



Comprehensive Quality Review Highlights Report – October 2017

**Kirtland Community College
10775 N. St. Helen Road
Roscommon, MI 48653**

President: Tom Quinn, Ed.D.
Accreditation Liaison Officer: Nick Baker

Introduction

Kirtland's Mission – To provide innovative educational opportunities to enhance student lives and build stronger communities.

Founded in 1966, Kirtland Community College recently celebrated its 50th anniversary and renewed its commitment of provide excellence and innovation, two of its core values, in education and training for its service area and beyond. In 2015, taxpayers voted to fund construction of a new building, the Health Sciences Center, on land acquired from the Michigan Department of Natural Resources on I-75 just south of Grayling thus consolidating all of the health science programs at a single site. With four locations (Kirtland-Gaylord (M-TEC), Kirtland-Grayling, Kirtland-Roscommon, and Kirtland-West Branch) as well as a demand for online course offerings, this meant a tremendous change for the small, rural “college in the woods”. Upon receipt of a State of Michigan grant, cutting edge equipment, currently used in various fields, was purchased to give students the hands-on experience to go with their content knowledge providing them with a competitive advantage upon graduation.

In August 2016, Kirtland-Grayling opened. And now (August 2017), the Board of Trustees (BOT) is preparing to build a 40,000+ square foot expansion onto the building. This is Kirtland at its best - a college of excellence, a sustainable and viable institution for the next 50 years in today's competitive education market. More changes are anticipated as decision are made regarding the four locations.

Kirtland has three active Action Projects underway, in addition to many mini-action projects, to achieve Kirtland's annual Operational Plan.

Project #1 - Project Persistence (P2) was conceived at the 2015 Strategy Forum to help meet student and other stakeholder needs with the purpose of stabilizing the college's financial standing through improved enrollment management by providing students a concise pathway to completion. Accomplishments: website redesign, improved program pages providing students with a clear plan of courses needed to be taken and the order in which to take them, clear course rotation, expanded student orientation, improved multi-site integration, and more programs with internships. In-progress: retention awards, on-time registration. No longer being considered: first-year experience. Anticipated completion June 30, 2018.

Project #2 - University Center (UC) Gaylord Operational Plan launched in February 2017. The project was undertaken to meet other stakeholder needs. Otsego County granted Kirtland the management responsibility for the UC in Gaylord (January 2017). The goal: to streamline and integrate of operations of the UC and reduce the duplication of effort between Kirtland-Gaylord M-TEC and the UC. Key areas include: 1) Create efficiency in the management of the UC and Kirtland-Gaylord M-TEC, 2) Integrate human resource and business office processes, 3) Consolidate the multi-layered UC budgets into a single budget, 4) Preserve and enhance room rental opportunities. A review of the degree of success for each area is planned for January 2018.

Project #3 - Closing the Loop – Assessing Assessment began in April 2017. This project was undertaken to help students learn. Based on recommendations received in the 2017 Systems Appraisal Feedback Report, Kirtland needed to evaluate the effectiveness of its current assessment process as presented in the 2016 Systems Portfolio. This project is one component of the ongoing Academic Assessment Plan. Faculty involvement and buy-in is critical to its success.

The three strategic challenges identified by the HLC reviewers in the 2017 Systems Appraisal Feedback Report form the first section of this document. For each challenge, the exact wording is provided (Feedback provided as a strategic challenge, core criteria, mark received (if applicable) and the reviewer recommendation), the interpretation and improvement Kirtland has instituted based on reviewer feedback with an update on the progress or actions taking place. The reasoning behind providing the reader with all of these pieces is for 1) ease of reading (not having to flip between documents) and 2) verification of the College's understanding, interpretation and improvement based on reviewer comments and suggested recommendation(s). The second section presents each core component area Kirtland was marked as "adequate but could be improved" on as listed in the Systems Appraisal. For each, a narrative response is provided that seeks to justify or clarify why Kirtland does what it does or explain the status of the improvement Kirtland is planning to make or is in the process of making.

Systems Appraisal Feedback – Assessment, Helping Students Learn

Feedback provided as a strategic challenge: While KCC has presented results, and at times included trend data, there are serious concerns around measures/results/data:

- It is not clear how KCC selects measures, nor is it always clear how these measures are meant to act as indicators of the effectiveness of the processes described.
- Direct measures are particularly helpful in understanding effectiveness and student mastery of learning outcomes—a critical piece that is missing from this portfolio. For example, while KCC has clearly articulated its general education outcomes, the direct evidence collected on student mastery of those outcomes was not included in the portfolio. Also, the fact that graduates met the graduation requirement for a cumulative GPA of 2.00 does not communicate the degree to which students have mastered relevant student learning outcomes. Evidence in the portfolio might be strengthened if KCC distinguishes between grades and direct assessment of student learning, as well as reporting examples of program learning outcomes and the actual results and evidence collected on student mastery of learning outcomes.
- The measures reported often do not produce actionable data. That is, the portfolio does not articulate how the measures selected can lead to effective decision-making.

Core Criteria 4.B. The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.

Mark received: Unclear or Incomplete.

