sources

- 16-17 PTA Program Assessment Plan
- Advisory input on outcomes
- ALH 250 Syllabus DQP(2)
- ART 281 Internship I

- Art_Program_Review_2016 pdf
- BIS 260
- Business Review
- CIS 185
- DRF_Program_Review-2016
- Eng 111.W01 & 02 Fall 2017
- English 112 Syllabus
- Licensure pass rates
- Map of DQP Proficiencies for PTA Program Courses
- Med Asst Prog Review
- New Program Proposal Form
- Program Review Guide
- Rad Assess plan with outcome data
- Regional Faculty Symposium
- Transfer GPA
- WHAT IS THE T

1.3 - Academic Program Design

Academic Program Design focuses on developing and revising programs to meet stakeholders' needs. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 1.C. and 4.A. in this section.

1P3: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for ensuring new and current programs meet the needs of the institution and its diverse stakeholders. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Identifying student stakeholder groups and determining their educational needs (1.C.1, 1.C.2)
- Identifying other key stakeholder groups and determining their needs (1.C.1, 1.C.2)
- Developing and improving responsive programming to meet all stakeholders' needs (1.C.1, 1.C.2)
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess the currency and effectiveness of academic programs
- Reviewing the viability of courses and programs and changing or discontinuing when necessary (4.A.1)

1R3: RESULTS

What are the results for determining if programs are current and meet the needs of the institution's diverse stakeholders? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P3. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of assessments (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

1I3: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 1R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

1P3: PROCESSES

Identifying student stakeholder groups and determining their educational needs (1.C.1, 1.C.2)

Per the college's mission, courses and programs are developed in response to changing stakeholder needs, and to enable both student and the community success in a diverse, global society. Additionally, as discussed in 1P1, one of the college's common outcomes is engaging diverse

perspectives, the goal of which is to help students develop the ability to understand how knowledge from different cultural perspectives might affect interpretations of prominent problems, as well as understand his or her own perspective on selected issues. To this end, student stakeholder needs are divided into several segments. For new students, the college provides a mandatory orientation through which, the college's Advisors and Mentors work with students in small groups to assess needs and assign students into one of the available degree paths (Associate of Arts, Associate of Science, Associate of Applied Science, Certificate, Training Credential). This process is aided by the creation of a new multiple measures math placement model, and a revised English placement model.

For returning students, educational needs are determined through a variety of sources including: course evaluation surveys, Student Satisfaction Inventory, Academic Advising, and course/program level assessment. Additionally, students are invited to serve as members of all shared governance committees, providing more detailed information on student need.

In addition to new and returning students, the college has a large dual enrollment population. The Associate Dean of Academic Outreach meets regularly with all dual enrollment partner institutions to gather educational needs for dual enrolled students that attend on-campus/online classes, as well as those enrolled at one of the off-site centers. Each spring the college also hosts a meeting of dual enrollment superintendents, principals, and counselors to discuss educational needs. All of this information is shared with the Off-Campus Advisory Committee who works to implement ideas for improvement based on feedback received.

Identifying other key stakeholder groups and determining their needs (1.C.1, 1.C.2)

MMCC recognizes that, given its mission as the community's college, it has many external stakeholder groups with a vested interest in its academic programs. This multiplicity of sources allows the college to hear from a wide range of our stakeholders.

Stakeholder	Expectations	Method to Determine Need
Four-Year Transfer Institutions	Transferring students demonstrate proficiencies equal to four-year partner coursework	Articulation agreements, regional faculty meetings, statewide faculty meetings
Employers	Graduates demonstrate competency in transferrable and job specific skills.	Surveys and meetings through Advisory Board committees, national data from EMSI and Burning Glass.
K-12 Institutions	Offer opportunities for students to complete aspects of their Associate's Degree while attending high school.	Regular meetings with K-12 partner institutions and our Associate Dean of Off-Campus Programs; summer meetings with K-12 Principals and Superintendents.
Community-Based	Active partnerships	Surveys and meetings through Advisory Board committees; local and regional workforce development partners.
Accreditors	Meet accrediting standards	Feedback on annual updates; appraisal feedback report

Developing and improving responsive programming to meet all stakeholders' needs (1.C.1, 1.C.2)

Regardless of the source, all new courses and programs are approved through the faculty led Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (CASC). This approval process ensures the Degree Qualifications Profile proficiencies are integral to the courses and programs, as well as there being a clearly identified pathway (sequence of courses) for students to follow. This portion of the process ensures the degree program meets both program specific learning outcomes and general education (common) learning outcomes. In accordance with the Committee bylaws, the proposal process begins with the lead faculty and dean presenting an overview and outline of the program to the CASC. The overview includes an evaluation of the health and scope of competitive programs at similarly situated institutions. The outline includes the basic requisite details of the program along with budgetary implications. If the CASC determines the program aligns with the college's mission and serves stakeholder needs, the faculty would proceed with developing the courses and the dean would pursue gaining approval of a budget for the program from the college administration and Board of Trustees. Individual courses for the program and detailed program requirements are then presented. Approval by the CASC is based on how well the proposed course/program meets identified stakeholder needs, transferability or suitability for gainful employment, fit with department and college mission, and adequate resource availability. Once the CASC approves a course or program, the Academic Vice President takes the proposal to the Board of Trustees for their approval.

Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess the currency and effectiveness of academic programs

The Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee's [program review process](#) requires each program to be reviewed on a four year cycle. This review process requires the program faculty and administrators to address specific questions under the following broad areas:

- The mission and goals of the program
- The overall quality of the program
- Specific indicators of the program's quality
- The overall health of the program; Issues facing the program
- Progress on action plan from the last review.

Finally a SWOT analysis is required based on the information gathered in response to the review along with an action plan for addressing the weaknesses and threats.

Reviewing the viability of courses and programs and changing or discontinuing when necessary (4.A.1)

In addition to the regular program review process discussed above, Academic Services utilizes a formalized new and existing program review matrix to determine current program viability as well as new program potential. This [process](#) was developed in the summer of 2017 for implementation during the fall of 2017.

1R3: RESULTS

Summary results of assessments (include tables and Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

- Measuring the performance of program specific learning objectives is accomplished in occupational and technical programs through the use of [licensure or certification exams](#). This information is collected annually and published in the Annual Instructional Report.

- In the traditional liberal arts and in some transfer-oriented programs, [graduation or transfer rates](#) are used. This information is also collected annually and monitored along with comparisons to other Michigan community colleges.
- Program-specific graduation rates and transfer information specific to MMCC's most common transfer partners is located in the [Annual Instructional Report \(figures 5.2, 5.3, 5.5, 5.7, and 5.8 located on pages 14-16\)](#).
- [Ruffalo Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory results](#) includes items specific to student perspectives on instructional programs and meeting their diverse needs.

Interpretation of results and insights gained

Data concerning licensing or certification exams confirms that generally, we are meeting the standardized expectations of our external stakeholders in those areas. However, Noel Levitz data shows that we are below the national average in all but three of the nine questions relating to meeting diverse stakeholder needs. Unfortunately it is difficult to glean actionable data since the results are in aggregate form. Conducting focus groups may result in more a detailed understanding of student stakeholder needs.

High level indicators, such as placement and transfer data, suggests that key stakeholders such as employers and university partners are receiving graduates who are prepared for employment and continued educational enrollment.

113: IMPROVEMENT

MMCC has broadened the scope of programs with licensure/certification exams for monitoring the effectiveness of program design. The college plans to further expand this effort by collecting data from internship experiences. These internships have recently been revised significantly in response to advisory committee input. We now need to monitor the effectiveness of these revisions. Measurement of this effectiveness would come in the form of satisfaction surveys for both the students and the employers. These will connect to the relevant DQP proficiencies which the student should have mastered in the course of the program and utilize during their internship experience.

One other improvement is currently being planned that includes the implementation of the Full Measure app. This tool will allow the college to monitor student progress on their curricular pathway and determine whether there are design barriers interfering with student progress.

Sources

- 2017 AIReport (Final)
- 1.3 SSI Results.pdf
- Licensure pass rates
- Program Review Guide
- Program Review Process
- Transfer Rates

1.4 - Academic Program Quality

Academic Program Quality focuses on ensuring quality across all programs, modalities and locations. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.A. and 4.A. in this section.

1P4: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for ensuring quality academic programming. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Determining and communicating the preparation required of students for the specific curricula, programs, courses and learning they will pursue (4.A.4)
- Evaluating and ensuring program rigor for all modalities, locations, consortia and dual-credit programs (3.A.1, 3.A.3, 4.A.4)
- Awarding prior learning and transfer credits (4.A.2, 4.A.3)
- Selecting, implementing and maintaining specialized accreditation(s) (4.A.5)
- Assessing the level of outcomes attainment by graduates at all levels (3.A.2, 4.A.6)
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess program rigor across all modalities

1R4: RESULTS

What are the results for determining the quality of academic programs? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P4. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of assessments (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

1I4: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 1R4, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

1P4: PROCESSES

Determining and communicating the preparation required of students for the specific curricula, programs, courses and learning they will pursue (4.A.4)

As an institution with an “open door” policy, MMCC does not have general admission standards. Students are, however, evaluated for sufficient background and preparation for math and English. Up to the Spring 2017 semester for math, students were evaluated by Accuplacer testing, prior experience

at a transfer school with performance at a “C” or better, or ACT scores. Beginning in 2014, MMCC undertook a project to examine alternative math placement through multiple measures. The goal was to revise our placement process, base it on measures that would predict success in our course taxonomy, and capture placement data on an ongoing basis for ongoing validation and improvement of placement. Based on published research, staff collected data on students who took a math and/or English class at MMCC their first term as a freshman, and collected the grade that each received in the math course. For these students, we purchased high school transcripts that included math courses taken and the grades students received in them, overall high school GPA, and other data. We used logistic regression to predict college course success based on high school courses, grades, and GPA. While high school courses did not predict success, overall high school GPA was significant and meaningful.

Math faculty associated with the study used this research to develop a new placement model that is, for new students, based on a formula that uses high school GPA and their composite Math SAT score. For dual enrolled students, we now use a combination of whether they have passed Algebra 1 or Algebra 2 with a “C” or better, together with a high school GPA of a “B” or better at the time they are placed into a dual enrollment course.

English faculty are in the process of their placement process update. Since predictive variables were less clear for English than for math, the faculty utilized established national data to establish a process that factors in a multiple measures guided self-placement, along with a writing sample that is evaluated by the English faculty.

Course prerequisites are proposed by the program faculty and reviewed by the appropriate academic dean. Then, the proposed prerequisites are brought to the Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee for review and approval. Once approved, the prerequisites are entered into the computer system by the Registrar. Once entered, the prerequisites are included in the course descriptions in the catalog and the online course search tool, as well as the program guides that are presented to students in mandatory orientation sessions and individual one-on-one advising appointments.

Learning outcomes are established by the program faculty, utilizing the Degree Qualifications Profile as the framework. All course syllabi are required to have learning outcomes listed. In the fall of 2016, the Assessment Committee led a project to review all course syllabi to ensure learning outcome consistency across course sections. This led to the establishment of master course proficiencies, which ensures consistency across all sections and modalities.

Evaluating and ensuring program rigor for all modalities, locations, consortia and dual-credit programs (3.A.1, 3.A.3, 4.A.4)

MMCC varies its course offerings by time, modality, and location, allowing students to find classes that fit their personal needs while working within the institution’s capacity. Daytime and evening classes are offered. The length of courses varies from shorter time frames (6-8 weeks) to a more traditional standard length of time (12-16 weeks). MMCC offers courses that begin with a traditional semester schedule, as well as late-start classes for students who are at-risk and in need of courses with sheltered content. Courses are delivered face-to-face, online, and through varied hybrid formats. The two main locations of MMCC courses are offered in Harrison, Michigan and Mt. Pleasant, Michigan. The institution also provides dual enrollment/concurrent enrollment courses at nine different high school or intermediate school district locations within MMCC’s region. Regardless of the program offering, modality, and location of delivery, the college retains authority over the curriculum and faculty qualifications.

As discussed above, MMCC has established master course proficiencies for all courses regardless of modality or location. The student learning outcomes for the college's associate degrees and certificate programs are driven by full-time program faculty, shared in the college's computer system (Colleague), and are exercised throughout the various delivery methods (face-to-face, online, hybrid) and locations (main campuses and area high schools). To ensure that student learning outcomes are uniformly understood by instructors across the college's various instructional delivery methods and locations, individual faculty on-boarding occurs. In addition to this, Welcome Back days occur prior to the start of the fall and winter semesters, and Professional Development days occur at least once each fall and winter semester. Faculty norming meetings, as well as regional faculty symposium meetings occur on a regular basis.

The Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee at MMCC reviews all college credit courses and programs on a regular basis. All new courses and programs are submitted to the Committee for their discussion and recommendations. The Committee oversees a 4-year program review cycle that monitors the instructional relevancy of the college's instructional programming, plans and evaluates the educational functions which the college has defined, and presents an opportunity for personal and unit communications. After review and deliberation, the Committee recommends appropriate action on curriculum and academic standards and presents its recommendations to the President/Board for approval prior to implementation.

With regard to online course offerings, the Office of Online Learning and Development uses a [rubric](#) for the development of all online course shells. The rubric is used to evaluate each online shell as well. The Instructional Designer in Distance Education fills out the rubric post-development, and then the Director of Online Learning and Instructional Design adds comments. The finalized rubric is sent to the faculty developer and the instructional administrator, who use the feedback for revisions.

Specific to concurrent enrollment and the rigor of course offerings, MMCC is accredited by the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP). "NACEP works to ensure that college courses taught by high school teachers are as rigorous as courses offered on the sponsoring college campus. As the sole national accrediting body for concurrent enrollment partnerships, NACEP helps these programs adhere to the highest standards so students experience a seamless transition to college and teachers benefit from meaningful, ongoing professional development." For courses offered off-campus, MMCC uses the [NACEP standards](#) to ensure that courses offered at the high schools are the same as those offered on-campus. The standards also ensure that students enrolled in these courses are held to the same standards of achievement as those on-campus, and instructors meet the same academic requirements for faculty and instructors teaching at MMCC. As an example of faculty evaluation through NACEP accreditation, courses offered off-campus are evaluated the first semester an instructor teaches, as well as every-other-year thereafter.

Awarding prior learning and transfer credits (4.A.2, 4.A.3)

Students seeking non-traditional credit must complete the [Non-Traditional Credit Application](#) and return it with supporting documentation to the Registrar. The Registrar reviews the application and forwards all materials to the appropriate academic department for further evaluation. If the program faculty approve the application, they forward it to the appropriate Academic Dean for final evaluation. If the Dean approves, he/she forwards the application back to the Registrar who notifies the student. If the program faculty do not approve the application, they return it directly to the Registrar who notifies the student. The student must pay \$20 per credit to have it listed on their transcript.

