

## **Standard I.B: Assuring Academic Quality & Institutional Effectiveness**

### **I.B.1 The institution demonstrates a sustained, substantive and collegial dialogue about student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement.**

#### **Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

- The College has institutional structures in place that support sustained dialogue about institutional issues. These include the Integrated Planning Model, the Annual Planning and Resource Allocation process, program review, and the Reflections Process [IB1.1 – IB1.3, IB1.6, IB1.15; see I.B.5 for additional details about program review].
- At the department and division level, the Instructor Reflections [IB1.3 – IB1.4] and Program Reflections processes [IB1.5], as well as the program review process [IB1.6] provide framework for dialogue about student learning and achievement in specific disciplines.
- Dialogue about student equity occurs during institutional presentations [IB1.7, IB1.8], through discussion of Student Equity Plans [IB1.9], and through program review [IB1.16].
- The Institutional Committee for Distance Education establishes documents describing quality in distance education [IB1.11] and provides professional development opportunities for faculty members to learn about them [IB1.12].
- The College engages in dialogue about student achievement through frameworks including the institution-set standards [IB1.16 – IB1.17], the Student Success Scorecard [IB1.8], and the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) framework of indicators related to student outcomes and performance [IB1.18]. Program review prompts dialogue about student achievement at the discipline level [IB1.15].

#### **Analysis and Evaluation**

The governance structure at MPC enables and promotes dialogue throughout the institution, from individual departments and divisions, to participatory governance committees, to the Board of Trustees. The Integrated Planning Model and the Annual Planning and Resource Allocation Process provide venues for dialogue in both annual and multi-year contexts.

The College designed its Integrated Planning Model with the goal of supporting continuous improvement in student learning and achievement [[IB1.1](#)]. Each year, processes such as developing the Institutional Action Plan, updating program reviews, and reflecting on student learning outcomes result in dialogue about student learning and achievement; this dialogue informs plans to improve. When plans are resource-dependent, they are prioritized by the advisory groups and College Council as part of the Annual Planning and Resource Allocation Process [[IB1.2](#)].

The Annual Planning and Resource Allocation Process supports dialogue in each step of the process. For example, the first step involves a broad-based review of student achievement data and a summary of the results of the reflections process. Student achievement data are contextualized in frameworks such as the institution-set standards, Student Success Scorecard, student equity plans, and Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative goals; details of these indicators and their disaggregation are discussed in more detail in Standard I.B.6. Faculty and others responsible for student learning outcomes analyze SLO attainment through the Reflections process at the course and program level. Results of the reflections analysis are used to inform dialogue and decision-making during the annual planning cycle and enhance programs and services for students.

### ***Dialogue on Student Outcomes: The Reflections Process***

MPC developed its reflections process as the vehicle for dialogue about improvement of student learning [IB1.3, p. 45]. Individual instructors consider and report on student attainment of SLOs within their courses using the Instructor Reflections on Student Learning process. In addition, they report on their individual plans to improve student learning in their courses, as well as any changes in student learning noticed since implementation of previous plans to improve student learning. Instructors participate in this process once per semester, with the collective goal of ensuring that the learning in each MPC course is reflected upon at least once every four semesters [IB1.4, IB1.14; more detailed information is provided in Standards I.B.2 and II.A.3]. Insights gained from the Instructor Reflections that have department-wide implications are shared through dialogue with colleagues during Program Reflections, the next step in the process.

During Program Reflections, campus personnel gather in departmental or area groups to engage in dialogue about student learning at the program level and across disciplines. The primary purpose of program reflections is to tie the results of SLO analysis to specific improvement plans and the resource allocation process. Typical results of the dialogue are the documented need for new equipment, furniture, technology, or personnel to support ongoing improvements. MPC has completed this process since the 2010-2011 academic year and archives the consolidated reports as evidence of student learning and ongoing efforts to improve [IB1.5a, IB1.5b, IB1.5c, IB1.5d, IB1.5e].

Specific plans or objectives to improve student learning and achievement at the department or division level are recorded in the Program Review Updates/Action Plan. These documents are completed once a year in the spring and list the specific needs of each department or division. Cost estimates are provided for budget-related needs. As each area of the institution engages in the Reflections and Program Review Update/Action Plan steps, discussion and analysis of the student attainment of SLOs and student achievement drives the development of plans for

continued improvement [IB1.6]. Results of this dialogue and analysis are then incorporated into the MPC Planning and Resource Allocation Process [IB1.2]

### ***Dialogue on Student Equity***

Dialogue on student equity occurs in a variety of venues and reporting mechanisms. The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) regularly presents information about student success and equity at participatory governance committees and meetings of the Governing Board. These presentations enable the College community to learn about and engage in dialogue about equity issues facing the College. For example, in fall 2014, OIR developed a two-part series of presentations related to specific equity issues. Part 1 focused on access issues, and compared MPC's intended students to its actual students [IB1.7a]. The data presented demonstrated that whereas the ethnic distribution of MPC students is similar to the ethnic distribution in the district, Latino residents in Seaside and Marina have attained a lower level of educational achievement than residents from other areas of the district. The presentations generated campus-wide dialogue and awareness of greater numbers of prospective students that could benefit from the services of MPC in the Marina and Seaside communities.

The second part of this series discussed success in the context of student equity, and compared basic skills success rates of students by ethnicity [IB1.7b]. These presentations demonstrated that ethnicities that have a sufficiently large number of enrolled students, Hispanics—especially males—consistently have among the lowest measures of student success in terms of basic skills course completion, academic progress or probation, and transfer. This presentation has generated dialogue about to engage in more effective outreach to the Latino communities in Seaside and Marina, as well as how to support this population of students more effectively. These conversations continue to inform the Student Equity Plan and its activities.

The Office of Institutional Research reports regularly on student success and achievement, both at Governing Board meetings, as well as at individual participatory governance committee meetings. The regularity of these presentations demonstrates sustained dialogue on the topics of student equity and student success. Presentations are archived on the OIR website for reference [IB1.8].

The College developed a new Student Equity Plan in 2014 [IB1.9]. The 2014 Student Equity Plan includes similar consideration of disproportionate impact described in the OIR presentations cited above. The 2014 Student Equity Plan was presented and discussed at multiple governance committees, including the Academic Senate, the Advisory Groups, and the College Council. Wide distribution of the plans and multiple readings at participatory governance groups contributes to sustained, substantive, and collegial dialogue about student equity.

Dialogue about student equity is built into the program review process as well. The instructional program review template requires a variety of student equity information, including comparison of enrollments of students of varying ethnicity and gender between the department and the College as a whole, as well as comparing retention and success rates among ethnic, age and gender groups. Program review generates dialogue about student equity first during discussion within the division undergoing program review as the student equity information is reviewed internally, and then during presentation of the results to a wider audience at advisory group and College Council meetings.

For example, the School of Nursing 2014 program review records dialogue about student equity within the context of the specific program. In earlier program reviews, Nursing faculty recognized that male students were underrepresented in the program. The School of Nursing developed and implemented the Men in Nursing program. This grant-funded program is designed to increase the proportion of men entering the program and support their success within the program. The coordinator attends outreach events at career days and science and health classes at high schools. Anecdotally, the Men in Nursing program is well known to MPC personnel as a result of ongoing dialogue at shared governance meetings and School of Nursing events [[IB1.15a](#), p. 14].

### ***Dialogue on Academic Quality***

MPC personnel engage in dialogue about academic quality regularly. Dialogue about academic quality includes conversations about SLO analysis, prioritization of open faculty positions, effective practices for distance education, and prioritization of instructional equipment and supplies.

### ***Student attainment of intended student learning outcomes and efforts to improve***

The Program Reflections process was specifically designed to promote dialogue around the extent to which students are meeting course or program outcomes. An example demonstrating the substantive nature of this type of dialogue is the Automotive Technology Program Reflections in fall 2014. The Auto Tech Department recognized inefficiencies in Auto Tech courses, including AUTO 100 and AUTO 102, where the “first few lab periods were very chaotic and disorganized”, and “students were expected to do things that they have not been given instruction on,” respectively. The document includes plans to remedy these problems to enable students to more effectively attain the SLOs and improve the academic quality of those courses [[IB1.5e](#), p. 38].

### ***Prioritization of faculty positions and balance of discipline expertise***

Institutional academic quality depends on a balance of discipline expertise among the faculty. When openings occur, or when opportunities for new positions arise, the institution decides which positions best meet the needs of students and fulfill the mission of the College. The

Academic Affairs Advisory Group is the shared governance committee responsible for making recommendations on faculty position prioritization to the College Council. The dialogue involves the benefits to overall student learning that each proposed position would bring to the College, and is based on information about each position as documented on the Faculty Position Request Form [IB1.10]. The type of information includes such things as description of the position in MPC planning documents; requirements of external licensure, accreditation, or legal mandates; effects on FTE and FTES; recommendations from CTE advisory groups; enrollment history; and projected teaching responsibilities. Members of the Academic Affairs Advisory Group consider the presentations from division representatives, as well as information documented on the forms. Finally, they vote on their preferences. After discussion of AAAG's preferences, the prioritized positions are forwarded to College Council for consideration and then on to the Superintendent/President. Because the institution is affected by the breadth of academic disciplines represented within the full-time faculty, this annual and substantive dialogue contributes to the academic quality of MPC.

#### *Effective practices for distance education courses*

Consistent with the increasing enrollment of distance education courses, campus dialogue continues to focus on the quality of MPC distance education offerings. In 2014, as a result of this dialogue, the Institutional Committee on Distance Education and Academic Senate oversaw the development of guidelines that defined the characteristics of high quality distance education. These "*Effective Strategies for Online Teaching and Learning*" are organized into such categories as course organization and design, course syllabus, course content and materials, communication and collaboration, assessment and evaluation, and learner support resources. This document has now become the centerpiece for the institution's ongoing professional development activities related to online teaching [IB1.11]. Substantive dialogue occurred as the Academic Senate and its subcommittees discussed the nature of effective strategies for online teaching and learning and debated the nature of the material to be included in the document. Dialogue is also generated as the Institutional Committee on Distance Education uses the *Effective Practices* explicitly in assignments and lessons in the ongoing Certificate in Online Teaching and Learning (COTL) professional development series [IB1.12].

#### *Adequate instructional equipment and supplies*

Academic Quality depends on adequate equipment and supplies for students to use during their programs of study. The Academic Affairs Advisory Group prioritizes large instructional equipment and supply purchases through the action plan process. As divisions and service areas discuss areas of need during their program review updates each year, they document budget-dependent items or plans in the action plan document. Rationale for each item is also documented in order to clarify how the item helps to provide adequate learning experiences for MPC students. Once completed, each advisory group collates action plans from its respective

area. Discussion about which items are most necessary for the improvement of the learning experience ultimately leads to a prioritized list of plans or items to fund.

The action plan from English demonstrates the variety of resource allocation requests made through this process, as well as the rationale provided for the requests. For example, they request \$5000/year for “professional development for English faculty members.” This request fulfills both institutional goals and objectives and the English Department Program Reflections. In addition, the form documents that “with the implementation of the Integrated Reading and Writing program, we will need to train instructors who have not taught reading and who will now be teaching both reading and writing. We also need money for ongoing professional development for all faculty” [IB1.6, p. 15].

### ***Dialogue on Institutional Effectiveness***

In working towards sustained effectiveness, the College engages in dialogue to make improvements to processes and procedures in order to ensure that they work together towards the same goal. Key processes are reviewed when key committees recognize that improvement is needed. Two examples of this type of sustained dialogue over the last few years include the ways in which the institution has examined Instructor and Program Reflections, as well as planning and resource allocation in order to improve institutional effectiveness.