Reviewer Recommendations: Program outcomes are determined by the faculty and the advisory committee affiliated with the program. The purpose and content of each program is conveyed to students through the college's online catalog, marketing materials, and Guided Pathways for each program. Course objectives are stated in the syllabi. The portfolio does not address where student learning outcomes for each program are stated or how they are communicated to students. Faculty use tests, papers, presentations, and art portfolios as direct measures to assess outcomes. The college uses the Graduate Follow-Up Survey to gather information from students regarding their continuing education, employment, preparation, and wages as indirect measures of program outcomes. Informal communication is an important tool for gauging whether or not students have attained proficiency of outcomes. The portfolio states that the Assessment Committee and

deans/directors utilize the PDSA method to identify areas in need of improvement based on assessment data; however, it does not describe the specifics of the process as implemented at KCC or provide results. Occupational programs are reviewed on a three--year cycle using the Program Review in Occupational Education (PROE). The institution is strongly encouraged to clarify how it has articulated student learning goals/outcomes for each program, how it is assessing the degree to which these outcomes are being met, what the results of student mastery on the learning outcomes are, and how it is using assessment data to make program improvements. This explanation should include a clear articulation of the goals/outcomes; specification of where they are articulated and how they are communicated; a description of the process faculty use to assess program goals/outcomes; and examples of how this assessment process has led to program improvements. The inclusion of data on direct measures of mastery of student learning outcomes is crucial. Indirect measures such as pass rates and CCSSE data, while helpful, do not provide evidence of the degree to which students are mastering learning outcomes. In addition, the process of assessment described should reflect recognized assessment practices that go beyond informal communication.

Focus area for continued improvement at Kirtland: Two assessment components based on Kirtland's plan as explained in the Systems Portfolio:

1. Documented outcome measures showing that students are mastering the six general education core competencies from Kirtland's threaded approach in a variety of courses.
2. Documented use of the information by faculty based on the data collected in the Canvas LMS from the artifacts completed by students to make improvements in instructional delivery or course content/structure.

The plan as presented in the Systems Portfolio is incomplete. There are additional questions to be answered as well as steps to the implementation process that need to be defined in order for the assessment process to be a closed loop [Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) – Plan, Do, Study/Check, Act (PDSA) cycle]. The informational reports generated from the Canvas LMS data collected need to be utilized in a consistent, repeatable manner by faculty in order to formulate insights that result in improvement in the measured outcomes. Specifically:

- How, when, and how often are faculty required to collect and report direct data on student mastery of program learning outcomes?
- How, when and how often are faculty/administrators required to analyze data on student learning of outcomes and make plans for improvement based on these analyses (course and program level)?
- How will data from the existing program review document, student performance on licensure and third party assessment examinations, and the direct assessment of learning outcomes in the Canvas LMS be connected together to determine where and when improvement(s) need to occur?

Kirtland Response/Improvement(s):

Kirtland initiated change in this area after submission of the 2011 Systems Portfolio. Revised competencies focused on what graduates needed to know to be successful in the future and were embedded, whenever possible, into the occupational curriculum. The new initiative, an AQIP project, was called Design Specifications for Learning. The common learning objectives were developed by administration and faculty, then reviewed and modified by the Instructional Council and approved by the Curriculum and Instruction Committee (CIC).

As stated in the 2011 Systems Portfolio, all faculty were trained in the Academic Quality Improvement Process (AQIP) methods. They were tasked with identifying assessment instruments as well as reviewing and analyzing the results to determine whether there was a problem with the assessment tool or whether the material was not appropriately covered. Faculty were to be continuously reviewing course content and assessment instruments to insure comprehension and application of concepts learned. If a larger issue was discovered, then the program would be modified/revised to address the issue.

At the 2013 Strategic Planning Summit, faculty, staff, administration, students, and other stakeholders recommended that Kirtland strengthen its commitment to student learning by emphasizing learning rather than teaching. Quality Learning and Instruction became the first theme in the College's 2013-2019 Strategic Plan. The strategic emphasis should not be on what the intentions are for instruction, but rather what students can do and what they know upon graduation. The College sent a team to attend the HLC Assessment Workshop. Out of this workshop, a new Assessment Plan was developed with training to occur in 2014. A phase-in approach was adopted in which would start in the Fall of 2015 and end in the Winter of 2018 – six competencies/learning outcomes in six semesters: Fall 2015 – Communication, Winter 2016 – Technology, Research and Information Literacy, Fall 2016 – Problem Solving, Winter 2017 – Work Productively, Fall 2017 – Systems/Processes, and Winter 2018 Personal Growth and Responsible Citizenship. In 2015, Canvas (learning management system) developed the ability for faculty to tag assignments to be evaluated, not only by the standard grade, but also for an assessment score tied to a core competency/learning outcome. Recently, Canvas developed additional enhancements that provide for the ability to extract this data into reports and other analysis tools.

After reviewing comments provided in the Systems Appraisal Feedback Report, the Assessment Plan was reviewed and revised. Additional details are provided in the Assessment Plan – link provided at the end of this document. Two additional improvements were undertaken based on the feedback received. First, the Assessment webpage on the Kirtland website was reviewed, revised and updated. Second, an AQIP Action Project – 'Closing the Loop – Assessing Assessment' began in April 2017. The plan was built on the goals, timelines, and measures included in the Assessment Plan. Specifically:

- Milestone 1 (Summer 2017): The project sponsor will extract recorded assessment data from Canvas for four of the six core competencies assessed between August 2015 and May 2017 and share the report with team members.
- Milestone 2 (August 2017): The team will create RUBRIC A (RA) for use in analyzing extracted data from Milestone 1. This rubric will include specific criteria that will allow the team to define consistency or lack thereof. The team will explore the following questions:
 1. Does the scoring system provide tangible data that can be used to improve course-level assessment? Is the current assessment system producing data that can pinpoint concrete areas that may need to be improved within individual courses or programs?
 2. How many artifacts used in the assessment process appear to be formative, and how many appear to be summative?
 3. What percentage of students were scored at each level (0, 1, 3) for each competency?
 4. How many faculty (full-time and part-time) completed assessment of the core competencies each semester?
 5. How many disciplines are represented in the extracted data?
- Milestone 3 (August 2017): The team will meet to score and analyze extracted data using RA. Results will be shared with the faculty during the Fall 2017 Convocation Week.

