Subject: FW: ACCJC - 2016 Annual Report Submission

From: support@accjc.org [mailto:support@accjc.org]
Sent: Thursday, March 31, 2016 10:13 AM
To: Susan Walsh
Cc: Susan Walsh
Subject: ACCJC - 2016 Annual Report Submission

This confirms that your 2016 Annual Report to ACCJC was submitted by Dr. Susan Walsh <walsh.s@mccd.edu> on 03/31/2016.
Below is a copy of the information submitted. You may also re-print the report by logging on at https://www.accjc.org/annualreport.

Western Association of Schools and Colleges
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

2016 Annual Report
Final Submission
03/31/2016

Merced College
3600 M Street
Merced, CA 95348

General Information

#	Question	Answer
1.	Confirm logged into the correct institution's report	Confirmed
2.	Name of individual preparing report:	Dr. Brian E. Ellison
3.	Phone number of person preparing report:	(209) 384-6105
4.	E-mail of person preparing report:	brian.ellison@mccd.edu
5a.	Provide the URL (link) from the college website to the section of the college catalog which states the accredited status with ACCJC:	http://www.mccd.edu/getstarted/catalog/mc-catalog-2015-16.pdf#page=9
5b.	Provide the URL (link) from the college website to the colleges online statement of accredited status with ACCJC:	http://222.mccd.edu/about/accreditation/html
6.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment:	Fall 2015: 11,161 Fall 2014: 11,072 Fall 2013: 11,153
7.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in degree applicable credit courses for fall 2015:	9,868

8.	Headcount enrollment in pre-collegiate credit courses (which do not count toward degree requirements) for fall 2015:	2,981
9.	Number of courses offered via distance education:	Fall 2015: 49 Fall 2014: 43 Fall 2013: 40
10.	Number of programs which may be completed via distance education:	2
11.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in all types of Distance Education:	Fall 2015: 1,568 Fall 2014: 1,378 Fall 2013: 1,230
12.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in all types of Correspondence Education:	Fall 2015: n/a Fall 2014: n/a Fall 2013: n/a
13.	Were all correspondence courses for which students enrolled in fall 2015 part of a program which leads to an associate degree?	n/a

Student Achievement Data

#	Question	Answer
14a.	What is your Institution-set standard for successful student course completion?	68%
14b.	Successful student course completion rate for the fall 2015 semester:	69.64%
15.	Institution Set Standards for program completion: While institutions may determine the measures for which they will set standards, most institutions will utilize this measure as it is core to their mission. For purposes of definition, certificates include those certificate programs which qualify for financial aid, principally those which lead to gainful employment. Completion of degrees and certificates is to be presented in terms of total numbers. Each student who receives one or more certificates or degrees in the specified year may be counted once.	
	a. If you have an institution-set standard for student completion of degrees and certificates combined, per year, what is it?	900
	b. If you have separate institution-set standards for degrees, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of degrees, per year?	750
	c. If you have separate institution-set standards for certificates, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of certificates, per year?	150
16a.	Number of students (unduplicated) who received a certificate or degree in the 2014-2015 academic year:	768
16b.	Number of students who received a degree in the 2014-2015 academic year:	673

16c.	Number of students who received a certificate in the 2014-2015 academic year:	182
17a.	If your college has an institution-set standard for the number of students who transfer each year to 4-year colleges/universities, what is it?	850
17b.	Number of students who transferred to 4-year colleges/universities in 2014-2015:	780
18a.	Does the college have any certificate programs which are not career-technical education (CTE) certificates?	Yes
18b.	If yes, please identify them:	CSU General Education Breadth Certificate, IGETC Certificate
19a.	Number of career-technical education (CTE) certificates and degrees:	93
19b.	Number of CTE certificates and degrees which have identified technical and professional competencies that meet employment standards and other standards, including those for licensure and certification:	15
19c.	Number of CTE certificates and degrees for which the institution has set a standard for licensure passage rates:	6
19d.	Number of CTE certificates and degrees for which the institution has set a standard for graduate employment rates:	6

20.