At the time of the last accreditation self-study, MPC had developed the concepts of Instructor Reflections and Program Reflections to assess SLOs, and was in the early stages of implementation. Instructor Reflections were developed first; in 2008, they were considered a “pilot project,” and were completed as MS Word documents and then stored on the Academic Senate website. The most important aspects of the SLO process were present in the 2008 forms, but some instructors were confused by some of the questions. There were questions about student preparedness and whether or not the instructor intended to make any pedagogical changes in the future. The return rate was low. The College collected forms for about 30 classes over the 2008-2009 academic year [IB1.13 (MyMPC log-in)].

In 2010, MPC recognized that SLOs could not be evaluated solely in isolation by individual instructors teaching individual courses. Dialogue was needed among colleagues within departments or divisions where students were taking similar courses in order to determine at department and division levels what strategies and plans were needed to improve student learning. In response to the recognized need for more substantive dialogue at the department/division level, MPC implemented the Program Reflections. The Program Reflections was intended as the link between observations about student learning in the classroom or outcomes of service areas within the Student Services area, and specific action plans or resource allocation requests as implemented through the Program Review process [see IB1.5a-e, IB1.6].

In 2013, the format for the Instructor Reflections was revised. Dialogue resulted in improving the forms by shortening and clarifying the questions to support sustained reflection and improvement. For example, instructors are no longer asked “Do you intend to make any” changes; instead, they are asked, “How do you plan to use the evaluation results to improve student learning [[IB1.14](#)]?”

In 2015, the institution embarked on a long series of conversations about the effectiveness of the connections between the reflections process, the Program Review annual updates and action plans, and the Planning and Resource Allocation Process. It was evident that the first two of these processes worked well enough on their own, and that substantive and productive dialogue took place as College personnel participated in them. However, by design, planning and resource allocation depends on the results of the dialogue within the reflections and program review processes. With reflections and program reviews documented in individual Word or PDF files, the College has found it increasingly cumbersome to retrieve information and make the connections between the processes. Through the participatory governance process, College committees engaged in dialogue about these issues and eventually endorsed the purchase of TracDat, an institutional performance management system that will be used to support the reflections and program review processes. The College anticipates that TracDat will improve access to and management of student learning and achievement data, leading to more effective use of these data in planning and resource allocation.

### ***Continuous Improvement of Student Achievement***

MPC engages in dialogue about student achievement at the course and program level, as well as at the institutional level, through discussion in participatory governance committees and processes. Within individual departments and divisions, student achievement information comprises a significant portion of the Program Review process. During the Program Review conducted every six years, each program considers student achievement data disaggregated by gender and race, and discusses these data in the context of the College averages for each indicator. This process is illustrated by the recent Economics and Anthropology program reviews, in which program faculty considered retention and success rates [[IB1.15b](#), p. 11; [IB1.15c](#), p. 12] These responses demonstrate that the program review process prompts dialogue and potential changes in practice within a department as a result of examining student achievement indicators.

Dialogue about student achievement at the College-wide level is accomplished at meetings of governance committees and the Board of Trustees. The framework under which student achievement data is discussed includes the Student Success Scorecard, the institution-set standards, the framework of indicators associated with the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative, Basic Skills reports, and Student Equity Plans [[IB1.7a](#), [IB1.7b](#), [IB1.8](#), [IB1.9](#), [IB1.16](#), [IB1.17](#), [IB1.18](#)]. Each of these reports or plans includes achievement indicators such as

completion, retention, success, and transfer. The ultimate goal of these conversations is always to ensure that all MPC students, whether they have differing ethnicity, age, gender, academic preparation, or educational goals, all receive appropriate support and equitable opportunities to pursue their educational goals.

### ***Dialogue – Analysis of Faculty and Staff Surveys***

In both 2008 and 2014, the College conducted a campus survey as part of its self-evaluation process. The survey asked MPC personnel to respond to the statement, “I am aware of an ongoing and broad-based dialogue about student learning at MPC.” Of those that expressed an opinion, the results were similar between the two surveys. Those that “somewhat agree” or “strongly agree” ranged from 89% in 2008 to 91% in 2014. Of all respondents, those that “don’t know” or responded with “not applicable” ranged from 6% in 2008 to 7% in 2014 [[IB1.19](#), [IB1.20](#)].

**Conclusion:** Monterey Peninsula College meets Standard I.B.1. The College anticipates that the implementation of TracDat (see QFE Action Project #2) will increase effectiveness of sustained dialogue on campus by making student learning and achievement data more readily accessible.

### **Evidence Cited:**

- IB1.1 [MPC Integrated Planning Model](#)
- IB1.2 [Planning and Resource Allocation Model](#)
- IB1.3 [2015-2016 Faculty Handbook: Reflections Process](#) (see p. 45-58)
- IB1.4 [Instructor Reflections Website](#)
- IB1.5 Program Reflections Compilations, 2010-2015
  - a. [2010-2011](#)
  - b. [2011-2012](#)
  - c. [2012-2013](#)
  - d. [2013-2014](#)
  - e. [2014-2015](#)
- IB1.6 [Program Review Annual Updates and Action Plans, 2014-2015](#)
- IB1.7 OIR Student Equity Presentation Series
  - a. [Access, Sept. 2014](#) (Prezi)
  - b. [Success, Nov. 2014](#)(Prezi)
- IB1.8 [OIR Website](#)
- IB1.9 [2014 Student Equity Plan](#)
- IB1.10 [Faculty Position Request Form](#)
- IB1.11 [Effective Strategies for Online Teaching and Learning](#)
- IB1.12 [MPC Online Professional Development Opportunities](#) (Fall 2015 sample)
- IB1.13 [Instructor Reflections Pilot Project, 2009](#) 5 (MyMPC Log-in)
- IB1.14 [Instructor Reflections Form](#)
- IB1.15 Program Review Examples
  - a. [Nursing](#)
  - b. [Economics](#)
  - c. [Anthropology](#)
- IB1.16 [OIR Presentation on Institution-Set Standards, Spring 2015](#)

IB1.17	<a href="#">Institution-set Standards Documentation</a>
IB1.18	<a href="#">OIR Presentation on IEPI Goals, Spring 2015</a>
IB1.19	<a href="#">2008 Faculty and Staff Accreditation Survey</a>
IB1.20	<a href="#">2014 Faculty and Staff Accreditation Survey</a>

**I.B.2 The institution defines and assesses student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services. (ER 11)**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

- The College has established SLOs for all of its courses, programs, student services, and learning support services [IB2.1, IB2.2, IB2.7, IB2.9, IB2.11].
- The College assesses learning outcomes using its Reflections processes: Instructor Reflections for assessment of course learning outcomes, and Program Reflections for assessment of program-level and service area outcomes [IB2.3 – IB2.6].
- Assessment of SLOs has led to pedagogical changes, curricular changes, and structural changes within the College [IB2.5, IB2.13 – 1B2.15].

**Analysis and Evaluation**

***Course-level Student Learning Outcomes – Definition and Assessment***

Discipline faculty define course-level SLOs as part of the curriculum development process [IB2.1, p. 45-58]. Considerations for SLO development include the course’s intended students, the course’s place within any sequences of courses within the curriculum, and the course objectives used to articulate courses with UC and CSU. For CTE courses, course SLOs also reflect industry standards, required competencies, and Advisory Board input (see Standard II.A.14). The College stores Course SLOs in CurricUNET, the curriculum storage system. Faculty include course-level SLOs on all syllabi [IB2.2, p.32].

To assess course SLOs, MPC uses a locally developed framework for learning outcome assessment referred to as Instructor Reflections. The Instructor Reflections process gives individual instructors flexibility regarding the methods they use to assess student learning, allows for a mixture of quantitative and qualitative results, and facilitates the ongoing use of assessment results to make improvements. Instructors complete the assessment by responding to the following questions about course SLOs [IB2.3]:

- What were the results of previous plans to improve student learning?
- What are the assessment methods for the SLOs?
- Brief summary of assessment results (please quantify when possible)
- How do you plan to use the assessment results to improve student learning?

Together, these four questions engage instructors in a “complete loop” of assessment, prompting them to link results of previous improvement efforts to current assessment results. The next time

they assess the course, instructors report on the outcomes of their plans for improvement to continue the cycle.

One indication of the effectiveness of the Instructor Reflections process comes from the narrative comments on the Instructor Reflections forms, which document efforts to improve students' attainment of learning outcomes (these may be viewed by logging in to the [Instructor Reflections website](#)). In general, instructors use the Instructor Reflections form to report course-level issues and devise plans to improve student learning in their courses. One example, from a biology instructor, shows efforts over multiple semesters to improve exam and project scores used to assess the course SLOs [[IB2.5](#), example 1].

In order to attain SLOs, students need a high level of engagement throughout the semester. As instructors assess students' attainment of course learning outcomes and reflect on the results, they often find opportunities to alter the presentation or structure of course content and activities in order to increase overall student engagement, thereby improving attainment for all of the SLOs in the course [[IB2.5](#), examples 2 and 3]. The process also allows instructors to see consistent increases in SLO attainment as they adjust instructional techniques [[IB2.5](#), example 4].

MPC offered approximately 550 courses in each of the five semesters from fall 2013 to fall 2015; approximately 850 individual courses were offered during this five-semester period. As of spring 2016, SLOs for approximately 625 (73%) of these courses had been evaluated at least once in the four-semester period. Approximately 275 courses were offered in all five semesters of the five-semester period between fall 2013 and fall 2015. As of spring 2016, SLOs for 243 of these core courses (roughly 89%) had been assessed during the four-semester period [[IB2.6](#)].

In summary, MPC's framework for documenting assessment of course-level SLOs through its Instructor Reflections process has produced positive results. Many instructors use this process effectively to assess the quality of their courses by documenting their reflections on assessments of student learning, plans for improving student learning, and changes in student learning over time. MPC could improve the effectiveness of this process by raising the percentage of courses for which SLOs have been evaluated, and improving the quality of the responses so that a higher number of instructors focus on specific SLOs rather than end-of-term grades as a representation of attainment of all course-level SLOs (See Actionable Improvement Plan, below).

### ***Program-level Student Learning Outcomes and Service Area Outcomes – Definition and Assessment***

MPC currently uses different strategies to define program-level outcomes for its CTE and transfer programs. Each CTE program has a set of unique, discipline-specific program-level outcomes [[IB2.7](#), see program descriptions]. For the transfer programs, MPC has defined

General Education Outcomes (GEOs) to serve as the program-level outcomes. GEOs describe the skills and abilities that students gain as they fulfill the General Education (GE) requirements associated with each transfer program. In this sense, MPC has considered all of the transfer programs collectively, as a single transfer program. The outcomes for this transfer program are the GEOs. Each GEO describes the skills and abilities gained in each of the GE areas, i.e., Humanities, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences, etc. [IB2.8, p. 53]. The GEOs are listed in the College Catalog for student reference [IB2.9, p. 55].

The rationale for defining the programmatic outcomes for the transfer programs in this way is two-fold. First, many transfer programs do not culminate in a capstone course, as is often the norm in CTE programs. Secondly, at the time it implemented learning outcomes, the College was seeking a simple and direct way to evaluate learning at the program level. At the time, placing the GEOs at the course level and evaluating the learning using MPC’s established, course-level Instructor Reflections framework was an efficient way to accomplish this goal.