- Milestone 4 (December 2017): The project sponsor will extract recorded assessment data from Canvas on a random sample of 50 students for five of the six core competencies assessed between August 2015 and December 2017 and share the report with team members.
- Milestone 5 (Winter 2018): The team will meet to create RUBRIC B (RB) for use in analyzing whether or not the points have been used consistently by faculty in various subject areas when assessing student performance. In addition to the questions from Milestone 2, the team will clearly define expectations for each core competency to add to the rubric.
- Milestone 6 (Winter 2018): The team will meet to score and analyze extracted data using RB. Then, using the compiled data from Milestones 1-5 for each competency, the team will test for consistency within faculty scoring using a one-way repeated measure, ANOVA. Results will be shared with the faculty during the Winter 2018 Convocation Week.
- Milestone 7 (May 2018): The team will meet to compare ANOVA results and scores/percentages from RA with scores/percentages from RB, and determine a plan of action to unify and strengthen assessment of the competencies across disciplines. The plan will be shared with the faculty during the Fall 2018 Convocation Week and implemented beginning in the Fall 2018 semester.

Kirtland is committed to the assessment of student learning. After careful analysis of the data collected, it will make improvements at the course, program and institutional level to provide the very best instruction and educational experience for students.

Systems Appraisal Feedback – Closing the Loop

Feedback provided as a strategic challenge: Throughout the portfolio there is a lack of alignment between processes described, measures tracked, and improvements planned or made. While some processes are clearly described, others appear to be a collection of activities lacking intentionality. Improvements made or planned often seem disconnected from the results reported in the portfolio. Analyses, when they are included in the portfolio, are often only minimally connected—if at all—to the results reported; and improvements often emerge only from a limited view of the results—if there is any such connection between improvements and results articulated at all. In other words, it is not always clear how KCC is closing the loop.

Focus area for continued improvement at Kirtland: Alignment of Processes, Results (measures tracked) and Improvements. The CQI-PDSA cycle, in its entirety, must be followed. Processes must be repeatable. Keys to improvements are:

- More direct measures
- More intentional selection of measures – indicators of effectiveness of process
- More measures that produce actionable data (pre-selected)
- More analysis, interpretation and insights beyond observational or subjectivity
- More faculty involvement
- More promotion of engagement across locations/groups/committees
- More explanation of the how and why for decisions based on the data
- More internal targets for existing data measures (reasonable/attainable)
- More documentation of improvements made based on decisions
- More comparison data with peer institutions or external comparison groups

Kirtland Response/Improvement(s):

Kirtland realizes it has issues with consistency in the intentional review and revision of institutional processes based upon data. While striving to create and publish repeatable, easily understood processes, Kirtland's challenges were based on employee turnover coupled with a lack of cross-training/succession planning and a cutback in staffing. Unlike financial audit processes or federal compliance reporting through NCES IPEDS, there are not a well-known standard practices or procedures to follow.

In an endeavor to strengthen the retention and the preservation of knowledge of internal institutional processes, Kirtland worked to identify a full-time employee listing that provides for primary and secondary areas of job responsibility along with a listing of cross-trained back-ups to that position. This an effort to provide for interim succession planning as often each position at the college has only one employee charged with that job duty or responsibility.

As a direct result of the System Appraisal Feedback Report and, at the request of the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), a review of many of the college's processes have been undertaken within various offices. Four examples are provided below.

First, inconsistencies were found in board policies and procedures posted on Kirtland's website while reviewing and updating the current Assumed Practices document. Accurate and clear articulation of Kirtland's compliance with the HLC Assumed Practices guidelines are critical to managing a successful institution of higher education. These inconsistencies, most likely, were due to the lack of cross-training in administrative support personnel which has experienced high turnover in the last few years. To correct the problem, the President's Office and Executive Council (EC) are reviewing all board policies and administrative procedures posted on Kirtland's website. A plan has been developed to provide appropriate training and support for new administrative support personnel hires. Further, the President and EC will implement a plan to ensure that all policies and procedures are reviewed by the College Administrative Team (CAT) and the BOT on a five-year basis – thus closing the loop of the process.

Second, an issue with academic program and accreditation webpages was found. The Instructional Division is reviewing and revising all program pages. Program accreditation webpages will be updated to accurately display, in uniform fashion, each program's mission, outcomes, and accreditation information. Furthermore, the development of a master program accreditation spreadsheet has been completed. The duty of regularly updating it and the corresponding webpages has been assigned to an Instructional Support Specialist.

Third, the Quality Coordinating Team (QCT) that actively monitors all AQIP activities at Kirtland will direct current and future team mentors to convey the importance for 'closing the loop' during the project and when planning for the institutionalization at the end of the project. Emphasis will be placed on the necessity of alignment between the processes implemented, measures tracked, and improvements planned that are used in data driven decision making. The words 'Closing the Loop' were added to the Assessment Plan's title by the team's mentor and leader. This serves as a reminder for the team each time they are engaged with the project.

Lastly, in an effort to provide more data, information, and survey results, the Director of Institutional Research (DIR) will remind the CAT and supervisors of the existence of the Institutional Reports and Surveys webpage. Annually, new information will be added to the website to support further analysis of existing data while comparing it with available peer data. The Institutional Research office will continue to provide College

departments, teams, and committees with the most accurate, timely data possible within the guidelines of FERPA and other applicable regulations. As part of the communication effort, the DIR, with the assistance of the Public Relations office, will redesign Kirtland's 'Fast Facts' pamphlet into a modern looking communication vehicle called '50 Things to Know'. Finally, discussion of current relevant topics with data and informational reports will continue to occur at the weekly CAT meetings as a standing agenda item.

