

Systems Appraisal Feedback Report

An AQIP Pathway Report Completed in Response to a Systems Portfolio Submitted by

1885 KIRTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

February 10, 2017

TEAM CHAIR
CYNTHIA L. SHEDD
TEAM MEMBERS
JEFF ANDERSON
BLAKE FAULKNER
MICHAEL SEWARD
PAMELA STEINKE

The Higher Learning Commission

Contents

I. Reflective Overview	2
II. Strategic Challenges Analysis	2
III. AQIP Category Feedback	4
IV. Accreditation Evidence Screening	8
V. Quality of the Systems Portfolio	10
VI. Using the Systems Appraisal Feedback Report	11
APPENDIX A: Stages In Systems Maturity	13
APPENDIX B: AQIP Category Feedback	14
APPENDIX C: Criteria for Accreditation & Core Component Evidence Screening	83

I. Reflective Overview

Upon completing its review of the Institutional Overview and Category Introductions included in the Systems Portfolio, the Systems Appraisal team formulates its understanding of the institution, the institution's mission, and the constituents served. This understanding is conveyed in the following Consensus Reflective Statement. Additional team insights are also summarized here in relation to the six AQIP Pathway categories.

Reflective Overview Statement

Kirtland is a public, not-for-profit community college with four physical locations, governed by a seven-member Board of Trustees and offering 36 degrees and certificates (six available fully online) in general education/transfer and technical program areas. The college covers the largest geographical area (2500 sq. miles) of any Michigan community college.

In fall 2016, the unduplicated head count was 1,529, and 1,238 students were enrolled in at least one online course. In terms of demographics, 61% of the students are female, 65% are 24 years of age or older, and 93% are Caucasian.

The college employs 112 full- and part-time faculty and over 200 employees overall. KCC's mission includes providing innovative educational opportunities, enhancing student lives, and building stronger communities. Examples of how it addresses the commitments of its mission include its Workforce Development Program, Early Middle College program, and partnership in the Michigan Transfer Agreement.

Kirtland has been in AQIP since 2004. The AQIP Quality Coordinating Team (QCT), representing a cross section of employees, guides the AQIP process and projects at KCC. While the college notes that it has faced challenges in completing projects in a timely manner and in finding time to reflect on the impact of completed projects, it hopes to move forward by leveraging the CQI Toolbox and developing new projects that are more focused and smaller in scale.

II. Strategic Challenges Analysis

In reviewing the entire Systems Portfolio, the Systems Appraisal team was able to discern what may be several overarching strategic challenges or potential issues that could affect the institution's ability to succeed in reaching its mission, planning, and overall quality improvement goals. These judgments are based exclusively on information available in the

Systems Portfolio and thus may be limited. Each item should be revisited in subsequent AQIP Pathway reviews, such as during the Comprehensive Quality Review (CQR) visit.

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. (Note: Category 5 includes examples of where KCC is closing the loop.) The college might find several steps useful in addressing this concern: proactive and intentional selection of measures tracked (see strategic challenge below); presentation and summary of results with an intent to provide for determination of progress towards pre-set targets or benchmarks; promotion of campus engagement; and deeper insights on actionable improvement opportunities resulting from the analyses.

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. For example, tracking the number of students who use tutors may have some utility, but how does it measure if tutoring is effective or what the strengths and opportunities are? While IPEDS data allow for comparisons with other institutions, KCC might want to consider their utility since (as of 2014) there were only 227 first-time full-time students out of the 1,431 degree/certificate seeking students enrolled.
- 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 (see Evidence Review of 4B).
- 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. For example, reporting only retention rates (while an important marker of broader institutional goals) might not enable leaders to identify where gaps are occurring in processes or where to target improvement efforts. Similarly, to report survey responses without disaggregating results by pertinent stakeholder subgroups hinders leaders from targeting future improvement efforts.

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. An example of this difference is that, in the portfolio, where there is interpretation of data, KCC often highlights "positive" results, while gaps revealed by the data remain unaddressed. While celebrating strengths is appropriate, excluding interpretation of the gaps identified means that KCC might miss opportunities for learning about processes and how they might be improved. The use of data (positive and negative) to understand and improve processes and other activities (e.g. student learning) is central to AQIP.

III. AQIP Category Feedback

As the Systems Appraisal team reviewed the Systems Portfolio, it determined for each AQIP Pathway category the stages of maturity for the institution's Processes and Results. These stages range from "Reacting" to "Integrated" and are described in Appendix A. Through use of the maturity stages and its analysis of the institution's reported improvements, the team offers below summary feedback for each AQIP Pathway category. This section identifies areas for further improvement and also possible improvement strategies. In addition to the summary information presented here, Appendix B conveys the team's specific feedback for all Process,

Results, and Improvement items included in the institution's Systems Portfolio. Appendix B is structured according to the "New Systems Portfolio Structure and AQIP Categories" document which is available on the Commission's website. The summary feedback below, and the detailed feedback offered in Appendix B, is based only upon evidence conveyed in the Systems Portfolio. It is possible that the institution has additional information on specific Processes, Results, and Improvements that was not included in the Systems Portfolio. In such instances, the institution should plan to provide this evidence in a future AQIP Pathway review process such as the CQR visit.

Category One: Helping Students Learn

While Kirtland has implemented a number of policies, processes and services to Help Students Learn, the portfolio does not specify how these are being intentionally evaluated for improvement. As a result, the College is operating primarily at a **systematic level of maturity in most process areas** of Category 1 and primarily at a **reacting level in most results areas**. In particular, the absence of direct data on student mastery of learning outcomes—both of core competencies and of program learning outcomes—constitutes a significant and concerning gap. Reporting how the college intentionally connects the processes it implements with both the results it collects and the attempts made at improvement will allow Kirtland to mature in the category. KCC might better be able to provide evidence of its ability to Help Students Learn if it can capture how it has embedded the principles of CQI into its processes for setting learning outcomes, supporting students, ensuring quality across delivery localities and modes and ensuring integrity: (1) What measures did decision-makers pre-select (before implementing any process) because they believed those measures would best indicate how well a process is at delivering its goals? (2) What were the results collected on those measures (and not on others)—particularly of student mastery of learning outcomes? (3) How did the people assigned the responsibility to analyze the results interpret the data collected, and what actions did they take as a result of their analysis of those data?

Category Two: Meeting Student & Other Key Stakeholder Needs

KCC has **systematic** processes in place for responding to student needs, tracking student persistence and completion, and collecting complaint information. The College is encouraged to replicate these strengths in other areas that remain **reacting**, including responding to stakeholder needs and building collaborative partnerships. Maturity could be

increased by strengthening (either the reporting or establishment of) campus-wide engagement in the processes and using evaluative mechanisms vital to a continuous improvement cycle of those processes. For example, the selection of appropriate measures and reporting formats (including meaningful targets) might provide more actionable results if attention is paid to how various areas (e.g. student success, advising, and academic assessments) interact in meeting needs. Given the relevance of this category to KCC's goals, this alignment could be addressed in KCC's strategic planning processes.

Category Three: Valuing Employees

Kirtland appears to have a number of efforts in place, reflecting institutional commitment to the hiring, development, and evaluation of faculty, staff, and administrators. KCC is beginning to recognize the problems with the types of data being collected in terms of providing useful information for continuous improvement of employee professional development. Similar insights could be made about measures for other processes in this section. KCC appears to be at the **systematic** level in many areas, while **reacting** in others. The institution is encouraged to consider ways of strengthening (1) methods for evaluating process effectiveness, (2) depth of campus engagement (including multi-location and online community members) promoted throughout these processes, and (3) data analyses revealing overall strategic planning connections and actionable interpretations.

Category Four: Planning and Leading

KCC's clear strategic planning and operational planning processes represent a strength of this category. Overall Kirtland seems to be **systematic** in this area. KCC has several other coordinated processes, but continues to struggle significantly with interpreting results and identifying improvements based on the results (closing the loop). Consistently demonstrating how the type of systematic, repeatable, documented processes involved in its strategic and operational planning are applied to other processes in this category and other categories of the portfolio might help to move KCC forward in its continuous improvement journey. Specifying and demonstrating how data are integrated into the planning process would also help to improve maturity. Kirtland's use of appreciative inquiry and the AQIP focus on the use of gaps in data to identify areas for targeted improvement efforts seem to be somewhat in conflict in this category. The College may want to consider how it might develop and

incorporate qualitative data from appreciative inquiry in interpreting quantitative data and making improvements.

Category Five: Knowledge Management & Resource Stewardship

Overall Kirtland seems to be **emerging into the systematic** level for its management of fiscal, physical, technological, and information infrastructures. The college appears to have progressed at a macro level since its last system appraisal concerning an overarching linking of planning, budgeting and assessment processes through the Kirtland Planning Cycle and the advancement of processes encompassed in that planning cycle. Kirtland has maintained the financial health of the institution—despite a decline in all major funding sources over several years—through both efforts to improve cost efficiencies, as well as to execute strategic initiatives, such as increasing online enrollment and dual enrollment. However, continued focus in this category on linking data at all levels of the organization (individual units and departments), the appropriate processes, measurements, and appropriate analysis of results to prioritize areas for improvement might be beneficial. The results provided in this category often do not align with either the processes or the improvements discussed. The AQIP training toolbox that has been developed may help by further advancing a culture of continuous improvement at Kirtland. The institution is additionally encouraged to consider ways of further drawing upon expertise within its community, in all locations and online programs, toward identifying key measures and tracking mechanisms that may provide a better representation of progress and opportunities across all levels.

Category Six: Quality Overview

Overall Kirtland appears to be **moving toward a systematic** level for its CQI efforts, infrastructure, and culture. Kirtland recognizes challenges it has faced in establishing an AQIP culture. While a CQI cycle appears to drive efforts related to Action Projects and Mini Action Projects, adoption of that same cycle in other campus processes seems to provide an ongoing challenge throughout categories of the current portfolio. As it moves forward, Kirtland is encouraged to demonstrate how CQI impacts its culture and operations in ways beyond explicit AQIP initiatives and how it has altered fundamental approaches to the college's operations and to stakeholders' attitudes and beliefs.

IV. Accreditation Evidence Screening

Since AY2012-13, Systems Appraisal teams have screened the institution's Systems Portfolio evidence in relation to the Criteria for Accreditation and the Core Components. This step is designed to position the institution for success during the subsequent review to reaffirm the institution's accreditation. In order to accomplish this task, the Commission has established linkages between various Process/Results questions and the twenty-one Core Components associated with the Criteria for Accreditation. Systems Appraisal teams have been trained to conduct a "soft review" of the Criteria/Core Components for Systems Portfolios completed in the third year of the AQIP Pathway cycle and a more robust review for Systems Portfolios completed in the seventh year. The formal review of the Criteria and Core Components for purposes of reaffirming the institution's accreditation occurs only in the eighth year of the cycle and is completed through the CQR visit, unless serious problems are identified earlier in the cycle. As part of this Systems Appraisal screening process, teams indicate whether each Core Component is "Strong, clear, and well-presented"; "Adequate but could be improved"; or "Unclear or incomplete." When the Criteria and Core Components are reviewed formally for reaffirmation of accreditation, peer reviewers must determine whether each is "Met," "Met with concerns," or "Not met."

Appendix C of this report documents in detail the Appraisal team's best judgment as to the current strength of the institution's evidence for each Core Component and thus for each Criterion. It is structured according to the Criteria for Accreditation and supporting documents that can be found on the Commission's website. Institutions are encouraged to review Appendix C carefully in order to guide improvement work relative to the Criteria and Core Components. Immediately below the team provides summary statements that convey broadly its observations regarding the institution's present ability to satisfy each Criterion as well as any suggestions for improvement. Again, this feedback is based only upon information contained in the institution's Systems Portfolio and thus may be limited.

Criterion One. Mission:

Overall, the responses for this criterion are strong, clear, and well-presented. Its mission is clear and articulated publicly, and it guides the College's operations. Evidence presented for 1.C seems observational, lacking proactivity and strategic planning and could be improved by the presentation of more active and data-driven examples.

Criterion Two. Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

KCC presents strong evidence that it operates with integrity and follows ethical policies; evidence for other components and subcomponents is adequate. To strengthen the evidence the institution is encouraged to take several steps: more clearly present accreditation information for programs; consider adopting a process for Board members to recuse themselves when appropriate to avoid possible conflict of interest; more clearly articulate how the processes and measures related to its core competencies (for example, “Personal Growth and Responsible Citizenship”) address human diversity; and clarify what it is doing proactively to reduce incidents of plagiarism and enforce policies on academic honesty and integrity. See Appendix C for further information.

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

Evidence presented for this criterion is adequate, but KCC is encouraged to improve it. For example, the report suggests a wealth of established infrastructure, processes, and corresponding data concerning wide ranging aspects of student learning and effective teaching; however, efforts to measure the impact of the student services that are provided and to track gains in student success are not described. Additional information is in Appendix C.

Criterion Four. Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

KCC has presented adequate evidence for this criterion except for in the area of assessment of student learning. The institution could strengthen its report by clarifying (1) how it has articulated student learning goals/outcomes for each program (with examples), (2) how it is assessing the degree to which these outcomes are being met, (3) what the actual results of student mastery of learning outcomes are, and (4) how assessment data are used to make program improvements. Other improvements could strengthen evidence for this criterion: describing the process for program review, which is referred to throughout the portfolio but is never fully described; and explaining the process used to ensure that retention and completion data are regularly used to make improvements, including providing examples of improvements made based on data beyond developmental education. See Appendix C for more information.

Criterion Five. Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

Much of the evidence presented in this criterion is strong, clear, and well presented; however, in some areas, the evidence could be improved. The institution is encouraged to clarify faculty involvement in non-instructional work, e.g., AQIP processes (including preparation of the systems portfolio), program review, strategic planning, etc; and to describe how strategic planning coordinates with processes for assessment of student learning, and evaluation of operations. The institution is strongly encouraged to provide evidence of closing the loop in all areas: how measures are identified and tracked; how data from these measures are interpreted for improvement – noticing and addressing gaps and focusing on opportunities in addition to strengths; and how the results and interpretation are used for improvement. See Appendix C for more details.

V. Quality of the Systems Portfolio

KCC's portfolio was honest and readable and provided a picture of the college and its activities. Descriptions of processes could, in some cases, be improved. For example, some were lacking details—who did what when? As a result, it was difficult for the team to understand if there was a coherent process in place or simply a collection of activities. In other cases, a philosophy was presented instead of process details and related evidence.

KCC did not include a list of acronyms as an appendix.

At times the portfolio claimed that KCC collected data but failed to include the actual data, for example, assessment data on student mastery of learning outcomes. The portfolio would be significantly strengthened—and reviewers would be greatly assisted in making accurate determinations of maturity levels—if KCC includes the data themselves in the portfolio, rather than just referring to the existence of the data. Even sample data would be beneficial.

The presentation of the results is sometimes incomplete. At times, pertinent context is missing: sample sizes, response rates, Likert scale ranges, how often data were collected, who is involved in collecting the data and/or how the results are shared.

It would be helpful, both to KCC and to peer reviewers, to include more interpretation of the results—what was learned from the data reported? In many cases there was little to no interpretation provided. Both KCC and peer reviewers might benefit if the portfolio were to include more actionable data and direct connections between data reported and actions taken

to improve. KCC could strengthen its portfolio by presenting clearly the alignment between processes implemented, measures selected to shed light on the effectiveness of those processes, the data collected and the decisions made to try to improve the results.

It was not clear to what degree faculty were involved in writing or reviewing the portfolio.

At times reviewers lacked the information needed to determine the accurate level of maturity of KCC's processes and results because the descriptions in the portfolio were incomplete or inadequately documented. For example, the portfolio alluded to the existence of data on student mastery of learning outcomes; however, such data were not included. Similarly, the descriptions of program review lacked detail for processes and results, beyond application of the approach to program elimination. KCC might be able to strengthen the quality of its portfolio by involving the appropriate parties in the creation and review of the information to ensure that all relevant and necessary information is presented.

While AQIP processes, action projects, mini-projects, etc. are described, it is not always clear after thirteen years in AQIP the degree to which a culture of continuous improvement exists in the day-to-day operations at KCC. That is not to say such a culture is absent, but rather that the portfolio does not communicate its existence clearly through descriptions of systematic processes, measures, results, and improvements across all college efforts (including at all locations and via all delivery modes).

VI. Using the Systems Appraisal Feedback Report

The Systems Appraisal process is intended to foster action for institutional improvement. Although decisions about specific next steps rest with the institution, the Commission expects every AQIP institution to use its feedback report to stimulate improvement and to inform future processes. If this Appraisal is being completed in the institution's third year in the AQIP cycle, the results may inform future Action Projects and also provide the focus for the institution's next Strategy Forum. In rare cases, the Appraisal completed in the third year may suggest either to the institution itself or to the Commission the need for a mid-cycle (fourth year) CQR visit. If this Appraisal is being completed in the institution's seventh year in the cycle, again the results may inform future Action Projects and Strategy Forums, but more immediately they should inform institutional preparation for the CQR visit in the eighth year of the cycle when the institution's continuing accredited status will be determined along with future Pathway eligibility. Institutions are encouraged to contact their staff liaison with questions.

APPENDIX A

Stages in Systems Maturity: *Processes*

Reacting	Systematic	Aligned	Integrated
<p>The institution focuses on activities and initiatives that respond to immediate needs or problems rather than anticipating future requirements, capacities, or changes. Goals are implicit and poorly defined. Informal procedures and habits account for all but the most formal aspects of institutional operations.</p>	<p>The institution is beginning to operate via generally understood, repeatable, and often documented processes and is prone to make the goal of most activities explicit, measurable, and subject to improvement. Institutional silos are eroding and signs of coordination and the implementation of effective practices across units are evident. Institutional goals are generally understood.</p>	<p>The institution operates according to processes that are explicit, repeatable and periodically evaluated for improvement. Processes address key goals and strategies, and lessons learned are shared among institutional units. Coordination and communication among units is emphasized so stakeholders relate what they do to institutional goals and strategies.</p>	<p>Operations are characterized by explicit, predictable processes that are repeatable and regularly evaluated for optimum effectiveness. Efficiencies across units are achieved through analysis, transparency, innovation, and sharing. Processes and measures track progress on key strategic and operational goals. Outsiders request permission to visit and study why the institution is so successful.</p>

Stages in Systems Maturity: *Results*

Reacting	Systematic	Aligned	Integrated
<p>Activities, initiatives, and operational processes may not generate data or the data is not collected, aggregated, or analyzed. Institutional goals lack measures, metrics, and/or benchmarks for evaluating progress. The monitoring of quality of operational practices and procedures may be based on assumptions about quality. Data collected may not be segmented or distributed effectively to inform decision-making.</p>	<p>Data and information are collected and archived for use, available to evaluate progress, and are analyzed at various levels. The results are shared and begin to erode institutional silos and foster improvement initiatives across institutional units. The tracking of performance on institutional goals has begun in a manner that yields trend data and lends itself to comparative measures in some areas.</p>	<p>Measures, metrics and benchmarks are understood and used by all relevant stakeholders. Good performance levels are reported with beneficial trends sustained over time in many areas of importance. Results are segmented and distributed to all responsible institutional units in a manner that supports effective decision-making, planning and collaboration on improvement initiatives. Measures and metrics are designed to enable the aggregation and analysis of results at an institutional level.</p>	<p>Data and information are analyzed and used to optimize operations on an ongoing basis. Performance levels are monitored using appropriate benchmarks. Trend data has been accrued and analyzed for most areas of performance. Results are shared, aggregated, segmented and analyzed in a manner that supports transparency, efficiency, collaboration and progress on organizational goals. Measures and metrics for strategic and operational goals yield results that are used in decision-making and resource allocations.</p>

APPENDIX B

AQIP Category Feedback

AQIP Category One

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

1P1. **Common Learning Outcomes** focuses on the knowledge, skills, and abilities expected of graduates from all programs. Describe the processes for determining, communicating and ensuring the stated common learning outcomes and who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

Aligning common outcomes to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution	Kirtland is systematic in its approach to aligning its common outcomes, referred to as core competencies, to its mission, educational offerings and degree level. Kirtland reports that its core competencies build off the mission and provide the foundation for program/department missions, program/department goals, course objectives, and student learning outcomes. It may be beneficial to Kirtland to formalize and more clearly articulate the linkages between the core competencies and these other components so those connections are more clearly understood. The core competencies are embedded across the general education program for associate degrees and are also encompassed within the broader Kirtland general education philosophy statement. It would be beneficial for Kirtland to consider how these core competencies are addressed within certificate level programs with limited general education courses.
Determining common outcomes	The inclusion of processes for determining and reviewing common outcomes (core competencies) in a cycle every three years as part of the System Portfolio process indicates that KCC is systematic in its approach. Furthermore, after a review of the revised core competencies by the Instructional Committee, faculty gathered to address revisions to program learning outcomes and student learning outcomes. Kirtland might further mature by demonstrating how, in its regular review cycle, stakeholders collect and respond to data on the efficacy of existing outcomes and on the evolving competency needs of students, local employers, and transfer institutions. Formalizing this review process may help further advance a more effective and efficient review process.
Articulating the purposes, content, and level of achievement of these outcomes	Kirtland is systematic in its approach to articulating the purposes, content and level of achievement of its six competencies. The core competencies are integrated into general education courses through common online syllabi, and the expected level of learning is provided. Students have up to five opportunities within the general education courses throughout their program to be evaluated on each competency. Level of student achievement is articulated through a standard

	<p>rubric developed by faculty and results are maintained in the Canvas LMS. Further defining the levels of learning of these core competencies as they scaffold across the general education program may be beneficial to help ensure their progressive development.</p>
<p>Incorporating into the curriculum opportunities for all students to achieve these outcomes</p>	<p>Kirtland has developed systematic processes as part of its recent redesign that ensures that students have up to five opportunities to demonstrate mastery of the six core competencies by embedding them within all general education courses. Outcomes are tracked by rubrics, with results maintained in the Canvas LMS. Specifying more clearly how each of these six broad and complex competencies is embedded and scaffolded in general education courses across the curriculum would help further advance maturity in this subcategory.</p>
<p>Ensuring the outcomes remain relevant and aligned with student, workplace, and societal needs</p>	<p>Kirtland has established advisory committees consisting of various stakeholders, including employers, who provide feedback on the quality of Kirtland graduates. Kirtland has also assigned faculty and staff the responsibility of ensuring alignment for transferability purposes. However, it is unclear what the process is for doing these things, and therefore Kirtland appears to be at the reacting stage of development in this area. Considering the dynamic nature of our technology-driven, global economy, as well as the rising expectation of society in regards to higher education, Kirtland might develop its approach into clear processes to attain higher levels of maturity. Relevance has become an essential element for creating competitive advantage for both the university and its students.</p>
<p>Designing, aligning, and delivering co-curricular activities to support learning</p>	<p>Kirtland acknowledges that the fact that it is a commuter college presents it a challenge in being able to garner participation in many of its co-curricular offerings. However, Kirtland does have a Phi Theta Kappa Chapter and Veterans Club, as well as cultural events and programs intended to advance and support general education goals. The absence of any clearly articulated plans for embedding competencies into program related co-curricular offerings demonstrates that Kirtland is operating at a reacting level in this area. It may be beneficial to Kirtland to review and develop a more robust process for identifying relevant co-curricular activities that are aligned with the mission and core competencies of the institution and for assessing the effectiveness of co-curricular activities in promoting student mastery of these outcomes.</p>
<p>Selecting tools/methods/instruments used to assess attainment of common learning outcomes</p>	<p>While Kirtland has started to utilize a standardized rubric developed in house to measure each core competency and Canvas now provides a technological tool to facilitate the assessment process, it is not clear how assessment methods and instruments for measuring common outcomes are selected, reviewed and evaluated for effectiveness. It would be beneficial for Kirtland to further articulate a clear process by which it selects its assessment tools in order to move forward from its</p>

	current reacting level.
Assessing common learning outcomes	Kirtland is at a systematic stage in implementing its redesign and assessment of its new core competencies. Although it is early in the implementation phase, Kirtland exhibits promise in moving to aligned with this process as several areas/processes of the college have been brought together, such as the Center for Teaching and Learning, the Canvas LMS to provide technology infrastructure and the ongoing rhythm of work of the Instruction Committee and other respective sub-committees. Full implementation of this process, including rubric testing/validation and norming, might also help to increase maturity in this subcategory as well as aligning measures from other assessment tools identified by Kirtland with specific core competencies. Due to the long gap in time in the three-year assessment schedule, Kirtland may want to consider interim assessments to better understand if the new system is working as planned.
Other identified processes	

1R1. What are the results for determining if students possess the knowledge, skills, and abilities that are expected at each degree level?

