Comprehensive Quality Review

SPRING 2019

Highlights Report

> Northwestern Michigan College

Northwestern Michigan College, 1701 E. Front Street, Traverse City, MI 49686 President: Timothy J. Nelson | Executive Director of Research, Planning, and Effectiveness: Joy Evans

Introduction

Northwestern Michigan College (NMC) was the first comprehensive community college chartered in the State of Michigan. Since its founding in 1951, NMC has become integrally woven into the educational, economic, social, and cultural fabric of the Grand Traverse Region. NMC's Mission is to provide lifelong learning opportunities to our communities.

Beginning with the re-affirmation preparation, the process of writing and documenting the 2017 Systems Portfolio reaffirmed our efforts to continue to improve various processes across the College. Processes align to our Plan, Do, Check, and Adjust (PDCA) cycle of continuous improvement, an emphasis of the AQIP Pathway. The feedback that we received aligned to our efforts and identified opportunities for improvement as well as strategic challenges. Our efforts specifically relate to ensuring ethical teaching, improving efforts to support reporting and tracking ethical breeches of academic integrity, assessing co-curricular activities, disaggregating assessment data, segmenting and sharing department or program level data, and improving communication, employee buy-in, and trust and are in various stages. Although the AQIP Pathway is phasing out and Action Projects are no longer required, the College will continue to be involved in projects and initiatives as part of our PDCA cycle. Our final two Action Projects one, Clarification of Shared Governance, closed and the findings were shared at the January 2019 Board of Trustee Meeting. The other, Experiential Learning, has transitioned into an expanded project. Both are described in more detail below.

The following narrative provides an update since the submission of our Systems Portfolio within the recommended length of this document; however, detailed metrics, tables, and any additional information can be made available upon request during the on-site visit scheduled for March 2019.

Systems Appraisal Feedback Report Follow-up

The College's Executive Leadership and AQIP Action Project Teams critically analyzed the Systems Appraisal Feedback Report. The College received ratings of "Clear" or "Adequate" for each Core Component. The following are the Summary Comments per Core Component and AQIP Category, along with our responses to address strategic challenges and opportunities for improvement.

Core Components 2D, 2E Category 1.5 Academic Integrity Rating received: Adequate Summary Comments from the Systems Appraisal Feedback Report:

"The College has several policies in place to ensure ethical teaching, including the Faculty Code of Professional Ethics. Details regarding how the College ensures the policies are followed would add clarity and provide additional evidence to support the Core Component."

The College has a process to ensure that the Faculty Code of Professional Ethics is followed, specifically, in Policy D-749.00 (**2.D**). The policy is made available to all faculty and is readily available on the College employee website. As an additional measure related to the comment to ensure compliance, the Educational Services Instructional Management Team (ESMIT) proposed that a compliance statement be included in the faculty performance evaluation form for faculty, "*I have complied with the college's Faculty Code of Professional Ethics*" and the supervisor, "*I verify this faculty member has complied with the college's Faculty Code of Professional Ethics*" (**2.D**).

The policy specifically addresses several aspects related to ethical behavior:

• Improving their scholarly competence (Policy D-753.00)(2.D)

Since the last Systems Portfolio submission, Human Resources implemented employee learning management software to provide easy access to online resources and professional development for faculty. Types of professional development for faculty include trainings such as FERPA for all faculty and specific training for certain program areas, such as blood borne pathogens, for the Health Occupations and Science areas. Additionally, the Professional Development Institute (PDI) and Center for Instructional Excellent (CIE) collaborate to offer professional development topics in the fall and spring semesters. The spring 2016 sessions focused on evaluating and discussing general education rubrics and assessments. Further training was indicated and as a result, in fall 2016, a representative from Dee Fink & Associates, experts in student learning outcomes, provided extensive training for faculty. A follow-up training in spring 2017 provided additional opportunities to further engage faculty in knowledge, skills, and writing of learning outcomes. The fall 2018 included approximately 22 sessions, or over one-half of sessions geared towards teaching staff. The CIE director includes learning outcome topics with new faculty as well as the new faculty from the previous year through the New Faculty Learning Community.

• Making every effort to foster honest academic conduct for their students.

