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This report attempts to provide a picture of how well MMCC is performing in terms of providing quality instructional services. The report looks at a number of factors relevant to the outcomes of what we do concerning student learning. The report looks at:

- Student Demographics
- Dual Enrolled High School Students
- Incoming Student Readiness
- Student Learning Outcomes
- What Happens to our Graduates
- Instructional Efficiency
- Conclusions & Observations

The flow of these particular pieces of information is intended to look at what we do starting from the intake of “raw materials” (the students we receive), what we attempt to do for the students while they are with us (the delivery of instruction), how our students do after they leave us (transfer success and job placement), and finally, a look at how efficient we are in providing educational opportunities for our students.

1. **Student Demographics**

   This first section provides information on our students in terms of age, gender, full or part time status, class designation, and ethnic background. Also provided is a chart indicating the counties from which our students come.

![Student Age Breakdown](image)
### Table 1.1

#### Fall Enrollments by Gender and Full-Time/Part-Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female FT</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female PT</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male FT</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male PT</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FT</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PT</td>
<td>2801</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2880</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 1.2

#### Fall Enrollments by Class Designation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree Seeking</td>
<td>3,309</td>
<td>3,098</td>
<td>2,942</td>
<td>2,919</td>
<td>2,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Time</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>1,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer In</td>
<td>1,516</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>1,429</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>1,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Degree</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>1,454</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>1,478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 1.3

#### Fall Enrollments by IPEDS Race-Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>3673</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>3674</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>3625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am Indian/AK Native</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more AK Native</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native HI/Pac Isles</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4694</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4552</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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*Note: To provide comparison, 2016 uses 2015 spring session data. Any change from last year’s spring enrollment will result in a corresponding change in the actual 2016 data.

Figure 1.2

2. Dual Enrolled High School Students

MMCC continues to realize an increasing number of dual enrolled high school students. The following charts provide information on the number of these students, as well as their academic performance. You will note that there are more classes taken than there are dual enrolled students. This is because many of these students enroll in more than one class.

Figure 2.1

DUAL ENROLLMENT TRENDS
We also track the success rates of dual enrolled students. These success rates are based on grades of C or better.

3. Incoming Student Readiness

A key factor effecting student success is their readiness for college level courses. The following chart shows how incoming students from the local school districts perform on our placement tests in Math and English. The chart shows the percentage of students that need remediation in these basic areas. The message presented in this chart is that many incoming students simply are not ready for college course work in these two areas.
4. Student Learning Outcomes

This section of the report addresses what happens with our students during the time they spend with us: are they learning? To get at this, the next two charts provide information on the success rates of the overall student population at MMCC: the first in terms of C or better grades, and the second in terms of average GPA. These charts are based on grades issued, so they include “W” grades but not official drops. Distance education is a significant segment of MMCC’s instructional program. Therefore, included on the charts below are success rates for online courses and their withdrawal rates.

![Overall Student Success](image1)

*Figure 4.1*

![Course Withdrawal Rate](image2)

*Figure 4.2*
Other key measures that indicate how well students are doing with us are the percent that actually complete a course and the percent that come back for additional courses in winter semester (retention).

The following charts show the completion and retention rates broken down by division.
Figure 4.5

*Note: This comes from the Governor’s metrics.

Figure 4.6
Student retention from fall to fall is another key indicator as to how well the college is performing. The following chart displays the percentage of degree seeking students that return.

![FALL TO FALL STUDENT RETENTION RATES](image1)

*Figure 4.7*

The following chart depicts the fall to fall retention by division.

![Fall to Fall Retention by Division](image2)

*Figure 4.8*
Another key measure of student success is how well they perform on externally administered exams. There are several program areas in which our students take such exams: Nursing, Radiography, Physical Therapist Assistant, Medical Assistant, Drafting/CAD, and Residential Air Conditioning & Heating.

The Michigan State Board of Nursing (MSBON) quit reporting Michigan Pass Rates to Colleges and the 2016 data for Michigan RN Board Exam Pass Rates will not be available until June 2017.
The Physical Therapist Assistant (PTA) Program did not graduate a class in 2016.
Figure 4.13

Certified Medical Assistant Exam Pass Rates

Figure 4.14

Certified SolidWorks Associate Exam Pass Rate
5. What Happens to Our Graduates?

While the number of graduates per year only provides limited insight into institutional performance, these statistics do provide a partial understanding of how the college serves our community.
The following charts graphically depict the programs from which our students graduated for academic years 2015 and 2016.

**Figure 5.2**

**Figure 5.3**
What happens to our graduates is an important measure of the value their time at MMCC provides them. The following placements rates are based on the State’s Core Indicators for Perkins funded programs.

![Placement for Occupational Students](image)

**Figure 5.4**

Since many of our students transfer to four year institutions, another important measure is how they perform after they transfer. This information is an indicator of how well MMCC prepares students for the four year setting. The following series of charts provides information on transfer performance. The first shows how many students we have transferring to the major regional universities.

![Number of Transfer Students](image)

**Figure 5.5**
The following charts indicate how the transfer students perform in comparison to the native student population of the respective four year institutions.

**Figure 5.7**

**MMCC TRANSFER STUDENT PERFORMANCE AT CMU AFTER 1 SEMESTER**

**Figure 5.8**

**MMCC TRANSFER STUDENT PERFORMANCE AT SVSU AFTER 1 SEMESTER**

**Figure 5.9**

**MMCC TRANSFER STUDENT PERFORMANCE AT FSU AFTER 1 SEMESTER**
6. **Instructional Efficiency**

With the assistance of the Business Office, the Instructional Team has developed a Return on Investment (ROI) model which shows how well each instructional department is doing from a financial perspective. The overall ROI for all of the instructional activities for 2015-16 was approximately $905 thousand. This compares to approximately $2.95 million for 2014-15.