As an example of how the GEO system is applied to courses in different disciplines, the table below shows two courses that both satisfy GE Area D, Social Science. These two courses, ANTH 4 and HIST 12, both use the same GEO (*shown in italics*) as one of their course-level SLOs. Note that both of these courses still have their individual, discipline-based, course-level SLOs as well.

GE Area D: Social Science
<p>Anthropology 4, Introduction to Cultural Anthropology</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Describe the ethical issues anthropologists encounter.</li> <li>2. Discuss the interconnectedness of the economic, political and sociocultural forces of globalization amongst diverse cultural groups.</li> <li>3. Consider the relativist perspective while discussing cultural variation.</li> <li>4. <i>Critically examine and comprehend human nature and behavior, social traditions, and institutions.</i></li> </ol>
<p>History 12, Women in United States History</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Describe and analyze how contemporary women’s actions, experiences and issues fit into the patterns of American history.</li> <li>2. Document and explain the ways in which women have contributed privately, professionally, socially, economically, or politically to the social and political culture of the United States.</li> <li>3. <i>Critically examine and comprehend human nature and behavior, social traditions, and institutions.</i></li> </ol>

Source: Online Instructor Reflections form

ANTH 4 and HIST 12 both fulfill the Social Sciences GE Area, and faculty assess students’ attainment of the same GEO in both courses. However, as the courses are within differing disciplines, faculty use different assessment strategies. For example, the Anthropology instructor asks students to maintain an annotated bibliography throughout the course, whereas the History instructor assesses written papers, exams, and discussion participation. In both courses, the

instructors develop plans for improvement based on consideration of the assessment results [\[IB2.10\]](#).

In summary, MPC's GEO process has provided a framework for the assessment of transfer program outcomes. This method of program assessment met the College's goals at the time of implementation. However, as MPC continues to evaluate and improve its assessment processes, it has begun to discuss ways to improve the effectiveness of program-level assessment, including the merits of using GEOs as program-level outcomes. More detail about these discussions and plans for improvement can be found in Standard II.A.11.

### ***The Program Reflections Framework***

At least once per year, departments, divisions, and service areas gather together to engage in dialogue about the degree to which students meet the intended SLOs or SAOs (Service Area Outcomes) from their program or area [see examples in IB2.11a – IB2.11e, linked below]. This part of the process emphasizes dialogue among MPC faculty and staff; it is designed to bring the most noteworthy issues concerning student learning to the attention of the department or program. The results of the conversation serve as the rationale to making resource allocation requests, and thus serve as one of the links between assessment of student learning and resource allocation. The Program Reflections form asks four basic questions [\[IB2.12\]](#):

1. What improvements that have taken place are due to past efforts or plans discussed in Program Reflections?
2. What SLOs/GEOs or objectives from the course outline of record did you discuss this semester?
3. Summarize the department/group discussion about student learning. Provide references to specific SLOs and GEOs.
4. What is the result of the dialogue? What are the goals, action plans, or other aspects of program review that have resulted from the analysis of student learning?

As with Instructor Reflections, the effectiveness of this assessment method is evident through the results of the dialogue. Faculty members in the Social Sciences Division, for example, use the Program Reflections as a time to talk about the Social Sciences GEO: "Upon successful completion of this course, students will be able to critically examine and comprehend human nature, social behavior, and/or institutions." During these discussions, faculty members from disciplines within Social Sciences discuss challenges related to the attainment of the outcome (both across and within disciplines) and share strategies for improving its attainment. The Program Reflections process can produce a variety of strategies to improve student learning, including pedagogical techniques shared across disciplines [\[IB2.13a, p.135\]](#) and curricular changes [\[IB2.13b, p.32\]](#). Program Reflections dialogue may also lead to major structural changes within a program, as was the case when the Child Development Center was restructured

as a learning lab to directly support the Early Childhood Education program [[IB2.13c](#), p. 60; [IB2.14](#), [IB2.15](#)].

MPC's learning support centers also utilize the Program Reflections process in a variety of ways to evaluate the effectiveness of their programs. Some, like the English and Study Skills Center (ESSC) and the Reading Center, use the SLOs of the courses that they manage to evaluate effectiveness of their programs [[IB2.16a](#), p. 12]. Others, like the Library, use the process to evaluate Service Area Outcomes that are distinct from the SLOs in their instructional program [[IB2.16b](#), p. 31]. Some, like the Math Learning Center, do not organize distinct Program Reflections, but rather substantively participate in the Math Department Program Reflections dialogue [[IB2.16c](#), p. 55-58].

The Program Reflections process is designed to provide rationale for Action Plans as well as input into resource allocation discussions in governance committees. Across the College, the program reflections process reveals several areas where many different areas/units expressed concern. These institutional-level trends included an inadequacy of staffing proportional to workload, a lack of communication, and technology resources that lag behind current needs. In addition, the broad categories of concern mirrored at least three of the issues identified during this self-evaluation process, i.e., staffing, technology, and communication. The summary was reported to College Council and informed the dialogue in ongoing budget discussions [[IB2.17](#)].

### ***Institution-level Student Learning Outcomes***

MPC uses its General Education Outcomes (GEOs) as its institutional outcomes. These Institutional Outcomes describe the skills or abilities that students have demonstrated after spending multiple semesters at MPC pursuing degree or transfer goals and being successfully engaged in the GE program. The GEOs *are* the Institutional Outcomes, and are listed on the Academic Senate web site, as well as in the College catalog where they are associated with each transfer program. Because they are the same by design, evaluation of MPC's Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) process is the same as that for the GEOs process [[IB2.8](#), p. 53-58, [IB2.9](#), p. 55].

### ***Effectiveness of SLO Processes – Faculty and Staff Surveys***

Since 2010, Program Reflections has been one of the flex day activities [[IB2.18](#)]. The College evaluates the effectiveness of flex day activities using surveys. Each semester, a number of questions in this voluntary survey pertain to the effectiveness of the Program Reflections. Participation rate, as measured by the percentage of respondents who attended a Program Reflections session, began at around 70% in spring 2011 and has risen to a consistent rate of around 90% for the last few semesters. The participation rate is presumably less than 100% because classified staff members are encouraged to fill out this survey but are not always

required to attend a Program Reflections session. Nevertheless, the participation rate has risen and maintained a high percentage in recent semesters.

The flex survey has also asked whether respondents “found Program Reflections to be a useful and appropriate framework to engage in dialogue about improving student learning.” The pattern of the responses to this question is similar to the participation results. Those that responded favorably by indicating that they “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” with the statement started at about 65% in Spring 2011 and increased to a steady 80% in the last few semesters. The increase and sustained positive response of these metrics indicates that the Program Reflections process has become part of the culture and that MPC personnel expect to participate every semester [IB2.19].

In 2008 and 2014, MPC offered faculty and staff surveys as an effort to evaluate the effectiveness of its processes and procedures. During this time, the SLO assessment process, as documented through the Instructor Reflections and Program Reflections, matured and became a regular part of MPC activities. The survey results reflect the maturation of these processes.

In both 2008 and 2014, the survey asked MPC personnel to respond to the statement, “My area assesses attainment of student learning outcomes and uses those results to make improvements.” Of those that expressed an opinion, positive responses in the “somewhat agree” or “strongly agree” categories rose from 80% in 2008 to 92% in 2014. Those that responded with “don’t know” or “not applicable” decreased from 22% in 2008 to 11% in 2014.

In 2008, the survey asked MPC personnel to respond to the statement, “In my area, we use established procedures to develop and assess learning outcomes for all our courses and programs.” In 2014 the statement had the same intent but slightly different wording. Of those that expressed an opinion, positive responses in the “somewhat agree” or “strongly agree” categories rose from 80% in 2008 to 94% in 2014. Those that responded with “don’t know” or “not applicable” decreased from 19% in 2008 to 15% in 2014 [IB2.20, IB2.21].

**Conclusion:** Monterey Peninsula College meets the standard; there are also opportunities for continued improvement in this area. The College has adopted a process for assessing course SLOs, but needs to improve proportion of courses that have been assessed as well as standards for the frequency of assessment. Program assessment has generated good dialog within disciplines through the Program Reflections process. However, to improve the effectiveness of program assessment, the College can improve its assessment of program outcomes that refer to specific patterns of courses.

**Actionable Improvement Plans:**

The College will implement recommendations from the Learning Assessment Committee to improve its course- and program-level SLO assessment practices, including recommendations

for assessment cycles and processes for disaggregation of learning outcome data by subpopulations of students.

*(Applicable Standards: I.B.2, I.B.5, I.B.6, I.C.3, I.C.4, II.A.2, II.A.3, II.A.11, II.A.16)*

The College will re-evaluate its current practice of using GEOs as sole program-level learning outcomes for Associate of Arts and Associate of Science degree programs, and design improved learning outcomes where necessary and appropriate, in order to describe skills and knowledge students will obtain through program completion with greater specificity.

*(Applicable Standards: I.B.2, II.A.11)*

### **Evidence Cited**

- IB2.1 [Faculty Handbook 2015-2016](#), p. 45-58
- IB2.2 [Faculty Handbook 2015-2016](#), p. 32
- IB2.3 [Instructor Reflections Form](#)
- IB2.4 Instructor Reflections Data, available at [Instructor Reflections Website](#) (MyMPC Log-in Required)
- IB2.5 [Instructor Reflections Examples](#)
- IB2.6 [Instructor Reflections Tracking Data](#)
- IB2.7 [2015-2016 College Catalog](#) (see individual CTE program descriptions)
- IB2.8 [Faculty Handbook 2015-2016](#), p. 53-58
- IB2.9 [2015-2016 College Catalog](#), p. 55
- IB2.10 [GEO Assessment Example—Anthropology and History](#)
- IB2.11 Program Reflections Compilations, 2010-2015
  - a. [2010-2011](#)
  - b. [2011-2012](#)
  - c. [2012-2013](#)
  - d. [2013-2014](#)
  - e. [2014-2015](#)
- IB2.12 [Program Reflections Form](#)
- IB2.13 Program Reflections Examples, Social Science Division
  - a. [2012-2013 Program Reflections Compilation](#), p. 135
  - b. [2012-2013 Program Reflections Compilation](#), p. 32
  - c. [2013-2014 Program Reflections Compilation](#), p. 60
- IB2.14 [CDC Restructuring Proposal](#)
- IB2.15 [Governing Board Minutes, 8/26/14, Item 14R](#)
- IB2.16 Program Reflections Examples, Student and Learning Support Services
  - a. ESSC: [2012-2013 Program Reflections Compilation](#), p. 12
  - b. Library: [2014-2015 Program Reflections Compilation](#), p. 31
  - c. MLC: [2013-2014 Program Reflections Compilation](#), p. 55-58
- IB2.17 [Program Reflections Summary Fall 2014](#)
- IB2.18 [Flex Day Schedules](#)
- IB2.19 [Program Reflections Survey Results](#)
- IB2.20 [2008 Faculty and Staff Accreditation Survey](#)
- IB2.21 [2014 Faculty and Staff Accreditation Survey](#)

**I.B.3 The institution establishes institution-set standards for student achievement, appropriate to its mission, assesses how well it is achieving them in pursuit of continuous improvement, and publishes this information. (ER 11)**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

- The College first established institution-set standards for student achievement in 2013 for the ACCJC Annual Report [IB3.2]. Since that time, the College has examined the institution-set standards as one indicator of how effectively it accomplishes its mission [IB3.1, IB3.3 – IB3.5].
- The Office of Institutional Research publishes all presentations of annual information-set standards on its website [IB3.9].