Systems Appraisal Feedback – Reconciliation of CQI & Appreciative Inquiry

Feedback provided as a strategic challenge: KCC notes that it is using appreciative inquiry. While this model may be a useful approach for learning about an organization's strengths and building on them, there are significant differences between it and AQIP's continuous improvement approach, which focuses on the use of data to track (and document) effectiveness and to identify both strengths and opportunities for improvement. KCC is strongly encouraged to reconcile these two approaches.

Focus area for continued improvement at Kirtland: CQI and Appreciative Inquiry (AI) are two distinct and very different methodologies/approaches. CQI uses data to improve processes. Focusing only on the positives or the strengths (AI) means missing the opportunities to review gaps in the results and making changes that improve performance. The HLC stresses the application of CQI, not Appreciative Inquiry.

Kirtland Response/Improvement(s): The two methodologies have a symbiotic relationship that is beneficial to Kirtland. Both, in their simplest form, have four base components. CQI is synonymous with the PDSA cycle that has the four phases of Plan, Study, Do/Check, Act. AI operates on the 4-D Cycle that has the four phases of Discovery, Dream, Design and Destiny. Kirtland uses the AI method when conducting its Strategic Planning Summit for two reasons: 1) All stakeholders (students, employees, local K12 members, business owners, healthcare providers, community members, local clubs/foundations and local governmental leadership) attending the Strategic Plan Summit are encouraged to focus on Kirtland's strengths ("The best of what is") and 2) to envision ("What is the world calling for") what Kirtland should be – Kirtland's preferred future. A common phrase associated with AI is when "focusing on an organization's strengths, the weaknesses will become irrelevant". From this inclusiveness, positivity, and openness of discussion, the strength is re-constructed ("what should be – the ideal") providing a path to sustaining ("How to empower, learn, and adjust") the strength. This stage often leads to "out-of-the box" thinking and breakthrough propositions that nourish the seeds of innovation since no one is fixated on the negative or gaps that need to be overcome. Themes emerging from the Summit form the Strategic Plan for the next five years. To accomplish the themes, objectives and goals are constructed and the CAT creates an annual Operational Plan. This plan is a list of goals, outcomes, and internal targets the College desires to complete moving Kirtland toward fulfilling the themes of the Strategic Plan. This is where CQI happens. The CAT, the president, and BOT review the College's current situation, by reviewing information available, consulting, surveying, or conducting focus groups of the specifically effected stakeholder groups, researching what peers are doing, and performing a gap analysis to determine where improvements are needed. While attending the HLC conference (2017), Kirtland had conversations with AI experts and colleges that have been using AI and AQIP together successfully. The biggest takeaway from these conversations was that AI is more suited for 'big picture – visionary thinking' while CQI is more suited to the daily operational processes and tasks an organization must endure (mouse on a wheel vs. mouse running free). Kirtland believes AI is best utilized when developing the Strategic Plan (being inclusive, focusing on what Kirtland does best, and being visionary) and using the AQIP and CQI philosophy to carry out the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

Systems Appraisal Feedback - Areas Deemed “Adequate but could be improved”

Core Criteria	Review Team's Suggestion(s)	Kirtland Response/Improvement(s)
<p>1.C. The institution understands the relationship between its mission and the diversity of society.</p>	<p>The available evidence could be improved by presenting more active and data-driven examples. Evidence presented in the portfolio seems more passive, observational, lacking proactivity and strategic intention. For example, it may be worthwhile to consider strengthening how the BOT philosophy “leading by example” (as mentioned in 4P3 of the portfolio) is intentionally reflected in the evidence.</p>	<p>In 2012, two policies were passed that applied to Board of Trustees (BOT) members – Standards of Good Practice and Conflict of Interest. A review of Board By-Laws was conducted. In 2014, the BOT adopted the current Mission, Vision and Values statements. They participated in the Strategic Plan Summit. In 2015, the BOT approved construction of a new building - the new Health Sciences Center in Grayling after taxpayers passed a millage for it. In 2017, responding to stakeholder needs, the BOT authorized the expansion of the Kirtland-Grayling location. The BOT has been proactive by updating college policies and the Campus Master Plan on a rotational cycle.</p>
<p>2.B. The institution presents itself clearly and completely to its students and to the public with regard to its programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships.</p>	<p>To strengthen the evidence that KCC presents all programs clearly to the public, the institution is encouraged to include program learning outcomes on the website and/or in the catalog. Evidence for presenting accreditation information may be strengthened by increasing the ease of access to information on the website about program accreditations; clarifying on the accreditation page of the website whether each of the programs listed are accredited, licensed, certified or approved; including a live link to the accrediting/approval body; and including accreditation/approval information in the program description sections of the website and catalog. Providing greater clarity on which programs are currently accredited or approved would also strengthen the evidence – the portfolio states there are seven but the website lists only four.</p>	<p>Transparency is provided to its stakeholders (students and public) and is found on the College’s website. Consumer/Student-Right-to-Know Disclosure Information is available in the College’s catalog as well as Gainful Employment information. Links to other services are found on the Student Central webpage. Programs We Offer webpages provides students with program costs, guided pathway course information, and program specific accreditation information. Since the writing of the Systems Portfolio, a spreadsheet with relevant program information is now maintained by both the Instructional Division and the ALO. The College’s Accreditation webpage will be updated using information from this spreadsheet and will include accrediting/approval letters. Each program page of the website will be reviewed and updated on a bi-annual basis. Available on the bottom of the Kirtland homepage are links to HLC accreditation status as well as the budget transparency icon giving easy access to Kirtland’s annual budget and audited financial statements.</p>

