Mid Michigan Community College

HLC ID 1348

AQIP: AQIP Pathway Systems Appraisal   Visit Date: Not Set

Dr. Christine Hammond
President

Linnea Stenson   Pamela Humphrey
HLC Liaison   *Review Team Chair*

Kristen Ball   Linda Stacy
Team Member   *Team Member*

1 - Reflective Overview

The first section of the System's Appraisal Feedback Report is the Reflective Overview. Here the team provides summary statements that reflect its broad understanding of the institution and the constituents served. This section shows the institution that the team understood the context and priorities of the institution as it completed the review.

In the Reflective Overview, the team considers such factors as:

1. Stage in systems maturity (processes and results).
2. Utilization or deployment of processes.
3. The existence of results, trends and comparative data.
4. The use of results data as feedback.
5. Systematic improvement processes of the activities each AQIP Category covers.

Instructions for Systems Appraisal Team

During this stage of the Systems Appraisal, provide the team's consensus reflective overview statement, which should be based on the independent reflective overviews written by each team member. The consensus overview statement should communicate the team's understanding of the institution, its mission and the constituents it serves. Please see additional directions in the Systems Appraisal procedural document provided by HLC.

Evidence

Overall

Mid Michigan Community College (MMCC) is a public, not-for-profit community college serving five local school districts in two counties. Citizens of these school districts support the college with a levy and elect the members of the board of trustees. The main campus is in Harrison, with an additional location in Mt. Pleasant. MMCC also has almost 1000 students in early college/concurrent enrollment classes. MMCC's mission is to provide educational and community leadership for the development of human ability. It offers four associate degrees with over 35 pathways under those degrees, and 18 certificate programs. MMCC also offers non-credit courses and recently was awarded Michigan Skilled Trades Training funds to work with employees in 20 companies across 8 counties, in 17 different skills.

Vision 2020 is the current strategic plan which was the result of the shared governance system, and has an emphasis on commitment to students, communities, employees, and institutional effectiveness.

In fall 2017, MMCC had 4049 for-credit students. In the 2016-17 academic year, it had 318 non-credit students. MMCC employs 53 full time faculty, 120 full time staff, 216 adjunct faculty, and 12 part-time staff.

MMCC joined AQIP in 2001 and has been using a number of AQIP Action Projects to address the strategic issues identified in the last portfolio. The AQIP Action Projects and other accomplishments suggest improvement of processes and utilization of data to accomplish systematic improvement. It

has recently engaged in numerous internal and external quality initiatives providing benchmarking data and measurements to help inform decisions.The narrative describes its processes and results primarily as aligned and/or systematic.   MMCC continues to face significant issues due to steadily declining enrollments and stagnant financial support from the state government and tax revenues.

Category One: Helping Students Learn

The College rates its maturity in this area as a mix of aligned and systematic in both processes and results, with the exception of Results for Academic Integrity, which is rated as reacting. Mid Michigan provides evidence of using benchmarks (including the DQP) to help define learning outcomes and for action projects to create rubrics for general education courses. The four-year cycle of academic program review aligns course and program outcomes with the mission of the college. Recommendations for improvement resulting from the program review become part of the budget and planning process. While a great deal has been accomplished in aligning general education outcomes to program outcomes, MMCC acknowledges that DQP proficiencies have not been integrated into the co-curricular process, and that the collection of data is uneven. While MMCC has a code of conduct and is committed to freedom of expression, little data exists in this area, which is the reason for them rating this area as reacting.

MMCC was the first public college in Michigan to receive accreditation through NACEP, with the goal to ensure college courses taught at high schools are as rigorous as those taught on campus.

Category Two: Meeting Student and Other Stakeholder Needs

MMCC identifies the processes as aligned across the institution and the results systematic, with more time needed to appropriately collect and analyze data. MMCC has made systematic efforts to provide appropriate academic and support services to a variety of stakeholders including veterans, at-risk, and international students. Using a variety of metrics, the Enrollment Management Committee is responsible for setting targets for completion, retention, and persistence. A Partners Committee is responsible for maintaining a list of current partnerships, identifying gaps, and identification and evaluation of partnership opportunities. Maxient software is used to tract and document the complaint process. Based on results from a recent Ruffalo Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI), improvements made include a new mentoring and student orientation program, Veteran Services and Support, expanded career services, targeted support services, and the LUCES Academy.

Category Three: Valuing Employees

MMCC rates the process maturation in this area as aligned, and the results as systematic. A new leadership team has led to a number of improvements in this area over the last three years. MMCC acquired a talent management system (iCIMS) that allows Personnel Services to better consult with hiring managers. The Personnel Services Advisory Committee developed a new evaluation method for administrators that facilitates alignment between staff member and the institution's mission and strategic plan, and communication has improved. The new faculty contract strengthens the faculty evaluation processes.

In 2015 Mid established a Professional Development Fund and an Innovation Fund and has expanded professional development to include opportunities for all staff. MMCC established a Center for Learning and Leadership which provides workshops and consulting to departments and divisions. While many initiatives are in place, at this point data is not yet available to quantify outcomes and identify trends.

Category Four: Planning and Leading

Mid-Michigan Community College rates both processes and results in the area as aligned. Implementation of the shared governance model is illustrated in the college's approach to drafting a new mission statement and acquiring input into Vision 2020, the strategic plan. Input from 16 committees and departments provided the basis for a recommendation to the Board regarding Mission and Values. Shared governance and administrative departments have addressed 77 of 88 objectives contained in the strategic plan. Leadership lines are well established, and the institution has very few grievances.

Category Five: Knowledge Management and Resource Stewardship

Mid rates process as aligned and results as systematic or aligned. The IR office leads the identification of data needs and the IR Advisory Committee provides input regarding broader stakeholder data needs. MMCC uses national surveys to provide trend and benchmarking data; data from the iCIMS talent management system will provide additional insight when it is fully functioning. Annual budgets are allocated through a shared governance structure aligned with the institution's mission and goals.The management of technological, financial, informational, and physical resources is structured with both long- and short-term strategies that are repeatable and reviewed regularly. Performance is comparable to other Michigan community colleges.

Category Six: Quality Overview

MMCC reports processes in this category are aligned and results are systematic. MMCC became an AQIP institution in 2001, and joined the Continuous Quality Improvement Network (CQIN) in 2015. It has taken two teams to CQIN institutes, in 2016 and 2017, and is one of six community colleges working with the Business Innovation Factory on new business models. Working with CQIN has encouraged the campus to improve shared governance

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2 - Strategic Challenges Analysis

Strategic Challenges are those most closely related to an institution's ability to succeed in reaching its mission, planning and quality improvement goals. Review teams formulate judgments related to strategic challenges and accreditation issues through careful analysis of the Institutional Overview and through their own feedback provided for each AQIP Pathway Category. These findings offer a framework for future improvement of processes and systems.

Instructions for Systems Appraisal Team

Strategic Challenges may be identified on the Independent Category worksheets as the review progresses. The team chair will work with the team to develop a consensus Strategic Challenges statement based on their independent reviews. Please see additional directions in the Systems Appraisal procedural document provided by HLC.

Evidence

Strategic Challenge 1: Data and trends: As indicated in the last systems appraisal, data was an issue then, and is still an issue in this portfolio. With an established IR office, this is an area that will continue to need to mature to support a true quality driven model. There is a lack of in-depth data collection and analysis, given the length of time MMCC has been an AQIP school. They have an opportunity to establish internal targets in addition to external benchmarks. There is also an opportunity to not rely solely on survey data and identify more direct measures.

Strategic Challenge 2: Resources and Institutional Sustainability: MMCC continues to struggle with limited resources, a tax resistant constituency, and aging infrastructure. MMCC has an extremely high percentage of adjunct faculty (80%), which diminishes MMCC's capabilities for sustainability of instructional initiatives. In addition, MMCC relies more heavily than many colleges on tuition for revenue. Identifying further sources of revenues and increasing the percentage of full-time faculty could contribute to greater institutional sustainability.

Strategic Challenge 3: Processes are not evaluated for effectiveness: MMCC has developed processes for shared governance and program review, incorporated DQP into its quality improvement plans, and developed a framework for identifying, selecting and evaluating partnerships. However, there is little evidence that there is a plan or process to regularly evaluate existing processes to ensure they remain effective and relevant.

Strategic Challenge 4: The institution does not appear to be fully vested in the AQIP processes. MMCC has engaged in activities related to quality improvement, such as aligning course proficiencies with DQP and changing the governance structure, but as the Portfolio states, "As mentioned in earlier sections, the college maps its continuous quality initiatives back to Vision 2020. However, the connection to the AQIP categories has not been as evident" (Category 6.2). Results are scarce, and there is very little evidence of completing the quality cycle by closing the loop. Additionally, MMCC questions its commitment to AQIP. The review team encourages MMCC to consider whether AQIP is the best pathway choice for its accreditation.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3 - Accreditation Evidence Screening Summary

Systems Appraisal teams screen the institution's Systems Portfolio evidence in relation to the Criteria for Accreditation and the Core Components. This step is designed to position the institution for success during the subsequent review to reaffirm the institution's accreditation. In order to accomplish this task, HLC has established linkages between various Process and Results questions and the Criteria's Core Components. Systems Appraisal teams have been trained to conduct a "soft review" of the Criteria/Core Components for Systems Portfolios completed in the third year of the AQIP Pathway cycle and a more robust review for Systems Portfolios completed in the seventh year. The formal review of the Criteria and Core Components for purposes of reaffirming the institution's accreditation through the comprehensive evaluation that occurs in the eighth year of the cycle, unless serious problems are identified earlier in the cycle. As part of this Systems Appraisal screening process, teams indicate whether each Core Component is "strong, clear, and well-presented," "adequate but could be improved," or "unclear or incomplete." When the Criteria and Core Components are reviewed formally for reaffirmation of accreditation, peer reviewers must determine whether each is "met", "met with concerns", or "not met".

The full report documents in detail the Appraisal team's best judgment as to the current strength of the institution's evidence for each Core Component and thus for each Criterion. It is structured according to the Criteria for Accreditation and the Systems Appraisal procedural document. Institutions are encouraged to review this report carefully in order to guide improvement work relative to the Criteria and Core Components.

Immediately below the team provides summary statements that convey broadly its observations regarding the institution's present ability to satisfy each Criterion as well as any suggestions for improvement. Again, this feedback is based only upon information contained in the institution's Systems Portfolio and thus may be limited.

Instructions for Systems Appraisal Team

In this section, the team should create summary statements/suggestions for improvement for each of the Criteria for Accreditation.

Evidence

Criterion One: Mission

The MMCC mission is clear and widely understood. The portfolio states that the mission was developed with input from a variety of stakeholders, however the process is not described. Explaining the process to define the mission will make this criterion more clearly met. Additionally, MMCC can more clearly define its mission in terms of meeting the needs of under-represented populations.

Criterion Two: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

MMCC clearly operates with integrity and presents itself clearly and completely to students and to the public. The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning. There are clearly policies in place to ensure ethical conduct but less clear is how the policies

are enforced. Describing how policies are enforced will provide clarity to this criterion.

Criterion Three: Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support

MMCC offers programs appropriate for a community college. It uses the Degree Qualifications Profile to guide general education outcomes. While there is a high dependence on adjunct faculty, there are sufficient faculty and staff to deliver quality programs and services. Focus on effective teaching and learning is one of MMCC's strengths. Information about co-curricular programs was less well developed in the portfolio.

Criterion Four: Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

MMCC clearly demonstrates that it pays attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its various programs. The College recognizes its challenges in tracking the success of its graduates, a challenge experienced by many institutions but, nevertheless, an opportunity for improvement. MMCC engages in assessment activities and maps courses to Master Course Proficiencies, however its progress in the assessment of general education curriculum is slow. It appears that MMCC is collecting data, however it is not clear how the data is used to improve or affect student learning.

Criterion Five: Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

Although one of MMCC's challenges is resources, it is clear that resources are used to promote and provide quality educational programs. The governance and administrative structures enable the College to achieve its mission. Planning appears to be less systematic. MMCC is an AQIP institution and recently joined CQIN, however it is not clear how planning is tied with mission and goals, nor how assessment of learning ties into the planning and budgeting processes. Furthermore, there does not appear to be systematic collection of evidence or use of data to influence decision making generally.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

4 - Quality of Systems Portfolio

In this System Appraisal, peer review teams should acknowledge any work that the institution has begun toward addressing the Criteria for Accreditation and the Core Components. The more focused analysis remains on the AQIP Categories and the institution's evidence related to the Process (P), Results (R), and Improvement (I) questions. In cases where there was HLC follow-up stemming from the institution's previous reaffirmation review, the institution may request closer scrutiny of those items during this Systems Appraisal.

Instructions for Systems Appraisal Team

Because it stands as a reflection of the institution, the Systems Portfolio should be complete and coherent, and it should provide an open and honest self-analysis on the strengths and challenges facing the institution. In this section, the peer review team provides the institution with constructive feedback on the overall quality of the Systems Portfolio, along with suggestions for improving future Systems Portfolio submissions.

Evidence

Overall the Systems Portfolio was complete and coherent, although it did not seem that the voice was consistent throughout the portfolio.

The Systems Portfolio did not clearly describe an institution dedicated to AQIP processes. While MMCC is engaged in activities that indicate progress in areas such as assessment and shared governance, the maturity of the continuing quality improvement processes was not at the level expected of an institution that has been on the AQIP pathway since 2001. MMCC is to be commended for initiatives such as using the Degree Qualifications Profile as a framework for its general education outcomes, developing Master Course Proficiencies, joining CQIN, revising its shared governance structure, and developing a model to assess its partnerships. However, the portfolio did not present sufficient evidence to show the effectiveness of these initiatives, how results of the initiatives are analyzed to make future decisions, or if processes are periodically evaluated to ensure they remain effective.

The quality of the Systems Portfolio reflects the statement in the portfolio that the link between its quality initiatives and AQIP categories is not evident.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5 - AQIP Category Feedback

The Systems Appraisal Feedback Report addresses each AQIP Category by identifying strengths and opportunities for improvement. Through detailed comments, which are tied to the institution's Systems Portfolio, the team offers in-depth analysis of the institution's processes, results and improvement efforts. These comments should be straightforward and consultative, and should align to the maturity tables. This allows the team to identify areas for improvement and recommend improvement strategies for the institution to consider.

I - Helping Students Learn

Focuses on the design, deployment, and effectiveness of teaching-learning processes (and on the processes required to support them) that underlie the institution's credit and non-credit programs and courses.

