MONTEREY PENINSULA COLLEGE

Accreditation Midterm Report
March 2013

Submitted by

Monterey Peninsula College
980 Fremont Street
Monterey, CA 93940-4799

Submitted to

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

Board of Trustees

Mr. Charles Brown, Chair
Dr. Loren Steck, Vice Chair
Dr. Margaret-Anne Coppernoll
Ms. Marilyn Gustafson
Mr. Rick Johnson
Mr. Daniel Cervantes, Student Trustee

Superintendent/President

Dr. Walt Tribley

Accreditation Mid-Term Committee

Dr. Celine Pinet
Dr. Alfred Hochstaedter
Ms. Diane Boynton
Ms. Grace Anongchanya-Calima
Ms. Catherine Webb

Table of Contents

Certification of the Mid-term Report

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

From: Monterey Peninsula College
980 Fremont Street
Monterey, CA. 93940

Monterey Peninsula College submits this Mid-term Report in fulfillment of the Commission's requirement.

We certify that there was broad participation by the campus community and the Mid-term Report reflects the status of the recommendations and improvement plans the College has been asked to address.

Signed: _____ Date: _____
Dr. Walt Tribley
Superintendent/President, Monterey Peninsula College

_____ Date:_____
Mr. Charles Brown
Chair, Governing Board

_____ Date: _____
Dr. Alfred Hochstaedter
President, Academic Senate

_____ Date: _____
Loran Walsh
President, Classified Union

_____ Date: _____
Mark Berube
President, Associated Students of Monterey Peninsula College

_____ Date: _____
Dr. Celine Pinet
Accreditation Liaison Office, Vice-President, Academic Affairs

Statement on Report Preparation

In August 2012, the College's Accreditation Liaison Officer, Celine Pinet (Vice President, Academic Affairs), initiated the development of the Accreditation Midterm Report. Assignments were given to specific members of the administration, classified staff and faculty in regards to investigating and reporting on progress made on:

1. The recommendations from the 2010 visiting team, and
2. The College's self-identified planning agendas from the 2010 Self-Study.

Leaders and team members convened in August and September to undertake the investigation and reporting phase of the overall report. Those participants are listed below:

Standard	Leaders	Position
Standard IIA.2.e, 2.f	Michael Gilmartin	Dean of Instructional Planning
Standard IIA.2.i	Celine Pinet Alfred Hochstaedter	Vice President, Academic Affairs Academic Senate President
Standard IIA.6, 6.a, 6.b, 6c	Carsbia Anderson Larry Walker Michael Gilmartin	Vice President, Student Services Dean of Student Services Dean of Instructional Planning
Standard IIC.1	Celine Pinet Carsbia Anderson	Vice President, Academic Affairs Vice President, Student Services
Standard IIC.1.a	Steve Ma	Vice President, Administrative Services
Standard IIC.1.b	Celine Pinet Gary Fuller Alfred Hochstaedter Catherine Webb	Vice President, Academic Affairs MPCTA Chief Negotiator Academic Senate President Distance Ed Committee Co-Chair
Standard IIC.1.d	Celine Pinet	Vice President, Academic Affairs
Standard IIID.2.g	Steve Ma	Vice President, Administrative Services
Standard IVB.1.e	Doug Garrison Walt Tribley Carla Robinson Vicki Nakamura	President/Superintendent (retired 12/14/12) President/Superintendent (12/17/12 to present) Executive Assistant to the President Assistant to the President

The Accreditation Midterm Report in its draft form was submitted to the College Council for a first reading on December 4, 2012. The College Council is the MPC shared governance group responsible for making recommendations to the President/Superintendent on institutional matters that must be submitted to the Board of Trustees. The second reading followed on December 18,

2012, at which time the College Council voted approval and recommended that the President/Superintendent submit the report to the Monterey Peninsula College Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees approved the Midterm Report on January 23, 2013 (ACCJC Mid-term Report Timeline).

Response to 2010 Visiting Team Recommendations and the Commission Action Letter

Preface:
Monterey Peninsula College completed its last Self-Study in 2010. Subsequent to the visit, the Commission reaffirmed the institution's accreditation and requested a series of follow-up reports. The principle events of the current accreditation cycle are as follows:

- January 2010: MPC submitted its Self-Study and Application for Reaffirmation of Accreditation.
  http://www.mpc.edu/information/accreditation/Accreditation%20Documents/AccreditationRpt.pdf
  http://www.mpc.edu/information/accreditation/Accreditation%20Documents/Addendum.pdf

- March 2010: MPC hosted the ACCJC visiting team and received their Evaluation Report, which includes four recommendations.
  http://www.mpc.edu/information/accreditation/Accreditation%20Documents/Accreditation%20Team%20Report%20March%208-11%202010.pdf

- June 2010: The ACCJC reaffirmed accreditation for MPC, issued four recommendations, and requested two follow-up reports to address the recommendations.
  http://www.mpc.edu/information/accreditation/Accreditation%20Documents/Accreditation%20Reaffirm%20Letter%206.30.10.pdf

- October 2011: MPC submitted a follow-up report to address Recommendation #4 -- Distance Education. The ACCJC accepted this follow-up report and requested a second follow-up report the following year.
  http://www.mpc.edu/information/accreditation/Accreditation%20Documents/ACCJC%20Follow-up%20Report%20Recommendation%204%20-%20Distance%20Education%20October%202011.pdf

- October 2012: MPC submitted a second follow-up report to address Recommendation #4 – Distance Education.
  http://www.mpc.edu/information/accreditation/Accreditation%20Documents/ACCJC%20Follow-up%20Report%202%20Recommendation%204%20-%20Distance%20Education%20October%202012.pdf

- October 2012: MPC submitted a follow-up report to address Recommendations #1-3 – SLOs.
  http://www.mpc.edu/information/accreditation/Accreditation%20Documents/ACCJC%20Follow-up%20Report%20Response%20to%20Recs%201%20to%203%20October%202012.pdf

The four recommendations, beginning on page 8, are derived from the June 2010 action letter from the Commission. All recommendations were substantially addressed and described in the October 2012 Follow-up Report for Recommendations #1-3 – SLOs, and the October 2011 and October 2012 Follow-up Reports for Recommendation #4 – Distance Education.