2013-2014 examination pass rates in programs for which students must pass a licensure examination in order to work in their field of study:

Program	CIP Code 4 digits (##.##)	Examination	Institution set standard (%)	Pass Rate (%)
Emergency Medical Technician	51.09	state	75 %	73.5 %
Diagnostic Radiologic Technology	51.09	state	75 %	92 %
Nursing Assistant	51.39	state	70 %	71.5 %
Registered Nursing	51.38	state	75 %	86.05 %
Vocational Nursing	51.16	state	75 %	92 %
Sonography	51.09	state	75 %	100 %

21.

2013-2014 job placement rates for students completing certificate programs and CTE (career-technology education) degrees:

Program	CIP Code 4 digits (##.##)	Institution set standard (%)	Job Placement Rate (%)
Diagnostic Radiologic Technology	51.09	85 %	100 %
Vocational Nursing	51.16	85 %	100 %
Registered Nursing	51.38	85 %	100 %
Nursing Assistant	51.39	90 %	100 %
Emergency Medical Technician	51.09	50 %	100 %
Sonography	51.09	75 %	100 %

22.	Please list any other institution set standards at your college:		

Criteria Measured (i.e. persistence, starting salary, etc.)	Definition	Institution set standard
n/a	n/a	

23.	Effective practice to share with the field: Describe examples of effective and/or innovative practices at your college for setting institution-set standards, evaluating college or programmatic performance related to student achievement, and changes that have happened in response to analyzing college or program performance (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).

Institution Set standards based on the IEPI indicator goals have been identified after extensive discussion in a variety of venues. The set standards are evaluated at the program level in instruction with datasets that include 4 key indices: student performance, staffing, course statistics and student demographics. Datasets provide information about the program and the district over the last 5 years, and are provided in both table and graph formats, facilitating analysis. Moreover, key indicators are disaggregated allowing comparisons related specifically to course offerings. This is a more equitable approach for programs with historically lower rates of student success(e.g. developmental courses)allowing these programs to evaluate their performance and identify developments which might have occurred over the 5 year time frame relative to students in their discipline. The office of student equity and success developed a dashboard of key indicators for core services to d etermine gaps between student groups. They found a large drop in the number of students who complete an ed. plan on time. The comprehensive student ed. plan is the single most valuable service a student can receive from counseling. The college has implemented a variety of programs to address this gap, and will continue to monitor the student success dashboard.

Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

Note: Colleges were expected to achieve the proficiency level of Student Learning Outcomes assessment by fall 2012. At this time, colleges are expected to be in full compliance with the Accreditation Standards related to student learning outcomes and assessment. All courses, programs, and student and learning support activities of the college are expected to have student learning outcomes defined, so that ongoing assessment and other requirements of Accreditation Standards are met across the institution. In preparation for the 2016 reporting, please refer to the revised Accreditation Standards adopted June 2014.

#	Question		Answer
24.	Courses		
	a.	Total number of college courses:	724
	b.	Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes	630
		Auto-calculated field: percentage of total:	87
25.	Courses		
	a.	Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs as defined by college):	85
	b.	Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes	81
		Auto-calculated field: percentage of total:	95.3

		Courses	
26.	a.	Total number of student and learning support activities (as college has identified or grouped them for SLO implementation):	23
	b.	Number of student and learning support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes:	23
		Auto-calculated field: percentage of total:	100

27.	URL(s) from the college website where prospective students can find SLO assessment results for instructional programs:	http://curricunet.com/merced/
28.	Number of courses identified as part of the general education (GE) program:	249
29.	Percent of GE courses with ongoing assessment of GE learning outcomes:	12.9%
30.	Do your institution's GE outcomes include all areas identified in the Accreditation Standards?	Yes
31.	Number of GE courses with Student Learning Outcomes mapped to GE *program Student Learning Outcomes*:	249
32.	Number of Institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined:	5
33.	Percentage of college instructional programs and student and learning support activities which have Institutional Student Learning Outcomes mapped to those programs (courses) and activities (student and learning support activities).	100%
34.	Percent of institutional outcomes (ILOs) with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes:	40%