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized	Kirtland includes trend data on multiple measures, such as class size; pass rates for developmental courses and general education courses; and student perception/satisfaction data related to general education courses. However, as a matter of timing, with the lack of data from direct measures of student learning in relation to new core competencies, Kirtland is currently in a reacting stage, poised to move toward a higher level, as direct measures of student learning are collected, analyzed and reported over the next three years per the timetable provided in the portfolio. Kirtland indicates that it has put technology tools and measurement methods in place to support its new assessment plan for its core competencies.
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	While the results provided indicate that Kirtland understands the importance of reporting trend data, the noted absence of both (1) data on direct measures of student mastery of the six competencies and (2) an explanation that clearly delineates how the measures that were provided are intended to shed light on the college's effectiveness at delivering the common learning outcomes indicates that Kirtland is at the reacting level. If the assessment plan for the new core competencies is fully implemented as articulated, the first limitation will be addressed and Kirtland will be well positioned to progress to higher levels of maturity. However, better understanding how the other indirect measures provided inform decision-makers on the college's effectiveness in delivering the core competencies is something that will also be required for Kirtland to progress to higher maturity levels. For example, Kirtland may want to clearly articulate how passing grades reflect student learning since this measure is utilized multiple times throughout the portfolio.

Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Kirtland includes comparative data for both its class sizes and its CCSSE scores, the latter of which also provide external benchmarks. However, there is no evidence of established targets or goals for improvement. What keeps Kirtland at the reacting level is an absence of any comparative data on direct measures of student learning. In addition to implementing the new assessment plan that has accompanied the redesign of its core competencies, Kirtland might consider including comparative data on other direct measures, such as (1) student mastery on national assessment tools related to its core competencies, (2) comparative data on how well students from several nearby two-year institutions fare at four-year transfer institutions, or (3) employer satisfaction with graduates' in relation to the college's core competencies.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	The lack of an explanation that clearly delineates how the measures provided were intended to inform Kirtland of its effectiveness at delivering the core competencies, as well as the lack of action for responding to the decline in student CCSSE responses and results that were lower than peer cohort scores in several cases, indicates that Kirtland remains at a reacting level of maturity in interpreting results and gaining insights that inform interventions for improvement.

111. Based on 1R1, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next 1 – 3 years.

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
The improvements provided are actions that will be taken in the future, and none of the improvements are directly linked to the results that were provided. The portfolio does not indicate how, as a continuous improvement institution, Kirtland intentionally selects measures, collects data on those measures, analyzes those data, and then acts on the analyses. The College might benefit from (1) explicitly delineating how and why it selects the measures it does (how those measures are intended to act as indicators of the efficacy of the performance of processes), (2) collecting data on direct measures, (3) assigning responsibility to key stakeholders to analyze the data on a regular basis, (4) planning actions intended to improve future performance, (5) implementing such actions, and (6) repeating the process to gauge the impact of attempts at improvement. In its current iteration, Kirtland appears reactive and does not close the loop on indirect and direct assessment measures of student mastery of its core competencies. For example, there are no improvements articulated based on the CCSSE data or pass rate data articulated in this subcategory. Specifically, although pass rates for developmental courses were cited as a measure of effectiveness, no improvements were provided in this section to address declining pass rates in mathematics.

1P2. **Program Learning Outcomes** focuses on the knowledge, skills, and abilities graduates from particular programs are expected to possess. Describe the processes for determining, communicating and ensuring the stated program learning outcomes and who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

Process	Team Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Aligning program learning	Kirtland has advanced to a systematic stage in its efforts to

outcomes to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution	develop programs that are appropriate and in line with the mission and the strategic plan. This process involves and is informed by the Curriculum and Instruction Committee, the New Program Form, state and federal requirements, accrediting and licensure requirements, the Guided Pathway process, financial aid, and other academic support service considerations. All programs must conform with Kirtland's certificate and degree requirements, as well as meeting state, federal, accrediting agency and licensure body specifications. Kirtland's success in making parallel multiple processes and stakeholders constitutes a best practice at the college that might be replicated elsewhere.
Determining program outcomes	Kirtland reports that program outcomes are determined by faculty and advisory committees affiliated with each program to ensure that program outcomes are consistent with the needs of today's workforce and the Kirtland mission. Transferability, accreditation standards, and licensure requirements are considered in this process. A three-year program review cycle is utilized for occupational programs with feedback from faculty, students, and advisory committee members. The dean of occupational programs leads the facilitation of this process and oversees the development of actions plans. It might be beneficial for Kirtland to develop metrics to measure the effectiveness of the program reviews to help move from systematic to higher levels of maturity. It might also be helpful to include examples of program outcomes in future portfolios and CQR materials to provide reviewers with a clearer view of program outcomes and where and how they are articulated. It was unclear from the information provided how Kirtland ensures the alignment of course objectives with program outcomes. Formal processes for mapping course objectives to program learning outcomes may be another opportunity to strengthen programs if a process is not already in place.
Articulating the purposes, content, and level of achievement of these outcomes	Kirtland is reacting in its approach to articulating the purposes, content and level of achievement of its program learning outcomes. Although it appears stakeholders can learn of purposes and content in the online catalog, marketing materials and in the Guided Pathways, the program learning outcomes do not appear to be articulated in the information provided to and reviewed by the team. Kirtland indicates that the success of programs is measured by student outcomes, including retention and graduation rates, pass rates on certification and licensure exams, and employability rates. However, although the portfolio states that the assessment of program outcomes is part of the current institutional assessment plan, as well as of individual program assessment plans, such measures are not present in the portfolio. Reviewers remain unclear as to what the direct measures of student learning are—or how, when or how often the data are collected and when and how often those data are analyzed

	and acted upon.
Ensuring the outcomes remain relevant and aligned with student, workplace, and societal needs	By integrating input from students, faculty, advisory committees and accrediting and licensing bodies, Kirtland has systematized its approach to ensuring that program outcomes remain relevant and aligned with student, workplace, and societal needs. The PROE (program review process) is used for occupational programs every three years to ensure that alignment and relevance are maintained. Formalizing the process by which these multiple inputs are integrated into the review and revision of program outcomes might be beneficial in helping all constituents understand the holistic and integrated nature of these processes in ensuring program relevance and alignment.
Designing, aligning, and delivering co-curricular activities to support learning	Kirtland acknowledges that in relation to co-curricular offerings, it is challenged by the fact that it is a commuter college. Although there are activities that support community and groups like the Veterans Club that provide social opportunities for veterans to connect with others, there is an absence of any clearly articulated plans or a mechanism for developing co-curricular activities that support program outcomes. Therefore, Kirtland is at a reacting level in this subcategory and may want to consider evaluating clubs and organizations that align with academic program offerings to further support student mastery of learning outcomes.
Selecting tools/methods/instruments used to assess attainment of program learning outcomes	Course-embedded assignments, informal communication, licensure exams, portfolios and graduate surveys that can be benchmarked against other community colleges are all provided as example measures. However, it is not clear from the portfolio that these are consistently used to assess the attainment of learning outcomes specific to each program. The portfolio states broadly that core competency assessment rolls up to program-level assessment but does not explain how this linkage occurs and how it is formalized to ensure it occurs in an ongoing fashion across all programs. Kirtland can move from its current reacting level to the next level of maturity by explicitly connecting its use of data from program review processes, student performance on licensure exams, and the direct assessment of program learning outcomes to its evaluation of programs.
Assessing program learning outcomes	What remains unclear from the portfolio is the intentionality and regularity of processes used at Kirtland to assess student learning of program outcomes. How, when, where 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 affected faculty required to analyze data on student learning of program outcomes and to make plans based on the analyses? In the absence of an articulation of these specifics, Kirtland appears to be at the reacting level.
Other identified processes	

1R2. What are your results for determining if students possess the knowledge, skills, and abilities that are expected in programs?

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized	Kirtland appears to be at the systematic level for the measures tracked and tools utilized to assess student achievement in relation to program outcomes. For several of its occupational programs, the College tracks student performance on the appropriate licensing/credentialing exams. Four things might help Kirtland further mature in its measurement of program outcomes: (1) to report how decision-makers disaggregate data and link student performance on credentialing exams to particular learning outcomes (thus providing information that could lead to actions taken to improve curriculum and the delivery of skills to students); (2) to report trend data to track the impact of any attempts at improvement; (3) to set benchmarks or targets against which results can be judged and evaluated; and (4) to track and report direct assessment data on program learning outcomes for all programs.
Overall levels of deployment of assessment processes within the institution	Kirtland reports data on multiple measures, such as pass rates on certifications/licensure exams, Technical Skills Attainment data, and employment data, graduate follow-up surveys. However, what remains unclear is the level to which best assessment practices have been embedded into processes across the institution: Are all programs assessing and collecting direct data on student achievement of program learning outcomes? Who is charged with analyzing and responding to the data collected? How has time for analysis, intervention and re-evaluation been built into processes and schedules? This lack of clarity keeps Kirtland at the reacting level.
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Kirtland is at the beginning stages of operating systematically in its approach to presenting summary results in relation to measures of program outcomes. Results are clearly presented and trending, and comparative data are regularly presented. To demonstrate further maturity, Kirtland might consider reporting how these data are linked to specific program learning outcomes, as well as explicating how the data are analyzed and used to close the loop and effect changes to pedagogy and curriculum. The establishment of targets and goals against which progress/achievement could be measured might also be beneficial in supporting optimal improvement in performance. Ensuring that summaries of results are actionable would also be beneficial to Kirtland.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Kirtland is systematic in providing comparative data with other Michigan community colleges as well as trending data internally over time. However, there are no internal targets for performance on metrics utilized, and there is no indication of how decision-makers use the data to make changes. To move beyond the systematic level of maturity Kirtland might address these elements.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Kirtland provides a summary of results, but very few insights are shared; therefore, KCC appears to be at the reacting level in regards to interpretation of results and insights gained. Comments are largely anecdotal. In the case of summative results, such as

	certification/licensure or employability, a lack of linkage with programmatic data limits the consideration of possible improvements or identification of successful practices or interventions.
--	--

1I2. Based on 1R2, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next 1 – 3 years.

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
Kirtland should be commended for its commitment to adding industry certifications/licensures/credentials to programs where possible and seeking programmatic accreditation for several healthcare programs to help enhance student skill attainment and broaden employment options. These programmatic accreditations entail significant outcomes-based assessment and should serve to support Kirtland in achieving its stated objectives for this improvement initiative. However, it is recommended that Kirtland keep in mind that summative measures of program outcomes like NCLEX Pass Rates will require either a deeper analysis (and likely a disaggregation of data) or augmentation with other assessments of program outcomes in order for decision-makers to identify strengths and weaknesses in curriculum and instruction, as well as the implementation of necessary interventions for improvement. As noted throughout the appraisal of this category, improvements are not articulated that directly address the results provided in 1R2.

1P3. **Academic Program Design** focuses on developing and revising programs to meet stakeholders’ needs. Describe the processes for ensuring new and current programs meet the needs of the institution and its diverse stakeholders. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

Process	Team Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Identifying student stakeholder groups and determining their educational needs	Kirtland is emerging into a systematic stage in identifying stakeholder groups and determining their educational needs. Career/personality interest tests and required individual advising are used to help new and current students make decisions about career pathways. Both student and graduate sub-groups have been defined, and data are analyzed using factors such as gender, age, ethnicity, working students and veteran status. Specifying how subgroup data are used to identify and determine students’ educational needs might help to increase maturity in this category. In addition, Kirtland might consider tracking data on pre-selected measures meant to shed light on the efficacy of these processes: what measures might indicate how successful processes for placement are or how well the various subgroups are performing at Kirtland or how effective the required advising is?
Identifying other key stakeholder groups and determining their needs	Kirtland is currently at a systematic level in identifying other key stakeholders and determining their needs. Kirtland does so by reviewing data from its service area and networking with state, regional and community groups and organizations to identify needs including the state employment agency, local economic development agencies, employers, advisory committees, K-12 systems, and other higher education institutions. The director of Workforce Development meets with local and regional business and industry to determine the

	<p>training needs of their employees. The activities described such as networking, discussions and meetings, appear to be ad hoc in some cases. Thus, to further advance its maturity and optimize these important relationships with other service area stakeholders, Kirtland might implement clear, regularized processes that are monitored and evaluated.</p>
<p>Developing and improving responsive programming to meet all stakeholders' needs</p>	<p>Kirtland is systematic in its development and improvement of programming to meet all stakeholders needs. Clear processes are in place for determining the feasibility of new programs, as well as developing and improving programs to meet stakeholder needs. Examples provided in the portfolio articulate Kirtland's attentiveness to the needs of employers and their employees. However, specifying other repeated, documented processes for meeting all stakeholders programming needs might support Kirtland's efforts to mature in this area. For example, how do decision-makers determine how satisfied stakeholders are with the new programming: students, community members, employers, etc.?</p>
<p>Selecting the tools/methods/instruments used to assess the currency and effectiveness of academic programs</p>	<p>Kirtland has established systematic methods and instruments to assess the currency and effectiveness of academic programs. Kirtland utilizes an annual program review process. In addition, occupational programs are evaluated on a three-year cycle utilizing the PROE review process mandated by the state. Assessment methods selected that are part of the review process include, among others, advisory committee feedback, state licensure and certification pass rates, data from 4-year institutions as related to the transfer success of Kirtland students, and graduate and leaver survey data. Specifying how these measures are integrated together into the evaluation and decision-making approaches that shape interventions for improvement might be beneficial to Kirtland. Furthermore, it might be beneficial if Kirtland clearly articulates how it selects and evaluates the effectiveness of the tools/method/instruments to assess currency and effectiveness of programs.</p>
<p>Reviewing the viability of courses and programs and changing or discontinuing when necessary</p>	<p>Kirtland's program review process is aligned in relation to reviewing the viability of courses and programs, as well as for changing or discontinuing them. Program review at Kirtland incorporates data from multiple sources. Alignment is evident in that, as curricular changes are considered, review and approval processes work in parallel to support, inform and make final decisions. If not already doing so, Kirtland might benefit from also incorporating direct data on student mastery of learning outcomes, program financial performance and human resource considerations into program review. Such alignment will further enhance Kirtland's decision-making processes in relation to its programs.</p>
<p>Other identified processes</p>	

1R3 What are the results for determining if programs are current and meet the needs of the institution’s diverse stakeholders?

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized	Kirtland measures and provides the number of program changes that have resulted from its comprehensive review processes over a four-year period. Kirtland utilizes census data from its service area to help inform the review process. Results from the fall student survey include data from students on what programs they would like to see the college add to its offerings, as well as documenting actions taken on these recommendations or reasons for non-action. The Michigan Bureau of Labor Information and Strategic Initiatives provides data on Kirtland’s Region 3 service area, which Kirtland utilizes to inform both new program development and ongoing program review processes. Collectively, these actions indicate that Kirtland is becoming systematic in its work in this area. However, Kirtland may benefit from tracking more direct measures of its ability to meet its student and other stakeholder needs in this area, measures such as student satisfaction data, direct assessment data on student mastery of learning outcomes, employer satisfaction data, data on student performance at transfer institutions and graduate satisfaction data.
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Kirtland’s program review process generated several changes that are displayed in a table. However, it is unclear if the table shows all changes or just major changes. Furthermore, developing a method to more clearly articulate results, including how results are prioritized for potential impact to correct deficiencies or better leverage strengths, may help Kirtland in providing more actionable results to its stakeholders. More consistent use of trend data in its summary of results, such as that provided in the portfolio for the student survey response, might also benefit Kirtland as it continues to progress beyond its current reacting stage of maturity.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	The lack of use of comparison data or of internal targets or external benchmarks, where appropriate, on the measures and instruments selected to provide evidence of Kirtland’s ability to meet stakeholder needs indicate a reacting level of development. To progress in this area it would be beneficial for Kirtland to address these shortcomings.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Kirtland is at a reacting stage of development in interpreting results and articulating insights gained from results. There is limited discussion on the results from the U.S. Census and the Fall Student survey. Only brief insights were provided in relation to changes resulting from the comprehensive review process. It might be beneficial to Kirtland to review how the results of measures and instruments chosen are interpreted and how decision-makers use the data to make changes and articulate insights gained.

1I3. Based on 1R3, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next 1 – 3 years.

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
Improvements are being made to the nursing program and the surgical technology program in preparation for programmatic accreditation. Adding a surgical technology program with new specialization areas is also being considered. However, these particular examples are not connected to the results presented. It might be beneficial to Kirtland to provide evidence of improvement initiatives that indicate that continuous improvement principles and approaches are being enacted across the institution.

1P4. **Academic Program Quality** focuses on ensuring quality across all programs, modalities, and locations. Describe the processes for ensuring quality academic programming. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

Process	Team Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Determining and communicating the preparation required of students for the specific curricula, programs, courses, and learning they will pursue	Kirtland is at the systematic level. All students take placement exams as part of the admissions program and receive general information about services and expectations during the mandatory orientation and in the student handbook. Program-specific prerequisites and recommendations are provided in the College Catalog. At the course level, co-requisites and prerequisites are required for course approval. Describing how processes are evaluated for improvement may help to increase maturity in this area. KCC is encouraged to consider the centrality of such connections between advising and available student performance data for evaluating the effectiveness of processes in this area.
Evaluating and ensuring program rigor for all modalities, locations, consortia, and when offering dual-credit programs	Kirtland is at the emerging stages of the systematic level for how it evaluates and ensures rigor for programs wherever and however they are delivered. Kirtland uses annual program review, licensure/certification results, PROE evaluations, hiring of graduates, and feedback from stakeholders. Faculty are trained for translating face-to-face courses into online courses and are further supported by CTL in improving their teaching and courses. KCC has also established an assessment committee for reviewing course outcomes and objectives. Collecting and monitoring comparative data on student mastery of learning outcomes across locations and modalities might help KCC mature.
Awarding prior learning and transfer credits	Existing policy delineates the processes for awarding credit for prior learning and transfer credits. The report on assessment methods concerning the effectiveness and continuous improvement of such processes could be strengthened, however, by the inclusion of key connections maintained between academic and student support areas, which may serve to advance the institution beyond the current systematic level of maturity.
Selecting, implementing, and maintaining specialized	KCC is at the systematic level and involves several areas to select, implement and maintain specialized accreditations. Advisory Committee and/or industry standards provide input.

accreditation(s)	Faculty research accreditations; the CIC reviews them, and the dean/director approves forward movement. IR data are used in reviewing programs for sustainability or discontinuation. The portfolio does not make clear, however, how this process works when new programs are considered or introduced.
Assessing the level of outcomes attainment by graduates at all levels	While the College uses multiple data points in assessing the attainment of learning outcomes by its graduates—and remains therefore at the systematic level—it might demonstrate a higher level of maturity by reporting how (and by whom) those data are regularly and intentionally analyzed and used by decision-makers in attempts to improve efficacy.
Selecting the tools/methods/instruments used to assess program rigor across all modalities	Although several tools and methods are referenced, there appears to be no indication of a process concerning how these instruments are selected. Nor does the portfolio delineate any measurable goals by which these tools are evaluated for efficacy. Thus, KCC remains at a reacting level of maturity.
Other identified processes	

1R4 What are the results for determining the quality of academic programs?

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized	KCC is at the systematic level. It has established processes for assessing student learning, as well as for monitoring retention and persistence, across modalities and locations. Transfer data indicate that the number of students receiving MACRAO and MTA endorsement consistently grew through 2015, with a slight decline in 2016. Data on third party credential exams or licensure exam results reflect consistently high pass rates. Providing benchmarking with other institutions might be helpful to KCC to better determine quality of results as compared to peer institutions. Graduate surveys are conducted, and the reporting of items includes trend data over a three-year period. As it moves forward, KCC is strongly encouraged to report on direct measures of student mastery of learning outcomes beyond course pass rates and external exams. The analysis of such data might allow Kirtland to mature in that evidence on how well students are faring vis-à-vis specific outcomes might lead to curricular improvements at both the course and program levels.
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Summary results are provided for the measures identified including trend results. Providing sample size and response rates where applicable may help to increase maturity beyond the current systematic level in this area, as might the inclusion of data both on the percentage of students requesting endorsements who received them (instead of simply the number receiving them) and on direct measures of student mastery of learning outcomes.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	While internal comparisons are made regarding retention and pass rates, the only data from external benchmarks shared are questions related to Bloom's Taxonomy, keeping Kirtland at the reacting level.
Interpretation of results and insights	Kirtland is at the reacting level vis-à-vis the interpretation of results and insights gained. While the College reports some data, how the

gained	data are interpreted and how decision-makers use the data to make changes remain unclear. KCC might demonstrate its maturity in this area by building into its processes time and responsibility for the documentation of interpretation of results and of insights gained and of changes planned based on such an interpretation, including commentary on how decision-makers hope the planned changes will positively impact future results.
--------	--

1I4. Based on 1R4, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next 1 – 3 years.

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
The reported transition from COMPASS to ACCUPLACER, while of institutional significance for supporting student success, appears more reactionary in nature than having resulted from intentional data analysis. The College may want to consider reporting (1) which data are used to drive decisions and/or (2) how the data included in the portfolio have been connected to efforts or plans for improvement.

1P5. **Academic Student Support** focuses on systems designed to help students be successful. Describe the processes for developing and delivering academic support to students. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

Process	Team Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Identifying underprepared and at-risk students, and determining their academic support needs	KCC is at the systematic level. Placement testing or other demonstrated proficiency (e.g., previous college coursework, ACT, AP) in reading, writing and mathematics is required of all Kirtland students. Support is provided to help students pass the placement tests. Support is also provided for those with documented disabilities. An early alert system helps to identify and respond to students who are having attendance and/or performance issues in their courses. Providing information on how these processes are evaluated for improvement may help to increase maturity. An additional opportunity for maturing exists in connecting processes across areas; for example, seeking a better understanding of possible impacts of the Early Alert system on student performance would provide for collaborations between faculty and support services.
Deploying academic support services to help students select and successfully complete courses and programs	Kirtland is at the systematic level. Tutoring services, drop-in math labs, and writing center help are available in multiple physical locations, with some online as well. Library assistance and career counseling services are also available. Providing information on how these services are evaluated for impact on student learning may help to increase maturity in this area.
Ensuring faculty are available for student inquiry	The Faculty Master Agreement states that full-time faculty will provide “reasonable accessibility to students via multiple modalities (e.g., in-person, phone, or email),” and the Part-Time Faculty Handbook states that “[p]art-time faculty must be available and accessible for office hours as needed/requested by students.” How does Kirtland verify, however, that its policies in this area are being followed? The absence of corresponding data, for example on posted office hours or

	faculty response times, keeps KCC at the systematic level. The College might consider, also, tracking student complaint or CCSSE data on student satisfaction with faculty availability.
Determining and addressing the learning support needs (tutoring, advising, library, laboratories, research, etc.) of students and faculty	Although Kirtland has student support services in place—research into best practices, networking, student and faculty requests—these approaches seem primarily ad hoc and informal in nature, keeping KCC at the reacting level. No pre-selected measures are described that decision-makers can review in planning future changes.
Ensuring staff members who provide student academic support services are qualified, trained, and supported	Kirtland is at the systematic level. Education and experience requirements for support service positions are specified, and Kirtland provides resources for professional staff development. Providing information on in-house training and support, including how it is evaluated for improvement, may help to increase maturity in this area.
Communicating the availability of academic support services	KCC appears to have in place a range of methods for informing students about available services. In addition to utilizing such a broad spectrum of approaches, KCC may wish to consider the ways in which the effectiveness of each method could be better understood. Introducing corresponding measurable goals for these approaches might provide data that can be analyzed as decision-makers engage targeted efforts to advance the college's maturity level beyond the current systematic . KCC may also want to consider the utilization of emerging mobile application technology to target the right messages to reach the right learner at the right time, which has always been a challenge in higher education in the past.
Determining goals for retention, persistence and program completion	No goals are provided in this section, keeping KCC at the reacting level.
Selecting the tools/methods/instruments used to evaluate the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of support services	Several tools and methods of evaluation are described. However, the process by which these are selected is not discussed. Maturity level is thus reacting .
Other identified processes	

1R5 What are the results for determining the quality of academic support services?