<p>2.D. The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.</p>	<p>The institution is encouraged to consider the following areas towards strengthening available evidence as presented in the portfolio. It seems more could be articulated about Faculty Management Agreement policy to provide stronger support of institutional commitment to freedom of expression. Perhaps further consideration will uncover sources of meaningful data and/or qualitative measures reflecting such commitment. Presented evidence concerning the training module (or further training programs in general) might be strengthened if extended beyond copyright and utilized by more than adjuncts. Additionally, is such a module part of ongoing training, performance expectations, incorporated into regular performance evaluations, etc? It would be helpful to clarify some of the specifics and related data regarding use of Plagiarism Traffic School.</p>	<p>Kirtland, since the last Systems Portfolio, has updated its policy on copyright. The Writing Center has, with faculty input, developed the Plagiarism Traffic School to help students who are having writing/citing difficulties or have been identified as plagiarizing a paper, project, or speech. Faculty can fill out and submit either the Writing Referral Form (identifying a student who does not have the necessary skills to properly document/cite) or the Academic Misconduct Form (student has written and submitted work with egregious errors in citing resulting in plagiarism). The Plagiarism Traffic School focuses on the basic skills of formatting and citing, is not meant to be a punitive process, and is to help students make ethical writing choices so that they are submitting properly formatted and cited work. Plagiarism identified as Academic Misconduct is logged into the Maxient system. Kirtland places high expectations on its faculty regarding Freedom of Expression. The Faculty Master Agreement states: "Instructors shall be free to present instructional materials which are considered pertinent to the subject and level taught and consistent with course objectives, and shall present controversial issues in an objective manner. Instructors shall be entitled to freedom of discussion within the classroom on all matters which are considered relevant to the subject matter under study." This topic is discussed in the bi-annual all-faculty meetings, in the part-time faculty orientation program, and in the KONA course available to faculty.</p>
<p>2.E. The institution's policies and procedures call for responsible acquisition, discovery and application of knowledge by its faculty, students, and staff.</p>	<p>The institution is encouraged to clarify what it is doing proactively to reduce incidents of plagiarism, how it enforces policies on academic honesty and integrity, and how it consistently documents instances of violations, particularly in relationship to students. It is not clear from the portfolio that student consequences for violating policies on plagiarism are applied consistently. Describing the procedures in place to ensure policies are enforced will strengthen the evidence.</p>	<p>The College's Writing Center provides information to faculty each semester on the services it offers as well as information on the Plagiarism Traffic School. The Health Information Technology program asked the Writing Center to devise a module on ethical writing choices and proper citing methods which is a required component in the program's entry level course. Data has shown that plagiarism in the course has been significantly reduced. Faculty report violations (plagiarism or other academic misconduct) using the online academic misconduct form. Maxient software is used to log and track each reported instance of academic misconduct allowing the Vice President of Instruction (VPIS) to see trends in repeat violations by students or numbers of reported violations by faculty. POL 6.125 outlines the procedure the VPIS follows to insure consistent enforcement of academic misconduct.</p>

<p>3.A. The institution's degree programs are appropriate to higher education.</p>	<p>In order to strengthen the evidence for this criterion, the institution is encouraged to articulate and differentiate learning goals for degree and certificate programs, as well as ensuring their consistency across modes of delivery and locations. For example, the portfolio could clarify whether the Assessment Committee regularly reviews program student learning goals/outcomes in addition to course outcomes; provide examples of how program learning goals/outcomes are the same across modalities and locations; and discuss the role of program learning goals/outcomes in program review.</p>	<p>Since receiving the Systems Appraisal Feedback Report, the VPIS updated the Assessment Plan to address many of these concerns. The Action Project, Closing the Loop – Assessing Assessment (begun in April 2017), is intended to study the use of rubrics by faculty across all subject areas, modalities, locations, and programs to ensure consistency. The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) works with all faculty to provide training and instructional support in order to assist in achieving the outcome of quality instruction for students. A universal syllabus template to help with consistency is now available. The CTL implemented several initiatives to standardize face-to-face and online courses. Learning outcomes for each program, along with four of the six institutional core competency assessments (with the remaining two scheduled for implementation in 2017-2018) now exist for all programs at Kirtland.</p>
<p>3.B. The institution demonstrates that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational programs.</p>	<p>In order to strengthen evidence for this criterion, the institution is encouraged to explain how the competencies and general education program explicitly recognize the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work (e.g., as part of Communication or Personal Growth and Responsible Citizenship). Providing more information about how the competencies are addressed within the general education courses, including ways in which faculty and students engage in activities that contribute to scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge, would also strengthen the evidence. The evidence would be further strengthened by providing data on direct measures of mastery of student learning outcomes.</p>	<p>Final course grades are used to evaluate mastery of the concepts, content, and outcomes being taught. For General Education Core Competencies, details of how the measures that will assess the mastery of student learning outcomes are contained in updated Assessment Plan. Faculty tag assignments within their courses to demonstrate the level to which the student has mastered a competency. These course assignments roll up into a student's program and, finally, to the institutional level. All of the functionality for this process is contained within Canvas. The CTL provides faculty with training to identify and appropriately tag assessments, create scoring rubrics, and record data in Canvas. The Systems Analyst creates reports which provide faculty and administration with analysis of the data collected. Currently, four of the six competencies are in Canvas with the remaining two to be implemented in 2017-2018.</p>
<p>3.C. The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective,</p>	<p>In order to strengthen the evidence in this area, the institution is encouraged to explain how it ensures it has sufficient numbers of faculty involved in non-classroom roles: oversight of the curriculum</p>	<p>Article X of the Faculty Master Agreement states the duties of faculty outside their classroom include but are not limited to participating in: curriculum decisions, committees, program reviews, budget proposals, advisory committees, academic appeals hearings, hiring/evaluating/mentoring new part-time</p>