Additionally, the college awards credit via national programs including College Level Examination Program ([CLEP](#)) and Advance Placement ([AP](#)). Cut off scores for awarding credit are set and

reviewed by the appropriate academic program faculty. [MMCC-specific credits by exam](#) are available in a limited number of disciplines. The tests and cut off scores are set and evaluated by the appropriate academic program faculty.

Military credit is also awarded. A **DD214** must be sent to the American Council on Education (ACE) for evaluation. When finished, ACE sends the transcript evaluation to the college. MMCC follows the ACE recommendation and posts credits to the student's MMCC transcript.

MMCC also has articulation agreements with several Michigan high schools. In these cases, MMCC course credit will be granted for successful completion of articulated course(s) at the Tech Center/High School. Successful completion is defined as a minimum grade of "B" (3.0) in the course/s, a requirement noted in each articulation agreement. A high school transcript is required to document grade earned. Some articulation agreements also require the student to successfully complete MMCC proficiency testing or a sequential course before credit will be posted to the MMCC transcript. These requirements would be noted in the articulation agreement on file with the high school/technical center. No tuition or fees will be charged for articulated credits under this agreement. The opportunity to apply for articulated credit will expire in September, two school years after the Center/School course/program is completed. Articulated credits will become part of the total number of credits for program completion at MMCC and will be listed on the student's MMCC transcript by course code and credit hour(s). High school articulated credit is NOT transferable to other institutions from MMCC. No grade will be recorded. At least 15 credits must be completed at MMCC to earn a certificate or degree.

Per the Board of Trustees policy (301.05) Mid Michigan Community College will accept transfer credit from other accredited institutions within certain guidelines:

1. An evaluation will only be done from an official transcript. An official transcript bears the appropriate signatures and seals and is mailed directly to MMCC from the issuing institution. Transcripts not sent directly from an issuing institution will be considered unofficial and will not be evaluated.
2. Credits are transferred for "C" or better courses. Grades from transfer courses are not calculated in the MMCC cumulative grade point average. Transfer credits will be shown on the student's academic record.
3. A minimum of one-half of the student's credits toward a program must be taken at MMCC to be eligible to graduate from MMCC with honors.
4. Students who transfer to MMCC after completing a degree at an accredited institution will be given the following exemptions from MMCC's General Education requirements:
 1. From a Two-Year Institution: Students transferring to MMCC with a two-year degree from an accredited institution will be exempt from 100 Level General Education requirements. 200 Level requirements will be determined in the transcript evaluation process.
 2. From a Four-Year Institution: Students transferring to MMCC with a four-year degree from an accredited institution will be exempt from both the 100 and the 200 Level General Education requirements.
5. Once an official transcript is received from a regionally-accredited college or university, the Registrar compares course descriptions and/or learning outcomes of existing MMCC courses to the transfer course in question. Credit is awarded if appropriate. If there is a question of how closely the course matches MMCC outcomes, the Registrar forwards on to the appropriate academic faculty for evaluation.

Selecting, implementing and maintaining specialized accreditation(s) (4.A.5)

Many occupational and technical programs maintain specialized accreditation status with external accreditation bodies, primarily in the Health Sciences and Occupational areas. Accredited programs include: Radiography, Physical Therapist Assistant, Pharmacy Technician, Magnetic Resonance Imaging, Medical Assistant, Automotive, and Concurrent Enrollment. While not accredited, MMCC's Welding program meets the SENSE (Schools Excelling through National Skills Education) certification guidelines. All occupational and technical programs maintain an advisory committee to provide feedback to the program on the changes and trends in business and industry. Occupational programs also participate in the Program Review of Occupational Education (PROE) as required by the State of Michigan. The college encourages faculty to participate in state and national conferences as a means of staying current with developments in their subject area. Currently, the Registrar lists all accreditation bodies on the back of transcripts and in the College Catalog.

Assessing the level of outcomes attainment by graduates at all levels (3.A.2, 4.A.6)

Like many institutions, MMCC has had difficulty assessing outcomes data through graduate surveys. Because of these obstacles, the college is beginning to transition toward more standard processes. Beginning in 2015, the college instituted a series of degree pathways that overlay our existing degrees. Utilizing the [Degree Qualifications Profile](#) as a framework, each pathway was reviewed to ensure that in the totality, the courses contained in these pathways meet all five of the DQP proficiencies (Specialized Knowledge, Broad and Integrative Knowledge, Intellectual Skills, Applied and Collaborative Learning, and Civic and Global Learning).

As discussed earlier, all course syllabi were reviewed by the Assessment Committee in fall of 2016 and winter of 2017 to ensure learning outcomes were tied back to the DQP framework. Beginning in the fall of 2017, the Assessment Committee began leading a project to assign DQP proficiencies to course assignments in Moodle (MMCC's Learning Management Software). This will allow for a much more standardized evaluation of the learning outcomes of students throughout their degree program.

In addition to the above, many programs have national and/or state certification exams that the college uses as measures of outcome attainment.

Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess program rigor across all modalities

MMCC maintains academic rigor across modalities, locations, and faculty through its assessment process, and the selection of instruments and methodologies for these processes was detailed in 1P1 and 1P2. As previously noted, all sections of a particular course have common course master proficiencies. In the process of new program development, faculty identify proficiencies and determine the instrument and method for assessing student achievement of those outcomes. Furthermore, as part of the annual Academic Program Review Process, programs are encouraged to incorporate multiple measures to be more certain that the program proficiencies are actually being attained. Thus, it is the college's assessment of proficiencies (described in 1P1 and 1P2), coupled with faculty conversations during the annual program review meetings, which ensure that academic rigor is consistently upheld.

1R4: RESULTS

Summary results of assessments

Since the last Systems Portfolio submission (November 2012), specialized accreditation bodies have

conducted site visits and approved all Health Sciences programs. Further, National Alliance of concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP) accreditation was granted in May 2017. The Nursing program is in the application process for the Commission for Nursing Education Accreditation.

Health Sciences Program Accreditations

Program	Accreditation Body	Next Site Visit
Magnetic Resonance Imaging	Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology	February 2018
Medical Assistant	Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs	2024
Nursing	Commission for Nursing Education Accreditation	October 2018 (Tentative)
Pharmacy Technician	American Society of Health-System Pharmacists	2018
Physical Therapist Assistant	Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education	2024
Radiography	Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology	June 2023

- Data for determining program quality comes from [licensure and certification exam pass rates](#) from the following sample of programs:
 - Nursing (population size:)
 - Radiography (population size: 2012 - 18; 2013 - 19; 2014 - 11; 2015 - 14; 2016 - 17)
 - Physical Therapist Assistant (population size: 2011 -17; 2013 - 14; 2015 - 19)
 - Certified Medical Assistant (population size: 2012 - 16; 2013 - 15; 2014 - 19; 2015 - 16; 2016 - 11)
 - Drafting/CAD (population size: 2013 - 15; 2014 - 12; 2015 - 13; 2016 - 17; 2017 - 4)
 - Heating, Refrigeration & Air Conditioning (population size: 2012 - 21; 2013 - 17; 2014 - 15; 2015 - 13; 2016 - 15)
 - Computer Information Systems
 - Networking Fundamentals (24 students)
 - Security Fundamentals (17 students)
- With relation to academic outreach, the Off-Campus Program assesses [student progression, persistence, retention and completion rates](#), and uses these metrics in assessing the overall quality of its programming.
- [Grade attainment comparison of the off-campus program courses with that of on-campus offering](#) are tracked on an annual basis and data is provided in the College’s Academic Outreach Annual Review.
- The college also monitors [grade attainment from the various delivery modes](#) as a check on consistent quality regardless of delivery method.
- Program enrollment and student feedback are additional metrics used to determine programming quality at MMCC. The college surveys concurrent enrollment students at both [one year out](#) and [four year out](#) points.

Interpretation of results and insights gained

Comparing Delivery Modes: The percentage of students who attained a “C” or better, on average, in

their online courses has remained consistent at about 86 percent. Students who take dual enrolled courses online now have comparable success rates to those who take courses on-ground or off-campus, and in some cases have demonstrated that they actually perform better. With the exception of fall 2014, on-ground students experienced lower success rates than those who took courses online.

It can be noted that nearly all instructional delivery types experience a drop in success rates from fall semester to the winter semester. Students enrolled in off-campus courses in fall 2012 experienced an 86 percent success rate, while students who took courses off-campus in the fall 2016 experienced a 91 percent success rate. These success rates in the 85-95% range have remained consistent over time.

Progression, Persistence, Retention and Completion: 16 percent of dual enrolled students are completing within three years of first dual enrolling. Completion rates for dual students include those who have completed a certificate, degree, or transferred to another institution of any type. Research from the Community College Research Center indicate that dual enrollment student completion rate for any award is 46% nationally and 47% in Michigan. However, this is based on a six-year window. Efforts are underway to determine whether dual enrolled students complete at a higher rate using a six-year completion window.

Off-Campus Program Surveys: Students have reported that their concurrent enrollment course was at least as challenging as the courses they are enrolled in at their current college or university.

Students also commented that their experience taking concurrent enrollment courses were overall very positive and nearly all courses have transferred to presently attending four-year universities and have counted toward their pursued degree.

Overall, MMCC's Off-Campus Program and initiatives toward academic outreach appear to be positive. Students are progressing, persisting, and completing at rates that are as high or higher than the regular MMCC student population. Students in the Off-Campus Program are also attaining C's or better at higher rates than the regular population, are achieving higher overall GPAs than regular students, and the students appear to be quite satisfied with their experience in the Off-Campus Program as illustrated in the one-year out and four-years out of high school survey results.

Licensure and certification exam pass rates: As discussed in 1R1 and 1R2, the licensure and certification pass rates are indicators showing our academic programs meet the needs of two key stakeholder groups (employers and transfer institutions) because they are passing at a rate consistent with national averages and are performing comparably with university partner students.

114: IMPROVEMENT

Academic Administration has developed a Program Development Process in which new program ideas are reviewed. A component of this process is reviewing HLC, specialized accreditation, and Federal/State Standards for approval. This allows for the potential for curricular alignment at the onset of program creation, as opposed to attempting to align program outcomes with accreditation standards after program creation.

A Specialized Accreditation committee will be created to review selection, implementation, and maintenance of new and current programs. This committee will be comprised of administrators and faculty who have experience in specialized accreditation. This will allow for a more formal process to explore and pursue accreditations consistent with budgetary limitations.

Sources

- 2012-13 Dual PPRC
- AP TEST
- College Level Examination Program
- Concurrent enroll survey 1 yr out
- Concurrent enroll survey 4 yr out
- Degree Qualifications Profile
- Dual Grade by delivery mode
- Dual Grade Comparisons
- Licensure pass rates
- MMCC Test Options
- NACEP_Accreditation_Guide
- Non-Traditional_Credit_Non-Traditional_Application_9-27-10_interactive_and_savable
- Revised Quality Rubric - TEMPLATE - Sheet1

1.5 - Academic Integrity

Academic Integrity focuses on ethical practices while pursuing knowledge. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 2.D. and 2.E. in this section.

1P5: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for supporting ethical scholarly practices by students and faculty. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Ensuring freedom of expression and the integrity of research and scholarly practice (2.D., 2.E.1, 2.E.3)
- Ensuring ethical learning and research practices of students (2.E.2, 2.E.3)
- Ensuring ethical teaching and research practices of faculty (2.E.2, 2.E.3)
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to evaluate the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of supporting academic integrity

1R5: RESULTS

What are the results for determining the quality of academic integrity? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P5. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures where appropriate)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

1I5: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 1R5, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

1P5: PROCESSES

Ensuring freedom of expression and the integrity of research and scholarly practice (2.D., 2.E.1, 2.E.3)

The college is committed to freedom of expression and the integrity of research and scholarly practice. This is evident through the master agreement between the Board of Trustees of Mid Michigan Community College and the [Faculty Senate](#). This agreement (p. 63 ff.) states that the instructor shall have the freedom to report the truth in the discipline of his/her professional expertise as he/she sees it both in the classroom and in reports of research activities. Additionally, the

agreement states that there shall be no artificial restraints which would impair the instructor's ability to present his/her subject matter in this context providing it is consistent with the institution's adopted course outcome objectives. The Board and Faculty Senate recognize the importance of inspiring students to develop respect for truth, individual freedom, social responsibility, democratic tradition, as well as the appreciation of individual personality. Therefore, the Board and the Faculty Senate are pledged to work together to create and preserve an atmosphere which is free from censorship and artificial restraint, and in which academic freedom for faculty is guaranteed. No special limitation shall be placed upon study and investigation of facts and ideas concerning humankind, the physical and biological world, or other branches of learning within curriculum guidelines.

The college supports students, faculty, and staff in the development and application of ethical practices related to research in the following ways:

- Copyright research and guidance is provided to faculty, staff, and students by the library staff
- Video tutorials are provided to demonstrate new databases or refreshers on existing resources
- Library staff can assist faculty in researching suspected cases of plagiarism
- In class instruction is provided by library staff on the research use of electronic databases and proper citation styles

Ensuring ethical learning and research practices of students (2.E.2, 2.E.3)

The Student Code of Conduct communicates to students the Academic Dishonesty Policy and Procedure while sharing a definition of plagiarism and cheating. The Student Code of Conduct is available to students on the MMCC website as well as the [College Catalog](#) (p. 168), and a reference is included on all course syllabi per the [faculty master agreement](#) (page 14). Students are informed about the location of the Student Code of Conduct as well as its contents in mandatory new student orientation. The faculty master agreement requires all course syllabi to include a statement on Academic Dishonesty and a link to the college catalog section on Academic Dishonesty. This statement must include the consequences of violating the course and/or college policy, and specifically, that the behavior will be recorded by the college.

Faculty are notified through presentations at pre-semester meetings and/or faculty professional development days (occur once each semester) of the policies and procedures for reporting plagiarism and academic dishonesty. Each student bears the ultimate responsibility for being aware of college policy, regardless of whether or not the faculty member has provided this information verbally. Since it is the faculty member's responsibility to assign grades, it is also his/her prerogative to determine what constitutes cheating or plagiarism in his/her classes. The first instance a student engages in plagiarism or academic dishonesty, the individual faculty member will determine the consequences consistent with their syllabi. Any further instances of plagiarism or academic dishonesty will additionally be subject to consequences as described by the Student Code of Conduct.

Ensuring ethical teaching and research practices of faculty (2.E.2, 2.E.3)

While MMCC is not a research institution by mission, the college supports research and inquiry by faculty particularly in the scholarship of teaching and learning. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) provides oversight to ensure the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by faculty, staff, and students. and that such research meets all federal guidelines. (Criterion 2.E.1) The IRB's Guidelines for the Protection and Ethical Treatment of Adult Human Subjects in Research are based on the American Psychological Association's guidelines: "[The Institutional Review Board \(IRB\): A College Planning Guide](#)" (2009). The IRB documents guide faculty and staff in the protection and ethical treatment of human subjects in research.