Instructions for Systems Appraisal Team

In this section, the team should provide a consensus narrative that focuses on the processes, results and improvements for Common Learning Outcomes, Program Learning Outcomes, Academic Program Design, Academic Program Quality and Academic Integrity.

Independent Category Feedback for each AQIP Category from each team member should be synthesized into an in-depth narrative that includes an analysis of the institution's processes, results and quality improvement efforts for each category. Wording from the Stages in Systems Maturity tables for both processes and results should be incorporated into the narrative to help the institution understand how the maturity of processes and results have been rated. The narrative should also include recommendations to assist the institution in improving its processes and/or results. It is from this work that the team will develop a consensus on the Strategic Challenges analysis, noting three to five strategic issues that are crucial for the future of the institution. Please see additional directions in the Systems Appraisal procedural document provided by HLC.

Evidence

CATEGORY 1: HELPING STUDENTS LEARN

Category 1 focuses on the design, deployment and effectiveness of teaching-learning processes (and the processes required to support them) that underlie the institution's credit and non-credit programs and courses.

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 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)

Systematic: MMCC's first of four enduring goals is Encouraging Student Success. Mid appears to have several well-developed pieces in place to ensure the alignment of outcomes to the mission. Examples of these processes include the work of the Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee with the new program proposal process and the program review process. All degree students are required by college policy to be exposed to similar educational experiences which are created through common education outcomes, determined by the faculty-led General Education Committee. MTA guidelines are used to inform selection of courses for the general education program. Having a designated group responsible for approval of all credit offerings and demonstrating alignment with the mission on the New Program Proposal Form are both solid strategies for achieving alignment. The strategic plan includes an objective to use the DQP/Tuning and T-Shaped Professional strategies to achieve this goal, however the role of these is less clear. To be more aligned in this area, Mid should evaluate its processes.

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

Systematic: Mid adopted the Degree Qualifications Profile as a framework for defining learning outcomes for its credit-bearing programs, both program-specific and general education. Having a consistent framework and a faculty-led general education committee appear to support the systematic development of appropriate common outcomes. It is not clear if there are common outcomes for certificate programs. It is also not clear if Mid has, or plans to, evaluate whether the DQP meets its needs.

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

Systematic: The General Education Committee established Master Course Proficiencies for every course that ties back to the DQP framework. The General Education Committee monitors proficiency assessment, although the process for doing so is not included. Subcommittees are formed in response to tasks and projects as needed. Mid could move to an aligned level by clearly articulating its processes.

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

Systematic: Mid joined the Michigan Guided Pathways project with the objective of creating a clear pathway for its students to meet the DQP proficiencies through their programs. An example for the PTA program is provided showing how the courses in the program map to the proficiencies.

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

Reacting: The College relies primarily on advisory committees to gather information related to program relevancy. From the sample minutes provided, it appears that Mid uses the feedback from the advisory board to make improvements. The minutes also mention an employer survey that also provides feedback. Mid has begun regional faculty symposia to discuss transfer issues. This appears to be a new process and the outcomes are not yet clear. It is not clear if these tools are evaluated for

effectiveness.

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

Reacting: Mid students participate in student clubs and service learning projects for leadership and diversity opportunities. The Student Showcase provides additional co-curricular opportunities. However, other initiatives, such as study abroad and service learning, appear to be more reactionary and limited.

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

Systematic: Following the College's selection of the DQP as a framework, faculty led committees determined the specific tools and methods to be used based on the DQP framework and with the help of a DQP/Tuning Coach from NILOA. The assessment and general education committees have identified rubrics to assess the common learning goals. These processes appear to be in the beginning stages. Mid can mature in this area as the processes are repeated, and if they evaluate the processes themselves.

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

Systematic: Mid uses rubrics and norming activities to assess common learning outcomes. This is a faculty led process has resulted in a common rubric for assessment, and results are incorporated in the program review process. It is unclear why the norming of the assessment tool is taking so long – it began in 2014, for just one of the DQP proficiencies. Mid may benefit from re-visiting the rubrics and ensuring the performance indicators are clear and measurable.

1R1   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)

Reacting: While Mid provides examples of results of assessment of common learning outcomes, and provides narrative regarding some of the outcomes, the College acknowledges that having external benchmarking data would be helpful in setting targets. Also, the data is primarily numbers of students demonstrating proficiency.

- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting: Mid recognizes the need to identify external benchmarks. Since Mid has been in AQIP since 2001, it is surprising that the College lacks this critical benchmarking information. It set an internal target of 78% of students demonstrating proficiency, but how that target was determined is not explained. Internal results—some with trend data—was provided by course, allowing for internal comparison. Mid could gain insights by aggregating the data for ALL students, and then drilling down to course level.

- Interpretation of results and insights gained

Reacting: Mid offers some insight and acknowledges areas where improvements are needed, and additional work is indicated. The inability to norm the rubrics is a major stumbling block to being able to successfully assess the general education outcomes. However, as mentioned above, given the length of time Mid has been an AQIP school, it is surprising that some of this is still in developmental stages. Mid has an opportunity to examine institutional outcomes for all students to determine baselines and targets for improvement.

1I1 Based on 1R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years? (4.B.3)

Improvements in progress include assessment of co-curricular activities by student support services and building a database to utilize data from the State of Michigan to provide benchmarking data. An outside consultant has been engaged to better develop the area of co-curricular activities. Mid has an opportunity to incorporate co-curricular activities through its five athletic sports with its curricular learning outcomes. Benefits realized through participation in athletics aligns with the competencies and outcomes of the T-shaped Person. The college may also benefit by tracking data in the aggregate for all students, as well as by program, degree, certificate, etc.

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 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)

Aligned: Mid's common learning outcomes at the program level are aligned using the New Program Proposal Form, and through a 4-year Program Review cycle. This alignment is reinforced through strategic planning. Mid may benefit from periodically reviewing its processes to evaluate their effectiveness over time.

- Determining program outcomes (4.B.4)

Systematic: The College's participation in the Michigan Guided Pathways project provided a review of programs, and renewed emphasis on student completion. Program faculty determine the outcomes, which are then reviewed and approved by the Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee. Input from field experts is not detailed.

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

Systematic: The DQP framework is used for all outcomes, which provides consistency and common language. The course outcomes are clearly identified on the course syllabi provided as examples in the systems portfolio. The outcomes and levels of achievement are articulated on the program review documents. In areas where there is a third-party exam, the outcomes are expressed in terms of licensure and preparation for those exams.

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

Aligned: Programs with AAS degrees rely on accreditation agencies and/or advisory committees to ensure relevance and alignment with workplace needs. Faculty and administrators annually review the transferability of courses by using the Michigan Transfer Network. Courses that do not transfer, or transfer only as elective credit, are evaluated for relevancy. When appropriate, outcomes are consistent with external accreditation standards. Additionally, Mid helped organize the development of a regional faculty partnership that meets to discuss transferability and curricular alignment between community colleges and four-year universities.

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

Reacting: Mid appears to be in the beginning stages of designing and aligning co-curricular activities to meet common outcomes. Mid uses internships to align with program curricular activities. Whether other co-curricular activities at Mid are similarly integrated is unclear. The college has an opportunity to investigate whether outcomes of the eighteen student clubs and organizations, athletics, and service projects are or can be intentionally aligned with program outcomes to support student learning.

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

Systematic: Faculty members lead the effort to select the methods and instruments for assessment of student learning, based on the DQP framework. The assessment methods identified are reviewed by the Curriculum Committee. An assessment repository exists for storing assessment documentation. Professional Development days provide opportunities for discussions about assessment across departments. Mid has an opportunity to formalize, document, and evaluate these processes.

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

Systematic: Program learning outcomes are assessed during the four-year program review cycle.

1R2   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)

Aligned: The four-year program review process applies to all programs, and all must provide proficiency data.

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

Systematic: Samples of licensure and certification exam results were provided, along with sample assessment plans. The outcomes of different programs lend themselves to different kinds of data collection, however Mid may benefit from working with assessment plan authors to develop more data-rich plans that are easily understood. A basic rubric could be provided for all assessment plans –

one that can be adjusted to fit the various academic programs. For example, the sample Radiography assessment plan presented benchmarks (thresholds) and outcomes in a clear and concise format. The college may have an opportunity to assess formative data in addition to summative data, to be able to adjust and improve before the students graduate.

- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Systematic: Mid's results in many programs show trend data are comparable or exceed state and national benchmarks. Other programs are just beginning to collect data to benchmark. The college has an opportunity to compare with prior years of national data to help set initial benchmarks and to inform its programs and student success levels.

- Interpretation of assessment results and insights gained

Systematic: Mid provides information about program and department changes that influenced test scores. They are also exploring the use of test prep software. The college is to be commended for critically analyzing its program assessment data to understand the factors influencing student success both positively and negatively.

1I2 Based on 1R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years? (4.B.3)

In the LMS, individual assignments will be aligned to the DQP master course proficiencies. The Faculty Master Agreement now requires faculty to use the LMS for all courses which should make course assessment information more readily accessible and should result in more accurate data for all courses and programs. This is a critical step for Mid to get to reach a more aligned level of maturity. Mid uses a variety of tools to measure assessment at various levels; it is encouraged to not become overwhelmed by the data, but to use the data to make meaningful decisions. It may also benefit from focusing on formative and summative data.

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 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)

Systematic: Mid has divided students into three cohorts: new, returning, and dual-enrolled. The college documents an aligned process for how these student cohorts and their respective needs are determined. However, the college might benefit from further identifying cohorts and needs through their existing processes (veterans, online students, special-needs, etc.).

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

Systematic: Mid identifies several stakeholder groups, expectations, and ways to determine needs, and the communication channel which facilitates this process. A process for evaluating these methods is not described.

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

Reacting: The College provides information about the process for developing new programs and courses that may be needed for stakeholders which is the same as that for the general student population. However, the process for an identified need becoming a new proposal is not described.

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

Systematic: The program review process is used to assess the currency and effectiveness of academic programs.While not mentioned here, Mid presented results from licensure and certification exams, Noel Levitz Satisfaction Survey, and graduation/transfer rates. The College also has a review matrix to determine viability. While it is clear that Mid regularly reviews programs, it is not clear how it selects the tools, methods and instruments to assess its programs.

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

Reacting: Courses and programs are reviewed during the program review process.   Mid developed a matrix in 2017, to be implemented in fall 2017, to review viability. Since the process was just developed, it is too soon to see results.

1R3   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)

Systematic: Mid provides a variety of results including licensure exams, graduation and transfer rates, and Ruffalo Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory results. More direct measures of program outcomes is encouraged.

- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Systematic: Mid reports many detailed analyses of data based on trends and could benefit by further breaking down the data to identify program trends. It notes that while overall enrollments are down, there is an increase in dual-enrolled students, which could be a cohort for future growth if they matriculate to Mid after completing high school. Most of the results mentioned above have external benchmarks; internal targets are not as clearly stated.

- Interpretation of results and insights gained

Reacting: While the College recognizes that the scores on the Noel Levitz survey are not satisfactory, they have no specific data to use for improvement. As stated previously, with the length of time they have been in AQIP, it seems this should have been addressed previously. Mid is encouraged to dig deeper into the results, as well as to identify some direct measures of program effectiveness.

1I3   Based on 1R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Planned improvements include collecting data from internship experiences. It would be good to collect data other than satisfaction surveys, in order to get direct measures of the experiences. Mid also plans to implement the Full Measure app which will allow Mid to monitor students' academic progress and identify barriers to their progress.

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 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)

Aligned: MMCC has established course prerequisites which are published and publicly available. The college should be commended for analyzing and updating those standards relative to student preparation and success. It does not appear that a common syllabus is used across course sections, but a project to review syllabi led to the establishment of master course proficiencies.

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

Aligned: MMCC ensures program rigor regardless of modality or location through master course proficiencies, program review and NACEP accreditation for concurrent enrollment. The Office of Online Learning and Development as well as the Instructional Designer in Distance Education support faculty teaching in the online format.

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

Aligned: Board policy establishes the guidelines related to the awarding of credit. The portfolio details the processes the college uses to award for Non-Traditional and prior learning as well as transfer credits. The college evaluates CLEP, AP, Military, and articulated courses. Transfer credit is accepted if it meets the requirements outlined in MMCC's policies.

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

Systematic: Technical programs are accredited by appropriate agencies and faculty are encouraged to participate in conferences to remain current in industry standards and trends. While Mid provides a list of the specialized accreditations, and it is clear that advisory boards assist in maintaining program relevancy, information is not provided as to how the institution decides which specialized accreditations to pursue.

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

Reacting: Mid is implementing a process, based on the DQP framework, to assess outcome attainment throughout all levels of award. The Assessment Committee is leading a project to incorporate DQP proficiencies with assignments in Moodle for a more standardized evaluation. Since this project is in the implementation phase, it is at the reacting level currently. As Mid implements the process, and continually evaluates and improves it, they will advance in maturity.

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

Aligned: The college uses Master Course Proficiencies to ensure rigor across sections and modalities. Program Review and new program development processes include evidence of instruments and measures for assessment. The 2017 Annual Instructional Report showed no differences in grade outcomes between online and face-to-face classes.

1R4   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)

Systematic: Since the last Systems Portfolio in 2012, all health sciences programs had site visits and all retained accreditation. Off-Campus programs assess measures for student progression, persistence, retention, completion, however similar data is not provided for on-campus programs; a comparison in data would be meaningful. Grade attainment for various delivery modes is examined. Enrollment statistics and student feedback are used to measure program quality.

- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Systematic: While Mid does an adequate job of collecting information and internal data and trends, it is unclear as to if or how internal targets are set. Furthermore, it is not evident how the data collected is evaluated and used to make improvements. The summary results show no significant differences in outcomes from students taking courses over different modalities. Off-Campus students earn higher GPAs than regular (on-campus?) students. Licensure and pass rates are comparable with external benchmarks and GPAs of transfer students are higher than native university students.

- Interpretation of results and insights gained

Systematic: Mid analyzes results in a number of areas, and continues to refine the tools and processes. However, it is not clear how the data are used for decision-making.

1I4   Based on 1R4, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

 A specialized accreditation committee is being developed, as well as a Program Development Process. Mid collects a lot of data and may gain insights by comparing outcomes for non-technical and technical students. Additionally, setting internal targets can help MMCC advance in this category.