<p>high-quality programs and student services.</p>	<p>and expectations for student performance; establishment of academic credentials for instructional staff; strategic planning; and administrative aspects of assessment of student learning. The institution is encouraged to provide specific evidence of the involvement of faculty in these roles. For all of the sub-criteria in this area, the evidence would be strengthened by the inclusion of more information on the use of preselected measures.</p>	<p>faculty. Specific examples of involvement include mandatory participation by all full-time faculty in at least one of the following committees: Assessment, CIC, Professional Development, the QCT, AQIP Project Persistence, and Grades First. Lack of participation will be reflected in their performance evaluation. Adjuncts are encouraged to participate as well if they have time and are available. Faculty participates in the Strategic Planning Summit. Evidence of this can be found in Theme 1 of the current Strategic Plan – Quality Instruction and Learning. Faculty credentials are based on the guidelines established by the HLC and program accreditation specifications. All full-time faculty and selected adjuncts reviewed credential requirements prior to finalizing them. Several faculty members are identified as program directors/coordinators. Faculty are participating in the AQIP Action Project Closing the Loop - Assessing Assessment”.</p>
<p>3.D. The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.</p>	<p>The presented report suggests a wealth of established infrastructure, processes, and corresponding data concerning wide ranging aspects of student learning and effective teaching. On the other hand, efforts to measure intentionally and proactively (i.e., in the contexts of meaningful targets and benchmarks) the impact of the student services and to track gains in student success (DFW rates, retention, performance in the core and on certification or licensure exams, graduation, employment) that could provide significantly stronger evidence appears to be largely missing. Further consideration and corresponding analyses in these areas, directly related to impact of student support services, may be helpful towards improving available evidence presented in the portfolio.</p>	<p>At the end of each semester, the DIR supplies a report to instructional administrators containing grade information along with drop-failure-withdrawal (DFW) data. These reports are shared and discussed at CAT meetings and the annual retreat. Employment information is obtained from the Graduate Follow-Up survey. Graduates are mailed the survey. If there is no response, then attempts are made via two phone calls. Licensure and third party examination pass rates for occupational programs are collected and reported as part of the Perkins annual reporting process (section 1P1). For 2015-2016, it was 92.61% which ranks Kirtland 12th out of the 28 community colleges in Michigan. Kirtland’s goal is to exceed the State of Michigan’s yearly expected performance level, 91.25%, which Kirtland did in 2015-2016.</p>

<p>3.E. The institution fulfills the claims it makes for an enriched educational environment.</p>	<p>The data provided in the portfolio tend to be in the form of anecdotal and ad hoc examples. The available evidence could be improved by presenting clear measures with corresponding data. The evidence provided in the portfolio seems more passive, observational, lacking proactivity and strategic planning. For example, it may be helpful to provide further discussion of the planning involved with the decision to drop student senate, and the subsequent approach to co-curricular opportunities, driven predominantly by student initiative, through a relatively unclear request and approval process, seems limited.</p>	<p>The student body consists of commuter students as well as a significant number of students taking online courses (48% in 2016-2017 took one or more online courses). Many of these students work full- or part-time (CCSSE 2016 data - 81.4% are working while attending and 59.7% of Kirtland students work 20 or more hours a week for pay) and schedule classes for the minimum number of days per week or never set foot on campus. Students have expressed that they do not have the time to participate in co-curricular activities even when offered. Organizations such as Student Senate dissolved due to lack of student participation. Membership in the Honors Society continues to decline each year. The procedure for dissolution of student organizations is to review student participation, discuss with advisor what the goals of the organization are and are they being met. Efforts are made to recruit new students through orientations and emails. If lack of participation continues and the goals are not being met, then the Vice President of Student Services (VPSS) dissolves an existing student organization. The College will continue to support co-curricular opportunities provided students will initiate and participate in.</p>
<p>4.A. The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.</p>	<p>The program review process is referred to throughout the portfolio; however, the actual process is not fully described. For example, it is not clear what the template or criteria look like, who is involved in the review, or what the timeline is. In addition, it is not clear whether the purpose of the review goes beyond program viability to program quality. Evidence in this area would be strengthened by an explanation of how the program review process includes a review of program quality including the use of student learning outcome data. Actual reports of course embedded general education and program learning outcomes assessment data appears lacking. It seems additionally unclear how all the resulting data is analyzed in the context of institutional targets, which are key to understanding the current success experienced by</p>	<p>Data (previous fall and winter semesters) for Program Reviews are collected by the DIR and provided to the Instructional and Business offices in August. Those offices then compile, analyze, and format the data for presentation to the administration and faculty in December. The complete process with data included is available on the AQIP Documents webpage. Upon review of this data and in consultation with the program advisory committee, faculty, and the Faculty Master Agreement, a program maybe recommended for suspension or discontinuation. The CAT has suggested the addition of licensure/third party credentialing examination pass rate to be added as an additional criteria for the program review for 2017-2018.</p>