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized	Usage data are presented for tutoring, early alerts, and writing center services, along with survey data on frequency of use and satisfaction. Some tracking data concerning student persistence in relation to completion of orientation are also presented. These measures do not reflect any direct data on the impact of support services on student success or academic performance; the college might be able to mature beyond the beginning stages of the systematic level by collecting data on more direct measures.
Summary results of	While summary results are provided for the measures identified,

measures (including tables and figures when possible)	including some trend results, the portfolio does not clarify how these measures are intended to provide actionable data: how do leaders hope that decision-makers can use the data reported? Including data on more direct measures, as well as clarification of how results can be used, may help to increase maturity in this area beyond the current reacting level.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	External benchmarks on survey data are presented in the form of peer group results. Trends may be observed in the data reported for some measures. However, targets and benchmarks appear to be otherwise absent from the analysis, reflecting a reacting maturity level. What results would decision-makers like to see on these measures? Why were those targets set? How do decision-makers hope to be able to determine whether the results reported indicate success or failure? To mature, Kirtland may find it helpful to set both internal targets and external benchmarks—and then to compare the results collected against those pre-set targets.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	There is minimal interpretation or discussion of insights gained from the results provided, keeping KCC at the reacting level. While the College recognizes that the number of students using support services has declined, for example, there is no discussion of why that might be the case. Determining causes and possible solutions could be a useful action project. Embedding time and responsibility for reflection and analysis of data collected might help KCC mature. Additionally, having stakeholders from various support areas communicate around data collected might help break down silos and improve results by addressing overarching needs that affect multiple areas.

115. Based on 1R5, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next 1 – 3 years.

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
Kirtland has identified two areas for improvement—faculty use of early alerts and online tools for tutoring. While both of these may be beneficial, it is not entirely clear how these were chosen based on the results presented. The College might mature by reporting a clear link between results collected and actions taken to improve.

1P6. **Academic Integrity** focuses on ethical practices while pursuing knowledge. Describe the processes for supporting ethical scholarly practices by students and faculty. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

Process	Team Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Ensuring freedom of expression and the integrity of research and scholarly practice	KCC describes comprehensive policies concerning freedom of expression that are appropriate to the academic environment. Students are provided direction in such areas through the writing center and, when recommended by faculty, in an online Plagiarism Traffic School. Copyright Policies are introduced as a module in the institutional orientation for adjunct faculty. There don't appear to be corresponding tracking data involved which could be used for evaluation of the effectiveness of processes in this area, suggesting that Kirtland is at the beginning stages of a systematic level of maturity.

Ensuring ethical learning and research practices of students	KCC is at the beginning stages of systematic in ensuring the ethical learning and research practices of students. Information on ethical learning and research for students is provided in the Code of Conduct in the Student Handbook, in the online College Catalog, during OAR, and in every course syllabus. Academic misconduct is beginning to be tracked using a new online form available through the Maxient software. Kirtland also provides an online Plagiarism Traffic School for identified students. Utilizing the online form to provide data that can be analyzed to guide efforts at improvement might help to increase maturity in this area. It does not appear that faculty are required to report academic dishonesty using the online form. While this may allow faculty to handle infractions themselves—and that may be appropriate—tracking of data using the forms will be less accurate. The College may want to consider having faculty report the number of infractions they handled themselves to better understand how else they might support students in being ethical learners.
Ensuring ethical teaching and research practices of faculty	KCC is at the systematic level. Ethical conduct is included as part of faculty job descriptions, incorporated into the faculty evaluation process, and articulated in the faculty handbook. Reporting on specified measures intended to act as key performance indicators in this area might help to increase maturity in this area. Although not a research institution, KCC might benefit from implementing processes for faculty training and development aligned with the scholarship of teaching and learning relevant to a teaching institution.
Selecting the tools/methods/instruments used to evaluate the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of supporting Academic Integrity	Academic dishonesty cases are reviewed by deans/directors and the VPIS; and enrollment in the Plagiarism Traffic School is tracked. However, the portfolio does not discuss how the college selects the tools/methods used to evaluate its effectiveness at ensuring academic integrity. Thus, KCC remains at the reacting level in this area.
Other identified processes	

1R6 What are the results for determining the quality of learning support systems?

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized	The College shares four data points: responses to one item on a 2013 plagiarism survey of faculty; the number of cases of integrity issues reported since 2014; the number of students referred to and completing Plagiarism Traffic School; and responses to one item on the 2013 and 2016 CCSSE. The limited nature of the outcomes tracked and, more importantly, the lack of clarification as to why these measures were selected or how decision-makers have used the data presented keep KCC at the reacting level.
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	CCSSE data indicate that students believe that Kirtland is contributing to their development of a personal code of values and ethics. With 73% of the faculty responding to the 2013 plagiarism survey indicating that plagiarism was a moderate to severe problem, there

	were only eight cases of plagiarism reported between 2014-2016. This disconnect indicates that optional reporting of infractions may not be accurately representing the situation at Kirtland. Additionally, the data provided seem limited in reach and disconnected from a broader context. Thus the level of maturity appears to be reacting .
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Except for comparison with a national result of a 2016 CCSSE survey, there are no targets, benchmarks, or context provided for the results discussed, reflective of a reacting level of maturity. For example, the significance of eight student plagiarism issues reported by faculty (2014-2016) seems difficult to judge without historical reference, information on number of faculty participating in the reporting structure, and follow-up on the number of these cases that advanced beyond allegations of plagiarism. Similarly, the student survey results are difficult to place in context without some form of secondary measure, whether provided by academic, counseling, or advising data.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	To draw meaningful interpretations or insights from the presentation of results does not seem possible—indicative of a reacting level of maturity in this area. While eight students were referred to traffic school, only half of them successfully completed it. Learning why students were not successful could lead to improvements.

116. Based on 1R6, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next 1 – 3 years.

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
If faculty are successfully encouraged to report accurately all cases of plagiarism, the implementation of the Maxient software might allow for useful tracking of student academic misconduct. Perhaps the implementation of Maxient was based in part on the survey data from 2013 that found that nearly 73% of faculty responded that plagiarism was a moderate to serious problem at the College; however, the portfolio does not make clear the connections between actions taken for improvement and data reported.

AQIP Category Two

MEETING STUDENT & OTHER KEY STAKEHOLDER NEEDS focuses on determining, understanding and meeting needs of current and prospective students' and other key stakeholders such as alumni and community partners.

2P1. **Current and Prospective Student Needs** focuses on determining, understanding and meeting the non-academic needs of current and prospective students. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

Process	Team Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Identifying key student groups	The college has identified four key student groups following the student lifecycle, indicating it is at the beginning stages of being systematic . Although Kirtland mentions (and addresses) subgroups within the Prospective Student grouping, articulating sub-groups within the other key groups might help KCC better target support in order to promote student success. Clarifying the process by which assigned

	stakeholders, on a regular cycle, review data and evidence to identify key student groups at KCC could mature the process.
Determining new student groups to target for educational offerings and services	While several stakeholders at KCC engage in activities to target new student groups, those actions appear to be largely ad hoc and informal. Information provided describes tactically how the college communicates but not how it determines what new students to target for educational offerings and services. The lack of a clear and evaluated process—in which parties are assigned responsibility for regularly reviewing data on predetermined measures—keeps KCC at the reacting level.
Meeting changing student needs	The mandatory OAR and the new Student Success Center (SSC) are indicators of how KCC is emerging into a systematic level for how it meets changing student needs. To mature, Kirtland might report how it collects data on preselected measures, so that decision-makers can evaluate how effective its approaches are: How might decision-makers track the impact of OAR or the SSC in helping meet students' needs?
Identifying and supporting student subgroups with distinctive needs (e.g., seniors, commuters, distance learners, military veterans)	KCC is at the systematic level. It provides services to meet the needs of its commuter student body as well as subgroups of the student body, such as 60-plus students, veterans, students with disabilities, online students, EMC and dually enrolled students, and athletes. While the portfolio states that institutional data reports, student comments, and CCSSE data are all used to identify the needs of distinct subgroups, specifying the explicit, repeatable processes for doing so may increase maturity.
Deploying non-academic support services to help students be successful	While KCC is to be lauded for having in place multiple non-academic mechanisms to help students be successful, what remains unclear from the portfolio is the process by which such mechanisms are selected. The portfolio does not specify who at the college “reviews student surveys, receives input from the Student Senate (now disbanded), has conversations with colleagues and gathers information.” The approach described seems ad hoc and informal, keeping the college at the reacting level. To mature, the college might demonstrate that someone is assigned responsibility for very specific actions and that each action is associated with a clear measure meant to act as an indicator of the effectiveness of that approach.
Ensuring staff members who provide non-academic student support	Kirtland has developed systematic processes for ensuring staff are appropriately qualified. Kirtland’s hiring and orientation processes provide onboarding training for new employees, and professional development opportunities are

services are qualified, trained, and supported	provided internally as well as at regional, state and national conferences and workshops. Student support staff participate in professional association conferences and webinars related to their respective functional areas. It is unclear from the information provided how Kirtland determines the professional development needs of staff, and describing a clear process for determining these needs might constitute an opportunity for improvement.
Communicating the availability of non-academic support services	A number of communication mechanisms is discussed; however, it is not clear how these are evaluated for effectiveness and/or continuous improvement opportunities. Institutional practice thus reflects a reacting level of maturity. Kirtland is encouraged to consider implementing intentional processes designed to establish, evaluate and improve communication with a variety of student sub-groups: those on different campus locations; those participating in online delivery programs; and those from specified, significant demographic/socio-economic and geographical classifications throughout the service region.
Selecting tools/methods/instruments to assess student needs	KCC appears to be at a reacting level. Kirtland reports that it uses several surveys for current students, graduates, and leavers and that the College has utilized focus groups to gather more candid and deeper input from students. The process for selecting these tools was not, however, provided, thus constituting an opportunity to mature in this area, as would identifying measures to determine the efficacy of the selected tools.
Assessing the degree to which student needs are met	There appear to be processes and some targets in place, and these are shared to some degree across campus units/departments. While this is indicative of a systematic level, vague references to how resources are “examined” and departmental analyses of “the positives and negatives” suggest KCC is only at the beginning stages of the systematic level of maturity. To mature, Kirtland might consider reporting a clear alignment for each identified subgroup (1) the party assigned responsibility for evaluating effectiveness, (2) the schedule of evaluation, (3) the measure selected to act as a key performance indicator, and (4) trend data on each measure.
Other identified processes	

2R1. What are the results for determining if current and prospective students' needs are being met?

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized	Kirtland remains at the beginning stages of the systematic level for the outcomes/measures tracked to determine if the needs of current and prospective students are being met. KCC has in place several clear measures on which it collects data and reports trends: student responses on certain CCSSE items and on the Student Survey, loan default data, numbers of local high school graduates enrolling at KCC, and dual enrollment and Early Middle College numbers. Some of these measures are directly linked to strategic goals and key student groups. KCC's comment that it has chosen to focus its resources on (1) preparing high school students for college-level courses and (2) recruiting high school students seems disconnected from tracked student demographics and related programming discussed elsewhere in the report. Aligning other measures such as CCSSE items and items on the student survey with specific services discussed under Processes and incorporating measures of statistical significance may better inform decision-making and increase maturity.
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Kirtland remains at the beginning stages of the systematic level for the summary results on the measures it tracks to determine if the needs of current and prospective students are being met. KCC reports data on several measures: student responses on certain CCSSE items and on the Student Survey, loan default data, numbers of local high school graduates enrolling at KCC, and dual enrollment and Early Middle College numbers. The report contains time series results; however, it does not appear to connect the data in ways that promote deeper understanding of meeting students' needs as a result of institutional initiatives and programs. The summary data provided do not represent results of the processes discussed in the previous section. Greater alignment between measures and processes will strengthen this section of the portfolio. While measures of the end goals (e.g. graduation rates for academics) may indicate effectiveness, KCC is encouraged to identify measures that are more closely aligned with its processes for understanding the needs of key student subgroups in order to have more actionable data.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Some trend data are reported. However, targets and benchmarks appear to be otherwise absent from the portfolio, reflecting a reacting maturity level. Benchmarks introduced appear to be more opportunistic in nature rather than intentionally incorporated into the analysis. To mature, Kirtland may find it helpful to set both internal targets and external benchmarks—and then to compare the results collected against those pre-set targets.
Interpretation of	Interpretations discussed are more observational in nature than

<p>results and insights gained</p>	<p>actionable, keeping KCC at the reacting level. Also, there are examples in the results that appear to be trending negatively but are not identified and addressed (e.g., declining number of high school students matriculating to Kirtland, default rates increasing 6.5% over three years, etc.). The quality improvement process requires a willingness to identify what you are not doing well and addressing it for improvement. It appears at times that Kirtland is looking for positive data to show the college is doing well without looking objectively at results. Greater alignment between results and processes may provide KCC with better data for interpretation.</p>
------------------------------------	---

2I1. Based on 2R1, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next 1 – 3 years.

<p style="text-align: center;">Evaluation of Improvement Efforts</p>
<p>KCC is making changes in support of the strategic plan, which is a positive step; however, it is not clear which data are being used to inform these changes. No improvements are described based on the data provided in the Results section. Without data-based decisions and evaluation of processes, it is difficult to ascertain whether changes are resulting in actual improvements. Data on EMC students are being used to inform future changes; however, these results and improvements are not aligned with the Processes discussed earlier. It may be worthwhile to consider engaging faculty, staff, and students in considering data and improvements to draw in rich institutional connections apparently not being tapped currently.</p>

2P2. **Retention, Persistence, and Completion** focuses on the approach to collecting, analyzing and distributing data on retention, persistence and completion to stakeholders for decision-making. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

<p style="text-align: center;">Process</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Team Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement</p>
<p>Collecting student retention, persistence, and completion data</p>	<p>Kirtland is systematic in its processes for collecting retention, persistence and completion data. These data are collected by the Director of Institutional Research on a regularly scheduled cycle, and information utilized is generated through the Jenzabar system. All students are tagged with a cohort that provides consistency in data for the various retention, persistence and completion measures. It may be beneficial for Kirtland to consider developing a completion rate measure that encompasses all of its student body in addition to IPEDS completion rates, which are limited to only first time, full-time students.</p>
<p>Determining targets for student retention, persistence, and completion</p>	<p>Kirtland is systematic in its approach to determining targets for persistence, retention and completion. State averages function as targets, and KCC is beginning to break down silos by having cross-functional teams analyze the data. To</p>

	<p>mature in this area, KCC might report specifically on which personnel review which data (and what the regular cycle is for each review), along with the ways in which the cross-functional teams use the data.</p>
<p>Analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion</p>	<p>Kirtland is at the beginning stages of systematic in analyzing retention and completion data. The DIR post the data, so relevant committees and other constituents have access to utilize the data, including survey results, which may indicate where potential problem areas are contributing to less than optimal results. Although an example is provided of how the administration and Transitional Studies Committee reviewed the impact of developmental studies on retention and then developed an intervention to address the issue, it is not otherwise clear who analyzes data and when on an ongoing basis (cycle). It may be beneficial to Kirtland to further document who does what and when.</p>
<p>Meeting targets for retention, persistence, and completion</p>	<p>Kirtland appears to be at the systematic level. As part of the Strategic Plan, KCC has a target of ranking in the top 10 of Michigan community colleges for retention, persistence, and completion. Early alerts, progress reports, and academic advisors are all used to help meet this overall target, but the portfolio does not specify how these strategies are tracked for effectiveness. Projects such as Credit When It's Due and Project Win-Win also have yearly targets that have been met, although the portfolio does not specify what they are or for how long they have been tracked.</p>
<p>Selecting tools/methods/instruments used to assess retention, persistence, and completion</p>	<p>Kirtland appears to be in early stages of systematizing its approach to selecting tools to assess persistence, retention and completion. While specific data points are referenced, the portfolio contains minimal description of a clear process for selecting such tools or for a mechanism for evaluating the effectiveness of the process for choosing them. In addition to clarifying its process for selecting tools, it might be beneficial to Kirtland to review its measurements for retention and completion to ensure that all of its students (full-time, part-time, transfer in, etc.) are reflected in the methodologies utilized and that those analyzing the data and making decisions fully understand the student cohort type encompassed in each data set used.</p>
<p>Other identified processes</p>	

2R2. What are the results for student retention, persistence and completion?

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized	Several forms of institutional level data are tracked, including national, state, and peer college comparisons—reflecting a systematic level. Retention measures developed in an AQIP project are also mentioned, including reported fall-to-fall retention and developmental course success trends. It would be helpful to clarify which of the reported results address progress toward the stated goal to rank in the top 10 of Michigan community colleges according to retention and graduation. The results seem to lack the intention of connecting the data across campus and institutional levels, so to mature, KCC might consider developing mechanisms by which cross-functional teams regularly and intentionally analyze the data for decision-making purposes.
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Kirtland appears to be at the systematic level in its summary results for retention, persistence and completion. A plethora of results are provided, including comparative and trend data. Decision-makers at the highest level appear to grasp the pertinence of these data and to analyze them in order to plan actions. Summarizing data in ways that help draw connections between data sets and across campus levels, along with using cross-functional teams to regularly and intentionally analyze the data for decision-making, could increase maturity.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Kirtland appears to be at the systematic level in its comparison results with internal targets and external benchmarks for retention, persistence and completion. Many results are provided, including comparative and trend data; however, it is not clear what the targets are for the metrics provided. Specifying targets and further engaging faculty, staff and students with the data might help to increase maturity.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Kirtland appears to be at the beginning stages of the systematic level. Some interpretation of the data presented is provided; however, many comments are either primarily observational or not entirely supported by the data presented: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved completion and graduation rates are attributed to institutional efforts, such as OAR, advising, and other support services promoting first-time student success, but it is also noted that course offerings increased at multiple campus locations and online during the same time frame. • Fall enrollments decreased nearly 200 students from 12/13 to 14/15, but in a later remark, this decline is then mentioned as “slightly skewing the numbers.”

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In other places KCC focuses only on positive results and does not provide interpretation for improvement when KCC results fall below average. <p>Identifying measures that will provide diagnostic data and more reliance on data analysis to gain insight could help maturity.</p>
--	---

2I2. Based on 2R2, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next 1 – 3 years.

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
<p>Improvements discussed include cross training of SFS and SS staff and the adoption of a new ASA degree, but these are not related to the results presented, and there is no mention of the data used to make these decisions. Two crucial points remain unclear from the portfolio: (1) How did decision-makers arrive at the conclusion to make these changes? That is, what data did the decision-makers review, and what was their interpretation of the data to lead them to land at these particular changes? (2) What are the measurable effects of these changes intended to be? While some recent improvements seem based on data from this section (e.g., student retention action project, Title III grant), such improvements are not discussed here. Changes made to the structure of developmental English may be argued as suggested by the presented data, but such a link is not explicitly clarified. Follow up on impacts of the newly implemented structure of developmental English would seem to present the institution with a key opportunity to integrate course level student performance data with institutional level retention and graduation rate data. Drawing upon such an example may be worthwhile toward identifying further ways to connect direct measures throughout the student experience at Kirtland.</p>

2P3. **Key Stakeholder Needs** focuses on determining, understanding and meeting needs of key stakeholder groups including alumni and community partners. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

Process	Team Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Determining key external stakeholder groups (e.g., alumni, employers, community)	KCC appears to be emerging into systematic maturity. The portfolio states that KCC focuses on connecting with the following key external stakeholder groups: Community, Legislators, Education, and Organizations/Agencies. Stakeholder relationships are built through the strategic planning summit every five years. Providing more information on how KCC determines the stakeholder groups and how subgroups are identified within these broad categories could increase maturity.
Determining new stakeholders to target for services or partnership	While KCC states that administrators engage in activities to determine new stakeholders to target, the actions described appear to be largely ad hoc and informal. The lack of a clear and evaluated process—in which parties assigned the

	responsibility review on a regular schedule data on predetermined measures—keeps KCC at the reacting level. Formalizing the process for determining new stakeholders and identifying data to understand how best to serve these groups could increase maturity.
Meeting the changing needs of key stakeholders	Kirtland has established communication structures with its key external stakeholders—community, legislators, education, and organizations/agencies—to ensure that the relationships with those stakeholders maintain alignment with their respective needs. Thus, KCC is at the systematic level. Feasibility studies are utilized, and Kirtland uses the renewal of its strategic plan, which occurs on a five-year cycle, to evaluate the college’s alignment with the changing needs of its constituents. To mature in this area, Kirtland might consider developing a means for formally evaluating how effective its processes for meeting stakeholders’ needs are.
Selecting tools/methods/instruments to assess key stakeholder needs	Although direct communication is reported as the best method of assessing stakeholder need, it is unclear by what mechanisms such practice has been deemed superior to best CQI practices and proven tools/instruments mentioned as having been reviewed. The institution is encouraged to consider delineating how the process is evaluated and might be adjusted better to meet the evolving nature of various stakeholder needs, particularly when direct communication is prone to be unreliable or unfeasible, toward advancing beyond the current reacting level of maturity
Assessing the degree to which key stakeholder needs are met	The Plan-Do-Study-Act method can be useful in assessing the effectiveness of projects in meeting the needs of individual stakeholders. However, the portfolio includes no examples of how the PDSA method has been implemented or of how data/evidence have been collected and analyzed in any of KCC’s relationship with key stakeholder groups. Thus, KCC remains at the reacting level. In addition, to improve maturity in this area, Kirtland could consider developing a process for formally assessing the collective impact of such projects on meeting key stakeholder needs.
Other identified processes	

2R3. What are the results for determining if key stakeholder needs are being met?

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized	The institutional data presented appear disconnected from potential outcomes/measures available from other areas with regards to meeting stakeholder needs. Expanding the sources of

	data incorporated, particularly for stakeholders other than students, and connecting these to strategic planning and other overarching campus goals may provide a richer understanding of KCC's value to the community and help it advance beyond a reacting level of maturity in this area.
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Summary results, including tables and figures, are provided for community education, affordability, dual enrollment, and scholarships; however, no results are provided to evaluate whether these services are meeting stakeholder needs, thus keeping KCC at the reacting level.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Kirtland remains at the reacting level in comparison results for determining if key stakeholder needs are being met. External comparisons for college affordability and transparency and trending data for majority of measures are utilized; however, targets and benchmarks appear to be otherwise absent from the portfolio. To mature, Kirtland may find it helpful to set both internal targets and external benchmarks—and then to compare the results collected against those pre-set targets.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Without context of targets, benchmarks, or over-arching campus wide connections, interpretations of the data provided seem observational rather than the result of analysis. The impact of the decisions to prioritize efforts towards a Health Sciences Center at one location over community ed classes is not analyzed. The descriptions in the portfolio seem, therefore, reflective of a reacting level of maturity.

2I3. Based on 2R3, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next 1 – 3 years.

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
While KCC reports that it plans to make improvements, it is not clear which data were used to inform the improvements listed. No improvements are discussed based on the results provided, and neither the results nor the improvements are aligned with the key stakeholder groups identified in the processes.