Through library sessions and a freshman composition course, students are provided with information about plagiarism and the appropriate use of resources (2.E.1, 2.E.2). Faculty are also to follow policy in reporting breaches of academic integrity (2.E.3). Reviewers commented that the consistent reporting of such incidents could help reveal trends and areas in need of attention (2.E.2, 2.E.3). Since we received the appraisal comments, the Educational Services Instructional Management Team (ESIMT) and

Student Services and Technologies (SST) leadership developed an easy FAQ handout to explain the purpose and need for reporting violations of academic integrity. In addition, the College Syllabus includes the Academic Code of Conduct statement with the process for those cases where violations occur as well. All course syllabi provide this information:

"NMC requires instructors report any cheating incidents to the Vice President of Student Services. Each offense will be recorded and multiple offenses could result in expulsion."(**2.E.3**)

• Seeking to be effective teachers and scholars by meeting all classroom obligations.

Course syllabi detail the responsibilities of all teaching staff. These responsibilities are within the faculty contract and are reviewed and verified by supervisors during their annual evaluation process. Examples of responsibilities include compliance with employee training, keeping accurate student academic records, and keeping classes during the scheduled time.

Faculty are also responsible for complying with College policies regarding ethical and professional behaviors (2.E.3). Administration, including Human Resources and the CIE Director communicate the necessity for policies that require faculty to participate in various trainings. Types of communication include emails, the CIE Newsletter, and the teaching@NMC website, an online resource for all NMC instructors. This helps to ensure that the policies are available in various formats for individual preferences. Importantly, faculty are required to participate in Title IX relating to sexual misconduct and violence against women as well as alcohol and drug awareness on an annual basis. There are set deadlines for faculty to comply with mandatory trainings. Other trainings are available as well, such as the prevention of sexual misconduct, campus safety and security, and procedures for using the College purchasing card.

Specific incidents of unethical behavior can be reported through RedFlag, an online incident reporting form, to the respective administrator or division chair, or to campus security. Once reported, the respective administrator investigates the complaint, collects evidence, if appropriate, reviews, and then evaluates the complaint until a resolution is reached. Students also have the opportunity to provide feedback regarding unethical faculty behavior through midor end-of-term course evaluations, meetings with their advisors, or through the VP for Student Services and Technologies, for example. Students are also able to make complaints through our Students Rights and Responsibilities Policy process. This data and information is collected, reviewed, and evaluated at various levels until a resolution is reached. Although there are no benchmarks to compare against, the College tracks incidents internally to identify possible trends. This information is then shared with relevant stakeholders at the College to collaborate on improvement initiatives when appropriate.

"The Maxient software supports efforts to improve the reporting and tracing of breaches of academic integrity. Northwestern Michigan cites the disparity in research findings regarding the frequency of integrity breaches in the general student population nationwide and the number of breeches documented at the College. The College has planned improvements regarding processes for detecting, tracking, responding to, and lessening breeches of academic integrity."

All course syllabi have academic integrity statements that include the process for cases where violations occur (**2.E.2**). The College provides professional development on this process which was most recently available at the CIE Friday Forum in November 2017. Over several meetings with faculty in different academic areas, some faculty shared that they had not reported violations for several reasons. In some cases, the student did not understand the scope of plagiarism and were subsequently educated at the time of the incident. In other cases; however, faculty reported concerns over labeling a student as dishonest to follow them through their educational career.

As part of our improvement process, ESIMT and SST leadership developed an easy FAQ handout to explain the purpose and need for reporting violations of academic integrity (**2.E.1**, **2.E.3**). The draft was distributed to ESIMT members for editing in May 2018. Prior to the beginning of the fall 2018 semester, the VP for Educational Services emailed all instructors the handout with an explanation. Department leaders addressed any questions raised by faculty members as a result of the email and explained the importance of reporting violations. For example, reporting incidents of dishonesty allows the College to have the ability to identify trends in violations in order to address them with students through focused efforts. The most recent data collected for reported incidents is for FY 2018. There were a total of 14 reported incidents related to academic integrity. This number is expected to increase based upon the explanation provided to faculty. As of December 2018 (FY19), the College has received 14 reported violations of academic integrity.