Selecting the tools/methods/instruments used to evaluate the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of supporting academic integrity:

In 2013, MMCC implemented the Maxient software to manage documentation of behaviors covered under the Student Code of Conduct. This software allows both Academic Services and Student Services to collect and track data regarding the number of incidences of academic dishonesty, severity of the incident, as well as the disposition of the incident. In issues of academic dishonesty, faculty report instances through the Maxient system, which is then forwarded to the appropriate Academic Dean. The Dean is responsible for following up with the student and updating the Maxient case file.

1R5: RESULTS

Summary results of measures

As noted above, the college relies on Maxient to track and document [student conduct issues](#), including matters pertaining to academic integrity. The results include both student conduct issues and specific instances of academic dishonesty.

The college also tracks the number of trainings presented to students and faculty that include the topics of academic honesty, use of electronic research databases, and proper citation styles:

Semester	Number of Classes
Fall 2016	23 classes
Winter 2017	22 classes
Fall 2017	26 classes

In addition, the college has video tutorials available demonstrating proper documentation and citation styles to help students avoid academic dishonesty. Usage of these video tutorials is tracked. Over the past three years, there have been **696** desktop computer views of these tutorial, and **212** views on mobile devices. Sample titles of the tutorials are:

- How to search for Academic Articles
- Documentation & Citation Styles
- Research Tips
- How to Find Books in our Collection
- How to Format a Hanging Indent

Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Much of the national data on academic dishonesty centers on incidents of undetected instances based on student self-report data. Because of this lack of national trend data on reported instances, the college instead seeks to reduce the number of reported cases to less than the three-year running average (approximately 24). However, given that Maxient has only been up and running for three years, the data pool is limited.

1I5: IMPROVEMENT

An Institutional Review Board was created in 2016. While the institution is not necessarily one that

conducts research regularly, there are several regional universities near by. One in particular has initiated a Community College Leadership program, which has led to an increasing number of research requests. Still, an opportunity exists to better communicate the necessity of going through the IRB as opposed to handling the requests informally.

Sources

- Incidents of student conduct by type
- irb-college-guide

2 - Meeting Student and Other Key Stakeholder Needs

2.1 - Current and Prospective Student Need

Current and Prospective Student Need focuses on determining, understanding and meeting the academic and non-academic needs of current and prospective students. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.C. and 3.D in this section.

2P1: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for serving the academic and non-academic needs of current and prospective students. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Identifying underprepared and at-risk students, and determining their academic support needs (3.D.1)
- Deploying academic support services to help students select and successfully complete courses and programs (3.D.2)
- Ensuring faculty are available for student inquiry (3.C.5)
- Determining and addressing the learning support needs (tutoring, advising, library, laboratories, research, etc.) of students and faculty (3.D.1, 3.D.3, 3.D.4, 3.D.5)
- Determining new student groups to target for educational offerings and services
- Meeting changing student needs
- Identifying and supporting student subgroups with distinctive needs (e.g., seniors, commuters, distance learners, military veterans) (3.D.1)
- Deploying non-academic support services to help students be successful (3.D.2)
- Ensuring staff members who provide non-academic student support services are qualified, trained and supported (3.C.6)
- Communicating the availability of non-academic support services (3.D.2)
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess student needs
- Assessing the degree to which student needs are met

2R1: RESULTS

What are the results for determining if current and prospective students' needs are being met? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 2P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

2I1: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 2R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the

next one to three years?

Responses

2P1: PROCESSES

Identifying underprepared & at-risk student, and determining their academic support needs (3.D.1)

MMCC is an open-enrollment institution. As such, the college receives a significant number of students underprepared for college-level academic work. MMCC designed and implemented a multiple measures placement assessment instrument that considers a student's SAT score, high school transcript, a Math placement score, and for writing, a guided self-placement quiz. The college administers this assessment to each new or transfer student. This multiple measures placement instrument assists staff in determining incoming student academic needs.

Current student need identification occurs through an online Referral Management System (RMS).

Faculty use the RMS to identify students they believe need additional support. The RMS alert goes to the Office of Student Oversight, who then contacts the referred students to assess their needs and directs them to appropriate support services. In addition, current students self-identify their needs through an online tutoring system.

The college provides a range of support services responsive to the learning support needs of students, which are coordinated through the offices of the Executive Dean of Student Services and the Vice President for Student and Community Relations. Some of those services are accessible to all students while other services target under-prepared, at-risk students, career, or first-generation transfer students.

Deploying academic support services to help students select and successfully complete courses and programs (3.D.2)

MMCC provides multiple opportunities and pathways for students to select programs of study. Prospective students have opportunities to interact with college recruiters to learn about programs of study during events at high schools, alternative education centers, technical centers, adult education sites, and local business and industry sites. MMCC hosts an annual career day on campus for local middle school students. During this event, recruiters and faculty begin the communication process with prospective students regarding their area of interest and provide them with information about program requirements, salary expectations, types of careers available, and future opportunities. Current MMCC students find assistance in the Career Services Office, which assists students with determining a career path. This team can help students decide on a program of study via informational interview assistance, career related workshops, and career exploration tools.

MMCC faculty establish prerequisites and co-requisites for all courses, along with guided pathways that layout course sequences for each program. These together with the results from placement assessments, assist students and academic advisors to select appropriate courses.

In addition to the identification of student support needs through the course placements and RMS alerts from faculty, the college communicates the availability of support services during mandatory new student orientations, and through the Mid Mentors. The college assigns each student a Mid

Mentor at the time of application, and this mentor serves as a single point of contact during the entire time the student remains at the college. Mid Mentors serve as a conduit between MMCC students and appropriate services.

Ensuring faculty are available for student inquiry (3.C.5)

Per the Master Agreement, faculty are required to hold a minimum of five office hours per week, and must have an on-campus presence four days per week. If they teach online courses, some of these hours can be fulfilled via electronic communications. Faculty communicate office hours on their course syllabi and post office hours outside their office doors, as well as on the college's Learning Management System (LMS). Each course section has an electronic course shell built in the LMS and this course shell facilitates student/instructor communications, even in traditional face-to-face courses.

Determining and addressing the learning support needs (tutoring, advising, library, laboratories, research, etc.) of students and faculty (3.D.1, 3.D.3, 3.D.4, 3.D.5)

Learning support needs of MMCC students are identified in the following ways:

1. Students new to MMCC are considered in need of initial support with the transition, so academic advising (through the first 12 completed credits) and new student orientation are required for degree- or certificate-seeking students.
2. Multiple measure instruments are used to identify academic deficiencies in reading, writing, and mathematics.
3. Students seeking accommodations due to a disability, must provide written verification of their disability from a licensed professional so appropriate accommodations can be made. Accommodations are arranged individually on an as-needed basis. The nature and extent of accommodations are based on the specific disability and are determined by the Office of Disability Services.
4. Students may self-identify and request services.
5. Faculty, staff, and outside professionals may refer students.
6. A Referral Management Program exists to facilitate the faculty referral process.

Learning support needs are addressed through services included in the [Support Services Table](#).

Determining new student groups to target for educational offerings and services

Determining new student groups occurs primarily through the college's Enrollment Management Committee. The committee's membership includes representatives from Marketing, Admissions, Student Services, Academic Services, and both full-time and adjunct faculty. The committee meets twice each month, generates enrollment projections, and sets enrollment targets for the following year. This process begins by utilizing multiple formulas to determine enrollment projections for various demographic groups. After projections are set, the committee prioritizes focus areas for new student groups to target. An example can be seen in the [2017-18 projections table](#). The college also receives requests to provide educational services to new geographic areas or school districts. The Partnership Committee handles such requests and provides relevant information on the request to the Enrollment Management Committee.

In addition to the Enrollment Management committee, the academic deans developed a process for the identification of potential new academic programs. The process is a three-pronged approach whereby each fall the current programs are reviewed using a rubric that was developed by the academic deans.

Additionally, each fall the deans will utilize the rubric in evaluating potential new programs. After coming up with a list of potential targets, the deans meet as a group and identify the top targets for the entire division, which then leads to discussions concerning curricular development, new hiring, and facility considerations.

Meeting changing student needs

As a college we value data, and use the Ruffalo Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory to determine our students needs and desires. Our choices of where our resources should be allocated is based, in part, upon this data. The following are examples of meeting changing student needs based on such data examination.

- MMCC has moved from an informal, individual student orientation practice to a formalized, required, group orientation experience. The goal is to build better awareness of all institutional resources in a consistent manner while also building peer relationships from the onset.
- To meet the needs of a growing number of international students (and better support students that may be viewed as at risk), MMCC developed the LUCES program. It is a set of courses that begin a week later, use a sheltered course content instructional delivery method, and are taught by specially prepared faculty. So far this project has shown great success in retention and learning outcomes.
- To aid dual enrolled students, the college trained our staff on their differing needs, adapted college semester start and end dates to better suit the off-site schools' schedules, created a dedicated academic advisor for dual students, and added web and hybrid course options.
- In 2017-2018, MMCC plans to offer 75 sections of college courses at area high schools, including 29 different courses. MMCC currently hosts classes at 9 different high school locations within the mid-Michigan region.
- The Off Campus Program is another way that MMCC provides college-level instruction and credit-bearing courses outside the walls of the college. These Off Campus courses provide students an opportunity to earn college-level credits in courses that transfer to universities. Typically these courses involve dual enrolled students and are offered at a high school location which makes them more accessible to high school students. The overall goal for MMCC is to provide a cohesive program for transitioning high school students into successful college students, by providing relevant college-level instructional programs integrated with success strategies for college. This program focuses on the development of student knowledge and academic skills, as well as assisting students with developing the knowledge and skill sets for successfully navigating the institutional aspects of attending college: i.e., dealing with financial aid forms, making and keeping appointments with advisors, how to seek out help from library and other staff.
- Because student interests change over time, MMCC strongly encourages and supports the creation of new student groups. We have both a dedicated administrative staff member and volunteer faculty serving as student group advisors helping these groups establish themselves, pursue their interests, and reach their goals.
- Some students have financial difficulty driving to campus frequently and others desire/need a bridge between web courses and traditional face to face courses. For that reason (and others), MMCC has expanded their hybrid course offerings. These courses combine the convenience of fully online courses with the benefits of face-to-face contact with an instructor.
- To continue flexibly adapting to student needs, MMCC conducts division wide course scheduling. This method provides a high level overview of how and when each department's courses intersect with other department's courses. Additionally, it facilitates discussion regarding which times and classes work best, and to avoid stacking required classes at the same meeting times. In short, it provides a view from the student perspective, which allows insights

on how to increase flexibility and options for students.

The information and data referenced above is provided to the various committees in the college's shared governance structure according to their respective charters and charges. Recommendations on specific actions or plans flow from these committees back to the College Council, which is the body that provides counsel to the Senior Staff and President. Use of this shared governance structure provides for greater coordination and alignment of efforts across divisions.

Identifying and supporting student subgroups with distinctive needs (i.e. seniors, commuters, distance learners, military veterans) (3.D.1)

Data identifying student subgroups originates from the admissions process in which students self-identify the information. Advisors, Mid Mentors, and registration staff verify and correct the information when needed. Once identified, student subgroups receive support with targeted resources delivered through a designated college office. For example, the college has an Office of Veterans Services & Support, which follows the Michigan Veterans Affairs Agency (MVAA) standards for student veteran programming. MMCC's Veteran Services Representative and Vice President of Student and Community Relations work closely to program and carry-out operations. In addition to hiring a Veteran Services Representative, MMCC has provided space for Veteran Services and created a Student Veterans Club on both campus locations.

Students may self-report a special need that may be eligible for an accommodation. In such cases, the student must provide written verification of the disability from a licensed professional before accommodations can be made. Accommodations are arranged individually on an as-needed basis. The nature and extent of accommodations are based on the specific disability and are determined by the Office of Disability Services. The services received may vary from course to course, instructor to instructor, and semester to semester. Possible accommodations include: Readers, Note Takers, Interpreters, Books on Tape, Alternative Testing, and Assistance with Accessibility.

Students identified as first generation college students, low income, or disabled, are eligible for the TRiO - Student Support Services (SSS) program. These students are served in various capacities to help them overcome barriers to academic success and academic program completion. Tutoring, financial literacy information, study skills, academic advising, career assessment, resume/cover letter/interview and job seeking skills workshops, assistance applying to university, exposure to universities for transfer, personal counseling, exposure to cultural events and activities, museums, concerts, and travel outside of their local area are among the many ways TRiO - SSS participants may be served.

Deploying non-academic support services to help students be successful (3.D.2)

Specific support services, including Library Learning Services, placement testing, tutoring, new student orientation, and the Mid Mentors were detailed previously in the 2P1 narrative. Another area of support is Academic Advising. Academic Advisors are assigned certain programs of study so they have an in-depth knowledge of the programs for which they advise. Students are required to meet with their Academic Advisor until they have completed 12 college credits. This process ensures students receive extra support as they begin their collegiate journey. Support services offered to MMCC students are highlighted in the [Support Services Table](#).

MMCC realizes there are many non-academic factors that can become barriers to student learning. To address such matters, the college partners with community agencies to provide resources to students which address these matters. MMCC includes a [Community Assistance Resources](#) page on the

college's website which lists the services available, the agencies which provide the services, and contact information. Students can simply dial 211 to get an up to date list of services, and be directed to the services relevant to their particular need.

Ensuring staff members who provide non-academic student support services are qualified, trained, and supported (3.C.6)

MMCC is committed to ensuring that staff members who provide non-academic student support services are qualified, trained and supported. Qualifications, credentials, and required licensures or certifications are all reviewed for currency at the time of posting vacant positions to ensure the position is requiring the appropriate qualifications. During the selection process, the hiring committee has the responsibility to verify the position candidate holds the appropriate credentials for the position. Professional development is available to all staff, and the evaluation process is a point where supervisors discuss professional development needs with employees. The college has a Center for Learning & Leadership which provides training opportunities and coordinates online training resources for all employees. Section 3.1 provides additional information regarding employee onboarding and section 3.3 provides additional information on staff professional development. Both of these processes are designed to provide employees with the support and training needed to fulfill their roles. Each department also has a travel budget to support staff travel to conferences and workshops for professional development.

Communicating the availability of non-academic support services (3.D.2)

The process of communicating the availability of non-academic support services begins at the new student orientation required of all new students. Information on non-instructional support services is compiled in a binder which is provided to students at orientation. Additionally, a special Student Success Workshop is presented for students at orientation where Mid Mentors tie traits of a successful student to non-academic support services.

After orientation, Mid Mentors follow up with students at regularly scheduled intervals to inform them of time-specific support services. Additionally, information on all support services are included on the college website, and information is sent out in The Laker Wave, a monthly newsletter for students.

Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess student needs

Results from the Ruffalo Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) play a key role in selecting tools, methods, and instruments to assess student needs. This survey tool provides not only the level of satisfaction students have with particular items, but also indicates how important particular items are to students. Thus, various committees can use the results to determine just which items are of most importance to students and their level of satisfaction. This informs the committee of the items needing attention. The committee then researches what tools may be available. If a tool is supplied by an external vendor, the appropriate department or committee would recommend an RFP be circulated and top vendors be invited to campus to demonstrate their tool. The committee would develop a rubric for evaluating the presentations/product. There are instances when a committee may determine we can develop a better tool using internal staff and resources. An example of such a decision was the task force that examined the validity of using Accuplacer for determining course placement of incoming students. To ensure the college was accurately placing students, the college undertook a large regression analysis to determine what variables best predict student success. Based on this analysis, MMCC designed and implemented a multiple measures placement assessment instrument that considers a student's SAT score, high school transcript, a Math placement score, and for writing,

a guided self-placement quiz. The college administers this assessment to each new or transfer student. This multiple measures placement instrument assists staff in determining incoming student academic needs.

2R1: RESULTS

Summary results of measures and Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Results for determining if students' needs are being met come primarily from the Ruffalo Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory. This SSI is administered each academic year to a representative sampling of our student body--typically 900-950 students are in the sample population. Results below indicate the effectiveness of:

- [Academic Support Services](#)
- [Advising/Counseling Services](#)
- [Services meeting diverse student needs:](#)
- [HelpDesk Usage Data](#)
- [Lynda.com usage Data](#)

Interpretation of results and insights gained

MMCC is at or above the national levels on all items except for Library staff helpfulness, which needs to be investigated for improvement. In terms of Advising, MMCC exceeds the national level on all items except for the counseling staff caring about students as individuals, but this is not a significant difference.

For meeting diverse needs, MMCC is below the national levels on six of the nine items. The two that particularly need investigation for improvements are the commitment to students with disabilities and the Veterans program.

HelpDesk Usage Data provides insight into the volume of assistance provided to both students and staff by the various service departments of the college. The significant increases in usage indicates students and staff are accepting this method of delivering support. However, a survey should be administered to determine the level of satisfaction with this system.

Lynda.com usage data provides insight into the volume of assistance provided to students and staff through the online training videos that cover a wide range of topics and software. Measured in terms of certificates completed, usage has increased at a rate of almost 140% over the last four years, and there have been significant numbers of new users each year. Both these measures suggest this is a helpful support tool.

2I1: IMPROVEMENT

While the use of national satisfaction instruments provide benchmark data, there needs to be added some local instruments to determine just what specific actions may be needed to improve some of the support services such as those of the Library and for Veterans. Additionally, the Library functions have been separated from the Testing functions. Breaking one position into two will hopefully allow both areas to focus more on student needs.

Sources

- Academic Support Services
- Advising
- Community Assistance Resources
- Diverse student needs
- Enrollment targets 2017-2018
- HelpDesk usage stats
- Learning and non-academic support services
- Online training usage

2.2 - Retention, Persistence, and Completion

Retention, Persistence and Completion focuses on the approach to collecting, analyzing and distributing data on retention, persistence and completion to stakeholders for decision making. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 4.C. in this section.

2P2: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for collecting, analyzing and distributing data on retention, persistence and completion. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Collecting student retention, persistence and completion data (4.C.2, 4.C.4)
- Determining targets for student retention, persistence and completion (4.C.1, 4.C.4)
- Analyzing information on student retention, persistence and completion
- Meeting targets for retention, persistence and completion (4.C.1)
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess retention, persistence and completion (4.C.4)

2R2: RESULTS

What are the results for student retention, persistence and completion? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 2P2. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

2I2: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 2R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years? (4.C.3)

Responses

2P2: PROCESSES

Collecting student retention, persistence and completion data (4.C.2, 4.C.4)

While the college has always placed a high value on retention, persistence, and completion (RPC), faculty, staff, and administration have developed an intense focus in this area in our latest [strategic plan](#) (see pp. 5-10 but especially 8-10) . Retention and completion rates are not as high as they should be on a national, statewide, or college level, and MMCC considers it our responsibility to improve the processes that will increase those rates.

A first step toward understanding the issues related to RPC rates is having good data. Based on feedback from the last Systems Portfolio, the college created an institutional research (IR) position to collect, verify, distribute, and analyze data about various issues. Chief among these issues were RPC rates and data. This new focus was important as the college increased efforts to collect and understand student retention, persistence and completion data (4.C.2, 4.C.4). Doubts about institutional data, and specifically, retention data prevailed at MMCC. Because the college reports to a number of state and federal agencies, and grant sources, often with different reporting requirements, the college had multiple ways of collecting and reporting retention data. To address this data issue, the IR Office developed a process to create Official Term Data (OTD). At consistent, specified dates each semester, IR and the information technology department (IT) pull data from the student information system (Colleague). Once pulled, the data is cleaned, verified, and compiled based on a set of consistent processes that ensures data accuracy. Once that process is completed, the OTD is the official data. To develop a useful set of data, this process was completed for the previous four years, and is carried out in an ongoing manner each semester.

The value of OTD is that the college now has a consistent set of data that provides a snapshot in time. Before OTD, retention reports were based on historical data that was “live” and, therefore, changing, which meant that the data was not consistent and the reports were not repeatable. Now with a standard data source, reports more accurately and consistently capture the college's RPC rates (4.C.2, 4.C.4).

Determining targets for student retention, persistence and completion (4.C.1, 4.C.4)

Sharing RPC rates and giving thoughtful consideration to rates of peer institutions is an important part of determining targets for student retention, persistence and completion (4.C.1, 4.C.4). While there are no perfect comparisons, data from other institutions is informative. The college also looks at its own data during its process to set targets for our persistence and retention rates. Each January, a sub group of the Enrollment Management committee meets to look at college and environmental data in an effort to forecast enrollment for the coming academic year. This forecast is used for budgeting purposes and to set targets for enrollment. During this process, the sub group examines a number of data sets including historic data for both persistence and retention. Based on trends at the college, new initiatives, and state and national information, the sub group sets targets for persistence and retention that are used in the forecast (4.C.1, 4.C.4). Additionally, the college's Enrollment Management Committee reviews the RPC rates of the college on at least an annual basis while it is setting ambitious, aspirational enrollment goals, as opposed to the budgeting targets mentioned above.

In 2013, the college established a Retention Committee which was housed under the college-wide Enrollment Management Committee. The Retention Committee was tasked with exploring issues relevant to retention and developing a plan to improve the RPC rates. This committee was made up of staff, faculty and administrators. The first task of the group was to identify factors involved in student attrition. Through the use of a Fish Bone exercise, the committee identified several factors that may be impacting student retention. [A survey was developed](#) and sent to all students registered for classes in fall of 2013. This survey asked students to identify which of the factors identified by the committee they felt were most impacting student retention. An open-ended question was included in the survey to identify other factors that the committee may have missed. Committee members then analyzed the data and arranged for focus groups to dig deeper into students' qualitative responses. From this, a plan was created that identified targets and endeavors for assistance.

Analyzing information on student retention, persistence and completion

Due to some personnel changes, the Retention Committee reformulated into a new Retention and Completion committee. The committee chairperson worked to make this committee more expansive and representative in an effort to increase buy-in across the college. At this point, the new committee has formed four subcommittees: Faculty Issues, Data, Student Issues, Student Interventions. Each of these subcommittees meets regularly to discuss barriers and interventions utilizing a Current State/Future State exercise. Each group requests data from the Data subcommittee to help determine issues and provide assessment data for any interventions developed.

In fall 2017, the four sub-committees presented their reports to the full Retention Committee. A smaller work group from each sub-committee has been identified and will review data presented from each sub-committee and together will develop a revised retention plan.

Meeting targets for retention, persistence and completion (4.C.1)

A number of the organizations to which the college reports data also have identified targets (state and federal agencies, and federal grants). As a matter of standard process, MMCC uses those targets to establish goals and determine whether the goal was achieved when the data is submitted annually. (4.C.1, 4.C.4)

MMCC shares data on RPC rates, and various other topics, with the entire college by way of monthly [Data Discussions](#). These presentations are open to anyone at the college and the presentations are shared on the IR website for everyone to access. The college's RPC rates have been featured at these meetings. In addition to college-wide meetings, the Enrollment Management Committee reviews our RPC rates on an annual basis to see if we met our goals. (4.C.1) Other departments and shared governance committees (like College Council) also review the targets and our performance against those targets. The college's RPC rates can be found on the institution's IR website, which allows various departments to access the information as needed.

Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess retention, persistence and completion (4.C.4)

The college reports on RPC rates to a number of external agencies: the State of Michigan, to IPEDS, to the Voluntary Framework of Accountability, and others. These reporting requirements serve as tools, methods and instruments to assess retention, persistence and completion (4.C.4). Submitting data to independent organizations also provides access to the data collected from other higher education institutions, which serves as a benchmarking tool. This comparative data enhances our ability to analyze and understand our performance on helping students succeed. Beyond the benefit of benchmarking, the process of submitting these annual figures provides an opportunity to self-check our data and to identify errors in reporting. This self-check is built into our process for reporting data. For example, if our RPC reports say that we have a 75% retention rate, but our historical trend is just 51%, then there are likely errors in the data or in the process for running the report.

This data is used by various committees that are responsible for strategic objectives relating to enhancing student success.

2R2: RESULTS

Summary results of measures and Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

MMCC results for retention, persistence and completion are monitored and tracked in the following

reports:

- [Annual Instructional Report](#) (pp. 7-10) -- Each year the VP of Academic Services provides a comprehensive report to the Board of Trustees on key metrics for the academic division, and this includes data on retention, persistence, transfer, and completion.
- The [State of Michigan tracks the transfer and completion rates](#) of the community colleges. The State defines these success rates as students who earned an associate degree and those who successfully transfer to a university as a degree-seeking student as well as degree -seeking students who attain a bachelor degree or a certificate.
- The Voluntary Framework of Accountability (VFA) provides a [Six-Year Outcome Data](#) that compares MMCC with all of the VFA colleges on transfer and awards earned within a six-year period. It also includes similar IPEDS data.
- [IPEDS Graduation and Transfer Out Rates](#)

Interpretation of results and insights gained

The college has set a goal of an 80% course completion rate (finish the course with a passing grade). For the past four years, the college has exceeded this rate for all but remedial courses in fall 2016. The fall-to-winter progression rate is compared to the State average, and from 2011-2015, MMCC's progression rate has exceeded the State average. MMCC's fall-to-fall retention rate has been on the rise. It is currently at 54% in 2015-16 (IPEDS), which is a bit behind the national average of 60% for our comparable institutions. However, our degree completion rate is low, hovering 10% (IPEDS). Our transfer rate is at 23%, which is close to our comparable institutions (24%). More investigation is needed to determine why students are not finishing degrees at a higher rate, despite comparable course completion and fall-to-winter persistence rates.

2I2: IMPROVEMENT

We recognize that the College has a lot of work to do in order to bring our RPC rates to national averages and to hit our benchmarks. As noted in 2P2, we have made good progress, but there are certainly areas that will benefit from the creation of new or improved processes.

MMCC will continue its commitment to having clean and consistent data through our Official Term Data system. This data will be used to construct dashboards that display our RPC rates in a standard format and allow for wider access and analysis of the data. This will facilitate getting the data and information into the hands of those responsible for the process which have a more direct impact on student success.

Further work on clarifying and communicating data definitions so that everyone at the college has a common understanding of key terms such as retention will facilitate the determination of appropriate targets upon which stakeholders can agree.

To further assist with data collection, warehousing, management, and sharing, the college will invest in a retention management system. This type of system will allow for more individualized and automated student success interventions aimed at proactively addressing student needs before there are persistence or retention issues.

Sources

- 2017 AIRreport (Final)
- Data Discussions
- IPEDS Completion Data
- Mich Colleges' transfer completion rates
- Retention Survey
- VFA six-year outcomes
- Vision2020_Final-May2016

2.3 - Key Stakeholder Needs

Key Stakeholder Needs focuses on determining, understanding and meeting needs of key stakeholder groups, including alumni and community partners.

2P3: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for serving the needs of key external stakeholder groups. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Determining key external stakeholder groups (e.g., alumni, employers, community)
- Determining new stakeholders to target for services or partnership
- Meeting the changing needs of key stakeholders
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess key stakeholder needs
- Assessing the degree to which key stakeholder needs are met

2R3: RESULTS

What are the results for determining if key stakeholder needs are being met? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 2P3. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

2I3: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 2R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

2P3: PROCESSES

Determining key external stakeholder groups

As part of the shared governance structure, MMCC established a college-wide Partnership Committee to identify partnership “gaps,” facilitate new partnership opportunities, and evaluate these opportunities against a rubric that was formed as part of an AQIP Action Project. When a potential opportunity is identified, the Partnership Committee uses [Phase I](#) of the partnership evaluation process (Prospective Partnership Worksheet) to review the opportunity. If the partnership is deemed worth pursuing, the Partnership Committee moves it to [Phase II](#) of the partnership evaluation process (the planning and implementation phase). One year after the partnership has been implemented, it is

assessed using [Phase III](#) (Assessment) of the rubric.

Additionally, the college maintains contact with alumni through the Alumni Network. Feedback from this group provides valuable information regarding external stakeholder needs, since they are now community members and are often involved with local business and industry.

Determining new stakeholders to target for services or partnership

The partnership evaluation process mentioned above is the primary process for determining new stakeholders to target. Potential new partnership opportunities are identified from regular work with advisory boards and other community organizations on the part of college representatives on these groups. In addition, MMCC's Workforce and Economic Division collects and routinely reviews regional labor and economic development data. These feedback mechanisms bring awareness to the college of new partnership opportunities as new businesses move into the region and join these associations and community boards. When potential partners are identified, the Partnership Committee runs them through the partnership evaluation process.

Meeting the changing needs of key stakeholders

The process for meeting changing needs of stakeholders operates primarily through key college contacts being involved as members of community boards and organizations. The attached [Table](#) depicts the key relationships, and college contacts. By attending the regular meeting of these groups, college representatives hear about changing needs directly from the stakeholders represented on these groups. In addition to having this direct contact, employer surveys and employer site visits are conducted. The feedback from the community boards and organizations, along with the survey results, identify gaps in existing programming or the need for new program development.

In addition to addressing changing needs in workforce areas, Academic Services also has established formal processes for gauging needs of stakeholders in terms of MMCC's academic programs. As part of the program development process described previously, MMCC surveys a variety of community members (employers, transfer institutions, MMCC Academic Advisors, etc.) to gather data on programmatic trends. The links are included below.

[New Occupational Program Viability Assessment Tool](#)

[New Transfer Program Viability Assessment Tool](#)

Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess key stakeholder needs

The process for selecting tools, methods, and instruments to assess key stakeholder needs are discussed and selected by the college-wide Partnership Committee. The committee is made up of the following:

- VP for Student and Community Relations
- Off Campus Program Coordinator
- 2 Faculty representatives
- 2 Administrators
- 2 Support Staff
- Subject Matter Experts as Needed.