Recommendations and Responses

The sections below reiterate each of the four recommendations and explain the response of the College leading up to the follow-up reports. In addition, for the Midterm Report, the College reports additional progress made on each recommendation since the October 2012 submission of the most recent follow-up reports.

Recommendation 1:

In order to meet the Commission's 2012 deadline and building upon the progress made in identifying student learning outcomes for nearly all courses, program, certificates and degrees, the team recommends that the College complete the process of assessment to guide improvement of student learning (IIA.1 and IIA.2).

Link to Response to Recommendation 1:

http://www.mpc.edu/information/accreditation/Accreditation%20Documents/ACCJC%20Follow-up%20Report%20Response%20to%20Recs%201%20to%203%20October%202012.pdf

Summary of Response to Recommendation 1:

MPC has completed this process by assessing student attainment of student learning outcomes, engaging in dialog about the results, and integrating the process into its program review and resource allocation processes. The heart of the process is "Program Reflections." Every semester at flex days, personnel from all areas of the institution take at least a two-hour break from their regular activities and engage in dialog about student learning. In instructional areas, faculty discuss student attainment of student learning outcomes and goals for improvement. In student services, faculty and staff discuss student attainment of the desired outcomes for their services. In administrative areas of the College, management and staff discuss how the services they provide for the College support student learning and how improvement could be attained.

Program reflections are well integrated into the program review and resource allocation processes. The results of the dialog during program reflections provides the rationale for resource allocation requests, both through the action plan process and through a variety of other resource allocation processes. Foundation grant proposals, classified position requests, travel reimbursement requests and other such processes all require statements about how the funds support student learning and related concepts discussed during program reflections. Summaries of program reflections are presented annually to shared governance groups such as the Academic Affairs Advisory Group, the Student Services Advisory Group, and the Administrative Services Advisory Group, as well as to the Academic Senate, College Council and to the Board of Trustees. The purpose of these presentations is to promote widespread understanding of student learning issues in various areas of the College and a deeper understanding of the rationale behind resource allocation requests, and ultimately resource allocation decisions.

Progress since submittal of Response to Recommendation 1:

Since MPC submitted its Follow-Up Report on Student Learning Outcomes in October 2012, there have been a few subsequent accomplishments. The institution has continued to improve its assessment process in the following ways:

1. Improving the form used to guide program reflections dialog. This form was revised in Fall 2012 and will be used during the Spring 2013 program reflections event. Questions on the form were re-ordered and the instructions were slightly revised so that respondents will more directly focus on referencing specific SLOs and related improvements or changes from the previous semester. For example, in the revised form, a question concerning improvements that have occurred as a result of past efforts is now the first question. In previous versions of this form, this question was preceded by "if possible…" Since MPC has now been engaged in the program reflections process for several semesters, the form now specifically asks participants to discuss improvements based on previous efforts.

Changes were also made to the instructions on the first page of the form. The slightly revised instructions target student attainment of student learning outcomes even more directly. The questions included in the instructions now include the following:

If you are unsure how to begin the discussion, respond to the following questions:

- What did you talk about last time in your Program Reflections? Were any changes made? Did you notice any changes in student learning that might have been caused by those changes?
- To what degree are students attaining the SLO(s) that you have decided to focus on this semester?
- Where would you like to see improvement?
- What kinds of programmatic changes could be made to instigate improvement in student learning?

The intent of these changes is to prompt MPC personnel to focus on student learning and attainment of SLOs to an even greater degree than in previous versions of the form. The changes were recommended by the SLO Committee and discussed at the Academic Affairs Advisory Group on October 24, 2012 **(R1.1)** and at the Academic Senate on November 1, 2012 **(R1.2)**.

2. Ongoing dialog about SLOs now naturally occurring outside formal "reflections" process: Many other conversations about student learning now take place across campus beyond that which takes place through our bi-yearly formal reflections about SLOs. For example, in October 2012, the Academic Senate President/SLO Coordinator attended the RP Group Strengthening Student Success Conference. Upon return, he reported back to the SLO Committee, the Academic Affairs Advisory Group, and the Academic Senate on information and insights gleaned from the conference. These presentations prompted wide-ranging conversations about the current state of SLOs in the California community college system in the context of evolving accreditation requirements, federal mandates, the Student Success Initiative, and improving student learning. Major points of discussion involved the appropriate uses of data in evaluating student learning, the "completion agenda", the accountability movement, and the movement

from a teacher- or course-centric model of instruction to an institutional model where faculty, management, and staff are all united in a common goal of student learning. One of the oft-repeated themes from the conference that resonated with MPC faculty and staff was the idea that for quantitative assessment to have value, one must be able to see the faces of the students in the data. Otherwise, the data lacks contextual meaning and is difficult to use effectively **(R1.1, R1.3, R1.4)**.

3. Tying Component Goals to the Education Master Plan, for integrated planning and institutional effectiveness in support of student learning. MPC has been using component, or operational, goals for several years to establish, communicate, and then evaluate progress on annual goals **(R1.5)**. These are tied in with Education Master Plan Objectives and with long term Institutional Goals **(R1.6)** and are developed for the three main areas of campus. Each led by a vice president, these three areas of campus include Academic Affairs, Administrative Services, and Student Services. As explained in the Institutional Follow-Up Report to Recommendations #1-3, the Education Master Plan (EMP) was developed through a process of widespread input from all areas of the College. To formulate the EMP, all areas of the institution were asked to review their recent Program Reflections documents and summarize their program's mission, scope, and direction. Through this inclusive process, the program reflections process provided the basis for development of the EMP.

