

EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

**Monterey Peninsula College
980 Fremont Street
Monterey, California 93950**

A confidential report prepared for the
Accrediting Commission for Junior and Community Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

This report represents the findings of the External Evaluation Team that visited Monterey Peninsula College October 10, 2016 through October 13, 2016.

Scotty Thomason
Chair

Table of Contents

List of Team Members	3
Summary of the External Evaluation Report	4
Major Findings and Recommendations of the 2016 External Evaluation Team	6
Introduction	10
Eligibility Requirements	11
Checklist for Evaluating Compliance with Federal Regulations and Related Commission Policies.....	12
STANDARD I	17
Standard I.A: Mission	17
Standard I.B: Institutional Effectiveness	19
Standard I.C: Institutional Integrity	23
STANDARD II	27
Standard II.A: Institutional Programs	27
Standard II B: Library and Learning Support Services	34
Standard II C: Student Support Services	39
STANDARD III.....	45
Standard III.A: Human Resources	45
Standard III.B: Physical Resources.....	50
Standard III.C: Technology Resources	54
Standard III.D: Financial Resources	58
STANDARD IV	67
Standard IV.A: Decision-Making Roles and Processes.....	67
Standard IV.B: Chief Executive Officer	71
Standard IV.C: Governing Board	74
Quality Focus Essay Feedback	77

Visiting Team Members

Mr. Scotty Thomason (Chair)
Superintendent/President
College of the Siskiyous

Dr. Todd Scott (Assistant)
Vice President of Instruction
College of the Siskiyous

Mr. Brian Jukes
English Professor
Yuba College

Dr. Barbara Dunsheath
History Faculty
East Los Angeles College

Dr. Bobbi Villalobos
Vice President, Academic Affairs
Los Angeles Harbor College

Dr. Hamid Eydgahi
Dean, Science, Technology, Engineering,
Mathematics
Victor Valley College

Dr. Maryanne Mills
Instruction and Outreach Librarian
West Valley College

Mr. Randy Beach
Professor English Education
Southwestern College

Mr. Lee Lindsey
Vice President Administrative Services
College of the Redwoods

Dr. Sandra Caldwell
President
Reedley College

Dr. Kay Nguyen
Administrative Director Research, Planning,
& Institutional Effectiveness
Golden West College

Summary of the External Evaluation Report

Institution: Monterey Peninsula College
Date of Visit: October 10, 2016 through October 13, 2016
Team Chair: Mr. Scotty Thomason
Superintendent/President College of the Siskiyous

An eleven-member accreditation team visited Monterey Peninsula College from October 10, 2016 through October 13, 2016 for the purpose of determining whether the College continues to meet Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and USDE regulations. The team evaluated how well the College is achieving its stated purposes, providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement, and submitting recommendations to the Accreditation Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the accredited status of the College.

In preparation for the visit, the team chair attended a team chair training workshop July 13, 2016 and conducted a pre-visit to the campus on September 9, 2016. During this visit the chair and the assistant to the team chair meet with campus and key personnel involved in the self-evaluation preparation process. The evaluation team received team training by staff from the ACCJC on August 30, 2016.

Prior to the visit the team members received the College's self-evaluation document and related evidence. To prepare for the visit the team completed written evaluation reports on their overall impression of Monterey Peninsula College's Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER) and their assessment of the Standards assigned to them. The team confirmed that the self-evaluation report was compiled through broad participation by the entire College community including faculty, staff, students, and administration. The team found that the College provided a thoughtful self-evaluation containing several self-identified action plans for institutional improvement.

The visiting team arrived in Monterey, California the afternoon of October 9, 2016 and had their first team meeting to discuss general impressions of Monterey Peninsula College Self-Evaluation Report and the evidence the College had provided to support the report. The team found the report to include relevant information regarding the accreditation standards and, although some of the evidence links were not working, the College was very responsive to requests.

During the visit, members of the team held informal meetings with 56 members of the College's administration/managers, faculty, staff, and students. Team members visited both the Marina and Seaside Centers and also attended a Board of Trustee meeting. The team also interviewed members of various committees including the Academic Senate, Budget Committee, College Council, Facilities Committee, Flex Committee, Learning Assessment Committee, Presidents Cabinet, Student Services Council, and the Technology Committee. Additionally, the team held two open forums on the main campus. Through informal meetings and open forums the team was able to confirm that there was broad participation in the preparation of the Self-Evaluation Report.

The College provided a team room at the hotel and at the main campus. Both team rooms were well equipped with laptops, projectors, WI-FI, and office supplies. The team reviewed numerous materials supporting the self-evaluation report in the team room and electronically, which included documents and evidence supporting the Standards, Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and USDE regulations. Evidence reviewed by the team included, but was not limited to, documents such as institutional plans, program review procedures and reports, student learning outcomes evidence, distance education classes, College policies and procedures, enrollment information, committee minutes and materials, and the College governance structure. The team also viewed evidence and documentation through the College's intranet and electronic copies stored on a flash drive.

The team greatly appreciated the enthusiasm and support from College employees throughout the visit. The team also appreciated the assistance of key staff members who assisted the team with requests for individual meetings and other needs throughout the evaluation process. Campus staff members met every request. The team found members of the campus community to be open and passionate about the College and the role they play in students' lives.

The team found a number of innovative and effective practices and programs and issued a number of commendations to the College. The team issued some recommendations to meet the standards as well as some to help the College to increase effectiveness.

Major Findings and Recommendations of the 2016 External Evaluation Team

Team Commendations

Commendation 1: The College should be commended for its use of flex days to generate dialogue on student learning and achievement through instructors and programs reflections. (Standard IB, III.A.14)

Commendation 2: MPC has a robust catalog review process that serves as a catalyst for program updates for both the website and hardcopy publications. Throughout Standard IC, the catalog review process is mentioned as a driver for updating various sources of information such as calendars, student fees, financial aid and other information for students and the public. Due to the comprehensive nature of the catalog review process, the college implemented significant process and timeline improvements aligned with curricular deadlines both internally and externally. The document includes the Institutional Goals and current information regarding college directions such as status on AD-T degrees. A supplement is published so that revised information is always available for students and the public. With the newly revised process, the need for a supplement will be reduced and possibility eliminated over time. The catalog review process includes specific program and course level information including certificate and degree options and student learning outcomes. While MPC sees areas for improvement regarding clarity and presentation, the Catalog Review Process provides an excellent mechanism for making such revisions. Particularly given the colleges ability to significantly revise the process relatively quickly, this is a robust process that could be adapted for use in other institutional efforts. (Standard IC)

Commendation 3: The team commends the College on its efforts to grow its online offerings, including a 200 percent increase in the number of students enrolled in online sections over the past four years, its support for students and faculty through its innovative Online Team Support—a "concierge" approach to student and faculty support, and its website that provides an FAQ and tutorials to students and faculty enrolled in and teaching online courses. (Standard IIA)

Commendations 4: The team commends the office of student activities for providing meaningful engagement among and services for Monterey Peninsula College students through a variety of means. The culture of inclusion and active student participation maintained by the student activities office demonstrates a commitment to student success. (Standard IIC)

Commendation 5: The team commends MPC for its student services programs, which demonstrate a positive culture of continual self-improvement and a commitment to change as needed to improve student success. (Standard IIC)

Commendation 6: MPC's Institutional Committee on Distance Education should be commended for its extensive faculty training and support site on MPC online. MPC faculty who desire to teach online or enhance their online offerings, have the option to complete the

MPC Online Teaching Certificate as well as the MPC Online Course Design Certificate. In addition, the website contains a plethora of training materials including a Faculty Handbook for Online Instruction, strategies for online teaching and learning, and course design templates. This exemplary resource could be used as a best practices site for online faculty training throughout the state. (Standard IIIC)

Team Recommendations

Recommendations to Meet the Standard

Recommendation 1: In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the College completes the implementation of TracDat and begin to assess learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services as well as disaggregating and analyzing learning outcomes and achievement data for subpopulation of students. When the institution identifies performance gaps, implement strategies to mitigate those gaps and evaluate the efficacy of those strategies. (Standards I.B.2, II.A.11, ER 11)

Recommendation 2: In order to meet the standards, the team recommends the College develop a process and calendar to assess College's progress and planning processes in a timely manner. (Standards I.B.2, I.B.7, II.A.1, II.A.3, IV.A.6, ER 9, ER 11)

Recommendation 3: In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the College attain the sustainability level per the ACCJC rubric for SLO assessment by raising the percentage of courses for which SLOs have been evaluated and increasing the percentage of programs that have had PLOs assessed. To do so, the team recommends that the College complete the implementation of their planning and outcomes assessment software as identified by their QFE1 and begin to assess learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services as well as disaggregating and analyzing learning outcomes and achievement data for subpopulation of students. (Standards I.B.2, I.B.6, I.C.1, I.C.3, II.A.3, II.A.11, ER 11)

Recommendation 4: In order to meet the standards, MPC needs to engage in continuous, broad-based, systematic evaluation, and planning. The institution needs to integrate program review, planning, and resource prioritization and allocation into a comprehensive process that leads to accomplishment of its mission and improvement of institutional effectiveness and academic quality. Institutional planning needs to be linked to short-ranged and long-ranged needs based on assessment of student learning and student achievement data. (Standards I.B.2, I.B.4, I.B.7, I.B.9, I.C.3, II.A.1, II.A.3, III.D.2, IV.A.6, IV.B.3, ER 11, ER19)

Recommendation 5: In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that MPC develop a process to ensure student complaints can be logged, resolved, reviewed and analyzed for improvement. (Standard I.C.8)

Recommendation 8: In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the College conduct regularly scheduled library surveys of all students and faculty, regardless of location, in order to gauge user satisfaction, knowledge of services, behavior and experience and to use the results as the basis for improvement. (Standards II.B.1, II.B.3)

Recommendation 9: In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the College improve its evaluation process of student support and learning services to include discussion of services offered at all centers and for distance education based on robust Service Area Outcomes and Student Learning Outcomes assessments that lead to quality improvement of student support programs and services in support of the college's mission. (Standards II.C.1, II.C.2)

Recommendation 13: In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the college create a Human Resources staffing plan to ensure that staffing levels and assignments for faculty, staff, and administrators are sufficient and appropriately distributed to support the institution's mission and purpose and interwoven into a larger integrated planning process of the college. (Standards III.A.9, III.A.10, ER 8)

Recommendation 14: In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that employee evaluations be regularly and consistently conducted for all employee groups. The team further recommends that faculty, academic administrators, and others directly responsible for student learning have, as a component of their evaluation, consideration of how these employees use the results of learning outcomes assessment to improve teaching and learning. (Standards III.A.5, III.A.6)

Recommendation 15: In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the College establish a review schedule of policy and procedures relevant to Human Resources. (Standards III.A.11, III.A.12, III.A.13)

Recommendation 16: In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the college immediately address network vulnerabilities starting with implementing a firewall solution in order for the College to ensure its technology infrastructure are appropriate and adequate to support the institution's management and operational functions. (Standards III.C.1, III.C.3)

Recommendation 17: In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the college complete and roll out the Information Technology Disaster Preparedness/Recovery Plan in order to recover data and system functionality for the college to operate in the event of a disaster. (Standards III.C.1, III.C.2)

Recommendation 18: In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the College completes the revisions and implementation of all board policies. The Board should fully implement the newly adopted board policies review cycle. The College should ensure that all existing, new, and revised Governing Board policies and administrative regulations are easily accessible through the College's website and other methods it deems appropriate for the college community and the public. (Standards III.C.5, IV.C.6, IV.C.7)

Recommendation 19: In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the College discontinue deficit spending by adopting budgets that match ongoing revenue and expenditures in the unrestricted general fund without the need to make significant draws against unrestricted fund balance, one-time resources or transfers from other funds. (Standards III.D.1, III.D.11, ER 18)

Recommendation 20: In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the College develop a funding plan and set aside funds in each year's budget to fund the OPEB actual required contribution (ARC) each year (Standard III.D.12)

Recommendation 21: In order to meet the standard, the team recommends MPC clarify Board, administrators, classified and faculty roles in the decision-making process and routinely evaluate and monitor these roles. These roles are not distinctly differentiated at faculty level between Academic Senate and the faculty bargaining unit's role in participatory governance and labor relations. (Standard IV.A.6)

Recommendation 22: In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that MPC should develop a calendar to regularly evaluate its policies, procedures, and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness (Standard IV.A.7)

Recommendations to Improve Quality

Recommendation 6: In order to improve, the team recommends that the College develop more intentional cycles of course assessment, strengthen the link between course and program assessment cycles, and reach greater levels of participation in student learning outcomes assessment from all faculty. (Standard II.A.3)

Recommendation 7: In order to improve, the team recommends that the College use enrollment data to inform scheduling decisions and implement an enrollment management system to facilitate data usage. (Standards II.A. 6; A.II.10)

Recommendation 10: In order to improve, the team recommends that all student services provided at the Marina Education Center be consistently scheduled and published. (Standard II.C.3)

Recommendation 11: In order to improve, the team recommends that the College obtain accurate data on students receiving comprehensive and abbreviated student education plans and review the data regularly to make appropriate action plans to increase Student Success. (Standard II.C.5)

Recommendation 12: In order to improve, the team recommends that the College update its administrative hiring procedures. (Standard III.A.3)

Introduction

Monterey Peninsula College (MPC) commenced its operation in September of 1947 on the campus of Monterey High School, holding classes from 4:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. daily. During this first year, 97 acres of land were purchased on Fremont Street; this parcel of land became the current main campus. In September 1948, classes opened in converted barracks buildings with 280 students and 20 faculty members.