	students as well as identifying actionable opportunities for improvement.	
4.C. The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs.	The institution is encouraged to clarify whether its retention goal is to rank in the top 10 of Michigan Community Colleges or to be at the state average or both, and if both, the timeline and plan for attainment of each. In addition, explaining the process used to ensure retention and completion data are regularly used to make improvements, including providing examples of improvement made based on data beyond developmental education, would strengthen the evidence.	An early Action Project, Student Retention, was the development of three persistence measures – fall-to-fall retention, courses developmental student enroll in and actually complete, and new, continuing, stop outs, and occasional student retention. Since 2006, these measures have been compiled, analyzed and improvements made based on the performance. In 2011, the State of Michigan Governor’s metrics were implemented to track persistence from fall to the next semester. This is used to determine Kirtland’s standing with relation to the other 27 community colleges in Michigan. Occupational programs use Perkins Core Indicator 3P1 to compare performance on retention in relation to the State Expected Level of Performance and provide data on other Michigan colleges. Kirtland’s 2015-2016 final level of 72.21% was higher than the expected level of performance of 71.00% and ranked Kirtland 7 th out of the 28 community colleges. Many programs at Kirtland use data to track and analyze retention and completion rates for their accrediting agencies. As an example for the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs (CAAHEP) accreditation, Kirtland’s Cardiac Sonography program has a 79.3% retention rate, a 100% national credentialing exam pass rate and a 77.8% positive placement rate.
5.B. The institution’s governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.	The institution is encouraged to clarify the degree to which faculty involvement is promoted throughout its leadership structure. For example, it would be helpful to explain how faculty are involved in AQIP processes including preparation of the portfolio, program review and assessment, strategic planning, ongoing decision-making, institutional technology planning, and the use of institutional data.	Kirtland believes our system of teams is strong and enables the college to achieve its mission. Two or more faculty members have attended each of the Strategy Forums. There are three faculty members on the QCT. Faculty submitted mini-action project sheets for Category 6 of the Systems Portfolio. The CIC has faculty representation. The implementation of the Assessment Plan is led by faculty. The “Closing the Loop - Assessing Assessment” Action Project is faculty driven. Faculty committee participation is mandated and their input is valued at all levels of the college. Kirtland faculty collaborate with the Admissions and recruiting staff to provide educational exposure programs to local high school students and are available for prospective students at Kirtland’s College Night event.

<p>5.C. The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.</p>	<p>Kirtland reports on its use of the Appreciative Inquiry model including for strategic planning process. This process is designed to build upon the strengths of the institution, rather than discuss threats and weaknesses. It would helpful for the institution to clarify how this process fits with AQIP processes. In addition, evidence could be strengthened by clarifying how internal constituent groups are including in ongoing planning and clarifying the link between budgeting decisions and the ability of the college to achieve its strategic goals.</p>	<p>Kirtland hosts a Strategic Planning Summit every five years inviting its various stakeholders to attend. The Summit uses AI to focus on Kirtland’s strengths. The Strategic Plan is then used by: the CAT in developing the annual Operational Plan, the QCT in setting Action Projects, and all college team members in moving the college forward to accomplish the Mission. These teams use CQI techniques to identify gaps in measured performance and weaknesses in processes for improvement. Having the resources to accomplish an intended outcome often means having the resources in terms of time and finances. The budget planning cycle starts in January for the next year. Revenues (property taxes, state appropriations and tuition revenue) are estimated by the Chief Financial Officer, the VPSS, and the DIR. Expenses are determined after supervisors submit a budget request for the next year. A review of staffing and any additional needs is conducted. Budget determinations are the made by the EC based on the Strategic and Operational Plans after giving each request a priority rank. Since Theme #1 of the Strategic Plan is focused on Helping Students Learn, budget requests and faculty hiring requests in this area receive the highest priority. More details for the Kirtland Planning Cycle can be found on page 105 of the Systems Portfolio in Figure 5P2.1.</p>
<p>5.D. The institution works systematically to improve its performance.</p>	<p>To strengthen evidence in this area, KCC is encouraged to explain how the CQI principles of AQIP are affecting the day-to-day operations of the College beyond the implementation of action projects and mini action projects. The institution is strongly encouraged to provide evidence of closing the loop in all areas of the institution including providing evidence of how impact measures are identified and tracked; how data from these measures are interpreted for improvement – noticing and addressing gaps and focusing on weakness in addition to strengths; and how the results and interpretation are used for improvement.</p>	<p>The CAT has an annual retreat in addition to weekly meetings. At this retreat, the Operational Plan for the current year is reviewed and development of the next year’s plan begins. To accomplish the objectives of the Operational Plan, the College uses the principles of CQI – specifically, Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA). Available data is used in decision making when planning change. In the area of completions, Kirtland now has access to two additional benchmarking reports to set internal goals and plan improvements. The first is the National Student Clearinghouse Post Secondary Completions Report. The second is the State of Michigan Center for Educational Performance and Information Completions Report which provides six-year trend information comparing Kirtland to the other 27 community colleges in Michigan. Kirtland now has access to improve its completion strategies beyond the data provided in IPEDS.</p>

Conclusion

Kirtland applies CQI strategies and methods in its decision making processes since becoming an AQIP institution in April 2004. Members of the College community have attended four Strategy Forums (2004, 2009, 2012, 2015), authored three Systems Portfolios (2007, 2012, 2016), and hosted two Check-up visits (2008, 2013). Three Action Projects are in progress. In addition to completing and institutionalizing a total of 23 action projects over the last 13 years, the College has set in place procedures to insure the review, revision and updating of the Mission, Vision and Values (2004, 2014, 2024), board and administrative procedures (continuous), and Strategic Plan (2009, 2013, 2019). Currently, the College is placing emphasis on the renewal of the Otsego County millage for the Kirtland-Gaylord (M-TEC) and UC location. Kirtland continues to make progress in achieving its mission and strategic goals.

The Kirtland-Grayling location opening in August 2016 and expansion, planned for 2018, is evidence of the commitment to the 'Future Design' of the college, Theme #3 in the Strategic Plan CQI tools and practices are embedded in College culture and operations as evidenced by Annual Operational Plans that provide a framework for development, implementation, and decision making that moves the College forward.