Now annual goals of the College are being tied to the EMP promoting alignment and cohesion. In this way, results of the previous semesters' program reflections dialog are being used to shape the annual goals of the Academic Affairs area, and then these goals are evaluated to assess progress. For example, 2012-13 Academic Affairs Operational Goal #1 is "In collaboration with the Academic Senate, Institutional Committee on Distance Education, Dean of Instructional Technology, Director of Information Technology, and other constituents, ensure support for distance education offerings." This goal directly supports working towards the EMP objective to "Develop an online MPC general education pattern and 3 to 5 online certificate programs. Also consider developing an online recertification program, a Career Technical Education online associate degree program, and online components that support SB 1440 general education transfer patterns." The general topics of technology and distance education are common topics of discussion during the program reflections discussions on student learning outcomes, and these topics commonly appear in departmental program review documents **(R1.7, R1.8)**.

Evidence of Progress in Response to Recommendation 1:

- **R1.1** AAAG Minutes 10-24-12: http://mympc.mpc.edu/Committees/AAAG/AAG%20Minutes/AAAG%20Notes%2010-24-12.pdf
- **R1.2** Academic Senate Minutes from 11-1-12 http://www.mpcfaculty.net/senate/11-1-12/Minutes11-1-12.pdf
- **R1.3** RP Group Report: http://www.mpcfaculty.net/senate/RPGroup/RPGroup2012Report.pptx
- **R1.4** Academic Senate Minutes 10-18-12: http://www.mpcfaculty.net/senate/10-18-12/Minutes10-18-12.pdf

- **R1.5** Shared Decision-Making Plan: http://www.mpc.edu/collegecouncil/College%20Council%20Bylaws/Planning%20and%20Resource%20Allocation%20Process%20CC%20approved%205-15-12.pdf
- **R1.6** Institutional Goals & College Catalog, PDF page 8: http://www.mpc.edu/classes/MPC%20Catalogs/2012-13%20Catalog.pdf
- **R1.7** Academic Affairs 2012-2013 Operational Goals: http://www.mpc.edu/collegecouncil/College%20%20Council%20Agendas%20and%20Minutes%202011/Component%20Goals%20Academic%20Affairs%202012-2013%20Final.pdf
- **R1.8** MPC Educational Master Plan: http://www.mpc.edu/academics/EducationMasterPlan2012/Education%20Master%20Plan%20Final.pdf

Recommendation 2:

In order to meet the Commission's 2012 deadline, the team recommends the College completes the process of identifying course level student learning outcomes and ensures student information is clear, that SLOs are described, and that students receive syllabi reflective of the identified student learning outcomes (IIA.2 and IIA.6).

Link to Response to Recommendation 2:
http://www.mpc.edu/information/accreditation/Accreditation%20Documents/ACCJC%20Follow-up%20Report%20Response%20to%20Recs%201%20to%203%20October%202012.pdf

Summary of Response to Recommendation 2:

At their first meeting of the Fall 2010 semester, the MPC Academic Senate recommended that all faculty members include their course SLOs on all syllabi (**R2.1**). In each succeeding semester MPC faculty members were required to include SLOs on their syllabi (**R2.2, R2.3**). The Office of Academic Affairs collects copies of syllabi for all MPC courses offered each semester. If SLOs are not included on syllabi, faculty members are asked by the Office of Academic Affairs to revise syllabi that lack SLOs and turn them in again **(R2.4)**. By Spring 2012, a large majority of syllabi contained the course SLOs (**R2.5**).

Progress since submittal of Response to Recommendation 2:

After several semesters of educating faculty members about the requirement to include SLOs on all course syllabi, MPC has attained virtually complete adherence to the requirement of including SLOs on all course syllabi. The Office of Academic Affairs now sends out much fewer emails to ask faculty members to revise their syllabi and include the SLOs on them. Nearly 100% of faculty members have now included SLOs on the first version of the syllabi collected by the Office of Academic Affairs

Evidence of Progress in Response to Recommendation 2:

- **R2.1** Academic Senate Minutes 9-2-12 recommending inclusion of SLOs on all syllabi: http://www.mpcfaculty.net/senate/9-2-10/Minutes9-2-10.pdf
- **R2.2** Fall 2012 Syllabi containing SLOs A-L
- **R2.3** Fall 2012 Syllabi containing SLOs M-Z
- **R2.4** Example of Academic Affairs Program Reflections Fall 2012 with progress feedback
- **R2.5** Examples of Spring 2012 Course Syllabi with SLOs: http://www.mpc.edu/information/accreditation/College%20Status%20Evidence%20Documents/Spring%202012%20Course%20Syllabi%20with%20SLOs%20(2).pdf

Recommendation 3:

In order to meet the Commission's 2012 deadline, the team recommends the College take appropriate steps to ensure that faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes, and that this standard is achieved by the 2012 deadline established by the ACCJC (IIIA.1c).

Link to Response to Recommendation 3:
http://www.mpc.edu/information/accreditation/Accreditation%20Documents/ACCJC%20Follow-up%20Report%20Response%20to%20Recs%201%20to%203%20October%202012.pdf

Summary of Response to Recommendation 3:

MPC has addressed the intent of the ACCJC standard to include SLOs in evaluations. Because the SLO process is contained within the program review process, the Academic Senate recommended to the faculty union that participation in program reflections and review be included in faculty evaluations. In late spring 2012, these additions to the faculty contract and evaluation documents were negotiated and agreed upon by the district and the faculty union **(R3.1, R3.2)**.

Progress since submittal of Response to Recommendation 3:

Beginning in the Fall 2012 semester, the new faculty self-evaluation guide that includes language about participating in program review and/or program reflections was used in MPC's faculty evaluation process. The new language in the self-evaluation guide reads, "Describe your participation in program review and/or program reflections." During the Fall 2012 semester, approximately 20 full-time faculty members and 40 adjunct faculty members were evaluated using these guidelines. Full-time faculty members were required to fill Part B, where this language resides, whereas for adjunct faculty members, the Part B section is optional. The 2010 Self Evaluation document reports that in recent semesters MPC has completed 100% of its faculty evaluations **(R3.3).**

Evidence of Progress in Response to Recommendation 3:

- **R3.1** Tentative Agreement between the faculty union and the district: http://www.mpcfaculty.net/senate/MPCTA/SLO-TentAgreement-5-10-2012.pdf
- **R3.2** Faculty union meeting minutes from 5-25-12, reporting the faculty had voted in favor of including the SLO language in the faculty contract: http://www.mpcfaculty.net/senate/MPCTA/MPCTAMinutes5-25-12.pdf
- **R3.3** Guide for faculty self-evaluation used beginning in Fall 2012: http://www.mpcfaculty.net/senate/mpcta/Guide-for-faculty-self-evaluation-2012-13.pdf

Recommendation 4:

To increase effectiveness of distance education offerings, the team recommends the College follow through with a plan to design an evaluation process and evaluation tool to provide students an opportunity to evaluate the learning experience specific to online courses (IIA.2 and IIB.3a). Further, the team recommends the Distance Education Task Force develop clear protocols and strategic goals for distance education learners that meet the institutional outcomes of the College and ACCJC policy on distance education (IIA.1, IIA.2 and IIA.6).