MPC separated from the Monterey Union High School District in 1961 and became a separate junior college district. With this reorganization, the Carmel Unified School District and the Pacific Grove Unified School District became part of MPC's Peninsula-wide junior college district.

After the campus opened in 1948, facilities continued to expand to meet the needs of the growing student population. The engineering building was constructed in 1958, the original library in 1960, and the art and music center and swimming pool in 1962. Enrollment continued to grow, as did the need for additional classrooms. In 1965, the original buildings of 1948 were replaced with new buildings for business, humanities, life science, physical education, physical science, and social science. The lecture forum, theater, and College Center were also part of this 1965 campus renewal.

In 1973, the College recognized an educational need in the communities residing in the north side of its service area, primarily in the communities of Marina and Seaside, near the former Ford Ord Army Base. From 1973 to 1993, the College operated a satellite campus at Fort Ord in cooperation with the U.S. Army, primarily for the benefit of Armed Forces personnel and their family members, as well as for residents in the adjacent communities of Seaside, Marina, and Sand City.

In 1982-1983, Monterey Peninsula College was selected as the site for the Maurine Church Coburn School of Nursing, established with a grant from the Maurine Church Coburn Charitable Trust. The School of Nursing is operated, in part, with funds from the Community Hospital Foundation. During August 1988, the engineering building was remodeled with funds from the Community Hospital Foundation to house the School of Nursing. In 1999, further remodeling of the building was completed, and the second floor of the International Center was remodeled to meet office and classroom space needs.

Monterey Peninsula College has enjoyed tremendous support from its residents. In November 2002, local voters approved Proposition 39 Measure I, a \$145 million bond for facilities infrastructure and equipment at Monterey Peninsula College. Funds from the bond continue to support the programmatic needs described in the College's Educational/Facilities Master Plan.

Eligibility Requirements

1. Authority

The team confirmed that Monterey Peninsula College is authorized to operate as a postsecondary, degree-granting institution based on continuous accreditation by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The ACCJC is a regional accrediting body recognized by the U.S. Department of Education and granted authority through the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008.

The College meets the ER.

2. Operational Status

The team confirmed that the College is operational and provides educational services to 8,120 unduplicated student enrollments within degree applicable credit courses for the fall 2015. For 2015, the College enrolled 9,057 unduplicated student enrollments across all courses and programs.

The College meets the ER.

3. Degrees

The team confirmed that all courses offered lead to a certificate, degree and/or transfer. A majority of Monterey Peninsula College's students are enrolled in a program that leads to a certificate, degree, and/or transfer. At MPC, 73.45 percent of their active courses are program applicable. Monterey Peninsula College does not offer a baccalaureate program.

The College meets the ER.

4. Chief Executive Officer

The evaluation team confirmed that the College has a Superintendent/President who is the Chief Executive Office and was hired by the Board of Trustees. The Superintendent/President is a full-time employee of the College and he possesses the requisite authority to administer board policies. The Superintendent/President is not a member of the board and does not act as the board president. When there is a change in the Superintendent/President, the College has notified the Commission in a timely manner.

The College meets the ER.

5. Financial Accountability

The team confirmed that Monterey Peninsula College engages a qualified audit firm to conduct audits of all financial records. All audits are certified and all explanations or findings are documented appropriately. Audit reports are made publicly available.

The College meets the ER.

**Checklist for Evaluating Compliance with
Federal Regulations and Related Commission Policies**

Public Notification of an Evaluation Team Visit and Third Party Comment

Evaluation Items:

☒	The institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comment in advance of a comprehensive evaluation visit.
☒	The institution cooperates with the evaluation team in any necessary follow-up related to the third party comment.
☒	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission <i>Policy on Rights and Responsibilities of the Commission and Member Institutions</i> as to third party comment.

[Regulation citation: 602.23(b).]

Conclusion Check-Off:

☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement

Evaluation Items:

☒	The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance across the institution, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. Course completion is included as one of these elements of student achievement. Other elements of student achievement performance for measurement have been determined as appropriate to the institution's mission.
☒	The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance within each instructional program, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. The defined elements include, but are not limited to, job placement rates for program completers, and for programs in fields where licensure is required, the licensure examination passage rates for program completers.
☒	The institution-set standards for programs and across the institution are relevant to guide self-evaluation and institutional improvement; the defined elements and expected performance levels are appropriate within higher education; the results are reported regularly across the campus; and the definition of elements and results are used in program-level and institution-wide planning to evaluate how well the

	institution fulfills its mission, to determine needed changes, to allocating resources, and to make improvements.
☒	The institution analyzes its performance as to the institution-set standards and as to student achievement, and takes appropriate measures in areas where its performance is not at the expected level.

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(i); 602.17(f); 602.19 (a-e).]

Conclusion Check-Off:

☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Credits, Program Length, and Tuition

Evaluation Items:

☒	Credit hour assignments and degree program lengths are within the range of good practice in higher education (in policy and procedure).
☒	The assignment of credit hours and degree program lengths is verified by the institution, and is reliable and accurate across classroom based courses, laboratory classes, distance education classes, and for courses that involve clinical practice (if applicable to the institution).
☒	Tuition is consistent across degree programs (or there is a rational basis for any program-specific tuition).
☒	Any clock hour conversions to credit hours adhere to the Department of Education's conversion formula, both in policy and procedure, and in practice.
☒	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission <i>Policy on Institutional Degrees and Credits</i> .

[Regulation citations: 600.2 (definition of credit hour); 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.24(e), (f); 668.2; 668.9.]

Conclusion Check-Off:

☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Transfer Policies

Evaluation Items:

☒	Transfer policies are appropriately disclosed to students and to the public.
☒	Policies contain information about the criteria the institution uses to accept credits for transfer.

☒	The institution complies with the Commission <i>Policy on Transfer of Credit</i> . [Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.17(a)(3); 602.24(e); 668.43(a)(ii).] Conclusion Check-Off:
☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Distance Education and Correspondence Education

Evaluation Items:

☒	The institution has policies and procedures for defining and classifying a course as offered by distance education or correspondence education, in alignment with USDE definitions.
☒	There is an accurate and consistent application of the policies and procedures for determining if a course is offered by distance education (with regular and substantive interaction with the instructor, initiated by the instructor, and online activities are included as part of a student's grade) or correspondence education (online activities are primarily "paperwork related," including reading posted materials, posting homework and completing examinations, and interaction with the instructor is initiated by the student as needed).
☒	The institution has appropriate means and consistently applies those means for verifying the identity of a student who participates in a distance education or correspondence education course or program, and for ensuring that student information is protected.
☒	The technology infrastructure is sufficient to maintain and sustain the distance education and correspondence education offerings.
☒	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission <i>Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education</i> .

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(iv), (vi); 602.17(g); 668.38.]

Conclusion Check-Off:

☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Student Complaints

Evaluation Items:

☒	The institution has clear policies and procedures for handling student complaints, and the current policies and procedures are accessible to students in the college catalog and online.
☐	The student complaint files for the previous six years (since the last comprehensive evaluation) are available; the files demonstrate accurate implementation of the complaint policies and procedures.
☒	The team analysis of the student complaint files identifies any issues that may be indicative of the institution's noncompliance with any Accreditation Standards.
☒	The institution posts on its website the names of associations, agencies and governmental bodies that accredit, approve, or license the institution and any of its programs, and provides contact information for filing complaints with such entities.
☐	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission <i>Policy on Representation of Accredited Status</i> and the <i>Policy on Student and Public Complaints Against Institutions</i> .

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(ix); 668.43.]

Conclusion Check-Off:

☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The college makes a distinction between student complaints and student grievances. The college has a formal process for student grievances and has at least six years of grievances and resolutions. The college does not collect student complaints as these types of complaints are handled on a case-by-case basis. The college does not have a single student complaint resolution log for these types of complaints.

Institutional Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials

Evaluation Items:

☒	The institution provides accurate, timely (current), and appropriately detailed information to students and the public about its programs, locations, and policies.
☒	The institution complies with the Commission <i>Policy on Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status</i> .
☒	The institution provides required information concerning its accredited status as

	described above in the section on <u>Student Complaints</u> .
--	---

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(vii); 668.6.]

Conclusion Check-Off:

☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Title IV Compliance

Evaluation Items:

☒	The institution has presented evidence on the required components of the Title IV Program, including findings from any audits and program or other review activities by the USDE.
☒	The institution has addressed any issues raised by the USDE as to financial responsibility requirements, program record-keeping, etc. If issues were not timely addressed, the institution demonstrates it has the fiscal and administrative capacity to timely address issues in the future and to retain compliance with Title IV program requirements.
☒	The institution's student loan default rates are within the acceptable range defined by the USDE. Remedial efforts have been undertaken when default rates near or meet a level outside the acceptable range.
☒	Contractual relationships of the institution to offer or receive educational, library, and support services meet the Accreditation Standards and have been approved by the Commission through substantive change if required.
☒	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission <i>Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations</i> and the <i>Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV</i> .

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(v); 602.16(a)(1)(x); 602.19(b); 668.5; 668.15; 668.16; 668.71 et seq.]

Conclusion Check-Off:

☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

STANDARD I

MISSION, ACADEMIC QUALITY AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS, AND INTEGRITY

Standard I.A: Mission

General Observations

Monterey Peninsula College has a clearly defined mission statement that was adopted by the board on October 22, 2014. The mission statement is linked with the planning process and data supports achievement of the statement. A large percentage of faculty, staff and administrators are knowledgeable about the mission statement and believe it helps to drive priorities at the campus.

Findings and Evidence

Monterey Peninsula College's mission statement describes the College's broad education purposes, intended student population, and types of degrees and credentials offered. During the mission statement's last revision, MPC added language to the statement that specified "transfer, career training, basic skills, and lifelong learning opportunities" as its educational purposes. Revision of the mission statement was initiated by the office of institutional research and the College Council to better align with the 2014 Accreditation Standards. As part of the revision process, MPC's College Council analyzed data on changes in the lifelong learning population of the district. A lengthy college-wide discussion about lifelong learning transpired. The College meets ER6 related to this standard. (Standard I.A.1; ER 6)

MPC assesses institutional effectiveness in achieving the mission through institutional goals and objectives, program review and student achievement data. The mission statement and college goals are woven into the Program review template and the College provided Program Review from both academic and career technical departments were provided as examples of a robust dialogue regarding fulfillment of the mission statement. Review of the Student Success Scorecard at various campus meetings is another example of how the College evaluates its mission through data driven processes. (Standard I.A.2)

MPC's mission is aligned to programs and services and guides decision-making, planning and resource allocation as well as informs goals for student learning and achievement. This is evidenced by linkage in program review, curriculum development and discussion of resource allocation, student learning and student achievement. For example, the Business department noted in their program review that they support students' goals of "transfer, work and growth into leadership roles." The curriculum review process as delineated in the Curriculum Development Guide ensures that all academic programs and courses align with the college mission. The College Council crafted a criteria for resource allocation that indirectly refers to the mission statement that cuts "must not have significant negative impact on student access or success" according to their September 24, 2016 minutes. Similarly the Academic Senate more explicitly mentioned fulfillment of the mission as being a criteria for budget cuts during their February 6, 2014 meeting. These views were substantiated in the 2014 Faculty and Staff Accreditation Survey that indicates 75 percent respondents agreed that "the mission statement provides guidance for institutional planning and decision-making

at the College.” The college recognizes their need to increase their capacity at integrated planning as mentioned in the Quality Focus Essay and Action Plan 2. As the college increases its knowledge and capacity for institutional research, it will be better able to align its mission statement to the various programs and services across campus. (Standard 1.A.3)

The current MPC Mission Statement was formally adopted at the Board of Trustees meeting on October 22, 2014 after thorough vetting from the Academic Senate and three Advisory groups of the College Council. In conjunction with the mission review, MPC adopted a Values Statement and modified the mission review process from three to six years as outlined in the Mission Review Process Summary. The College has drafts of a *Decision Making-Guide* and *Integrated Planning Handbook* which further elaborates the process for revising the Mission Statement and more clearly links the statement to other aspects of the campus. MPC needs to complete the process of adopting these documents initiated by the College Brain Trust.