	Incidents						
Case Type	FY16	FY17	FY18				
	#	#	#				
Academic	3	15	14				
BIRT	77	62	58				
Complaint	6	3	10				
Conduct	71	64	91				
FYI	2	2					
Security Report	1	1					
Title IX	4	9	7				
Total	164	156	180				

Table 1:	Incidents b	y Case Type
----------	-------------	-------------

The College also tracks the average number of days involved in the various stages of reported incident reports. Over the past three fiscal years, the average time to adjudicate cases from date of receipt has increased each year (0.45, 1.65). The increase in this average number of days to adjudicate cases from FY17 to FY18 is most likely due to the increase in the total

number of incidents reported. Additionally, student services indicated that their area is still adjusting to and making improvements in the actual documentation of the incidents. For example, rather than one person being responsible for entering incidents, this task is now shared with other employees so as to coordinate schedules with one another. The student services team is also now aware of an educational opportunity to learn how to use the reporting system, Maxient software, more efficiently and if able, will send a team member to this upcoming conference, MaxFest. Another issue relates to the type of case and the number of individuals involved. Time taken to gather evidence during the investigation is dependent on the specific situation. As of December 2018 (FY19), the average time from Report to Adjudication is 6.87 days (201 cases).

8.59

92

able 2. Average Days to Adjuncation									
	verage # of Day	'S							
	FY16	FY17	FY18						
Report to Adjudication	6.49	6.94							
Total Cases	39	32							

Table 2: Average Days to Adjudication

Note. Total cases include academic, conduct, and Title IX cases and do not include outstanding cases.

Core Components 3E, 4B Categories 1.1 Common Learning Outcomes and 1.2 Program Learning Outcomes Rating received: Adequate

Summary Comments from the Systems Appraisal Feedback Report:

"The College notes that some co-curricular activities do not clearly articulate the intended learning outcomes or have a regular process for assessing achievement of learning outcomes. The College recognizes this is an opportunity and has plans to develop a repeatable process that will support systematic continuous improvement of these programs."

"An opportunity exists for the College to develop enhanced processes for assessing cocurricular activities."

As mentioned in the Systems Portfolio, the College provides many structured co-curricular learning opportunities; however, also noted in this report included that the College identified the need to develop a simple, consistent process for articulating and assessing learning outcomes for all co-curricular activities (**4.B.2**). In 2017, the College launched the Experiential Learning (EL) Action Project with the goal to expand the use of experiential learning, reaching all NMC learners (**3.E.1**). Since the submission of the Systems Portfolio in November 2017, the EL project made significant progress. Most of the progress relates to learning more about incorporating EL into our culture, such as through identifying what resources are available, untapped resources, and a prototype to develop the various components. EL team members attended several training sessions and spoke with consultants regarding the prototype development which is modeled after the Business Innovation Factory (BIF) in collaboration with

institutional leaders to make business model transformations. This was detailed in the EL AQIP summary submitted in August 2018.

In fall 2018, the team organized and delivered EL Professional Development Day to communicate completed work to date as well as to provide future plans. Through regularly scheduled meetings, the team recognized the need to build a sustainable system to support EL. As a result of researching various systems, the team learned about a professional development opportunity, the Experiential Education Academy hosted by the National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE). Through this academy, faculty and staff were able to complete experiential curriculum resulting in EEA certification. The curriculum is grounded in theory that includes practical application to real world settings. The goals of the NSEE align to NMC's Strategic Plan that learners will be provided with opportunities for EL in programs and co-curricular activities (3.E.1). The team coordinated with NSEE to bring a team to campus in January 2019. Over a course of three days, a team consisting of faculty and staff attended five sessions: Fundamentals of EE, Principles of Ethical Practice, Reflection, Assessment, and Legal Issues. Optional sessions include Teaching and Learning Experientially, Developing a Quality Internship Program, Service-Learning, Strengthening EE at Your Institution, and Strategic Planning for Experiential Program Design. Follow-up opportunities for NSEE events include workshops and an annual conference. Through this framework, the College will be positioned to communicate a full system/prototype beginning in fall 2019, followed by a subsequent assessment of the system at the end if the fall semester.

While there are consistent processes for articulating and assessing learning outcomes among several co-curricular activities at the College as indicated on departmental operational plans (A3), the process for scaling this process up to the College's movement towards incorporating EL into all programs and co-curricular activities at NMC is expected to take several years to accomplish given that this is a system change. NMC continues to work to this end in incremental steps with follow-up evaluations along the path. Although AQIP Action Projects have phased out, the College will continue to engage in projects as part of our continuous improvement efforts. The prototype development for spring 2019 includes many steps with specific outcomes such as those involving communication, professional development, and systems development/culture.