In summation, Kirtland is committed to:

- Helping Students Learn through Quality Instruction and Learning (Strategic Plan Theme #1 - Quality Instruction and Learning)
- Connecting with External and Internal Communities through continued analysis of stakeholder needs for the service region (Strategic Plan Theme #2 - Connections with External and Internal Communities)
- Providing students with access to modern facilities equipped with the state-of-the-art equipment industry is using today (Strategic Plan Theme #3 - Future Design)
- Full implementation of the Academic Assessment Plan
- Economic development for the region through Workforce Development and Community Education
- Compliance with federal, state, and accreditation (HLC and Program specific accreditors) requirements
- High standards for faculty qualifications
- Work to strengthen partnerships with local high schools (Dual Enrollment, Early College) and universities (improved transferability of courses)
- Continued maturity on the CQI continuum.

Kirtland Community College - www.kirtland.edu	
College	
Mission, Vision, Values	http://www.kirtland.edu/about-kirtland/mission-vision
Strategic Plan 2014-2019	http://www.kirtland.edu/wp-content/uploads/about-kirtland/Strategic-Plan-2014-2019.pdf
Submitting a Complaint	https://cm.maxient.com/reportingform.php?KirtlandCC&layout_id=4
Consumer/Student Right to Know	http://www.kirtland.edu/consumer-student-right-to-know-disclosure-information
Institutional Effectiveness Plan	http://www.kirtland.edu/wp-content/uploads/about-kirtland/institutional-reports-and-surveys/Kirtland-Institutional-Effectiveness-Plan-2017.pdf
Institutional Reports & Surveys	http://www.kirtland.edu/about-kirtland/institutional-reports-and-surveys
Budget Transparency/Audited Financial Statements	http://www.kirtland.edu/business-office/#budget-transparency
Campus Safety	http://www.kirtland.edu/wp-content/uploads/public-safety/Kirtland-Community-College-2016-Security-Report.pdf
Human Resources	
Faculty Master Agreement	http://www.kirtland.edu/wp-content/uploads/human-resources/Faculty-Master-Agreement-2016-18.pdf
Part-time Faculty Handbook	http://www.kirtland.edu/wp-content/uploads/human-resources/handbook_ptfac_2015_final.pdf
Full-time Support Staff Handbook	http://www.kirtland.edu/wp-content/uploads/human-resources/ftstaffhandbook.pdf
Part-time Support Staff Handbook	http://www.kirtland.edu/wp-content/uploads/human-resources/ptstaffhandbook.pdf
Organizational Chart	http://www.kirtland.edu/wp-content/uploads/human-resources/Kirtland-Organizational-Chart.pdf
Policies and Procedures	http://www.kirtland.edu/policies-and-procedures
Full-time Employee List/ Cross Trainings/Succession Planning	http://www.kirtland.edu/wp-content/uploads/about-kirtland/institutional-reports-and-surveys/Kirtland-Full-Time-Employee-Cross-Training-and-Succession-Planning-2017.pdf
Student Services	
College Catalog and Student Handbook	http://catalog.kirtland.edu/
Programs We Offer	http://www.kirtland.edu/programs-we-offer
Program Accreditations	http://www.kirtland.edu/accreditation
Net Price Calculator	http://www.kirtland.edu/static/net-price-calculator
Cost of Attendance	http://www.kirtland.edu/paying-for-college/tuition-and-fees
Student Financial Aid	http://www.kirtland.edu/paying-for-college
Gainful Employment	http://www.kirtland.edu/gainful-employment-regulations
Student Central	http://www.kirtland.edu/student-central
Admissions	http://www.kirtland.edu/admissions
Tutoring	http://www.kirtland.edu/tutoring
Testing	http://www.kirtland.edu/testing-center
Academic Advising	http://www.kirtland.edu/academic-advising
Disability Services	http://www.kirtland.edu/disability-services
Transfer	http://www.kirtland.edu/transferring-from-kirtland
Graduation	http://www.kirtland.edu/graduation
Accreditation	
HLC Accreditation	http://www.kirtland.edu (icon bottom of webpage)
Assumed Practices	http://www.kirtland.edu/accreditation/aqip-documents
Accreditation/AQIP webpage	http://www.kirtland.edu/accreditation/aqip-at-kirtland
Systems Portfolio - 2016	http://www.kirtland.edu/accreditation/aqip-pathways-documents
Systems Appraisal - 2017	http://www.kirtland.edu/accreditation/aqip-pathways-documents
Instructional Services	
Academic Assessment	http://www.kirtland.edu/academic-assessment
Assessment Plan	http://www.kirtland.edu/wp-content/uploads/about-kirtland/institutional-reports-and-surveys/AcademicAssessmentPlanJune302017.pdf
Program Review 5 Year Trend Document	http://www.kirtland.edu/wp-content/uploads/about-kirtland/institutional-reports-and-surveys/FiveyeartrendProgramReviewKirtland2011to2016.pdf
Program Review Document 2015-16	http://www.kirtland.edu/wp-content/uploads/about-kirtland/institutional-reports-and-surveys/AcademicProgramReview_Dec2016.pdf
Finding Classes	https://my.kirtland.edu/ics/Academics/Academics_Homepage.jnz?portlet=Course_Sch_&screen=Advanced+Course+Search&screenType=next
Faculty Credentials	http://www.kirtland.edu/wp-content/uploads/programs-we-offer/faculty-credentials.pdf
Community Education and Workforce Development	http://www.kirtland.edu/community-education
Center for Teaching and Learning	http://cti.kirtland.edu/
Library	http://www.kirtland.edu/library