**Analysis and Evaluation**

MPC first established institution-set standards for student achievement in 2013 for the ACCJC Annual Report. Since that time, the College has used the institution-set standards as one indicator of how effectively it accomplishes its mission. Table 1 lists the specific metrics for which the College has set standards each year. Each of the institution-set standards is appropriate to the College’s mission, as they address transfer, career, and basic skills instruction.

<b>Chronology of metrics used in institution-set standards</b>			
	2013	2014	2015
Retention rate (fall-to-fall persistence)	√		
Course completion rate	√	√	√
Degree completion number	√	√	√
Number of transfers to 4-year institution	√	√	√
Certificate completion number	√	√	√
Licensure pass rates		√	√
Job placement rates for certificate and CTE programs			√
<i>Data source: Institution-set Standards Workbook</i>			

In 2013, the College examined its own student achievement data as well as statewide achievement data to establish the institution-set standards [IB3.2, p. 2-7]. The institution used a variety of methods to set standards for each metric in 2013. For example, for course completion rate, the College used the state average of 70% as its standard; for student retention, it chose to set the standard at slightly under MPC’s five-year average for retention, or 41% [IB3.2, p. 2]. Following the completion of the 2013 Annual Report, the College reflected on its methodology for establishing its institution-set standards and reviewed the methodologies that other Colleges used to set their standards. This discussion resulted in a new, consistent methodology and data source for each of the institution-set standards for 2014 [IB3.3, pp. 1-2]. Beginning in 2014, the College sets its standards as a five-year average minus the standard deviation for those five years. Thus, the 2014 standard is the lower edge of the “range of normal” for each of the six institution-set standards [IB3.3, p. 1; IB3.4, slides 8-9]. As it prepared the data for its 2015

institution-set standards, the College reviewed this methodology to confirm that it remained valid and appropriate [IB3.5, slide 7]. At this time, the College also recalculated its 2013 institution-set standards based on the new methodology, in order to have three years of data (2013, 2014, and 2015) using the same methodology for use in longitudinal comparisons [IB3.1].

The College assesses its performance on the institution-set standards each year as it prepares its annual ACCJC accreditation report. As part of the assessment, the College examines disaggregated data for the categories within the standard as appropriate (e.g., online vs. face-to-face students, by program, by college-prepared vs. unprepared, etc.) and compares each standard against actual institutional performance. For example, the College compared course success rates for online students to those for face-to-face students and the college as a whole as it evaluated its standards for the 2015 Annual Report submission in March 2015. The College found that success rates for online students were lower than those of face-to-face students; in addition, success rates for online courses had declined from fall 2013 to fall 2014 [IB3.5, slide 10]. This evaluation led the Institutional Committee on Distance Education (ICDE) to establish working goals for 2015-2016 specifically focused on improving student success rates [IB3.6].

The College engaged in wide review and the institution-set standards in the 2014-2015 year to enable campus-wide understanding of methodology used to set the standards and the institution's performance against them [IB3.7a, IB3.7b, IB3.7c, IB3.7d]. The Office of Institutional Research makes copies of the presentations available on its website [IB3.8]. A focus on achieving the institution-set standards has been embedded into institutional planning through the Institutional Action Plan [IB3.9, Objective 1.8].

**Conclusion:** Monterey Peninsula College meets Standard I.B.3.

**Evidence Cited:**

- IB3.1 [Institution-Set Standards Workbook](#)
- IB3.2 [Institution-set Standards 2013](#)
- IB3.3 [Institution-set Standards 2014](#)
- IB3.4 OIR Presentation: [First Look at MPC's Institution-set Standards](#)
- IB3.5 OIR Presentation: [2015 Institution-set Standards](#)
- IB3.6 [ICDE Working Goals, 2015-2016](#)
- IB3.7 Discussion of Institution-set Standards
  - a. [College Council minutes, 9/23/14](#)
  - b. [Academic Senate minutes, 10/2/14](#)
  - c. [Board of Trustees minutes, 1/30/15](#)
  - d. [Board of Trustees minutes, 3/25/15](#)
- IB3.8 [OIR Website](#)
- IB3.9 [Institutional Action Plan](#), Objective 1.8

## **I.B.4 The institution uses assessment data and organizes its institutional processes to support student learning and student achievement.**

### **Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

- The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) regularly provides presentations featuring various categories of student achievement data as they pertain to student learning and success to the Governing Board [IB4.1].
- OIR presentations about student learning and achievement data are given at relevant committee meetings to promote understanding and inform discussions concerning planning and institutional effectiveness. College Council considers analyses of student learning assessment data (as compiled in Program Reflections documentation) to inform institutional planning and resource allocation decisions [IB4.2, IB4.3, IB4.4].
- College Council integrated assessment data into its processes for developing and evaluating progress towards Institutional Goals and objectives in fall 2015, in order to inform planning and assessment of progress toward the mission [IB4.5].
- Divisions and departments use student achievement and assessment data as part of their evaluation of program quality during program review (see Standard I.B.5).
- Programs regularly use achievement data to support resource allocation requests such as faculty position prioritization and funding proposals for basic skills projects [IB4.10 – IB4.11, IB4.13 – IB4.14].

### **Analysis and Evaluation**

Monterey Peninsula College uses assessment data to support student learning and achievement at a variety of levels throughout the institution. The College's efforts to improve student learning and achievement for basic skills math students demonstrate how the institution uses assessment data at various levels of the institution to support improvements to student learning. Regular presentations from the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) use assessment data to help educate College personnel on issues of student success, particularly on those challenges faced by underprepared students (including those in basic skills math) [IB4.6, slides 10-12; IB4.7, slide 4]. The Office of Institutional Research makes its presentations available on its website to facilitate institution-wide understanding and discussion informed by assessment results and achievement data [IB4.8].

The Math Department consistently uses assessment data to appraise program quality and support resource allocation requests. An ongoing goal for the Math Department has been to improve student learning and achievement in basic skills Math courses by stabilizing staffing in the Math Learning Center (MLC) and providing additional tutoring services for basic skills math students [IB4.9]. The Math Department requested a full-time MLC Coordinator in fall 2012, using assessment and achievement data as its rationale. The faculty position request form emphasized the differences that the MLC had made over the previous semesters for students that utilized its

services, using assessment and achievement data spanning across six different courses [IB4.10]. Because the assessment data convincingly demonstrated the urgent need for stable MLC leadership, the Academic Affairs Advisory Group ranked the position as its second highest priority when discussing faculty position requests [IB4.11, p. 2-3].

In a 2013-2014 analysis of assessment and achievement data, the Math Department discovered a strong variation in student success between those students who used the MLC and those who did not. Across a spectrum of six Math courses offered over a period of nine semesters, the success rates of those students who used the MLC were three to thirty percentage points higher than those students who did not use the MLC [IB4.12, p. 55-58]. In a recently funded Basic Skills Initiative (BSI) project, the Math Department compared the achievement of students who used math tutors three or more times to those who worked with a tutor two times or less. Again, the results across four different courses indicate tutored students achieved success at a significantly greater rate than those who did not take advantage of the tutoring [IB4.13]. Analysis of assessment data for a BSI report reveals further challenges for specific Math courses, and supports continued funding for the MLC [IB4.14, page 3].

### ***The Institution Organizes its Institutional Processes to Support Student Learning***

The College has organized its Integrated Planning Model and its Planning and Resource Allocation Process to ensure that institutional processes directly support student learning. The Integrated Planning Model guides planning processes that operate on annual to six-year cycles. The planning documents incorporated into the Integrated Planning Model directly support student learning by providing assessments of student learning and using the results to improve student learning [IB4.15]. For example, Reflections and Program Review processes document assessments of student learning and achievement. Results of the assessments inform plans to improve student learning at the course and program level (Reflections; Program Review), and at the institutional-level (Institutional Action Plan, Technology Plan, etc.). The Institutional Action Plan documents the specific, measurable objectives that the College pursues to meet its institutional goals, all of which support student learning directly or indirectly [IB4.5]. Similarly, the Planning and Resource Allocation Model organizes the timing of the annual resource allocation process [IB4.16]. In particular, the process emphasizes the consideration of the Reflections and program review documents, as well as institutional objectives, achievement data, and consideration of institutional-level planning documents.

The transition of MPC's Child Development Center (CDC) from a childcare unit to a learning laboratory for the Early Childhood Education (ECE) Department demonstrates how College processes support student learning. Faculty members in the ECE Department identified a need for a learning lab to support ECE students. The College recognized that restructuring the CDC from a childcare facility to a learning lab allowed for better alignment with the institutional mission of student learning. Discussion of this transformation began in Program Reflections

[[IB4.17a](#), [IB4.17b](#)], continued into Program Review [[IB4.17c](#)], and ultimately, the Board of Trustees [[IB4.17d](#), [IB4.17e](#)]. The CDC began operation under the new structure in fall 2015.

In its ongoing efforts to support for student learning, MPC continues to evaluate its processes and make revisions in order to become more effective. The College's decision to proceed with an implementation of the software system TracDat emerged from such a process evaluation, and represents an effort to reorganize institutional processes around assessment, data use, and planning. During its institutional self-evaluation, the College determined that its method of organizing and communicating data (including data related to student learning and achievement) involved separate, "siloed" systems. The College uses Program Review and Reflections processes to document results of assessment and evaluation. However, the information in the Reflections documents are not easily accessible, making it more challenging to link the assessment results to Program Review, annual action plans, and resource allocation decisions. Similarly, basic student demographic information and student achievement data have not been easily accessible to all College personnel who wish to use them for program-level planning purposes. In essence, the College determined that institutional processes encapsulated within the Planning and Resource Allocation Process worked well in theory, but were not as effective in practice due to the availability of data and in visualizing connections between the various components [[IB4.18](#)]. To strengthen the effectiveness of its processes, the College decided to implement an institutional performance management system (TracDat) [[IB4.19](#)].

**Conclusion:** MPC meets Standard I.B.4. However, the College continues to work to improve effectiveness and strengthen its processes related to this Standard. The College began work on its TracDat implementation in late fall 2015; work will be ongoing through the remainder of 2105-2016 and into the 2016-2017 year to set up the system for course and program-level assessment, program review, and support for annual resource allocation requests (see QFE Action Project 2). The system will enable more effective collection and assessment of outcomes data, improved communication of results of data analysis, and stronger links between assessment results and resource allocation requests. Overall, this will support a broader understanding of student learning and achievement at the institution.

#### **Actionable Improvement Plan:**

The institution will implement tools to improve its Planning and Resource Allocation Process and more effectively link SLO/SAO assessments, annual action plans, and program review to resource allocation and Institutional Goals.