The mission statement is posted electronically on the main website, in the catalog, and class schedules as well as on governance documents such as the draft *Integrated Planning Handbook* and *Resource Guide to Decision-Making*.

The college mission statement is posted in the following physical locations: MPC Library (main entry/foyer), student Services building (Admissions Office), Administration building (lobby) and Marina Education Center (main building/administration) (Standard 1.A.4; ER 6)

Conclusion

The College meets the Standard and related Eligibility Requirements.

Standard I.B: Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations

The College should be commended for its robust process of generating dialogue on student learning and achievement. The College has a mechanism through flex days to allow for annual faculty and program reflections. A review of program review documents shows consistent use of program evaluation and that instructional programs follow the same template to evaluate program effectiveness.

The College utilizes student achievement data such as course success rates, degrees and certificates attainment, transfer numbers, licensure passing rates, etc., as means of evaluating institutional effectiveness. Where appropriate, the College also disaggregates data by gender, ethnicity, and age groups to address student equity concerns. The College utilizes the Student Equity Plan to plan and address identified equity gaps. Currently, the College is unable to disaggregate student learning outcome assessments by subpopulations of students and is in the process of implementing TracDat in order to effectively collect outcome data, including subpopulations of students.

The College assesses student learning through faculty and program reflections. Course SLOs assessments provide quantitative data, whereas program SLOs do not. The College recognizes the need to better integrate and communicate assessment data for program planning and resource allocation. The College is in the process of implementing TracDat to ensure better integration of student learning assessment with program review and resource allocation. Reviews from program reflection samples provided by the College and reviews of program SLOs that exist in the College's catalog indicate that those program SLOs are not being assessed.

The College also provides ample evidence of assessing its policies and practices to assure effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of the mission. The college should be commended for its assessment culture. The flex days provide time and opportunities for instructors to reflect on student learning and develop plans for improvement. Similarly, the flex days allow for departments to engage in program reflections, which provide opportunities to dialogue on student learning and achievement. Evidence of using data and assessment to improve student learning include the Auto Tech Department developing a document to remedy programmatic inefficiencies identified in program reflections and the Institutional Committee on Distance Education utilizing course success rates to mitigate disproportionate impact for online students.

Findings and Evidence

The College currently does not have a mechanism to disaggregate student learning outcomes data. Additionally, because program reviews, instructors' reflections, and program reflections are completed in word documents, the College cannot effectively extract and integrate assessment results for planning and resource allocation. While the college regularly reviews its core processes, it does not have a formalized process to review these areas systematically. The College is working with an external firm called Collaborative Brain Trust to review its planning and decision-making processes in order to address inefficiencies

and redundancies. While the college has defined student learning outcomes for all instructional programs, samples from program reflections indicate that the College is not consistently assessing those outcomes that exist in the College catalog. (Standard I.B.1)

Individual instructors use the faculty reflections on the student learning process template to report on student attainment of SLOs and also provide plans to improve student learning in their courses. Faculty participate in this process once per semester and insights gleaned from instructor's reflections are utilized in program reflections. The College has utilized this process since 2010-11. Evidence provided includes compilations of Program Reflections dating since 2010-11 through 2014-15 academic years. Based on program reflections, specific plans or objectives to improve student learning are recorded in the program review Updates/Action Plan which then inform the resource allocation process. The program review process and the program reflection process provide opportunities for dialogues on student learning and achievement to take place at the departmental level. Because program reflections is one of the flex day activities, the College has seen an increase in faculty and staff participation rate since offering these sessions in 2011. Survey result indicated that participation in program reflections started at 70 percent in 2011 and has risen to 90 percent. (Standard I.B.4; ER 9)

MPC utilizes different strategies to define program-level outcomes for its CTE and transfer programs. CTE program SLOs are unique to the respective programs and are developed based on feedback from the advisory group. As for transfer programs, MPC defines its General Education Outcomes (GEOs) to serve as the program-level outcomes. Examples provided on program reflections do not show consistent reference to General Education Outcomes in program reflections. Additionally, while the college defines learning outcomes for its instructional programs (CTE and non CTE), those outcomes are not being assessed, even though the College confers degrees and certificates. The College indicated that it will re-evaluate its current practice of using GEOs as sole program-level learning outcomes for Associate of Arts and Associate of Science degree programs and design improved learning outcomes where necessary and appropriate in order to describe skills and knowledge students will obtain through program completion. Additionally, because assessments are reported out as summarized data in Instructors' Reflections and Program Reflections, the College does not have an effective way of disaggregating learning outcome results. In its QFE, the College discusses its implementation of TracDat, which would hopefully allow the college to collect data and disaggregate student learning based on different subpopulations of students. (Standard I.B.2; ER 11)

Program reflections are integral to the College's planning and resource allocation process. The resource allocation process emphasizes consideration of the reflections and program review documents, as well as institutional objectives, and achievement data. An example of the College using program reflections to inform its resource allocation is through the transition of MPC's Child Development Center from a childcare unit to learning laboratory. The discussion of the transition took place in Program Reflections and continued through Program Review, and finally to the Board of Trustees. The second piece to Program Reflections is the assessment of previous action plans, which helps close the planning and assessment loop. (Standard I.B.6)

Dialogue about student achievement at the college-wide level is done at governance committee meetings and Board of Trustees meetings. The Director of Institutional Research presents student achievement data, including metrics in the Student Success Scorecard, the institution-set standards, Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative indicators, Basic Skills report, and Student Equity Plans. (Standard I.B.8)

The College has been establishing standards for student achievement since 2013. The college follows similar methodologies as other California community colleges by taking five-year average of each metric and set its standard as five-year average minus the standard deviation for those six years. Evidence from office of institutional research presentations show the College is engaged in wide review of institutional set standards. Discussions of institutional set standards take place at College Council meetings, Academic Senate meetings, and Board of Trustees meetings. (Standards I.B.3; I.B.8; ER 11)

The Federal Scorecard was provided to the team that shows the following: total enrollment, percent of full and part time students, number of Title IV recipients, retention rates for full and part time students, percent of students with federal student loans and Pell grants, three-year default rates, median student debt, graduate debt, and debt for non-completers. This data shows that student completion rates for “150% completion is %”. Which is (above or below) the benchmark set by the Council of Regional Accrediting Commissions (C-RAC) of 15% for two year schools). However, the team recognizes that this reported value of % only applies to the full time students (% of MPCs student population) and is not reflective of the overall student performance. In order to fully analyze its student achievement, MPC utilizes the completion rate data provided by the California Community College’s Chancellor Office’s Scorecard, which breaks out the completion rate based on prepared and un-prepared students. The CCCCO’s Scorecard also look at completion rate after 6 years, recognizing that many students do not attend college full-time and many need additional support to complete the basic skills sequence. Overall, MPC’s current use of the CCCCO’s Scorecard is a more accurate representation of the college’s performance. (Standard I.B.3; ER 11)

The College reviews and updates policies and procedures based on discussions and recommendations from four advisory groups including the Academic Senate, Academic Affairs Advisory Group, Student Services Advisory Group, and Administrative Services Advisory Group. Instances of updates to policies and procedures include opportunity for programs to participate in Program Reflections during flex days, human resources mapping that resulted in improving employee onboarding process, and automated applications where students can apply to MPC and receive confirmation of acceptance within 15 minutes. Recommendation from the Student Services Advisory Group resulted in policy changes where students are allowed to select the grades that will be dropped from their GPA rather than forcing them to drop an entire semester of work. The College’s ISER recognizes that while the College regularly reviews its processes, it has not formalized a cycle to review its processes. The College is working with CBT to review its planning and decision-making processes, among their recommendation for improvement is suggestion that the College establish a regular and coordinated schedule for evaluating its processes. (Standard I.B.7)

The Federal Scorecard data on loan default is useful in assessing college performance, but it is not useful when used alone. While addressing Standard IIID.15, the college indicated that the 2012 fiscal year three-year cohort default rate for MPC students is 21.4 percent, which is down from 23.3 percent in previous year. This information is somewhat different than the data provided by Scorecard which indicates that 50 percent of MPC students pay down their debt. That rate is 18 percent less than the national average. This information should be used within the context also of job placement rate, licensure passing rate, and also CTE graduation rate so that there's a comprehensive assessment of the college's performance and educational quality. MPC did not reference IPEDS College Scorecard in its ISER.

Conclusion

The College does not meet the Standards or Eligibility Requirements 9 and 11, except for I.B.1, I.B.3, I.B.5, I.B.8, I.B.9, I.B.10.

Recommendations to Meet the Standards

Recommendation 1: In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the College completes the implementation of TracDat and begin to assess learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services as well as disaggregating and analyzing learning outcomes and achievement data for subpopulation of students. When the institution identifies performance gaps, implement strategies to mitigate those gaps and evaluate the efficacy of those strategies. (Standards I.B.2, II.A.11, ER 11)

Recommendation 2: In order to meet the standards, the team recommends the College develop a process and calendar to assess College's progress and planning processes in a timely manner. (Standards I.B.2, I.B.7, II.A.1, II.A.3, IV.A.6, ER 9, ER 11)

Recommendation 3: In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the College attain the sustainability level per the ACCJC rubric for SLO assessment by raising the percentage of courses for which SLOs have been evaluated and increasing the percentage of programs that have had PLOs assessed. To do so, the team recommends that the College complete the implementation of their planning and outcomes assessment software as identified by their QFE1 and begin to assess learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services as well as disaggregating and analyzing learning outcomes and achievement data for subpopulation of students. (Standards I.B.2, I.B.6, I.C.1, I.C.3, II.A.3, II.A.11, ER 11)

Recommendation 4: In order to meet the standards, MPC needs to engage in continuous, broad-based, systematic evaluation, and planning. The institution needs to integrate program review, planning, and resource prioritization and allocation into a comprehensive process that leads to accomplishment of its mission and improvement of institutional effectiveness and academic quality. Institutional planning needs to be linked to short-ranged and long-ranged needs based on assessment of student learning and student achievement data. (Standards I.B.2, I.B.4, I.B.7, I.B.9, I.C.3, II.A.1, II.A.3, III.D.2, IV.A.6, IV.B.3, ER 11, ER19)

Standard IC: Institutional Integrity

General Observations

Monterey Peninsula College is a publicly funded, open-access institution with a mission focused on student learning and achievement. The institution has processes in place to ensure the college catalog is current and accurate. The process has currently been revised to better integrate timelines for curricular changes. The process and document serve as a catalyst to review the college website and publications. The college has policies and procedures in place regarding student and faculty expectations including ethics, academic freedom, and conduct. The college widely makes its information available and communicates through different venues both internally and externally. Educational programs are communicated, reviewed, and assessed. Distance Education is folded into the different aspects of courses and programs.