35.	Effective practice to share with the field: Describe effective and/or innovative practices at your college for measuring ILOs, documenting accomplishment of ILOs in non-instructional areas of the college, informing college faculty, staff, students, and the public about ILOs, or other aspects of your ILO practice (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words). The college hosted a campus-wide GE Day, focusing on the General Education program outcomes and assessment practices. Faculty and staff from the college met separately by Area and together throughout the day to discuss assessing outcomes and how to make the process more effective. The day culminated in the college theater, where all faculty collectively discussed a sample of GE assessment data for an institution, analyzed it and discussed forming an action plan. More time has been spent on defining and implementing authentic assessment of SLOs as a result of this discussion. The College has focused efforts over the past year into creating a website where program review documents are made available to the public. The current plan calls for the ISLOs to be assessed over a five year cycle using courses in the General Education program which map to the ISLOs. The first report on the Computation GE Learning Outcome is available at http://www.mccd.edu/about/committees/assessment/index.html. Our Computation GELO was assessed during the 2014-15 school year and the report is available on the website. Flex workshops have increased participation amongst the faculty, and a LEAP rubric from AAC&U is being used for the Global Understanding and Cultural Diversity GELO assessment during the 2105-16 school year.

Each of the following narrative responses is limited to 250 words. As you develop your responses, please be mindful of success stories t hat can be reported in the last question of

this section. We look forward to including this information from colleges in our report to the Commission and the field in June.

	Please discuss alignment of student learning outcomes at your institution, from institutional and course to program level. Describe your activities beyond crosswalking or charting all outcomes to courses in a program (often called "mapping"), to analysis and implementation of alignment in the planning of curriculum and delivery of instruction. Discuss how the alignment effort has resulted in changes of expected outcomes and/or how students' programs of study have been clarified. Note whether the described practices apply to all instructional programs at the college (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).
36.	As each of the state-mandated TMC degrees are approved, degree requirements are changing. As a result of this process, and going through an assessment cycle, several disciplines have revisited both course and program outcomes in order to more directly measure student success and learning. All Chemistry course outcomes have been directly mapped to the Program SLOs and the department is looking at the results of course assessment from fall 2015 to facilitate measuring student success relative to the Program SLOs. The Biology faculty reexamined and rewrote their Program SLOs after reviewing course SLO assessment reports. The Math faculty reviewed their program SLOs as part of the GE Program Computation assessment and identified a gap in their course assessments related to their Technology Program SLO; discussions are underway to determine how to remedy this gap. The Child Development Program has aligned their course SLOs, titles and CID numbers with other California Community Colleges to expedite transferring courses between schools. Student Services has ma de a push to focus on students forming comprehensive Ed. plans with counselors. Student athletes who completed an Ed. plan had higher retention and success compared to athletes who did not have an Ed Plan; this was also seen when compared with all students in the District.

	Describe the various communication strategies at your college to share SLO assessment results for usage by internal and external audiences. Explain how communications take into account how the information is expected to influence the behavior or decisions of particular audiences. Discuss how communication of student learning outcomes assessment information and results impacts student behavior and achievement (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).
37.	Students are informed of Course SLOs on their course syllabi and the public at-large is informed of Program and Inst itutional SLOs in the college catalog and on the college website mentioned in response 35. Each area of the College has webpages on the college website, while the outcomes reports and discussions by their oversight committees are stored internally. SLO assessment results have been reported in a wide variety of Newsletters in Student Services and in instruction. The Assessment Review Committee ARC report during fall convocation also provides information about the status of program review to a large audience including students, faculty, staff and the public. Instructional areas are also updated about assessment through regular emails to all faculty and Flex workshops. The instructional SLO coordinators and curriculum chair have held "all faculty" meetings to provide updates about changes in the process. For example, a survey of faculty using CurricUNET resulted in the creation of new SLO assessment forms in house using InfoPath software. The new forms focus on the asse ssment, process identifying each outcome, the means of assessment, and sections where SLO data and results are summarized, leading into the action plan for improvement. Course and program review SLO reports, now complement each other. Rubrics