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   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)

Aligned: MMCC is committed to ensuring freedom of expression and academic integrity as evidenced through the Master Agreement between Faculty Senate and the Board of Trustees, and through training on ethical practices for students and employees.

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

Systematic: The College has appropriate policies in place to address ethical learning and research policies. The Student Code of Conduct and the Academic Dishonesty Policy and Procedure communicate the college's expectations for ethical learning and research and the consequences of violating the policy. Mid may benefit from institutionalizing what constitutes plagiarism and cheating and providing guidelines for infractions of policies to ensure consistency across the university.

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

Systematic: Mid states that it supports research and inquiry by faculty, especially as it pertains to the scholarship of teaching and learning. An IRB is in place with oversight to ensure ethical practices in research. Ensuring ethical teaching is not mentioned in this response. It is not evident that Mid's policies related to research and ethical teaching are reviewed on a regular basis.

- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to evaluate the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of supporting academic integrity

Systematic: Mid utilizes Maxient software to collect and track data related to the Student Code of Conduct. Processes and responsibilities are in place to address instances of inappropriate student conduct. It is not clear how Mid measures or evaluates ethics in teaching or research by faculty.

1R5   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)

Reacting: At this point, the College only reports on the number of training programs presented to students and faculty concerning integrity. Information about problems or infractions is not provided. While providing training is essential, data points that indicate the training is successful is also important.

- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting: Mid acknowledges a lack of information to report in this area. It is critical that relevant data be identified and collected in order to determine effectiveness in this area.

- Interpretation of results and insights gained

Reacting: As there is little to report in terms of results, no interpretation is provided.

1I5   Based on 1R6, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

While the College has appropriate policies and agreements in place, as well as a software package to assist in documentation, there has been little progress in terms of developing an actual process to report, collect, and analyze relevant information.

CATEGORY SUMMARY

Mid-Michigan Community College is primarily Systematic in its processes and Reacting to Systematic in its results in this category. While Mid has a number of processes in place that appear to support development of programs with solid common learning outcomes, and the DQP provides consistency across programs, there is not a well-developed process in place to use data as effectively as possible. In many cases there is no comparable data, and the institution needs to identify specific information needed to support a quality improvement process.

CATEGORY STRATEGIC ISSUES

Processes are not evaluated for effectiveness.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

II - Meeting Student and Other Key Stakeholder Needs

Focuses on determining, understanding and meeting needs of current and prospective students and other key stakeholders, such as alumni and community partners.

Instructions for Systems Appraisal Team

In this section, the team should provide a consensus narrative that focuses on the processes, results and improvements for Current and Prospective Student Needs, Retention, Persistence and Completion, Key Stakeholder Needs, Complaint Processes, and Building Collaborations and Partnerships.

Independent Category Feedback for each AQIP Category from each team member should be synthesized into an in-depth narrative that includes an analysis of the institution's processes, results and quality improvement efforts for each category. Wording from the Stages in Systems Maturity tables for both processes and results should be incorporated into the narrative to help the institution understand how the maturity of processes and results have been rated. The narrative should also include recommendations to assist the institution in improving its processes and/or results. It is from this work that the team will develop a consensus on the Strategic Challenges analysis, noting three to five strategic issues that are crucial for the future of the institution. Please see additional directions in the Systems Appraisal procedural document provided by HLC.

Evidence

Category 2 focuses on determining, understanding and meeting needs of current and prospective students and other key stakeholders, such as alumni and community partners.

2.1: CURRENT AND PROSPECTIVE STUDENT NEED
Current and Prospective Student Need focuses on determining, understanding and meeting the 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 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)

Systematic: As an open-enrollment institution, Mid serves a large number of underprepared students. All new and transfer students are evaluated using multiple measures. This evaluation serves as the initial point in determining academic needs. Additionally, faculty can refer students using an online form. This form goes to the Office of Student Oversight which is then responsible for referring students to appropriate resources.

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

Aligned: The college provides aligned academic support and career discovery processes starting as early as middle school and continuing through college. Mid Mentors functions as a point of contact for students and the Career Services Office assists students through orientation, workshops, individual assessment, and career exploration tools.

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

Systematic: In addition to the Learning Management System that facilitates communication, the Faculty Master Agreement requires faculty to have five office hours a week, and faculty must have a presence on campus four days a week.

• 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)

Systematic: New students and developmental students have required support through advisors and placement. Students can self-identify and request basic academic support services or are referred to resources through placement testing. Specialized services for international, disabled, dual-enrolled, and other student cohorts are in place to serve individual cohorts as applicable. However, there is no mention of the learning support needs of faculty.

• Determining new student groups to target for educational offerings and services

Integrated: MMCC has a commendable integrated process for analyzing trends and future needs through a cross-functional Employment Management Committee that meets bi-monthly and uses data analysis to inform their projections and enrollment targets. Deans use data from an internally developed rubric to establish current targets for the divisions, and to inform discussions on curriculum, staffing, and facility needs.

• Meeting changing student needs

Systematic: Mid provides an extensive list of changes and initiatives that have been implemented to meet student needs. Mid indicates that it uses in part data from the Ruffalo Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey, but does not say on what other information decisions are based. The system could be improved by collecting data from ongoing student contacts with student services, faculty, and staff.

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

Reacting: MMCC relies on students to self-report subgroups with which they identify and has services for Veterans, students with disabilities, and those who are eligible for TRiO services. These appear to be reacting responses to students with distinctive needs. The College may have an opportunity to use data from the Enrollment Management Committee or by mining its own databases

to identify other possible subgroups in need of distinctive services. For example, are there distinctive needs of dual enrollment or distance learners?

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

Reacting: MMCC refers students to outside resources for non-academic support services. This is evidence of a reactive process, possibly due to limited resources. The College could move to a systematic level if it can identify a point of contact for students in need of urgent non-academic support services. For example, the portfolio does not mention financial aid support, mental health support, or how Title IX issues are handled.

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

Aligned: Staff qualifications and requirements are established as part of the hiring process. Qualifications are verified during the screening process. The College provides professional development opportunities and resources.

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

Systematic: Rather than duplicating services, Mid partners with community agencies to provide non-academic services. 211 provides direct access to information and referrals. MMCC students learn of non-academic support services during orientation, on the College website, and through the monthly newsletter.

• Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess student needs

Systematic: The College relies on Ruffalo Noel-Levitz SSI to assess student needs. Committees use that data to determine if other instruments should be purchased or developed internally. The multiple measurements placement assessment instrument was a product of this process. However, relying on data collected annually from a sample population can provide limited data that could lead to lag time in identifying student needs and responding to them. Collecting data on students at points of contact with faculty and staff can provide more immediate results and would be evidence of a higher level of maturity.

• Assessing the degree to which student needs are met

Systematic: Key items of importance to students are determined through the Ruffalo Noel-Levitz SSI which guides the selection of appropriate tools. However, the survey is administered to only a sample of students and is based on student perception. It is not clear what the average response rate is. More direct measures of meeting student needs, in addition to the SSI, would help MMCC advance in maturity.

2R1 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)

Systematic: Results from the SSI are provided which provide a comparison to the national average. Results are mixed, with Mid rating lower than the national average in Meeting Diverse Stakeholder Needs, yet they score much higher than the national average on Academic Advising and Counseling. However, the results are not dated. Since the SSI is administered every year, Mid should be able to present trend data over time. It is also not clear what the response rate is, or how the sample is selected. Not having this information minimizes the significance of the results.

• Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting: While the charts provided clearly show how the College ranks in terms of comparison to the national averages, no discussion is offered concerning internal targets.

• Interpretation of results and insights gained

Reacting: MMCC reports that it needs to do surveys in multiple areas to further analyze results. This is an indication that the SSI may not be a sufficient tool for determining all student needs. The College needs to make further investigation of the results a priority, as many of the areas are vital to success for specific student cohorts (like older students, Veterans). Since the institution has been in AQIP since 2001, it's surprising that there is not a deeper level of analysis in this area.

2I1 Based on 2R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Mid acknowledges the limitations in using the SSI. While it provides a broad overview, there is a level of detail missing that is critical for the College to determine appropriate improvements and actions.

MMCC has more mature processes for analyzing and predicting enrollment trends than for analyzing the needs of its current students. Many student needs are integral to success for these cohorts. If not identified and addressed, the deficiency could lead to lower success rates for the College and more importantly, for the students.

The College has an opportunity to develop trend data and to expand survey and data collection for determining student needs and satisfaction. Student interactions with faculty, and with advising and other support services could be examined for possible trends for more responsive service. SSI is administered annually, and MMCC could identify additional areas for improvement through more timely data analyses.

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 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)

Aligned: MMCC used previous feedback indicating that its processes for determining RPC data were not integrated or consistent. An IR position was created, and processes for standardizing RPC at specific, regular intervals were developed. Establishing official, trusted data helped the College develop reasonable, attainable targets for improvement. To move to an integrated maturity, MMCC should regularly evaluate its processes for optimum effectiveness.

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

Aligned: MMCC used its own refined RPC data and external data from state and national sources to inform setting its targets for RPC. In 2013, the Retention Committee led an exercise to identify factors affecting student attrition, primarily by surveying students and conducting focus groups. Analysis of this data led to the development of a plan to identify targets and ways to increase retention. It is not clear whether the data collection was a one-time event or if it is on-going.

• Analyzing information on student retention, persistence and completion

Reacting: As the result of personnel changes, Mid has made changes in this area. There is now a new Retention and Completion committee, with four subcommittees. Based on reports from the subcommittees, a work group is now developing a retention plan. It remains to be seen what this plan will entail, and the direction in which the college will move.

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

Reacting: MMCC describes how it developed a process to determine its own targets yet reverted to using targets determined at state and federal levels. This is indicative of a reactive process. While useful for comparison in establishing its own target, it may not be in the College's best interest to rely on aggregate national targets. The portfolio does not describe a process for meeting RPC targets, only how the data is shared.

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

Reacting: The portfolio does not report how it selected its own tools, methods, and instruments to assess RPC data. It appears that MMCC relies on the required reporting processes of external and independent agencies to determine its own processes. This indicates that MMCC is reacting to the tools, methods, and instruments determined by outside sources and not choosing its own. While it is necessary to meet the requirements of funders/agencies, the College may want to determine if there

are tools, other than those that are required, that may support the institution's goals.

2R2 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)

Aligned: MMCC provides results for retention and persistence in aggregate and by major. Completion, transfer, and placement rates are included for all students subdivided for technical students earning certificates. Providing summary results and trend data for context is an indication that summary results are aligned.

• Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Systematic: The portfolio provides comparisons with external cohorts in the state and through the VFA. Most of the results are based on required reporting, while the VFA shows an attempt to reach beyond the minimum requirements for peer comparisons beyond the state lines.

Reacting: No internal trend targets were reported, just results.

• Interpretation of results and insights gained

Systematic: MMCC has a static target for course completion and relies on IPEDS and State targets for external comparison. The College reports consistency for results based on internal reporting, yet mixed results when compared to state and national results. These results appear to be systematic in maturity. If MMCC does further analysis to understand the discrepancies between internal and external comparisons it can increase the confidence level in its results and reporting.

2I2 Based on 2R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years? (4.C.3)

Mid recognizes that further improvements are needed in this area, and that is very much supported by goals in the strategic plan. MMCC appears to have tools but perhaps not the resources or personnel to take full advantage of their capacity. This gap in analyzing and interpreting the results with a high degree of confidence appears to have lowered the institution's trust in its numbers. The College has reverted to using comparisons that may not be applicable or accurate. It would be valuable for the College to invest in examining its processes for gathering and reporting data to validate its results to its stakeholders and to plan for improvement.

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 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)

Aligned: MMCC leveraged an action project to create a process for identifying and evaluating key external stakeholder groups. This process is utilized by the college-wide Partnership Committee and incorporates worksheets, flowcharts, and rubrics to facilitate the process. The college-wide Partnership Committee is charged with identifying gaps, facilitating new partnerships, and evaluation of partnerships. Through an AQIP Action Project, the College developed a rubric to expedite this process. To advance to an integrated maturity, MMCC could routinely evaluate the process to ensure it remains effective.

• Determining new stakeholders to target for services or partnership

Aligned: Potential new stakeholders are identified through the contacts with advisory boards and community contacts, combined with environmental scanning done by the Workforce and Economic Division. When potential new stakeholders are identified they are submitted to the Partnership Committee to be evaluated through their established processes. This collaborative process is commendable and a model for aligned processes for the entire college community.

• Meeting the changing needs of key stakeholders

Aligned: MMCC meets the changing needs of its key stakeholders through regular contact with key college involvement, and through employer surveys and visits. The College has developed robust tools to evaluate the viability of new occupational and transfer programs that incorporates a wide variety of variables for analysis. These are collaborative aligned processes for developing and maintaining relationships with key stakeholders. To advance in maturity, MMCC can evaluate its processes to ensure they remain effective.

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

Aligned: MMCC uses aligned processes to select the tools, methods, and instruments to assess these processes. An internal rubric was developed by the college-wide Partnership Committee to evaluate the partnerships. Additional tools are utilized by individual departments to analyze specific outcomes relative to its requirement and needs. To advance to an integrated maturity, MMCC could evaluate the processes to ensure they remain effective.

• Assessing the degree to which key stakeholder needs are met

Systematic: The College uses feedback from the stakeholders to determine the degree to which stakeholder needs are being met. MMCC may advance in maturity by including in its rubrics the measures that will be used to measure the effectiveness of partnerships. This would provide some objectivity to the assessment process.

2R3 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)

Systematic: Mid provides several examples of surveys which are used. While the Business survey results provide valuable information for the college in terms of area employment needs, it does not provide information upon which to evaluate the College's success in meeting these. The Sample Partnership Evaluation is a well- designed tool that can very much yield information about success in meeting the needs of the partnership.

• Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting: While some good information is contained in the various surveys, there was no discussion concerning targets and benchmarks.

• Interpretation of results and insights gained

Systematic: Results from surveys were not clear, and the College might benefit from asking respondents to rank their needs by priority, and then rate the extent of their satisfaction with outcomes and performance of students placed with employers.

2I3 Based on 2R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Trend data will be extremely helpful in evaluating MMCC's results for meeting key stakeholder needs. Survey results need to be further evaluated—it appears that the respondents have a very young workforce with few retirements in the foreseeable future, except in a few areas (like HVAC). Accurate analysis of these data points could be very informative for college planning, if it is representative of the existing and future stakeholders' needs. MMCC is in the process of developing a Career Center. MMCC has now been named the Apprenticeship standard holder for the Mid Michigan region. It is not clear why this was not mentioned earlier in the portfolio.