Findings and Evidence

The mission is reviewed through the newly developed strategic planning process and is widely disseminated and pervasive in publications. Clearly expressed in the mission statement are student learning and achievement as paramount to all other objectives. MPC is a publicly funded, open-access institution. (Standards I.A.4, I.C.1, I.C.5, I.C.14)

The college catalog is reviewed annually by the Catalog Review Committee, which conducts its work electronically. Once completed, the catalog serves as the master document for the website and other publications to be reviewed and revised. While there is a dedicated webmaster who works directly with department and unit level personnel to update website via the Content Management System, this is not a permanent position serving in a professional services capacity. (Standards I.C.1, I.C.2, I.C.5, I.C.6, ER 20)

While the college indicates the course-level SLOs and program PLOs are managed through CurricUNET and are evident on all syllabi and degree and certificate programs, it is unclear if the college assesses its ILOs or how the college communicates and shares assessment information regarding its ILOs. The college identifies that it lists its ILOs in the college catalog. (Standards I.C.1, I.C.3, ER 20)

The College has an office of institutional research that provides a variety of current and historical information regarding student performance and achievement through different sources of data. Additionally, while program-level information is reviewed and used by the discipline area, it does not appear to be disaggregated nor does it appear well understood by students and the public. MPC has identified this as an area of improvement. (Standard I.C.1) The college's information on distance education appears to be limited to class schedules. Distance education classes are identified clearly in both the published class schedule each semester and the MPC website. However, it is unclear if information regarding student achievement in distance education programs and courses is reviewed beyond the level of aggregated retention and success, compared to those of traditional modality, or analyzed for effectiveness. (Standard I.C.1)

Procedures for grievances and appeals and complaints are available in the catalog and in several locations on the website. The discipline and complaint process are designed to be clear, progressive, and fair. Complaints and grievances are distinguished within the catalog and may occur at the class, service area, or district level. It is unclear if there is a six year log for the student complaint resolution log. While there is a six year and longer, formal student grievance resolution log, it is unclear if student complaints are gathered, analyze, and reviewed for patterns and issues related to student issues. (Standard I.C.1, ER 20)

The primary source for the catalog is online. Limited hardcopies are available for reference purposes in the Library and admissions and records. The Catalog Review Committee meets annually to review the catalog. The college has a detailed process to review the catalog. Once the catalog is published, the college has a comprehensive process to ensure it is accurate, precise, and current. Catalog addendums are published as changes occur to ensure timeliness and accurate information to students and the public. The college has revised its process in the recent process revision to reduce the need for addendums with strong linkages to the curriculum process and deadlines. The catalog includes information on the mission, learning outcomes, educational programs including those offered via distance education and student support services. Past catalogs for the previous 10 years are available on the MPC Catalog website. (Standard I.C.2, ER 20)

The college collects a variety of assessment data from multiple levels of the institution including program, department, discipline, and unit area. The college also has reflections processes for both the faculty and program, which are compiled and reviewed at the appropriate level. Program reflections are further compiled by the SLO Coordinator and posted to the Academic Senate website, which is available both internally and externally. Additional information gathered includes Student Success Scorecard, Institutional-Set Standards, Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative indicators (IEPI), and Gainful Employment. It is unclear if any data is gathered or compiled related to the ILOs. (Standard I.C.3)

The college shares its assessment and student achievement data through multiple venues and modalities. Multiple reports are created and shared for different groups and audiences including departments, programs, committees, Board of Trustees, and the public. The President/Superintendent through the MPC Foundation hosts an annual Address to the Community where the state of the college is shared including student success and achievement information. The event is videoed and broadcast on local public TV. (Standard I.C.3)

The college ensures that all information for programs including its degrees and certificates is clear and accurate through its annual Catalog Review Process. SLOs are included in program and course-level descriptions and the college requires course-level SLOs are to be included in all syllabi regardless of modality. The college has a process in the office of academic affairs, which reviews each syllabus for every instructor and every class section including distance education every semester to ensure each matches the Course Outline of Record. (Standard I.C.4, ER 20)

The college has an involved process for revising the catalog, which serves to create revisions in the website and printed material; however, the Catalog Review Process does not appear to establish the regular review of policies and procedures related to mission and programs. College Council serves as the participatory governance body for the college once policies and procedures come forward as evidenced in I.A.4, I.C.3, and IV.B.1, but it is unclear if there is a regular schedule to conduct these reviews. Board policy review appears to have some recent activity as identified in IV.C; however, this appears to be minimal in past years with no clear process or schedule to ensure board policies are reviewed. The review of the mission appears to have undergone a recent change to coincide with the new six year strategic planning process. There are conflicting documents and statements indicating that regular reviews of the mission, occurs in three year and six year cycles. It appears revisions occurred in 2009 and 2014 with the next cycle occurring in a six year timeframe. (Standards I.A.4, I.C.4, I.C.5, IV.C.3)

The college has a multi-channel approach to ensure current and prospective students have accurate information regarding total cost of attendance including tuition, fees, and other expenses as well as information related to Gainful Employment. The college catalog review process acts as a trigger to evaluate and update all information. Information is available on-line in multiple locations on the college's website including: catalog, class schedule, admissions and records, student financial services, portal, bookstore, and cost of attendance. (Standard I.C. 6)

The college has board policies on academic freedom and students' rights and responsibilities. Academic freedom addresses both faculty and students and is available on the board policies and faculty handbook websites. Students' rights and responsibilities, which protect students' freedom of expression and inquiry, is available in the college catalog and in various locations on the college website. Faculty and students appear to have access to the information and are knowledgeable on the content. (Standard I.C.7, ER13)

The college has board policy on academic freedom and also has a faculty handbook that emphasizes critical thinking and original thought rather than an instructor opinion. The college implements AAUP's statement on professional ethics. The curriculum review process and the Curriculum Advisory Committee review the different components of each proposed course to address any concerns prior to course approval. (Standard I.C.7)

The college has established board policies and institutional procedures to promote and clarify expectations for honesty, responsibility, and academic integrity including cheating, plagiarism, conduct, confidentiality of records, and participation in student government. The information is shared and available in the college catalog. (Standard I.C.8)

The college sets expectations for standards of conduct and institutional code of ethics for student and faculty and staff through board policy, college catalog, faculty handbook, and programs such as Massage Therapy and Nursing. (Standard I.C.10)

The college is currently fully accredited and indicates that it responds to all accreditation requests and requirements. MPC has an Accreditation webpage, which is one click from the

homepage, which provides accurate and current information regarding the college's accreditation status and activity. Also included are links to ACCJC, accreditation documents such as follow-up reports, substantive change proposals, status reports, and mid-term reports as well as official communication from ACCJC. The college's accreditation website is dedicated to consistently and accurately reflecting matters with ACCJC. Additionally, program-level accreditation such as Nursing (ACEN) and Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) are available publically on the accreditation webpage, program webpage and is listed in the college catalog. (Standards I.C.12, I.C.13, ER 21)

Conclusion

The College meets the Standard and related Eligibility Requirements except for Standard I.C.1, I.C.3, I.C.8.

Recommendations to Meet the Standards

See **Recommendation 3** and **Recommendation 4**.

Recommendation 5: In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that MPC develop a process to ensure student complaints can be logged, resolved, reviewed and analyzed for improvement. (Standard I.C.8)

STANDARD II

STUDENT LEARNING PROGRAMS AND SUPPORT SERVICES

Standard II.A: Institutional Programs

General Observations

This section provides a comprehensive accounting of the College's practices as it works to meet accreditation standards. The College provides an array of instructional programs for students seeking transfer, general education, basic skills, career and technical education, and noncredit coursework. These programs are consistent with the College mission, appropriate to higher education, and culminate in student achievement of degrees, certificates, employment and/or transfer.

Data analysis shows that the number of degrees and certificates has generally been increasing over the past five-year period, both in terms of the number of degrees awarded and the number of students receiving degrees (ER 2). The College offers 24 associate degrees for transfer. The College provides evidence that a substantial portion of its educational offerings lead to degrees and that a significant proportion of its students are enrolled in them. (ER 3)

The degrees and programs are reviewed via appropriate College and State processes, follow practices common to American higher education, and are awarded on generally accepted practices for degree-granting institutions (ER 10). Information regarding the degrees and certificates are clearly stated in the College catalog, and an Articulation Officer ensures accuracy of the information regarding articulation to meet the transfer needs of students. Per Board Policy, the College requires that its degree programs include a general education component. The Curriculum Advisory Committee determines whether courses meet standards for inclusion in the College's general education pattern, and the courses are submitted to the CSU and UC systems for approval for inclusion in CSU-Breadth and IGETC general education patterns (ER 12). The general education patterns are clearly outlined in the College catalog.

The College has in place a process for defining standards for student achievement and assessing its performance against those standards, and, since its March 2013 Midterm Report, it has demonstrated improvements in course student learning outcomes. However, the College recognizes that its performance in SLO assessment is not consistent with expectations that SLO assessment be at the sustainability level per the ACCJC rubric. (ER 11, II.A.3) In addition, MPC utilizes different strategies to define program-level outcomes for its CTE and transfer programs. CTE program SLOs are unique to the programs and are developed based on feedback from the respective advisory group. For transfer programs, the College defines its General Education Outcomes (GEOs) as program-level outcomes. Examples provided on Program Reflections do not show consistent reference to General Education Outcomes in program reflections. Additionally, while the College defines learning outcomes for its instructional programs (CTE and non-CTE), CTE program level outcomes are assessed while outcomes for Associate for Arts and Associates for Science degrees are not. The College indicated that it will re-evaluate its current practice of using

GEOs as sole program-level learning outcomes for Associate of Arts and Associate of Science degree programs and design improved learning outcomes where necessary and appropriate in order to describe skills and knowledge students will obtain through program completion.

Findings and Evidence

The College's program review process requires assessment of programs in relation to the College mission through the comprehensive program review process. The College ensures the quality and rigor of its courses and instructional programs by following a curriculum approval process outlined in the College Curriculum Handbook and facilitated by the Curriculum Advisory Committee, a faculty committee that uses the California Community College Chancellor's Office Program and Course Approval Handbook and the CCC Academic Senate Curriculum Reference Guide for guidance. Distance education courses must follow an additional process facilitated by the CAC Distance Education Subcommittee, in which the faculty considers need, appropriateness, and feasibility for the course. Student learning outcomes are included on the Course Outlines of Record that appear in the College's CurricUNET system; however they are not included on CORs that the College submits to the California Community College Chancellor's Office. The College meets ER 9.

Student learning outcomes are identified for courses in each instructional program, and the process for this assessment is conducted via Instructor Reflections in which faculty write a summary of their assessment results using qualitative and quantitative data and discuss how they plan to use the assessment results to improve student learning. At the time of the next assessment of the course, the instructor reviews the plan to determine if it was successful. The results are shared department wide during the program assessment process. Dialogue regarding program outcomes focus around program reflections that the faculty and staff from each program complete, by evaluating the effectiveness of program improvements that have resulted from previous reflection. Then the students' level of attainment is discussed in one or more program level outcomes. Program Reflection activities start during Flex Days in the fall semester, with follow-up during Flex in the spring semester. The College recognizes that while this process results in meaningful dialogue, it does not always generate useful quantitative data related to learning outcomes at the program level. Starting fall 2015, the College implemented TracDat to support its assessment processes, and it established a new Learning Assessment Committee that is charged with improving the College's learning assessment practices.

Student achievement, as evidenced in number of degrees and certificates awarded and the number of transfers, has increased at the College over the past five years. A 10 percent gap exists in the success rate for students in traditional classes 74 percent vs. online 64 percent. (Standard II.A.1., ER 2, ER 3)

The College follows a curriculum review and evaluation process in which data regarding student achievement and attainment of learning outcomes is evaluated through comprehensive program review (completed every six years), annual program review updates, and action plans, all of which are founded in the faculty and program reflections. From this process, the faculty review and approve curriculum changes, implement approved changes,

and assess the impact of the changes, completing the cycle of assessment and improvement. Evidence of this process working is demonstrated in the faculty efforts to align program areas with Transfer Model Curricula (TMCs). Faculty evaluated current course outlines of record in comparison to TMC requirements and made appropriate curricula adjustments. By fall 2015, the faculty had updated 130 courses. (Standard II.A.2)

The College recognizes that while the student learning outcomes assessment process works overall, it needs to develop more intentional cycles of course-assessment; strengthen linkages between course and program assessment cycles; and create a greater level of participation, including adjunct faculty. The College acknowledges that the state of student learning outcomes at the College is not consistent with expectations of the ACCJC. Only 40 percent of the active courses at the College have been assessed. In fall 2015, the College convened a working group to address the issue, which included the creation of a new Learning Assessment Committee and a review of active courses that are not regularly taught. The College has created an actionable improvement plan to improve course and program outcomes assessment (Standard II.A.3)

Consistent with its mission, the College offers pre-collegiate courses to support students seeking preparedness for college level courses. Pre-collegiate courses are offered in reading, writing, mathematics, English as a Second Language, and learning skills. The College catalog clearly identifies course levels via its course numbering system and provides an explanation of the numbering, descriptions, a flow chart for Math, English, and ESL sequences, and course requisites for students. However, these identifications are not included in the class schedule. Each degree and program is also listed in the Catalog and includes program learning outcomes. To meet basic students' needs, the ESL program recently created new levels of combined credit and non-credit ESL courses with imbedded tutors; the Math department created accelerated sequences and will soon implement a non-STEM major pre-statistics/statistics pathway; and the English department revised its curriculum to integrate reading and writing into one course at all basic skills levels and thus create a single sequence leading to freshman level English, and it plans to focus on acceleration pathways in the future. All these efforts are supported by the Basic Skills Committee and with Basic Skills Initiative funding, along with Equity and SSSP. (Standard II.A.4)

The College's degrees and programs follow practices common to American higher education, including appropriate length, breadth, depth, rigor, course sequencing, time to completion, and syntheses of learning. The College adequately lists and meets the minimum of 60 semester credits or equivalent at the associate degree requirement level. The evidence examined, such as the 2016-2017 College Catalog, demonstrates that programs require minimum credits. The STEM program provides students articulated pathways for transfer to UC Santa Cruz and UC Monterey Bay, including a summer research "access" program to UCSC for MPC students who have successfully passed Chemistry 1A. (Standard II.A.5, Federal Regulation)

The College follows scheduling processes that ensure students can complete certificate and degree programs in a period of time that is consistent with established expectations of higher

education. In the program review process, faculty must include a course offerings rotation and comment on how the scheduling allows students to complete in a timely manner. Departmental websites provide estimated time to completion information for certificates. The College is also working toward developing an annual schedule of classes. To ensure students can complete the math sequence in a timely manner, the College altered the math schedule to include day, evening, and online sections. To improve its ability to gather enrollment management data, the College began an implementation of an Enrollment Management System, which is included as an Action Plan in the Quality Focus Essay. To improve scheduling and enrollment management decisions, in spring 2016 the College worked with an external firm (Collaborative Brain Trust) to review and improve enrollment management practices, including implementing a block schedule plan, creating a two-year program plan, and reviewing class cancellation policies and processes. (Standard II.A.6, ER 9)

The College provides evidence that it effectively uses delivery modes, teaching methodologies and learning support services that reflect the diverse and changing needs of its students in support of equity in success for all students. Faculty determines the methods of instruction for all courses, and course outlines of record document the methods to be used.