#### **Evidence Cited**

- IB4.1 [OIR Student Success Reporting Calendars, 13/14 – 15/16](#)
- IB4.2 [Program Reflections Summary, Fall 2014](#)
- IB4.3 [College Council minutes, 9/23/14](#)
- IB4.4 Program Reflections Compilations 2010-2015

- a. [2010-2011](#)
  - b. [2011-2012](#)
  - c. [2012-2013](#)
  - d. [2013-2014](#)
  - e. [2014-2015](#)
- IB4.5 [Institutional Action Plan](#)
- IB4.6 [OIR Presentation: Progression through English and Math](#)
- IB4.7 [OIR Presentation: Success in Basic Skills Math, English, and ESL](#)
- IB4.8 [OIR Website](#)
- IB4.9 [Math Program Review](#)
- IB4.10 [MLC Faculty Position Request, Fall 2012](#)
- IB4.11 [Academic Affairs Advisory Group minutes, 10/17/12](#)
- IB4.12 [Program Reflections Compilations, 2013-2014](#)
- IB4.13 [Basic Skills Initiative Report, summer 2014](#)
- IB4.14 [Basic Skills Initiative Annual Report, 2013-2014](#)
- IB4.15 [Integrated Planning Model](#)
- IB4.16 [Planning and Resource Allocation Process](#)
- IB4.17 Child Development Center Transition Discussion
- a. [Program Reflections Compilation, 2012-2013](#), p. 136
  - b. [Program Reflections Comilation2013-2014](#), p. 60
  - c. [Program Review ECD Program Review](#), p. 18, 23-24, 33-36
  - d. [Governing Board Minutes, 8/26/14](#), Item No. R, p. 15
  - e. [Governing Board Minutes, 9/8/14](#)
- IB4.18 [Rationale for TracDat](#)
- IB4.19 [College Council minutes, 6/9/15](#)

**I.B.5 The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of goals and objectives, student learning outcomes, and student achievement. Quantitative and qualitative data are disaggregated for analysis by program type and mode of delivery.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

- Monterey Peninsula College assesses accomplishment of its mission through methods including program review [IB5.1 – IB5.4, IB5.10], evaluation of Institutional Goals and objectives [IB5.6 – IB5.7], and analysis of data related to student learning outcomes and student achievement [IB5.9, IB5.11-IB5.12].
- The College’s program review process involves disaggregating quantitative and qualitative data related to student ethnicity, gender, and level of college preparedness for analysis by program type and mode of delivery [IB5.3].

**Analysis and Evaluation**

***Assessing Accomplishment of the Mission through Program Review***

MPC’s program review process ensures that each campus program and unit assesses itself in relation to the College mission every six years. All academic divisions, student services departments, and administrative services units complete a comprehensive program review every

six years. During the process, each division, department, and unit considers how effectively its programs and/or services support the mission of the College. To ensure alignment between the mission of each program or service and the mission of the College, program review participants begin by demonstrating how the mission of the program supports the mission of the College's mission [[IB5.2a](#), [IB5.2b](#), [IB5.2c](#)]. If the program mission does not clearly align with the College mission, writers must describe how the program will change or revise its mission to come into better alignment.

Program review templates for all three areas of the College include prompts to ensure program/unit members review important, mission-centered elements of their programs. Although the specific elements in the program review templates vary somewhat due to the specific functions of Academic Affairs, Student Services, and Administrative Services [[IB5.3](#)], each template includes categories related to Mission, Program Vitality/Services, Impact on Student Learning, and Staffing. In the Mission section, for example, each program/ unit responds to identical prompts identifying how the program/unit mission supports the College mission. Prompts are different in those areas where instructional departments within Academic Affairs support the College mission differently than units within Student Services or Administrative Services. Instructional programs, for example, evaluate student learning outcomes, whereas Student and Administrative Services units assess their support of student learning. The comprehensive program review template for divisions in Academic Affairs has prompted program review writers to make clear links between College and program missions for all of the current cycle; in the 2014-2015 year, the College updated the templates for Student Services and Administrative Services were updated to include the mission alignment element, as well [[IB5.1a](#), [IB5.1b](#), [IB5.1c](#)].

The program review process provides each program/unit with an opportunity to review relevant data, including data related to student learning and achievement; quality of program, services, and infrastructure; and support of student goals as they relate to transfer and career training, basic skills, and lifelong learning opportunities. For example, program reviews for academic divisions and Student Services units include analysis of longitudinal student achievement data for each program area. Program review writers examine this data, compare program rates to College-wide rates, and provide a brief analysis of what these data might suggest about the overall health and direction of the program [[IB5.4a](#), p. 12; [IB5.4b](#), p. 2-4]. Administrative services units discuss data related to demand for the programs and/or services offered [[IB5.1b](#), p. 5-7].

### ***Assessing Accomplishment of the Mission through Evaluation of Goals and Objectives***

Monterey Peninsula College has established long-term, overarching Institutional Goals in support of the College mission [[IB5.5](#)]. The Institutional Goals are the basis for short-term, measurable objectives that describe specific actions the College plans to take to reach the

Institutional Goals. The College documents the Institutional Goals and objectives in its Institutional Action Plan [IB5.6]. As the College Council evaluates the institution's accomplishment of the short-term objectives, it also assesses progress towards achieving the long-term Institutional Goals, and by extension, fulfillment of the College mission. For example, in 2014, the College Council evaluated progress on the objectives that were developed to support the 2011-2014 Institutional Goals [IB5.7].

Prior to fall 2014, the College Council evaluated MPC's Institutional Goals and objectives every three years, potentially revising the Institutional Goals as warranted. The College used these three-year institutional goals to drive the strategic initiatives outlined in the Education Master Plan [IB5.5, p. 8]. The Education Master Plan also outlined five-year objectives and strategic initiatives for the College [IB5.5, p. 26]. The objectives identified in the Education Master Plan supported achievement of the 2011-2014 Institutional Goals, and intended to be reviewed (and revised, if warranted) during the planning and resource allocation process. However, the EMP objectives differed from the objectives developed in concert with the 2011-2014 Institutional Goals. The College referred to these objectives as EMP Objectives and Institutional Objectives, respectively.

In the 2014-2015 year, the College Council assessed college-wide planning and identified several problem areas:

- Evaluating two sets of objectives (institutional objectives and EMP objectives) was confusing and inefficient.
- Some objectives did not include timelines or specific, measurable indicators of progress,
- Several EMP objectives extended beyond the 2011-2014 timeframe of MPC's Institutional Goals.
- Evaluation efforts tended to be qualitative and ad-hoc in nature.

As a result of this assessment, College Council revised the institutional planning process to include an Institutional Action Plan that would be evaluated annually.

To improve the institution's evaluation of progress against its Institutional Goals during the remainder of the current Education Master Plan term (2012-2017), College Council revised the Institutional Goals to strengthen their connection to the College mission and revised objectives as needed to ensure that they are measurable and have reasonable timeframes [IB5.6].

Adopting an Institutional Action Plan with specific, measurable objectives and evaluating progress annually allows the College to maintain a more consistent, timely focus on the College's mission. Annual assessment also allows all members of the College to understand early in the planning process how each objective will be met and who will lead the effort and be responsible for its completion [IB5.6]. In the current planning model, College Council is

charged with reviewing the Institutional Action Plan annually to evaluate progress towards the objectives and add new objectives as needs arise [IB5.7]. The College anticipates that this change to an annual evaluation of progress towards objectives directly linked to Institutional Goals will greatly improve the effectiveness of both short-term and long-range planning.

### ***Assessing Accomplishment of the Mission through Student Learning Outcomes***

As shown above, each unit demonstrates how their department or area supports the institutional mission during the program review process. Each unit also assesses their SLOs or SAO (Service Area Outcomes) on an ongoing basis. As part of the comprehensive program review, each department/unit summarizes the changes and improvements emerging from ongoing dialogue around outcomes assessment in support of the programs goals and mission. Assessment of course-level and programmatic SLOs and Service Area Outcomes (Service Area Outcomes) helps demonstrate the attainment of programmatic missions. In turn, the programmatic missions support the institutional mission.

For example, in its Program Review, the History department summarized changes to pedagogy and support for student success that emerged from ongoing SLO assessment discussions at the course and program level [IB5.9a, p. 10; IB5.9b; IB5.9c, p.59]. The changes emerging from the SLO and PSLO dialogue support the program's mission of fostering student learning and success through excellent instruction in history for students pursuing transfer, career, and lifelong learning. Because the program mission aligns with the College mission, as the department evaluates the effectiveness of the changes, it indirectly assesses the institution's effectiveness of meeting its mission of fostering student learning and achievement, as well.

### ***Assessing Accomplishment of the Mission through Disaggregated Student Achievement Data***

As discussed above, MPC's comprehensive program review processes ensure that departments/units analyze student achievement data as they evaluate programs and services and consider the degree to which they support the mission of the College. Program review participants also examine disaggregated success and retention rates for demographic groups within each program. For programs that deliver instruction in both face-to-face and online modalities, program review participants compare success and retention disaggregated by mode of delivery. Participants provide analysis of any gaps in retention and success rates between their face-to-face and online courses, and discuss interventions that could mitigate those gaps [IB5.10, p. 13-14]. However, in past program review cycles, participants noted that it was difficult provide meaningful analysis of demographic data for individual programs without having the disaggregated success and retention rates for the College as a whole. As a result, the College has begun discussions of how to provide College-wide demographic data using TracDat to support more meaningful discussion and analysis of data disaggregated by student demographics within program review.

The College has also embedded student achievement data into other institutional processes related to assessing the accomplishment of mission, including the regular review of the mission statement itself. During the last mission review cycle, the College intentionally linked the mission statement with student achievement, in order to make the mission statement more evaluable and clarify that student achievement data are one measure of mission accomplishment [IB5.11, IB5.12]. The Institutional Action Plan indicates which student achievement data are relevant for each objective's progress and/or evaluation. When relevant for the discussion, the data are disaggregated by program type and/or mode of delivery [IB5.6, Objectives 1.4c, 1.5a].

The College also considers student achievement data in relation to the institutional mission when it reviews and discusses mandated reports that rely on achievement data. These include the institution-set standards required by the US Department of Education; state-mandated reports such as the Student Success Scorecard, Institutional Effectiveness Goals, Student Success and Support Plan (3SP) and Student Equity Plan; and reports required by the Chancellor's Office, such as the annual Basic Skills Initiative report. Data considered in these processes include (but are not limited to) course completion and retention, degree and certificate attainment, transfer rates, and licensure and job placement rates. As the institution prepares each report, student achievement data are disaggregated, analyzed, and discussed at various committee meetings, as well as presented to the Governing Board. The dialogue that results from each presentation helps to increase institutional awareness of key student achievement indicators in relation to the overall mission of the College. As the institution evaluates the degree to which it fulfills its mission through each of these processes and mechanisms, student achievement data are used to inform the dialogue and help prioritize areas for improvement and resource allocation.

**Conclusion:** MPC meets Standard I.B.5.

### **Evidence Cited**

- IB5.1 Program Review Templates
  - a. [Academic Affairs](#)
  - b. [Administrative Services](#)
  - c. [Student Services](#)
- IB5.2 Program Review Examples
  - a. [History](#)
  - b. [Campus Security](#)
- IB5.3 [Program Review Elements](#)
- IB5.4 PR Student Achievement Data Examples
  - a. [Anthropology](#), p. 12
  - b. [EOPS](#), 2-4
- IB5.5 [Educational Master Plan, 2012-2017](#)
- IB5.6 [Institutional Action Plan](#)
- IB5.7 [Evaluation of 2010-2014 Goals](#)
- IB5.8 [College Council Bylaws](#)
- IB5.9 SLO Assessment Examples

- a. [History Program Review](#), p. 10
  - b. [Instructor Reflection for HIST 17](#)
  - c. [History Program Reflection, 2013-2014](#), p. 59
- IB5.10 [Economics Program Review](#), p. 13-14
- IB5.11 [OIR Presentation: Accomplishing the Mission](#)
- IB5.12 [College Council minutes, 3/25/14](#)

**I.B.6 The institution disaggregates and analyzes learning outcomes and achievement for subpopulations of students. When the institution identifies performance gaps, it implements strategies, which may include allocation or reallocation of human, fiscal, and other resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

- The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) routinely disaggregates data by program, instructional modality, age, gender, and ethnicity for use in activities related to integrated planning, program review, institutional effectiveness, and ongoing conversations related to student success and access. Evidence of this work can be seen throughout OIR presentations archived on the OIR website, as well as in the Student Equity Plan, Student Support and Program (3SP) Plan, discussions of the Institution-set Standards and State Chancellor’s Office IEPI Goals, and within program review [IB6.1 – IB6.5; see also discussion of Program Review in Standard I.B.5].
- When the College identifies performance gaps, it implements strategies to mitigate the gaps [IB6.6 – IB6.11].