This committee created the overall three-phase rubric the college uses in determining and evaluating partnerships. Additionally, several tools are utilized within individual departments specific to their

desired outcome (i.e. [workforce development surveys](#), advisory board meetings, Burning Glass, Michigan Hot 50 jobs, US Department of Labor data, and comparison data against similar regional colleges).

Assessing the degree to which key stakeholder needs are met

The process for assessing the degree to which stakeholder needs are met is the same as how the College first identifies the needs: Collecting information from Advisory Committees, direct feedback from stakeholders, and survey responses are the primary mechanisms for determining needs are met.

2R3: RESULTS

Summary results of measures and Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

- [Business survey results](#)
- [Sample Partnership Evaluation](#)
- [Excerpts from Advisory meeting](#) minutes showing stakeholder feedback -- see especially the first entry (6/17) that addresses the short-term welding program. This feedback was translated into a [revised program as seen in this flyer on the welding program](#).

Interpretation of results and insights gained

The survey was distributed to employers in the fall of 2016 with the following response rates:

1. 23% employ fewer than 10 people
2. 60% employ 50-100; 101-250; 250+
3. 90% plan to add employees in the next year

Responses Indicated:

1. Job-specific skills (blueprint reading, Welding, ISO9000, etc.)- Nearly 90% at least "somewhat needed"
2. Workplace skills (attendance, flexibility, customer services, etc.)- Nearly 90% at least "somewhat needed"
3. Critical Thinking (problem solving, decision making, etc.)- Just over 75% at least "somewhat needed"
4. Computer Skills (word processing, spreadsheets, CAD/CAM)- 75% at least "somewhat needed"
5. Personal Characteristics (responsibility, initiative, etc.)- 80% at least "somewhat needed"
6. Manufacturing Skills (shop math, precision instruments, quality control, etc.)- Over 90% at least "somewhat needed"
7. Basic Academic Skills (writing, reading, verbal, etc.)- only 50% at least "somewhat needed"

The results were somewhat surprising, as we expected to see employers place a higher premium on more of the "transferrable skills." Instead, they focused on much more general, yet job-specific skills. This will need to be utilized in future design of short-term and/or non-credit programming.

2I3: IMPROVEMENT

MMCC is in the process of developing a Career Center to connect students and employers. An

outside consultant worked with MMCC to develop basic service areas to address. A Director has been hired and searches are under way for Success Coaches.

Additionally, MMCC has now been named the Apprenticeship standard holder for the Mid Michigan region.

Sources

- Assessing MMCC Partnerships
- Business Survey tool
- Evaluating Existing Partnerships
- Occupational New Program Viability Assessment
- Planning and Implementation Checklist
- Sample Partnership Eval Form
- Table meeting changing needs
- TBS Business Survey Results Summary 11.8.16
- Tech Ed Center Advisory mtg notes
- Transfer - New Program Viability Assessment.docx
- Welding RT Flyer MAY-JUNE 2017

2.4 - Complaint Processes

Complaint Processes focuses on collecting, analyzing and responding to complaints from students or key stakeholder groups.

2P4: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for collecting, analyzing and responding to complaints from students and stakeholder groups. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Collecting complaint information from students
- Collecting complaint information from other key stakeholders
- Learning from complaint information and determining actions
- Communicating actions to students and other key stakeholders
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to evaluate complaint resolution

2R4: RESULTS

What are the results for student and key stakeholder complaints? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 2P4. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

2I4: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 2R4, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

2P4: PROCESSES

Collecting complaint information from students

Students and stakeholders have multiple ways of lodging [complaints or comments](#). Many of these complaints are received and handled at the departmental level. For example, students that have a complaint about an instructor can easily access the online Instructor Concern Form on the college website. Once submitted, the form is routed to the appropriate Academic Administrator who will contact the student directly to help resolve the issue. Both complaints and responses are cataloged in a Google document. Additionally, complaints logged on an end-of-course evaluation are also addressed with the faculty member. As the evaluations are anonymous, student follow up is not

possible.

If an academic-related student complaint results in a grade grievance, a separate process is followed. Initially, students are encouraged to contact their instructor to see if the issue can be resolved. If not, the appropriate Academic Administrator will schedule an informal conference between the student and the faculty member. If no resolution is found, the student has the right to petition the Vice President of Academic Services. He/she will review the complaint, speaking with the student, faculty member, and Academic Administrator. He/she then has the option of either convening a grade review panel (consisting of 3 faculty members from outside the academic department of the class in question), the Executive Dean of Student Services, and the appropriate Academic Administrator. After presentation of the facts by the student and the instructor, the Grade Review Panel will deliberate in closed session. The vice president will consider the assessment of the Grade Review Panel in rendering his/her decision to maintain or change the grade in question. The decision of the vice president is final. If the vice president decides that a review panel is not warranted, the grievance ends and the decision is final.

For student conduct, behavioral concerns, discrimination, or Title IX issues both staff and students have access to an online [Student Concern Form](#) found in their Portal. The online process allows for timely feedback, tracking, and analysis. Policies, procedures and appeal processes are posted on the website, student handbooks, and catalog. The college employs a complaint tracking software system called Maxient. The Maxient system houses all complaints, responses, sanctions, and a student watch list. This system allows for the discovery of patterns of student behavior. Students are also offered a paper or online satisfaction survey to complete after receiving any type of service from any department of the Student and Academic Support Services division. These compliments and complaints are reviewed by the Executive Dean of Student Services then recorded in an online database for managers to access and share with their staff. Students may provide their contact information if they wish to have a follow up conversation.

Collecting complaint information from other key stakeholders

There are several different mechanisms for other key stakeholders to report issues. Employees can offer suggestions or lodge concerns through an online data management system labeled ideaQ. Entries are logged, displayed, weighted and reviewed. Ideas or concerns are reported to the College Council for review, possible implementation, and outreach to the reporting party.

For concerns about other staff (including supervisors), benefits, or working conditions, employees can contact Personnel Services. A representative from Personnel Services will follow up and work with the individual to resolution. Furthermore, employees direct any community member complaints or compliments to the Office of Student and Community Relations. They filter and distribute complaints to the appropriate office. Serious complaints will be brought to the attention of the President and/or Senior Staff. Facilities and technology departments have implemented a Help Desk ticket system. Requests or complaints are accepted by central dispatch through email, online ticket, or phone. This system allows for timely feedback, tracking and analysis.

Learning from complaint information and determining actions

While Academic Administrators respond to each student complaint, they evaluate complaints in their totality to identify any trends in the data. If multiple complaints center on a particular instructor, the Academic Administrator will work with that faculty member to take the necessary steps to address the situation (through the faculty evaluation process or a more timely response should the situation warrant it).

For student conduct, behavioral concerns, discrimination, or Title IX issues, complaint information is reviewed and evaluated by the Student Oversight Committee. This committee looks for patterns and identifies programs, trainings and other endeavors based on these patterns of behaviors.

Communicating actions to students and other key stakeholders

Complaint procedures are communicated in the [College Catalog](#) (p. 166) and is discussed in detail on the [Student Oversight Committee](#) website. The resolution of a specific complaint is shared with the student or stakeholder (when applicable) via their preferred method of communication (part of the information collected at the time of receiving the complaint). Deans, Directors, Security Officers, etc. who receive complaints in their respective areas are responsible for attempting to resolve the complaint at the time of incident and communicate that resolution to the individual(s) involved.

The Annual Security and Fire Safety Report is shared with students and other key stakeholders annually via e-mail and is available on the Student Right to Know page of the college website.

Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to evaluate complaint resolution

In 2014, the college evaluated several tools for complaint resolution. After evaluating materials, the college selected Maxient as our provider. This tool is used in matters of academic dishonesty, conduct, and harassment. Continued evaluation of the tool and other conduct-related matters is evaluated regularly by the Student Oversight Committee.

2R4: RESULTS

Summary results of measures and Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

- [Maxient results](#) -- there are varied types of concerns/complaints tracked with this system, including student - student concerns, and student - staff concerns.
- [Student Instructor Concerns](#) -- these are the concerns students file using the Student Instructor Concern form, or who contact an academic administrator with such a concern.

Interpretation of results and insights gained

Regarding instructor complaints, the average number of complaints represents approximately 04% of total sections offered. This is an exceedingly small figure. However, it is unknown if complaints are this few, or if students do not understand the procedure for filing complaints. In the future, the college will look to post the concern form and associated procedures in more prominent locations on the website and around campus.

In terms of Maxient data on student conduct issues, no clear pattern was identified in the data. There was a dip in general conduct reporting and academic dishonesty in 2016. But both increased in 2017. This is likely due to more marketing efforts college-wide for employees (particularly faculty) to report concerning behavior as opposed to attempting to handle it by themselves. There was also a significant decline in general wellness concerns and harassment in 2017. The concern is that the marketing efforts to increase reporting on these issues has not yet had an impact. The Student Oversight Committee will continue to work on outreach efforts to increase awareness and highlight the importance of reporting.

214: IMPROVEMENT

While the college currently uses Maxient for conduct-related matters, the college will implement an employee-related complaint/concern process utilizing Maxient. This will condense a complaint/concern into one location and allow better and more accurate reporting.

Sources

- complaint options
- Incident Report Form
- Incidents of student conduct by type
- Student concern form
- Student Instructor Concern Reports 2014-2017

2.5 - Building Collaborations and Partnerships

Building Collaborations and Partnerships focuses on aligning, building and determining the effectiveness of collaborations and partnerships to further the mission of the institution.

2P5: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for managing collaborations and partnerships to further the mission of the institution. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Selecting partners for collaboration (e.g., other educational institutions, civic organizations, businesses)
- Building and maintaining relationships with partners
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess partnership effectiveness
- Evaluating the degree to which collaborations and partnerships are effective

2R5: RESULTS

What are the results for determining the effectiveness of aligning and building collaborations and partnerships? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 2P5. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

2I5: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 2R5, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

2P5: PROCESSES

Selecting partners for collaboration (e.g., other educational institutions, civic organizations, businesses)

The college's shared governance structure includes a Partnership Committee charged with providing guidance, insight, and evaluation of partnerships. This committee “considers and recommends collaborative relationships that would enable the college to more effectively meet its mission and goals. A subset of this committee serves as an advisory body for initiatives related to K-12 partnerships.” The Partnership Committee is comprised of administrators, faculty, and staff from various parts of the college to ensure a broad perspective on the partnerships that already exist and

those that should be suggested.

The Off Campus Advisory Committee (OCAC) is a subcommittee focused on the college's partnerships with K-12 schools. This committee has a high faculty representation and also has members from the institution that are involved with dual enrollment activities. Rather than look at broad partnerships across the college, this subcommittee is focused on working more closely with K-12 schools for dual enrollment and other purposes.

Both the Partnership and OCAC are part of the process to select partners for collaboration. The Partnership Committee maintains a comprehensive list of relationships and partnerships in which the college is involved. The committee reviews that list for gaps in our partnerships and to recommend areas to add or strengthen partnerships. This work is primarily focused on civic, business, and community partnerships. The Committee uses criteria like geography, community needs, and college priorities to identify where partnerships need strengthening. When a gap is identified, the Partnership Committee involves the department at the college most connected with the potential partnership, and that department is charged with developing the new partnership.

The OCAC is focused on selecting, building, and maintaining partnerships with K-12 schools in our service area. Rather than identifying gaps and selecting schools with which to partner, the committee is responsible for evaluating the benefits and risks of partnering with a specific school that approaches the college. As outlined in 2.3, the college has a multi-phase process for evaluating and approving potential partnerships. A key part of that process involves taking a proposal to the OCAC for feedback before it moves forward. The committee's feedback is used in determining whether to proceed with the partnership.

Building and maintaining relationships with partners

Once partnerships are built, the key partnership contacts at the college have the responsibility to groom and maintain those relationships. The activities outlined in Section 2.3 regarding stakeholder needs specifically relates to maintaining partnerships. On the academic side, the college's advisory committees work directly with key community partners to further those relationships and to ensure that our mutual needs are met. Partnerships that involve community and business groups are maintained through our Workforce and Economic Development function and our community outreach administrators. Through personal interactions, regular contact, and occasional surveys (related to business services), the college maintains positive relationships and identifies additional beneficial partnerships. With the college's K-12 partners, key staff (mostly related to Dual Enrollment and the Admissions Office) have regular contact with school administrators to build and maintain those partnerships. Others are brought in as necessary to enhance our services to the schools or react to feedback.

Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess partnership effectiveness

The Partnership Committee used process improvement tools to identify issues and develop solutions for determining how to evaluate the college's partnerships. The committee clarified the definition of a partnership, how we compare different types of partnerships, and developed an evaluation tool to handle the variety of partnerships encountered. The Committee developed a Partnership Evaluation Form. The form was tested by using it to evaluate different kinds of partnerships. Based on the results of the tests, the form was revised to better address the variations between K-12 and community partnerships.

Evaluating the degree to which collaborations and partnerships are effective

The final version of the [Partnership Evaluation Form](#) is a rubric to evaluate partnerships based on

- the Shared Vision between partners
- the presence of clearly defined Roles and Responsibilities
- the level of Communication between the partners
- the availability of key performance indicators to establish Accountability
- the degree to which there is Mutual Benefit between the partners

The rubric includes questions to guide the evaluator through the form and provide context for each element. The form can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of existing partnerships, as well as to proactively gauge the potential strength of a partnership.

2R5: RESULTS

Summary results of measures and Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

The data in this section is a sampling of the ways we examine and evaluate partnerships. Unfortunately, we have not set many targets in this area and applicable benchmarks are scarce. Having said that, our relatively new focus on data through an official IR office and our commitment to developing KPIs and dashboards across the college should allow us to grow in this area over the next few years.

- Table for [Dual Enrollment Partnerships](#)
- [Fall Dual Enrollment numbers](#)
- [Table of Partnerships](#) and [Map of Partnership Locations](#)
- [Philanthropic giving](#)

Interpretation of results and insights gained

The significant growth in the number of dual enrolled students is an indicator of satisfaction with these partnerships by the high schools sending their students to MMCC for dual enrollment classes. The Table of Partnerships and Map of Partnership Locations together provide an indication of the success MMCC has in serving regional partnerships. Such a large geographic footprint could not be sustained without mutually beneficial partnerships. Philanthropic giving is one measure of the effectiveness of partnerships: if the college is fulfilling its role in the community, then local businesses and individuals will be inclined to support the college. In the graph, the spike in giving is related to the college's capital campaign. The \$5 million goal was exceeded. During the 18 months campaign, \$5.1 million in gifts came from the community, foundations, and employees.