The College has expanded online course offerings and services that support such instruction, including an online help desk staffed by the Online Support Team that offers online and face-to-face drop in support for students and faculty. Per the "Effective Strategies for Quality Online Teaching and Learning" document, regular and effective contact in online section is instructor initiated and includes student-to-student interactions. In fall 2015, the College created an online student orientation to address topics such as accessing online courses, technology readiness, and student skills for on line courses. Faculty professional development includes an Online Teaching Certification program and Flex presentations on how to retain online students. Online offerings have increased from 73 sections in fall 2012 to 167 sections in fall 2016.

The College Student Equity Plan includes activities designed to increase success rates for at-risk subpopulations of students, which include Personal Development courses; the Access Resource Center that offers academic counseling, specialized instruction, and classroom accommodations; the English and Study Skills Center and the Math Learning Center. The College hired a digital services Librarian and math learning center coordinator to meet the needs of students. (Standard II.A.7)

The College does not use departmental and/or program examinations. (Standard II.A.8)

The College awards course credit, degrees, and certificates based on student attainment of learning outcomes. Units of credit awarded are consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms in higher education. The Curriculum Advisory Committee reviews and approves course outlines of record, which use both learning outcomes and course objectives to describe the skills and knowledge that students will be able to demonstrate when they successfully exit a course. The College views SLOs as broader in scope while course objectives have a more specific and narrow focus. As instructors assess

students on course objectives, it is understood that there is an implicit connection to attainment of SLOs for the course. The College has established SLOs for courses and programs; however, the assessment of SLOs for all courses is at only 40 percent. In addition, MPC utilizes different strategies to define program-level outcomes for its CTE and transfer programs. CTE program SLOs are unique to the programs and are developed based on feedback from the advisory group. For transfer programs, the College defines its General Education Outcomes (GEOs) to serve as the program-level outcomes. Examples provided on program reflections do not show consistent reference to General Education Outcomes in program reflections. Additionally, while the College defines learning outcomes for its instructional programs (CTE and non CTE), CTE program level outcomes are assessed while outcomes for Associate for Arts and Associates for Science degrees are not. The College indicated that it will re-evaluate its current practice of using GEOs as sole program-level learning outcomes for Associate of Arts and Associate of Science degree programs and design improved learning outcomes where necessary and appropriate in order to describe skills and knowledge students will obtain through program completion. (Standard II.A.9)

The College provides transfer policies and related information to students in a variety of ways, including the college catalog, the Career and Transfer Resources Center, and through individual student-counselor meetings. However, the schedule of classes does not provide this information as required. The College utilizes ASSIST.org for articulation information and to determine how a specific course would apply to general education requirements and the majors. The articulation officer (AO) has been in the position for two years and has moved forward nearly 280 articulation agreements as of spring 2016 after a ten year period of mediocre articulation progress. The AO has created an ASSIST log so counselors can submit "missing" course articulation that the AO can act on immediately. A focus in the past two years has been on STEM, Liberal Arts, and Foreign Language articulations. The AO reviews existing curriculum at least three times a year to report curriculum changes to the ASSIST coordination site. The College has articulation agreements with all institutions identified as primary transfer institutions, and as of fall 2016, offers 24 AA-T or AA-S degrees. (Standard II.A.10, ER 10).

While the College provides evidence that learning outcomes address communication competency, quantitative competency, analytic inquiry skills, ethical reasoning, and the ability to engage diverse perspectives, it recognizes that program outcomes could be improved to better describe the skills and knowledge students will obtain through program completion. This need was seen as faculty determined that program level outcomes in place for AD-Ts and CTE degrees and certificates described the competencies and knowledge students gain with much greater specificity than the general education program outcomes it uses for institutional-level learning outcomes. (Standard II. A.11, Federal Regulation)

The College requires of all degree programs a component of general education based on carefully considered philosophy for associate degrees, per Board Policy 3001: General Education. The general education components are clearly outlined in the College Catalog. Students who satisfy competency requirements, general education requirements, major/are of emphasis requirements, a minimum of 60 degree-applicable units with a 2.0 or better grade point average, and a local completion requirement of 12 units are awarded appropriate AA,

AS, AA-T, or AS-T degrees. The general education program is a faculty-driven process and is divided into six broad areas, each with a direct relationship to the arts, humanities, sciences, mathematics, social sciences, lifelong learning, self-development, and/or culture understanding. The Curriculum Advisory Committee considers faculty request for courses to be included in the general education curriculum based on recommendations from its GE Requirements subcommittee. (Standard II.A.12; ER 12)

All of the College's degrees include general education requirements as well as a set of core course requirement that focus on the discipline or field of study. The majority of courses have SLOs determined by faculty with expertise in their specific fields, and these are included on course syllabi. The Curriculum Advisory Committee assesses courses in terms of their place within their disciplines and considers the stated course objectives in terms of their appropriateness to the degree level. The CI-D articulation process also helps the College assure that course SLOs reflect key theories and practices within the field of study. (Standard II.A.13, ER 11)

The College's Institutional Self Evaluation Report provides evidence that graduates who complete career technical certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment standards and other applicable standards and preparation for external licensure and certification. The College uses faculty and advisory committees help to identify the skills required for employment and that these are included in the SLO for each course within the programs. The SER cites two exemplary programs at the College: Nursing, which has a 93 percent NCLEX pass rate, and Automotive Technology, which awards an Automotive Service Excellence Certification. (Standard II.A.14)

Board Policy 3005: Academic Program Discontinuance and Administrative Procedure 3005: Procedure for Academic Program Discontinuance outlines the policies and procedures for initiating and conducting a viability review of educational programs. Based on one or more early warning signs, a program can be recommended to enter a process of focused examination and analysis that leads to one of three outcomes: no further action, College assistance for the program, or discontinuance. The process reviews 13 different criteria, including enrollment trends, completion rates, FTES/FTEF trends, alternative program options, and Costs/FTES trends. Also considered are labor market and employment data and licensure issues. When a program is discontinued, the College staff contact students currently enrolled in the program, and counselors work with students to assist them in making alternative arrangements for program completion. (Standard II.A.15)

The College provided evidence of identified student learning outcomes at the course, program (via general education outcomes), and institution level. Every instructional program is required to participate in a comprehensive program review every six years and to use both quantitative and qualitative data in its review. During this review, faculty completes a curriculum review to evaluate the quality and currency of courses and programs. The Curriculum Advisory Committee facilitates the process. Faculty and staff also utilize instructor and program reflections during the program review process. CTE programs participate in the six-year comprehensive program review process but also follow a two-year evaluation process as required by California Education Code. (Standard II.A.16, Federal Regulation)

Conclusion

The College meets the Standard and related Eligibility Requirements except for Standard II.A.1, II.A.3, II.6, II.A.10, II.A.11, II.A.16 and ER 11.

Recommendations to Meet the Standards

See **Recommendation 3** and **Recommendation 4**.

Recommendations to Improve Quality

Recommendation 6: In order to improve, the team recommends that the College develop more intentional cycles of course assessment, strengthen the link between course and program assessment cycles, and reach greater levels of participation in student learning outcomes assessment from all faculty. (Standard II.A.3)

Recommendation 7: In order to improve, the team recommends that the College use enrollment data to inform scheduling decisions and implement an enrollment management system to facilitate data usage. (Standards II.A. 6; A.II.10)

Standard II.B: Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations

The MPC library and the eight learning support services on campus are sufficient to support the institutions instructional programs on campus. The library collection consists of both print and online sources as well as 83 research guides accessible to online and on-campus students on a number of subjects. The college must move to a new integrated library system (ILS) by Spring 2017. The ILS is the systems backbone of an academic library and is tied to circulation, inventory and resource sharing. The library has recently joined with two other local community colleges to form a regional consortium in order to share an ILS. The library has recently increased its open hours by 3.25 hours weekly based on library hours survey conducted in 2015.

The English and Study Skills Center (ESSC) offer reading, writing and study skills to students across all disciplines. The college's Reading Center offers one-on-one and small group tutoring to students who need assistance with developing their reading skills. There are six other learning centers on campus that meet the needs of a variety of students: The High Tech Center for Students with Disabilities, Math Learning Center, Nursing Learning Resource Center, TRIO Learning Center, Business Skills Center and the Graphic Arts Lab. The college has two off-campus sites. The Marina Education Center (MEC) focuses on basic skills courses and the Library, ESSC, Math Learning Center, Business Skills Center offer some support services at this location. The other site is the Public Safety Training Center which includes the Fire and Police Academy.

Findings and Evidence

The College supports student learning and achievement by providing library services to students and personnel responsible for student learning and support and meets the Eligibility Requirement 17. The Library and Technology Center occupies two floors of the library building and has 155 computer stations available for student use. These computers have access to the library's online collection of resources, the library catalog and are all equipped with accessibility programs such as Kurzweil and Zoom Text. (Standard II.B.1)

The library's physical and online book and periodical collections are available via the library's web site and can be accessed 24/7 from off-campus to all registered students as well as faculty and staff. In addition, the library has successfully initiated a unique service which enables instructors to bring online journal articles, e-books, and other digital resources from the library's discovery system directly into the online learning environment. Called Curriculum Builder by Ebsco, this technology speaks to the collaborative relationship between librarians and instructors in their mutual support for student success. (Standards II.B.1, II.B.2)

Student workstations in the open lab areas of the library are outdated and many are unable to handle the Windows 10 Operating System. There is a critical need for a technology refresh of these computers as this equipment supports student learning in all programs. (Standards II.B.1, II.B.2)

Each of the four full-time librarians serve as a subject liaison to several instructional departments in order to build and maintain the collection. In that way, librarians and instructors collaborate to ensure the library's collection supports the curriculum. Librarians select and de-select material to maintain the currency and depth of the collection information. The library has a permanent seat on the Curriculum Advisory Committee in order to confirm that the library has the appropriate material to support the objectives and outcomes of courses coming under review by the Committee. (Standards II.B.2)

Library research instruction occurs in a number of ways. One-on-one assistance between librarians and students takes place at the reference desk during regular library hours. Librarians are also available by appointment for specialized research help and by the reference desk telephone during regular library hours. The library also offers discipline-specific instruction sessions for entire classes requested by subject faculty. The presentations are tailored to the class assignments and course learning outcomes. The library facilitated 130 of these sessions in 2014-2015. In their 2015-2016 Program Review, the library reported that students in English 111 and English 1A classes that attended library instruction sessions had higher completion rates than those who had not received library instruction. Finally, the library also offers two credit courses. Library 50-Introduction to Library and Research Skills fills the local graduation requirement for information competency and Library 80-Internet Literacy. In evaluating the effect and relationship between library instruction and overall course completion rates, first time students who took Library 50 had an overall course completion rate of 74.3% compared to 66% for those who did not take Library 50. Up until spring 2015, library credit courses were online. The librarians discussed the option of making Library 50 a hybrid class in their most recent Program Review and Program Reflection in order to accommodate the needs of students who may be more likely to succeed with a face-to-face component. The first hybrid class will be offered in spring 2017. (Standards II.B.1, II.B.3)