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

2P4 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

Systematic: MMCC has an online form which students may use for complaints or comments.

Students can enter anonymous complaints, or formal complaints which have separate processes for following up. A detailed process is in place to address grade grievances. The college uses Maxient to track and document conduct issues and concerns.

• Collecting complaint information from other key stakeholders

Systematic: Internal stakeholders (staff, faculty, supervisors) can log complaints through the ideaQ system for College Council to address. Personnel Services handles complaints about other staff and human resources matters. A Help Desk system collects and routes requests regarding technology and facilities. These processes appear to be systematic in nature. While there are avenues for others to report issues, it is not clear how those processes are communicated to all stakeholders.

• Learning from complaint information and determining actions

Systematic: In terms of student issues, the College looks for trends and consistent issues during the response process. Academic complaints are processed by Academic Administrators who evaluate trends in totality. The Student Oversight Committee reviews and evaluates complaints registered by or involving student behavior. When trends are identified, they are addressed with the appropriate person or department.

Reacting: However, it is not clear how actions are determined with complaints from external stakeholders. Nor is it clear how trends are identified.

• Communicating actions to students and other key stakeholders

Systematic: Student complaints are addressed by the Academic Administrator and outcomes are reported to the originator of the complaint through their preferred communication media. It is unclear if or how the College reports intermittent actions or occurrences regarding student complaints outside the annual report.

• Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to evaluate complaint resolution

Reacting: In 2014, the College selected Maxient as the provider for complaint resolution. However, this tool appears to be used for the purpose of tracking student incidences of academic dishonesty, conduct, and harassment. Tools for processing complaints from other stakeholders are not included.

2R4 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)

Reacting: It is not clear from the evidence provided if student conduct is tracked or if the incidences

recorded are the result of student complaints. If these are student complaints, no outcomes are included. The departments related to faculty complaints are reported, but no other details are provided. The lack of results indicates a reacting process.

• Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting: No internal targets or external benchmarks were documented. The College has an opportunity to research possible benchmarks through Maxient or Clery reports.

• Interpretation of results and insights gained

Reacting: MMCC is at a reacting level for this area. Inadequate data appears to be collected which limits the interpretation and analysis of its complaint systems. The College has results but cannot use them to make informed decisions because of its incomplete and vague nature.

2I4 Based on 2R4, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

The narrative of the portfolio implies that the Maxient system is used to collect student complaints, however it is not evident from the results presented that this is the case. Limited results are reported, which makes any evaluation of the process less than meaningful. Mid reports that it intends to incorporate an employee complaint process into the Maxient system.

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 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)

Aligned: Selection of collaborating partners is a function of the Partnership Committee and Off Campus Advisory Committee (OCAC). The Partnership Committee takes a proactive approach, collaborating with other campus departments and seeking partners to fill gaps. The OCAC is tasked with selecting, buiding, and maintaining partnerships with K-12 schools.

• Building and maintaining relationships with partners

Systematic: While the Partnership Committee and OCAC take the lead in identifying, pursuing, and evaluating partnerships, key campus personnel have the responsibility for building and maintaining the partnership. These roles are determined by the type of partnership, and where it best fits into the college culture. These could be staff in Workforce and Economic Development, or in the academic areas, and the frequency of contact varies based on needs of the partnership. It is not clear how the Partnership Committee and OCAC communicate with the key campus personnel who have the responsibility for maintain the partnerships – it is assumed that there is collaboration between the two.

• Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess partnership effectiveness

Systematic: The Partnership Committee has the responsibility for identifying tools, methods and instruments. A rubric which can be used at all stages of the partnership development has been developed, as well as a Partnership Evaluation Form. However, the results presented do not include results from the rubric, so it is unclear whether the evaluation tool is being used.

• Evaluating the degree to which collaborations and partnerships are effective

Systematic: MMCC created and revised the rubric to evaluate the effectiveness of the partnership relationships. Areas of evaluation include Shared Vision, Roles and Responsibilities, Communication, Accountability, and Mutual Benefit. However, it is not clear how or if the rubric is being used to evaluate the effectiveness of partnerships.

2R5 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)

Systematic: While peer benchmarks are scarce, MMCC is collecting a variety of data for partnership assessment, including regional data. The data is primarily numbers, such as dual enrollments and number of partnerships, rather than measures that can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the partnerships. Applying the evaluation rubric and making decisions based on the results will help MMCC advance in maturity. The College has an opportunity to set targets and additional KPIs that measure partnership satisfaction from the partners' perspective.

• Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting: The College acknowledges the lack of target and benchmarks. This is an area of concern, given the length of time that MMCC has been an AQIP school.

• Interpretation of results and insights gained

Reacting: MMCC provides few interpretations and insights about the nature of its results, which shows a reacting level. Further research and surveying can provide understanding for the trends in dual enrollment increases and the irregular capital campaign results.

2I5 Based on 2R5, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

The College acknowledges that previously, partnerships were handled very informally. The Partnership Committee and the rubric represent a step forward, but the institution now needs to apply the rubric to its partnerships and also to evaluate the process.

CATEGORY SUMMARY

While it is clear that MMCC values students, the communities which it serves, and the business and industry community, there is more work to be done in this area. The College's Partnership Committee appears to be an effective approach to working with external agencies. The rubric that has been developed shows great promise, but as indicated, the entire process now needs to be evaluated. Data continues to be a challenge for the College, and the addition of an IR office should help to develop this area.

There are some aligned processes in this category, but overall MMCC is at Systematic, sometimes Reacting maturity levels. The portfolio indicates desires for what it wants to do, or should do, but without plans and goals they are just dreams. Not understanding and probing results for meaning can put MMCC in a vulnerable position in an environment where competition for student enrollment and partnership involvement is intensifying.

CATEGORY STRATEGIC ISSUES

As indicated in the last portfolio, data was an issue then, and it is still an issue in this portfolio. With an established IR office, this is an area that will continue to need to mature to support a true quality driven model.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

III - Valuing Employees

Explores the institution's commitment to the hiring, development, and evaluation of faculty, staff and administrators.

Instructions for Systems Appraisal Team

In this section, the team should provide a consensus narrative that focuses on the processes, results and improvements for Hiring, Evaluation and Recognition and Development.

Independent Category Feedback for each AQIP Category from each team member should be synthesized into an in-depth narrative that includes an analysis of the institution's processes, results and quality improvement efforts for each category. Wording from the Stages in Systems Maturity tables for both processes and results should be incorporated into the narrative to help the institution understand how the maturity of processes and results have been rated. The narrative should also include recommendations to assist the institution in improving its processes and/or results. It is from this work that the team will develop a consensus on the Strategic Challenges analysis, noting three to five strategic issues that are crucial for the future of the institution. Please see additional directions in the Systems Appraisal procedural document provided by HLC.

Evidence

Category 3 explores the institution's commitment to the hiring, development and evaluation of faculty, staff and administrators.

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 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)

Systematic: MMCC has well-developed, systematic recruiting, hiring, and orienting processes to ensure the hiring of staff with the needed skills, qualifications, and values. A new talent management system has improved hiring processes. Evaluation of those processes would move MMCC to a more aligned maturity.

• Developing and meeting academic credentialing standards for faculty, including those in dual credit, contractual and consortia programs (3.C.1, 3.C.2)

Reacting: The decision to review faculty credentials was reacting to HLC guidelines. MMCC

developed three-year compliance plans with those who did not meet the standards and indicates that the standards will be used in future faculty hires. As this new process is carried out and the results are evaluated the College can increase its maturity level.

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

Reacting: Sufficient number of faculty is addressed through the program review process. Other ways of identifying sufficiency is via surveys and advisory groups, yet it is unclear as to how the input from these various channels is then prioritized as the information goes to the VP of Academic Services. These are indirect methods of measurement and do not appear to be strategic, indicating a reacting level of maturity.

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

Reacting: Discussions concerning appropriate staffing levels are part of annual budget discussions, including not just the need for new staff, but also changes in responsibilities, and consideration for positions that may be obsolete. While there appears to be a process for presenting staffing needs to the president, it is not clear on what basis the president makes final decisions, and how that is communicated to the rest of the college community, indicating reacting maturity.

• **Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools**

Reacting: MMCC reports results (see 3R1) for hiring, staffing, and other HR processes, indicating some systematic collection of data. MMCC is just beginning to use the TMS to track outcomes in this area. It also plans to survey employees and hiring managers to assess the outcomes of the hiring practices. Since these are new initiatives, they are reacting in maturity.

3R1 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)

Reacting: MMCC collects data and it appears that some analysis occurs. For example, MMCC recognized that the number of staff in management positions is much higher than comparative institutions, and the college's leadership council has begun to address this. It is not as clear how MMCC is addressing other issues that were identified, which indicates a reacting maturity.

• Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting: MMCC provides charts and comparison data with peer institutions for several areas. However, the College includes no data on creating and striving to meet internal targets and is at

a reacting maturity level.

• Interpretation of results and insights gained

Reacting: MMCC recognizes the areas where improvements are needed. The College has implemented an optional employee exit interview. It may be beneficial to make this a standard process, and to analyze the results along with trend data. MMCC provides some interpretation of the results but it is not evident that this occurs on a regular basis.

3I1 Based on 3R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

The most significant accomplishment in this area is the acquisition of the CMS Talent Management System. MMCC states that with the current funding structure, challenges with hiring faculty are hard to overcome. This could be a problem in the future, as MMCC's reliance on adjunct faculty may increase.

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 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

Systematic/reacting: Full time faculty performance evaluations are determined via collective bargaining and agreement made with the Board of Trustees, and adjunct faculty are evaluated on a regular basis, indicative of a systematic maturity level. Information about the past evaluation process, and its effectiveness, would provide some context in this area. It is not clear how the administrative and hourly staff evaluations are designed, indicating a reacting maturity stage.

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

Reacting: MMCC employees have opportunities to communicate via the committee structure as well as in departmental meetings. The President holds bi-weekly meetings with senior staff. While the process is in place, it appears to be top-down in nature, with committees "receiving" charges – it isn't clear if they are also able to develop action items on their own or provide input. Since this structure is still relatively new, some method to evaluate this is critical.

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

Systematic: It is the supervisor's responsibility to make sure the employee and the respective position are aligned with the college's mission. The employee goal setting process is intended to enhance the employee's position or address an element of the strategic plan. It is not clear if supervisors are given training or parameters to provide some consistency in the goal setting process, but this process appears to be systematic.

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

Systematic: The faculty master agreement, board policy, and the collective bargaining agreement with hourly staff provide the structure for the evaluation processes for the various groups. While the Portfolio states that adjunct faculty are observed at various points, it is not clear that this is documented in an institutional policy, but overall this process appears to be systematic.

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

Systematic: The shared governance system appears to play a role in this process, as does the Employee Benefits Task Force. Compensation is determined by collective bargaining. The Mid Matters committee sponsors events to encourage and recognize employee engagement, although no examples were given. Employees are recognized for years of service on Fall PD day. These processes appear established and systematic**.** While there appears to be several communication channels, there is a lack of clarity concerning how these various groups interact in a cohesive fashion.

• Promoting employee satisfaction and engagement

Reacting: While some processes to promote satisfaction and engagement are given, there is no discussion of employee engagement and the PACE results suggest these processes may not be particularly effective, pointing to a reacting maturity. MMCC might benefit from exploring additional, more comprehensive means to promote employee satisfaction and engagement.

• Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

Systematic: MMCC provides tables systematically comparing the performance on the PACE survey in 2011 to the results in 2015.

3R2 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)

Systematic: MMCC provides tables comparing the performance on the PACE survey in 2011 to the results in 2015.

• Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting: While MMCC's results are comparable with national norms, in many areas, the results have declined in the four years between the surveys. The College reports analyzing questions before the next PACE survey, but could benefit by developing targets and conducting internal surveys on a more frequent basis, and could move up from a reacting level.

• Interpretation of results and insights gained

Reacting: MMCC correctly interprets the results of the PACE survey by acknowledging various areas that need improvement, as reflected by the survey results. By establishing repeatable processes, analyzing the data, and creating action plans for improvement, MMCC can move to a higher level but currently is reacting in maturity. The College has an opportunity to further investigate the results, possibly with additional surveying or focus groups, in order to identify areas of improvement for valuing employees.

3I2 Based on 3R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Systematic/Reacting: MMCC correctly interprets the results of the PACE survey by acknowledging various areas that need improvement, as reflected by the survey results. The College has an opportunity to further investigate the results, possibly with additional surveying or focus groups, to establish areas for improvement for valuing employees.

While MMCC has identified areas for improvement, these appear reactionary in nature. The PACE is administered every four years, which is not often enough to keep in touch with employee satisfaction. MMCC may benefit by developing interim, more direct, measures in this area to better monitor outcomes for employee evaluation and recognition.

3.3: DEVELOPMENT
Development focuses on processes for continually training, educating and supporting employees to remain current in their methods and to contribute fully and effectively throughout their careers at the institution. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.C. and 5.A. in this section.

3P3 Describe the processes for training, educating and supporting the professional development of employees. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

• Providing and supporting regular professional development for all employees (3.C.4, 5.A.4)

Reacting: In addition to professional development required by the collective bargaining agreement, MMCC provides and supports professional development, provides tuition reimbursement, and participates in Michigan Community College Leadership Academy. However, the College is operating at a reacting level of maturity due to a lack of understood, repeatable, and documented processes for this area. MMCC has not developed criteria and guidelines for awarding faculty

professional development funds. It is not clear how all professional development opportunities operate in a coordinated fashion to best serve all employees.

• Ensuring that instructors are current in instructional content in their disciplines and pedagogical processes (3.C.4)

Systematic: MMCC follows the HLC faculty qualifications guidelines. Faculty are required by the master agreement to participate in professional development annually. Faculty work with their dean to develop plans to remain current in their fields.

• Supporting student support staff members to increase their skills and knowledge in their areas of expertise (e.g. advising, financial aid, etc.) (3.C.6)

Systematic: Many student support staff belong to professional organizations and participate in professional development opportunities provided by those organizations. On-campus professional development is also available for support staff, appearing to be a systematic process.

• Aligning employee professional development activities with institutional objectives

Systematic/reacting: Supervisors are responsible to ensure employees engage in activities that align with institutional objectives. The annual goal setting that takes place as part of the evaluation process also supports this and indicates a systematic process.