"The GEOs identify four levels of achievement: proficient, sufficient, developing, and deficient. These levels are defined through rubrics. The GEOs are embedded in all degrees, and NMC aspires to ensure that all graduates will demonstrate sufficiency or higher on each of the outcomes. Although NMC has a stated goal that all graduates will perform at the "sufficient" or "proficient" level for each general education outcome, assessment data is obtained on all students and is not disaggregated by level."

As noted in the Systems Portfolio, the College launched the Learning Outcomes Action Project (LOT) in 2014 as we recognized that NMC's evaluation of General Education Outcomes (GEO) was in the early stages of development. Since 2014, the project was completed and significant hallmarks of success were documented. Continuing in this work, the majority of the team

members transitioned to a standing committee, the Assessment Team (AT) in 2017. The AT is co-chaired by the Assessment Coordinator (half-time instructor) and a Faculty Member.

NMC faculty and administration have expanded the assessment process for numerous years through a continual improvement process (4.B.3). Along with other institutions engaging in best practices regarding assessment, NMC has made significant improvements. First, ORPE makes program and institutional level assessment results available to faculty via the ORPE Intranet page. The results are easily accessible to faculty who are able to evaluate the results in order to inform planning at program levels. Faculty are also able to evaluate their course level results directly in Moodle, the learning management system (LMS). Second, because the results are easily accessible, faculty and department chairs incorporate assessment results in departmental operational plans (A3) each year. The results and improvement plans are available across departments. During departmental meetings, faculty are able to address outcomes based upon the results presented in their respective A3 and plan accordingly. Third, there has been an increase in the proportion of GEO outcomes submitted online through Moodle using course assignments. Faculty score individual assignments per GEO, which allows the AT to aggregate varied samples of actual student work for assessment. Additionally, the AT is also able to disaggregate GEOs by class standing and other relevant student characteristics. The results are presented and made available in an interactive graphical format. For example, departments are able to filter their respective results by class standing, enrollment status, age, etc.



As part of our regular practice, the AT collaborates with faculty to continue to make improvements to the assessment process (**4.B.4**). Since the 2017 SP submission, the AT collaborated with stakeholders to:

- Review all current course outlines to determine if the learning outcomes are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART). Along with the guidance of the Instructional Designer, faculty made improvements as needed.
- Regularly update the teaching@NMC web resource to provide greater accessibility to learning outcomes resources
- Design a new faculty professional development course, Online Course Design, to write and assess quality learning outcomes as a part of the new faculty three year provisional period
- Review assessment data from the Office of Research, Planning, and Effectiveness (ORPE) to recommend improvements to the Curriculum Committee, Educational Services Instructional Management Team (ESIMT), and Center for Instructional Excellence.

The reviewers provided comments in the Systems Appraisal related to specific opportunities for improvement that include:

(1) Increase the return rates for outcome scores: The College began to collect data for all students beginning in fall 2016 with Critical Thinking (CT). Data was collected only for near graduates for the COMM and QR outcomes. Data for all three GEOs began to be collected each semester beginning in fall 2017. As a result, the number of responses has for the most part continually increased to allow the College to disaggregate data to better inform improvement (**4.B.2**). There was a slight decrease in the number of complete QR outcomes for the most recent fall 2018 semester. The AT will evaluate possible reasons for this decrease during the current semester.



Graph 1: Number of General Education Outcomes

Note. Duplicated students totals based upon complete data

(2) Disaggregate assessment data by student level: Along with ORPE, the Assessment Coordinator reviewed and identified student cohorts by earned credits using an applied statistical analysis. Based on the results, significant differences in attainment by class standing were identified as freshman, 0-30; sophomore, 31-60; junior, 61-90; and senior, 90 or more.

NMC is a two-year public institution that also offers select Bachelor level programs. We have an open admission process and admit students with varying credit attainment levels. Analyzing students identified as "near graduates" did not inform processes for improvement to the degree that we needed. As mentioned in the Systems Portfolio, after fall 2015, we began collecting GEOs on all students as we recognized the need for longitudinal data made possible through an improved sampling methodology and tools (i.e., Moodle). By disaggregating student class standing, differences were observed for the Communication, Critical Thinking, and Quantitative Reasoning GEOs.