Link to Response to Recommendation 4:
http://www.mpc.edu/information/accreditation/Accreditation%20Documents/ACCJC%20Follow-up%20Report%202%20Recommendation%204%20-%20Distance%20Education%20October%202012.pdf

Summary of Response to Recommendation 4:

Monterey Peninsula College has taken direct action in response to this recommendation, as outlined in the ACCJC Follow-up Report for Recommendation #4 on Distance Education. This report, submitted to the Commission in October 2012, identifies the activities, initiatives, procedures and protocols that have been established and implemented to address ACCJC recommendations for increasing the effectiveness of distance education offerings on our campus.

Recommendation #4 urges focus in two main areas: (1) the online course evaluation process and tool, and (2) development of clear protocols and strategic goals for distance education learners. In response to the first element of the recommendation, MPC has redesigned the online teacher evaluation survey and implemented its use in all distance education evaluations **(R4.1)**. In addressing the second element of the recommendation, concrete actions have been taken to clarify distance education protocols and strengthen strategic goals. These actions include the establishment of the MPC Online Center, the Institutional Committee on Distance Education (ICDE) as a standing campus committee, formal reporting procedures, updated protocols for online and hybrid course curriculum approvals, student learning outcomes for all online courses, resources and professional development activities for online faculty, resources and services that support online student success, and a long-term commitment to the growth and development of distance education.

Progress since submittal of Response to Recommendation 4:

In Fall 2012, the College hired an Associate Dean of Instructional Technology and Development, who now has direct oversight for distance education programs. The Associate Dean leads efforts related to continuous improvement of the online learning environment, including improvements to the online course evaluation process, clarification of protocols and strategic goals for distance education learners, and the development of quality standards for online learning environments **(R4.2, R4.3)**.

Additionally, the Institutional Committee on Distance Education adopted goals for the 2012-2013 school year related to the elements of Recommendation 4 to continue implementing

activities documented in our October 2012 response **(R4.4)**. Reports on specific progress on these goals can be seen in the ICDE minutes **(R4.5)**.

Evidence of Progress in Response to Recommendation 4:

- **R4.1** Guide for Faculty Self-Evaluation
- **R4.2** ICDE discussion on what is quality online education
  ICDE minutes, 11-16-12
- **R4.3** Academic Senate discussion on DE Quality
  http://www.mpcfaculty.net/senate/11-15-12/Minutes11-15-12.pdf
- **R4.4** ICDE Working Goals, 2012-2013
- **R4.5** ICDE Minutes, 9-21-12

Response to Self-Identified Planning Agendas

Planning Agenda Summary

The accreditation self-study process encouraged the College to evaluate the quality of the institution in its service to students and the community. Satisfied with most of its programs, processes, and procedures, the College nonetheless determined that further steps could be taken to institutionalize continuous quality improvement. The College set forth nine plan recommendations relevant to various sections of Standards II, III, and IV.
These recommendations are as follows:

1. The CurricUNET specialist, under the supervision of the Dean of Instructional Planning, will train faculty to use the CurricUNETsystem.
2. In collaboration with the Academic Senate, Division Chairs, and faculty, the SLO Committee will provide leadership to complete the General Education SLOs.
3. The Counseling Department, in collaboration with academic departments and instructional faculty, will establish a formal, consistent method of evaluating the course content, course objectives and/or student learning outcomes of incoming transfer coursework to assure that these courses have course objectives and/or learning outcomes comparable to MPC courses.
4. The coordinators and directors of academic support programs will implement a plan to inform faculty and staff of services available, their location and hours of operation.
5. The College will conduct an examination of on-campus computer usage and develop a plan that will enable the institution to replace equipment and upgrade software on a schedule congruent with resources.
6. As part of the continuous quality improvement effort, the Vice President of Academic Affairs will collaborate with the Academic Senate, the faculty union and the instructional divisions to design an evaluation process for all online courses.
7. The College will examine access points to the Library and Technology Center, as various learning support services keep inconsistent hours and thus make securing the building a challenge. Following this examination, the College will implement a plan to address issues associated with securing the Library and Technology Center.
8. Fiscal Services will implement a system to process purchase requisitions online and computerize the district's capital asset accounting.
9. The Superintendent/President will inform the College community of Board policy revisions.

These recommendations provided the framework for continued College-wide efforts to enhance the College in areas related to Student Learning Programs and Services, Resources, and Leadership and Governance.

Plan Standards

Standard IIA.2e, 2.f:
Section 2.e – The institution evaluates all courses and programs through an ongoing systematic review of their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans.

Section 2.f – The institution engages in ongoing, systematic evaluation and integrated planning to assure currency and measure achievement of its stated student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution systematically strives to improve those outcomes and makes the results available to appropriate constituencies.

Plan Recommendation
The CurricUNET specialist, under the supervision of the Dean of Instructional Planning, will train faculty to use the CurricUNET system.