The following graph provides a summary look at the ROI information at the division level for the last three years.

![Division Level Return on Investment](image)

*Figure 6.1*
A key part of the ROI depends on how well we manage the average class size. The following table shows how Mid compares to our counterparts in Group 1 as well as the overall state average.

**Table 6.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMCC</td>
<td>17.97</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>18.44</td>
<td>17.14</td>
<td>17.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 Colleges</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>14.09</td>
<td>15.22</td>
<td>14.39</td>
<td>14.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Average</td>
<td>18.86</td>
<td>17.97</td>
<td>19.11</td>
<td>18.56</td>
<td>17.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final two tables provide information on Instructional Cost per Student Contact Hour and Instructional Cost per FYES (Fiscal Year Equated Student). This information is from the ACS Annual report.

**Table 6.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Per Student Contact Hour</th>
<th>MMCC</th>
<th>State Average</th>
<th>Group 1 Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Instruction</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>9.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>8.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Public Service</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>8.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades &amp; Industrial</td>
<td>10.02</td>
<td>12.65</td>
<td>13.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Occupations</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>12.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Cost per FYES</th>
<th>MMCC</th>
<th>State Average</th>
<th>Group 1 Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>$4,533</td>
<td>$5,683</td>
<td>$6,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>$3,831</td>
<td>$5,416</td>
<td>$5,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>$3,678</td>
<td>$4,887</td>
<td>$5,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>$3,377</td>
<td>$4,544</td>
<td>$4,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>$3,149</td>
<td>$4,262</td>
<td>$4,624</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions/Observations

- With regards to student demographics, the overall patterns seem to be holding. Enrollments, of course, are down, but appear to be leveling off. You can note the modest increase in the 18-19 age group. This reflects our growth in dual enrolled students.

- For the enrollment from the Top Seven Counties, there doesn’t appear to be any significant change in the pattern in the data on which counties our students come from.

- The overall pattern in dual enrollment has been one of significant increase, but this may be leveling off. The course success rate is steady at a good level.

- Student readiness for college-level work has been showing a very modest improvement for those taking the Accuplacer test. It should also be noted that we are moving to a new placement model that will involve using multiple metrics, including high school GPA.

- There has been a slow, gradual improvement in overall successful course completion from 69% in Fall 2012 to 74% in Fall 2016.

- There still remains a lack of any significant difference between online and traditional courses in terms of success rates or withdrawal rates.

- Note regarding the bump in Overall Student GPA for Winter 2016 and Fall 2016: this is due to an error that has been corrected in the calculation. It previously included withdrawals when those should have been omitted.

- The percentage of students completing their fall courses is above 80% for all divisions, except the remedial areas, with the technical and health divisions the highest at approximately 94.8% and 92.7%.

- Looking at the Fall to Winter return rate, we see that MMCC continues to compare positively to the overall rate for Michigan community colleges.

- Looking at the Fall to Winter return rate more locally and by division, it seems to be leveling off at or just under 80% with health students slightly higher than the others.

- The Fall to Fall student retention has an overall pattern of modest increase. For comparison, the national average according to ACT is 54.7% for public two year, open admissions institutions.

- Looking at Fall-to-Fall retention by division, we find the health programs regaining their previous rate after a one year dip.

- We also monitor the Governor’s metric of the completion and transfer rate. MMCC had achieved the state average but has again dipped below.

- We now regularly monitor the certification/licensure exam pass rates for a number of our programs.
  - The RN licensure pass rates are near but just below national level.
  - The Radiography pass rates have been fluctuating somewhat. The rate is has rebounded but is still below the national average.
  - Our Physical Therapy Assistant students are outperforming the national average. Note that we have only had a cohort every other year. We are moving to running two cohorts in the PTA program in the future.
  - Our Medical Assistant students have been regularly outperforming the national average.
○ The Certified SolidWorks Associate exam pass rates are taken by students from our Computer Aided Design program, and they have been doing quite well. We do not receive state or national data at this time.
○ We continue to be near the State and National levels for the HRA results.

- The Graduates by Year graph (Figure 5.1) may need some explanation on the trends depicted:
  ○ We added a number of Credential-level programs that accounts for the increases for that award:
    ■ Geothermal
    ■ Heating & Electricity
    ■ Refrigeration & Air Conditioning
    ■ Legal Office Specialist
    ■ Medical Office Specialist
    ■ Records Information Management Specialist
    ■ Pharmacy Tech
  ○ The drop in certificates is due to our ending the LPN certificate program.
  ○ The gradual drop in associate’s degree primarily relates to our overall enrollment decline.

- Looking at which programs our students graduate from, with the obvious exception of MACRO, the largest portion of our graduates continues to come from our health programs, and our transfer degrees.

- Graduate placement data for our occupational students continues to compare with the state average. Note that this data is based on self-reported information from students. Additionally, "placed" includes employed, transferred to a senior institution, or joined the military.

- The number of students transferring to CMU has returned to the previous high level in 2013, while transfers to FSU remain fairly constant, and those to SVSU increased slightly. The performance of our transfer students remains just under that of the native student population at CMU, and continues to be close or equal to FSU and SVSU students. Note that CMU has not reported the Fall 2016 data yet.

- The Return on Investment model for indicates a continued decline, which is largely due to declining enrollments along with increasing costs.

- In comparison to other community colleges in the state, our instructional division continues to be very efficient as measured by the cost per student contact hour and by the instructional cost per fiscal year equated student.