**Analysis and Evaluation**

***Analyzing Disaggregated Learning and Achievement Data***

Monterey Peninsula College regularly analyzes data related to learning outcomes and student achievement as part of institutional conversations about mission fulfillment and continuous improvement. The Office of Institutional Research routinely disaggregates data by program, instructional modality, age, gender, ethnicity for use in activities related to integrated planning, program review, institutional effectiveness, and ongoing conversations related to student success and access. During discussion and analysis of the data, the institution looks for performance gaps between subpopulations of students (or between individual subpopulations and the student population overall). When these gaps exist, the College acts quickly to identify and implement strategies that would better support lower performing subpopulations. Evidence of this work can be seen throughout OIR presentations (archived on the OIR website) [[IB6.1](#)], as well as in the Student Equity Plan [[IB6.2](#)], Student Support and Program (3SP) Plan [[IB6.3](#)], conversations about the Institution-set Standards and State Chancellor’s Office IEPI goals [[IB6.4](#), [IB6.5](#)], and within program review.

Discussions of how to disaggregate student learning outcome data for subpopulations of students have begun, but as of fall 2015, the College has not yet begun to disaggregate student learning outcome data for subpopulations of students. In its current assessment processes, instructors report SLO data at the course or program level, rather than at the level of the individual student. The Learning Assessment Committee, Office of Institutional Research, and Accreditation Steering Committee are investigating ways to disaggregate using current processes. The institution has also begun a TracDat implementation project with the intention of improving data collection, assessment, and reporting practices (see QFE Action Project #2).

MPC regularly uses disaggregated student achievement data related to age, gender, ethnicity, and college preparedness to inform planning and assess mission fulfillment. These data form the basis for Student Equity plans, 3SP plans, Basic Skills plans, the Scorecard, institution-set standards, and IEPI goals. The College uses each of these documents to identify performance gaps and inform plans on how to address them. Standard I.B.5 discusses examples of student achievement data disaggregated by program type and instructional modality. Discussion of disaggregation of other subpopulations relevant for College planning follows below.

### ***Mitigating Identified Performance Gaps***

Disaggregation of student learning and achievement data enables the institution to identify and discuss performance gaps between subpopulations of students (either among subpopulations, or between an individual group and the student population as a whole). Once a statistically significant difference in performance has been identified, the institution begins to discuss the context for the gap in relevant committees, departments, and/or governance groups. For example, committees might discuss whether the gap appears to be part of a trend, or whether it represents a one-time outlier in the data; external factors affecting the subpopulation are also considered. By examining the context in which the gap occurs, the institution is better able to determine an appropriate response. For example, faculty and staff working with prospective English as a Second Language (ENSL) students observed that these students encountered challenges as they attempted to register for classes. Specifically, language skills became a barrier when trying to navigate the online registration system. The Basic Skills Committee proposed two specific projects to address this gap: a dedicated counselor for ENSL students [IB6.6] and a pictorial guide to the registration system [IB6.7].

If necessary, data are disaggregated further to support better understanding of the nature of the gap. As noted in Standard I.B.3, when examining disaggregated data for course success rates in spring 2015, the College realized that online students had lower success than face-to-face students, and that course success for online students appeared to be trending downward. In response, the Institutional Committee on Distance Education (ICDE) established working goals for 2015-2016 that were specifically geared towards increasing online course success [IB6.8], including a dedicated professional development series for faculty around success and

engagement in online courses [IB6.9]. During the discussion of online success and retention data, data the College further disaggregated by program in order to get a better understanding of specific programs that might need more focused attention and interventions. In addition, the MPC Online Support Team established a data dashboard to enable close monitoring of trends in course success and retention as compared to statewide rates for online students, MPC face-to-face students, and MPC's overall institution-set standard for course success [IB6.10].

### ***Evaluating Efficacy of Improvement Strategies***

MPC has found that an effective way to evaluate the effectiveness of strategies intended to mitigate performance gaps is to identify a measurable goal or outcome at the time that the strategy is proposed or implemented. The project proposal for the SCORE+ Summer Bridge math program illustrates this approach. The proposal includes a statement of the measurable goal (3% increase in success and retention in Math 351 after program completion), as well as a short narrative of how the project will be evaluated [IB6.11]. By establishing evaluation guidelines prior to the start of the project, those involved with the project can monitor progress towards the goal as the project progresses and make course corrections if necessary.

**Conclusion:** Monterey Peninsula College effectively disaggregates student achievement data for subpopulations of students, and implements strategies to mitigate performance gaps when necessary. However, the College currently has no practical way of disaggregating student learning outcome data by subpopulation. The Learning Assessment Committee, Accreditation Steering Committee, and Office of Institutional Research have begun discussions of how to approach disaggregation of student learning data in a way that respects the privacy of individual students and faculty while informing decisions about how to improve the learning environment. The College anticipates that its TracDat implementation (see QFE Action Project #2) may enable more effective collection of outcome data, including for subpopulations of students.

### **Actionable Improvement Plan:**

The College will implement recommendations from the Learning Assessment Committee to improve its course- and program-level SLO assessment practices, including recommendations for assessment cycles and processes for disaggregation of learning outcome data by subpopulations of students.

*(Related Standards: IB2, IB5, IB6, IC3, IC4, IIA2, IIA3, IIA16)*

### **Evidence Cited**

- IB6.1 [OIR Website](#)
- IB6.2 [2014 Student Equity Plan](#)
- IB6.3 [2014 Student Success and Support Program \(3SP\) Plan](#)
- IB6.4 [OIR Presentation: 2015 Institution-set Standards](#)
- IB6.5 [OIR Presentation: Setting IEPI Goals](#)
- IB6.6 [BSI Proposal: ESL Counselor](#)
- IB6.7 [BSI Proposal: Pictorial MPC Application & WebReg Guides](#)

IB6.8	<a href="#">ICDE Working Goals, 2013-2016</a>
IB6.9	<a href="#">MPC Online Professional Development, Fall 2015</a>
IB6.10	<a href="#">MPC Online Data Dashboard</a>
IB6.11	<a href="#">BSI Proposal: SCORE+</a>

**I.B.7 The institution regularly evaluates its policies and practices across all areas of the institution, including instructional programs, student and learning support services, resource management, and governance processes to assure their effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of mission.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

To ensure that policies and practices across all areas of the institution support academic quality and accomplishment of the mission, the College reviews and updates policies and procedures appropriately.

- Instructional Programs
  - The Academic Senate is responsible for reviewing and recommending changes to policy and practice that involve academic and professional matters [IB7.1, IB7.2].
  - Under the leadership of the Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Academic Affairs Advisory Group (AAAG) is responsible for making recommendations for action to College Council on issues of policy (including Board Policy), planning, and resource allocation [IB7.3].
- Student and Learning Support Programs
  - Under the leadership of the Vice President of Student Services, the Student Services Advisory Group (SSAG) is responsible for making recommendations for action to College Council on issues of policy (including Board Policy), planning, and resource allocation [IB7.10].
- Resource Management
  - Under the leadership of the Vice President of Administrative Services, the Administrative Services Advisory Group (ASAG) is responsible for making recommendations for action to College Council on issues of policy (including Board Policy), planning, and resource allocation [IB7.13].

**Analysis and Evaluation**

***Policy and Practice Evaluation in Instructional Programs***

MPC’s instructional programs evaluate and update policies and practices as appropriate to assure effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of the College mission. The Academic Senate is responsible for reviewing and recommending changes to policy and practice that involve academic and professional matters [IB7.1]. Under the leadership of the Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Academic Affairs Advisory Group (AAAG) responsible for making recommendations for action to College Council on issues of policy (including Board Policy), planning, and resource allocation [IB7.2]. AAAG reviews policies and procedures

brought forward from divisions and departments as well as those brought forward after review by the Academic Senate and other shared governance groups across campus. Recent policy and practice review in instructional programs has led to the following improvements:

- Updated curriculum policies and practices  
The Academic Senate reviews policy recommendations to ensure that MPC's curriculum practices and outcomes are effective at supporting academic quality. Academic Senate review has included a plan for adopting prerequisites under the new Title 5 requirements as recommended by the Curriculum Advisory Committee as well as endorsing the Effective Strategies for Quality Online Teaching & Learning as recommended by the Institutional Committee on Distance Education [[IB7.3](#), [IB7.4](#)]
- Academic Affairs Process Review  
During the fall 2013 semester, the VP of Academic Affairs initiated process mapping within the area of instruction to identify areas for improvement and greater alignment with the institutional mission. The process led to the documentation of roles and responsibilities, process dependencies, and improvement in processes including how part-time faculty office hour load requests were assigned [[IB7.5](#)].
- Scheduling for Program Reflections  
To provide faculty with sufficient time for program assessment activities, the College has designated time during scheduled flex days for Program Reflections. A review of the Reflections process indicated that some non-instructional areas of the campus were not taking this opportunity to assess their programs and services. In fall 2014, these areas were encouraged to look at service area outcomes in various program areas across campus [[IB7.6](#), [IB7.7](#), p. 102-104]

### ***Policy and Practice Evaluation in Student and Learning Support Services***

MPC's student and learning support programs evaluate and update policies and practices as appropriate to assure effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of the College mission. Under the leadership of the Vice President of Student Services, the Student Services Advisory Group (SSAG) is responsible for making recommendations for action to College Council on issues of policy (including Board Policy), planning, and resource allocation [[IB7.8](#)]. SSAG reviews policies and procedures brought forward from student services departments and programs as well as those brought forward after review by other shared governance groups across campus. Recent improvements resulting from policy and practice review include:

- Revision to MPC's Academic Renewal Policy  
In March 2015, SSAG reviewed the College's Academic Renewal Policy, made recommendations for changes, and approved a draft of a revised policy for review by other participatory governance groups [[IB7.9](#)]. The recommended policy changes will

allow students to select the grades that will be dropped from their GPA rather than forcing them to drop an entire semester of work.

- **Business Process Analysis**

In Dec. 2013, student services managers, faculty, and classified staff worked with an external consultant to map existing and desired processes involving all aspects of student enrollment from application through the second week of the semester [IB7.10]. The following policy and process improvements were made to student learning support services a result of the BPA:

- **Automated Applications:** The Admissions & Records staff worked collaboratively with the Information Systems department to streamline and automate applications. Instead of manual processing—which took three or more days to complete—students can now apply to MPC and receive a confirmation of acceptance within 15 minutes.
- **Laserfiche Student Records Digitization:** Admissions & Records and the Information Systems department worked together to implement a process for digitizing all remaining paper-based student records. As a result, counselors and other learning support services have immediate access to student records necessary to serve the needs of students.

### ***Policy and Practice Evaluation in Resource Management***

MPC programs and departments responsible for the management of resources evaluate and update policies and practices as appropriate to assure effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of the College mission. Under the leadership of the Vice President of Administrative Services, the Administrative Services Advisory Group (ASAG) is responsible for making recommendations for action to College Council on issues of policy (including Board Policy), planning, and resource allocation [IB7.11]. ASAG reviews policies and procedures brought forward from Administrative Services departments and programs as well as those brought forward after review by other shared governance groups across campus. The Human Resources Department and Office of the Superintendent/President initiate the review of policy and practice related to human resources.