2I5: IMPROVEMENT

Historically the college handled its partnerships in an informal manner and often partnerships happened based on the people involved. The implementation of the Partnership Committee has changed this informal approach to a process driven approach. However, this committee has only been operating for two years. For the first part of that period, the committee focused on building the process, rubrics, and criteria for evaluating existing and potential partnerships. There now needs to be evaluation of the effectiveness of this new process, which in turn will require data to be collected. So the improvement, here, will be fully implementing the process and collecting relevant data, and then analyzing it. The Partnership Committee has developed a list of partnerships and now needs to

evaluate the effectiveness of these, and make recommendations to maintain them, or recommend the college walk away from ineffective partnerships.

Sources

- 2.5 Donations
- 2.5 Dual Schools
- 2.5 Partnerships Table
- Dual Enrollments
- Map of Partnership Locations.pdf
- Revision - Partnership Evaluation Form 3_20_2017

3 - Valuing Employees

3.1 - Hiring

Hiring focuses on the acquisition of appropriately qualified/credentialed faculty, staff and administrators to ensure that effective, high-quality programs and student support services are provided. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 3.C. in this section.

3P1: PROCESSES

Describe the process for hiring faculty, staff and administrators. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Recruiting, hiring and orienting processes that result in staff and administrators who possess the required qualification, skills and values (3.C.6)
- Developing and meeting academic credentialing standards for faculty, including those in dual credit, contractual and consortia programs (3.C.1, 3.C.2)
- Ensuring the institution has sufficient numbers of faculty to carry out both classroom and non-classroom programs and activities (3.C.1)
- Ensuring the acquisition of sufficient numbers of staff to provide student support services
- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

3R1: RESULTS

What are the results for determining if recruitment, hiring and orienting practices ensure effective provision for programs and services? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 3P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

3I1: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 3R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

3P1: PROCESSES

Recruiting, hiring and orienting processes that result in staff and administrators who possess the required qualification, skills and values (3.C.6)

Hiring

The Personnel Services (PS) team facilitates recruiting, hiring, orientation and onboarding for new employees in collaboration with hiring managers. MMCC includes talent management, specifically in recruiting, hiring and orientating, as a focus at the operational and strategic planning levels. The college implemented a new talent management system (TMS) in 2016 to improve the process of recruiting and screening qualified candidates for newly created and vacant positions. This TMS has increased the college's ability to attract candidates from a wider labor pool (beyond local markets), to pre-screen the qualifications of candidates, and to make the review of application material more efficiently available to hiring managers and interview teams.

Recruiting

When a newly created or vacant position occurs, hiring managers meet with members of their department to review the position description, define the specific needs for the position, determine how the position should be structured, and discuss the skills and qualifications required to meet those needs. The discussion involves input from members of other departments, especially those with which the position interacts. In addition, when evaluating candidates, MMCC seeks individuals who support the institution's beliefs and values of collegiality and mutual respect, use data in decision-making, are innovative and service-minded, and strive to improve themselves and their work processes.

When a full-time faculty position need is identified, the relevant Dean discusses the position with the departmental faculty. Additional input is gathered from outside the discipline area, as well as from external stakeholders such as key employers, advisory committees, and regional universities. These discussions result in the development of a decision matrix. Faculty positions have job description templates that spell out the knowledge, skills, and abilities common to all faculty positions. Input from stakeholder discussions rounds out the specific elements needed for a specific position.

The completed job description is the foundation used for creating the job posting, which is uploaded on the TMS. Job screening questions are added to the posting to assist in identifying candidates whose credentials meet the minimum criteria and whose background meets the qualifications and credentials identified. The hiring manager generates the job requisition, which is approved by the budget manager and the Executive Director of Personnel Services through the TMS.

The job posting is advertised in resources identified by the interview team and PS. PS is responsible for ensuring fair and consistent recruitment practices. All positions are posted internally. For administrative and faculty positions, ads are placed regionally and nationally. Hourly staff vacancies are posted internally for five days (per the collective bargaining agreement). If no qualified candidates are identified within the five day period, the position is posted externally. When positions are advertised externally, postings go to sources such as, MMCC's job portal, local newspapers, state-wide talent banks, career services sites, social media, email campaigns, and national job boards or publications.

Applicants must submit a resume/CV, cover letter, application, letters of recommendation, transcripts, and where applicable, a teaching philosophy. The TMS provides the hiring manager access to the applicant's materials during the hiring process.

Members of the interview team may assist with identifying and encouraging qualified applicants. The team may be asked to review and screen applications. Initial phone interviews may be used to gather

additional information. After review of applications, the team will determine whether the remaining pool of applicants is adequate or whether additional posting is desired.

Selection

The institution recognizes the value of qualifications, as well as the fit with institutional vision and values. The hiring manager invites faculty, administrators and staff within/outside of their department to participate on the interview team to help assess applicants' qualifications, values, and credentials.

The interview team also provides input on the questions for the interview process and the criteria used for evaluation of candidates. This ensures the questions and evaluation connect to the criteria identified on the job description.

The college uses additional assessments as part of the interview processes, such as classroom teaching demonstrations for faculty positions, in-box problem solving activities for managerial positions, presentations or other assessment tools for administrative positions, or computer spreadsheet simulations for administrative support positions.

For faculty positions, selected candidates are invited to campus for a full day. The day includes: committee interview, teaching demonstration (with student participation), departmental/divisional interview, tour of campus/tour of area, and an interview with the college President. The interview committee identifies the unacceptable candidates, and provides the Vice President of Academic Services (VPAS) with commentary and ranked finalists. The VPAS identifies the top candidate and assists the supervising Dean with reference checks and salary parameters. The VPAS makes recommendation to the President, and the President brings the recommendation to the Board.

For administrative and staff positions, the hiring manager and interview team determine the selected candidate or the need to re-post the position. The hiring manager completes reference checks on the selected candidate. The hiring manager makes the recommendation to their supervisor and the Executive Director of Personnel Services. Once the offer recommendation is approved, the candidate is offered the position contingent upon the results of the background checks.

Orientation/On-boarding

Newly hired employees meet with PS to start the orientation process. The first step is completion of regulatory documents as well as related personnel and payroll forms. PS notifies the IT department of new employees so they can set-up technology resources prior to the employee's start.

During orientation, PS provides a broad overview of MMCC's mission, vision, and enduring goals, in addition to general information regarding shared governance, policies, and practices. The employee also receives a copy of the job description and information about compensation and benefit options.

Full-time faculty and administrative staff receive a salary contract. To ensure successful on-boarding, the hiring manager is provided a supervisor checklist and an on-boarding worksheet. The hiring manager provides department specific information such as: desk space, department projects, budget review, and ways to get involved in MMCC committees. Additionally, new employees are enrolled in an on-line learning system and assigned training modules to be completed during a specified timeframe. These modules provide training for topics such as safety, conduct, and compliance. MMCC provides two college-wide professional development days annually. The college President addresses all employees on these days with important updates and current information on the latest challenges, strategic issues, and success celebrations.

Developing and meeting academic credentialing standards for faculty, including those in dual

credit, contractual and consortia programs (3.C.1, 3.C.2)

To meet HLC guidelines, the VPAS, academic Deans, and designated faculty established credentialing standards for faculty, including those in the dual credit, contractual and consortial programs. The college reviewed all full-time and adjunct faculty credentials. The academic deans communicated with each faculty member who did not meet the credentialing requirements and created a [contract](#) that detailed a plan for each faculty member to be brought up to the credentialing requirements within a three-year time frame. Going forward, these credentialing standards will be followed during the hiring process for all faculty positions.

Ensuring the institution has sufficient numbers of faculty to carry out both classroom and non-classroom programs and activities (3.C.1)

Short-term needs are handled at the Dean level by hiring qualified adjunct instructors. Long-term faculty staffing to ensure sufficient numbers of faculty to fulfill the mission of the college is addressed in several manners. First, the program review process (discussed in 1P3) addresses this issue as part of the review of program quality. Both faculty and administration are involved in these reviews. Second, several academic committees (especially the Academic Council, Curriculum Committee, and the Council of Chairs and Deans) discuss academic issues, which includes appropriate faculty staffing. Both faculty and administration are represented on these groups, and they use data and information from student satisfaction surveys, learning outcomes assessment, employee satisfaction surveys, as well as input from advisory groups to determine appropriate staffing levels. Recommendations from these groups go to the Vice President of Academic Services who takes it to the annual budget meetings for a final determination.

Ensuring the acquisition of sufficient numbers of staff to provide student support services

In preparation for annual budget meetings, MMCC reviews position requests for administrative and hourly staff. The budget discussions include a review of where additional positions may be needed, whether other positions need responsibilities re-aligned, and whether there are any positions no longer needed. For new positions, the senior staff meets with their managers to identify the needs of the department. The senior staff then provides rationale for why the position is needed. The rationale is provided via a comprehensive job analysis questionnaire that identifies the time, credentials, experience, and skills required to meet the identified staffing need. The President, with input from senior staff members, makes the final decision and shares the rationale during budget sessions.

Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

The TMS has a wealth of data available and we are in the beginning stages of tracking and utilizing this data. MMCC has also revised employee orientation and on-boarding processes. These will assist us with a more consistent flow of data from and to new employees. In addition, we plan to survey employees and hiring managers to assess the outcomes of these practices.

3R1: RESULTS

Summary results of measures and Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

- To measure the effectiveness of the hiring and selection processes, the college monitors [employee turnover rates](#), [employee feedback through PACE](#), [number of positions posted](#), [time position is open](#), and [number of applicants per position](#). Some of these data are collected from

the Talent Management System in an ongoing manner, while the PACE survey is administered every third year. This data is reviewed by Personnel Services and the PS Advisory Committee and shared with hiring managers.

- MMCC uses the following measures to ensure sufficient numbers of faculty for classroom and non-classroom programs and activities:
 - [FT/PT faculty ratio](#)
 - [IPEDS student to faculty ratio](#)
 - [IPEDS Staffing level comparisons](#)
 - [Student feedback through Noel-Levitz SSI](#)
 - [Employee feedback through PACE](#)

- MMCC uses the following measures to ensure sufficient numbers of staff to provide student support services:
 - [Student feedback through Noel-Levitz SSI](#)
 - [Employee feedback through PACE](#)
 - [IPEDS staffing level comparisons](#)
 - For measuring [how we ensure qualified faculty](#) are assigned to the classroom, we check each instructor's credentials against the qualification policy for the course they are assigned to teach.

Interpretation of results and insights gained

In terms of employee turnover, the college's turnover rate has been higher than the comparison group (other Michigan Community Colleges). In comparing the means, MMCC has stayed relatively consistent, with a dip in 2015. The State average, however, has varied much more so from year to year. MMCC's challenge is to lower its consistent average. As part of the separation process, employees now are given the option for an exit interview. The hope is that these qualitative data sets will allow for more detailed information that is more MMCC-specific.

Regarding the PACE survey questions, MMCC employee views on meeting student needs across the employee groups (classified, faculty, and non-faculty) have remained consistent since 2011. Results have also hovered near the average of our comparison group. Like many institutions, employee groups tend to be somewhat siloed. With the new shared governance process that was recently implemented, the hope is that a greater understanding of the specific duties and efforts of each employee group, which hopefully will increase the scores from historical averages.

MMCC's faculty hiring increased in 2017. Much of this was due to the change in faculty qualification requirements. This also impacted the average days to fill, as some areas are very hard to fill with master's level candidates given our rural location. As such, the college has contracted with 3rd party vendors like Adjunct Professor Link to assist in locating faculty for hard to fill positions. It is less clear why the time to fill non-faculty positions increased so substantially.

While MMCC has made strides in increasing the number of full-time faculty positions, the faculty is still made up of 60% adjunct.

The two biggest classification differences occurred in post-secondary teachers and management.

While the difficulty of hiring additional full-time faculty was discussed before, the management issue was not. The President has recently restructured the college's leadership council. This new leadership team will be responsible for setting the direction concerning staffing levels.

While the college's individual office student satisfaction scores, as measured by the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory, hover closely to the national average, the broad question concerning helpfulness and caring of the campus staff in general is above the national average. That being said, the college lacks in career services per the survey. This shortcoming is being addressed with the creation of a new and expanded career services operation.

As discussed earlier, the largest difference between MMCC and the comparison figures are in faculty and management. Faculty, with the current funding structure, is difficult to overcome. With the hiring of new development personnel, that external funding support should increase, allowing for more flexibility in hiring full-time faculty.

311: IMPROVEMENT

The key recent improvement was the implementation of the iCIMS Talent Management System. This TMS provides critical data and tracking capabilities which will allow the college to base improvement strategies in the Personnel Services processes on reliable data.

Since 72% of the college budget comes from student tuition, significant outside fundraising needs to occur. A new Vice President of Community Outreach has recently been hired and has endowed chair positions as a goal.

Sources

- 3.1 Data Pertaining to Job Postings
- 3R1 ft-pt fac ratio
- Employee Turnover Rates
- Faculty Qualifications
- HLC compliance contract
- PACE Student Specific Results
- Ruffalo Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory
- Staffing Levels IPEDS
- Student Faculty Ratios

3.2 - Evaluation and Recognition

Evaluation and Recognition focuses on the assessment and recognition of faculty, staff and administrators' contributions to the institution. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 3.C. within this section.

3P2: PROCESSES

Describe the processes that assess and recognize faculty, staff and administrators' contributions to the institution. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Designing performance evaluation systems for all employees
- Soliciting input from and communicating expectations to faculty, staff and administrators
- Aligning the evaluation system with institutional objectives for both instructional and non-instructional programs and services
- Utilizing established institutional policies and procedures to regularly evaluate all faculty, staff and administrators (3.C.3)
- Establishing employee recognition, compensation and benefit systems to promote retention and high performance
- Promoting employee satisfaction and engagement
- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

3R2: RESULTS

What are the results for determining if evaluation processes assess employees' contributions to the institution? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 3P2. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

3I2: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 3R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

3P2: PROCESSES

Designing performance evaluation systems for all employees

The college's shared governance structure includes three groups that address issues relating to enhancing employee impact: Mid Matters, Directors Council, and Personnel Services Advisory

Committee. These groups provided input into the revised (2016) evaluation process for hourly and administrative staff. Personnel Services (PS) staff used this input along with review of evaluation instruments used by other colleges to select and implement revisions to the performance evaluation forms and process.

Full-time faculty performance evaluations are designed through the collective bargaining process. This process involves teams from the administrative staff and from the faculty membership. These teams mutually agree upon the evaluation tool, forms, and process. Full details and forms of the faculty performance evaluation can be found in Appendix H of the [Faculty Senate Master Agreement](#) (p. 76ff).

Adjunct instructors receive a classroom observation in their first semester teaching and every two – three years thereafter. The evaluation tool was designed by a team of academic administrators with input from the Academic Council, which has representatives from both the adjunct and full-time faculty ranks.

Soliciting input from and communicating expectations to faculty, staff and administrators

MMCC's shared governance consists of 21 committees, each receiving an annual charge (expectations) based on the strategic plan. This charge is determined with input from the College Council, which by way of its representative makeup, is designed to solicit input from all college members. Once each of the shared governance committees receives its annual charge, the committee chair incorporates the charge in their agendas and projects for the year. In addition, the President holds bi-weekly meetings with the Senior Staff team. These meetings serve as a two-way communication channel for input and communicating expectations. In turn, the Senior Staff members share the expectations with their respective departments. Each department holds meetings to allow supervisors opportunity to engage with their staff and disseminate information as needed, and to receive feedback.