For the Communication GEO, there was an increase in the percentage of students earning "Sufficient" or "Proficient" by class standing. For example, in spring 2018, there was a difference in the average scores from freshman to sophomore (+11%), from sophomore to junior (+6%), and from junior to senior (+2%). This increase aligns to what we expected regarding outcome attainment.

For Critical Thinking, there was an increase in the percentage of students earning "Sufficient" or "Proficient" by class standing. In spring 2018, there was an increase in the average scores from freshman to sophomore (+3%), from sophomore to junior (+10%), but a decrease from junior to senior (-8%). This information was shared with the AT to identify possible reasons for the inconsistencies in CT scores by class standing. As mentioned in the Systems Portfolio, the Assessment Coordinator and two faculty members provided training for a revised CT rubric in summer 2016 given that the previous rubric was difficult for faculty to understand. Training was provided to all academic and occupational areas. Given the fluctuations in scores, we recognized that additional training may be required as many of our academic areas have a significant portion of adjunct instructors who may have not been available when the trainings were offered.

For Quantitative Reasoning, there was an increase in the percentage of students earning "Sufficient" or "Proficient" by class standing. In spring 2018, there was an increase in the average scores from freshman to sophomore (+2%), from sophomore to junior (+7%), and an increase from junior to senior (+5%).

Communication Gen Ed Outcome					Critical Thinking Gen Ed Outcome				Quantitative Reasoning Gen Ed Outcome								
SP 2018	С О М М 1	СОММ 2	С О <u>М</u> М	00∑∑4	X	n	CT 1	CT 2	CT 3	X	n	QR1	QR 2	Q R 3	QR4	X	n
Cohort	%	%	%	%	%	#	%	%	%	%	#	%	%	%	%	%	#
Freshman	87	79	80	74	70	1242	83	74	70	70	1682	78	77	77	72	70	514
Sophomore	93	87	89	82	81	652	88	80	73	73	937	80	79	78	75	72	525
Junior	96	90	93	87	87	291	91	84	80	83	364	88	84	84	76	79	303
Senior	98	89	91	91	89	107	87	82	75	75	132	88	88	89	85	86	109

Table 3:	Spring 2018	Percentage of	students scoring	"Sufficient"	or "Proficient"
----------	-------------	---------------	------------------	--------------	-----------------

Note. All scores were averaged (x) across each GEN ED OUTCOME level. Only students with complete scores for all levels were included.

(3) Review external benchmarks to inform improvement: At NMC, departments use internal benchmarks when external benchmarks are not available (**4.B.2**). Similar to other colleges, NMC developed general education rubrics internally. The rubrics were developed by faculty and approved through the Curriculum Committee. At NMC, benchmarks are generally set based on the previous three-year average of the metric. GEOs benchmarks are set using this same methodology. Although GEOs align to the Michigan Transfer Agreement, the rubrics are specific to the College and are not identical to the rubrics of other Michigan Community College GEOs or other institutions.

Given the recommendation received in the Systems Appraisal, the AT reviewed standardized CT Assessments with acceptable psychometric properties as an additional measure of CT to include benchmarks. This is addressed in more detail below in (4).

(4) cross-departmental norming related to types of assessment: The LOT/AT recognized the need for departments to reliably score GEOs. Beginning in summer 2016, LOT/AT and two additional faculty provided training sessions for each department to norm the rubrics. This sub-team conducted separate and specifically tailored training sessions on the updated CT rubric across academic areas at the College.

In fall 2017, the Communications department shared anecdotal information regarding using the Communication (COMM) rubric differently compared to other departments with the AT. This was supported when comparing the average results between Communications (M= 3.39, SD=.74) and other departments (M = 3.15, SD=.69); t(7.664), p=.000).

As a result, the AT collaborated with the Communications department in fall 2018 to pilot a preand post- writing prompt assessment at the beginning of an entrance English course (ENG 111) to compare to students at the end of the subsequent course (ENG 112). The department established a common understanding of the outcome levels through norming within the department and are currently planning to scale this to courses in other departments.