Improvements resulting from recent policy and practice review include:

- **Human Resources Process Mapping [IB7.12]**  
During the 2013-2014 school year, Human Resources Staff conducted a review of HR policies and workflows, which led to the improvement and formal documentation of existing processes. Examples of improvements made include improving the employee onboarding process, which included a shift from paper-based forms to electronic submission. In addition, a more formal introduction to Board Policies is now provided to new employees to increase awareness of campus policies.
- **Evaluation of Faculty Hiring Processes**

In January 2014, a group of managers, faculty, and classified staff worked with an external consultant to map existing and desired processes involving all aspects of full-time faculty hiring to identify barriers, redundancy, and inefficiencies to ensure that the campus can recruit highly qualified faculty to deliver instruction on campus.

- **Compliance with Changing Regulations Related to Employee Benefits**

In response to the introduction to the Affordable Care Act (ACA) and new paid sick leave requirements, the district has reviewed existing policy and practice and implemented new processes and procedures to ensure compliance. Human Resource Staff have received training in regulations, requirements, and compliance and the district has implemented the WorxTime system for tracking and monitoring hours worked by employees to determine eligibility for benefits according to regulations set forth by the ACA. In addition, the Human Resource Department has created a new administrative procedure—7340 Leaves: Short-term, Non-continuing employees, Federal Work Study, Substitutes, Interns, Tutors, and other Temporary Employees—to provide documentation and guidance on district leave policy and ensure that adequate coverage is in place to support academic quality and accomplishment of the district’s mission [[IB7.13](#)].

- **Information Technology Policy and Practice Updates**

As a component of the development of the Technology Plan (see Standard III.C.2), the Technology Committee and Information Services department conducted a review of campus policies related to information and instructional technology. A Computer and Network Acceptable Use Agreement was developed to provide guidance about technology use in instruction and across campus operations to support academic quality and accomplishment of the district’s mission [[IB7.14](#), p. 38].

### ***Policy and Practice Evaluation in Governance Processes***

In addition to the Board Policy review that occurs in the areas noted above, campus governance groups regularly evaluate and update policies and practices to assure effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of the College mission. Recent policy and practice reviews include:

- **Evaluation of the effectiveness of the MPC Planning and Resource Allocation Process**

The evaluation revealed that the Planning and Resource Allocation Process as presented in the 2010 self-study could be improved. Among the improvements were:

- More effective multi-year planning mechanism
- More intentional integration of unit planning documents (e.g., Technology Plan, Facilities Plan, etc.) into College planning
- More intentional incorporation of Reflections results into the planning process
- Timing adjustments to more evenly distribute major decisions and events across both semesters

[[IB7.15](#), [IB7.16](#)]

- **Committee Bylaw Review & Updates**  
Participatory governance committees regularly review and update by-laws in order to ensure that they support the needs of MPC’s students and accomplishment of the district’s mission.
- **Action Plan Process Updates**  
The cycle for completing action plans was reviewed and adjusted to better align with resource allocation and budget development. Prior to the spring 2015 semester, action plans were due in late spring. The College adjusted the due date to February, which enables College Council and others in budget development and resource allocation to use the information in the action plans more effectively. Each division and unit now completes its Action Plan during time built into the Flex Day event at the beginning of the spring term [[IB7.17](#)].

**Conclusion:** Monterey Peninsula College meets Standard I.B.7; however, there are opportunities for continued improvement in this area. The College regularly reviews core processes such as Program Review and the Planning and Resource Allocation process, but has not formalized a systemic cycle for process review in all areas. In spring 2016, the College worked with an external firm (Collaborative Brain Trust) to review planning and decision-making processes, in order to address inefficiencies and redundancies. Among the recommendations, CBT recommended that the College establish regular and coordinated schedule for evaluation of its processes (including planning processes) [[IB7.18](#)].

### **Evidence Cited**

- IB7.1 [Academic Senate Bylaws](#)
- IB7.2 [Academic Affairs Advisory Group Bylaws](#)
- IB7.3 [Academic Senate Minutes, 5/16/13](#), p. 7
- IB7.4 [Academic Senate Minutes, 2/6/14](#), p. 6
- IB7.5 [Academic Affairs Process Mapping Guidelines](#)
- IB7.6 [Flex Day Schedules, 2013-2014, 2014-2015](#)
- IB7.7 [President's Office, Program Reflections 2014](#), p. 102-104
- IB7.8 [Student Services Advisory Group Bylaws](#)
- IB7.9 [SSAG Minutes, 3/19/15](#)
- IB7.10 [Business Process Analysis Report, Student Enrollment Processes](#)
- IB7.11 [Administrative Services Advisory Group Bylaws](#)
- IB7.12 [Human Resource Department Process Mapping](#)
- IB7.13 [Administrative Procedure 7340](#)
- IB7.14 [Technology Plan](#), p. 38
- IB7.15 [Integrated Planning Model](#)
- IB7.16 [Planning and Resource Allocation Process](#)
- IB7.17 [AAAG Minutes, 1/26/15](#)
- IB7.18 [College Council Minutes, 2/9/14](#)

**I.B.8 The institution broadly communicates the results of all of its assessment and evaluation activities so that the institution has a shared understanding of its strengths and weaknesses and sets appropriate priorities.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

- To promote a shared understanding of institutional priorities, strengths, and areas for improvement, the College has embedded assessment and evaluation activities into annual and multi-year institutional planning processes [IB8.1, IB8.2].
- Results of assessments and evaluations are incorporated into Program Reflections, Program Review, annual program review updates/ action plans, and other planning documents (e.g., Technology Plan) [IB8.3 –IB8.4, IB8.6].

**Analysis and Evaluation**

As of fall 2015, broad communication of assessment and evaluation results primarily occurs through reports and presentations given at participatory governance and Board of Trustees meetings. To promote wide dissemination of information, reports are presented to multiple groups to ensure wide dissemination of information. For example, divisions present an executive summary of Comprehensive Program Review to advisory groups, College Council, and the Board of Trustees in order to communicate the results of their evaluation of program quality. The Office of Institutional Research presents evaluations of student success and achievement data to relevant participatory governance groups, as well as the Board of Trustees.

Segmental plans, such as the Technology Plan, Facilities Plan, Student Success and Support Program (3SP) Plan, and Student Equity Plan, all rely on some type of assessment or evaluation as their basis. These plans or reports inform MPC personnel of institutional strengths, weaknesses, and plans for improvement. Minutes of MPC’s participatory governance groups and Governing Board show that discussion of at least one of these reports or presentations occurs at nearly every meeting. Several examples of reports and presentations that communicate assessment and evaluation results follow below.

The Program Reflections compilation communicates the results of the dialogue about attainment of student learning outcomes or service area outcomes that occurs across many areas of the institution [see IB8.3a-3; links provided below]. The College Council considers these program-level assessment results from a broader, institutional perspective by reviewing and discussing a summary of Program Reflections results from all divisions, departments, and service areas [IB8.4, IB8.5, p. 3]. By examining the program assessment results in aggregate, College Council can consider patterns of institutional or cross-department strengths, needs, and areas for improvement that emerge from the collected Reflections. This information informs planning bodies like the College Council as they prioritize needs within the College.

Program review serves as the principle mechanism for communicating results of evaluation of quality at the programmatic level. Sharing the results of program reviews at committee and Board meetings furthers understanding of the strengths and challenges faced by individual programs. The most recent Nursing Program Review [IB8.6], for example, reports that the program is successful in terms of student achievement (e.g., job placement of graduates; p. 6) and attainment of SLOs (p. 22), but faces the ongoing challenge of expense due to the low student to teacher ratios required in clinical settings (p. 40). This type of information informs planning and resource allocation conversations. Comprehensive program reviews are posted on the College website to facilitate broad communication and as supporting material for the summary conversations in College Council and elsewhere [IB8.7; IB8.8, p. 6].

A number of reports communicate the institution's performance in terms of institutional-level student achievement. Many of these are reported on an annual basis, such as the institution-set standards, the ACCJC annual report, and the annual Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) goals. Although packaged or calculated slightly differently, all of the reports typically include indicators that employ course completion, persistence, basic skills progression, degrees/certificates awarded, and transfers. Presentations explaining the institution-set standards and the IEPI goals contain tables showing how these indicators are used in multiple efforts including the Student Success Scorecard, the Student Equity Plan, and the CTE-focused "Doing What Matters for Jobs" [IB8.9, p. 5; IB8.10, p. 17]. This communication strategy helps emphasize the importance of and widespread interest in using these kinds of assessment results to convey institutional quality both internally and to external audiences.

The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) provides data and reports that dig deeper than the annual reports, and elucidate differences in success between different populations of students. These reports have served to both substantively support the basic skills, 3SP, and Student Equity efforts at MPC, and communicate the issues of basic skills, performance gaps, and student equity to a wide audience at MPC [IB8.11]. As reported in one of the OIR's student equity reports, for example, assessment data indicates lower success rates (i.e., completions) by Hispanic students, and especially Hispanic men. One intended outcome of these types of communication efforts is for a wider spectrum of institutional personnel to recognize the rationale behind resource allocation towards basic skills and student success initiatives [IB8.12].

Segments of the institution present planning documents to the institution via the shared governance structure. Examples include the Technology Plan, Facilities Plan, and Educational Master Plan. Each of these plans use evaluation results as a basis for improvements. The Technology Plan, for example, lists several areas where the College can improve its technology systems where MPC technology does not meet current standards for educational institutions. Some examples include MPC's reliance on an outdated student information system and need for a fully integrated Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system, Wi-Fi coverage not meeting

demands, and more effective use of the College website as a tool for marketing [IB8.13]. These findings align with other assessment results; see, for example, generalizations about technology in the Program Reflections Summary.

Another strategy to communicate assessment results is what MPC calls open forums. These are *ad hoc* opportunities for all members of the campus community to hear a presentation on a pertinent topic and engage in dialogue about its implications. A recent open forum concerned the budget. The College recognized that its assessments of budget stability were not being widely understood or accepted, and invited an outside expert to give a presentation on budgetary issues and invited the campus community to participate. The presenter, a president from a nearby College, showed how College budgets were constructed and provided documentation that compared fiscal indicators to other Colleges. This example illustrates MPC's efforts to provide clear communication on issues critical to the success of the institution, especially when indications of misperception and misunderstanding had arisen [IB8.14].

### ***Shared Understanding of Strengths and Weaknesses***

Current College processes for communicating and disseminating information rely heavily on committee representatives reporting to their constituencies on a regular basis. In practice, this “reporting back” step may be somewhat inconsistent in terms of both frequency and amount of detail. The process works best in groups with divisional representation, such as the Academic Senate and the advisory groups. In these groups, representatives have an opportunity to provide reports to their divisional peers at division or area meetings. In contrast, members of groups such as the College Council represent broad constituencies, such as all faculty, classified, or management staff. The College currently does not have an effective mechanism for communicating items discussed at these meetings broadly throughout the campus community, beyond posting minutes of the meetings. Significantly, the most frequent discussions of the results of assessment and evaluation occur at College Council and during presentations at monthly Governing Board meetings. While minutes of these meetings include links to the presentations of evaluation results, it is questionable whether minutes alone are sufficient to communicate shared understanding of institutional strengths and weaknesses to those who do not attend these meetings.