2P4. **Complaint Processes** focuses on collecting, analyzing and responding to complaints from students or key (non-employee) stakeholder groups. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

Process	Team Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Collecting complaint information from students	Kirtland has in place clear policies, procedures and methods for collecting complaint information from students, placing the college at the systematic level. The portfolio states that each policy/procedure is handled by a specified individual or department. Explaining how the complaint information is

	coordinated and communicated across the institution may increase maturity. KCC might also consider reporting how it has built into its processes mechanisms for tracking the nature, involved parties and resolution of complaints, in order to identify patterns of concern.
Collecting complaint information from other key stakeholders	Kirtland appears to have begun to implement more systematic processes in the collection of complaint information from other key stakeholders than it has historically. Processes for electronically submitting and collecting complaints and suggestions/concerns appear now to be in place for key stakeholders. Processes for faculty to submit academic misconduct complaints are also now reported. In order to mature beyond the current systematic level, KCC might engage groups across campus or across locations in reviewing corresponding processes.
Learning from complaint information and determining actions	By permitting the tracking of pertinent aspects of complaints, the Maxient software has poised Kirtland to move beyond its current reacting level. By collecting data on the nature of complaints, the parties involved and the resolutions, KCC might systematize its approach to learning from complaints across the institution.
Communicating actions to students and other key stakeholders	Appropriate timelines and communication mechanisms are described for responding to individuals who have submitted a complaint. The institution is encouraged to consider how the effectiveness of these communication practices are reviewed and the way in which cross-unit/interdepartmental involvements are supported, e.g., by keeping everyone informed internally yet assigning to one party the responsibility to communicating to all individuals who have submitted a complaint. The implementation of an intentional evaluation might help advance the institution beyond the current systematic level of maturity.
Selecting tools/methods/instruments to evaluate complaint resolution	No processes have been discussed concerning the selection of methods for evaluating complaint resolution. For example, Maxient software is currently used, yet the process by which it was selected and is continually evaluated for effectiveness is not described in the report, reflective of a reacting level of maturity. Information on complaints not entered into Maxient are kept in files, but the tools used to track this information is not specified beyond administrator and department review.
Other identified processes	

2R4. What are the results for student and key stakeholder complaints? This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of the following:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized	Kirtland has identified appropriate measures to track information on complaints; however, the limited amount of data collected could be an indication of a lack of effectiveness, which suggests that the College is at the beginning stages of being systematic . For example, in a 2013 survey, mentioned in a previous section, nearly 73% of the faculty responding reported that plagiarism is a moderate to serious problem at the college; but only eight complaints of academic dishonesty have been reported since 2014. It would be helpful to clarify whether the low number of complaints across the board is the result of a reluctance to report incidents and complaints/issues or if it reflects positive conditions proactively supported on campus locations and in online communities. Ensuring that Kirtland’s complaint systems are effective can improve maturity in this area.
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	The summary of results was minimal due to limited availability of data. To mature beyond the reacting level, KCC might consider reporting how it tracks the nature, involved parties, and resolution of complaints in order to identify patterns of concern.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	In other parts of the report, results are minimally compared against peer, state, and national averages. References were previously made to communicating with high performing peer institutions to identify best practices. The institution is encouraged to consider these opportunities as a starting point for generating meaningful benchmarks and targets, which might help advance current practice beyond a reacting level of maturity.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	There was little or no interpretation of the results, and no insights were reported—indicating that KCC is at the reacting level.

2I4. Based on 2R4, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next 1 – 3 years.

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
Improvements to expand capabilities for reporting in the current complaint process are described. In parallel, the institution is encouraged to strengthen its process for proactively drawing information from the data and introducing additional mechanisms for analyzing system usage rates. An example question that such an approach may begin to address is whether the low number of complaints/reports is due to low usage rates, pointing to a possible need for bringing underlying issues to the surface, or due to positive impacts of campus initiatives, indicating practices that might be considered for deployment or adaptation in other areas of campus planning.

2P5. **Building Collaborations and Partnerships** focuses on aligning, building, and determining the effectiveness of collaborations and partnerships to further the mission of the institution. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

Process	Team Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Selecting partners for collaboration (e.g., other educational institutions, civic organizations, businesses)	Through campus-wide networking opportunities, Kirtland learns of potential partnerships in communities within its service area. Such potential partners are considered in relationship to strategic planning goals. While this process generates partners for collaboration in support of the strategic plan, the College may want to consider how it might be more targeted and effective in making connections with potential partners, especially in terms of how it could leverage such partnerships to align its operations and move beyond the current systematic level.
Building and maintaining relationships with partners	The portfolio states that KCC uses meetings and ongoing conversations to build and maintain relationships with partners—an hoc and informal approach. Kirtland might consider how more formal processes and goals might be used to increase maturity beyond the current reacting level.
Selecting tools/methods/instruments to assess partnership effectiveness	Kirtland appears to be poised to move to the next level in selecting tools/methods/instruments for assessing partnership effectiveness. For example, performance of students who transferred out to four-years institutions is an appropriate measure for the effectiveness of Kirtland's community mission. Developing formal measures for other types of partnerships might be beneficial, as it appears that currently the selection process is informal and inconsistently applied; additionally, identifying measures to evaluate the efficacy of the tools/methods/instruments chosen might further increase maturity beyond the current reacting level.
Evaluating the degree to which collaborations and partnerships are effective	Although there are signs that KCC is poised to attain the next level in evaluating some partnerships, overall it appears that Kirtland is currently operating at a reactive level. Sample reasons provided in the portfolio for the discontinuation of partnerships may provide insight into some of the areas that Kirtland might consider and address during the relationship-building and maintaining stages of a partnership. However, the needs of partners typically evolve over time, and evaluating partnerships on a regular cycle and having open, honest and transparent dialogue on strategic synergy can allow partners an opportunity to adapt relationships accordingly and might minimize the dissolution of

	partnerships.
Other identified processes	

2R5. What are the results for determining if students possess the knowledge, skills, and abilities that are expected at each degree level?

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized	KCC reports data on four measures selected to indicate its effectiveness at building collaborative relationships: data on transfer to and from other institutions; GPA data of KCC transfer students at other institutions (as compared to the GPA averages of students from other two-year schools); the number of concurrent nursing students; and the number of hours offered through Workforce Development. These data are meant to act as indicators of KCC's relationships with other institutions of higher education and with the local community and workers and indicate that KCC is beginning to systematize its approach in this area. The outcomes/measures tracked do not seem to reflect the range of stakeholder groups, partnerships, and possible assessment methods introduced in the previous section. The institution is encouraged to consider tracking and reporting measures of effectiveness that reflect the breadth of progress with college partnerships, as well as contributions to overarching strategic goals.
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Summary data are provided for transfer partners and workforce development; however, results focus on student characteristics and do not directly address the effectiveness of the partnerships, thus suggesting that KCC remains at a reacting level.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Kirtland demonstrated systematic use of external benchmarking for the comparison of the performance of transfer students from other community colleges to four-year institutions and evaluated the number of transfer students to and from other Michigan institutions. Although trending over time was used in many instances, there was no comparison of performance against targets or goals. Establishing such aspirational benchmarks might allow KCC to move to higher levels of maturity in this area.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	While some of the data included suggest the impact of KCC's collaborations, the portfolio does not include enough context to permit effective interpretation—keeping the maturity level at reacting . The portfolio does not make clear how the data reported are intended to lead to action. In a previous analysis, a decline of ten students retained to the second year of the Early Middle College program prompted active improvement efforts. Here an identical numerical decline may be observed in second year retention for concurrent nursing students (representing a larger overall

	percentage of students than in the EMC program), yet apparently this decline did not motivate a similar response. Likewise, while contact hours/seats have held relatively steady, contact hours and enrollments in workforce development programs have declined appreciably in the past three years. KCC might consider how the numbers reported compare to those of other institutions, if trends are upward or downward, and how differences might be explained and effectively addressed.
--	---

2I5. Based on 2R5, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next 1 – 3 years.

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
Kirtland reports that its strategic plan lays out goals for collaborative relationships, but the portfolio includes no description of plans for ensuring that those goals are met. KCC recognizes that the lack of a central database and process for collecting and analyzing data on partnerships is affecting maturity in this area; however, no plans for the development of a central repository are described. Given that the Strategic Plan includes goals for developing local business and non-profit partnerships, KCC is encouraged to integrate into future strategic planning efforts the setting of targets and the tracking of metrics for these goals. The development of such plans (with clearly articulated targets/goals for each relationship, as well as a means of tracking the ability of the relationship to help KCC meet its strategic goals) and of such a database will help Kirtland mature.

AQIP Category Three

VALUING EMPLOYEES explores the institution’s commitment to the hiring, development, and evaluation of faculty, staff, and administrators.

3P1. **Hiring** focuses on the acquisition of appropriately qualified/credentialed faculty, staff, and administrators to ensure that effective, high-quality programs and student support services are provided. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

Process	Team Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Recruiting, hiring, and orienting employees	Prior to posting an open position, supervisors, department heads, and administrators review the position to make sure that it is needed, structured appropriately, compensated appropriately (goal is above the 50 th percentile of colleges nationally, based on CUPA data), and is funded in the budget. Supervisors work with HR to recruit, hire, and orient qualified applicants. Media used for recruiting include the KCC website and Facebook page, professional associations, newspapers, <i>The Chronicle of Higher Education</i> , <i>higheredjobs.com</i> , and MLive. Orientation of new employees is a coordinated effort between HR and supervisors. Peer mentors are provided to all full-time faculty and are available for other employees. An orientation course in Canvas has been created for part-time faculty. All of these efforts indicate that KCC is

	<p>systematic. Specifying how all processes are evaluated might increase maturity. Given the advantages for hiring from within the institution, the college may want to consider using professional development plans to identify and develop potential in-house candidates.</p>
Designing hiring processes that result in staff and administrators who possess the required qualification, skills, and values	<p>KCC is at the systematic level for hiring and orienting employees, with a clear process that includes parties assigned specific responsibilities and forms and structures in place. If not doing so already, Kirtland might consider the administration of criminal background checks in tandem with credential reviews. Specifying how these processes are evaluated (particularly against the ability of the college to meet its strategic goals) and how wider input beyond the supervisor and peers is elicited early on may increase maturity.</p>
Developing and meeting academic credentialing standards for faculty, including those in dual credit, contractual, and consortia programs	<p>KCC's <i>Faculty Credentialing Review Process</i> specifies that the determination of appropriate credentials is the responsibility of deans and directors, with final validation by the VPIS. Minimal faculty requirements are based on HLC and Perkins Grant standards, with the additional requirements determined by industry standards or other disciplinary-specific standards. In winter 2016, a full review was completed of all faculty credentials. All of these efforts indicate that KCC is systematic. KCC might consider adding a process verifying that each faculty member vetted by a consortium partner (e.g., the radiology program) is also affirmed by Kirtland as meeting Kirtland requirements, if this process is not already in place. As HLC expectations are changing, such an approach might (1) help provide Kirtland the assurance that partner institutions' faculty qualification standards are aligned with both Kirtland's and the new HLC faculty credential requirements and (2) eliminate any compliance exposure in this area moving forward.</p>
Ensuring the institution has sufficient numbers of faculty to carry out both classroom and non-classroom programs and activities	<p>Kirtland appears to be at a systematic stage in its processes for ensuring sufficient numbers of faculty members. Processes, procedures, and responsibilities are in place for developing course schedules and faculty assignments. Kirtland's relationship with EDUStaff to help provide a broader and deeper potential part-time faculty pool appears to be an important step due to the challenges that KCC faces due to its rural location, its having multiple campuses, and its need to comply with the Family Medical Leave Act and the Affordable Care Act. While KCC noted that the VP of Business Services leads the program review process, it might be helpful to clarify faculty's role as well. The College is encouraged to identify measures for evaluating if the number of faculty for staffing classrooms and carrying out non-classroom roles is sufficient.</p>
Ensuring the acquisition of	<p>The descriptions in the Portfolio for how KCC ensures the acquisition of sufficient numbers of staff indicate that the College is at the reacting</p>

sufficient numbers of staff to provide student support services	level. Data on enrollment and demographics, statewide trends, and past staffing patterns are all used to determine needs; however, the approach appears to be informal without clearly defined and repeated steps or pre-selected measures that can be tracked to determine effectiveness.
---	--

3R1. What are the results for determining if recruitment, hiring, and orienting practices assure effective provision for programs and services?

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized	Outcomes concerning employee satisfaction, turn-over rates, average employee age by grouping, full-time/part-time employee count trends, and full-time faculty credentialing trends are presented. It would be helpful to clarify, perhaps in the processes section, how these measures are intended to provide a coordinated evaluation of success in recruitment, hiring, and orientation practices. Such clarifications may serve to advance the institution beyond the current systematic level of maturity.
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	KCC includes a number of data points, with trend data included for several measures and with some measures (in particular turn-over rates and faculty credentialing data) being directly linked to processes described. What might help the College mature beyond its current reacting level, however, is to make an explicit link between the reported data points and the processes the measures are intended to shed light on. For example, while the College tracks and reports the total number of employees in specific occupational categories, what remains unclear is if those numbers are sufficient and effective.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	No internal targets are identified, and no comparative data are provided. Although IPEDS data are used, the IPEDS comparison data are not included. KCC is at the reacting level.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Minimal interpretation of the results is provided. The fact that the data included are not clearly aligned with recruiting, hiring and orientation makes interpretation difficult. KCC is at the reacting level.

3I1. Based on 3R1, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next 1 – 3 years.

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
KCC reports several changes already made (contracting with EDUStaff and attendance at a job fair), as well as some planned changes. What remains unclear from the portfolio, however, is how decision-makers arrived at the conclusion to make these changes. That is, what data did the decision-makers review, and what was their interpretation of the data to lead them to land at these particular changes? It may be beneficial to Kirtland to establish evaluative measures for its relationships with EDUStaff. Surveying employees to get their input into recent changes made to strengthen employee orientations would appear to be an important next step in being able to determine the effectiveness of these changes and to inform any additional changes required moving forward.

3P2. **Evaluation and Recognition** focuses on processes that assess and recognize faculty, staff, and administrators' contributions to the institution. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

Process	Team Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Designing performance evaluation systems for all employees	Kirtland appears to be operating at the systematic level of designing evaluation systems for new employees. Kirtland has adopted evaluation tools and established timeframes, policies, and procedures for evaluating both full and part-time faculty, the president, administrators and new staff. Additionally, as a standard practice KCC has identified those responsible for conducting the evaluation. Procedures for remediation, probation or dismissal appear to be well defined; however, it does not appear from the information provided that Kirtland has a formal ongoing evaluation process for staff after initial probation period review. A formal evaluation mechanism for regular review of staff would be beneficial. Specifying how the evaluation processes are aligned with institutional goals may increase maturity.
Soliciting input from and communicating expectations to faculty, staff, and administrators	The approaches described for soliciting input from and communicating expectations to employees seem largely ad hoc and informal, keeping KCC at the reacting level. To mature, the College might consider building into its schedule required and tracked interactions between employees and supervisors around expectations. Important will be the selection of measures that can be tracked over time: What indicators will help leaders know if they are (1) effectively soliciting input from and (2) effectively communicating expectations to employees?
Aligning the evaluation system with institutional objectives for both	While the portfolio describes many activities around strategic planning and professional development opportunities, what keeps KCC at the reacting level is that no mention is made of an intentional mechanism by which leaders have aligned the

instructional and non-instructional programs and services	evaluation processes at the college with broader institutional objectives. The expectations mentioned for communication and listening by administrative supervisors appear reflective of a reacting approach. Additionally, the comment, “[w]hat is satisfactory performance this year will not necessarily be so the next year,” seems especially reactionary and counter to the goals for an inclusive environment of continuous improvement and measurable targets in support of effective processes.
Utilizing established institutional policies and procedures to regularly evaluate all faculty, staff, and administrators	KCC has the foundation for moving to the next level of maturity above its current reacting . It has documented processes used to evaluate administrators and staff (Board Policy and Procedure 5.050) and to evaluate full-time faculty (FMA). However, it appears that the college evaluates non-probationary employees only on an informal basis, as that approach is reported as fitting with its institutional culture. Collecting effectiveness and employee satisfaction data around evaluations could validate this method or identify opportunities for improvement.
Establishing employee recognition, compensation, and benefit systems to promote retention and high performance	KCC uses compensation comparisons that have changed over the years in order to maintain fair and competitive compensation ranges. Employee benefit packages include a range of medical and professional development benefits. Several employee recognition activities exist: peer-to-peer recognition events, employee achievements (including in the monthly BOT report), years-of-service pins and plaques, and recognition for wellness activities participation. More fully describing processes (who does what and when, what data are used, etc.), and strengthening the discussion of how processes proactively draw upon inclusiveness, including developing meaningful employee recognitions (which seems to not have been included here), may help advance institutional maturity beyond the current systematic level.
Promoting employee satisfaction and engagement	While a mix of employee recognition activities and service awards are reported, the examples provided appear to be reacting : they are employee-generated social activities to build community instead of the result of an intentional, systematic process to recognize employees—the establishment of which constitutes an opportunity for KCC. Participation in committees, both internally and externally, as well as in professional associations is encouraged, and sabbaticals for faculty and professional improvement leave programs for staff are in place; however, no mention is made of how these structures are evaluated for promoting satisfaction. Employee surveys are conducted annually to garner input from employees, but it is not clear how the results are used in promoting satisfaction and engagement. Being more intentional in continuing to develop a collaborative culture that ensures that employees at all

	levels feel empowered to contribute and identifying and tracking measures to evaluate satisfaction and engagement might enable KCC to mature to the next level.
--	---

3R2. What are the results for determining if evaluation processes assess employees' contributions to the institution?

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized	The data points included in the portfolio indicate that KCC is at the beginning stages of the systematic level for the outcomes/measures it tracks to determine how effective it is at determining if its evaluation processes assess employees' contributions to the institution. Employee satisfaction data are included, as is a sample of results from a 360 Review. However, other notes in this section acknowledge that much of the culture at KCC is informal. The college has the opportunity to mature by (1) formalizing more of its processes and (2) clarifying what the measures are for employee performance evaluations and how the results of all the measures help determine if evaluation processes assess employees' contributions to the institution.
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	The Employee Satisfaction Survey results provided do not specify the sample size, response rate, or rating scale and do not break the results down by the different employee groups discussed in Processes. A review of such data would be necessary for using the results for decision-making, especially since processes in the section vary by employee group (e.g., FT faculty, PT faculty, staff, administrators). No data are provided for employee performance evaluations. Overall, the college remains at the reacting level.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Kirtland is at the beginning stages of systematizing its use of comparative data. Employee satisfaction data have been trended, and statewide comparisons for turn-over rates are provided. To mature, the college might consider setting targets for employee satisfaction data: What response average would leaders like to see on certain survey questions? Why were those targets set? How do decision-makers hope to be able to determine whether the results reported indicate success or failure?
Interpretation of results and insights gained	There is little to no interpretation of the results reported, keeping KCC at the reacting level. It is not clear who is responsible for interpreting the data and what decision-makers do with the results.

3I2. Based on 3R2, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next 1 – 3 years.

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
The improvements discussed do not seem to be based on the results presented. Several improvements have been reported in the area of employee evaluations. The implementation of a more systematic recognition system might, in particular, help the college mature in this area. In addressing multi-location concerns with the recent Grayling location opening, the institution is encouraged to consider ways to engage employees in developing shared processes for the engagement of multi-location and online community members. Along with these processes measurable goals and targets should be developed for guiding continuing improvement opportunities.

3P3. **Development** focuses on processes for continually training, educating, and supporting employees to remain current in their methods and to contribute fully and effectively throughout their careers within the institution. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

Process	Team Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Providing and supporting regular professional development for all employees	KCC has several policies to ensure professional development for all regular employees including Professional Improvement Leave (POL 5.075), Tuition Free College Courses for Employees (POL 5.170), Financial Support for Professional Development (POL 5.430), and faculty advancement, sabbatical leave and professional development leave (FMA). Professional development funds beyond those in departmental budgets are also available to administrators and staff for professional meetings, conferences, workshops needed to keep current in the field. These efforts place KCC at the systematic level. Specifying how the professional development is periodically evaluated to ensure that it is meeting the needs of the employees and the institution may increase maturity.
Ensuring that instructors are current in instructional content in their disciplines and pedagogical processes	KCC is emerging into the systematic level. It reports that it has in place certain mechanisms (the Strategic Plan, the FMA, the Faculty Evaluation/Professional Development Committee and the CTL) to encourage professional development and currency; however, what remains unclear is how KCC evaluates the effectiveness of these mechanisms.
Supporting student support staff members to increase their skills and knowledge in their areas of	The inclusion of expectations in job descriptions/dimensions and financial support for professional development activities poises KCC to move beyond its current level of reacting . To mature, the college is encouraged to develop clearly defined processes for tracking and evaluating its effectiveness at ensuring that employees fulfill the requirements listed in the job descriptions.

expertise (e.g. advising, financial aid, etc.)	
Aligning employee professional development activities with institutional objectives	The approaches described in the Portfolio for how KCC aligns professional development with institutional objectives are ad hoc and informal, keeping KCC at the reacting level. No mention is made of an intentional mechanism by which leaders have aligned the professional development processes at the college with broader institutional objectives. What might help the college mature, for example, is the inclusion in sabbatical, trainings or CTL opportunities an explicit and intentional connection to the institution's strategic goals—and a subsequent review of the impact of those activities on an employee's ability to promote the associated strategic goals.

3R3. What are the results for determining if employees are assisted and supported in their professional development?

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized	Some of the measures tracked indicate that KCC is at the beginning stages of systematic in the outcomes/measures it tracks for determining if employees are assisted and supported in their professional development. Several measures are directly linked to the processes described: employee satisfaction data, funding data, professional membership numbers and dollar amounts, and total credit hours used via scholarships. These data shed light on employee development and satisfaction. The inclusion of more direct measures of the effectiveness of activities and processes beyond participation data may improve maturity. (Note: While the results of wellness programs may relate to benefits provided for employees, the portfolio does not clarify how these results constitute an appropriate measurement of how the institution assists and supports employees' professional development.)
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Several measures are directly linked to the processes described, and many of the data points are also trended, suggesting that the college is emerging into a systematic level of maturity. KCC's maturity could be further developed if it breaks down data to show results for different employee groups and tracks professional development expenditures per number of employees.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	No internal targets or external benchmarks are provided, placing KCC at the reacting level.
Interpretation of	While the portfolio includes emerging analyses of certain data

results and insights gained	points, it fails to include any insights gained about areas to improve. For example, were any patterns or areas of concern identified? Kirtland remains at the reacting level.
-----------------------------	---

3I3. Based on 3R3, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next 1 – 3 years.

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
The initiative to move beyond a simple tracking of the amount of professional development funds spent toward the development of measures of effectiveness of professional development programming is a very positive step. Similarly positive is the fact that the development of the ETC originated from faculty survey data that indicated the faculty’s desire to collaborate with the CTL in further developing their pedagogy and sharing ideas across the curriculum to eliminate silos. The college is encouraged to follow through on these improvements. Closing the loop—evaluating processes by using data and making improvements based on what is learned—might help the KCC mature.

AQIP Category Four

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

4P1. **Mission and Vision** focuses on how the institution develops, communicates, and reviews its mission and vision. Describe the processes for developing, communicating, and reviewing the institution’s mission, vision, and values and who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

Process	Team Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Developing, deploying, and reviewing the institution's mission, vision, and values	Kirtland is at the beginning stages of becoming aligned in the review of its mission documents. Kirtland reviews and revises its mission, vision, and values on a five-year cycle, during its strategic plan review process. Kirtland has developed and deployed a robust, iterative process of engaging its board of trustees, administrators, and employees in revising the mission, vision, and values. Finding ways to incorporate outside stakeholders and students in this process might help Kirtland to further mature in this area. Furthermore, Kirtland might consider establishing measures (and targets—desired levels for those measures) that might indicate how effective its planning and mission document review processes are. The tracking of such measures as survey questions on employee perceptions of and satisfaction with inclusion in planning or stakeholder perceptions of and satisfaction with newly revised mission documents might provide leaders with insight into the effectiveness and impact of their planning and mission review techniques.

<p>Ensuring that institutional actions reflect a commitment to its values</p>	<p>Kirtland appears to be at the reacting stage in regards to its processes to ensure that its ongoing actions reflect a commitment to its values. It is clear from KCC's response that the institution is committed to its values, and there is some evidence demonstrating this commitment. However, a formal process for ensuring such commitment is not described. An example might be how Kirtland ensures that new AQIP action projects are aligned with the mission, vision, and values as they are designed. Including checkpoints in the budget process (e.g., how does this project/process/purchase/etc. demonstrate our values?) might help ensure ongoing alignment. It might also be beneficial to KCC to consider reviewing how objectives and initiatives in the long-range plan reflect the college's values to better ensure that ongoing actions/priorities remain aligned with them as intended.</p>
<p>Communicating the mission, vision, and values</p>	<p>KCC's use of a variety of ways to communicate its mission, vision, and values to its employees, indicate that it is emerging into a systematic level of maturity. Considering additional means by which the mission documents are communicated to students and external stakeholders and assessing the effectiveness of the multitude of ways it communicates its mission documents to its identified constituent groups could further strengthen maturity in this area. The development and linkage of academic program mission statements with the College Mission indicate a commitment to moving toward higher levels of maturity. It might be beneficial to KCC to think about how it will measure its effectiveness in developing and retaining this linkage over time and to also ensure that the review cycles for the College Mission trigger review of the subordinate program mission statements in order to support ongoing alignment.</p>
<p>Ensuring that academic programs and services are consistent with the institution's mission</p>	<p>KCC appears to be at a reacting stage of maturity in ensuring that academic programs and services are consistent with the institution's mission. The portfolio states that KCC ensures that academic programs and services are consistent by incorporating the mission into the strategic plan. However, KCC does not explain what strategies are used and precisely how incorporating the mission into the strategic plan in and of itself ensures consistency of academic programs with the mission. As noted previously in the appraisal, the portfolio indicates that each academic program develops a mission statement that connects to the College's Mission. Such connection suggests that the college is beginning to further mature its approach to ensuring that academic programs are consistent with the institution's mission. However, to build on that growth, Kirtland is encouraged to collect and report data on the effectiveness of its approach. What mechanisms could be put into place that could</p>

	result in data on measures that indicate effectiveness?
Allocating resources to advance the institution's mission and vision, while upholding the institution's values	It appears that Kirtland has established a budgeting process that is linked to its planning and assessment processes as evidenced by the Kirtland Planning Cycle provided in the portfolio. However, Kirtland has not clearly articulated how it ensures that resources are allocated to advance the institution's mission and vision, while upholding the institutions values. Kirtland may benefit from incorporating in both its planning and budgeting processes an explicit mechanism that requires a cross-walk and review between impact of proposed initiatives and expenditures on the advancement of the institution's mission and value statements (i.e., mission documents). Formalizing this process would support Kirtland's advancement beyond its current reacting stage of development.
Other identified processes	

4R1. What are the results for developing, communicating, and reviewing the institution's mission, vision, and values?