The Library evaluates its services using several methods. The comprehensive Program Review of 2015-2016, and their five Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) are instruments used to assess the effectiveness of its support service beyond the course curriculum. The five SAOs are: 1) Users will be able to access information in a variety of formats. 2) Users will be able access computers and software to support their educational goals. 3) Through reference and instruction, users will develop information literacy skills. 4) Users will be able to study individually or collaboratively in a welcoming environment with supportive staff. 5) Users will be able to study and explore ideas in an environment that is healthy, safe, and well-maintained. In the 2015 Program Reflection, the library decided to concentrate on SAOs 1, 3 and 5. Progress and improvements were made in each of these three SAOs per the 2015 Program Reflection. At the current time, the library does not conduct comprehensive student or faculty satisfaction surveys on their physical resources, collections, or library services. In fall 2015, a survey on library hours was conducted with the result being the expansion of library hours. (Standard II.B.3)

The MPC library maintains collaborative relationships with other institutions and contracts with standard library service providers to maintain and enhance library services and support instructional programs. The Library belongs to the Monterey Bay Area Cooperative Library

System (MOBAC) which provides members with the ability to lend and borrow materials amongst 18 member libraries. During the 2014-2015 academic year, the library borrowed 305 books from other MOBAC libraries and fulfilled requests for 166 titles from their own collection to other libraries. The tracking of these library loans gives valuable information to the Library on resource demand and for evaluation of the College collection. The library also belongs to the Community College Library Consortium (CCLC) which allows the library to take advantage of consortia pricing for online resources at a reduced rate. (Standard IIB.4)

The library is currently using an integrated library system (ILS) based at the California State University Monterey Bay (CSUMB) campus which has hosted the system for MPC and other local community colleges since 1997. The ILS supports the library's online catalog and integrates the circulation, acquisitions, serials management and cataloging and materials inventory. In fall 2015, CSUMB communicated that it will cease hosting the ILS by December 2017. Soon thereafter, the MPC Library began talks with two other local community colleges with the intention of forming a regional consortium that would collaborate on sharing an ILS. As of August 2016, the three libraries have stated their intention to migrate to a new ILS together and have begun to discuss the structure, policies and potential ILS functionalities that would best suit the needs of all three colleges. The library anticipates several benefits of this shared ILS. Overlap in student populations at the three colleges will have the effect of expanding access to library services at all locations. In addition, the libraries see opportunities for coordinated collection development, allowing the individual libraries to develop more in-depth collections to support specialized programs with limited materials funds. (Standard II.B.4)

The English and Studies Skills Center (ESSC) have a vibrant presence on campus. Operating on the first floor of the library, the ESSC works closely with the English department and the majority of their lab activities are for student enrolled in developmental reading and writing courses. During the fall of 2014, surveys were conducted to determine the needs of English as a Second Language (ENSL) students. The surveys revealed that additional support in the way of resources available to ESSC tutors and students were needed. As a result, textbooks were purchased for ENSL students to borrow and an online resource was created pointing to resources on the ESL site. In 2015, 77 percent of ENSL students reported using the ESSC regularly. Also in 2015, research was conducted that showed students taking English 400 had much higher success rates in English 111 and English 1A than those students who did not take English 400. (Standards II.B.1, II.B.2, II.B.3)

The Reading Center is open to all enrolled MPC students and offers foundational reading skills tutoring. The Center also provides assessment for students registered in the lower levels of the College's reading course sequence. Like the ESSC, they report to the Humanities Division.

The Reading Center has been regularly tracking assessment data for their reading strategies lab students. The next step will be to correlate success in the Reading Center to success and retention across campus. Student surveys also led to positive changes of the "How-To" videos on MPC Online. (Standards II.B.1, II.B.3)

The Math Learning Center (MLC) offers tutoring and coaching of all math levels through calculus and advanced physics. In 2012, the Math Learning Center ran a statistical comparison of student success rates between students who used the MLC on a regular basis with those who used it rarely and those students who never used it. Students who used the MLC regularly (more than eight hours a semester) did remarkably better with Math 261 and Math 263 students showing the largest success rates versus their peers who did not use the MLC. (Standards II B.1, II B.3)

Other student support services on campus include the High Tech Center for Students with Disabilities, the Nursing Learning Resource Center, the TRIO Learning Center, the Business Skills Center and the Graphics Arts Lab. (Standard II.B.1)

Beginning this semester all college classes (both face-to-face and online) have access to the California Open Education Initiative's (OEI) NetTutor online tutorial service. The College offered Flex day workshops on how instructors could take advantage of this free service. (Standard II.B.1)

The College has two off-campus sites located on the old Fort Ord Army Base. The Marina Education Center is the location for basic skills and general education offerings, maintaining the original emphasis of the Center as an access point to higher education. The Seaside location is designated as the location of the Public Safety Training Center where fire, police and EMT students conduct their classes. The two locations generate 529.5 FTES in a full academic year.

The Marina Education Center (MEC) has eight classrooms including a computer classroom which also doubles as a lab for the ESSC. There are 44 laptops/workstations for student use. The workstations were recently refreshed with one-time IELM funds. The Instructional Technologist that services the Center is shared with the Humanities and Social Sciences Divisions and visits the MEC on a case-by-case basis. There is a full-time Unit Office Manager that oversees the day-to-day operations of the facility and a recently hired Categorical Services Coordinator who assists students with the entire matriculation process. The MEC is open 8 a.m.-9:15 p.m. Monday – Thursday and 8 a.m.-4:30 p.m. on Fridays, yet learning support services at the MEC are minimal. The English Study Skills Center (ESSC) at Marina provides support four hours a week. In reviewing class times for fall, 2016, ENGL 111 was the only class out of four English classes being offered at Marina where the class hours overlapped with ESSC hours. English as a Second Language (ENSL) classes at Marina with 12 sections had no overlap with ESSC hours. Drop-in Math Tutoring had six hours of tutorial assistance overlapping three out of six math classes. The Reading Center does not have the financial capacity to place a faculty member at the MEC despite a clear desire evidenced in their Program Reflections. The Dean of Instruction shared that when there are thirty students on the Monterey campus requesting Reading help, and only three requesting help at Marina, the Reading Center has to make the tough choice of where to focus their limited resources. (Standard II.B.1)

The Library offers basic support services at the MEC. Student can borrow textbooks for onsite use, search online databases for e-books and journal articles and call or email a reference librarian at the Monterey campus for reference assistance. There is no librarian that visits the campus regularly; however, when an instructor requests a library research orientation for a class, a librarian from the Monterey campus travels the 15 minute drive to MEC to conduct the orientation. (Standards II.B.1, II.B.2)

According to the Institutional Self Evaluation Report, the area surrounding the Marina Education Center has the highest need for educational services. As a result, the college has included as a goal in their Institutional Action Plan to provide essential support services for the Marina Educational Center. The Dean of Student Services confirmed that the goal was initiated by the Collaborative Brain Trust Institutional Review. The Review mentioned the lack of a comprehensive enrollment management plan at the MEC both in terms of day and evening classes. Students have difficulty finishing transfer programs at the Marina campus. Although courses exist, they are not planned in a comprehensive package, and thus do not offer students the ability to fulfill their goals. A work group subcommittee is working to grow MEC into a full-time center and they are currently considering what types of benchmark programs and/or courses to offer at the MEC to get the greatest number of enrolled students. With the Marina High School close by, they are considering classes in English as a Second Language, computer science and business. As progress continues on an MEC enrollment plan, the college will have to take into consideration adequate support services per their Institutional Action Plan goal. (Standards II.B.1, II.B.2)

At the Seaside Public Safety Training Center (SPSTC), the director is on site fulltime, and the fulltime office manager assists students in accessing student services. Students at the SPSTC are limited to a few specialized programs with prescribed pathways. Library staff in conjunction with SPSTC staff, have determined that library support services are not required at this time due to the prescribed nature of the programs.

Conclusions

The College meets the standard, except for II.B.1 and II.B.3.

Recommendation to Meet the Standards

Recommendation 8: In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the College conduct regularly scheduled library surveys of all students and faculty, regardless of location, in order to gauge user satisfaction, knowledge of services, behavior and experience and use the results as the basis for improvement. (Standards IIB.1, II.B.3)

Standard II.C: Student Support Services

General Observations

The Student Service Programs provide quality services regardless of location or means of delivery and provide an adequate means of evaluation. The student services staff demonstrate a positive culture of continual self-improvement and a commitment to change as needed to improve student success.

Findings and Evidence

The College evaluates the quality of its student support services and demonstrates these services, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education. The College evaluates its services using primarily a six-year Program Review cycle and annual program reflections every fall, which lead to annual action plans every spring. The College also uses SLO and SAO assessment to evaluate the quality of its student services. Additionally, some programs, such as TRIO, conduct and share mandated student support evaluations with external agencies.

Neither the Marina Education Center nor the Seaside Public Safety Training Center receives a separate evaluation of student services. Nor does the college have a separate formal process for evaluating the quality of Student Support Services through distance education other than through its program review and Program Reflection processes. An example of evaluation and improvement of online Student Services that emerged from a counseling department program reflection is the assessment of its “Ask a Counselor” option on the College website, resulting in a reduction in irrelevant questions. The College’s DE Committee, on which a counselor and the Director of Financial Aid serve, establishes annual goals that address student service needs, among others, of online students. One of its achieved goals was to invite a guest speaker (Director of Online Student Support for OEI) in Spring 2016 to instruct all faculty about the student services which are available online and how to make them readily available to MPC students.

To complement the evaluation of Student Services through Program Review, Program Reflection and SLOs/SAOs, the College has incorporated Noel-Levitz surveys, conducted in 2009 and 2014. These surveys, along with other student needs assessment surveys, have augmented the College’s efforts to evaluate its student services in the context of changing needs and challenges for its student population. (Standard II.C.1, ER 15)

Student services program reviews include a comprehensive evaluation of SLOs and SAOs. Identifying gaps, making improvements and evaluating the results of those action plans are done through the program review and program reflection processes. For example, the Access Resource Center used its 2012 Program Review data to assess student progress in toward two specific program SAOs: 1) using technology and 2) using knowledge of their disability to assist in academic planning. As a result, the ARC developed a mentor program and established a designated space for mentors to work with students. Each program review requires a response to the following questions:

- How does your program support student learning?
- Please describe how the “Program Reflections on Student Learning” led to improve connections with your plans to improve student learning?

The *MPC SLO Assessment Report of 2013-14* identifies the assessed SLOs and SAOs for all College programs and the plans each program made for improvements. (Standard II.C.2) The College offers comprehensive services to students regardless of service location or delivery method. Student Services are available to students in person at the Monterey Campus, Marina Education Center, and the Seaside Public Safety Training Center (SPSTC). The Marina Education Center hosts student activities occasionally, such as a Mayoral Debate which was hosted on October 8, 2016. A Marina Education Center student representative serves on the Student Activities Council, and additional student activities will be planned for the center. A fulltime categorical services coordinator has been trained to provide comprehensive services (admissions, registration, assessment, orientation, counseling, Financial Aid, and Health) at the Marina Education Center. The individual is assigned 24 hours per week at the Marina Education Center and 16 hours per week providing outreach in the Marina and Seaside communities. While counseling and tutoring services are regularly scheduled at the Marina Education Center, other services are not consistent month to month; therefore, students must access the Marina Center calendar of events online to determine when those services will be provided on site.

At the Seaside Public Safety Training Center (SPSTC), the director is on site fulltime, and the fulltime office manager assists students in accessing student services. The student services and SPSTC staff determined that since Seaside Center students are limited to only a few specialized programs with prescribed pathways (police academy, fire academy, and EMT cohorts) and are enrolled in short-term classes (1 day to 1 week long), on-site student services need not extend beyond those provided by the fulltime office manager and visiting categorical services coordinator.

The SPSTC office manager has been cross-trained by admissions and records and financial aid so she can provide general student service functions. Her access to Student Information Systems (SIS) data and her training mean that there are very few processes that she cannot perform for students on site. For more specialized service requests, such as Veterans Affairs, the office manager serves as a liaison between the student and the Monterey Campus, acquiring the services for the student usually over the phone without the student having to travel to the Monterey Campus. The categorical services coordinator, who is assigned 24 hours per week at the Marina Education Center, also serves students at the SPSTC each week. He provides classroom presentations to each cohort group that includes orientation and an overview of student services and how to obtain them. The student health services department provides physicals to each cohort group on site, sending a physician to the SPSTC to provide that service. Displays of Student Service information are clearly posted on the SPSTC campus, and students have online access to all student services via the open computer lab.