There does not appear to be a systematic process for aligning professional development with institutional objectives. While there seems to be some connection between professional development and institutional objectives, the efforts seem to be siloed within departments, indicative of a reactive system.

• Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

Systematic: MMCC uses the PACE, Lynda.com and SSI results to measure the effectiveness of professional development. While these measures are systematic and repeatable, they track outcomes in terms of participation or completion. MMCC may benefit from identifying more direct measurement of outcomes and effectiveness.

3R3 What are the results for determining if employees are assisted and supported in their professional development? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 3P3. 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)

Systematic: PACE results are presented, with the national norm and 2 years of results. The PACE is administered every four years – MMCC may consider either administering the survey more often or identifying other ways to measure the effectiveness of professional development on a more frequent

basis. The SSI results provide the national norm and one year of results – the year of the survey is not provided so we don't know how recent this data is. The SSI measures student satisfaction with student services. The Lynda.com data provides numbers of employees participating in online training opportunities. These appear to be systematic, as data are collected, analyzed, and shared across the institution.

• Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting: PACE and SSI provide national benchmarking, and MMCC does not meet the national norm in several areas. Internal targets are not provided, which would provide the College with interim goals and impetus to advance to a higher level than reacting. MMCC may benefit from setting internal targets for its measures to better identify areas of strength and opportunities for improvement.

• Interpretation of results and insights gained

Based on the survey information and internal analysis, staff were least satisfied with professional development opportunities.

3I3 Based on 3R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Improvements are planned to professional development opportunities on campus, however it is not clear how the topics for professional development are determined. In light of the dissatisfaction determined from PACE, MMCC may benefit from asking for input from employees when designing these opportunities. Other improvements include a year-long professional development program for the Director's Council and developing a system to ensure financial support is equitably distributed.

CATEGORY SUMMARY

MMCC is generally systematic and reacting in its processes and results for Category 3, indicating a number of areas for improvement in this category. One area for improvement in all areas in this category is identifying some direct ways to measure success in hiring, recognition and evaluation, and development.

While MMCC has encouraged campus involvement and communication through the shared governance model, it is not clear that this process has reached a level of maturity to ensure that the various committees are able to move initiatives forward. In many processes there are opportunities for measuring results and outcomes, but there is no mechanism or impetus for closing the loop. Comparison of the PACE surveys from 2011 to 2015, indicates several areas where the College has experienced decreased satisfaction. It is critical that more attention is given to these areas to better assess the effectiveness of processes.

CATEGORY STRATEGIC ISSUES

As with other categories, there is a lack of in-depth data collection and analysis, given the length of time MMCC has been an AQIP school. The College has an opportunity to establish internal targets in addition to external benchmarks, and to analyze results collectively for continuous improvement.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

IV - Planning and Leading

Focuses on how the institution achieves its mission and lives its vision through direction setting, goal development, strategic actions, threat mitigation, and capitalizing on opportunities.

Instructions for Systems Appraisal Team

In this section, the team should provide a consensus narrative that focuses on the processes, results and improvements for Mission and Vision, Strategic Planning, Leadership and Integrity.

Independent Category Feedback for each AQIP Category from each team member should be synthesized into an in-depth narrative that includes an analysis of the institution's processes, results and quality improvement efforts for each category. Wording from the Stages in Systems Maturity tables for both processes and results should be incorporated into the narrative to help the institution understand how the maturity of processes and results have been rated. The narrative should also include recommendations to assist the institution in improving its processes and/or results. It is from this work that the team will develop a consensus on the Strategic Challenges analysis, noting three to five strategic issues that are crucial for the future of the institution. Please see additional directions in the Systems Appraisal procedural document provided by HLC.

Evidence

Mission and Vision focuses on how the institution develops, communicates and reviews its mission and vision. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 1.A., 1.B. and 1.D. within this section.

4P1 Describe the processes for developing, communicating and reviewing the institution's mission, vision and values, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

• Developing, deploying, and reviewing the institution's mission, vision and values (1.A.1, 1.D.2, 1.D.3)

Reacting: While MMCC discusses the development of the shared governance structure, and its approval in February 2015, far less information is provided about the Philosophy and Mission statements adopted in 2009. In totality, these indicate a reacting process, which could become systematic as the College collects evidence that the mission statement and goals are generally understood and pervasive across campus.

• Ensuring that institutional actions reflect a commitment to its values

Systematic: It appears that MMCC is beginning to work systematically to ensure its actions reflect its values. Using the values developed as a basis, it has made several improvements since 2015. The new strategic plan, Vision 2020, affirms the goals identified in 2015.

• Communicating the mission, vision and values (1.B.1, 1.B.2, 1.B.3)

Systematic/Reacting: Although main processes are not described, MMCC reports using employee participation in shared governance as a key strategy in communicating mission, vision, and values, demonstrating the start of systematic processes. Additionally, a redesigned website and direct communication from the president are intended to help reinforce these. While several actions are described in the past tense it is not clear if these are on-going communication efforts or one-time activities, which indicated a reacting level of maturity

• Ensuring that academic programs and services are consistent with the institution's mission (1.A.2)

Reacting: MMCC provided a schedule of data discussions from 2015, and the Local Strategic Value report as evidence that programs and services are mission driven. However, this describes activities, not processes, making it difficult to determine how it ensures academic programs and services are consistent with its mission on an on-going basis. Without generally understood, repeatable, and documented processes the College remains in the reacting stage.

• Allocating resources to advance the institution's mission and vision, while upholding the institution's values (1.D.1, 1.A.3)

Reacting: MMCC reports using feedback from the previous site visit to improve the allocation of resources but does not address how allocating these resources applies to the mission and values. Monthly meetings among leadership from select areas indicates a development of coordination among units across campus. Evidence of how the College is benefiting from shared governance in all units to implement effective practices would signal that the College has risen from a reacting process maturity level to a systematic level.

• Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (e.g. brand studies, focus groups, community forums/studies and employee satisfaction surveys)

Systematic: MMCC uses the PACE, SSI, the Voluntary Framework of Accountability, and a customized study of EMSI on graduate success to track outcomes in this area. Combined with the College's significant investment in establishing an Office of Institutional Research, this is evidence of repeatable, documented, systematic processes.

4R1 What are the results for developing, communicating and reviewing the institution's mission, vision and values? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 4P1. 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)

Systematic: While PACE results directly related to mission as perceived by employees are provided, including the number of participants in the survey would provide additional context. The Ruffalo

Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction inventory results listed do not include a year or the number of participants. Documented, repeatable, and generally understood results are evidence that MMCC has a systematic process for collecting summary results for developing, deploying, and reviewing the institution's mission, vision and values.

• Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting: While MMCC generally scores better when compared to the national performance in PACE and SSI, it is critical to note that generally, MMCC's performance was better in 2011 than in 2015. No internal targets are provided, indicating a reacting level of maturity

• Interpretation of results and insights gained

Reacting: No interpretation of the results from the two surveys is provided in the portfolio, signifying MMCC is in a reacting maturity stage. The College has a significant opportunity to analyze the results further and to develop internal benchmarks and initiatives for continuous improvement.

4I1 Based on 4R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Given MMCC's documentation and interpretation in this section, it is apparent that the process used to determine the shared governance system was not designed to include the evaluation process. The College plans several significant changes over the next few years. A new mission statement is anticipated, as well as a name change. The College anticipates servicing a larger geographical area, which will present not only opportunities, but also significant challenges in terms of administration and communication. Revisiting the structure and process periodically will help MMCC advance in maturity in this area.

4.2: STRATEGIC PLANNING
Strategic Planning focuses on how the institution achieves its mission and vision. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 5.B. and 5.C. in this section.

4P2 Describe the processes for communicating, planning, implementing and reviewing the institution's plans and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

• Engaging internal and external stakeholders in strategic planning (5.C.3)

Reacting: Many internal stakeholders were involved developing the shared governance model in 2014-15. However, it is not clear to what extent students, external stakeholders, and other key constituencies are involved in ongoing strategic planning. Focus groups of stakeholders were used in development of the Campus Master Plan in 2015, but it is not evident if those types of shared government processes were since used for ongoing strategic planning, indicating a reacting level of maturity.

• Aligning operations with the institution's mission, vision and values (5.C.2)

Systematic: MMCC presents a diagram depicting how the college's plans and operations are encapsulated in the mission and values. The portfolio reports that the Vision 2020 document was created with input from shared governance committees across campus, although details on the process are not included.

• Aligning efforts across departments, divisions and colleges for optimum effectiveness and efficiency (5.B.3)

Reacting: MMCC describes how the Vision 2020 document was created with input and in consideration of several other critical planning efforts, reflective of a systematic maturity. However, a reacting process is indicated due to lack of details for continuing efforts across the College.

• Capitalizing on opportunities and institutional strengths and countering the impact of institutional weaknesses and potential threats (5.C.4, 5.C.5)

Reacting: While it's clear that Vision 2020 and shared governance committees are key to capitalizing on strengths and moving the institution forward, it is not as clear how the institution deals with weaknesses and threats, placing MMCC at a reacting stage. The portfolio highlights specific actions regarding operationalizing the strategic plan, but it is not clear that these are processes. Every August the president gives charges to the committees – this appears to be a top-down approach to identifying committee foci for the year.

• Creating and implementing strategies and action plans that maximize current resources and meet future needs (5.C.1, 5.C.4)

Reacting: Participation in CQIN resulted in the drafting of a new mission statement. Beyond that, it is not clear how the college implements strategies and action plans to maximize current resources and meet future needs, indicating the processes are reacting.

• Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (e.g. achievement of goals and/or satisfaction with process)

Reacting: Although MMCC includes results for tracking outcomes the portfolio does not include details on how it tracks outcomes or how it measures goal achievement, which indicates a reacting maturity level. MMCC would have benefited from describing more of the processes related to the goals in the other sections of this sub-category.

4R2 What are the results for communicating, planning, implementing and reviewing the institution's operational plans? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 4P2. 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)

Systematic: MMCC presents a variety of descriptions of measures related to the goals of the strategic plan, and reports that a majority have received attention. The IR dashboard provides overviews for progress on many of the measures, evidence of providing information to evaluate and communicate progress across institutional units. This is indicative of a systematic result maturity level.

• Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Systematic/Reacting: While many of the charts provided show comparisons, there is no discussion about internal targets or trend data.

• Interpretation of results and insights gained

Reacting: MMCC acknowledges that there are challenges associated with the current planning process. However, it is not clear exactly how the college intends to address these issues, as there is a lack of clarity concerning real versus perceived problems, representative of a reacting stage.

4I2 Based on 4R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

The process, results and improvement portions of this sub-category, 4.2, do not appear to be related. That is, the data in the results are not linked to processes, and it is not clear how the improvements mentioned follow from the data in the results section. While MMCC has a lot of activities and initiatives, there appears to be a lack of consensus as to the effectiveness and overall campus satisfaction with the direction. It appears that a great deal of time has been spent clarifying the mission statement, while a new strategic planning session will begin in 2019.

4.3: LEADERSHIP
Leadership focuses on governance and leadership of the institution. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 2.C. and 5.B. in this section.

4P3 Describe the processes for ensuring sound and effective leadership of the institution, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

• Establishing appropriate relationship between the institution and its governing board to support leadership and governance (2.C.4)

Aligned: The relationship between the Board of Trustees and the institution is clearly explained in Board policy.

• Establishing oversight responsibilities and policies of the governing board (2.C.3, 5.B.1, 5.B.2)

Aligned: The Board policy establishes oversight responsibilities and policies of the governing board. MMCC has also developed a Delegation Roster indicating the person or area responsible for the various policies. The roster was initiated in 2009 and updated in 2014. The College's shared governance policy is described, all indicating an aligned maturity.

• Maintaining board oversight, while delegating management responsibilities to administrators and academic matters to faculty (2.C.4)

Systematic: Academic and operational divisions report monthly to the Board. It is evident from the Delegation Roster that management and academic matters are appropriately delegated, appearing to be systematic in nature.

• Ensuring open communication between and among all colleges, divisions and departments

Systematic: MMCC uses a variety of tools to communicate among stakeholders including publication of committee meeting minutes, quarterly report by the President, Mid Mich Weekly Report and Mid Month report, and a text message service to reach adjunct faculty, collectively representative of a systematic process.

• Collaborating across all units to ensure the maintenance of high academic standards (5.B.3)

Systematic: MMCC uses primarily the shared governance structure to facilitate collaboration among various areas of the college, indicating a systematic process. Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee has primary responsibility for maintaining high academic standards, and there is faculty representation on various committee. Several examples of collaboration are given, but it is difficult to get a sense that these are actual processes that are evaluated periodically.

• Providing effective leadership to all institutional stakeholders (2.C.1, 2.C.2)

Systematic/Reacting: Both internal and external stakeholders have regular opportunities to interact the Board. The response in the Portfolio focuses on leadership provided by the Board. Leadership provided by institutional leaders is not discussed.

• Developing leaders at all levels within the institution

Systematic/Reacting: The Center for Learning and Leadership (CLL) is a resource for all employees that provides resources for professional development. In addition, there are two professional development days per year for staff and one for faculty. Additionally, employees may be selected to participate in state or local leadership academies. While several opportunities are listed, it is not clear how they were identified or if they are assessed for effectiveness.

• Ensuring the institution's ability to act in accordance with its mission and vision (2.C.3)

Systematic/Reacting: The Board has open meetings that make its work transparent and the Portfolio states that the shared governance committees support institutional alignment. However, processes explicitly related to acting in accordance with mission and vision are not provided.

• Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

Reacting: MMCC primarily uses the PACE to measure leadership effectiveness. MMCC may benefit from identifying more direct ways to measure leadership effectiveness.

4R3 What are the results for ensuring long-term effective leadership of the institution? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 4P3. 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)

Systematic: PACE results for several items related to leadership effectiveness are presented, along with response rates.

• Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Systematic/Reacting: Climate issues at MMCC fall in the Consultative range, and are very close to those of comparable institutions. However, in several areas, MMCC scored lower in 2015 than in 2011. Although benchmarking with the national norm is provided, no internal targets are included.

• Interpretation of results and insights gained

Reacting: MMCC correctly identifies areas of improvement as indicated by the PACE results. Given the time and effort expended to create the shared governance structure, it is telling that one area for improvement is lack of effective communication for policies and procedures and lack of clearly defined administrative processes. MMCC may benefit from evaluating the effectiveness of the shared governance structure and processes to ensure they are functioning as intended.