For Quantitative Reasoning (QR), no differences were found when comparing Math/Science to other departments, t(1.30), p = .194. However, at NMC, a significant number of students register for Intermediate Algebra (MTH 111) and the subsequent College Algebra (MTH 121) or Introduction to Probability and Statistics (MTH 131). Although the AT and faculty use the results for planning, the AT recognized that an external comparison would provide additional information. The AT collaborated with the Math Department and as a result, this department plans to pilot a standardized QR test in fall 2019. This will provide external benchmarks for comparison.

At NMC, no specific program directly corresponds to CT. For this reason, information for CT is obtained from courses across departments that align to this learning outcome. When reviewing GEOs, the AT noticed differences across departments. The Aviation and Technical

departments scored students lowest (M=2.79, SD=.75), followed by Communications (M=3.05, SD=.79) which was compared to all other departments (M=3.22, SD=.74). As shown in most recent spring 2018 data, there was a decrease in students reaching sufficient or proficient from junior to senior level. This is contrary to what was both observed and expected by class level. A review of fall 2017 CT results indicated that there were increases by class level but in spring 2017, results decreased from sophomore to junior but then increased at the senior level. These inconsistencies led to further inquiry into the rubrics used to score student work. It was discovered that faculty may continue to have difficulty interpreting the internal CT rubric to assess student outcomes consistently across programs and courses, particularly for adjunct faculty who were not able to participate in the summer 2016 training. In fall 2018, the AT reviewed several standardized critical thinking instruments for college students. The team reached a consensus to select a critical thinking assessment to pilot in the spring 2019 semester, supported by CC. The pilot will be available to nine instructors to use in spring 2019 course sections. The results from the pilot will be evaluated and compared to the results of the internal CT assessment results at the end of the spring 2019 semester. As part of our facultydriven practice, a discussion between the AT and other faculty members indicated that continued research was warranted to search for an additional measure and benchmark. One outcome of this discussion resulted in the Curriculum Committee reinstating the CT subcommittee to lead the charge in thinking about how to best collect data on CT as part of our continuous improvement process. Consistent with our practice to ensure a faculty-driven assessment process, the CT sub-committee consists of the Assessment Coordinator and four additional faculty members (4.B.4). The AT will review fall 2018 data during the current semester.

(5) Collect trend data to provide longitudinal tracking of data and early detection of ways to improve student learning:

GEO results are provided across time to assist faculty and administration in planning (**4.B.1**). As mentioned, beginning in fall 2015, students at all levels are assessed which has increased the overall sample size significantly. Over the past two years, the QR GEO has decreased for all students, but in fall 2018, there was a slight increase. The AT will evaluate the possible reason(s) for this in the spring 2019 semester.



Graph 2: Percentage of students scoring "Sufficient" or Proficient" for Quantitative Reasoning over Time

As mentioned previously, departments have the ability to disaggregate data by their respective program area as well as other student characteristics to identify and target possible student groups for continuous improvement (**4.B.3**). The interactive graphs are available on the ORPE

page and available to faculty and staff. Departments are able to identify specific student groups to include goals for improvement on their operational plans. The results are reviewed annually at a minimum but are available at the end of each semester in order for departments to take immediate action to improve student learning. As mentioned previously, an additional standardized QR test is being piloted as a means to determine if the decrease is related to factors other than student learning outcomes.

Core Component 4C Category 2.2 Retention, Persistence, and Completion Rating received: Adequate

Summary Comments from the Systems Appraisal Feedback Report:

"Reviewers noted that the most recent targets provided are for fall 2016."

As indicated in our Systems Portfolio, NMC collects data on retention, persistence, and completion through a repeatable process which is reported to various stakeholders (4.C.2, 4.C.4). Additionally, the College considers both strategic and operational benchmarks to determine those most appropriate to support student success (4.C.1). Reviewers commented that most recent targets were provided for fall 2016. After reviewing this comment, we agreed that this information was not the most currently available data. As a result, we updated our metrics and website to include fall 2018 targets.