Status and Progress Made: Implemented and Ongoing

Faculty training on CurricUNET began on September 9, 2009. Over the last few years, training for faculty on how to use CurricUNET has been provided in a variety of ways including flex day presentations, department meetings, small groups and individually. To date, over 100 full-time and adjunct faculty members have been trained **(SIIA.E1)**. Some faculty members have been trained more than once. After their initial training, faculty member(s) can contact the CurricUNET specialist if they need additional training. When faculty need help with specific issues, the CurricUNET specialist is available to assist faculty in working through any problems they may encounter. As CurricUNET continues to evolve and change to keep up with revisions to Title 5 and with new versions of the software, training will continue to be provided by the College for all full-time and adjunct faculty on an ongoing basis.

Evidence:

- **SIIA.E1** List of faculty trained on CurricUNET

Standard IIA.2.i:
The institution awards degrees and certificates based on student achievement of a program's stated learning outcomes.

Plan Recommendation
In collaboration with the Academic Senate, Division Chairs, and faculty, the SLO Committee will provide leadership to complete the General Education SLOs.

Status and Progress Made: Implemented

In its efforts leading up to the 2010 accreditation visit, the institution identified a philosophy and plan for its General Education Outcomes (GEOs). The College recognized that transfer and Associate degree programs share similar general education patterns and thus require students to engage in specific bodies of knowledge drawn from Humanities, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, English, etc. To capture the similarities, the College created one GEO for each area **(SIIA.E2)**.

After significant dialog, the GEOs adopted by the College include the following:

- *MPC Area A1: English Composition*
  Upon successful completion of this area, students will have demonstrated an ability to form a provable thesis, develop it through factual research, distinguish between fact and opinion, and make effective rhetorical choices in relation to audience and purpose.
- *MPC Area A2: Communication and Analytical Thinking*
  Upon successful completion of this area, students will have demonstrated an ability to analyze and evaluate complex issues or problems, draw reasoned conclusions and/or generate solutions, and effectively communicate their results.
- *MPC Area B: Natural Sciences*
  Upon successful completion of this area, students will have demonstrated an ability to use the scientific method to investigate phenomena in the natural world and use concepts, experiments, and/or theory to explain them.
- *MPC Area C, Humanities*
  Upon successful completion of this area, students will have demonstrated an ability to analyze and interpret human thought, achievement, and expression relevant to such branches of knowledge as philosophy, literature, and/or the fine and performing arts, and to communicate the results.
- *MPC Area D, Social Sciences*
  Upon successful completion of this area, students will have demonstrated an ability to critically examine and comprehend human nature and behavior, social traditions, and institutions.
- *MPC Area E1, Life-Long Learning and Self Development--Wellness*
  Upon successful completion of this area, students will have demonstrated an ability to analyze how physical, social, emotional, and/or intellectual factors contribute to wellness and healthful living.
  OR

- *MPC Area E2, Life-Long Learning and Self Development--Introduction to Careers*
  Upon successful completion of this area, students will have demonstrated an ability to accurately assess knowledge, skills, and abilities in relationship to their educational, career, and/or personal goals.
- *MPC Area F, Intercultural Studies*
  Upon successful completion of this area, students will have demonstrated an ability to examine interactions and interconnections across cultures.

After the development of this Plan Recommendation for the 2012 accreditation Self Evaluation, the institution implemented the GEO plan. Implementation involved taking each general education course and inputting the appropriate GEO into CurricUNet as one of the course-level SLOs. The program SLOs would therefore be assessed during the normal process of evaluating course-level SLOs in the regular program reflections process.

Implementation was carried out by contacting each faculty member who taught a general education course, informing them of the plan, and asking them for their consent. Details of the process were explained to shared governance groups including the Academic Senate and the Academic Affairs Advisory Group. By Fall 2012, GEOs were uploaded into CurricUNet for all general education courses. Evaluation of these GEOs is currently underway with the ongoing program reflections each semester during flex days.

PowerPoint used to explain the process to various shared governance groups:
http://www.mpcfaculty.net/senate/SLOs/GEOsSLOsProgramsExample.pdf

Evidence:

- **SIIA.E2** MPC General Education Outcomes
  http://www.mpcfaculty.net/senate/SLO-GE.htm

Standard IIA.6, 6.a, 6.b, 6.c:

Section 6 – The institution assures that students and prospective students receive clear and accurate information about educational courses and programs and transfer policies. The institution describes its degrees and certificates in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, and expected student learning outcomes. In every class section students receive a course syllabus that specifies learning objectives consistent with those in the institution's officially approved course outline.

Section 6.a – The institution makes available to its students clearly stated transfer-of-credit policies in order to facilitate the mobility of students without penalty. In accepting transfer credits to fulfill degree requirements, the institution certifies that the expected learning outcomes for transferred courses are comparable to the learning outcomes of its own courses. Where patterns of student enrollment between institutions are identified, the institution develops articulation agreements as appropriate to its mission.

Section 6.b – When programs are eliminated or program requirements are significantly changed, the institution makes appropriate arrangements so that enrolled students may complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption.

Section 6.c – The institution represents itself clearly, accurately, and consistently to prospective and current students, the public, and its personnel through its catalogs, statements, and publications, including those presented in electronic formats. It regularly reviews institutional policies, procedures, and publications to assure integrity in all representations about its mission, programs, and services.

Plan Recommendation

The Counseling Department, in collaboration with academic departments and instructional faculty, will establish a formal, consistent method of evaluating the course content, course objectives and/or student learning outcomes of incoming transfer coursework to assure that these courses have course objectives and/or learning outcomes comparable to MPC courses.

Status and Progress Made: Implemented and Ongoing

The Counseling Department has engaged in several efforts over the past two years to establish methods of evaluating course content, course objectives and student learning outcomes of incoming transfer coursework to assure that these courses have course objectives and/or learning outcomes comparable to MPC courses. Counselors make use of the CurricUNET system **(SIIA.E3)**, which displays a detailed outline of course descriptions and student learning outcomes. This resource along with others such as ASSIST and College Source (an online data base of college catalogs) **(SIIA.E4, SIIA.E5)** provide counselors with information needed to make the appropriate evaluations. Additionally, counselor liaisons meet and discuss incoming transfer coursework which may be questionable with area divisions.