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized	Although KCC reports trend data on survey results, including comparative results from the CCSSE and CCSFE, Kirtland appears to be operating at a reacting level of maturity in its outcomes/measures for developing, communicating and reviewing its mission, vision and values. The link between some of the measures reported and the effectiveness of the institution at developing, communicating, and reviewing its mission is not made explicit. For example, why do leaders believe that the results reported from the Annual Fall Student Survey are indicative of the College's effectiveness at communicating its mission, vision and values? To mature, the College should pre-select clearly relevant measures that will provide actionable data for each communication process.
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Kirtland is at the reacting level in its summary results for developing, communicating and reviewing its mission, vision and values. Kirtland has the opportunity to further mature by (1) selecting and reporting data on measures linked more directly to its processes for communicating its mission and (2) more explicitly contextualizing the data reported (for example, how are reviewers to make sense of the survey data: are the results reported above or below expectations; why were those expectations set?) Trend data are included for some of the measures; however, response rates are missing for the student and employee survey results, and for the employee survey data

	<p>the wording of the scale is not provided and the points of the scale are not comparable across all three years. CCSSE results are missing sample size and response rates. These types of missing elements make it very difficult to interpret results and identify actions for improvement.</p>
<p>Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks</p>	<p>Kirtland appears to be at a reacting level of maturity in its comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks. Although Kirtland provides comparison of CCSSE results, the data appear to include a comparison group of Top Performers but not the average of similar size colleges that the narrative states that KCC benchmarks against. The narrative in the results states that in comparison with other colleges, KCC is average. However, the actual results provided indicate that KCC is well below the Top Performer comparative data provided. Better defining comparative groups and the measurement utilized for comparison would be beneficial as Kirtland works toward higher levels of maturity in this area.</p>
<p>Interpretation of results and insights gained</p>	<p>Several factors indicate that Kirtland remains at the reacting level of maturity in this area. Given the processes described, the rationale behind the decision to report the data included in the results remain unclear. Similarly, the reasons for decision-makers to believe that the measures reported on are indicative of Kirtland’s ability to develop, communicate and review its mission, vision and values remain insufficiently clarified. There is very little interpretation of results shared although some of the items reported raise questions—for example, all CCSSE 2016 items results for student engagement are lower than the prior three measurement periods, but there is no interpretation of this decline and in some cases interpretation is not reflective of the scope of the data provided. Interpretation of results is critical to identifying needed improvements and closing the loop.</p>

411. Based on 4R1, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next 1 – 3 years.

<p>Evaluation of Improvement Efforts</p> <p>KCC seems to be communicating its mission, vision, and values statements widely and incorporating them into ongoing processes, along with mission document review processes. However, KCC appears to be struggling with how to assess the impact of this communication to provide actionable data for improvement. Adopting the practice of surveying constituents in association with millage campaigns is a signal of continuous improvement and data-informed decision making, as it is an evaluation tool that has been adopted as a standard practice at KCC because of the effective use of surveying to</p>

quantify support in a recent millage campaign. Replicating this use of survey data via employee satisfaction data around communication of the mission might prove useful.

4P2. **Strategic Planning** focuses on how the institution achieves its mission and vision. Describe the processes for communicating, planning, implementing, and reviewing the institution’s plans and who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

Process	Team Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Engaging internal and external stakeholders in strategic planning	Kirtland is at the beginning stages of being aligned in its processes for engaging internal and external stakeholders in strategic planning. Kirtland holds strategic planning summits every five years and includes internal and external stakeholders in the appreciative inquiry model to identify strengths and opportunities. It may be beneficial to Kirtland to further clarify how stakeholders are engaged in between the five-year summit cycles and which mechanisms are utilized for evaluating the success of its processes to engage both internal and external stakeholders in strategic planning.
Aligning operations with the institution’s mission, vision, values	<p>KCC is currently systematic, but well positioned to move toward higher levels of maturity, in its planning processes to ensure operations are linked and align with the mission, vision, and values. The operational plan is developed during an annual retreat in alignment to the strategic plan. Measurable goals are identified to address elements in the strategic plan, and a draft of these goals is posted on Google Drive for review and editing. Further refinements are made by the CAT, and the BOT also has a voice in the process. Each goal is assigned to an administrator who is responsible for ensuring it is completed. The plan is then used to inform the budgeting process, AQIP action projects, departmental, and program assessment plans. Progress on goals is evaluated by the CAT and administrator evaluations often include a review of the effectiveness of the administrator in meeting objectives in the Operational Plan for which they are responsible.</p> <p>To further mature, KCC might identify key performance indicators for each of its processes for aligning operations with the mission documents, so that leaders can have evidence to review in determining their effectiveness at aligning operations with the mission. Also, it is not clear from the response how faculty are included in strategic planning or in aligning operations with the</p>

	<p>mission, vision, and values. While the “CAT, directors, and other guests” attend the retreat, it is not clear if faculty are included—faculty are not listed on the organizational chart (Figure 4P2.1). Finding ways to give faculty a place at the table or more clearly articulating their participation in and contributions to the processes could strengthen maturity.</p>
<p>Aligning efforts across departments, divisions, and colleges for optimum effectiveness and efficiency</p>	<p>Reference made to the organizational chart and corresponding supervisory duties do not communicate an intentional process in this area, reflective of a reacting level of maturity. The portfolio states that data is generated on the efficiency of academic programs but does not discuss efficiency of non-academic programs or the methods used for measuring effectiveness overall. More clearly defining and/or developing processes that support aligning efforts to optimize effectiveness and efficiency would aid KCC’s maturation in this area. Furthermore, KCC might consider assessing whether the threat mitigation plan developed has strengthened connections across departments (depending on who was cross-trained) or has fostered greater awareness of what other departments or positions are doing as this could aid in breaking down any silos that may exist within the organization.</p>
<p>Capitalizing on opportunities and institutional strengths and countering the impact of institutional weaknesses and potential threats</p>	<p>KCC appears to be at the beginning stages of operating at a systematic level in capitalizing on opportunities and strengths and minimizing the impact of institutional weaknesses and threats. KCC uses the appreciative inquiry model in the strategic planning process. This model focuses on strengths rather than threats or weaknesses. Committees do address concerns and issues relevant to their goals, and the college learns about negative public perceptions through employee-community involvement. While the appreciative inquiry model appears to be an innovative approach that could be beneficial to planning, it may be helpful for Kirtland to clearly explain how this planning approach is integrated with the AQIP approach of identifying institutional obstacles or areas of weakness in order to improve continuously.</p>
<p>Creating and implementing strategies and action plans that maximize current resources and meet future needs</p>	<p>The College’s strategic plan, operational plan, facilities management plan, five-year budget projections and annual budgeting process support maximizing resources. KCC also seeks and utilizes outside funding (e.g., grant monies) to meet present and future needs. Recognition in 2015 as one of the top 100 nationally for having the lowest net cost for students suggests that this approach has been effective. However, further developing the internal mechanisms utilized to evaluate the effectiveness of these processes may support KCC in moving</p>

	beyond its current systematic stage of development in this area.
Other Identified Processes	

4R2. What are the results for communicating, planning, implementing, and reviewing the institution’s operational plans?

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized	KCC is systematic in its use of outcomes/measures for evaluating the effectiveness of its processes for communicating, planning, implementing and reviewing the institution’s operational plans. Table 4R2.1 lists the indicators of effectiveness selected for most of its operational planning. The existence of such indicators suggests that KCC is poised to further mature in this area. By reporting trends on each of the selected indicators, KCC can demonstrate increasing application of CQI practices. The data reported on employee satisfaction with planning processes provide additional evidence on the effectiveness of such processes. It may be beneficial for Kirtland to focus on developing this type of correlation between processes and measures of effectiveness in other AQIP Categories.
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Data reported relate to the processes described in this category and indicate that Kirtland is at a systematic level of maturity. The data support the planning and budgeting processes and related decision-making. Evaluating the effectiveness of these measures and how they are presented could increase maturity. Furthermore, providing summary results of the indicators of institutional effectiveness that are used to inform strategic planning (Figure 4R2.1) may increase maturity. Utilizing a similar structure of that utilized in Figure 4R2.1 to intentionally align measures of effectiveness directly to processes may help Kirtland advance its institutional quality improvement and institutional effectiveness efforts.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Some trend data were reported, and Figure 4R2.1 indicates that trend data are utilized in several other institutional effectiveness measures. However, targets and benchmarks appear to be otherwise absent from the portfolio, reflecting a reacting maturity level. What results would decision-makers like to see on these measures? Why were those targets set? How do decision-makers hope to be able to determine whether the results reported indicate success or failure? To mature, Kirtland may find it helpful to set both internal targets and external benchmarks—and then to compare the results collected against those pre-set targets. For example, the response in relation to perhaps never being able to

	elevate above “average” in retention rates due to the demographics and socioeconomic status of the students KCC serves may be able to be addressed by using benchmarking against peer institutions with a student population with similar demographic and socioeconomic characteristics. Setting incremental, reasonable and achievable internal targets for improvement may also help KCC advance in this regard.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	While data are reported, the portfolio indicates that KCC remains at the reacting level in terms of interpretation, primarily for two reasons: (1) Many of the data are either not actionable (they do not provide an opportunity to leaders to make decisions on what to do), or no action is reported as having resulted from an analysis of the data provided. (2) The analyses provided in the portfolio do not always reflect the data provided. For example, the portfolio states that completion rates remain a concern; yet, it then goes on to attribute the datum to two causes, without explaining how leaders reached the conclusion that the two named factors were, indeed, causal. As noted previously, in Table 4R1.2 KCC identifies institutional effectiveness measures. It might be beneficial if Kirtland more intentionally directed analyses toward those identified measures.

4I2. Based on 4R2, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next 1 – 3 years.

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts	
Although there are some incongruities in the interpretation of results, the data provided and the pending improvement areas of focus described generally emerge from the measures that are being tracked and close the loop. For example, the data indicate that there is an opportunity for improving communication and ongoing participation in the planning process (in between the very inclusive strategic summits), and Kirtland has recognized and has plans in place to address these gaps. This focus may help further unify the institution across all locations in executing plans and being able to address better the increasing pace of change that was noted as an institutional challenge.	

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

Process	Team Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Establishing appropriate Board-institutional relationships to	Kirtland is at the beginning stages of systematic in establishing appropriate institutional relationships to support leadership and governance. Monthly Board of Trustee meetings as well as special meetings as necessary are conducted. It appears that the Board

support leadership and governance	has established appropriate policies and procedures and has bylaws that are reviewed periodically that set forth the responsibilities of the Board and leadership team. The Board is responsible for hiring and evaluating the performance of the president, to whom it delegates responsibility for the day-to-day operations of the university. Oversight of academic matters is delegated to the vice president of instructional services. Kirtland may want to consider how it could further mature its processes in this area by reviewing and formalizing how the Board and employees “talk and work together.” Without a more clearly articulated approach, it may appear that some individuals have more access to the Board than others, or Board members may feel they’re hearing from employees but are not getting a complete or accurate information. Developing (or describing as it appears from other areas of the report that there may be more processes in place than were articulated here) such an approach would further increase/clarify maturity beyond the institution's current systematic level of development in this area.
Establishing oversight responsibilities and policies of the Governing Board	KCC’s Board of Trustee (BOT) oversight responsibilities and policies are established by the Michigan Community College Act of 1966, as amended, which defines the limits and responsibilities of the board. The BOT’s bylaws were substantially revised in 2013, and BOT policies are regularly reviewed and updated to reflect the current practices of the College. Training is provided to new Board members, and ongoing meetings, retreats and professional development opportunities occur to support the Board in fulfilling their responsibilities and to keep abreast of best practices in higher education governance. Specifying how responsibility and policy review is part of a predictable process and inclusion of evaluation for optimum effectiveness may increase maturity beyond the current aligned level of maturity in this area.
Maintaining board oversight, while delegating management responsibilities to administrators, and academic matters to faculty	Bylaws and policies delineate roles for the BOT and the president and his/her senior leadership team. The BOT is not involved with running the daily operations of Kirtland. As defined in the Kirtland bylaws, this responsibility is delegated to the president and through him/her the administrative team of the university. Academic matters are overseen by the Vice President of Instructional Services. The president communicates with BOT members to build consensus for strategic decisions, and the CIC makes recommendations to the administration and BOT on academic programming and curriculum. More clearly depicting these governance processes and the ongoing relationships among the BOT, administration, and faculty may further increase maturity beyond KCC’s current systematic level. Developing a more

	<p>formal process for ensuring that the BOT has the information and data (dashboard) needed to make effective decisions could also further increase maturity.</p>
<p>Ensuring open communication between and among all colleges, divisions, and departments</p>	<p>KCC recognizes its inherent challenges with communication given the low number of employees, the large area it serves and its four geographically disbursed locations. The existence of several required and repeated activities indicates that KCC is beginning to systematize its approach to ensuring open communication: having administrators rotate among physical locations, holding regularly scheduled CAT meetings, holding a convocation every semester. These regularized occurrences poise KCC to mature in this area. Further expanding mechanisms to measure the effectiveness of these various communication activities and establishing benchmarks to gauge performance might be beneficial to Kirtland. Furthermore, exploring the use of new applications and technologies that support more targeted communication at both a macro and micro levels (small groups of like constituents) might support stronger communication as well as institutional effectiveness. Lastly, tracking communication effectiveness by stakeholder sub-groups, such as faculty, staff and students, might also be beneficial.</p>
<p>Collaborating across all units to ensure the maintenance of high academic standards</p>	<p>The fact that a number of cross-functional bodies exist, such as the CIC, which consists of advisors, financial aid advisors, faculty, deans, and students and is responsible for the review, recommendation and approval all changes to the curriculum, indicates that KCC is beginning to systematize its approach to collaborating across all units to ensure the maintenance of high academic standards. The cross functional membership of the program advisory boards also plays a significant role in ensuring that appropriate academic standards and relevant curriculum are in place. While such teams can break down silos, KCC might mature by evaluating the effectiveness of such teams. What data/evidence might leaders review to help them determine that these cross-functional teams are having the desired impact?</p>
<p>Providing effective leadership to all institutional stakeholders</p>	<p>KCC’s response appropriately assumes that effective leadership starts with the Board, which, per the bylaws, has, among other duties, the responsibility for hiring and evaluating the president, to whom the board delegates the obligations of day-to-day operations. Although the portfolio notes that the president is responsible for managing the college and carrying out the strategic plan, it does not address the other leadership structures at different levels and within the various functional areas of the college. This lack of a comprehensive view of the leadership structures that support all institutional stakeholders is an opportunity area for KCC</p>

	to advance beyond its current reacting level of maturity in providing effective leadership for all stakeholders.
Developing leaders at all levels within the institution	KCC is at a reacting stage in developing leaders at all levels. KCC indicates that leadership development occurs through the evaluation process, professional development funding, and committee participation. Although the Board has developed a succession plan for the president, there does not appear to be an intentional and comprehensive leadership development plan and succession plan within and across the different levels of the organization. The portfolio states that through the flattening of the organizational structure, decision-making is no longer found only at the top levels of administration. However, no process for evaluation is provided, and previous results from the employee surveys suggest that employees are overall not highly satisfied with the success of the evaluation process or with their participation in the decision-making process. Therefore, it might be beneficial to Kirtland to continue to advance these important processes and evaluate results for continued improvement. Furthermore, due to the rural nature of the service area that Kirtland serves, as well as the related challenge of attracting new employees from outside the service area, enhancing its ability to develop leaders from within might be very beneficial to Kirtland.
Ensuring the institution’s ability to act in accordance with its mission and vision	The Michigan Community College Act helps to ensure KCC is acting in accordance with the mission of the Michigan community college system. However, the portfolio describes no formal process for ensuring that the institutions acts in accordance with its mission and vision other than noting that KCC adheres to HLC approvals/requirements and other programmatic accreditation approvals, and that the Board has the ability to change policy as necessary. It would be prudent for KCC to develop (or more clearly describe) processes to ensure more proactively its ability to act in accordance with its mission in order to progress beyond its current reacting stage of development.
Other identified Processes	

4R3. What are the results for ensuring long-term effective leadership of the institution?

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized	KCC is in the early stages of being systematic in its use of outcomes/measures for ensuring long-term effective leadership of the institution. The inclusion of trend data on such indicators as the CCSSE/CCSFE, the employee satisfaction survey and the Chronicle survey suggests that KCC is tracking measures linked to

	its processes in this area. The institution is encouraged to consider strengthening the scope of outcomes and measures tracked, towards providing greater representation of the dimensions of effective leadership envisioned in its processes and achieving a complementary balance of direct measures on the effectiveness of leadership with indirect measures such as the survey results reported. Such changes might help advance Kirtland beyond the current systematic level of maturity.
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	KCC is in the early stages of being systematic in its use of summary results for ensuring long-term effective leadership of the institution. The inclusion of trend data on such indicators as the CCSSE/CCSFE, the employee satisfaction survey and the Chronicle survey suggests that KCC is tracking some measures directly linked to its processes in this area. To mature, KCC might report more explicitly how decision-makers make sense of these outcomes. Many of the data indicate low performances or gaps or patterns that require attention; yet the portfolio includes little to no explanation or contextualization of the results to allow for interpretation.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Some trend data are reported, and The Chronicle – Great Colleges to Work for Survey results allowed for comparison to external institutions before being discontinued. However, targets and benchmarks appear to be otherwise absent from the portfolio, reflecting a reacting maturity level. What results would decision-makers like to see on these measures? Why were those targets set? How do decision-makers hope to be able to determine whether the results reported indicate success or failure? To mature, Kirtland may find it helpful to set both internal targets and external benchmarks—and then to compare the results collected against those pre-set targets. When comparative data are included, KCC is strongly encouraged to include an analysis of why its results are what they are in comparison to other institutions' data—and what actions leaders might take based on their analysis of such comparative results.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Kirtland is at a reacting level in its interpretation of results and insights. There is some discussion about the data presented; however there seems to be a focus on positive data at the expense of gaps identified (which might be addressed for purposes of continuous improvement). For example, Kirtland reports that items related to the performance of senior leadership, job satisfaction/support, and professional development opportunities all showed improvement in the last year the college participated in the Great Colleges survey. While that statement is accurate, it ignores the fact that, except for two items, the numbers are all

	<p>lower than the first year the survey was taken, the largest drop being a 30-point decline in the rating for shared governance, including more specific questions about leadership and professional development opportunities. In addition, the responses to a large majority of items were significantly lower than the benchmark data provided.</p> <p>In 2014 the college opted to develop its own employee survey. While this had the potential for getting more nuanced and actionable data, it is not clear how the items shared achieve that goal, nor is there any further discussion on it. The College has chosen to approach challenges by using appreciative inquiry; however, the data reported do not communicate how this approach is being applied in this area. The quantitative data could be augmented with qualitative data from appreciative inquiry processes that might help Kirtland mature in reporting and understanding the results of its processes.</p>
--	--

4I3. Based on 4R3, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next 1 – 3 years.

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
<p>KCC has implemented the cross-training of employees to mitigate the potential threat of loss of leadership. No improvements based on the results in 4R3 were provided so it is difficult to ascertain how effective Kirtland is at linking its analysis of results to actions for improvement.</p>

4P4. **Integrity**, focuses on how the institution ensures legal and ethical behavior and fulfills its societal responsibilities. Describe the processes for developing and communicating legal and ethical standards, monitoring behavior to ensure standards are met, and who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

Process	Team Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
<p>Developing and communicating standards</p>	<p>Kirtland has processes in place for developing standards for integrity and has two values statements that specifically relate to integrity. Standards for legal and ethical behavior are informed by local, federal and state laws and regulations, Board policies and procedures, external financial audits, and other formal procedures. Standards are communicated with email (for new policies), the website, handbooks, manuals, and are discussed with students during new student orientation. Formalizing processes, along with the appropriate evaluative mechanisms, for communicating standards of integrity to all college constituents might help the college as it works to mature beyond its current systematic level</p>

	of maturity.
Training employees for legal and ethical behavior	New employees receive training in this area during new employee orientation and are by assigned mentors; new faculty have an online course and handbooks. Other training in specific areas (e.g. FERPA, hazardous materials, etc.) are required for all employees and as needed. Standards for legal and ethical behavior are also addressed during the evaluation of each employee, and incidents that violate ethical and/or legal conduct are monitored by the human resource department and addressed per established policies approved the Board of Trustees. Specifying how training in this area is periodically evaluated for effectiveness might increase maturity beyond Kirtland’s current systematic stage. In addition, clearly defining how the evaluation process helps ensure and advance the ethical practice of all employees might be beneficial.
Modeling ethical and legal behavior from the highest levels of the organization.	The portfolio does not specifically address how ethical and legal behavior is modeled from the highest levels of the organization. While the value statement on character addresses organizational expectations, it is not clear how that statement is implemented and modeled at the highest levels of the organization. Kirtland has an opportunity to focus on advancing beyond its current reactive stage by developing (or better describing) its processes for modeling ethical and legal behavior.
Operating financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions with integrity, including following fair and ethical policies and adhering to processes for the governing board, administration, faculty, and staff.	Kirtland utilizes both institutional and state policies and procedures to operate at a systematic level in relation to integrity. Financial and auxiliary functions are audited by external auditors annually; BOT members sign conflict of interest statements; and the college adheres to the HLC Criteria and related assumed practices and guidelines. Institutional compliance is evaluated as part of the reaccreditation process, with employee compliance included as part of employee evaluation. To mature, KCC is encouraged to identify additional measures on which leaders could collect data that might indicate the degree of effectiveness of their approach.
Making information about your programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships readily and clearly available to all constituents	KCC makes information available to all constituents available through several channels including the website, the online College Catalog, and the Student Handbook. Guided pathway templates are to be completed for each program to provide necessary data, including career opportunities, salary, job outlook, program mission and goals, courses with descriptions, and cost, for both the prerequisites and actual program. The portfolio seems to suggest that these are posted on the website, but it is not obvious where they are posted, and program goals are not included in the College Catalog. Cost of tuition and fees and HLC accreditation

	are clearly articulated on the website. However, statements of control and program accreditation relationships are not as obviously articulated. Addressing these deficiencies might help Kirtland further advance maturity in this area beyond its current systematic level, as well as ensure compliance with all HLC Criteria for Accreditation, Assumed Practices and Federal Compliance Requirements.
Other identified Processes	

4R4. What are the results for ensuring institutional integrity?

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized	Kirtland appears to be operating at a reacting level based upon information provided. The financial audits, legal risks, and employee and student survey responses are all identified as outcomes for ensuring institutional integrity. The portfolio states that the expectation is that there will be no exceptions to legal and ethical behavior but does not identify measures for tracking processes implemented to accomplish this goal. However, earlier in this category it was articulated that human resources monitored and applied university policies to address violations of ethical or legal standards, so the opportunity exists to track the number and type of violations to identify patterns in order to inform ongoing improvement actions. It is unclear which employee and student survey items are specifically measuring institutional integrity. It might be beneficial to Kirtland to consider developing a formal process for documenting complaints related to ethics and integrity as such data might constitute a potential direct measure.
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Kirtland is at a reacting level in summarizing results of measures of its effectiveness in ensuring integrity. The portfolio does not provide summary results for this subcategory beyond mention of an unqualified financial report in 2015 and an incident of questionable operations in its athletic program. This section focuses mainly on processes rather than results. There appears to be a significant opportunity for improvement in this area.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Kirtland is at a reacting level in this area. The portfolio contains no specific outcomes/measures tracked to ensure institutional integrity. No benchmarks are shared, and the only noted target is that everyone will behave legally and ethically. No data are reported to track if this target is being met or not. Developing internal measures of effectiveness of integrity that could, over time, create the opportunity to set clear targets/ goals might be very beneficial to Kirtland and reinforce the college's commitment to integrity across all

	operations.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	The portfolio contains no specific outcomes/measures tracked to ensure institutional integrity, making it impossible to evaluate and discuss interpretations and insights where there are none. The significant lack of evaluation measures, results and interpretation indicate a lack of commitment to the AQIP process in this reacting area.