Distance education students can access admissions and records, registration, orientation (through *Comevo*), counseling, advising sheets (for all majors), education plans, placement scores, financial aid, EOPS appointments, TRIO appointments, tutoring services (through *NetTutor*) and library services all online. Students can access online tools, including “WebReg” and “Ask a Counselor,” and faculty can utilize *Verisite*, a plagiarism checking program, and *Proctario*, an online quiz proctoring program that verifies student identity and locks down the browser. A counselor is assigned to respond to questions posted to “Ask a

Counselor” every morning for an hour and every afternoon for an hour. More counselors are assigned to respond to questions posted online during peak times. Potential and current students can access “Ask a Counselor” through the College website, and current students can access the service on the web portal and Canvas or Moodle. The College, participating in the state’s Online Education Initiative, plans to implement *Cranium Café* by fall 2017, which will allow students to video conference live with a counselor from a distance. The MPC Online Student Services Table lists where all student services may be currently found online. (Standard II.C.3, ER 15)

Co-curricular programs and athletic programs are suited to the College’s mission and conducted with sound educational policy and standards of integrity. The College has responsibility for the control of these programs, including their finances. The student activities office oversees the Associated Students of Monterey Peninsula College (ASMPC), its sub-councils, and at least 20 active student clubs. The office of student activities has a full-time coordinator who reports directly to the vice president of student services. The direct reporting structure encourages student leaders to feel comfortable coming directly to the vice president’s office to share concerns and proposals, which are then taken to President’s Cabinet meetings. ASMPC maintains established academic requirements and clear expectations for students participating in elected leadership roles, as stated in its bylaws. The student activities coordinator and club advisors conduct verification of enrollment and GPA each semester. ASMPC’s structure includes three sub-councils: The Inter-Club Council, the Student Representative Council, and the Activities Council.

The student activities coordinator coordinates the activities of the ASMPC and its sub-councils. The Inter-Club Council (ICC) brings together all student organizations for advocacy and networking to enhance student learning and contribute to student life. The Student Representative Council ensures that college committees and councils have student representatives. The Activities Council, composed entirely of students, coordinates student activities at the College. To publicize and promote club activities, ASMPC hosts an event called “Lobo Days” each semester during which student clubs, counselors, financial aid, and other student services promote programs and services during the third week of classes. The inclusion of student services in Lobo Days during the third week of classes assists struggling students and buttresses student retention and persistence. Other regular activities include a Thanksgiving Luncheon for the campus community, a faculty and staff appreciation luncheon in the spring, and an annual Earth Day. The student activities coordinator also coordinates the activities of the Student Welfare Council, which maintains a food pantry for students in need and facilitates other welfare services.

The College offers 12 intercollegiate athletic teams for men and women in 12 sports. MPC is a member of the California Community College Athletic Association (CCCCAA) and competes in the Coast Conference and the Northern California Football Conference. In order to participate in athletics, students must maintain academic standards based on conference requirements. The College’s athletic program adheres to the CCCCCAA constitution, which specifies eligibility requirements. To ensure that student athletes have adequate support to meet and maintain these requirements, the Athletics Program collaborates with other departments and programs on campus, such as TRIO/Student Support Services, to provide

quality support services. All student athletes attend an orientation where they receive a code of conduct and discuss expectations for behavior. The athletics program collaborates with the office of admissions and records to conduct the student eligibility process for new and incoming student athletes. (Standard II.C.4)

The College provides counseling and academic advising programs to support student success and prepares faculty and other personnel for their functions. The College orients students to ensure they understand the requirements of their programs of study. Three categorical service coordinators coordinate outreach efforts to area high schools, nonprofit organizations, and outreach in response to invitations from outside the district. In providing orientations for potential incoming students, these positions, through the use of a student services outreach calendar, ensure coordination among all programs in community and high school outreach and orientation. In addition to these orientation efforts, an annual “High School Breakfast” ensures continual cooperation and communication between the high school counselors and the College counselors and other student services. “Tent Days” established by the counseling department ensure that students need not stand in long lines during peak registration times to see a counselor and allow student services staff to assist students whose needs can be met without seeing a counselor. Counselors also developed “Drop-in Days,” permitting counselors to see as many students as possible without students needing an appointment. “Lobo Days,” sponsored by student activities, include counselors and financial aid among other student services, during the third week of each semester to assist struggling students and buttress student retention and persistence. College events, such as the “High School Assessment Day,” lead incoming students through assessment and to an Education Plan. Counselors collaborate with the career resource and transfer center to host “Transfer Day,” an on-campus open house event in which students can interact with representatives from four-year colleges and universities.

The counseling department conducted 7,400 counseling sessions in 2014-15 and uses SARS to schedule student appointments. The counseling department established online assistance through “Ask a Counselor” so that potential and current students can receive counseling assistance from a distance. Additionally, the counseling department plans to implement *Cranium Café* by fall 2017, which will allow students to video conference live with a counselor from a distance. Lastly, the College purchased *Comevo*, a software that provides online orientation.

The counseling department maintains regular communication with academic programs by assigning individual counseling faculty to liaise with one or more academic division. Furthermore, specialized programs, such as Nursing and Athletics, have designated counselors that provide program-specific counseling and advising for students. The early childhood education program supports a fulltime counselor to support ECE students. The counseling department also implemented Schedule Building and Educational Planning workshops to assist students with understanding their assessment results, how to read a class schedule, and how to develop a semester educational plan. The counseling course PERS 10 concludes with a requirement to obtain a two-semester education plan. Unfortunately, the College reports that the data on students receiving comprehensive and abbreviated student education plans is inaccurate. Obtaining accurate data will assist the College in making appropriate action plans to increase student success. (Standard II.C.5)

The College specifies the qualifications appropriate for its programs and defines and advises students on clear pathways to complete degree, certificate, and transfer goals. Qualifications for admission to the College are clearly defined in the college catalog. Individual programs, such as Nursing, may have specific requirements for students wishing to enroll, and these requirements are also clearly defined in the college catalog. Degree, certificate, and transfer requirements are clearly defined and accessible for students in person, via the catalog, and online. The College provides Major Advising Sheets online, updated by the college articulation officer annually, clearly delineating for students the major requirements and General Education requirements of each major. (Standard II.C.6, ER 16)

The College evaluates admissions and placement instruments and practices. The office of admissions and records evaluates its practices for effectiveness through program review, program reflections, and ad hoc processes such as departmental business process analysis. The offices of admissions and records and student success and equity participate in the College's program review, program reflections and action planning processes for regular evaluation of their services. As a result of one such program reflection and action plan, on January 2014 the office of admissions and records automated the application acceptance process, reducing the time for processing from three days to five minutes. Assessment instruments are reviewed for disproportionate impact and validity, either by third-party test vendors or by the office of institutional research and discipline faculty. No assessment instruments were reviewed by the office of institutional research and discipline faculty in the last two years. Third-party vendors provide impact and validity studies on a regular cycle, and these are disseminated to the discipline faculty. Moving forward, the College is planning to review all assessment instruments on a three-year cycle. (Standard II.C.7)

The College maintains student records permanently, securely and confidentially with a secure backup of all files. The college publishes and follows established policies for the release of student records. The admissions and records office maintains enrollment records of all MPC students; microfilm copies prior to 1995 are stored in fireproof locked cabinets; however, since spring 2015 all microfilm copies have been converted to digital format to make those records more easily accessible. Records after 1995 are stored electronically in the Student Information System (SIS). Access to student enrollment records is limited to authorized personnel. Students, faculty and staff can access personal records (including grades) securely by logging into the Student Information System or student portal. Counseling notes are kept in SARS, ensuring that access to these confidential records is based upon system permissions. Counseling files located at the Marina Education Center are stored in a locked cabinet, housed in a locked office in an alarmed building. The Seaside Public Safety Training Center stores applications, training records, and student files in locked cabinets within double locked offices. All student discipline records are maintained in locked cabinets in the office of the vice president of student services. The College backs up all administrative data stored on its services, including student records, in accordance with Board Policy. (Standard II.C.8)

Conclusion

The College meets the Standard and related Eligibility Requirements except for Standards II.C.1 and II.C.2.

Recommendation to Meet the Standards

Recommendation 9: In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the College improve its evaluation process of student support and learning services to include discussion of services offered at all centers and for distance education based on robust Service Area Outcomes and Student Learning Outcomes assessments that lead to quality improvement of student support programs and services in support of the college's mission. (Standards II.C.1, II.C.2)

Recommendations to Improve Quality

Recommendation 10: In order to improve, the team recommends that all student services provided at the Marina Education Center be consistently scheduled and published. (Standard II.C.3)

Recommendation 11: In order to improve, the team recommends that the College obtain accurate data on students receiving comprehensive and abbreviated student education plans and review the data regularly to make appropriate action plans to increase student success. (Standard II.C.5)

STANDARD III RESOURCES

Standard III.A: Human Resources

General Observations

Human Resources are generally sufficient to meet the needs of the College and its off-site locations, and faculty, classified professionals and administrators are qualified and hired using appropriately crafted job descriptions and hiring procedures that include a focus on the mission. The College utilizes a prioritization process for determining the order of faculty hiring based on data and need factors. Human resources staffing is challenged as most employees in this area are new hires and are learning processes that are primarily manual processes, and which is impacting the unit's effectiveness at managing the evaluation process and policy and procedure upkeep.

The College takes steps to ensure that the needs of diverse personnel are met and assesses whether hiring procedures and results support a diverse and equitable College environment. The College has several policies that include a written code of professional ethics though these policies have not been updated in many years. The College offers a robust program of Flex activities under the coordination of the Academic Senate Flex Advisory Committee, and provides some professional development opportunities for the benefit of all employees. The College maintains personnel records in a confidential, secure location and personnel have access to their personnel records in a timely manner.

Findings and Evidence

Human resources are generally sufficient to meet the needs of the College and its off-site locations. Faculty, classified professionals and administrators are qualified and hired using appropriately crafted job descriptions and hiring procedures that include a focus on the mission. Evidence of samples of job descriptions for all employee groups was provided. (Standard III.A.1).

The faculty job descriptions include responsibilities for developing curriculum and engaging in assessing student learning outcomes. (Standard III.A.2)

The College provided hiring procedures for all employee groups including full-time faculty, part-time faculty, classified professionals and instructional and student services administrators. Those procedures include processes for recruitment, vetting of minimum qualifications and equivalencies, and interview and selection processes. (Standard III.A. 3)

In accordance with Title 5, §53400, Monterey Peninsula College ensures that required degrees held by faculty, administrators, and other employees are from institutions accredited by recognized U.S. accrediting agencies. MPC requires that applicants with foreign degrees submit their transcripts directly to the American Associate of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO) for evaluation. This requirement is specified in job announcements and required prior to the official hiring. (Standard III.A.4)

The office of human resources coordinates the evaluation processes for administrators, managers, faculty, classified, and confidential staff. Administrators, managers, supervisors, and confidential employees are evaluated annually based on the Management Team Employee Performance Evaluation Process. Full-time and part-time faculty, are evaluated per negotiated agreement with the Monterey Peninsula College Teachers Association. Classified employees are evaluated based on agreement with the Monterey Peninsula California School Employees Association. All probationary employees are evaluated by the end of the fifth month of the six-month probationary period. All permanent classified employees are evaluated annually. Written criteria for evaluation are established in these agreements. While agreements and processes are in place, tracking of evaluations of classified personnel is a challenge. Manual processes and a high turnover rate for employees in the human resources office and managers responsible for evaluations have hindered timely and effective evaluation of classified professionals. Because of this, it's unclear that actions following evaluations are formal, timely and documented. (Standard III.A.5)

Full-time and part-time faculty have as a component of their evaluation, an opportunity to describe their engagement in the assessment of student learning outcomes at the program level in their self-evaluations. The form prompts faculty to "Describe your participation in program review and/or program reflections." During program reflections, campus personnel gather in groups to dialogue about student learning at the program level and across disciplines. The purpose is to connect the results of SLO analysis to specific improvement plans and the resource allocation process. Typical results of the dialogue are documented resource needs. This language provides an opportunity for this discussion though there is not a clear requirement that a faculty member respond to this prompt with a description of engagement in outcomes assessment.

The standard calls for other personnel directly responsible for student learning to also have as a component of their evaluations engagement in outcomes assessment to improve teaching and learning. The College noted in its self-evaluation report that the majority of non-faculty personnel are indirectly responsible for student learning and therefore the forms for evaluation of non-faculty positions do not include a reference to outcomes assessment. In instances where it is determined a non-faculty member is directly responsible for student learning, consideration of how effectively these duties are performed is addressed in the "Quantity of Work" and "Performance Goals" components of the classified evaluation. (Standard III.A.6)

The number of faculty is sufficient to support educational programs. Academic credentials for faculty and administrators are published in the college catalog. The College's Academic Affairs Advisory Group (AAAG) utilizes a prioritization process for determining the order of faculty hiring. Division chairs submit completed position requests to their appropriate dean, and the AAAG vets those proposals using a rubric. Proposals are prioritized and forwarded to the president for approval and implementation. (Standard III.A.7, ER 14).