Evidence:

- **SIIA.E3** MPC's CurricUNET http://curricunet.com/MPC/
- **SIIA.E4** ASSIST Welcome Page http://www.assist.org
- **SIIA.E5** College Source Online http://www.collegesource.org/

Standard IIC.1:
The institution supports the quality of its instructional programs by providing library and other learning support services that are sufficient in quantity, currency, depth, and variety to facilitate educational offerings, regardless of location or means of delivery.

Plan Recommendation
The coordinators and directors of academic support programs will implement a plan to inform faculty and staff of services available, their location and hours of operation.

Status and Progress Made: Implemented and Ongoing

The coordinators and directors of academic support programs have implemented several strategies that inform faculty and staff of services available and hours of operation **(SIIC.E1, SIIC.E2)**. The Basic Skills Initiative (BSI) Committee developed a poster **(SIIC.E3)** and a brochure **(SIIC.E4)** describing each support service available on campus. The BSI Committee maintains a page on the campus website called "College Success" **(SIIC.E5)**. In addition to offering tips to students with basic skills needs and staff who teach or support basic skills, the site also provides a description of academic support services and times of operation. Designated BSI counseling faculty visit basic skills classes to inform students of available services on campus **(SIIC.E6, SIICE7)**. Additionally, efforts such as Lobo Day (a festive event designed to inform students about available services and campus clubs), Early Alert **(SIIC.E8)** and the MPC webpage all provide information about location, hours of operation and available services.

Evidence:

- **SIIC.E1** BSI Meeting Minutes 5-18-12
- **SIIC.E2** BSI Minutes 8-31-12
- **SIIC.E3** BSI College Success Poster
- **SIIC.E4** BSI College Success Brochure Fall 2012
- **SIIC.E5** College Success website http://www.mpc.edu/GotSuccess/Pages?default.aspx
- **SIIC.E6** BSI Counselor Class Visits
- **SIIC.E7** Class Visits Fall 2012
- **SIIC.E8** Early Alert and Student Retention

Standard IIC.1.a:
Relying on appropriate expertise of faculty, including librarians and other learning support services professionals, the institution selects and maintains educational equipment and materials to support student learning and enhance the achievement of the mission of the institution.

Plan Recommendation
The College will conduct an examination of on-campus computer usage and develop a plan that will enable the institution to replace equipment and upgrade software on a schedule congruent with resources.

Status and Progress Made: Implemented and Ongoing

The Information Technology and Media Services Program Review and the Technology Assessment Plan were completed in Fall 2010 **(SIIC.E9, SIIC.E10)**, providing an examination of technology usage on campus and a resulting action plan. In Spring 2011, the Superintendent/President proposed a task force to examine institutional technology needs; the Academic Senate suggested that this role could be filled by the existing Technology Committee **(SIIC.E11)**. Further efforts at identifying and triaging needs continued in Fall 2011 with an ad hoc "tech triage" task force, tasked with surveying the campus community about technology needs **(SIIC.12)**.

In Fall 2011, the Dean of Technology announced her plan to retire in Summer 2012. The College administration working in collaboration with the Academic Senate, started assessing how the institution should organize its administration of technology and technology-related services to best serve the institution and continue addressing the needs identified through program review, campus surveys, and shared governance committees **(SIIC.E13, SIIC.E14)**. In Spring 2012, the Academic Senate hosted the Vice President of Administrative Services at a meeting to discuss technology and re-organization at MPC **(SIIC.E15, SIIC.E16)**.

With the impending retirement of the Dean of Technology and in recognition of the importance of technology to enhance and support student learning, the district restructured management positions to provide further leadership and organizational structure of technology functions. This resulted in the creation of two positions, Director of Information Services and Associate Dean of Instructional Technology and Development. The first position replaced the outgoing dean and the second restores an instructional dean position that was temporarily unstaffed. The instructional dean will be responsible for providing leadership and supporting faculty and staff training in applications of technology. This dean will also facilitate the use of technology for curricular purposes, while working cooperatively with the Director of Information Systems. The added leadership will provide strengthened structures and attention to institutional technology in support of instructional needs **(SIIC.E17)**.

In Fall 2012, in anticipation of the imminent arrival of the new Associate Dean of Instructional Technology and Development and Director of Information Services, the Academic Senate formulated a goal to "Participate in improvement of technology implementations related to instruction and user-centeredness" **(SIIC.E18, SIIC.E19)**. Objectives associated with this goal included the following:

- Prepare a summary of past institutional discussions regarding technology concerns (e.g. Academic Senate minutes, "Tech Triage" survey responses, etc.) for the incoming Associate Dean of Instructional Technology and Director of Information Services to provide a context for campus technology needs from the faculty perspective.
- Collaborate with the incoming Associate Dean of Instructional Technology and Director of Information Services on a plan to continue addressing campus technology needs.

Evidence:

- **SIIC.E9** Information Technology and Media Services Program Review 2010
- **SIIC.E10** Technology Plan 2010-2012
- **SIIC.E11** Academic Senate Minutes 2-17-11: http://www.mpcfaculty.net/senate/2-17-11/Minutes2-17-11.pdf
- **SIIC.E12** MPC Technology Survey conducted by the Tech Triage Task Force
- **SIIC.E13** Academic Senate Minutes 10-13-11: http://www.mpcfaculty.net/senate/10-13-11/Minutes10-13-11.pdf
- **SIIC.E14** 2011-2012 Academic Senate Annual Report: http://www.mpcfaculty.net/senate/GoalsObjectives/AnnualReport2012.pdf
- **SIIC.E15** Communication between the Academic Senate and the Vice President of Administrative Services: http://www.mpcfaculty.net/senate/Technology/AcademicSenateToSteve4-5-12.pdf
- **SIIC.E16** Academic Senate Minutes 4-5-12: http://www.mpcfaculty.net/senate/4-5-12/Minutes4-5-12.pdf
- **SIIC.E17** "Back to the Future" – MPC Technology Needs document
- **SIIC.E18** Academic Senate Goals 2012-2013: http://www.mpcfaculty.net/senate/GoalsObjectives/Goals2012-13.htm
- **SIIC.E19** Academic Senate Minutes 9-20-12: http://www.mpcfaculty.net/senate/9-20-12/Minutes9-20-12.pdf

Standard IIA.2.a: (previously referenced as Standard II.C.1.b*)
The institution uses established procedures to design, identify learning outcomes for, approve, administer, deliver, and evaluate courses and programs. The institution recognizes the central role of its faculty for establishing quality and improving instructional courses and programs.