4I4. Based on 4R4, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next 1 – 3 years.

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
While the portfolio indicates two sets of actions are being taken (a review of policy and the creation of digital versions of the catalog and student handbook), what remains unclear is (1) why leaders believe these actions are intended to improve KCC’s abilities to ensure institutional integrity and (2) what data were reviewed to lead to these changes.

AQIP Category Five

KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT & RESOURCE STEWARDSHIP addresses management of the fiscal, physical, technological, and information infrastructures designed to provide an environment in which learning can thrive.

5P1. **Knowledge Management** focuses on how data, information, and performance results are used in decision-making processes at all levels and in all parts of the institution. Describe the processes for knowledge management and who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

Process	Team Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Selecting, organizing, analyzing, and sharing data and performance information to support planning, process improvement, and decision-making	Kirtland appears to be beginning to operate at a systematic level in some aspects of sharing and organizing data to support planning, process improvement, and decision-making. The Kirtland Planning Worksheet and Kirtland Planning Cycle both indicate that Kirtland has identified the overarching connections between planning, budgeting and assessment/institutional effectiveness processes required to support effective decision-making and improvement. These elements constitute a significant step forward from the last systems appraisal and provide a critically important foundation to further advance the institution’s quality improvement journey. The college uses its Strategic Plan to drive the Operational Plan, which establishes priorities and actions. What remains unclear from the portfolio is how leaders evaluate the effectiveness of this approach: what measures are in place that leaders review to identify gaps or strengths? Specifying how these data are used to support process improvement may increase maturity.

<p>Determining data, information, and performance results that units and departments need to plan and manage effectively</p>	<p>At an institutional level, through the IEP and centralized coordination by the Director of Institutional Research, Kirtland appears to have developed a process for determining macro data needs and performance results. What seems absent from the portfolio is a well-defined, measured and evaluated process by which leaders determine the data, information, and performance results needed by units and departments to plan and manage effectively. The portfolio states that “[r]equests for data and deadline dates are submitted to the DIR”; however, no mention is made of a clear process by which requests are evaluated for impact on strategic priorities. Explaining how KCC determines the data, information, and performance results needed by individual departments and units, alongside supporting overall institutional planning, might increase maturity beyond the current reacting level.</p>
<p>Making data, information, and performance results readily and reliably available to the units and departments that depend upon this information for operational effectiveness, planning, and improvements</p>	<p>The master calendar used by the DIR, along with the Campus Data Responsibilities Chart, indicates KCC is beginning operate at a systematic level in this area. Such a calendar can enable leaders to predetermine what data needs are and to regularize the provision of the data. It seems less clear how the college measures the effectiveness of its processes for distributing, warehousing, and making the campus stakeholders aware of data available to them. Addressing these areas may provide an opportunity for advancing in maturity.</p>
<p>Ensuring the timeliness, accuracy, reliability, and security of your knowledge management system(s) and related processes.</p>	<p>The College is at a systematic level of maturity in this area. A master calendar is used for managing deadlines. User groups determine level of access and cycle upgrades for each of the following major software systems: Jenzabar, GradesFirst, Canvas, Maxient, Rave, and Campus Labs CourseEval. IT monitors security for management systems and backs up data on virtual servers at two of KCC’s campuses. FERPA training is provided annually to employees. A cross-functional team allows communication between departments regarding the Jenzabar software and has increased efficiency and utilization. While KCC reports that the DIR reviews the reports that s/he generates for accuracy and reliability, it is not clear how having requestors responsible for reviewing other reports ensures their accuracy and reliability. In addition, it might be beneficial to Kirtland to further develop measures of effectiveness of these processes (similar to its measurement of timelines for technology upgrades which reflected significant improvement.)</p>

Other identified processes	
----------------------------	--

5R1. What are your results for determining how data, information, and performance results are used in decision-making processes at all levels and in all parts of your institution?

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized	Several examples are presented concerning how data are used for decision-making; however, it seems unclear which outcomes/measures have been identified by the college to act as key performance indicators for obtaining actionable data relevant to the processes in place. While the two examples provided indicate the use of evidence in decision-making and in achieving strategic objectives and illustrate effectiveness, the college may want to consider how this qualitative approach might be done more intentionally, e.g., clarifying the methods of analysis via introduction of appropriate rubrics. Specifying how the measures listed in 5P1.3 are tracked and utilized, as well as the measures used to track the timeliness, accuracy, reliability and security of KCC’s knowledge system, might increase maturity beyond the current reacting level.
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	The inclusion in the portfolio of multiple examples of the use of data in specific decision-making processes indicates that KCC has matured in its use of evidence and knowledge; the college is now poised to move beyond its current level of reacting . A summary of data on stakeholder perceptions used to pass the millage is included and seemed to be very useful in determining communication strategies. Two graphs are included that illustrate data used in changing stakeholder perceptions. The narratives were clearly written and informative. However, it is not clear if these examples are representative of standard practice or are stand-outs. Providing a more comprehensive report of data and related summaries, inclusive of all levels of the college, might increase maturity. A richer set of data could include meta-measures that address the college's effectiveness at using data. Such meta-measures might include a tracking of how many predetermined data needs are met according to the calendar; how many processes show improvements in results over a set number of years; what the rating is on a survey item for stakeholder satisfaction on the availability of timely and useful data, etc.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	No comparisons with internal targets or external benchmarks are provided, reflective of a reacting level of maturity.

Interpretation of results and insights gained	The absence of data on measures for processes for the provision and use of data prevents the inclusion of any analysis, reflecting a reacting level of maturity. Specifying how results are analyzed and used in decision-making for knowledge management may increase maturity.
---	---

5I1. Based on 5R1, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next 1 – 3 years.

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
The addition of a Jenzabar module for online requisitions and purchase orders has been beneficial. On the one hand, using an online Maxient form for reporting academic misconduct could be useful in understanding and avoiding offenses. On the other hand, given the current dearth of reporting of such incidents, the college might adapt the form/system to address the causes to which leaders attribute that lack. For example, if the purpose of the system is to gather data about number and types of infractions and faculty are reluctant to report students, might they be willing to report these things without the names of those involved? It might be beneficial for Kirtland to describe the data or information that led to the decision to improve these two processes, which would show the connection between process, measurements, analysis of results and improvement that currently appears to be lacking.

5P2. **Resource Management** focuses on how the resource base of an institution supports and improves its educational programs and operations. Describe the processes for managing resources and who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

Process	Team Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Maintaining fiscal, physical, and technological infrastructures sufficient to support operations.	KCC’s planning cycle incorporates the strategic and operational plans into budgeting processes to ensure expenditures are aligned with objectives and support operations. The Facilities Master Plan, which follows a similar cycle, ensures locations are safe and efficient. The ITS director attends IC meetings to stay current with the technology needed to support academics, and weekly department meetings cover issues, processes, and improvements. Processes for maintaining physical and technological infrastructures appear to be discussed largely in terms of the responsibilities of various offices, yet the descriptions in the portfolio present no context for how these processes are coordinated with the promotion of campus-wide engagement, e.g., faculty, students, and staff. Similarly, mechanisms for evaluating the effectiveness of all processes in this area do not seem to have been addressed. Strengthening these parts of the report and/or existing processes might help advance the institution beyond the current level of maturity. Kirtland has been recognized for its

	strength in technology among other community colleges, and this strength could be leveraged to help further advance the college's leadership position if a plan is not currently in place.
Setting goals aligned with the institutional mission, resources, opportunities, and emerging needs.	Several indicators suggest that KCC is emerging into a systematic level. Kirtland's decision and goal-setting in relation to the development of the Health Science Center, to better meet the needs of its broadly disbursed service area and aging population into the future, is an example of connecting the mission, resources, and meeting emerging needs. The goal of developing 25 new online services to meet the disbursed population provides another example of such connection. These are indicators that Kirtland's planning and resource allocation processes are maturing since the last system appraisal. While the portfolio states that the budget process is linked to the Strategic Plan, what remains unclear are the mechanisms established to ensure that the financial goals set do, indeed, support strategic directions. For example, what data points do leaders review and analyze to determine if budgetary decisions are having the desired impact on the college's ability to achieve its strategic goals? Specifying the ongoing processes used to set these goals along with the corresponding evaluative mechanisms might increase maturity.
Allocating and assigning resources to achieve organizational goals, while ensuring that educational purposes are not adversely affected.	The Business Office collects and analyzes cash flow data in order to monitor the allocation and assignment of resources. Data include independent and external audit reports, annual financial results of operations, fund balances in total and by department, State of Michigan ACS reports, reports of cost center budgeted and actual amounts and detailed tuition and fee information for all Michigan community colleges. The college appears to be at the beginning stages of systematizing its processes. To mature further, Kirtland is encouraged to consider mechanisms for ensuring that educational purposes are not adversely affected by financial decisions. For example, what data points might leaders (both academic and financial) review and analyze to determine if budgetary decisions are having the desired impact on the college's ability to achieve both its organizational and academic goals?
Other Identified Processes	

5R2. What are your results for Resource Management?

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized	KCC tracks data on several external factors that affect institutional resources, including state or regional high school graduates, population change, age group changes, and community college enrollment declines. For similar purposes, state appropriations,

	<p>property tax revenue, and tuition hours are also tracked over time. To mature beyond the current systematic level, the college is encouraged to track data on more direct measures of its effectiveness at managing resources. That is, what measures might leaders track to provide them with insight on how effective the college is at using its admittedly decreasing financial resources, as well as its human, technological, and physical resources, to support operations and achieve both strategic and educational goals. It would seem more illuminating to integrate these along with the current measures, which are focused predominantly on revenue.</p>
<p>Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)</p>	<p>Summaries of results are presented to show changes in demographics, comparisons of Kirtland enrollment declines with peer community colleges, and funding source trends. However, it appears there has been less effort devoted to summarizing measures that (1) are distinctive to KCC, (2) reflect the breadth of college area opportunities, and (3) provide insightful directions for future initiatives to have a positive impact on institutional resources. As such, the college is beginning to systematize its use of summary results on its ability to manage resources. KCC reports trend data on many measures related to revenue. To mature, the college is encouraged to consider results on a wider range of direct measures concerning its effectiveness at managing resources. For example, an earlier improvement section reports Kirtland plans to begin a local alumni association and to take over management of the University Center in Gaylord. In an earlier results section, it is reported that the institution has chosen to focus resources on preparing high-school students for college-level courses and on recruiting high-school graduates to Kirtland. It would be helpful to consider summaries which clarify the rationale for these efforts and how they are anticipated to have positive impact on overall campus resource management plans. Additionally, what measures might leaders track to provide them with insight on how effective the college is at using its admittedly decreasing financial resources, as well as its human, technological and physical resources, to support its operations and to achieve its strategic and educational goals—measures beyond just information on revenue? An easily-monitored institutional dashboard that tracks progress on key, high-level strategic priorities might be useful in promoting maturity in this area.</p>
<p>Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks</p>	<p>In tracking enrollment trends, Kirtland utilizes external benchmarking against other Michigan community colleges. Benchmark data are also tracked for the counties in Kirtland's service area regarding changes in population overall and by age</p>

	<p>groups. Although institutional trend data over multiple years are consistently utilized, the use of internal targets is not provided in the results. Towards advancing beyond the current reacting level of maturity, Kirtland might benefit from clearly articulating enrollment targets/goals, targets for institutional reserves, etc. and to measure effectiveness against the achievement of those internal targets.</p>
<p>Interpretation of results and insights gained</p>	<p>Kirtland appears to be systematic in its interpretation of results and insights. The portfolio describes how declining enrollment and loss of tuition revenue were used to inform the strategic plan and specific initiatives such as online and dual enrollment. Similarly, Kirtland explains what it has done to improve efficiencies and effectively manage periods of declining or static state funding. However, the omission of Program Review data in this section creates a gap in the analyses presented; thus, academic data might be considered here as well.</p>

5I2. Based on 5R2, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next 1 – 3 years.

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
<p>The examples provided in relation to heating/cooling efficiencies and improved student environment, use of Virtual Desktop to reduce cost by managing IT systems from one location, and initiatives to improve student persistence to help strengthen and further stabilize Kirtland’s financial position all appear to reflect disciplined management of resources. While the AQIP project improvements listed do not emerge from the data presented in the results section, they do seem to address areas in need of improvement as reflected in other data. The institution is encouraged to consider more clearly articulating the direct linkages between results in 5R2 and these improvement initiatives. Specifically, which data were utilized to inform the decisions to prioritize and act upon these initiatives, and what are the measures of whether such actions have been effective?</p>

5P3. **Operational Effectiveness** focuses on how an institution ensures effective management of its operations in the present and plans for continuity of operations into the future. Describe the processes for operational effectiveness and who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

Process	Team Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
<p>Building budgets to accomplish institutional goals.</p>	<p>The business office initiates the budget process and makes projections based on available revenue data. Budget officers and department heads propose budgets for their areas. The portfolio suggests this is the point at which priorities and new projects are identified. At the department and unit levels, it appears the review process is limited to each specific area budget. Additionally, no</p>

	<p>mention is made of measures tracked by leaders, in an intentional manner, regarding the impact of budgetary decisions on the college’s ability to advance its Strategic Goals. Towards increasing in maturity beyond the current systematic level, leaders might track and report how well financial decisions help the college achieve specific goals. The college is also encouraged to consider strengthening its discussion of how the budgeting process is intentionally designed to draw upon cross-campus engagement, along with mechanisms for evaluating the effectiveness of the approach.</p>
<p>Monitoring financial position and adjusting budgets.</p>	<p>Kirtland appears to have developed processes for monitoring and adjusting budgets. Monthly financial statements are reviewed with the Board of Trustees, and the CFO has the opportunity to modify the budget with Board approval at least twice per year. Even with declining revenue, KCC has been able to add new programs. KCC has begun to systematize its approach to monitoring its financial position and adjusting its budgets. To mature, the college is encouraged to track and evaluate on a regular basis the degree to which financial decisions are helping the college make progress on its Strategic Goals. Explaining how decisions are made and priorities set when budget adjustments are needed may also increase maturity.</p>
<p>Maintaining a technological infrastructure that is reliable, secure and user-friendly.</p>	<p>ITS is responsible for oversight of and regularly reviews processes for maintaining a technological infrastructure that is reliable, secure, and user-friendly. The portfolio states that KCC participates in the EDUCAUSE CORE data service and the Center for Digital Education’s Digital Community College Survey; however, the portfolio does not discuss how these are used, and these results are not included in the results section. To mature beyond the current systematic level, KCC might consider reporting the measures it tracks, such as number of security breaches, survey response data on stakeholder satisfaction with technology, usage rates, information on cases in which data integrity has been called into question, etc. The institution is also encouraged to consider how it proactively reaches out to all users at Kirtland, particularly reflecting multi-locations and online campus communities, to inform technology planning.</p>
<p>Maintaining a physical infrastructure that is reliable, secure and user-friendly.</p>	<p>The Facilities Masterplan guides the FMD in maintaining a physical infrastructure that is reliable, secure, and user-friendly, including the review and recommendation of updates and closures of old buildings. The college has developed processes for writing and securing grants to support both new and refurbished facilities and has processes for managing high operational cost items such as propane and electricity. Beyond processes described for addressing logistical issues and providing for work order submission, the institution is encouraged to consider ways that it might proactively engage the community (inclusive of all locations and online members) towards identifying</p>

	<p>areas of improvement and opportunities and impact on user-friendliness. To mature beyond the current systematic level, the college might also consider (1) putting into place measures that it can track on the effectiveness of its ability to maintain its physical infrastructure (such as number of security-related incidents/complaints, stakeholder satisfaction data on the facilities, usage rates, etc) and (2) demonstrating that it has intentionally built into its decision-making processes around the physical infrastructure a consideration of how facilities management can be leveraged to help the college advance its Strategic Goals.</p>
<p>Managing risks to ensure operational stability, including emergency preparedness.</p>	<p>The presence of multiple plans, policies and strategies indicates that KCC has begun to systematize its approach to managing risk for ensuring stability. The CAT has established a succession plan for all full-time employees involving cross-training. A safety committee is responsible for developing policy to cover policies and procedures for ensuring the safety of students and employees during threats and emergencies. The Public Safety Department, in conjunction with local law enforcement, monitors campus safety and communicates emergency situations. The RAVE system is used for communication. Explaining how these processes are periodically evaluated and how students and employees are trained in emergency preparedness may increase maturity. Additionally, no mention is made of an intentional approach to managing financial risks. The college is encouraged to identify means by which it might monitor corresponding risk-management effectiveness and provide reporting on how potential financial risks are addressed.</p>
<p>Other identified Processes</p>	

5R3. What are your results for ensuring effective management of your operations on an ongoing basis and for the future?

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
<p>Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized</p>	<p>Kirtland appears to be at a systematic level in its outcomes/measures for ensuring effective management of operations. Audit results, in-house revenue to expenses statements, and general budget information are all identified as financial measures Technological infrastructure measures are not clear. Physical infrastructure measures include indirect measures from CCSSE on Active and Collaborative Learning. Risk management measures include indirect measures of crime statistics and an item on the employee survey about safety. It would be helpful to clarify how retention and completion/transfer</p>

	<p>data are used to measure outcomes in this subcategory. Identifying direct and indirect measures for each outcome in this subcategory many increase maturity. Such measures may be part of the data that KCC already collects. For example, it is not clear why items from CCSSE on student satisfaction with safety and technology are not tracked or why the technology survey results mentioned in the processes narrative are not included. Additionally, no measures or outcomes appear to be reported concerning how well KCC draws upon its budgeting processes to leverage financial resources in such manner that promotes achievement of strategic goals. The college is strongly encouraged to report measures that can be reviewed by leaders to evaluate the efficacy of the intentional connections made between strategic and budgetary planning processes.</p>
<p>Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)</p>	<p>KCC is at the emerging stages of a systematic level in reporting summary data on the measures it tracks. Trend data are reported for many measures, and selected measures the portfolio include a brief description of analyses that suggest how leaders made sense of the numbers. However, survey results (CCSSE and Employee Survey) do not include sample sizes, response rates, or response format/scale. To increase in maturity level, leaders might consider (1) providing an analysis of all measures reported on (for example, how did leaders interpret the drop in student ratings on active learning in 2016?); (2) providing summary results on measures particularly selected to track the college’s ability to achieve its strategic goals; and (3) including data on a broader range of processes (for example, those related to the technological and physical infrastructures).</p>
<p>Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks</p>	<p>Kirtland has begun to systematize its use of comparative data. Benchmarks are incorporated where available, such as those provided for retention data, Student Cost/Contact Hour, and the CCSSE item, allowing peer and statewide comparisons. Identifying targets for the data, providing a driver for subsequent analyses and interpretations, may improve maturity.</p>
<p>Interpretation of results and insights gained</p>	<p>Although some observations were discussed, there are noticeable incongruities in what the data reflect and the interpretation of results articulated. For example, when explaining results on enhancing student engagement with active and collaborative classrooms, Kirtland noted a positive impact of redesign and technology in the classrooms funded by a Title III Grant. However, most current results in 2016 showed a significant decline in comparison with prior years and were below benchmarked Top Performing Colleges. Beyond observational comments provided, the presentation seems to lack the rich set of measures and driving</p>

	context of institutional targets necessary for drawing actionable conclusions from the analysis. The analysis also seems to permit limited insights applicable to future planning and success. This is reflective of a reacting level of maturity.
--	---

5I3. Based on 5R3, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next 1 – 3 years.

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
KCC’s stewardship of funds, strategic planning, and use of data resulted in a millage passed for building the new HSC. The adoption of the RAVE platform and other developments in technology emerged from planning improvement processes. What remains unclear is (1) how these improvements resulted from the analysis of specific data in the previous results section and (2) what the impact of these changes is intended or expected to be on future results. While the college states the opening of the HSC allowed the college to meet several of its Strategic Goals, it would be helpful to clarify which strategic goals those are along with corresponding evidence that the new building has led to the fulfillment of those goals.

AQIP Category Six

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

6P1. **Quality Improvement Initiatives** focuses on the Continuous Quality Improvement initiatives the institution is engaged in and how they work together within the institution. Describe the processes for determining, and integrating CQI initiatives, and who you involve in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

Process	Team Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Selecting, deploying, and evaluating quality improvement initiatives.	Kirtland has developed a formal process for selecting and deploying quality improvement initiatives as defined in the Kirtland AQIP Process Flow Chart CQI Toolbox and Kirtland Action Project Checklist. A mentor is assigned for each HLC action project; QCT also identifies a champion and appoints project members who have the knowledge and skills needed. Other members are invited by the champion. The Action Project Checklist documents required steps and provides a central location for project-related documentation, which, thus, becomes available to all. To advance beyond the current beginning stages of a systematic maturity level, the college is encouraged to report on (1) how it has built into its processes an

	ability to track the impact of each initiative, especially on the institution's ability to achieve its Strategic Goals; (2) the way in which the college has embedded AQIP principles and practices broadly across the campus, into many processes, beyond just AQIP Action Projects; and (3) how continuous improvement best practices have been embedded in all portfolio sections. It would also be helpful to clarify the way in which processes address the multi-location and online programming aspects of the Kirtland community.
Aligning the Systems Portfolio, Action Projects, Quality Check-Up, and Strategy Forums.	The portfolio provides a description of the general processes that are part of all AQIP institutions. While Kirtland reports that it leverages these AQIP processes, what remains unclear is how, in an intentional and measured/evaluated manner, leaders at Kirtland explicitly align the Portfolio, the Action Projects, the Quality Check-up and the Strategy Forums with KCC's own processes (e.g., Strategic Planning, Operational Plans, Assessment, Program Review). To mature beyond the reacting level, Kirtland is encouraged to put into place clear processes (with steps, parties assigned responsibility, measures, and time for reflection) for ensuring that all of its continuous quality improvement efforts are aligned and functioning collectively to reinforce each other and move the college forward in its strategic directions. Such alignment is not obvious in the current portfolio, in which action projects and strategy forums are mentioned but not well-integrated. An example of feedback from the last systems appraisal regarding leadership threat mitigation, planning and the Action Project completed to address this vulnerability is discussed; however, these types of examples appear to be reactively occurring in pockets and silos, rather than systematically across the institution.
Other identified processes	N/A

6R1. What are your results for continuous quality improvement initiatives?

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
What are your results for continuous quality improvement initiatives?	By reporting on its Action Projects, Kirtland indicates that it has begun to systematize its use of results for continuous quality improvements. Kirtland describes the success of its action projects; however, it is not clear from these project descriptions how success was measured or how the results compared with the goals of the projects. In addition, reflecting on ways in which projects did not succeed can provide useful information and increase maturity (e.g., What could have been done to improve the projects? How could the interventions have been more effective? Which goals were not met, and how might they be subsequently met?) Kirtland reports that

	<p>action projects are becoming more forward-thinking and aligned with the strategic plan over time and that CQI principles are becoming infused into the daily operations of the college. However, it is not clear from the portfolio how CQI approaches are being embedded throughout all of the institution’s processes or what the level of campus engagement is in these processes. In order to move forward from its current systematic level of maturity, Kirtland is strongly encouraged to report (1) how all of its AQIP efforts (the Portfolio, the Quality Check-up and the Strategy Forums) have impacted its efforts and its ability to achieve its goals; (2) how CQI has improved results of a sampling of its processes across the campus; and (3) how employees are engaged in a way that reflects Kirtland’s aspirations “to create a culture in which employees see AQIP as a mechanism for input into decision making and as a process to create positive change.”</p>
--	--

6I1. Based on 6R1, what quality improvement initiatives have been implemented or will be implemented in the next 1 – 3 years.