	Explain how dialog and reporting of SLO assessment results takes place at the departmental and institutional levels. Note whether practices involve all programs at the college. Illustrate how dialog and reporting impact program review, institutional planning, resource allocation, and institutional effectiveness (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).
38.	The college has increased engagement in institution-wide dialogue on improving assessment practices with the GE Day mentioned in response 23, and making use of assessment results in improving student achievement. Faculty and staff review SLO as sessments practices and results during discipline planning sessions after Convocation in the Fall, and at department and Area meetings where SLO assessment reports are agendized. SLO reports from program reviews and courses are available on the college website and CurricUNET. Each Area of the college has an oversight committee which reviews and provides feedback on assessment reports. Master planning committees for each Area evaluate the program review findings.

Instruction utilizes Dean's summaries of program reviews to prioritize goals for the next year. Plans from the master planning committee are in support of the college's mission and strategic goals and, are used in the budget/resource allocation process. \"Is it in your program review?\" is used as part of the process. If a need for resources is not identified in program review it is not considered. Institutional effectiveness is part of our integrated planning process assessment cycle, the college is stressing that re source requests must include an assessment method for measuring its impact on linked outcomes.	

#		
39.	Please share with us two or three success stories about the impacts of SLO practices on student learning, achievement, and institutional effectiveness. Describe the practices which led to the success (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).	
	A student success task for at the college, identified that our students are likely to seek what they think will be their most direct path through college-level courses, without regard to their academic preparation for college-level work. The college has mandated orientation for all new students and implemented a process to develop comprehensive and abbreviate education plans for all continuing students and all new students, respectively. As mentioned previously, more than 20 faculty in the Social Scienc es met to discuss assessment in their area and area forming a common set of related outcomes for multiple programs in the discipline in order to work on a integrated program review document which would be more inclusive and combine the assessment efforts and action plans for all of the faculty in the discipline. After going through a few cycles with assessment, faculty and staff across the campus are starting to reexamine the original SLOs which were written now that they have seen how the practice has worked, and are refining their statements and methodology now that they have concrete examples available. The Assessment Review Committee recommended 2 major changes for program review: 1) Annual reviews with more details and stopping the 5 year comprehensive review, 2) utilize a common form, regardless of the area being reviewed.	

Substantive Change Items

NOTE: These questions are for monitoring purposes only and do not replace the ACCJC substantive change approval process. Please refer to the Substantive Change Manual regarding communication with the Commission.

#	Question	Answer
40.	Number of submitted substantive change requests:	2014-2015: 2 2013-2014: 0 2012-2013: 1
41a.	Is the institution anticipating a proposal for a substantive change in any of the following change categories? (Check all that apply)	Change in sites offering 50% or more of a program, certificate, or degree Delivery mode (Distance Education or Correspondence Education)
41b.	Explain the change(s) for which you will be submitting a substantive change proposal:	LBC offering 50% or more of a program; DE online offering 50% or more of a program.

Other Information

#	Question	Answer
42a.	Identify site additions and deletions since the submission of the 2015 Annual Report:	n/a
42b.	List all instructional sites other than the home campus where 50% or more of a program, certificate, or degree is offered:	Los Banos Campus, Mariposa High, Delhi Center, Dos Palos High
43.	List all of the institutions instructional sites out of state and outside the United States:	n/a

The data included in this report are certified as a complete and accurate representation of the reporting institution.

If you need additional assistance, please contact the commission.

Sincerely,

ACCJC
10 Commercial Blvd., Suite 204
Novato, CA 94949
email: support@accjc.org
phone: 415-506-0234