*In the College's 2010 Self-Study document, this planning agenda item was aligned with Standard II.C.1.b. The College realigned this agenda item with Standard IIA.2.a to better reflect the intent behind our efforts to improve online course evaluations.

Plan Recommendation
As part of the continuous quality improvement effort, the Vice President of Academic Affairs will collaborate with the Academic Senate, the faculty union and the instructional divisions to design an evaluation process for all online courses.

Status and Progress Made: Implemented and Ongoing

As discussed above (see response to Recommendation 4), the online teacher evaluation survey was redesigned in a collaborative effort between faculty union representatives, the Faculty Coordinator for Distance Education, and the Dean of Instruction. The new survey was approved by all necessary governance bodies in Spring 2012, and is currently in use for all distance education evaluations **(SIIA.E6)**. The College continues to monitor this process to improve student participation in providing quality feedback to all our online instructors.

The Institutional Committee on Distance Education (ICDE) continues to monitor and refine the evaluation process and tool that provides students with an opportunity to evaluate the online learning experience **(SIIA.E7)**. In Spring 2012, campus IT staff developed a process enabling the link to online course evaluations to be distributed to students' preferred email addresses. Academic Affairs staff implemented this method of survey distribution beginning with late-start classes in Spring 2012, and noted an increase in survey response rate for the Spring 2012 semester **(SIIA.E8)**. The Faculty Coordinator for Distance Education continues to work with the Academic Affairs team administering the Class Climate survey to monitor survey response rates and identify and promote factors that may contribute to an increased response.

The ICDE is also working on activities related directly to developing best practices for peer evaluations for online instructors **(SIIA.E9)**.

Evidence *(the items in the evidence list have hyperlinks to the documents unless noted otherwise.)**:***

- **SIIA.E6** ICDE Minutes 4-6-12
- **SIIA.E7** ICDE Working Goals 2012-2013
- **SIIA.E8** Online Course Evaluation Response Rates 2011-2012
- **SIIA.E9** ICDE Minutes 9-21-12

Standard IIC.1.d:
The institution provides effective maintenance and security for the library and other learning support services.

Plan Recommendation
The College will examine access points to the Library and Technology Center, as various learning support services keep inconsistent hours and thus make securing the building a challenge. Following this examination, the College will implement a plan to address issues associated with securing the Library and Technology Center.

Status and Progress Made: Implemented

Representatives of the service areas housed in the Library and Technology Center (LTC) have conducted a survey of the hours of each of the learning support services housed in the LTC. Hours of each service point have been shared throughout the building, so that all areas are aware of each other's hours of operation. To communicate the hours of service to the public, signage at doors and entry points have been examined to ensure that the hours of operation for each service are clearly posted at each entry. Representatives of each service area collaborate to ensure issues affecting the security of the building are communicated clearly, and appropriate steps are taken to keep the building secure as needed (up to and including adjusting service area hours – see email thread regarding the LTC alarm panel) **(SIIC.E21, SIIC.E22, SIIC.E23)**.

In addition, new procedures for building key control have been implemented. The Library's Division Office Manager maintains a master list of building staff who have been assigned keys to the various areas of the LTC, and distributes keys to any new building staff on an as-needed basis **(SIIC.E24)**. At the LTC all-building meeting in November 2012, the Library Division Office Manager introduced a practice of communicating with heads of each service area at regularly scheduled times during the semester to make sure that building key lists and security codes are accurate **(SIIC.E25)**.

Evidence:

- **SIIC.E21** Email thread re: alarm panel, week of 10-25-12
- **SIIC.E22** Map of access points to Main Floor exits
- **SIIC.E23** Map of access points to First Floor exits
- **SIIC.E24** Sample page from Master Key List
- **SIIC.E25** LTC Building Meeting Minutes, 11-16-12

Standard IIID.2.g:
The institution regularly evaluates its financial management processes, and the results of evaluations are used to improve financial management systems.

Plan Recommendation
Fiscal Services will implement a system to process purchase requisitions online and computerize the district's capital asset accounting.

Status and Progress Made: Implemented

Purchase Requisitions Online: Fiscal Services held online training sessions in 2011 for all department groups. The training was held in the Administration conference room. Pete Buechel, Kim Panis, and Rosemary Barrios held meetings for divisions and departments. An email was sent to all budget managers, Division Office Managers and others to attend. A printout was provided at the time of the sessions with instructions and screen shots for the attendees to follow as the instructors went through the screens using an overhead projector. Questions were answered during the presentation.

Individual trainings were held with department staff who needed a little extra time or personalized training. Those individuals were trained in the Fiscal Services office, which allowed direct access on the computer.

An All Users email was sent out with detailed step-by-step instructions on how to use the new PR system **(SIIID.E1)**.

Capital Asset Accounting: All items over $5,000 that need to be depreciated are tracked on an Excel spreadsheet. The 2011-2012 spreadsheet will be updated once the fiscal year has been closed. This information is now used as part of the annual audit and is audited each year.

The tracking has saved time, because a spreadsheet can now be updated once or twice during the year. There are formulas built into the spreadsheet that change the depreciation each year. Both the tracking and spreadsheet make it easier to have accurate information for the audit **(SIIID.E2, SIIID.E3)**.

Evidence:

- **SIIID.E1** Online Purchase Requisition System
- **SIIID.E2** Capital Assets Inventory Tracking
- **SIIID.E3** Fixed Assets Database Spreadsheet

Standard IVB.1.e:
The Governing Board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The Board regularly evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary.

Plan Recommendation
The Superintendent/President will inform the college community of Board policy revisions.