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
<p>Kirtland has identified its next Action Project as focused on improving its capabilities in the precision management of enrollment to further improve the financial stability of the college. By intentionally addressing enrollment concerns, the college may be able to position itself to navigate future financial challenges and improve student success. Kirtland has identified developing concise pathways to completion as a strategy for achieving this goal, including specific improvements to the website, advising, student services, and instructional services. The focus on improvements needed to increase completion rates emerged from strategic planning and data about the financial status of the college. However, it might be helpful to clarify some key connections between the processes and related data described earlier that led to the decision to select this as a next action project. To increase a positive culture around AQIP principles, the institution is encouraged to consider the size of the project being discussed, identify metric/measures to guide development, intentionally seek inclusion from all units/departments of the Kirtland community (including students), and determine which steps are anticipated to provide a good time to reflect upon and celebrate achievements. Doing so should put Kirtland in a better position for reporting (1) improvements to the culture of CQI at the institution (for example, the number of processes that have been mapped and assigned metrics); and (2) the intentional analysis of evidence (by whom, at what point, using which data) that lead to planned or attempted improvements.</p>

6P2. **CULTURE of QUALITY**, focuses on how the institution integrates continuous quality improvement into its culture. Describe how a culture of quality is ensured within the institution. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

Process	Team Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Developing an infrastructure and providing resources to support a culture of quality.	The recent creation of the flowchart for action projects and of the CQI Toolbox, as well as the engagement of more people in CQI processes, are positive steps toward supporting a quality culture. However, a much more intentional and continual focus on incorporating CQI principles into the daily operations of the institution (beyond AQIP Action Projects and other AQIP components) is needed to move beyond KCC’s current reacting level of maturity. Although Kirtland has incorporated planning and budgeting processes into its ongoing operations, it does not appear that it has developed a clarity of processes for continuous improvement over the 13 years as an AQIP institution. KCC is encouraged to consider identifying measurable goals for guiding improvement of processes (beyond participation at planning summits), so that it is able to demonstrate how, in an intentional, measured and evaluated manner, the college has leveraged CQI in order to alter—in a fundamental manner—many of its methods or approaches to accomplishing its goals.
Ensuring continuous quality improvement is making an evident and widely understood impact on institutional culture and operations.	Although it appears that Kirtland’s focus on developing a culture of continuous improvement has ebbed and flowed at times over the past thirteen years, there is evidence of learning that has occurred and a recognition of key areas required to advance further from its current systematic level of maturity. Several steps indicate that KCC has begun to systematize its approach to ensuring that CQI is having an impact: the implementation of an annual retreat for the CAT; the establishment of the QCT; the integration of AQIP and CQI into new employee orientation; the inclusion of employees from different areas in the strategy forum and in action projects; and the creation of the AQIP Mini Action Project Reporting Sheet. The institution is encouraged to develop evaluative mechanisms for guiding process improvements beyond explicit AQIP initiatives (the Action Projects, the Portfolio, the Quality Check-up, and the Strategy Forums). For example, some of the questions from the Mini Action Project Reporting Sheet could be applied to processes across the institution (e.g., “What are your goals?” and “How will you assess your outcomes and how will you review them for continuous quality improvement?”). Applying CQI approaches to more operations might allow Kirtland to mature beyond its current maturity level as it demonstrates how CQI has altered its culture and day-to-day functions in ways that are fundamental to specific

	operations and to stakeholders' attitudes and beliefs.
Ensuring the institution learns from its experiences with CQI initiatives.	Kirtland provided examples of how the CQI Toolbox has helped the college learn from its experiences. While these examples demonstrate that QCT and members of action project teams are learning from their experiences, it is not clear how the <i>institution</i> is learning from all action projects (successful and unsuccessful). Considering how to create opportunities for sharing results/challenges/learning experiences across projects, including evaluative mechanisms applied in drawing conclusions, might increase maturity beyond the current systematic level. Kirtland is encouraged to continue exploiting CQI in order to break down silos, align the work of multiple units, and integrate its efforts to achieve maximum positive impact on outcomes and its ability to achieve its strategic goals.
Reviewing, reaffirming, and understanding the role and vitality of the AQIP Pathway within the institution.	Kirtland's description of its reaffirming of the AQIP process includes key times that are inherent in the AQIP process itself. In order to mature beyond the reacting level of maturity, Kirtland is encouraged to demonstrate how CQI has altered its culture and operations in ways beyond explicit AQIP initiatives (the Action Projects, the Portfolio, the Quality Check-up, and the Strategy Forums) including evaluative mechanisms for these initiatives.
Other Identified Processes	N/A

6R2. What are the results for continuous quality improvement to evidence a culture of quality?

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
What are the results for continuous quality improvement to evidence a culture of quality?	Mini Action Projects are discussed as evidence of KCC's culture of quality; however, the informal nature of the improvement/efficiency gained is indicative of a culture that is still at the early stages of developing a culture of continuous improvement. While over 50 such projects are referenced in the narrative, only 11 (all successful) are reported. Looking at results for all the Mini Projects might move Kirtland beyond a reacting level. In addition, the description of the projects could be strengthened by inclusion of information on corresponding metrics/measures applied and promotion of campus-wide engagement engendered. As it moves forward, Kirtland is encouraged to clearly demonstrate for each of its important efforts/operations the degree to which it has embodied CQI principles and approaches, including a clear process with steps, a repeated schedule, parties assigned responsibility, measures pre-selected and intended to act as indicators of impact for the process, data on those measures, built-in time for reflection

	and analysis of the resulting data, and the use of the analysis for intervention and improvement.
--	---

6I2. Based on 6R2, what improvements to the quality culture have been implemented or will be implemented in the next 1 – 3 years.

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
<p>The plans to use the Mini Action Project Reporting Sheets as a data source and to inform future action projects seems to be a forward step in KCC’s quality journey, as do the repository and the Celebration of Learning. What remains unclear, however, is how these actions resulted from an intentional analysis of data. The college is encouraged to consider ways of further developing all institutional processes according to CQI principles to ensure that Kirtland continues to progress. KCC might advance the recognition of and engagement with AQIP if it consistently and clearly implements processes with measurable goals that are regularly assessed for effectiveness and improvement opportunities and if the work proceeds in an intentionally, authentically inclusive environment (including all multi-location and online communities).</p>

APPENDIX C
Criteria for Accreditation & Core Component
Evidence Screening

Criterion One. Mission

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

Core Components (sub-components noted)	Evidence	Screening Feedback on Core Component
<p>1.A. The institution's mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operations.</p> <p>1. The mission statement is developed through a process suited to the nature and culture of the institution and is adopted by the governing board.</p> <p>2. The institution's academic programs, student support services, and enrollment profile are consistent with its stated mission.</p> <p>3. The institution's planning and budgeting priorities align with and support the mission.</p>	<p>Kirtland reviews its mission, vision, and values every 5 years as part of the strategic planning cycle. The mission statement was revised in 2014. After input from the BOT and employees, a team of employees identified themes for the new mission and vision statements and worked with the CAT to create the final statements. The new mission, vision, and values statements were shared with the campus community in fall 2014, then approved by the BOT. The current mission statement is: "To provide innovative educational opportunities to enhance student lives and build stronger communities."</p> <p>Kirtland has a variety of policies and procedures in place that support the mission, including the program review process, the inclusiveness of the strategic planning summit, fundraising, resolution of disputes, financial transparency, and the Kirtland Center for the Performing Arts. Kirtland states that it ensures that academic programs and services are consistent with the mission through incorporation into the strategic plan. Budgeting is based on operational plans, which are based on the strategic plan, which is informed by the mission. The BOT discusses the proposed budget presented by the administration at a board retreat, and their approval provides final direction to the college in the allocation of resources to</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong, Clear, and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

	<p>accomplish the mission and vision. Over half of the college’s budget goes for instruction and another 18% for student support. In the current strategic plan, Theme #1, “Quality Learning and Instruction,” was designated as the most important direction for the College.</p> <p>Kirtland communicates the mission, vision, and values in multiple ways, including the convocation at the start of fall and winter semesters, on the website, in the College Catalog and Student Handbook, in framed copies on campus, and on the back of business cards. The mission informs strategic planning, BOT meetings, program mission statements, and AQIP action projects.</p>	
<p>1.B. The mission is articulated publicly.</p> <p>1. The institution clearly articulates its mission through one or more public documents, such as statements of purpose, vision, values, goals, plans, or institutional priorities.</p> <p>2. The mission document or documents are current and explain the extent of the institution’s emphasis on the various aspects of its mission, such as instruction, scholarship, research, application of research, creative</p>	<p>Mission, Vision, and Values are communicated to the college community on the website, through email, in the college catalog and student handbook, during BOT meetings, and in the Strategic Plan. Framed copies are displayed prominently around campus, and statements are printed on the back of employee business cards, as well as on bookmarks for distribution. Plans are in place to publish a formal account of Kirtland’s first 50 years, which will document college mission, vision, values, and corresponding accomplishments for all stakeholders in the communities it serves.</p> <p>College mission, vision, and values are reviewed on a five-year cycle along with the Strategic Plan. The current statements emerged out of the most recent strategic planning summit (2013), subsequently approved by the BOT in Fall 2014. The new statements incorporate changes that were deemed necessary to reflect the evolving culture and future directions of the greater campus community. The mission statement, “to provide innovative educational</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong, Clear, and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>works, clinical service, public service, economic development, and religious or cultural purpose.</p> <p>3. The mission document or documents identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the higher education programs and services the institution provides.</p>	<p>opportunities to enhance student lives and build stronger communities”, encompasses college aspirations and initiatives to contribute to the lives of the people and industries in a rural service region currently impacted by significant poverty and limited education attainment beyond high school. Values including inclusiveness, reflection, character, and respect focus on providing student growth necessary for success in an increasingly diverse, global society, which, according to the demographic data regularly reviewed by the college, is currently quite different from that within the five county Kirtland service region.</p> <p>Kirtland offers 36 degree and certificates including 16 AAS degrees, 15 Certificates of Completion, 3 transfer Associate degrees, and 2 special certificates. Programs are supported by advisory boards, which include external members, maintain corresponding accreditations or licensure board approvals, and regularly review continuing education, licensure, and employment data on recent graduates for planning and assessment efforts. Four associates degrees and two certificate programs are offered online, and the college is a participant in Michigan Colleges Online. Workforce Development programs in northern Michigan collaborate with Kirtland on specialized training for area business and industry employees. An Early Middle College program, expanding upon dual enrollment courses, and partnership in the Michigan Transfer Agreement provide support for area students in successfully working towards certificate, associate’s, and baccalaureate degrees.</p>	
<p>1.C. The institution understands the relationship between its</p>	<p>Institutional data on student demographics, available through Jenzabar, are regularly tracked and reviewed. Subgroups identified</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/>Strong, Clear, and well presented</p>

<p>mission and the diversity of society.</p> <p>1. The institution addresses its role in a multicultural society.</p> <p>2. The institution's processes and activities reflect attention to human diversity as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves.</p>	<p>include developmental education students, students by gender, age, and ethnicity, first-year college students, dual-enrolled and early middle college students, transfer students, veterans, students with disabilities, and working students. According to the Fall 2016 unduplicated head count at Kirtland, 61% of its 1,529 students are female, 65% are 24 years old or younger, 67% are considered part-time, and 93% are Caucasian. Within the college service region having population 68,462, 12.3% hold a bachelor's degree or higher and nearly 20% live at or below the poverty line. Kirtland reports that it is a rural community college serving a largely homogeneous Caucasian population, with very few minorities living in the area.</p> <p>(Note on census data above: On page 19 of the report, 2010 US Census data for the 5 county service area is reported to be 93,026. It would be worthwhile to clarify population data included for the college service area.)</p> <p>The college offers cultural events and programs, with goals including to foster cultural enrichment, diversity, and social and cultural awareness. Example programs include the Performing Artists series and student writing and art competitions. The Student Veterans of America student organization assists service men and women in personal growth and adjusting to civilian life. Student activities on Domestic Violence Awareness and an Empty Bowls Project, supported in conjunction with a River House Shelter, are implementations of an overarching goal to provide safety and shelter for survivors of domestic and sexual abuse and the homeless. Additional student activities include Political Awareness/Meet the Candidates events, a Food Pantry for assisting students who experience financial difficulties, student construction of 38 beds</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>
---	--	--

	<p>for a local shelter, and student volunteerism in Habitat for Humanity.</p> <p>Kirtland mission includes within its purpose to enhance student lives and build stronger communities. College values include “Inclusiveness,” to inspire tolerance and welcome diversity of people and thought. Core competencies, required of all students, have been recently redesigned (2014) and a new model implemented that all general education courses address each of these competencies. There are six core competencies, including “Personal Growth and Responsible Citizenship” that states that students “act purposefully, effectively, and responsibly to function in social and professional environments as a productive citizen in the community”. The college has tracked student survey data on 2013 and 2016 CCSSE surveys showing low reported results on “[e]ncouraging contact among students from different economic, social and racial/ethnic backgrounds”. A series of global awareness presentations were offered 2012-2014, are reported as having had substantial participation, yet were cancelled due to minimal perceived impact.</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. In addition, the institution could more clearly articulate how the processes and measures related to its core competencies such as “Personal Growth and Responsible Citizenship” address human diversity and demonstrate student mastery of</p>	
--	--	--

	associated skills.	
<p>Criteria 1.D. The institution’s mission demonstrates commitment to the public good.</p> <p>1. Actions and decisions reflect an understanding that in its educational role the institution serves the public, not solely the institution, and thus entails a public obligation.</p> <p>2. The institution’s educational responsibilities take primacy over other purposes, such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests.</p> <p>3. The institution engages with its identified external constituencies and communities of interest and responds to their needs as its mission and capacity allow.</p>	<p>The service area of the college is economically deprived, and Kirtland has recognized that it has an important role in being responsive to the needs and requests of stakeholders in order to promote the concept of building stronger communities as indicated in the Mission statement. Given that the region is poverty-stricken, administrators continually search for funding to provide unique and innovative resources that align with programs and curriculum such as the millage that funded the Health Sciences Center (HSC) and a Title III grant that funded state-of-the-art technology and health science equipment.</p> <p>As a public institution, Kirtland’s educational responsibilities take primacy over other purposes. The fact that instruction and instructional services encompass approximately two-thirds of Kirtland’s annual expenditures provides evidence that Kirtland is committed to fulfilling its educational responsibilities.</p> <p>Advisory boards for occupational programs provide input into curriculum design to ensure it is meeting current employer needs. As part of the budgeting process, deans and directors seek input from the advisory committee stakeholders, and based on this input, make recommendations for materials to support the current needs and innovations of the industries they represent.</p> <p>Through its Center for the Performing Arts, Kirtland brings performers of diverse backgrounds and differing opinions to the College and surrounding communities in an effort to provide cultural experiences for a primarily white rural population.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong, Clear, and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

Criterion Two. Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

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

Core Components (sub-components noted)	Evidence	Screening Feedback on Core Component
<p>2.A. The institution operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions; it establishes and follows fair and ethical policies and processes for its governing board, administration, faculty, and staff.</p>	<p>Two of Kirtland's value statements address integrity: "Reflection – Evaluating Processes" and "Character – Adherence to the Principles of Integrity, Honesty, Reliability, Transparency, and Accountability." The state legislature, local and state regulations, and other agencies determine some standards and legal behaviors of the college, and other standards of integrity and ethics are developed by the BOT and administration. Financial and auxiliary functions are guided by policy and procedure informed by the college's auditing firm and are evaluated yearly by external auditors. A set of bylaws governs the BOT, and all BOT members sign a conflict of interest statement. BOT and administrators follow the Freedom of Information Act and the Open Meetings Act of Michigan protocols. Kirtland policies related to fair and ethical practices include citizen complaints; personal and college acceptance of gifts/grants/contracts; patent and copyright protection; protection of proprietary information; conduct of campus employees, students, and visitors; weapons; drug-free workplace; prohibition of tobacco; and identity theft. Policies and procedures for academic misconduct are found in the College Catalog. Standards for student behavior are in the student handbook and are discussed at orientation. HR is responsible for ensuring that equal opportunity employment, Office of Civil Rights, and affirmative action protocols are followed.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong, Clear, and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>
<p>2.B. The institution presents itself clearly</p>	<p>Kirtland uses its website to provide access to institutional information in real time. The</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, Clear, and well presented</p>

<p>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>online College Catalog and Student Handbook contain information on student resources, program information, course descriptions, and credentials of administrators, faculty, and staff. All new and transfer students are required to attend orientation and meet (either face-to-face or by phone) with their advisors at least twice during the first year. During these meetings, advisors provide program specific materials and discuss grades, costs, transfer, and other topics of particular significance to each student situation. Representatives from the college assist with area college nights and early middle college orientations, providing relevant programmatic and financial aid information to parents and students. The “How to Contact Us” webpage provides for multiple ways to locate and employee, department, or BOT member, including a fillable online form that can be submitted to initiate further contact.</p> <p>A Guided Pathway is created for each program and contains data on career opportunities, salary, employment outlook, program mission and goals, course descriptions, prerequisites, and all related costs. Guided Pathways are made available on the college website, as well as a net cost calculator to assist students in calculating the cost of attending Kirtland. The website location of Guided Pathways is designed to be easily updateable, ensuring that visitors to the site have accurate information reflecting any recent program changes.</p> <p>Every two years, the Director of Institutional Research compiles the “Kirtland Fact Book,” a compilation and comparison of data, including demographics, headcounts for programs offered, retention rates, Perkins Core Indicators, budget information, Workforce Development statistics, and</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>
--	--	--

	<p>comparisons to other in-state community colleges. This information provides a snapshot of the College and is readily available to the general public. Also available on the college website is information about HLC accreditation, specific program accreditations and approvals, as well as transfer planning from Kirtland and reverse transfer.</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>2.C. The governing board of the institution is sufficiently autonomous to make decisions in interest of the institution and to assure its integrity.</p> <p>1. The governing board’s deliberations reflect priorities to preserve and enhance the institution.</p>	<p>BOT members are active participants in all strategic planning summits, alongside college administration, faculty, students, and representatives from the community, and provide input for annual operational plans. BOT members attend conferences and workshops, where they can acquire increased insight into leadership and best practices for community colleges. The BOT is responsible for continued financial stability of the College and oversight of board policies. Prior to approval of the annual budget, all department requests, financial data and</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong, Clear, and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>2. The governing board reviews and considers the reasonable and relevant interests of the institution’s internal and external constituencies during its decision-making deliberations.</p> <p>3. The governing board preserves its independence from undue influence on the part of donors, elected officials, ownership interests, or other external parties when such influence would not be in the best interest of the institution.</p> <p>4. The governing board delegates day-to-day management of the institution to the administration and expects the faculty to oversee academic matters.</p>	<p>projections, and other inputs are brought together in the planning process. Prior to approval of the new Mission, Vision, and Values statements, the Board considered input gathered from across the college, which was summarized for common themes by a team of employees and followed College Administrative Team efforts to achieve campus consensus on the final statements generated.</p> <p>The BOT has adopted Standards of Good Practice for ethical behavior. New members undergo new board member training at the onset of their terms to familiarize themselves with all aspects of their positions. BOT powers are identified by the Michigan Community College Act of 1966 as amended, and by board bylaws, which define the limits and responsibilities of the board, in accordance with state regulations, federal laws, and by contracts established with bargaining units.</p> <p>The BOT is not involved in daily operational decision-making at the College. Board bylaws and policies define the role of the administration in decision-making, and the process for changes in board policy creates oversight by the board. The president’s contract provides him or her with the authority to make all hiring and termination decisions. The president communicates with BOT members to build consensus for important strategic decisions. The college Curriculum and Instruction Committee makes recommendations to the administration and ultimately to the Board on matters of programming and curriculum. Employees at the department level have input in establishing budget priorities and written procedures.</p> <p>A specific conflict of interest process,</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>including continual training/formal discussion, clarity that a statement is signed annually by all members, and a recusal practice for the Board, are not addressed in the portfolio. The institution is encouraged to consider strengthening the discussion, including corresponding data and/or qualitative measures, toward improving the evidence provided.</p>	
<p>2.D. The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.</p>	<p>College mission, vision, and values contain statements including excellence, innovation, character, and respect. Kirtland policy affirms the rights of faculty and students to express opinions and engage in classroom discussions, relevant to the course of study, without fear of discipline or censorship by the college.</p> <p>The Faculty Management Agreement contains policy that faculty “shall present controversial issues in an objective manner”. A module of the online college orientation for new adjuncts provides instruction to faculty on copyright as applied to academia. College policy on copyright compliance adheres to the corresponding US Copyright Act and applies to the entire Kirtland community.</p> <p>Existing college policy details academic freedom assurances for students. In cases of plagiarism, faculty may recommend students be enrolled in an online Plagiarism Traffic School, where instruction is provided on plagiarism and proper citation techniques. Library staff are available to guide students on appropriate research practices in general, including evaluating the integrity and validity of resources.</p> <p>The institution is encouraged to consider the following areas towards strengthening available evidence as presented in the</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, Clear, and well presented</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

	<p>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. For example, the nature of faculty recommending students to the school, versus some form of requirement, as well as consequences for students who do not complete the school, seems vague in the current presentation for purposes of judging commitment.</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>1. The institution provides effective oversight and support services to ensure the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by its faculty, staff, and students.</p>	<p>Information on ethical learning and research for students is provided in the Code of Conduct in the Student Handbook, in the online College Catalog, during OAR, and in every course syllabus. Academic misconduct is beginning to be tracked using a new online form available through the Maxient software. The college provides an online Plagiarism Traffic School for students to learn what plagiarism is and how to properly cite information. Faculty may recommend students enroll in the online Plagiarism Traffic School course when they commit plagiarism. Library staff are available to guide students on the use of proper research practices and how to evaluate the validity and integrity of resources.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, Clear, and well presented</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>2. Students are offered guidance in the ethical use of information resources.</p> <p>3. The institution has and enforces policies on academic honesty and integrity.</p>	<p>Ethical conduct is included as part of faculty job descriptions, incorporated into the faculty evaluation process, and articulated in the faculty handbook. The Copyright Policy (POL 4.085) covers the entire Kirtland community including independent contractors hired by the College. A module is included in the online Kirtland Orientation for New Adjuncts (KONA) course to instruct faculty on copyright as it applies to academia.</p> <p>The policy on Rights and Responsibilities of Students (POL 6.125) provides details on cheating. The College has a Peer-To-Peer File Sharing policy (POL 4.100) to address penalties and disciplinary actions for illegal downloading on the College’s computer system.</p> <p>Occurrences of academic integrity/misconduct are reviewed by deans/directors, and the VPIS. Based on a 2013 faculty survey, nearly 73% of respondents thought that plagiarism was a moderate to serious problem at the College; however, between 2014 and 2016, eight student cases of plagiarism were reported by faculty.</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>	
---	--	--

