

This confirms that your 2016 Annual Report to ACCJC was submitted by Dr. Walter Tribley <wtribley@mpc.edu; sanderson@mpc.edu> on 03/31/2016.

Below is a copy of the information submitted. You may also re-print the report by logging on at <https://www.accjc.org/annualreport>.



Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

2016 Annual Report

Final Submission

03/31/2016

Monterey Peninsula College
980 Fremont
Monterey, CA 93940

General Information

#	Question	Answer
1.	Confirm logged into the correct institution's report	Confirmed
2.	Name of individual preparing report:	Catherine Webb
3.	Phone number of person preparing report:	831-646-4096
4.	E-mail of person preparing report:	cwebb@mpc.edu
5a.	Provide the URL (link) from the college website to the section of the college catalog which states the accredited status with ACCJC:	http://www.mpc.edu/home/showdocument?id=13506#page=4
5b.	Provide the URL (link) from the college website to the colleges online statement of accredited status with ACCJC:	http://www.mpc.edu/about-mpc/campus-information/accreditation
6.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment:	Fall 2015: 9,057 Fall 2014: 8,464 Fall 2013: 10,339
7.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in degree applicable credit courses for fall 2015:	8,120
8.	Headcount enrollment in pre-collegiate credit courses (which do not count toward degree requirements) for fall 2015:	716
9.	Number of courses offered via distance education:	Fall 2015: 85 Fall 2014: 84 Fall 2013: 52

10.	Number of programs which may be completed via distance education:	13
11.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in all types of Distance Education:	Fall 2015: 1,830 Fall 2014: 1,806 Fall 2013: 1,572
12.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in all types of Correspondence Education:	Fall 2015: 0 Fall 2014: 0 Fall 2013: 0
13.	Were all correspondence courses for which students enrolled in fall 2015 part of a program which leads to an associate degree?	n/a

Student Achievement Data

#	Question	Answer									
14a.	What is your Institution-set standard for successful student course completion?	70.1%									
14b.	Successful student course completion rate for the fall 2015 semester:	70.3%									
15.	<p>Institution Set Standards for program completion: While institutions may determine the measures for which they will set standards, most institutions will utilize this measure as it is core to their mission. For purposes of definition, certificates include those certificate programs which qualify for financial aid, principally those which lead to gainful employment. Completion of degrees and certificates is to be presented in terms of total numbers. Each student who receives one or more certificates or degrees in the specified year may be counted once.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>a.</td> <td>If you have an institution-set standard for student completion of degrees and certificates combined, per year, what is it?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b.</td> <td>If you have separate institution-set standards for degrees, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of degrees, per year?</td> <td>339</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c.</td> <td>If you have separate institution-set standards for certificates, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of certificates, per year?</td> <td>48</td> </tr> </table>	a.	If you have an institution-set standard for student completion of degrees and certificates combined, per year, what is it?	N/A	b.	If you have separate institution-set standards for degrees, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of degrees, per year?	339	c.	If you have separate institution-set standards for certificates, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of certificates, per year?	48	
a.	If you have an institution-set standard for student completion of degrees and certificates combined, per year, what is it?	N/A									
b.	If you have separate institution-set standards for degrees, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of degrees, per year?	339									
c.	If you have separate institution-set standards for certificates, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of certificates, per year?	48									
16a.	Number of students (unduplicated) who received a certificate or degree in the 2014-2015 academic year:	561									
16b.	Number of students who received a degree in the 2014-2015 academic year:	423									
16c.	Number of students who received a certificate in the 2014-2015 academic year:	176									
17a.	If your college has an institution-set standard for the number of students who transfer each year to 4-year colleges/universities, what is it?	505									