Every two to three years, MMCC participates in the Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE) survey. This survey allows employees an opportunity to provide feedback about many aspects of their employment at the college. The results are shared at a college-wide professional development day and areas of improvement are discussed with recommendations of ways to improve. Departments and/or committees are involved with providing recommendations to the College Council for changes.

Aligning the evaluation system with institutional objectives for both instructional and non-instructional programs and services

The staff performance evaluation tool addresses specific categories of performance:

- Quantity of Work
- Quality of Work
- Work Habits
- Job Attitude
- Job Knowledge
- Ability to Learn
- Relationship with People

The performance appraisal also has categories for the supervisor and employee to discuss the employee strengths, weaknesses, satisfaction in their work, and improvements, as well as a section

that reviews the job description. The final section addresses goal setting. In review of the job description and in goal setting, the supervisor has the responsibility to ensure the position and the employee are properly focused and aligned with the college's mission and current objectives. The employee and supervisor discuss and agree on a minimum of three goals for the next year. The goals need to enhance the employee's current position within the institution or address an aspect of the strategic plan.

The faculty performance review includes a Professional Responsibilities and Faculty Effectiveness Portfolio (PRFEP). This PRFEP must address specific duties and responsibilities covered by the master agreement between the college and faculty, as well as current objectives of the strategic plan that are relevant to the faculty.

Utilizing established institutional policies and procedures to regularly evaluate all faculty, staff and administrators (3.C.3)

All administrative and hourly employees receive an annual performance evaluation, which utilizes the same evaluation tool and timeline. The administrative evaluation is required by Board Policy 404, and the hourly staff evaluation follows their collective bargaining agreement requirements as specified in [Article 11](#) of that agreement.

Per the [faculty master agreement](#) (Article XI, C and Appendix H-1), newly employed instructors are evaluated each of their first five semesters, while full status faculty may be evaluated once each academic year, but shall be evaluated once every three years. The process includes several components: student feedback each semester, administrative review which includes classroom observations, and self evaluation.

Adjunct instructors receive a classroom observation in their first semester, and every two – three years thereafter. Student feedback is solicited each semester in each course section. In addition, adjunct instructors submit a self-appraisal to their dean at the end of their first semester teaching and annually thereafter.

Establishing employee recognition, compensation and benefit systems to promote retention and high performance

The college's shared governance system again plays a role in establishing employee recognition. In particular, the Mid Matters committee develops various events that encourage and recognize employee engagement. The Employee Benefit Task Force assists in recommendations for employee benefits, wellness, and performance evaluations. Compensation for the hourly staff and for faculty is a result of collective bargaining. The college uses representative administrative teams to work with staff and faculty teams to identify issues of concern and to develop mutually agreed upon responses to these issues. Compensation and benefits for these groups is also negotiated through this process. The recommendations from the aforementioned Benefits Task Force are used in these negotiations.

Employee years of service are recognized at the Fall PD day in November. Each employee reaching a five (5) year (i.e. 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, etc.) anniversary is recognized with a certificate, a personal gift from the college, and a monetary stipend.

Promoting employee satisfaction and engagement

The Personnel Services (PS) home webpage posts employee recognition for employee achievements such as: years of service, completing a certificate or degree program, or presenting at a national

conference, etc. These employee recognitions are also published in the weekly newsletters and Mid Month Report to the Board of Trustees.

Senior Staff members are encouraged to engage their teams in internal celebrations. If the team completes a large project, new initiative, etc. the team takes time to celebrate the accomplishment. Individual accomplishments, such as degree/certificate completion, awards from MMCC or external parties, etc. are encouraged to be celebrated by the team.

3R2: RESULTS

Summary results of measures and Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

For determining the effectiveness of its processes relating to employee evaluation and recognition, the college relies primarily on the PACE employee satisfaction survey

- To measure [the effectiveness of employee evaluation process](#) the college relies on specific items from the PACE survey feedback: item numbers 12, 13, 20, 21, 30, 34
- To measure the effectiveness of how well the college's [processes for soliciting input and communicating](#) expectations the college uses specific item responses from the PACE survey feedback: item numbers 10, 12, 13, 26, 30, 44, 45
- To measure [how well the evaluation system is aligned with institutional objectives](#) the college uses specific item responses from the PACE survey feedback: item numbers 1, 6, 36, 41, 44
- For measuring how well the college does [using established policies and procedures](#) in the employee evaluation the college uses specific item responses from the PACE survey feedback: item numbers 1, 7, 8, 16, 29, 44
- To measure the effectiveness of the [college's recognition, compensation,](#) and benefit systems the college uses specific item responses from the PACE survey feedback: item numbers 2, 9, 15, 22, 45. Additionally, the college periodically checks with like-sized public two-year colleges in Michigan for comparisons on faculty compensation rates, and state or national data on administrative and staff compensation rates.
- To measure [employee satisfaction and engagement](#) the college uses results from the PACE survey responses: item numbers 2, 9, 15, 22, 25, 26, 27, 39

Interpretation of results and insights gained

Based on these data, the college is not only behind comparison group averages, but has taken a step back between administrations of the PACE survey. Most of the questions deal with communication between the employee and his/her supervisor. To help address this, a new process was created that gives the employee more input into goal setting and is intended to open up communication. The hope is, scores will trend upward once the new process is fully implemented.

For the most part, employee ratings for processes for soliciting input were near like-group comparisons. The one exception was "my work is guided by clearly defined administrative processes." The average rating for this question was below the comparable average, and had gone down since the last PACE administration. The reason behind this could relate to the overall issues reported concerning employee-supervisor communication. With the new evaluation and goal setting in place, it is hopeful the average on this question will rebound.

Most of the item averages approximate the comparable averages and have stayed consistent between PACE administrations. The two that have varied are "my work is guided by clearly defined

SP1: PROCESSES

Selecting, organizing, analyzing and sharing data

The Office of Institutional Research is responsible for coordinating external reporting, assisting with and coordinating data requests, and improving data reliability, security, and access. The college uses Ellucian Colleague as the primary system for housing and accessing institutional data. This system requires intensive IT involvement to access and author Colleague-based data reports. The college utilizes Entrisik Informer to pull data from additional data sources such as the Learning Management System (Moodle) and other internally developed databases. While the use of Informer has increased access to custom reports to users familiar with Informer, other data users rely on the IR Office to supply data needs. End users submit data requests through the college's Helpdesk Trouble Ticket System, WebHelpDesk. The IR Office responds to the requests by either pointing the end user to existing data on the IR website or compiling a custom report to meet the need.

The Office of Institutional Research creates snapshots of key student data each enrollment period at predetermined dates to establish Official Term Data (OTD) which remains constant for reporting and comparative purposes. The Director of IR along with the IT Systems Programmer identified the relevant data elements to include in the OTD files. Both consulted colleagues in their fields as well as internal stakeholders for this data element determination. During the setup of the official term data, several areas were identified for clean-up due to missing data, inconsistent fields for collecting certain data elements, and other anomalies. Research essential fields went through a cleaning and verification process to ensure reliability. The OTD now forms the basis for many internal and externally required reports.

Determining data, information and performance results needs

Under the college's shared governance system, the Institutional Research Advisory Committee (IRA) provides advisement and assistance to the Director of Institutional Research. One of the directives for the IRA is to solicit data needs of other college committees and departments. This soliciting occurs through attendance at meetings by IRA members, and the Director of IR reaching out through electronic communications. This stakeholder input informs the IR Office of unit and departmental data needs. Other routine data needs are defined by external reporting requirements.

Making data, information and performance results readily and reliably available

Institutional data is openly available on the [IR website](#). This data includes Institutional KPI's, MMCC Fast Facts, dashboards, and the college's data repository. Institutional KPI's include the Voluntary Framework for Accountability (VFA), Ruffalo-Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory, Graduation/Transfer rates, HLC Financial ratios, and the Workforce and Economic Development Annual Report. The data available here was that which is identified by the process described above. If additional data is routinely requested, it is added to the appropriate category on the IR website.

Each month the college schedules a "Data Discussion" open to all employees. A different department hosts the discussion each month and presents on some aspect of data and data use by their department. The goal of these discussions is to increase awareness and understanding of the data available, how it is being used, where to find it, and how it is defined.

As mentioned previously, any employee needing custom reports may use Informer to create the report or use the HelpDesk Ticket System to request specific data as needed.

Ensuring the timeliness, accuracy, reliability and security of knowledge system

Our primary source and storage of data is our Student Information System (SIS), Ellucian Colleague. The system is hosted locally in a secure server room with physical access limited to the Chief Information Officer and the Director of Information Technology. Because of the sensitivity of data stored in this system, controls are in place to limit access to data to employees who require access.

Accounts are separate, dedicated accounts and are only created for a subset of staff members who require access to the SIS. A majority of instructors do not require direct SIS access and instead use supporting online systems for submitting grades and communicating with students.

Colleague access requests requires signatures by designated division-level approvers. Colleague account password changes are required periodically, and chosen passwords must meet the standard Red Hat Enterprise Linux complexity requirements. Off-campus remote access to Colleague requires a Virtual Private Network (VPN) connection, which must be requested separately and configured with IT assistance. All on-campus access to the Colleague web user interface goes through encrypted HTTPS through our centralized load balancers. All inter-server traffic for Colleague is restricted to a private server network.

Periodically, the college invites Ellucian to assess our practices against known best-practices for using Colleague. Ellucian provides documented recommendations for improvement and training based on their review. These recommendations appear in the Results section.

The Ellucian recommendations go to the Technology Services Advisory Committee sub-committee, the Colleague Process Committee (CPC). The CPC consists of representatives from departments that use Colleague. The CPC prioritizes the recommendations and arranges staff trainings. Additionally, the CPC schedules regular update patch meetings to go over how update patches would affect various departments and determine the best course of action to test patches in a test environment before implementation.

All campus web sites and systems are hosted over encrypted HTTPS which is centralized through our load balancers. This limits which servers have a copy of our certificate's private key. A shared wildcard web certificate for all web sites simplifies certificate renewal. The centralized load balancers allow us to adjust HTTPS configuration for all campus-hosted systems, thereby providing response to vulnerabilities quickly, and to enable quicker revocation of certificates in case of an intrusion event.

Our Learning Management System, Moodle, is hosted locally in a secure server room with limited physical access. The college's single sign-on system manages all accounts and allows access for faculty to only those courses assigned to them within Colleague. Moodle stores gradebook data and faculty submit final grades through a Colleague web interface.

The website and web content access is limited to web administration staff responsible for maintaining and updating web content. The college plans to decentralize some web content administration to content experts in various departments after individual content experts have completed developer training, as well as accessibility training to assure all web administrators meet accessibility requirements.

The Office Institutional Research along with IT personnel completed Official Term Data (OTD) cleanup and verification. This OTD will remain "frozen" for comparative reporting. The Office of Institutional Research has the responsibility of coordinating data clean-up and evaluation of data entry standards.

Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

Tracking and measuring the effectiveness of knowledge management processes occurs through contracted consultants -- Ellucian -- for our main administrative database. In addition, the SSL Labs website, which is a non-commercial research effort hosted by Qualys, provides a collection of documents and tools related to SSL (Secure Sockets Layer). SSL Labs provides a means to assess our website security and issues a grade.

5R1: RESULTS

Summary results of measures and Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

- [Ellucian's Discovery Report on MMCC](#)
- [SSL Lab Grade on MMCC web security](#)
- [Number of Informer reports & dashboards](#)
- IR Website Usage
 - [2016](#)
 - [2017](#)
 - [Revised Page \(after Oct 2017\)](#)
- Help desk tickets
 - [IR/Data tickets opened and tickets closed for data/information](#)
 - [All HelpDesk Tickets Closed \(2014-2017\)](#)
- [Monthly Data Discussion Presentations](#)

Interpretation of results and insights gained

As mentioned in 5P1, MMCC uses the Ellucian Colleague SIS. In an effort to deepen our understanding of the system, and expand its usage, a consultant was hired to:

- Identify utilization and inefficiencies of technology through best practice business processes
- explore new solutions that will enhance staff, faculty and student success
- establish a support structure to sustain success.

The consultant provided a detailed set of recommendations aligned to the college's four enduring goals established in Vision 20/20 (see 5R1). More generally, there is an increased need for greater automation. This is true from end user perspectives (faculty/staff and students) and from a communications management perspective. The college will need to have further discussions on the value of increased automation compared to the financial investment.

Given the amount of information contained in the SIS, it is critical to keep these data secure. The college earned an SSL Lab grade of A, with high scores in Certificate, Protocol Support, Key Exchange, and Cipher Strength. With the changing technical landscape, levels will need to remain high.

Most of the help desk ticket items have shown steady increases over the past several years. The two that haven't been as consistent are Data and Reporting and IT Tech Support. Data and Reporting reductions coincides with a change in staffing, as the full-time IR individual left the institution and was replaced temporarily by a retiring Vice President. Also, the implementation of monthly Data Discussions likely provided data at the onset which reduced the need for additional requests.

One of the largest increases in requests relates to Moodle, the college's Student Information System. As the college has put a greater emphasis on online course offerings, the number of requests has good up significantly (nearly tripling the requests between 2014 and 2017). As the need for additional online offerings and a push towards integration of open educational resources into online course shells, there may be a need to evaluate staffing plans to handle the increased demand.

511: IMPROVEMENT

Although the college implemented data request tracking in our Helpdesk ticket system, enforcement of data request tracking should be improved to provide an accurate picture of data needs and identification idea of which data requests remain unfilled. Some departments have learned to create their own reports. The college approves of individuals creating their own reports; however, when they do, awareness and communication of the existence of these reports is lacking. This can lead to duplicated efforts. By centralizing the tracking, not necessarily the reporting itself, the college could benefit from everyone's reporting work.

The Colleague Process Committee identified issues with the approval process for granting access to data in Colleague. If a person moves to a different department, that person may retain the level of Colleague access required in their former position, even though it's not required for their new position. They maintain it to provide transitional support to their former department. This support role needs clearer definition in terms of scope and time. The Colleague Process Committee recommends:

- Colleague Access should be attached to a position rather than an individual person
- If a person moves to another department, the transitional support interval should be defined and terminated after the interval has passed.

We expect to have this new process defined by Fall of 2018. Transitioning to the new process will have to be cascaded and will take a few years.

Sources

- Closed HelpDesk Tickets
- Data Discussions
- Ellucian MMCC Discovery Report
- HelpDesk usage stats IR Closed tickets.pdf
- Informer usage
- IR Website Links
- IR-Data page stats 2016
- IR-Data page stats 2017
- Revised IR Website after Oct 2017
- SSL Server Test_ www.midmich

5.2 - Resource Management

Resource Management focuses on how the resource base of an institution supports and improves its educational programs and operations. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 5.A. in this section.