4I3 Based on 4R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

In order to develop a skill based professional program and succession planning, MMCC intends to identify and assess leadership competencies, and to use survey data more strategically. There is an opportunity to examine leadership effectiveness beyond the Board of Trustees. As mentioned above, MMCC may benefit from evaluating the effectiveness of its shared governance structure.

4.4: INTEGRITY
Integrity focuses on how the institution ensures legal and ethical behavior and fulfills its societal responsibilities. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 2.A. and 2.B. in this section.
4P4 Describe the processes for developing and communicating legal and ethical standards and

monitoring behavior to ensure standards are met. In addition, identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

• Developing and communicating standards

Systematic/Reacting: Board policy guides the development of standards and delegates the management function to the President and his administration. Shared governance committees review proposed policies and standards. The College depends on the shared governance structure for communication purposes, as well as electronic communication. These appear to be systematic processes. However, the processes for developing ethical standards are not discussed. It is not clear if the policy and procedural standards include ethical standards as well, indicating a reacting maturity level.

• Training employees and modeling for ethical and legal behavior across all levels of the institution

Systematic: MMCC uses SafeColleges for training employees regarding ethical and legal behavior. Additionally, the College systematically provides training on legal and ethical topics during the two professional development days offered each year.

• Operating financial, academic, personnel and auxiliary functions with integrity, including following fair and ethical policies and adhering to processes for the governing board, administration, faculty and staff (2.A.)

Reacting: MMCC has several mechanisms in place to ensure that financial, academic, personnel and other areas function with integrity. Processes are not clearly identified, so it is not clear if they are repeated and evaluated; doing so could help advance the maturity level from reacting to systematic.

• Making information about programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships readily and clearly available to all constituents (2.B.)

Systematic/reacting: Comprehensive information is provided on the website and in the catalog. Other tools to inform students include a partnership with FullMeasure to provide a mobile application, Elucian's Self Service for financial aid, a NetPrice Calculator. It is not clear if there are processes in place to systematically review the information to ensure currency.

4R4 What are the results for ensuring institutional integrity? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 4P4. 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)

Systematic/Reacting: MMCC utilizes the PACE survey for evaluation purposes. PACE is an indirect measure of assessment; MMCC may benefit from identifying direct ways to measure the effectiveness of process related to integrity.

• Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting: MMCC utilizes the PACE survey for evaluation purposes. PACE is an indirect measure of assessment; MMCC may benefit from identifying direct ways to measure the effectiveness of process related to integrity. No internal targets are included, signifying a reacting stage.

• Interpretation of results and insights gained

Reacting: MMCC recognizes that a potential area of opportunity is in the communication of its mission and values to employees. Helping employees connect their work to the mission of the institution is also an area for improvement.

4I4 Based on 4R4, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

MMCC has appropriate policies, controls, and training in place to communicate the expectations concerning integrity. MMCC has developed an Improvement Model to help administrative units connect individual projects to the mission of the college. The College has employed tools such as SafeColleges and FullMeasure to provide support in this area.

CATEGORY SUMMARY

Process and results in this category are primarily reacting and systematic. While appearing to be continuously under construction, there is not a clear sense of how the mission statement drives the operations and planning of the institution. MMCC seems to do a lot of "things" related to shared governance and committee work, but the "things" may enable working in silos rather than collaborating across the college. The PACE results indicate that employees do not have a clear sense of how their work connects with the mission and values. Comparison of the 2015 and 2011 surveys indicates that little has changed, and in some areas, performance has declined. Despite the Shared Governance committees and other communication avenues, it appears that communication continues to be a challenge, and is an area that needs to be addressed.

CATEGORY STRATEGIC ISSUES

MMCC lacks direct measures and internal targets necessary to comprehensively analyze processes, results, and improvements.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

V - Knowledge Management and Resource Stewardship

Addresses management of the fiscal, physical, technological, and information infrastructures designed to provide an environment in which learning can thrive.

Instructions for Systems Appraisal Team

In this section, the team should provide a consensus narrative that focuses on the processes, results and improvements for Knowledge Management, Resource Management and Operational Effectiveness.

Independent Category Feedback for each AQIP Category from each team member should be synthesized into an in-depth narrative that includes an analysis of the institution's processes, results and quality improvement efforts for each category. Wording from the Stages in Systems Maturity tables for both processes and results should be incorporated into the narrative to help the institution understand how the maturity of processes and results have been rated. The narrative should also include recommendations to assist the institution in improving its processes and/or results. It is from this work that the team will develop a consensus on the Strategic Challenges analysis, noting three to five strategic issues that are crucial for the future of the institution. Please see additional directions in the [Systems Appraisal procedural document](#) provided by HLC.

Evidence

Category 5 addresses management of the fiscal, physical, technological and information infrastructures designed to provide an environment in which learning can thrive.

5.1: KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT
Knowledge Management focuses on how data, information and performance results are used in decision-making processes at all levels and in all parts of the institution.

5P1 Describe the processes for knowledge management, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

• Selecting, organizing, analyzing and sharing data and performance information to support planning, process improvement and decision making

Systematic: The Office of Institutional Research is responsible for data functions. The College states that the office is responsible for improving data reliability, security, and access. A coordinated effort to select and clean data was undertaken by the Director of IR and the IT Systems Programmer. Official Term Data was designated at regular intervals, establishing data points for reporting purposes. However, the process for selecting the data is not clear . Ellucian Colleague is used to house and access institutional data. Entrinsik informer is used to pull data from other data sources such as the LMS . As data drives AQIP, it is essential that these improvements continue.

• Determining data, information and performance results that units and departments need to plan and manage effectively.

Systematic: Data and information are determined by internal stakeholders and by requirements from external constituencies. The Institutional Research Advisory Committee provides feedback and assistance to the Director of IR, strengthening shared governance at MMCC in a systematic process.

• Making data, information and performance results readily and reliably available to the units and departments that depend upon this information for operational effectiveness, planning and improvements

Aligned: Information and results are publicly available through MMCC's IR page and additional reports can be requested through the HelpDesk. The College rotates monthly "Data Discussions" throughout departments, providing transparency and staff awareness. This is an aligned process which increases efficiency and effectiveness.

• Ensuring the timeliness, accuracy, reliability and security of the institution's knowledge management system(s) and related processes

Aligned: The servers are physically secured and protected by encryption to ensure the integrity and security of information resources. Maintenance of the MMCC website is being decentralized in the College. Ellucian is periodically invited to audit MMCC's practices, and two campus-wide committees inform and provide feedback. The QIR and IT worked jointly to clean the OTD, providing another example of alignment regarding the College's data and information processes and systems.

• Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (including software platforms and/or contracted services)

Systematic: External consultants provide assessment for knowledge management processes and security. Ellucian was contracted to identify efficiencies, compare utilization with industry best practices, and to provide recommendations with regards to MMCC's four enduring goals.

5R1 What are the results for determining how data, information and performance results are used in decision-making processes at all levels and in all parts of the institution? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 5P1. 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)

Systematic: Results for Knowledge Management processes are systematic, and primarily reported in terms of counts, number of reports, users, and HelpDesk tickets; however, no information was provided regarding stakeholder satisfaction with these systems. SSL assessment results were high, and Ellucian's report provides a deeper analysis into quality of services and areas for improvement.

• Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting: No targets were reported. Trend data has been established, and by setting benchmarks MMCC can identify areas of possible improvement, especially for HelpDesk processes. This is indicative of a reacting process, but by adding feedback loops like short surveys for HelpDesk tickets the College can work to evaluate their results for this area. MMCC has an opportunity to research industry benchmarks for IT customer service to stakeholders.

• Interpretation of results and insights gained

Systematic: As data needs have continued to increase, the Ellucian consultant has recommended the need for the Campus to pursue additional automation. Additionally, as the number of online course offerings increases, MMCC recognizes the need to evaluate staffing levels to provide adequate support. Further investigation of the results could reveal other insights into knowledge management processes and identify areas for additional improvement.

5I1 Based on 5R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

MMCC has identified areas for improvement and increased efficiency by documenting and coordinating reporting efforts and creating a process to facilitate a smooth, non-disruptive transition when staff transfer between departments.

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 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)

Aligned: MMCC has an appropriate administrative structure to support these key operations. Two-thirds of MMCC's revenue is generated through tuition and fees, and 25% comes from state funding. The College has strategically focused on enrollment growth strategies, coordinated and led by a campus-wide Enrollment Management Committee. In 2015, MMCC developed a Campus Master Plan to manage the physical infrastructure. The IT infrastructure is operating at appropriate levels with scheduled replacement planned. The College faces fiscal challenges due to a low millage rate and stagnant state support; however, college personnel have been aggressive in seeking outside funding sources. These processes are transparent and aligned.

• Setting goals aligned with the institutional mission, resources, opportunities and emerging needs

(5.A.3)

Systematic: MMCC has processes for goal setting that clearly support the mission. However, these processes are not clearly presented in the portfolio.

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

Systematic: A balanced budget is created through processes beginning with budget officer requests and culminating with Board of Trustee approval. The VPFA coalesces the requests and verifies alignment with the strategic goals. It is unclear as to what extent internal stakeholders are involved in the budgeting process. This appears to be a systematic process, but could be raised to a higher level of maturity with evidence of campus-wide opportunities for documented feedback.

• Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

Reacting: MMCC relies on external benchmarks to track outcomes and results, which indicates a reacting level of maturity. The College could benefit by establishing internal benchmarks and comparing year-to-year progress and trends.

5R2 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)

Systematic: HLC financial ratios and cost per student as compared to other Michigan community colleges are presented. This area could be improved with data presented relative to physical or technological infrastructure.

• Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Systematic: MMCC compares favorably in terms of cost per student contact hour and instructional cost per FYES. However, it should be noted that while MMCC's instructional cost per FYES is still less that the state average, it increased significantly from 2014-15 to 2015-16. It is not clear that MMCC has internal targets for these costs; however, they are cognizant of the limitations of financial resources.

• Interpretation results and insights gained

Systematic: MMCC recognizes that its comparatively low cost is somewhat due to the high percentage of adjuncts, which is not always the most cost effective in the long run. Class sizes are larger than peer institutions, and schedule reconfiguration is being explored.

5I2 Based on 5R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the

next one to three years?

MMCC is heavily reliant on tuition and fees for revenue. In the event of stagnant enrollment or decreased state funding, the College will need to explore increasing tuition.

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 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

Aligned: The College starts the budget process with open discussions. This provides for transparency and inclusiveness. Priorities are based on the strategic plan, with focus on student learning and completion. The balanced budget is approved by the Board of Trustees and managed by the Business Office.

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

Aligned: Expenses are monitored by the Board of Trustees via monthly financial statements. Current budgets are monitored by budget officers through Elluclan, and adjustments can be initiated at the budget officer level. Approval levels are in place for various spending amounts.

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

Systematic: Responsibility for ensuring the reliability and security of IT infrastructure resides in the IT department and appear to be standard and systematic. User-friendly, self-service tools provide access to appropriate resources based on user needs. Updates and patches are first installed in a test environment before going live.

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

Systematic: The Director of Facilities, who reports directly to the VPFA, is responsible for ensuring a safe, reliable campus infrastructure. A system of maintenance requests helps to ensure the viability of the physical plant. The College contracts with a third party to provide security, and officers are on both campuses while classes are in session.

• Managing risks to ensure operational stability, including emergency preparedness

Systematic: MMCC manages fiscal risk through fiscal conservatism and contributions to savings. Considering uncertain state funding, the College has focused on increasing the Foundation balance and seeking grant funding. Emergency and Crisis Response Plans were created to train and prepare for emergency situations.

• Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

Systematic: Budgets, audits, HelpDesk tickets, and safety reports are used to document, track, and measure outcomes for operational effectiveness.

5R3 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)

Systematic: The summary of results indicates that the College is monitoring the budget, HelpDesk tickets, and safety. MMCC may want to identify another way to monitor the effectiveness of IT services and risk management other than tracking numbers of HelpDesk tickets.

• Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting: Peer comparison regarding instructional expenses document that MMCC is spending less than other institutions and operating in a fiscally-conservative environment. However, no comparisons, internal targets, or benchmarks are provided for IT effectiveness or campus security. This indicates a reacting level of maturity.

• Interpretation of results and insights gained

Systematic: It is not clear which expenses are included in Student Services and which are included in Instruction. The Portfolio mentions looking at the number of adjunct versus full time faculty, but it's not clear if they are in two different categories of the budget. The College may benefit from looking into the various expenses comprising these two categories to identify where costs may be reduced while still maintaining academic rigor.

5I3 Based on 5R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

MMCC appears to operate effectively with limited resources. MMCC states that a weakness identified in the FY financial audit has been addressed; however, information related to the nature of the weakness was not provided. The College also recognizes the need to continue to address cyber security.

CATEGORY SUMMARY

MMCC appears to have the infrastructure and controls in place to address the components of knowledge management. Designated positions have direct responsibility for the various aspects of the operation. MMCC's major challenge is the constraint in terms of financial resources, as this has the potential to have a negative impact on operations. The measures tracked and reported related to

Knowledge Management could be more robust.

CATEGORY STRATEGIC ISSUES

Fiscal resources are an issue for MMCC, but an issue which they seem to address proactively. These constraints result in an unbalanced ratio of full to part-time faculty, which can be a challenge.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

VI - Quality Overview

Focuses on the Continuous Quality Improvement culture and infrastructure of the institution. This category gives the institution a chance to reflect on all its quality improvement initiatives, how they are integrated, and how they contribute to improvement of the institution.

Instructions for Systems Appraisal Team

In this section, the team should provide a consensus narrative that focuses on the processes, results and improvements for Quality Improvement Initiatives and Culture of Quality.

Independent Category Feedback for each AQIP Category from each team member should be synthesized into an in-depth narrative that includes an analysis of the institution's processes, results and quality improvement efforts for each category. Wording from the Stages in Systems Maturity tables for both processes and results should be incorporated into the narrative to help the institution understand how the maturity of processes and results have been rated. The narrative should also include recommendations to assist the institution in improving its processes and/or results. It is from this work that the team will develop a consensus on the Strategic Challenges analysis, noting three to five strategic issues that are crucial for the future of the institution. Please see additional directions in the Systems Appraisal procedural document provided by HLC.

Evidence

Quality Improvement Initiatives focuses on the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) initiatives the institution is engaged in and how they work together within the institution.

6P1 Describe the processes for determining and integrating CQI initiatives, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

• Selecting, deploying and evaluating quality improvement initiatives

Reacting: In addition to participation in HLC conferences and strategy forums, MMCC has been a member of the Continuous Quality Improvement Network (CQIN) since Spring 2016.   However, it is not clear how these are used to select, deploy, and evaluate quality improvement initiatives.