17b.	Number of students who transferred to 4-year colleges/universities in 2014-2015:	575																												
18a.	Does the college have any certificate programs which are not career-technical education (CTE) certificates?	Yes																												
18b.	If yes, please identify them:	Art-Photography Art-Studio Art-History Family Research Studies Engineering Technology Mechatronics (local cert.) English: Basic Skills English as a Second Language English: Creative Writing (local cert.) English: Great Books (local cert.) Essential Computer Skills (local cert.) GE-CSU GE-IGETC Linguistics (local cert.) Music Theatre Arts																												
19a.	Number of career-technical education (CTE) certificates and degrees:	86																												
19b.	Number of CTE certificates and degrees which have identified technical and professional competencies that meet employment standards and other standards, including those for licensure and certification:	86																												
19c.	Number of CTE certificates and degrees for which the institution has set a standard for licensure passage rates:	1																												
19d.	Number of CTE certificates and degrees for which the institution has set a standard for graduate employment rates:	28																												
20.	2013-2014 examination pass rates in programs for which students must pass a licensure examination in order to work in their field of study: <table border="1" data-bbox="321 1339 1240 1514"> <thead> <tr> <th>Program</th> <th>CIP Code 4 digits (##.##)</th> <th>Examination</th> <th>Institution set standard (%)</th> <th>Pass Rate (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Nursing</td> <td>51.1699</td> <td>national</td> <td>89.4 %</td> <td>93.3 %</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Program	CIP Code 4 digits (##.##)	Examination	Institution set standard (%)	Pass Rate (%)	Nursing	51.1699	national	89.4 %	93.3 %																		
Program	CIP Code 4 digits (##.##)	Examination	Institution set standard (%)	Pass Rate (%)																										
Nursing	51.1699	national	89.4 %	93.3 %																										
21.	2013-2014 job placement rates for students completing certificate programs and CTE (career-technology education) degrees: <table border="1" data-bbox="321 1604 1240 1986"> <thead> <tr> <th>Program</th> <th>CIP Code 4 digits (##.##)</th> <th>Institution set standard (%)</th> <th>Job Placement Rate (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Administration of Justice</td> <td>43.0107</td> <td>70.9 %</td> <td>93.7 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Automotive Technology</td> <td>47.0604</td> <td>68.9 %</td> <td>84.2 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Business -- Business Administration</td> <td>52.0101</td> <td>53 %</td> <td>57.1 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Child Development</td> <td>19.0709</td> <td>45.9 %</td> <td>62.1 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Computer Networking</td> <td>11.0901</td> <td>49.4 %</td> <td>61.1 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Massage Therapy</td> <td>51.3501</td> <td>62 %</td> <td>63.6 %</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Program	CIP Code 4 digits (##.##)	Institution set standard (%)	Job Placement Rate (%)	Administration of Justice	43.0107	70.9 %	93.7 %	Automotive Technology	47.0604	68.9 %	84.2 %	Business -- Business Administration	52.0101	53 %	57.1 %	Child Development	19.0709	45.9 %	62.1 %	Computer Networking	11.0901	49.4 %	61.1 %	Massage Therapy	51.3501	62 %	63.6 %
Program	CIP Code 4 digits (##.##)	Institution set standard (%)	Job Placement Rate (%)																											
Administration of Justice	43.0107	70.9 %	93.7 %																											
Automotive Technology	47.0604	68.9 %	84.2 %																											
Business -- Business Administration	52.0101	53 %	57.1 %																											
Child Development	19.0709	45.9 %	62.1 %																											
Computer Networking	11.0901	49.4 %	61.1 %																											
Massage Therapy	51.3501	62 %	63.6 %																											

	Nursing	51.1699	0 %	0 %
22.	Please list any other institution set standards at your college:			
	Criteria Measured (i.e. persistence, starting salary, etc.)	Definition	Institution set standard	
	Course Retention Rate	Percentage of students who do not withdraw from a credit class (i.e., Course retention count divided by course enrollment count). Standard is set as the 5-year mean less standard deviation.	84.0%	
23.	<p>Effective practice to share with the field: Describe examples of effective and/or innovative practices at your college for setting institution-set standards, evaluating college or programmatic performance related to student achievement, and changes that have happened in response to analyzing college or program performance (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).</p> <p>MPC uses a 5-year average minus the standard deviation as its method for setting institution-set standards for course completion and retention, degrees & certificate awards, transfer, job placement, and licensure pass rates. Data related to each of these categories are disaggregated by student demographic group and mode of instruction as appropriate. Ongoing analysis and evaluation suggests that our methodology leads to a standard that accurately reflects realistic baselines for the required categories. This methodology also enables MPC to meet its standards unless the data start trending consistently downward or an anomalously low number is reached in a particular year. To maintain institutional effectiveness, MPC discusses year-to-year trends, 5-year trends, and outliers (if they occur) to provide context for its annual evaluation of performance against the standards. Downward trends, anomalously low numbers, or a failure to meet a standard prompt further inquiry, evaluation, and corrective actions if necessary. MPC finds that this method works well in the categories for which there are stable, reliable data sources and large numbers of students. In categories where data sources are incomplete/inconsistent across a 5-year span or where our "ns" are small (e.g., job placement), MPC is considering adding an absolute baseline.</p>			

Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

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

#	Question	Answer
24.	Courses	
	a. Total number of college courses:	1437
	b. Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes	573

	<input type="checkbox"/>	Auto-calculated field: percentage of total:	39.9
25.	Courses		
	a.	Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs as defined by college):	145
	b.	Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes	132
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Auto-calculated field: percentage of total:	91
26.	Courses		
	a.	Total number of student and learning support activities (as college has identified or grouped them for SLO implementation):	21
	b.	Number of student and learning support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes:	21
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Auto-calculated field: percentage of total:	100
27.	URL(s) from the college website where prospective students can find SLO assessment results for instructional programs:	https://www.mpc.edu/about-mpc/shared-governance/academic-senate-new/student-learning-outcomes	
28.	Number of courses identified as part of the general education (GE) program:	495	
29.	Percent of GE courses with ongoing assessment of GE learning outcomes:	50%	
30.	Do your institution's GE outcomes include all areas identified in the Accreditation Standards?	Yes	
31.	Number of GE courses with Student Learning Outcomes mapped to GE <i>program Student Learning Outcomes</i> :	474	
32.	Number of Institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined:	8	
33.	Percentage of college instructional programs and student and learning support activities which have Institutional Student Learning Outcomes mapped to those programs (courses) and activities (student and learning support activities).	92%	
34.	Percent of institutional outcomes (ILOs) with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes:	100%	
35.	Effective practice to share with the field: Describe effective and/or innovative practices at your college for measuring ILOs, documenting accomplishment of ILOs in non-instructional areas of the college, informing college faculty, staff, students, and the public about ILOs, or other aspects of your ILO practice (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).		
	MPC uses GEOs as its ILOs with the rationale that meaningful institutional-level assessment is done on a cohort of students taking a consistent suite of courses, such as the GE program. A GEO developed for a specific GE area serves as one of the SLOs in all courses that fulfill that GE area. MPC evaluates GEOs during regular SLO assessment, which includes assessing outcomes, engaging in dialogue about the results, using the results to plan improvements, and documenting the results for re-evaluation in the next cycle. Results are published on the College website and inform planning and resource allocation discussions. This practice ensures that results of ILO assessment are incorporated into integrated planning. In fall 15, MPC		

established a Learning Assessment Committee to lead communication, training, and support related to assessment of ILOs/GEOs, PLOs, and SLOs. LAC members have also visited divisions and departments to assist with understanding and assessment of ILOs and other SLOs. E.g., the LAC Co-chair/SLO Coordinator attended the Creative Arts Division's 2015 Program Reflection meeting and led discussion about the difference between GEOs, PLOs, and course-level SLOs. The Program Reflections document indicates that this dialogue has improved understanding of how SLOs, GEOs, and ILOs fit into MPC's assessment practices.

Each of the following narrative responses is limited to 250 words. As you develop your responses, please be mindful of success stories that can be reported in the last question of this section. We look forward to including this information from colleges in our report to the Commission and the field in June.

Please discuss alignment of student learning outcomes at your institution, from institutional and course to program level. Describe your activities beyond crosswalking or charting all outcomes to courses in a program (often called "mapping"), to analysis and implementation of alignment in the planning of curriculum and delivery of instruction. Discuss how the alignment effort has resulted in changes of expected outcomes and/or how students' programs of study have been clarified. Note whether the described practices apply to all instructional programs at the college (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).

36.

MPC's course-level SLOs build up into PLOs and GEOs (GEOs). GEOs are also evaluated as Institution Level Outcomes. MPC intentionally considers this alignment when developing curriculum and during Program Reflections (MPC's PLO assessment activity). During fall 2015 Program Reflections, Business Department faculty reviewed SLOs and PLOs and evaluated whether having several programs share a similar mix of classes and outcomes was effective. As a result of the dialogue, the Business program redesigned its curriculum to focus on a single Business Administration degree with multiple concentrations. Under the new model, students can select a desired concentration based on the PLOs that describe the knowledge and skills desired by the student. Programs and courses no longer needed have been eliminated and resources have been refocused to strengthen the core curriculum. MPC's new Learning Assessment Committee is leading efforts to strengthen knowledge and practice related to alignment of SLOs and PLOs for all programs across campus. E.g., LAC offered workshops on strengthening course-level SLOs and aligning course- and program-level SLOs during the spring 2015 Flex Days. In addition, MPC is in the process of implementing TracDat to improve tracking, documentation, and support for SLO and PLO assessment practices.