Table 4: Board of Trustee Success Metrics

Metrics		Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	Fall 2018 Targets
B1_1.	College-level Course Completion (all grades-Ws)/(all grades)	93.4%	93.5%	↔93.5%	93.2% ¹
	College-level Course Enrollee Success Rate (2.0 and above)/(all grades)	80.2%	81.7%	↑82.4%	79.9% ¹
	College-level Course Completer Success (2.0 and above)/all grades - Ws)	85.6%	87.4%	↑88.1%	87.2% ¹
	Community College Completion/Graduation Main Cohort rate within six				
	years (cohorts from 2009, 2010 and 2011)	16.3%	14.6%	↔14.6%	11.2% ²
	Community College Transfer Main Cohort rate within six years (cohorts from				
	2009, 2010, and 2011)	36.7%	35.0%	个37.9%	39.3% ²
	Total Community College Main Cohort Completion/Graduation/Transfer rate				
	within six years (cohorts from 2009, 2010, and 2011)	53.0%	49.6%	个52.5%	50.5% ²
B1_2.	Fall-to-spring persistence (all currently enrolled less dual enrolled, grads,				
	transfer)	77.5%	80.9%	√77.4%	74.8% ¹
	Retention Plan: Fall to fall persistence (all currently enrolled less dual				
	enrolled, grads, transfer)	43.1%	53.4%	个56.6	52.2% ¹

Note. Not available = N/A. Cohort tracking from the VFA began with the 2007 cohort.

¹National Community Colleges Benchmarking Project (NCCBP), target set to the 3-year national average of community colleges at the 75th percentile. We did not participate in NCCBP in 2017 so benchmark is derived from the past three years of available report data.

² Voluntary Framework for Accountability (VFA), target set to benchmarking college average

At or above target Below target

Subsequent fall targets are set once national reports are received by the College (e.g., NCCBP, VFA), typically in late fall of the academic year. Given the timing of the Systems Portfolio submission, November 2017, the fall 2017 metrics were not included. The metrics and targets are reviewed by the Board of Trustees each year with an upcoming review planned for the

February 2019 regular meeting. The final updates are made available on the ORPE website after Board review and shared with college leadership after Board review annually.

As reported in the Systems Portfolio, ORPE makes disaggregated persistence and success metrics available at the course level (NCCBP) for college-level and developmental courses. The targets for each success metric are ambitious yet attainable as these targets reflect the three-year average of NCCBP peers at the 75th percentile (4.C.1). This information is reviewed and used by academic and non-academic areas across campus. For example, academic areas use metrics in reviewing and updating their respective operational plans (A3). Non-academic areas use these metrics to help them target student groups or initiatives to assist in student outcome attainment. For example, Educational Media Technology (EMT) tracks course level success in online courses compared to face-to-face courses (4.C.3). Since the 2015-16 academic year, for example, the average difference has been 7.3%. An internal target to close the gap between online and face-to-face success rates include reducing the average difference through focused initiatives. These include academic success coaches for at-risk students in online courses and faculty participation in our Online Course Review Process for courses that have a pattern of success rates far below the institutional average. A few of the Business and Computer Information Technology online courses experienced a pattern of lower than average success rates over the past three years. Removing those courses from the spring 2018 online course success rate average calculation raises the success rate to 77.8%. In an effort to meet the internal target of reducing the average difference in success rates, four of the five faculty members who participated in the fall 2018 Online Course Review Process cohort teach a Business or Computer Information Technology course.



Graph 3: Face-to-Face vs Online Success Rates

In fall 2015, a small group of faculty began requiring online students to check in with an Academic Success Coach at least once during the semester to improve success rates in their online courses. While results have been mixed across the two participating subject areas, Accounting 121 and 122 have realized an 8% and 25% increase in success rates from 2015 to 2017. A lesson learned across the two courses is the existence of an incentive, for example extra credit, to participate in addition to the stated course requirement. A third course, Math 111 -Intermediate Algebra, does not require a check in with an Academic Success Coach or offer an external incentive for students to voluntarily participate. The course had a significant jump between the first and second semester of participation, however, in the third semester, the success rate regressed back to the first semester rate. Without the requirement for at least one

check-in as was the case with the two other participating courses, we cannot use this data for the overall Academic Success Coach initiative. As of fall 2018, NMC is using this initial data to require contact with an Academic Success Coach in two online math courses to gather comparative success rate data from the courses that have not made it a requirement in the past three years.