Status and Progress Made: Ongoing

When Board policy changes are considered, the Policy and Communication Committee (PACC) follows the College's shared governance process, informing and eliciting input from the advisory committees, Academic Senate, and the College Council **(SIVB.E1)**. In addition, monthly MPC All User emails inform the campus of the Governing Board's Regular Meeting Agenda, which contains consent action items on new or updated policies. All policy changes approved by the Board are uploaded to the MPC Board Policy webpage to be accessible to the public and campus community **(SIVB.E2)**.

The College is currently involved in a complete update of existing Board policies using the Community College League of California's Policies and Procedures service as the standard. As new or revised policies are approved by the Board, campus members will be informed through email **(SIVB.E3)**.

Evidence:

- **SIVB.E1** Policy and Communications Committee website: http://mympc.mpc.edu/Committees/PACC/default.aspx
- **SIVB.E2** Monterey Peninsula College Governing Board Policies: http://www.mpc.edu/GoverningBoard/Pages/GoverningBoardPolicies.aspx
- **SIVB.E3** College Council Minutes 3-6-12: http://www.mpc.edu/collegecouncil/College%20%20Council%20Agendas%20and%20Minutes%202011/College%20Council%20Minutes%20March%206%202012.pdf

Response to ACCJC letter about USDE and Title IV Funds

Standard III.D.2:
To assure the financial integrity of the institution and responsible use of financial resources, the financial management system has appropriate control mechanisms and widely disseminates dependable and timely information for sound financial decision making.

Standard III.D.3:
The institution systematically assesses the effective use of financial resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.

Title IV Funds

Finding Number 2011-2, Return to Title IV (R2T4) Funds Made Late, Pages 70-71 from the audit report.

Response:
In collaboration with Fiscal Services, Student Financial Services (SFS) has established a consistent method of returning Title IV funds to the Department of Education within the required 45 day period **(TIV.E1, TIV.E2, TIV.E3, TIV.E4, TIV.E5, TIV.E6)**.

R2T4 – Student Financial Services (SFS)
Student Financial Services (SFS) generates on a weekly basis a list of all financial aid students who have 0 units. This list is compared to the previous list for accuracy. For students who do not appear on the previous list, Student Financial Services performs a R2T4 calculation by using the Department of Education worksheet. If it is found that there is money to be re-paid, a purchase requisition is generated and is then referred to Fiscal Services **(TIV.E7)**.

Through this process, students are placed into four categories:

- School repayment
- Student and School Repayment
- Student Post Withdrawal
- Students who did not begin attendance

School Repayment:
SFS generates a Purchase Requisition to authorize school repayment to the Department of Education. The requisition includes the name of the students and the amount to be repaid to the Department of Education. A copy of the letter advising the student of the overpayment is also attached to this requisition. The Purchase Requisition is given to Fiscal Services for repayment.

School and Student Repayment:
The Purchase Requisition is generated by Financial Services to be forwarded to Fiscal Services for repayment as stated above. In addition, the students are notified using the R2T4 form for repayment notification. One copy is sent to the student with repayment options. The second is attached to the Purchase Requisition.

Students are given three methods of repayment options:

- Repayment of the full amount within 45 days;
- Set up a payment plan;
- Adjust next disbursement within the same award year to reflect the repayment.

If a student has not made arrangements for repayment in 45 days, or set up a payment plan, the account is turned over to the Department of Education for collection.

Student Post Withdrawal:
Students who are eligible for a Post Withdrawal Disbursement (PWD) are sent a registered letter requesting updated biographical information. Then the PWD is mailed to the students.

Students Who Do Not Begin Attendance:
If a student is listed on the 0 Unit List, the date of the student's last day of attendance is verified by checking his enrollment status on the Registration System. If the student does not begin attendance and has a check at Fiscal Services on the first day of school, a request to cancel the check is given to Fiscal Services.

Evidence:

- **TIV.E1** Audit Finding Letter to ACCJC 12-10-12
- **TIV.E2** Length of Time Completion of R2T4 2009-2010
- **TIV.E3** Treatment of Title IV Funds
- **TIV.E4** R2T4 Procedures Final 2011-2012
- **TIV.E5** R2T4 Checklist Final Fall 2012
- **TIV.E6** Overpayment-Repayment Statement
- **TIV.E7** Over Award, Withdrawal, and Repayment Policy http://www.mpc.edu/financialaid/Pages/OverawardWithdrawalRepayment.aspx

Update on Substantive Change in Progress, Pending, or Planned

Programs where 50% or more of the courses are offered through distance or electronic delivery

In Fall 2012 Monterey Peninsula College submitted a draft substantive change proposal to the Commission. This substantive change proposal is a request for approval to offer some of the College's programs where 50% or more of the courses in the program are offered through a mode of distance or electronic delivery. The College has been converting many of its courses into a distance education format. As this has occurred many of the College's programs now have or soon will offer more than 50% of their program online. The substantive change report describes the history and planning that has gone into moving the College's programs in this direction. This mode of delivery will enable the College to better meet the dynamic needs of the College's students.

Monterey Peninsula College received feedback from ACCJC January 1, 2013. http://www.mpc.edu/information/accreditation/Accreditation%20Midterm%20Report%20Evidence/Substantive%20Change%20Report%20Email%20Communication.pdf. The final substantive change proposal will be submitted on time to be reviewed at the ACCJC May 8, 2013 meeting.

SB 1440 Transfer Degrees

The College has been actively developing associate degrees for transfer following the Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) prescribed by SB 1440. At present, the College has transfer degrees in Communication Studies, Early Childhood Education, and Mathematics approved by the Chancellor's Office. Degrees in Anthropology, Art History, Computer Science, Kinesiology, and Studio Arts are currently going through the local approval process. Faculty are also working on developing additional transfer degrees in Administration of Justice, Economics, English, History, Music, Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology. As new TMC's are developed, faculty will continue to work on updating their curriculum to address the new programs. Monterey Peninsula College will be submitting degrees approved by the California Community College Chancellor's Office using the three questions from the Substantive Change manual, plus attachments describing the actual programs. This will be submitted on time to be reviewed at the ACCJC May 8, 2013 meeting.