Responses to the 2014 Faculty & Staff Accreditation Survey indicate that the majority of the campus community has an understanding of the processes used by the institution to set priorities, and is keenly aware that dialogue related to assessment (particularly assessment of student learning) occurs on campus. However, fewer survey respondents reported an awareness of where to look for institutional-level assessment results or other information about institutional strengths and weaknesses. Survey results suggest that additional methods of communicating about assessment and evaluation results and discussions (i.e., in addition to “reporting back” from committee meetings) would be helpful. Embedding documents containing assessment and

evaluation results directly into tools used for institutional planning will help to increase shared understanding of strengths and areas for improvement.

72.7% of survey participants agreed with the statement that “MPC uses evidence to assess progress toward its goals and objectives,” and 69.9% of respondents agreed with the statement “I know what progress MPC has made in accomplishing its goals during the last few years.” However, only 51.7% of respondents believed that “the institution uses assessment data to inform resource allocation decisions,” and only 56.5% reported that “assessments of student learning and institution quality/effectiveness are available for me to review” [IB8.15].

**Conclusion:** Monterey Peninsula College meets Standard I.B.8; however, there are opportunities for continued improvement in this area. Although assessment and evaluation results are discussed regularly at College Council, the Academic Senate, and advisory groups, the College does not have effective practices for communicating the results to smaller groups or the campus at large. This may lead to confusion about institutional priorities and rationale behind decisions.

### Evidence Cited

- IB8.1 [Planning and Resource Allocation Process](#)
- IB8.2 [Integrated Planning Model](#)
- IB8.3 Program Reflections Compilations, 2010-2015
  - a. [2010-2011](#)
  - b. [2011-2012](#)
  - c. [2012-2013](#)
  - d. [2013-2014](#)
  - e. [2014-2015](#)
- IB8.4 [Program Reflections Summary, 2014](#)
- IB8.5 [College Council minutes, 9/23/14](#)
- IB8.6 [Nursing Program Review](#)
- IB8.7 [College Council minutes, 6/23/15](#)
- IB8.8 [Governing Board Minutes, 6/24/15](#)
- IB8.9 [OIR Presentation: 2015 Institution-set Standards](#)
- IB8.10 [OIR Presentation: Setting IEPI Goals](#)
- IB8.11 [OIR Student Success Reporting Calendars, 13/14 – 15/16](#)
- IB8.12 [OIR Presentation: Student Equity Plan, Part II](#)
- IB8.13 [Technology Plan](#)
- IB8.14 [Open Forum on Budget](#)
- IB8.15 [2014 Faculty & Staff Accreditation Survey](#)

**I.B.9 The institution engages in continuous, broad-based, systematic evaluation and planning. The institution integrates program review, planning, and resource allocation into a comprehensive process that leads to accomplishment of its mission and improvement of institutional effectiveness and academic quality. Institutional planning addresses short- and long-range needs for educational programs and services and for human, physical, technology, and financial resources. (ER 19)**

#### **Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

- The College engages in continuous, broad-based, systematic evaluation and planning to ensure that resources are used wisely in support of the institutional mission and academic quality. The College's Integrated Planning Model [IB9.1] and Planning and Resource Allocation Process model [IB9.2] outline promote shared understanding of the College's planning processes.
- Key processes that support integrated planning and resource allocation include Program Review, Program Reflections, and updates to institutional and unit action plans [IB7, IB8, IB9].

#### **Analysis and Evaluation:**

Monterey Peninsula College engages in continuous, broad-based, systematic evaluation and planning to ensure that resources are used wisely in support of the institutional mission and academic quality. Key planning processes include review of the mission and Institutional Goals, which establishes the foundation of the Education Master Plan; Program Review; Program Reflections; and updates to institutional and unit action plans, which inform the planning and resource allocation process. The College's Integrated Planning Model [IB9.1], as well as the Planning and Resource Allocation Process model [IB9.2], help all members of the campus community understand and appreciate the College's planning processes.

#### ***MPC's Integrated Planning Model***

Integrated planning activities at Monterey Peninsula College generally fall into one of two cycles: a long-term (six-year) cycle of strategic planning, or an annual cycle of planning and resource allocation. All integrated planning activities, regardless of whether they fall within the multi-year or annual cycle, link directly to the Institutional Goals that enable the fulfillment of MPC's institutional mission.

Long-term strategic planning at MPC follows a six-year cycle of mission review and strategic planning [IB9.1]. The multi-year cycle mirrors the program review processes followed by individual divisions and service areas of the College at the institutional level, which supports communication and understanding of the cycle. Short-term planning and resource allocation

follows an annual cycle that includes development of the budget for the upcoming fiscal year, as well as consideration and implementation of shorter-term goals and objectives.

College decision-making processes reflect this planning cycle. For example, during the 2013-2014 academic year, College Council reviewed the College's mission and institutional goals, and recommended small revisions to the Superintendent/President [[IB9.3](#), item 5]. Based on the Superintendent/President's recommendation, the Board reviewed and supported revisions to the mission statement, recognizing that the mission statement emphasizes student learning and achievement within the College's diverse community [[IB9.4](#)]. The mission provides not only a clear and concise description of the College's charge; it also acts as a foundation for the College's Institutional Goals and objectives.

Following its review of the College's mission, College Council created new Institutional Goals and objectives relevant to the College's mission, state and federal regulations, community needs, and accreditation standards. Each goal includes measurable objectives that indicate the actions the College will take in order to meet the goal [[IB9.5](#)]. As noted in Standard I.B.5, revising the Institutional Goals and setting measurable objectives improves the institution's evaluation of progress against its Institutional Goals during the remainder of the current Education Master Plan term (2012-2017) [[IB9.6](#)]. This change allows for an annual evaluation of progress towards objectives directly linked to Institutional Goals.

The Integrated Planning Model also provides a framework for the significant processes related to College planning, including an annual review of progress toward institutional goals and objectives. College Council receives a progress report on the institutional goals and objectives. The progress reports allow for ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the degree to which the College fulfills its mission. Likewise, Individual units at the College establish and make progress toward their own goals and objectives that support the institutional mission and Goals. Unit goals, objectives, and resource needs (both short and long-term) are documented in program review, program reflections, and program review updates/action plans [see [IB9.7a-c](#), linked below; [IB9.8](#), [IB9.9a](#)].

Each unit at the College completes a comprehensive program review every six years. To ensure an emphasis on student learning, the College created templates for each of the three broad administrative units at the College: Academic Affairs, Administrative Services, and Student Services [[IB9.7a](#), [IB9.7b](#), [IB9.7c](#)]. Each template includes a description of the review process, calendar, and specific elements relevant to the units' primary mission, including alignment with the College mission, program vitality/services, learning or service area outcomes, and staffing levels. Program review reports provide the foundation for each unit's action plan, which includes both budget-dependent and non-budget dependent items that support each unit's goals as they relate to the College's goals and objectives. Budget-dependent needs in particular inform

short and long-range planning and allocation of human, physical, technology, and/or financial resources. More detail about the program review process is given in Standard I.B.5.

### ***The Planning and Resource Allocation Process***

The College's annual Planning Resource Allocation Process supports integrated planning on an annual cycle. Action plans, critical for resource allocation in support of both short and long-term planning, require unit members and institutional leaders to tie funding requests and non-budget dependent items to the College's mission and institutional goals and objectives [[IB9.9a](#), [IB9b](#)].

Broadly speaking, the annual Planning and Resource Allocation Process includes two categories of activities:

- Gather/evaluate information to inform planning discussions
  - Evaluate and discuss student learning and achievement data from the previous academic year.
  - Evaluate and discuss progress towards institutional goals and objectives.
  - Evaluate and discuss information about the previous year's budget and resource allocation.
  - Gather and share information about external factors that will inform current resource allocation and budget development activities.
- Allocate resources based on prioritized areas of need
  - Prepare annual updates/action plans.
  - Begin discussing resource allocation priorities.
  - Recommend resource allocation priorities to Superintendent/President.

During its institutional self-evaluation, the College determined that its method of organizing and communicating the data supporting short and long term planning efforts (including data in program review and action plans) were housed in separate, "siloes" systems and documents. As noted above, unit program review updates, action plans, and Reflections documents are particularly important for integrated planning and resource allocation efforts. However, the information in these documents is not easily accessible, making it more challenging and time-consuming to link unit needs to integrated planning and allocation of resources. In essence, the College determined that institutional process encapsulated within the Planning and Resource Allocation Process worked well in theory, but were not as effective in practice due to the availability of data and in visualizing connections between the various components [[IB9.11](#)]. To strengthen the effectiveness of its integrated planning processes, the College decided to implement an institutional performance management system (TracDat) [[IB9.12](#)]. TracDat implementation is in process as of fall 2015. Both action plan and program review processes are slated to be in place by the end of the 2016-2017 academic year (see QFE Project #2).

A substantial number of College members understand and support MPC's integrated planning model. In the 2014 Faculty and Staff Accreditation Survey, a majority of respondents strongly or somewhat agreed with the following statements [IB9.13]:

- I know my area's program review and action plans are integrated into the College's planning and resource allocation process. (70.4%)
- MPC has clearly defined, specific institutional goals and objectives. (80.5%)
- The institution allocates resources to improve student learning. (73.9%)

In 2014, the College began revising its 2009 Shared Governance Handbook into a Shared Governance and Integrated Planning Handbook. This document was intended a guide to institutional decision-making and integrated planning processes. Prior to approval of the revised handbook, however, the College contracted with an external firm, Collaborative Brain Trust (CBT), for an external review of several areas of College operations [IB9.14]. Based on its review, CBT recommended that the College examine and restructure participatory governance structures and decision-making practices in order to improve efficiency, flexibility, and timeliness of decisions in support of integrated planning. In spring 2016, a work group comprised of faculty, staff, administrators, and a CBT facilitator began meeting to develop a proposal for re-structured governance and decision-making processes. As part of this task, the work group has been charged with producing two new handbooks to document decision-making processes, governance structures, and integrated planning processes [IB9.15]. The College anticipates the draft of the new Integrated Planning Handbook in fall 2016.

**Conclusion:** Monterey Peninsula College meets Standard I.B.9.

### **Actionable Improvement Plans**

The College will implement tools and revise processes to improve Planning and Resource Allocation Process and more effectively connect data elements in SLO/SAO assessments, annual action plans, program review, and resource allocation with institutional goals.

### **Evidence Cited:**

- IB9.1 [Integrated Planning Model](#)
- IB9.2 [Planning and Resource Allocation Process](#)
- IB9.3 [College Council recommendations re: Mission and Institutional Goals](#)
- IB9.4 [Board Meeting Minutes, 10/22/14](#)
- IB9.5 [Institutional Action Plan](#)
- IB9.6 [Education Master Plan \(2012-2017\)](#)
- IB9.7 Program Review Templates
  - a. [Academic Affairs](#)
  - b. [Administrative Services](#)
  - c. [Student Services](#)
- IB9.8 [Program Reflections Template](#)
- IB9.9 Program Review Annual Update/Action Plans

- a. [Action Plan Template](#)
- b. [2014-2015 PRAU/AP \(Compiled\)](#)
- IB9.10 [College Council Bylaws](#)
- IB9.11 [Rationale for TracDat](#)
- IB9.12 [College Council minutes, 6/9/15](#)
- IB9.13 [2014 Faculty and Staff Accreditation Survey](#)
- IB9.14 [College Council Minutes, 2/9/16](#)
- IB9.15 [CBT Workgroups: Governance & Integrated Planning](#)