Accounting	Fall	Fall	Fall	Accounting	Spring	Spring	Spring	Spring
121	2015	2016	2017	122	2015	2016	2017	2018
Success	76.2%	78.3%	84.2%	Success	61.7%	80.0%	87.0%	91.3%
Withdrawal	14.3%	13.0%	21.0%	Withdrawal	23.1%	12.0%	8.7%	4.4%
Fail	9.5%	8.7%	5.3%	Fail	15.4%	8.0%	4.4%	4.4%

Table 5: Course Rates Outcomes with Coaching beginning SPRING 2016

Note. Spring 2015 and fall 2015 did not offer coaching and are for comparison purposes.

"NMC collects retention persistence and completion data as required for state and national reporting. However, it is not clear if the data are segmented at a department or program level and shared accordingly."

The College has a regular process and methodology for collecting and analyzing information related to student success metrics (**4.C.2**). As mentioned previously, the College collects and submits these metrics to various external stakeholders. In turn, the College chooses to track progress using the most appropriate benchmark. These chosen benchmarks (e.g., NCCBP, VFA) align to the Goals of the Strategic Plan. The College reviews and evaluates these metrics annually to identify improvement opportunities. Each department documents program goals and provides action steps based on data by program on student success on its respective Operational Plan or A3 (Program Review) (**4.C.4**). This includes annual information about course completion rate, enrollee success rate, completer success rate, and graduate rate. The A3 also provides data on student retention or transfer and on non-traditional student completion rates. The data is collected on the ORPE website and available to employees. For example, the Accounting A3 records retention, persistence, and completion data as well as several other metrics for monitoring trends and taking action. This data is reviewed and the department sets an Action Plan accordingly each year (**4.C.3**).

Core Component 5B Categories 4.2 Strategic Planning and 4.3 Leadership Rating received: Adequate

Summary Comments from the Systems Appraisal Feedback Report:

"The governing board has clear policies that define both the scope and purpose, and board meetings provide transparency to the public. The college regularly seeks feedback on the quality of its programs and services, both internally and from external stakeholders. NMC has a stated commitment to shared governance and the inclusion of leaders at all levels in the decision-making process. The College has recently recognized that the current shared

governance structures and processes were not fostering a shared sense of inclusion and transparency as the college had hoped. A shared governance Action Project was launched in May 2017, along with a newly-charged Leadership Group (LG), to review leadership roles across the institution and to improve channels of communication, employee buy-in, and trust."

Since the submission of the Systems Portfolio, the College made direct and measurable progress on three of the four original goals. It was noted that policies relating to shared governance were reviewed and updated, and a Staff Council was created. The Staff Council established bylaws of operation and implemented a new council structure based on the recent re-classification of staff and now recommends staff appointments to the governance councils (**5.B.3**). NMC's values are embedded into the governance policies and the Shared Governance team continues to collaborate with the LG to further clarify employee roles and develop an updated communication plan (**5.B.2**).

Among the revisions to the shared governance policy, D-502.00, is the transformation of LG into a new shared governance council called the Leadership Council (LC). With the charge of improving college-wide communication and enhancing employee engagement, the new council is positioned to serve as a new and vital bridge between the College's executive leadership and the faculty and staff leadership as well as other shared governance councils and committee chairs of the College (**5.B.2**).

As a result of this collaboration, there is a growing sense of improved engagement and continued assessment will provide this indication. Initial feedback from indirect measures provide that employees have had meaningful discussions with leadership at the College. Comments such as, "Leadership Group is a good place for communication of major decisions and rationales and involvement in the decision-making process" were captured in the Decision-Making survey that was made available to the LC. Additionally, the creation of the Leadership and Staff Councils have been regarded positively.

The College has also made considerable progress related to the creation of a single repository for shared governance materials. This is located on the College's internal *Committees* page which includes access to the majority of committee meeting minutes as appropriate.

The outcomes of the AQIP Team shared governance improvements was reported to the Board of Trustees at its January 2019 meeting.

Conclusion

In this report, we have described the progress that we made as well as the actions that are underway to address the feedback and strategic challenges that were noted in the Systems Portfolio Feedback Report. As our responses indicate, the College continues to be committed to continuous improvement as it relates to our Mission to provide lifelong learning opportunities to our communities. We look forward to sharing our story during the upcoming site visit.