• Aligning the Systems Portfolio, Action Projects, Comprehensive Quality Review and Strategy Forums

Reacting: The Portfolio describes some quality initiatives that have been undertaken, but does not describe how the AQIP components are aligned.

6R1 What are the results for continuous quality improvement initiatives? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 6P1. 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.

Systematic: MMCC provides an overview of actions that resulted from participation in CQIN and the Strategy Forum. Results include an integrated advising model and reorganization of the Student Services Division, Mid Improvement Model, the relationship between clarity and employee effectiveness, and software to enhance the Guided Pathways model. While results appear systematic, and cross-campus participation is breaking down silos, there may be an opportunity for more coordination among the various quality improvement initiatives.

6I1 Based on 6R1, what quality improvement initiatives have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

MMCC is reexamining the mission and vision of the College, as well as reorganizing some operational areas. The Mid Improvement Model has been adopted. Mid is working with the Business Innovation Factory to redesign its business model.

6.2: CULTURE OF QUALITY
Culture of Quality focuses on how the institution integrates continuous quality improvement into its culture. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 5.D. in this section.

6P2 Describe how a culture of quality is ensured within the institution. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

• Developing an infrastructure and providing resources to support a culture of quality

Reacting: While MMCC has developed a shared governance system and created an office of Institutional Research, there still appears to be an opportunity to create a more integrated infrastructure to support a culture of quality. For an institution that has been in AQIP since 2001, a higher level of maturity is expected.

• Ensuring continuous quality improvement is making an evident and widely understood impact on institutional culture and operations (5.D.1)

Reacting: The Portfolio explains how the Mid Improvement Model was created to align Vision 20/20 with the development of action projects. However, it is not clear how this ensures continuous quality improvement in the culture and operations of the College, indicating that MMCC remains at a reacting level.

• Ensuring the institution learns from its experiences with CQI initiatives (5.D.2)

Reacting: Mid reports progress related to Vision 2020 and recommendations from the previous portfolio. However, it is not clear if in addition to meeting the objectives, the College has examined the effect of those efforts and closed the loop to include lessons learned. As such, this indicates a reacting process.

• Reviewing, reaffirming and understanding the role and vitality of the AQIP Pathway within the institution

Reacting: Mid is re-evaluating its commitment and participation in the AQIP pathway, as the associated cost is a challenge. Without a collective commitment to quality (regardless of pathway), the College remains at a reading level of maturity.

6R2 What are the results for continuous quality improvement to evidence a culture of quality? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 6P2. All data presented should include the population studied, the 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.

Systematic: In addition to the shared governance system which is the result of participation in AQIP, MMCC provides a list of Action Projects and samples of the Mid Improvement Model. Despite these successes, the College might benefit from a climate survey to verify the pervasiveness of a quality culture on campus.

6I2 Based on 6R2, what process improvements to the quality culture have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

IMMCC identified 88 objectives in Vision 2020. At this time, the college has completed 77 of those through the shared governance committees. In the next 3 years, they will be working to achieve the remainder of the goals. The College has goals to expand its footprint in the region and hopes for vitality at Harrisonburg based on renovations.

Category Summary Statement

MMCC is at a crossroads. The maturity for an institution that has been in AQIP is expected to be higher than reacting to systemic for processes and results. While MMCC describes several initiatives, it is not clear that these initiatives are integrated or provide an infrastructure for quality improvement. MMCC has identified barriers to participation in AQIP, and is questioning its commitment to the AQIP pathway.

CATEGORY STRATEGIC ISSUES

The institution does not appear to be fully vested in continuous quality improvement. Results are scarce, and there is very little evidence of completing the quality cycle by closing the loop.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1 - Mission

The institution's mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution's operations.

1.A - Core Component 1.A

The institution's mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operations.

1. The mission statement is developed through a process suited to the nature and culture of the institution and is adopted by the governing board.
2. The institution's academic programs, student support services, and enrollment profile are consistent with its stated mission.
3. The institution's planning and budgeting priorities align with and support the mission. (This sub-component may be addressed by reference to the response to Criterion 5.C.1.)

Rating

Adequate

Evidence

The institution's mission, vision, and values were developed with involvement from the campus community, and were adopted by the Board of Trustees in 2009. The values and shared expectations were developed with input from college committees, but it is not clear what processes were used to develop the mission statement itself. The mission is very focused and is aligned with academic programs and services.

Beginning in 2014, MMCC developed a process to ensure that planning and priorities reflected the mission. A new shared governance model was developed, and a new strategic plan was adopted in 2015 for the period 2016-2020. MMCC has made investments in resources to ensure it is meeting its mission and enduring goals.

Data discussions for Academic Services provided insights that informed faculty work in the Guided Pathways project. The Local Strategic Value report documents the ways in which academic offerings support the MMCC mission. PACE results indicate that employees believe the work of the institution reflects the mission.

The institution holds public meetings to start the budget planning process. As the institution continues to have fiscal challenges, it is important that the budget priorities align with and support the mission. Annual Expenditures indicate that the areas of biggest expenditures are instruction and student services, which are consistent with the mission. The institution has also made a number of investments to address strategic opportunities and advance the mission and its four enduring goals.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.B - Core Component 1.B

The mission is articulated publicly.

1. The institution clearly articulates its mission through one or more public documents, such as statements of purpose, vision, values, goals, plans, or institutional priorities.
2. The mission document or documents are current and explain the extent of the institution's emphasis on the various aspects of its mission, such as instruction, scholarship, research, application of research, creative works, clinical service, public service, economic development, and religious or cultural purpose.
3. The mission document or documents identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the higher education programs and services the institution provides.

Rating

Clear

Evidence

The mission is communicated on the MMCC website. MMCC identified four enduring goals related to its mission: enabling student success, engaging the community, enhancing employee effectiveness, and ensuring institutional effectiveness. These goals are clearly articulated in Connecting Our Community document that was shared with the college community.

MMCC has utilized the Shared Governance committees to promote communication and understanding of the college's mission and values. Additionally, the mission is promoted in both print and electronic communications.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.C - Core Component 1.C

The institution understands the relationship between its mission and the diversity of society.

1. The institution addresses its role in a multicultural society.
2. The institution's processes and activities reflect attention to human diversity as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves.

Rating

Adequate

Evidence

MMCC develops programs with changing stakeholder needs in mind. The mission supports enabling students to succeed in diverse, global society. One of the college's common learning outcomes is engaging diverse perspectives. The college recognizes its role in the communities it serves in terms of professional training, preparing students to transfer to four-year institutions, continuing education, and dual enrollment. It is less clear how MMCC meets the needs of under-represented populations. This is evident in the Noel Levitz Ruffalo Cody SSI results where MMCC is at or above the national average in serving commuters, evening students, returning learners and part-time students, but below the national average in serving students with disabilities and under-represented populations.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.D - Core Component 1.D

The institution's mission demonstrates commitment to the public good.

1. Actions and decisions reflect an understanding that in its educational role the institution serves the public, not solely the institution, and thus entails a public obligation.
2. The institution's educational responsibilities take primacy over other purposes, such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests.
3. The institution engages with its identified external constituencies and communities of interest and responds to their needs as its mission and capacity allow.

Rating

Clear

Evidence

The mission statement clearly addresses its role in providing leadership for the community to achieve success.

MMCC has invested resources to strengthen partnerships with the local organizations and also created the "State of the Community" event every February.

Educational responsibilities clearly take precedence over other purposes. The college's budget is developed with academic programming and services as the primary focus.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2 - Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

2.A - Core Component 2.A

The institution operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions; it establishes and follows policies and processes for fair and ethical behavior on the part of its governing board, administration, faculty, and staff.

Rating

Clear

Evidence

The Board of Trustees establishes policies to guide ethical behavior, and meetings are open to the public. The college's financial operations utilize Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GASB). There is an annual audit approved by the Board. The Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee oversees development and approval of academic standards. MMCC uses SafeColleges for employee training in areas such as FERPA, Title IX, Sexual Violence Awareness, etc. Other professional development sessions are held twice a year, sponsored by the Personnel Services Advisory Committee (staff) and Academic Council (faculty).

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.B - Core Component 2.B

The institution presents itself clearly and completely to its students and to the public with regard to its programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships.

Rating

Clear

Evidence

The relevant information is available to students and the public on the website and catalog. The college also has mobile application for students to access information. Financial aid information is communicated through Ellucian Self Service. The college utilizes the Net Price Calculator, and textbook pricing is available on the bookstore website. Accreditation information is on the college website.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.C - Core Component 2.C

The governing board of the institution is sufficiently autonomous to make decisions in the best interest of the institution and to assure its integrity.

1. The governing board's deliberations reflect priorities to preserve and enhance the institution.
2. The governing board reviews and considers the reasonable and relevant interests of the institution's internal and external constituencies during its decision-making deliberations.
3. The governing board preserves its independence from undue influence on the part of donors, elected officials, ownership interests or other external parties when such influence would not be in the best interest of the institution.
4. The governing board delegates day-to-day management of the institution to the administration and expects the faculty to oversee academic matters.

Rating

Clear

Evidence

Board policies 107 and 108 define the role of the Board in governance and delegation authority, and the college adheres to Michigan Open Meetings Act. The day-to-day management of the institution is the responsibility of the president and administration, and the faculty have oversight of academic matters. The Board receives a monthly report from administration, including a financial summary, community relations, academic updates and progress, and enrollment updates, and senior staff attend the meetings.

The MMCC Foundation, established to collect funds and gifts to support the college, ensures that the Board is independent from donors to the college. Also, Board members sign a conflict of interest statement each year.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.D - Core Component 2.D

The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.

Rating

Clear

Evidence

The Master Agreement between Mid Michigan Community College Faculty Senate, MEA/NEA & Board of Trustees states that faculty have the freedom to report truth in his/her profession in the classroom and in his/her own research. Both the Board and faculty agree to create a climate in which academic freedom is guaranteed.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.E - Core Component 2.E

The institution's policies and procedures call for responsible acquisition, discovery and application of knowledge by its faculty, students and staff.

1. The institution provides effective oversight and support services to ensure the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by its faculty, staff, and students.
2. Students are offered guidance in the ethical use of information resources.
3. The institution has and enforces policies on academic honesty and integrity.

Rating

Adequate

Evidence

Academic freedom and freedom of expression are addressed in the master agreement between the Board of Trustees and the Faculty Senate. The agreement (p.63) specifically addresses this. The agreement also has a Code of Conduct to which faculty are expected to adhere. The MMCC IRB provides oversight to ensure faculty and student research adhere to ethical guidelines.

The College provides guidance relevant to research via library staff, video tutorials, and in class instruction is provided by the library staff.

The Student Code of Conduct includes the Academic Dishonesty Policy and Procedure, as well as addressing plagiarism and cheating. This statement is also on all syllabi (per the faculty master agreement), and these policies are explained at the New Student Orientation.
While it is evident that policies are in place, it is less clear how MMCC enforces its policies.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3 - Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support

The institution provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.

3.A - Core Component 3.A

The institution's degree programs are appropriate to higher education.

1. Courses and programs are current and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree or certificate awarded.
2. The institution articulates and differentiates learning goals for undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate, and certificate programs.
3. The institution's program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (on the main campus, at additional locations, by distance delivery, as dual credit, through contractual or consortial arrangements, or any other modality).

Rating

Clear

Evidence

MMCC provides certificates, associate degrees, and non-credit workforce training activities. In order to meet the needs of a wide variety of students, MMCC offers courses in various times, modalities, and locations. Master course proficiencies are in place for all classes, regardless of delivery. The student learning outcomes for all programs are driven by the full-time faculty.

The Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee reviews all credit courses and programs on a regular basis, and there is a 4-year program review process in place. The Office of Online Learning and Development, working with faculty and the Instructional Designer in Distance Education, monitor the quality of online courses.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.B - Core Component 3.B

The institution demonstrates that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational programs.

1. The general education program is appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution.
2. The institution articulates the purposes, content, and intended learning outcomes of its undergraduate general education requirements. The program of general education is grounded in a philosophy or framework developed by the institution or adopted from an established framework. It imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess.
3. Every degree program offered by the institution engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments.
4. The education offered by the institution recognizes the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work.
5. The faculty and students contribute to scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge to the extent appropriate to their programs and the institution's mission.

Rating

Clear

Evidence

MMCC uses the Degree Qualifications Profile as the framework for its general education outcomes for all credit-bearing programs. The general education curriculum is customized for its two types of degree programs: 1) for the Associate in Applied Science degrees, the general education programs are more interdisciplinary and students have fewer choices; and 2) for the Associate in Arts and Associate in Science degrees, intended for transfer to four-year institutions, the general education curriculum is more varied with more options. Master Course Proficiencies are tied back to the DQP.

MMCC joined the Michigan Guided Pathways project, which created clearly defined and structured course sequences for students to ensure they achieve the DQP proficiencies. For example, one of the DQP Intellectual Skill proficiencies is *engaging diverse perspectives*, which requires students to recognize different cultural perspectives as well as identify their own cultural perspectives.

The College ensures the curriculum remains current and relevant to society's needs via the curriculum approval process, consultation with advisory boards, and transfer institution feedback. For programs with program accreditation, the accreditation standards are aligned with current societal and workplace needs, including a diversity component. For other programs, advisory boards provide input regarding current workplace needs and expectations of new entrants to the workforce.

While MMCC is primarily a teaching college, there are opportunities for students and faculty to conduct research, which is overseen by the IRB.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.C - Core Component 3.C

The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services.

1. The institution has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out both the classroom and the non-classroom roles of faculty, including oversight of the curriculum and expectations for student performance; establishment of academic credentials for instructional staff; involvement in assessment of student learning.
2. All instructors are appropriately qualified, including those in dual credit, contractual, and consortial programs.
3. Instructors are evaluated regularly in accordance with established institutional policies and procedures.
4. The institution has processes and resources for assuring that instructors are current in their disciplines and adept in their teaching roles; it supports their professional development.
5. Instructors are accessible for student inquiry.
6. Staff members providing student support services, such as tutoring, financial aid advising, academic advising, and co-curricular activities, are appropriately qualified, trained, and supported in their professional development.

Rating

Clear

Evidence

The number of faculty members is monitored to determine sufficiency through the program review process, use of adjunct faculty, and based on results of student and employee satisfaction surveys, learning outcomes assessment, and feedback from advisory groups.