Describe the various communication strategies at your college to share SLO assessment results for usage by internal and external audiences. Explain how communications take into account how the information is expected to influence the behavior or decisions of particular audiences. Discuss how communication of student learning outcomes assessment information and results impacts student behavior and achievement (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).

37.

Communicating results of course- and program-level SLO assessment is a main purpose of MPC's Program Reflections process. During Program Reflections, departments and service areas engage in dialog around the results of SLO assessments (looking at qualitative and quantitative data where available) and contextualize the results in ways that lead to greater understanding of concerns about student learning and opportunities increase student success. Program Reflections support the development of annual departmental Action Plans and annual Program Review updates which serve to tie the results to resource needs and budget requests. MPC's participatory governance groups engage in dialog around the themes that emerge from Program Reflections. Where possible, issues and concerns related to student learning are addressed through the institution's planning and resource allocation process. Program Reflections summaries are also shared at public meetings of the Governing Board of

	<p>Trustees to inform the Board and the public about broad topics related to student learning across the institution. The Program Reflection compilation is posted on the college website for all interested stakeholders.</p>
38.	<p>Explain how dialog and reporting of SLO assessment results takes place at the departmental and institutional levels. Note whether practices involve all programs at the college. Illustrate how dialog and reporting impact program review, institutional planning, resource allocation, and institutional effectiveness (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).</p> <p>Dialogue and reporting of assessment takes place through MPC's Instructor and Program Reflection processes. Faculty assess SLOs through Instructor Reflections. This involves: 1) Closing the loop by describing the results of plans for improvement developed during the last assessment cycle; 2) Describing the assessment methods for the current assessment cycle; 3). Summarizing the assessment results for the current cycle; 4) Establishing a plan for improvement based on the current assessment results. All units engage in Program Reflections dialogue to provide context to assessment results and link results to planning and resource allocation. The process involves: 1) Noting improvements that have taken place since the last Program Reflection cycle; 2) Identifying SLOs, PLOs, SAOs, and GEOs assessed during the current cycle; 3) Summarizing the assessment results; 4) Linking the results to improvement plans. This process influences program review by providing the rationale for Action Plans. Summaries of Program Reflections inform discussions about student learning across the institution. All forms related to resource allocation involve prompts to demonstrate how the requested funds will support student learning, the attainment of SLOs, and program improvements. These efforts lead to improved institutional effectiveness.</p>
39.	<p>Please share with us two or three success stories about the impacts of SLO practices on student learning, achievement, and institutional effectiveness. Describe the practices which led to the success (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).</p> <p>MPC has improved SLO practices by encouraging greater understanding of the importance of clearly defined SLOs\SAOs and strengthening assessment practices. Over the past year, MPC began several projects to better track, plan, and manage SLO assessment results, including more consistent and effective tracking of assessment results and strengthening program assessment practices. MPC has also licensed TracDat for launch in fall 2016 to help report on assessment at all levels and document connections between assessment, planning, resource allocation, and institutional effectiveness. MPC expects improved campus-wide understanding and communication of SLO practices as a result. MPC's English Dept. combined its 300-level reading and writing courses into an integrated reading/writing curriculum. As a result, the English Study Skills Center and Reading Center must revise their respective curricula. In fall 2015 program reflections, both centers discussed SLOs for the existing stand-alone reading and writing support labs. Faculty and staff in both Centers discussed assessment results as well as the support needed by staff and tutors to help students achieve the SLOs. The process led the Centers to identify gaps that may exist as a result of the integrated curriculum and establish plans to add new SLOs.</p>

Substantive Change Items

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

#	Question	Answer
---	----------	--------

40.	Number of submitted substantive change requests:	2014-2015: 0 2013-2014: 0 2012-2013: 1
41a.	Is the institution anticipating a proposal for a substantive change in any of the following change categories? (Check all that apply)	Courses and/or Programs (additions and deletions) Delivery mode (Distance Education or Correspondence Education)
41b.	Explain the change(s) for which you will be submitting a substantive change proposal:	Degree and certificate changes More than 50% of program offered via Distance Education

Other Information

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

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

If you need additional assistance, please contact the commission.

Sincerely,

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