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

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

Core Components (sub-components noted)	Evidence	Screening Feedback on Core Component
<p>3.A. The institution's degree programs are appropriate to higher education.</p> <p>1. Courses and programs are current and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree or certificate awarded.</p> <p>2. The institution articulates and differentiates learning goals for its undergraduate, graduate, postbaccalaureate, post-graduate, and certificate programs.</p> <p>3. The institution's program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (on the main campus, at additional locations, by distance delivery, as dual credit, through contractual or consortial arrangements, or any</p>	<p>Kirtland utilizes a program review process to evaluate the overall currency and effectiveness of academic programs. Assessment methods that are used in the program review process include advisory committee feedback, state licensure and certification pass rates, transfer success rates, and graduate and leaver survey data. Recommendations about the discontinuation of courses and programs are based on the program review process. Course changes are initiated by faculty, reviewed and approved by the CIC, and forwarded to the VPIS for final approval. Program revision or suspension is initiated by faculty or deans/directors, reviewed and approved by the CIC, and recommended to the BOT for final approval.</p> <p>The faculty Assessment Committee meets regularly to review course outcomes/objectives, upon which programs are built.</p> <p>In order to encourage continuity across all modalities, the CTL reviews face-to-face course content with faculty then provides training (best practices, assessment, and pedagogy of online education) in creating the course in Canvas. Evaluating and ensuring program rigor in all modalities and locations is the responsibility of the faculty and administrators.</p> <p>In order to strengthen the evidence for this criterion, the institution is encouraged to</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, Clear, and well presented</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>other modality).</p>	<p>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>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>1. The general education program is appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution.</p> <p>2. The institution articulates the purposes, content, and intended learning outcomes of its undergraduate general education requirements. The program of general education is grounded in a philosophy or framework developed</p>	<p>Kirtland’s six core competencies are based on the current Mission of the College to enhance student lives and build stronger communities. In 2014, the previous thirteen competencies were reduced to six to better reflect the 21st century workforce.</p> <p>The six core competencies are: Communication; Personal Growth and Responsible Citizenship; Technology, Research, and Information Literacy; Problem Solving; Work Productivity; and Systems/Processes. Core competencies are addressed through general education courses for all degree-seeking students. The competencies are threaded through all general education courses rather than tied to a specific course or a single subject area. Since the core competencies are embedded within general education courses, degree-seeking students have multiple opportunities to attain mastery of each competency prior to graduation. A Guided Pathways model is used and includes a list of the general education courses associated with each specific program.</p> <p>Information gathered from student surveys, part-time faculty working in the field, partnerships, and accreditation and licensing</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, Clear, and well presented</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>by the institution or adopted from an established framework. It imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess.</p> <p>3. Every degree program offered by the institution engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments.</p> <p>4. The education offered by the institution recognizes the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work.</p> <p>5. The faculty and students contribute to scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge to the extent appropriate to</p>	<p>bodies, are used to provide feedback as to whether outcomes are consistent with current industry needs and standards. The PROE is administered every three years and provides an evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of all occupational programs, which assists administrators in making modifications in order to keep the programs viable.</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>their programs and the institution's mission.</p>		
<p>3.C. The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services.</p> <p>1. The institution has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out both the classroom and the non-classroom roles of faculty, including e.g., oversight of the curriculum and expectations for student performance; establishment of academic credentials for instructional staff; involvement in assessment of student learning.</p> <p>2. All instructors are appropriately credentialed, including those in dual credit, contractual, and consortial programs.</p> <p>3. Instructors are evaluated regularly in accordance with established institutional policies and procedures.</p> <p>4. The institution has</p>	<p>The VPIS is responsible for ensuring the institution has sufficient numbers of faculty. The VPIS gets input from other instructional administrators, the Vice President of Business Services (VPBS), Institutional Research (IR), and HR in deciding how many faculty are sufficient.</p> <p><i>Kirtland's Faculty Credentialing Review Process</i> specifies determination of appropriate credentials is the responsibility of the deans and directors, with final validation by the VPIS. Minimal faculty requirements are based on HLC and Perkins Grant standards with the additional requirements determined by industry standards or other disciplinary-specific standards. In winter 2016, a full review was completed of all faculty credentials. Instructors teaching dual enrollment classes must adhere to the same credentialing requirements as Kirtland faculty. Faculty providing courses and programs offered through consortia agreements are vetted by the originating college and meet industry standards for certification.</p> <p>The Faculty Master Agreement (FMA) specifies the process of evaluation of new full-time faculty. New faculty who are on probation are evaluated a minimum of two times per semester. Part-time faculty are evaluated once within the first two semesters of employment and then once every three semesters thereafter.</p> <p>The FMA states that faculty members will "maintain state of the art knowledge as it relates to their subject area(s)," and this stipulation is referenced in all faculty job descriptions. Institutional support for faculty</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, Clear, and well presented</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>processes and resources for assuring that instructors are current in their disciplines and adept in their teaching roles; it supports their professional development.</p> <p>5. Instructors are accessible for student inquiry.</p> <p>6. Staff members providing student support services, such as tutoring, financial aid advising, academic advising, and co-curricular activities, are appropriately qualified, trained, and supported in their professional development.</p>	<p>professional development includes obligations specified in the FMA (which are monitored by supervisors), the Faculty Evaluation/Professional Development Committee (which makes decisions on funding requests), the CTL (which provides professional development on Canvas and course design), and a partnership with the ETOM (for the design and implementation of online courses).</p> <p>The FMA states that full-time faculty will provide “reasonable accessibility to students via multiple modalities (e.g., in-person, phone, or email)” and sustain a campus presence separate from teaching hours. The Part-Time Faculty Handbook states, “Part-time faculty must be available and accessible for office hours as needed/requested by students.” Faculty contact information can be found in course syllabi, in Canvas, and on the College’s website.</p> <p>Education and experience qualifications are specified for student support staff including Counselor, Academic Advisor, Director of Library and Tutoring, Reference Librarian, Professional Tutors, Director of CTL, and Teaching and Learning Liaison. All hourly and professional staff and administrators are required by their supervisors, as specified in their job descriptions, to upgrade their skills and capabilities continuously. Support is provided for these expectations and sanctions implemented when there is repeated failure to meet expectations. Professional development funds, beyond those in departmental budgets, are available to administrators and staff for professional meetings, conferences, and workshops needed to keep current in the field.</p> <p>In order to strengthen the evidence in this area, the institution is encouraged to explain</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>how it ensures it has sufficient numbers of faculty involved in non-classroom roles: oversight of the curriculum 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>3.D. The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.</p> <p>1. The institution provides student support services suited to the needs of its student populations.</p> <p>2. The institution provides for learning support and preparatory instruction to address the academic needs of its students. It has a process for directing entering students to courses and programs for which the students are adequately prepared.</p> <p>3. The institution provides academic advising suited to its</p>	<p>Kirtland reports more than 70% of its students in 2016 may be characterized as at-risk, in the sense they received need-based financial aid as economically disadvantaged, disabled, commuters, or unemployed. Placement testing and a mandatory orientation program (called “Orientation, Advising, Registration”) for new students, including meeting with their advisor, address remediation needs and initial program of study design. Faculty reports through GradesFirst software are submitted to alert advisors about students who have not attended or participated in class during the first week of the semester. After the first week, faculty are able to provide further alerts determined by progress, attendance, or poor test scores, as well as provide suggestions to students for improvement and recommend/require tutoring. Math Drop-In Labs and Writing Centers (available at multiple locations and modalities) are corresponding mechanisms in place for supporting student success. Following a review of best practices, the college recently shifted from faculty advising to dedicated advising staff, with the intent of increasing capacity to support students in a broad range of academic, personal, and career</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, Clear, and well presented</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>programs and the needs of its students.</p> <p>4. The institution provides to students and instructors the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning (technological infrastructure, scientific laboratories, libraries, performance spaces, clinical practice sites, museum collections, as appropriate to the institution’s offerings).</p> <p>5. The institution provides to students guidance in the effective use of research and information resources.</p>	<p>counseling. KCC provides services for student subgroups including veterans and students with disabilities. Veterans are supported through a designated veteran resource representative who works one-on-one with veterans as well as a webpage designed to provide general and local veteran information. In 2014, KCC was a recognized as a Military Friendly College and it achieved gold status in 2016. Student services provides a range of disability services for learning and physically disabled students who self-identify and provide documentation to the Disabilities Coordinator.</p> <p>All new students must take placement tests as part of the admissions process. Cut-scores that determine the level of mathematics and/or English courses students can enroll in are periodically reviewed and benchmarked against peer institutions to ensure scores are comparable. KCC provides developmental English and Math courses for students who score below the cut score for college preparedness. Based on declining rates of course completion, changes were made to developmental reading and writing. The Transitional Studies Committee and Instructional Services are responsible for monitoring and measuring the impact of these changes on pass rate.</p> <p>Students recognized as First Time In Any College are required to meet with their advisor prior to being allowed to register for their second semester. Based upon the chosen program of study, the online Guided Pathways, corresponding future course choices, and relevant support services are reviewed. Students who are undecided on a program of study are advised by the college counselor concerning available career information, such as testing and employment resources, and costs and suggested course</p>	
---	---	--

	<p>sequences associated with program choices. Students unsure of a career path are recommended to take the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator test, Strong Interest Inventory, or the ASVAB Career Exploration Program and Find Your Interests Inventory to determine areas of interest and potential future careers.</p> <p>Library support is provided in both on-location print materials and online, with website access provided to interlibrary loan, an assignment calculator, research guides, a bibliography creator, style guide templates, and research tutorials. Library staff are available to provide library tours and information literacy instruction in courses upon faculty request. Faculty may also opt to have librarian modules embedded within Canvas customized to particular courses or research projects, including functionality providing for student contact with a reference librarian. High speed, wireless internet access is supported at all campus locations. Chromebooks are available for classroom use, the library has additional computers available for student use, and every classroom is equipped with projection technology. Kirtland was provided a recent grant by Michigan's Community College Skilled Trades Equipment Program to purchase equipment for several occupational programs which meets or exceeds industry standard. The college reports it is the only location in the region where such equipment is available.</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</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>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>3.E. The institution fulfills the claims it makes for an enriched educational environment.</p> <p>1. Co-curricular programs are suited to the institution’s mission and contribute to the educational experience of its students.</p> <p>2. The institution demonstrates any claims it makes about contributions to its students’ educational experience by virtue of aspects of its mission, such as research, community engagement, service learning, religious or spiritual purpose, and economic development.</p>	<p>Kirtland reports limitations faced as a commuter college regarding co-curricular activities. In Fall 2016, the Student Senate was disbanded. The college hosts an honors society, Phi Theta Kappa. A Veterans Club encourages personal growth and support readjustment to civilian life for service men and women. Other organized activities hosted according to common interests include political awareness events (Constitution Day Recognition, Meet the Candidates), art shows to present the talents of art students, and economic and community assistance (Domestic Violence Awareness, Empty Bowls Project, Food Pantry, Bunk Beds for Local Shelter, and Habitat for Humanity). Students who wish to organize a club may present such a request to the Vice President of Student Services and are required to recruit an employee of the college as an advisor.</p> <p>Kirtland’s core competencies required of all students were recently redesigned (2014). The core includes ability to interact with different audiences in a variety of social and professional settings, growth as a productive citizen in the community, actively participate in the solution of real world problems, ability to contribute to group success, and adapt to changes in the workplace and global community. All elements of the core are</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, Clear, and well presented</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

	<p>required in all general education courses, intentionally differing from a model of general education designations corresponding to individual core competencies. Such a model is also reported as having reduced the number of courses required for completion of an associate's degree. A timeline for assessment of each core competency in rotation has been developed, with the first two scheduled for course embedded assessment during 2015-2016.</p> <p>The design and approval of new programs begins with the consideration of how the proposed program fits with the college mission and strategic plan and with the college's aspirations to enhance student lives and build stronger communities. In parallel, all courses within a proposed program must align with certificate or degree requirements, and programs must meet the requirements of state, federal, and accrediting agencies, as well as those of professional licensure bodies. A campus-wide Curriculum and Instruction Committee reviews program proposals from the perspectives of advising, financial aid, gainful employment, library resources, degree/certificate granted, and enrollment outlook. Each program develops its own Guided Pathway, providing students with routes to complete the degree in a reasonable length of time taking into account any financial aid considerations.</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</p>	
--	---	--

	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.	
--	---	--

Criterion Four. Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

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

Core Components (sub-components noted)	Evidence	Screening Feedback on Core Component
<p>4.A. The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.</p> <p>1. The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.</p> <p>2. The institution evaluates all the credit that it transcripts, including what it awards for experiential learning or other forms of prior learning.</p> <p>3. The institution has policies that assure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.</p> <p>4. The institution maintains and exercises authority</p>	<p>Feedback from the 2007 Systems Portfolio indicated the need for a systematic repeatable program review model. In 2011, the college completed a pilot and formally adopted a new model for annual program reviews, which includes assessments by faculty and administration on strengths, opportunities for improvement, and viability of programs. This also provides criteria used in considerations of program suspension or elimination. Over the past four years, Kirtland has assessed all its degree programs using the program review process, incorporating input from external advisory committees in addition to program review data. Through the process of program review, course outcomes/objectives, faculty credentialing and educational requirements, student success on third party licensure/credentialing examinations, and uniformity of standards across all locations and delivery modalities. Online courses and faculty teaching dual-credit courses must satisfy the same requirements as applied to on-campus locations.</p> <p>Existing college policy applies to</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, Clear, and well presented</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. It assures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.</p> <p>5. The institution maintains specialized accreditation for its programs as appropriate to its educational purposes.</p> <p>6. The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. The institution assures that the degree or certificate programs it represents as preparation for advanced study or employment accomplish these purposes. For all programs, the institution looks to indicators it deems appropriate to its mission, such as employment rates,</p>	<p>consideration of awarding prior learning and transfer credits. Kirtland is a partner in the Michigan Transfer Agreement, allowing a block transfer of 30 general education credits to other higher education institutions in the state. The college additionally maintains transfer degrees and cooperative programs, such as a concurrent nursing baccalaureate program with Saginaw Valley State University. Kirtland recognizes other examinations or educational experiences including armed services educational experiences, possession of licensures or certifications, and portfolio assessments applied to cases of occupational programs. Prior learning credit may be in the form of specific course credit or elective credit in an appropriately determined area.</p> <p>Faculty teaching dual enrollment classes adhere to the same credentialing requirements as Kirtland faculty. Student access to learning resources includes one-on-one tutoring through the GradesFirst software, Math Drop-In Labs available at multiple locations, Writing Center help at multiple locations in addition to the OWL and the VWC writing help by appointment.</p> <p>Kirtland has seven occupational programs (Automotive, Certified Nursing Assistant, Cardiac Sonography, Cosmetology, Medical Assistant, Phlebotomy, and Police Academy) that are certified/recognized/approved and four programs (Emergency Medical Services, Health Information Technology, Nursing, and Surgical Technology) that are at various levels in the accreditation/certification process. Adding industry certifications/licensures/credentials to programs where possible and moving programs through the accreditation/approval process has been identified as a priority for the college.</p>	
--	--	--

<p>admission rates to advanced degree programs, and participation rates in fellowships, internships, and special programs (e.g., Peace Corps and AmeriCorps).</p>	<p>Several sources provide tracking of student success following graduation or transfer, in addition to data considered in program reviews. This includes data concerning success and satisfaction of students transferring to four-year universities. Graduate follow-up surveys provide further input on recent graduates as they seek employment. Leavers Survey results are tracked for data on student who leave Kirtland before completing a program. The college reviews Michigan Bureau of Labor Information and Strategic Initiatives monthly data on available jobs by location and type for trends and top jobs, concerning the employment outlook for future graduates of new and existing programs. Data on placement, employment, and unemployment rates for past graduates are similarly followed, in comparison with the results at peer Michigan colleges.</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 (even though the statement is made all program have been reviewed over the past four years). 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</p>	
---	--	--

	<p>experienced by students as well as identifying actionable opportunities for improvement. Further consideration and corresponding analyses in these areas may be helpful towards improving available evidence presented in the portfolio.</p>	
<p>4.B. The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.</p> <p>1. The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.</p> <p>2. The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.</p> <p>3. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.</p> <p>4. The institution's processes and methodologies to assess student</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Occupational programs are reviewed on a three-year cycle using the Program Review in Occupational Education (PROE).</p> <p>The institution is strongly encouraged to clarify how it has articulated student learning</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, Clear, and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff members.</p>	<p>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.</p>	
<p>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.</p> <p>1. The institution has defined goals for student retention, persistence, and completion that are ambitious but attainable and appropriate to its</p>	<p>As part of the Strategic Plan, Kirtland has a goal of ranking in the top 10 of Michigan Community Colleges for retention, persistence, and completion. Early alerts, progress reports, and academic advisors are all used to support retention efforts. Kirtland identified the state average as a target for student retention, persistence and completion. Projects such as Credit When It's Due and Project Win-Win also have yearly targets.</p> <p>A variety of data are collected on student retention, persistence, and completion including fall-to-fall retention, fall-to-winter completion, State of Michigan Governor's Metrics, IPEDS completion data, Perkins, and VFA data. Data from ACS-I schools of similar size and demographics allows</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, Clear, and well presented</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>mission, student populations, and educational offerings.</p> <p>2. The institution collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence, and completion of its programs.</p> <p>3. The institution uses information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs to make improvements as warranted by the data.</p> <p>4. The institution's processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs reflect good practice. (Institutions are not required to use IPEDS definitions in their determination of persistence or completion rates. Institutions are encouraged to choose measures that are suitable to their student populations, but institutions are accountable for the validity of their measures.)</p>	<p>comparison of peer institutions within Michigan.</p> <p>Institutional retention data, CCSSE data, and graduate survey data were all used to inform improvements in developmental education including rolling two courses into one and revamping the content.</p> <p>The AQIP Project, <i>P2-Project Persistence</i>, consists of a cross-departmental team with members from student services and faculty working on monitoring, advancing, and assessing retention and completion initiatives.</p> <p>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.</p>	
--	---	--

Criterion Five. Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

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

Core Components (sub-components noted)	Evidence	Screening Feedback on Core Component
<p>5.A. The institution’s resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.</p> <p>1. The institution has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered.</p> <p>2. The institution’s resource allocation process ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas or disbursement of revenue to a superordinate entity.</p> <p>3. The goals</p>	<p>Kirtland’s budget process is formalized in an annual planning cycle, which begins in November/December. A budget calendar is produced, and new programs are considered. Then each department head submits a budget request, and institutional research prepares enrollment projections for the following year. A preliminary revenue forecast is generated based on projected tuition, state funding appropriations, and property taxes. Department budgets are reviewed and revised based on the revenue forecast. The BOT holds budget hearings, votes on the final proposed budget, which is required to be balanced by the State of Michigan, and budgets are loaded into Jenzabar for departmental availability by the beginning of the fiscal year. Approximately six months into the fiscal year and again at the end of the fiscal year, the CFO may recommend budget amendments to the BOT, based on actual revenues and expenditures. In the annual audit report, auditors may also recommend changes to accounting practices for the purpose of maintaining acceptable fund balances. Despite enrollment and revenue declines, Kirtland reports audit results reflecting responsible financial stewardship, with cash flow remaining steady and having avoided significant cuts to departments.</p> <p>The college reviews its cost per student contact hour in comparison to peer colleges</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong, Clear, and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>incorporated into mission statements or elaborations of mission statements are realistic in light of the institution's organization, resources, and opportunities.</p> <p>4. The institution's staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.</p> <p>5. The institution has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expenses.</p>	<p>in Michigan, for purposes of remaining competitive and projecting future revenue. Additionally, budgeted and actual expenses are tracked according to instruction, public service, instructional support, student services, administrative, and physical plant. Although data for the 14-15 and 15-16 budgets appear to show significantly lower than budgeted instructional expenses and higher than budgeted administrative expenses, potentially due to expense classification issues that can be further reviewed, this allows for analysis of college allocation decisions in relation to overall instructional support. Corresponding data from a 2015 audit report shows more than 50% of college funds committed to instructional purposes and another 18% devoted to student support. Kirtland mission and values, which focus on enhancing student lives, building stronger communities, and becoming a first choice institution for learner-centered education, are reflected in such attention to resources directed toward educational purposes. Kirtland also sees it as vitally important to work closely with its regional stakeholders who are supported by and provide support for its mission.</p> <p>In accordance with HLC guidelines on faculty qualifications, all faculty in the arts and sciences hold master's or doctorate degrees. Starting in 2014, faculty in the career and technical education programs for both certificate and associate's degrees hold a bachelor's, master's, or doctorate degree. Those teaching dual-enrolled courses are required to meet the same faculty qualifications of the college. Faculty providing courses and programs offered through consortia agreements, such as in the case of a radiography program with Mid-Michigan Community College, have been vetted by the originating college and meet industry</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>standards for certification. Qualifications for support services personnel are detailed according to positions as counselor, academic advisor, director of library and tutoring, reference librarian, professional and lead tutors, director of the CTL, and teaching and learning liaison. Full-time faculty have peer mentors assigned within their disciplines. Part-time faculty have peer mentors made available to them. Volunteer peer mentors are available to assist other new employees. Professional development activities/training are made available to both staff and faculty.</p>	
<p>5.B. The institution’s governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.</p> <p>1. The institution has and employs policies and procedures to engage its internal constituencies—including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff, and students—in the institution’s governance.</p> <p>2. The governing board is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight for the institution’s</p>	<p>College policies and procedures are written to reflect the mission, vision, and values. An example of this is evident in the inclusion of students, employees, local school districts, program advisory members, local business leaders, and community members in strategic planning summits held every five years. Regarding operations and mission effectiveness, faculty union members meet with administration to discuss College issues. The Instructional Council (IC) whose members include academic advisors, financial aid advisors, faculty, and students meet monthly to discuss and resolve instructional concerns brought before them. The College additionally has policies in place for the resolution of disputes in a civil and respectful manner.</p> <p>BOT responsibilities and scope of authority are identified by the Michigan Community College Act of 1966 and board bylaws, in accordance with state regulations, federal laws, and bargaining unit contracts. New members participate in training at the beginning of their terms to provide familiarity with all aspects of the position. Additionally, members attend several retreats during the</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, Clear, and well presented</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities.</p> <p>3. The institution enables the involvement of its administration, faculty, staff, and students in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort.</p>	<p>years, allowing for extended discussion of strategic, operational, and budgetary topics, as well as attending relevant conferences on trustee-related best practices. The BOT has adopted Standards of Good Practice for ethical behavior and regularly reviews its bylaws for currency (most recent revision 2013). In compliance with Michigan state law, the Board passes a balanced budget for each upcoming fiscal year. Employee achievements, professional and civic, are included in a monthly report provided to the BOT. Upon completion of a professional improvement leave, employees are asked to present a report to their supervisors and/or the Board.</p> <p>Core competencies, required of all students, were reviewed in 2014 and recently revised. Recommendations of a campus Instructional Committee were presented for further review, revision, and implementation by the faculty during a professional development day. The Curriculum and Instruction Committee (CIC) reviews, recommends, and approves all changes to the curriculum while exploring how the proposed changes will affect various departments (e.g. financial aid) and programs. Representatives to the CIC are advisors, financial aid advisors, faculty, deans, and students. Occupational programs require advisory committees consisting of faculty, deans, and employers in the field to work with the faculty and deans on the skills needed for the current workforce. Student input from mid- and end-of- semester surveys provides feedback to faculty and deans/directors as to where course instruction and/or the learning environment could be modified to improve student success in the course. Several groups ensure the currency, relevancy, and alignment of student learning outcomes. Advisory committees, comprised of faculty, employers, and others</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>related to the program, provide feedback as to quality of employees Kirtland graduates make. Faculty review data from the core competency assessments to determine the adjustments needed to ensure the competencies are relevant and can be met. Student Services (SS) and the faculty work with other colleges and universities to ensure that both new and existing courses and content are aligned and transferable.</p> <p>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.</p>	
<p>5.C. The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.</p> <p>1. The institution allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities.</p> <p>2. The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.</p> <p>3. The planning process encompasses the institution as a</p>	<p>The first strategic planning summit was held in 2008 and the most recent was held in September 2013. The strategic planning summit that is held every five years includes students, employees, the BOT, the Kirtland Foundation, program advisory board members, representatives from local government, and community members. Institutional data and planning assumptions are incorporated into the planning process.</p> <p>Kirtland's strategic plan is aligned with its mission, vision, and values and the operational plan flows from the strategic plan. Administrators are assigned responsibility for each of the goals in the operational plan. Components of the plan also inform yearly budgets, AQIP action projects, departmental/division plans, and assessment plans.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, Clear, and well presented</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups.</p> <p>4. The institution plans on the basis of a sound understanding of its current capacity. Institutional plans anticipate the possible impact of fluctuations in the institution's sources of revenue, such as enrollment, the economy, and state support.</p> <p>5. Institutional planning anticipates emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization.</p>	<p>Kirtland takes into account current trends of shrinking revenue sources and increasing costs when planning. Kirtland has expanded programming, strengthened online education, added locations to increase access for students, streamlined its organizational structure, and restructured facilities management. The College pursues state and federal government grants for the purchase of equipment for many of its programs. According to a 2015 federal government report, Kirtland ranks in the top 100 in the nation for lowest net cost for students.</p> <p>The institution is encouraged to more clearly explain how it links its strategic planning process with its processes for assessment of student learning and its processes for evaluation of operations, including how data from these processes support planning and budgeting.</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>5.D. The institution works systematically to improve its performance.</p> <p>1. The institution</p>	<p>Kirtland has developed a formal process for selecting and deploying quality improvement initiatives as defined in the Kirtland AQIP Process Flow Chart CQI Toolbox and Kirtland Action Project Checklist. Additional steps taken to systematize its approach to CQI</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, Clear, and well presented</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p>

<p>develops and documents evidence of performance in its operations.</p> <p>2. The institution learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its component parts</p>	<p>include the implementation of an annual retreat for the CAT; the establishment of the QCT; integration of AQIP and CQI into new employee orientation, including employees from different areas in the strategy forum and in action projects; and the creation of the AQIP Mini Action Project Reporting Sheet.</p> <p>The portfolio states that Kirtland is committed to the AQIP process and recognizes challenges it had had in building a culture of continuous improvement across the institution.</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><input type="checkbox"/>Unclear or incomplete</p>
--	--	--