Availability of faculty is ensured through the faculty Master Agreement. Faculty are required to hold a minimum of 5 office hours a week, and must be present on campus four days a week. Faculty teaching online can meet these requirement through electronic communications. Office hours are posted outside faculty offices, as well as communicated on the course syllabus. MMCC's Learning Management System also provides a course shell that enhances faculty/student communications. HLC guidelines are used to ensure that all faculty are appropriately qualified. The qualifications of all faculty have been reviewed, and those who were found to be lacking have plans in place to meet the guidelines within three years.

MMCC uses a talent management system to aid in recruiting qualified employees. Job descriptions are used to determine qualifications needed for staff positions. Qualifications for faculty positions are reviewed by the appropriate dean to determine relevancy.

MMCC ensures that staff are appropriately qualified through screening during the hiring process. The

general new employee orientation is provided by PS, with the hiring manager providing specifics about the department. The student services staff have opportunities to attend state and national conferences, as well as a number of opportunities on campus provided by the Center for Learning and Leadership.

Per the faculty master agreement (Article XI, C and Appendix H-I) newly employed faculty are evaluated each of their first five semesters. Full status faculty may be evaluated once each academic year but must be evaluated once every three years. Adjunct faculty are evaluated via classroom observation in their first semester and every 2-3 years thereafter. The evaluation is systematic and adequate, but would be more rigorous if evaluation occurred more than once every three years.

MMCC supports faculty professional development by hosting four professional development days per year. The faculty master contract requires faculty to participate in professional development every year, such as attending workshop and conferences to ensure they are current in their discipline. MMCC has a $50,000 faculty development budget; the funds are available to full time faculty as well as adjunct faculty.

Staff providing student support services maintain professional currency via membership in professional organizations, attending conferences and workshops, belonging to list servs, and participating in webinars.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.D - Core Component 3.D

The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.

1. The institution provides student support services suited to the needs of its student populations.
2. The institution provides for learning support and preparatory instruction to address the academic needs of its students. It has a process for directing entering students to courses and programs for which the students are adequately prepared.
3. The institution provides academic advising suited to its programs and the needs of its students.
4. The institution provides to students and instructors the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning (technological infrastructure, scientific laboratories, libraries, performance spaces, clinical practice sites, museum collections, as appropriate to the institution's offerings).
5. The institution provides to students guidance in the effective use of research and information resources.

Rating

Clear

Evidence

MMCC uses a multiple measures placement instrument to identify student academic needs, although students may also self-identify. Faculty can also use an online RMS tool to refer a student for assistance. MMCC has a TRiO grant to provide services for first generation, low income, or disabled students.

Academic advising and new student orientation are required for all new students. The Support Services Table provides a list of resources available to students to help them be successful. Additionally, MMCC provides *Community Assistance Resources* to identify non-academic services students may need, such as counseling services, food pantry, etc. Faculty have mandatory office hours to ensure availability to students.

The LUCES is a program designed to help international students and some at-risk students to be successful and persist in college. MMCC offers about 75 section of college courses at area high schools to provide opportunities for high school students to take college classes while in high school. MMCC has recently expanded its hybrid offerings to meet the needs of students who face difficulty taking traditional face-to-face classes.

MMCC has some very specific strategies to help students persist. Guided Pathways, mandatory new student orientations, academic advising through the first 12 credits, and Mid Mentors are all designed to help students stay on track to graduation.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.E - Core Component 3.E

The institution fulfills the claims it makes for an enriched educational environment.

1. Co-curricular programs are suited to the institution's mission and contribute to the educational experience of its students.
2. The institution demonstrates any claims it makes about contributions to its students' educational experience by virtue of aspects of its mission, such as research, community engagement, service learning, religious or spiritual purpose, and economic development.

Rating

Adequate

Evidence

MMCC utilizes several strategies to ensure alignment of curriculum to the mission. The New Program Proposal Form requires a statement as to how the program fits within the mission. The Program Review process also reinforces this. MMCC adopted the Michigan Transfer Agreement guidelines to help design the general education program. Common general education outcomes for all degree-seeking students ensures students have similar experiences.

Based on advice from advisory committees, MMCC redesigned the internship for all technical and occupational programs.

MMCC offers study abroad opportunities, service learning projects and Honors Society activities, however information concerning these and other co-curricular activities is not well developed.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

4 - Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

4.A - Core Component 4.A

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.

1. The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.
2. The institution evaluates all the credit that it transcripts, including what it awards for experiential learning or other forms of prior learning, or relies on the evaluation of responsible third parties.
3. The institution has policies that assure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.
4. The institution maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. It assures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.
5. The institution maintains specialized accreditation for its programs as appropriate to its educational purposes.
6. The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. The institution assures that the degree or certificate programs it represents as preparation for advanced study or employment accomplish these purposes. For all programs, the institution looks to indicators it deems appropriate to its mission, such as employment rates, admission rates to advanced degree programs, and participation rates in fellowships, internships, and special programs (e.g., Peace Corps and Americorps).

Rating

Adequate

Evidence

All new courses and programs are reviewed and approved by the Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee. The Curriculum Committee maintains oversight of the four-year program review process. In 2017, Academic Services developed a program review matrix to determine current program viability and new program potential. It had not been implemented as of the portfolio review.

The Board of Trustees policy provides guidelines for accepting transfer credits. Credit may also be given for non-traditional credits, credit by exam including CLEP and AP, military credit, and articulation agreements with area high schools. There are policies in place to guide accepting these

various types of credit.

Course pre-requisites are proposed by program faculty and approved by the Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee. Learning outcomes are designed using DQP and are communicated via course syllabi. Master Course Proficiencies ensure consistency across all sections and all modalities of courses. MMCC is accredited by NACEP, which helps to ensure that dual enrollment courses are as rigorous as courses offered on campus and via other modalities. Faculty qualifications requirements follow HLC guidelines.

The College maintains specialized accreditations for many of its occupational and technical programs, primarily in Health Sciences and Occupational areas. Occupational programs participate in the Program Review of Occupational Education as required by the state of Michigan.

MMCC tracks licensure and certification exam pass rates. However, the College acknowledges that tracking the success of its graduates is challenging and data regarding employment and further education is limited.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

4.B - Core Component 4.B

The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.

1. The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.
2. The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.
3. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.
4. The institution's processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff members.

Rating

Unclear

Evidence

The DQP establishes a common framework throughout the institution for the defining the learning outcomes. In 2016, the General Education Committee established Master Course Proficiencies for every course which are tied back to the framework of the DQP. MMCC also utilizes the 30-credit block Michigan Transfer Agreement as a guide to ensure common learning outcomes. Information about the General Education Outcomes are on the General Education website, so information is readily available to all audiences.

Progress toward assessing the general education is slow. The General Education Committee developed a common rubric for assessing Intellectual Skills proficiencies. Faculty engage in norming exercises utilizing the rubric, and some results are provided. It is not clear when other proficiencies will be evaluated.

Program faculty assess program outcomes formally as part of the four-year program review process.

It is not clear how the data collected is used to improve student learning.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

4.C - Core Component 4.C

The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs.

1. The institution has defined goals for student retention, persistence, and completion that are ambitious but attainable and appropriate to its mission, student populations, and educational offerings.
2. The institution collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence, and completion of its programs.
3. The institution uses information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs to make improvements as warranted by the data.
4. The institution's processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs reflect good practice. (Institutions are not required to use IPEDS definitions in their determination of persistence or completion rates. Institutions are encouraged to choose measures that are suitable to their student populations, but institutions are accountable for the validity of their measures.)

Rating

Clear

Evidence

A position of Institutional Researcher was created after the last Systems Appraisal to assist in collecting and analyzing data. MMCC utilizes a number of resources to examine student retention, persistence, and completion. The College acknowledges the need to improve the RPC rates, which are discussed during monthly data discussions, and the latest strategic plan provides focus in this area.

The IR office has identified a process to identify Official Term Data. The IR office and IT worked to clean, verify and compiled data that was pulled for past four years. Going forward, the process will be repeated every semester to ensure data is reliable. The institution feels that this will provide more consistency and reliability in examining RPC rates.

Retention, persistence, and completion data are used to project enrollment, which is used for budgeting. MMCC uses trends at the college, state and national information, and new initiatives to set RPC targets for the subsequent year.

The data collected by MMCC includes the Annual Instructional Report, transfer and completion rates published by the State of Michigan, and IPEDS graduation and transfer out rates.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5 - Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

5.A - Core Component 5.A

The institution's resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

1. The institution has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered.
2. The institution's resource allocation process ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas or disbursement of revenue to a superordinate entity.
3. The goals incorporated into mission statements or elaborations of mission statements are realistic in light of the institution's organization, resources, and opportunities.
4. The institution's staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.
5. The institution has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expense.

Rating

Clear

Evidence

Qualifications for positions are established during the hiring process, and a job description is developed. The PS and hiring manager review qualifications and check references. Training opportunities are offered on campus, through conferences, and tuition reimbursement is available. MMCC participates in the Michigan Community College Leadership Academy.

MMCC's operating budget in FY 2017 was about $32 million. The main sources of revenue are tuition and fees, state appropriations, and property taxes. While MMCC is overly reliant on tuition and fees, its resources and infrastructure are adequate to support its mission, and MMCC is investigating ways to decrease reliance on tuition and fees. In 2015, MMCC adopted a Campus Master Plan to guide the college in evaluating and prioritizing future capital projects. MMCC indicates that its technological infrastructure is appropriate to support faculty, students, and staff.

The Board of Trustees is responsible for oversight of the policy and budget. Working with the Vice President for Finance and Administration, the Board approves a budget each year that ensures priority is given to MMCC's educational mission.

MMCC's Center for Learning and Leadership (CLL) provides training resources, personal and

professional development, and coaching for all employees. All employees are eligible for tuition reimbursement upon completion of approved college courses.

MMCC has a very clear mission statement and four enduring goals with a strong connection to the mission statement. This clarity provides a foundation for alignment. The budget process includes a review of requests in terms of their connectedness to the college's vision.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.B - Core Component 5.B

The institution's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.

1. The governing board is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight of the institution's financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities.
2. The institution has and employs policies and procedures to engage its internal constituencies—including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff, and students—in the institution's governance.
3. Administration, faculty, staff, and students are involved in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort.

Rating

Clear

Evidence

Board Policy 107 defines the role of the Board in establishing policies and how it governs the college. Board Policy 108 defines the relationship of the Board with the President and delegation of authority. Board policy 303.09 addresses financial oversight, and details how the Board maintains oversight of the financial activities of the college while day-to-day operations are delegated to administration.

The shared governance structure document summarizes how internal constituencies are engaged in governance at the college. The shared governance structure encourages collaboration across the college. Committees are comprised of faculty, staff, and student representatives.

 The primary responsibility for academic standards rests with the Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee; the role of the committee is defined in the Faculty Master Agreement.

Board policies 107 and 108 define roles and responsibilities of the Board and administration, and 303.09 addresses fiscal oversight of the Board. Vision 2020 and the Shared Governance structure were both developed and implemented with extensive input from faculty, staff, and administration.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.C - Core Component 5.C

The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.

1. The institution allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities.
2. The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.
3. The planning process encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups.
4. The institution plans on the basis of a sound understanding of its current capacity. Institutional plans anticipate the possible impact of fluctuations in the institution's sources of revenue, such as enrollment, the economy, and state support.
5. Institutional planning anticipates emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization.

Rating

Adequate

Evidence

The mission and goals set priorities for planning, but details of how this is done are not provided in the portfolio. Nor is it clear how the assessment of student learning ties to the planning and budgeting processes.

The college's shared governance model was drafted with input from representatives of areas across the college. Planning initiatives engage the campus community through the Shared Governance committees, and the Campus Master Plan also involved external constituents. The Vision 2020 Strategic Plan drives committee work. Every August the President gives a "charge" to each committee, which makes the process seem top-down.

In 2016, MMCC joined the Continuous Quality Improvement Network (CQIN), and MMCC has sent teams two years to participate in the CQIN Institute where they focus on one area of planning.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.D - Core Component 5.D

The institution works systematically to improve its performance.

1. The institution develops and documents evidence of performance in its operations.
2. The institution learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its component parts.

Rating

Unclear

Evidence

There is evidence that MMCC has developed processes and is in the beginning stages of collecting evidence related to the processes, but there does not appear to be systematic collection of evidence or use of data to influence decision making. With the addition of an IR position, it is expected that MMCC will improve its ability to collect as well as analyze data and use it to make improvements. Much of the data presented in the portfolio is survey data, measuring perception or satisfaction. This type of data is important, but collecting more objective types of evidence may result in more actionable results.

MMCC states that there is not campus wide understanding of the connection between campus initiatives and AQIP. While the college has created the Mid Improvement Model to address this, it is not clear that this has been effective.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

Review Dashboard

Number	Title	Rating
1	Reflective Overview	
2	Strategic Challenges Analysis	
3	Accreditation Evidence Screening Summary	
4	Quality of Systems Portfolio	
5	AQIP Category Feedback	
I	Helping Students Learn	
II	Meeting Student and Other Key Stakeholder Needs	
III	Valuing Employees	
IV	Planning and Leading	
V	Knowledge Management and Resource Stewardship	
VI	Quality Overview	
1	Mission	
1.A	Core Component 1.A	Adequate
1.B	Core Component 1.B	Clear
1.C	Core Component 1.C	Adequate
1.D	Core Component 1.D	Clear
2	Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct	
2.A	Core Component 2.A	Clear
2.B	Core Component 2.B	Clear
2.C	Core Component 2.C	Clear
2.D	Core Component 2.D	Clear
2.E	Core Component 2.E	Adequate
3	Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support	
3.A	Core Component 3.A	Clear
3.B	Core Component 3.B	Clear
3.C	Core Component 3.C	Clear
3.D	Core Component 3.D	Clear
3.E	Core Component 3.E	Adequate
4	Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement	
4.A	Core Component 4.A	Adequate
4.B	Core Component 4.B	Unclear
4.C	Core Component 4.C	Clear
5	Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness	
5.A	Core Component 5.A	Clear

5.B	Core Component 5.B	Clear
5.C	Core Component 5.C	Adequate
5.D	Core Component 5.D	Unclear

Review Summary

Conclusion

Overall Recommendations

Criteria For Accreditation
Unclear

Sanctions Recommendation
Not Set

Pathways Recommendation
Not Set

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.