5P2: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for managing resources, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Maintaining fiscal, physical and technological infrastructures sufficient to support operations (5.A.1)
- Setting goals aligned with the institutional mission, resources, opportunities and emerging needs (5.A.3)
- Allocating and assigning resources to achieve organizational goals, while ensuring that educational purposes are not adversely affected (5.A.2)
- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

5R2: RESULTS

What are the results for resource management? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 5P2. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

5I2: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 5R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

5P2: PROCESSES

Maintaining fiscal, physical, and technological infrastructures sufficient to support operations (5.A.1)

The College's fiscal, physical, and technological infrastructures are each managed by an administrator who reports directly to the President of the College, and ultimately the Board of Trustees. The Vice President for Finance and Administration is responsible for accounting, budgeting, purchasing, payroll, facilities management, risk management, and auxiliary services. The Chief Information

Officer is responsible for information technology hardware and software, network maintenance, data integrity, cyber security, user support, email, and telecommunications.

MMCC has an annual operating budget of approximately \$32M (FY17) to support its operations. The primary operating fund revenue sources are tuition and fees, state appropriations, and property taxes. These three sources comprise 99% of total revenues as depicted in this attached chart ([2017 GenFund](#)). The remaining sources of revenue at 1% include the following: interest income, facility rental, scrap sales, and other miscellaneous sources.

The College's low millage rate of 1.2232 and stagnant state appropriations leave MMCC more heavily reliant on tuition and fee revenue than other Michigan community colleges ([revenue comparison chart](#)). As a result, processes were put in place to identify growth areas and create strategies to target these areas. This process is primarily housed with the Enrollment Management Committee (EMC). As mentioned previously, this committee consists of representatives from academic administration, student services, marketing, and faculty. Each spring this committee develops enrollment projections, and target areas for growth. The EMC arrives at its projections and targets by beginning with a review of enrollment data from the previous academic year to compare actual results to the proposed targets. This analysis, along with trend data that pulls enrollment data from the previous five years, informs the committee's discussion as it plans for the upcoming Fall and Winter semesters. With the enrollment data as a foundation, the committee members provide additional input into the strategic and environmental factors that may influence enrollment. Based on these discussions, the committee sets enrollment targets for the academic year, including percentages for various sub-groups of students like dual enrolled, international, veterans, etc. These targets are shared with the college through meeting minutes, and the documents are also shared with various committees. Individual departments are then responsible for developing and implementing strategies to increase enrollment.

MMCC continues to apply for federal, state, and private grants. The college was awarded the TRiO Educational Talent Search/Student Support Services grant to provide intensive support to those who need it most: low income students, first generation students, and students with disabilities. This is a retention strategy, and addresses both efforts to increase student success and resource needs garnered through the enrollment revenue of the retained students. In March 2016, it was announced that the college was one of 20 community colleges in the country chosen to participate in the Right Signals initiative. The purpose of the initiative is to standardize a credentialing system that will recognize quality credentials that will send the "right signals" to prospective employers, students, and other colleges regarding the meaning of the credentials. This effort assists in the recruiting of technical/occupational students by providing clear, short-term pathways to careers in technical occupations.

In April 2015, MMCC engaged Neumann/Smith Architecture to partner with the College to develop a Campus Master Plan. Over twenty focus groups, consisting of over two hundred students, faculty, administrators, support staff, community members and business representatives, and Board of Trustee members dedicated extensive time and effort providing input through information gathering sessions. The process involved understanding MMCC's mission statement and core values, evaluating the existing characteristics and conditions of each campus, establishing and prioritizing needs, and developing a framework to guide how these needs may be addressed in the future. The Master Plan is guiding the College in evaluating and prioritizing future capital projects.

The College's technological infrastructure is at an appropriate level to support faculty, staff, and student needs on both campuses. In addition to scheduled maintenance of network infrastructure and scheduled hardware and software replacement, the College's technology resources are supported

through a helpdesk ticket system.

Setting goals aligned with the institutional mission, resources, opportunities, and emerging needs (5.A.3)

MMCC plans effectively to ensure that its resource allocation aligns with the College’s mission. The mission of MMCC is “to provide educational and community leadership for the development of human ability. To this end the College provides post-secondary education and services to enable students and the community to achieve success in a global society.” This statement, as well as the four enduring goals of the College (Encouraging Student Success, Engaging the Community, Enhancing Employee Impact, and Ensuring Institutional Effectiveness), are adaptable to the changes in the College’s organizational structure, resources, and opportunities. The outcome of the annual budgeting process is the culmination of fiscal, physical, and technological strategies with regard to institutional mission and the availability of funding sources.

During the budget process, each budget manager presents his/her recommendations and requests for the following academic year. These are reviewed by College Council and evaluated in part on their connectedness to the college's vision.

Allocating and assigning resources to achieve organizational goals, while ensuring that educational purposes are not adversely affected (5.A.2)

MMCC is governed by a Board of Trustees elected by citizens who reside in one of the public school districts of Beaverton, Clare, Farwell, Gladwin, or Harrison. The Board of Trustees establishes those broad policies appropriate to the functioning of the College. The Board derives its authority from the community, and therefore, must act on behalf of, and be accountable to, the entire community. The Board of Trustees forms a vital link between the College and the community, facilitating communication on behalf of the College’s interests. The Board of Trustees has the responsibility of policy and budget approval. Under the guidance of the Vice President for Finance and Administration, budget assumptions are identified and budget guidelines, worksheets, and instructions are distributed to departmental budget officers. Budget officers are responsible for reviewing current and historical data for each budget area to establish their annual budget request. The Vice President for Finance and Administration reviews the departmental submissions to ensure alignment with the College’s fiscal, physical, and technological needs, strategic goals, and resource availability. A balanced budget is developed and presented to the Board of Trustees for formal adoption, following a special public budget hearing in June.

Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

<i>Tool</i>	<i>Measure</i>	<i>Use</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Reviews Results</i>
HLC Financial Ratios	Primary reserve ratio; net operating revenue ratio; return on net assets; viability ratio	Operational results of higher education institutions	Annual	Administration; Higher Learning Commission
ACS Data	Revenue; expense; student count	Categorizes information by activity classification	Annual	Administration; other community colleges

5R2: RESULTS**Summary results of measures and Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks**

Mid Michigan Community College					
HLC Financial Ratios					
	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16
Primary Reserve Ratio	0.150	0.189	0.262	0.322	0.331
Net Operating Revenue Ratio	0.072	0.075	0.077	0.134	0.001
Return on Net Asset Ratio	0.053	0.131	0.168	0.074	-0.008
Viability Ratio	2.321	2.945	4.495	6.447	8.049
CFI	3.42	4.86	6.46	6.09	4.3

The Michigan Community College Activities Classification Structure (ACS) is a set of categories and related definitions, which allows users to examine the operation of an institution as they relate to the accomplishment of that institution's objectives. It is a framework that categorizes information by activity classification. The resulting data tables provide helpful comparisons among the 28 Michigan community colleges and aid in setting tuition rates, expense budgets, and capital requirements. The attached charts are samples that indicate [MMCC's effectiveness in terms of instructional costs](#) as compared to other Michigan Community Colleges.

Interpretation of results and insights gained

Among the ACS measures cited above, MMCC is well below both the State average as well as the comparable Michigan community college group average for both cost per student contact hour and instructional costs per Fiscal Year Equated Student (FYES). This demonstrates that MMCC operates very efficiently. In tight fiscal times, with both property tax and state support declining, it is critical for MMCC to operate efficiently. That being said, much of the difference is attributed to the unbalanced ratio of full-time to adjunct faculty. Hiring more adjunct faculty is efficient, but it also doesn't provide for as many student-to-faculty interaction opportunities as adjunct faculty tend to have more outside responsibilities that take them off campus. In the long run, MMCC must continue to develop ways to bring this balance in line.

In terms of average class size, MMCC is on par with the State average, but is significantly over the average of our comparable group. This is an issue MMCC is going to have to explore further.

Preliminary thoughts involve the schedule of classes. It is possible that MMCC does not have the right classes offered on the right days and times. While initial exploration has not been able to

confirm this on a large scale, qualitative data from Advisors has indicated a need to have more block scheduling of classes to provide students with either a Tuesday/Thursday OR a Monday/Wednesday schedule. More analysis needs to be completed in this area.

5I2: IMPROVEMENT

The College anticipates the need to steadily increase tuition rates and fees in order to mitigate the impact of low property tax values, a stale millage rate, and below modest increases in state appropriation funding from the State. In addition, the College plans to regularly review contracts and prepare RFPs for competitive pricing and service to reduce or maintain current expenditure levels.

The College completed a significant construction project in 2015, and continues to perform annual maintenance projects to ensure the physical and technological infrastructures are maintained and used efficiently for current and future academic and community needs.

Sources

- ACS Instructional costs
- General Fund Revenues FY 2017
- Revenue per FYES.pdf

5.3 - Operational Effectiveness

Operational Effectiveness focuses on how an institution ensures effective management of its operations in the present and plans for continuity of operations into the future. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 5.A. in this section.

5P3: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for operational effectiveness, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Building budgets to accomplish institutional goals
- Monitoring financial position and adjusting budgets (5.A.5)
- Maintaining a technological infrastructure that is reliable, secure and user-friendly
- Maintaining a physical infrastructure that is reliable, secure and user-friendly
- Managing risks to ensure operational stability, including emergency preparedness
- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

5R3: RESULTS

What are the results for ensuring effective management of operations on an ongoing basis and for the future? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 5P3. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

5I3: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 5R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

5P3: PROCESSES

Building budgets to accomplish institutional goals

MMCC begins its annual budget process by providing overview information in open sessions. It continues by building and distributing budget worksheets to departmental budget officers. The worksheets include prior year figures, salary and benefit assumptions, and overall expense targets. The Business Office staff compile the returned worksheets and shares them with the College Council for review and input. This stage seeks the broad perspectives of the entire college community.

The Senior Staff then weighs the budget requests against revenue estimates, projections, and requests for strategic project funding to determine proposed tuition and fee increases and/or further expense reductions. The broad criteria used for setting budget priorities are: the strategic plan objectives, focus on student learning, and completion. The final proposed balanced budget is presented to the Board of Trustees and adopted upon their approval. The operating budget is managed by the Business office. Expenditures are initiated at staff levels and routed to the appropriate budget officers for approval.

Monitoring financial position and adjusting budgets (5.A.5)

College expenses are monitored through an accounts payable process and reported to the Board of Trustees in monthly financial statements. Departmental and institutional expenditures are subject to available budget dollars and any resulting budget adjustments are initiated at the budget officer level and approved by the Business office up to \$5,000, approved by the President from \$5,000-\$19,999, and approved by the Board of Trustees if \$20,000 or more. Budget officers have the ability to monitor their budgets in real-time by using a self-service budgeting module within the college's administrative database system (Colleague by Ellucian).

Maintaining a technological infrastructure that is reliable, secure, and user-friendly

The Information Technology (IT) department oversees the technological infrastructure that ensures data is reliable, secure, and user-friendly. They are responsible for the key processes of maintaining and updating computer equipment and software, managing risks through technology audits, and providing technological assistance through a Helpdesk ticket system. Additionally, IT is responsible for maintaining data backups, applying timely software patches, and creating test versions of the college's administrative database system.

The college's administrative database system includes student academic, billing, and financial aid subsystems, as well as accounting, payroll, and human resources. Web-based self-service tools are available to students and employees and allow registration, payments, grades, transcripts, budgets, paystubs, leave summaries, direct deposit banking information, and electronic tax documents. All software updates and patches are first installed to a test environment by IT staff and once testing is complete and approved by the Director of IT, the updates are installed into production and communicated to college staff.

Maintaining a physical infrastructure that is reliable, secure, and user-friendly

The Vice President for Finance and Administration is responsible for maintaining the college's physical structure, including facilities and grounds. Reporting directly to the VP is the Director of Facilities. The Director of Facilities is responsible for monitoring timely responses to maintenance requests, and electricity, water, heating, ventilation, and physical safety concerns.

Security is provided by a third party vendor (Whelan Security Services). This vendor was selected through an open bid process, with proposals reviewed by the Safety and Security Committee and approved by the President and Board of Trustees. Security officers are provided on both of the college's campuses for the entire time classes are in session.

Managing risks to ensure operational stability, including emergency preparedness

Because MMCC is extremely reliant on tuition revenue, risk assessment is imperative during the planning process. Trend data is collected throughout the fiscal year to help the College Council and Senior Staff plan for realistic risk. The college allocates resources conservatively and continues to

contribute annually to planned savings. College leadership works to effectively plan academic programs, scheduling, and human resources to effectively do more with less. Efforts focus on increasing the Foundation balance, increasing state appropriations, and seeking grant funding to support sustainable programs.

The college is committed to maintaining a safe, secure and positive learning environment. The primary concern is for the safety of our students, faculty, staff and visitors. To meet this end, the Office of Student Oversight was created to construct policies and procedures that keep the college community secure, informed, and in compliance with mandated laws and policies. The college has [a written emergency plan \(see especially pp. 9-20\)](#), and conducts periodic training exercises with local emergency responders. As mentioned, the college contracts for on-campus security at both the Harrison and Mt. Pleasant locations.

The Office of Student Oversight has overall responsibility for ensuring the college remains up-to-date with MIOSHA rules, regulations, and requirements and complies with all safety mandates. This includes providing safety boots, prescription safety glasses, and conducting regular training sessions on safety and compliance processes. A MIOSHA representative tours the campuses annually and provides feedback on safety conditions. Risk Management provides an assessment report after their annual tour of the campuses. Changes are made after evaluating both reports at the departmental level.

MMCC has a detailed [Crisis Response Plan](#) that outlines the college’s immediate response to a crisis and its operational procedures. This includes the use of electronic and cellular communications in the event of a major emergency. The Core Crisis Response Team along with Campus Security, the Office of Student Oversight, and members of the Campus Safety and Security Committee are assisted by local law enforcement and Homeland Security to review, update and routinely reassess the Crisis Response Plan. Campus Security along with the Office of Student Oversight, are positioned to have the initial responsibility of making a determination and requesting the necessary resources to investigate any situation that may constitute an emergency or dangerous situation. The Office of Student Oversight has the responsibility of notifying the Core Crisis Response Team of any such incident so that judgment may be made to determine if the situation does, in fact, pose a threat to the health and safety of the campus community. If so, a course of action will be imposed, including notification to the campus community.

Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

Tool	Measure	use	frequency	review
Budget report	Budget versus actual	To monitor expenditures	As expensed; formal report monthly	Budget officers; Finance; President
annual audit	Internal and financial controls	Report annual financial position and risk of fraud	Annual	Finance; President; Board of Trustees
helpdesk ticket	Response times; areas of concern	Process improvement	As needed	IT Staff and Facilities