The College employs part-time faculty and has a separate hiring procedure for part-time faculty recruitment and hiring. Part-time faculty, are provided an orientation at the beginning of each semester to provide crucial information, basic employment documents, and other

information. The College attempts to integrate adjunct faculty through division activities, participatory governance structures, and college-wide events. Adjunct faculty serve on committees, including the Academic Senate (per the Senate's bylaws). Adjunct faculty are encouraged to share their opinions and feedback through surveys on both campus-wide and division-specific issues surveys, including program reviews. (Standard III.A.8)

The College has a sufficient number of staff in most areas to support the effective educational, technological, physical, and administrative operations of the College. Grounds and maintenance areas lack sufficient staffing to manage all three sites; however administrative services has developed a schedule to make maximum use of existing staff. (Standard III.A.9)

The College has had difficulty maintaining high-level administrative staff, and many administrative staff members are newly in their positions. Within the past year the positions of vice president of administrative services and vice president for student services have been filled. Also, the College has not filled a vacant facilities director position. (Standard III.A.10)

In order to address this issue and other staffing challenges, the College intends to create a human resources staffing plan, expected by spring 2017. Lack of staffing in human resources has increased the backlog of projects, such as policy and procedures revision, making it difficult to update the administrative hiring procedures, which have not been updated since 1991. The College has indicated an actionable improvement plan to create a human resource staffing plan, at which time administrator hiring procedures will be updated. The College does not meet Eligibility Requirement 8 related to this standard. (Standards III.A.9, III.A.10, ER 8)

The College establishes, publishes, and adheres to written personnel policies and procedures that are fair and equitably administered. Current board policies related to personnel are available online through the Board of Trustees website. In the 2014 Faculty and Staff Accreditation Survey, 76.9 percent of staff who responded strongly agreed or agreed that they know where they can find personnel policies and procedures that are relevant to their job, and 78.2 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they had been treated fairly. Many of the College policies have not been updated for a significant number of years, and it's unclear that a schedule for the review of policies and procedures has been established. The College has hired a consultant to update existing policies. (Standard III.A.11)

Through its policies and procedures, the institution maintains programs to support its diverse personnel. The College has established Board Policy 5100: Equal Employment Opportunity and Commitment to Diversity to ensure that applicants and employees will not be subjected to discrimination in any program or activity. The College has adopted an Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Plan to ensure equitable hiring. The College's Equal Employment Opportunity Advisory Committee (EEOAC) includes representatives from the campus and an eclectic and diverse array of community partners, and acts as an advisory body to the College in the implementation of the EEO Plan. The associate dean of human resources presents an annual EEO report to the Board of Trustees and other groups, which includes information about the diversity of current applicant pools and active employee demographics. (Standard III.A.12).

The College has established several board policies in support of professional ethics, which include consequences for violation. These policies include Board Policy 5001: Institutional Code of Ethics; Board Policy 5310: Faculty Professional Commitment; Board Policy 5530: Management, Supervisory and Confidential Rights and Responsibilities. In addition to these policies the Board has established policies on teaching and faculty duties and responsibilities, personal conduct, and sexual harassment. While these policies are in place, several have not been updated in several years. (III.A.13)

The College provides professional development opportunities for all employees. The Academic Senate's Flex Advisory Committee (FAC) coordinates Flex days during which all staff may attend professional development workshops. The FAC conducts a survey at the conclusion of Flex days to determine if there are additional needs that should be addressed at future Flex days. The FAC meets regularly, is actively engaged in program self-evaluation, and plans to implement innovations to their process for determining needs and coordinating offerings.

Specifically for faculty, MPC offers the MPC Online Teaching Certification program based on the California Community College @ONE online training curriculum. The curriculum has been adapted to incorporate MPC's Effective Strategies for Online Teaching and Learning as well as specific aspects of MPC's online teaching and learning environment. The program is voluntary for faculty. Also for faculty is the weekly "Faculty Coffee and Conversation" series designed to support faculty teaching online.

In addition to the offerings by the FAC, The MPC Foundation provides small faculty and staff advancement grants (FSAA) to support professional development opportunities outside the College. FASA awards support off-site professional development activities, professional development coursework and other endeavors. Though the grants are competitive, evidence was provided that the grants are utilized by faculty and managers and less so by classified professionals. In addition to these offerings, the human resources office coordinates on-demand professional development offerings through several services, such as Keenan Safe Colleges Online Training. the college does not conduct a Needs Assessment survey of all staff to inform planning in professional development, although there are many offerings available to staff. (Standard III.A.14)

The College makes provision for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. Physical access to personnel records is controlled in filing cabinets that can lock and restricted for purposes of security and confidentiality to authorized employees. These include Workman's Compensation documents and other personnel files. The human resources office has made improvements in recent years to the processes for handling confidential files by purchasing new equipment and establishing new protocols. Employees have access to their own personnel records and are able to review them on request within 48 hours of making a request. (Standard III.A.15)

Conclusion

The College meets the Standard and related Eligibility Requirements except for Standards III.A.5, III.A.6, III.A.9, III.A.10, and ER 8.

Recommendations to meet the Standard

Recommendation 13: In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the college create a Human Resources staffing plan to ensure that staffing levels and assignments for faculty, staff, and administrators are sufficient and appropriately distributed to support the institution's mission and purpose and interwoven into a larger integrated planning process of the college. (Standards III.A.9, III.A.10, ER 8)

Recommendation 14: In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that employee evaluations are regularly and consistently conducted for all employee groups. The team further recommends that faculty, academic administrators, and others directly responsible for student learning have, as a component of their evaluation, consideration of how these employees use the results of learning outcomes assessment to improve teaching and learning. (Standards III.A.5, III.A.6)

Recommendation 15: In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the College establish a schedule for the review of policies and procedures relevant to Human Resources. (Standards III.A.11, III.A.12, III.A.13).

Recommendations to Improve Quality

Recommendation 12: In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College update its administrative hiring procedures (Standard III.A.3).

Standard III.B: Physical Resources

General Observations

Monterey Peninsula College serves residents on the Monterey Peninsula—which includes the communities of Carmel, Carmel Valley, Del Rey Oaks, Marina, Monterey, Pacific Grove, Pebble Beach, Sand City, and Seaside, as well as the portion of the central coast extending south just beyond the community of Big Sur. The college operates three locations: The Monterey Campus located at 980 Fremont Street, the Education Center at Marina, and the Public Safety Training Center in Seaside.

Facilities are constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment. Supporting documentation shows major changes to capital plans are developed through a collaborative committee structure with final recommendations for capital budget adjustments approved by the Board of Trustees. Security and protection systems are well developed and again reflect a collaborative committee structure and effective communication processes at all College locations. Various safety trainings such as earthquake preparedness and active shooter training have been held. Evidence provided from two consecutive SWACC Property and Liability Inspection Reports documented steady progress on improving safety and reducing hazards. Staff addresses any safety-related requests and accessibility-related requests first. Evidence provided from surveys showed general satisfaction with facilities and safety. The security department works cooperatively with the Monterey Police Department at the Monterey campus, the Marina Police Department at the MPC Education Center at Marina, and the Seaside Police Department at the Public Safety Training Center. Annual safety inspections occur along with regular, onsite inspections by MPC grounds and maintenance personnel.

The College engages in long and short-term planning to acquire, build, maintain, upgrade or replace facilities and physical resources in support of educational planning. In consultation with the vice president for administrative services, the facilities committee participates in the creation of a Facilities Master Plan, based on the Educational Master Plan, but is not currently involved in the prioritization of physical resource and facilities needs identified in annual planning. Long range planning includes consideration for the total cost of ownership for physical resources and capital needs.

Findings and Evidence

The ACCJC Midterm Report from March 2013 did not cite any recommendations relative to Standard III.B.

The Facilities Department provides physically safe campus spaces. It consists of 28 employees under the direction of the facilities operations supervisor, currently vacant, who in turn reports to the vice president for administrative services. The College maintains a five-year Capital Construction Plan, Space Inventory, and a five-year Scheduled Maintenance Plan, as well as maintaining appropriate facility information and data in the Chancellor's Office FUSION system. The College completed a comprehensive assessment of its compliance with ADA and accessibility requirements and a comprehensive review of its maintenance and grounds services. The College uses an electronic, trouble ticket system

called, “Maintenance Direct” to manage facilities-related work order requests including maintenance requests, repairs, office moves, and set-up for campus events under the supervision of the facilities operations supervisor and the vice president of administrative services. Staff prioritizes incoming requests with safety-related requests and ADA accessibility-related requests receiving first priority.

The campus security department is charged with protecting the College and persons in cooperation with local police departments. The department consists of five employees, plus four substitutes, under the direction of the director of emergency responsibility and security, currently under recruitment, who in turn reports to the vice president for administrative services. Campus security provides 6 a.m. to midnight service during the work week for the main campus, the Safety Training Center in Seaside, CA..., and the educational center in Marina, CA. A new position, funded from parking resources, will be dedicated to the Seaside and Marina locations. Public safety services are further supported through the College’s agreements with local police forces serving the communities around the College’s three locations. The department of education has not been audited by the College’s Cleary Act reporting since the mid-term report, so no findings were reviewed. Copies of Cleary Act reports dating back to 2007 are publicly available on the College’s website.

The campus security department trains for emergency preparedness and holds emergency operations center desktop drills regularly to test the campus emergency communications/preparedness plan. For example, a multiagency active shooter drill was recently completed. The campus security department activated its emergency operations center during a 2014 incident. After the incident, College representatives met with other responding agencies to debrief and adjust plans for future incidents. The College maintains a notification system for employees and students including messaging via phone, public address system, and social media outlets. Results of a faculty and staff survey showed very high marks for safety during the day with lower results at night. The College responded by upgrading parking lot lighting to brighter and more efficient LEDs, is in the process of upgrading additional exterior lighting, and recently added two new security officers, paid for with parking funds. Student surveys cited concerns with parking lot lighting. Results have improved, and the College plans to continue improve parking lot safety.

The College provided as evidence a comprehensive program review for campus security, which included a description of the department, its mission, relevant data such as annual call volume, identified challenges and plans for continuous improvement, a section for reflection on the department’s relationship to student learning, resource requests, and feedback comments on the program review from an employee from outside the department (Standard III.B.1).

For public safety matters, the College’s Health and Safety Committee provides recommendations to the vice president for administrative services relative to safety, security, emergency preparedness, and monitoring unsafe work conditions. Results of student satisfaction surveys show positive results relative to how well the campus is maintained and faculty and staff surveys show respondents agreed relative to the adequacy of space (III.B.1).

The College acquires builds, maintains, upgrades or replaces facilities and physical resources in support of educational planning. The Health and Safety Committee and the Facilities Committee are the primary constituent committees providing recommendations to College Council on long-range facilities plans for safe and sufficient physical resources at all college locations. In turn, the College Council provides recommendations to the superintendent/president. The College uses a unit level program review framework as part of its integrated planning process to identify and prioritize new physical resource investments and needed renovations and upgrades to existing facilities.

For long range facilities planning, the Facilities Committee makes recommendations on facility change requests, minor capital projects, and the development of the College's Facilities Master Plan. The committee also recommends adjustments to the allocation of budgets for the College's local bond funds. The Facilities and Budget Committees have reviewed a recent proposal to allocate bond funds for high priority safety projects, including network security equipment, new door locks, and reflective window coverings. The Committee's recommendation and the approved board allocation provide capital project budget through local bond funds (Measure I), while maintaining a healthy unallocated budget for contingencies and potential future projects. However, the Facilities Committee currently does not review annual action plans and program review in order to prioritize physical resource and equipment needs outside of the bond program.

Physical resources have benefitted from a \$145 million general obligation bond passed in 2002. Evidence provided shows that nearly \$20 million in facility renovations are planned for the near future with \$65 million in capital upgrade projects currently in process and \$65 million in completed projects. Some of the College's oldest buildings are benefitting from upgrade projects. The Board of Trustees approves major changes to the bond project spending plan, including budget overages and changes to project scope enacted to control budgets. These changes are approved by the Board after receiving recommendations from the Facilities Committee, Budget Committee, and the College Council.

As the College continues to implement its 2005 Facilities Master Plan, projects identified in the plan have been adjusted over time through a collaborative process determined by the Facilities Committee to determine appropriate prioritization of projects. In consultation with the vice president for administrative services, the Facilities Committee has participated in the creation of a new Facilities Master Plan, based on the Educational Master Plan and other planning documents. The updated Facilities Master Plan is currently a draft which will be reviewed by appropriate committees for feedback. This plan will be the basis of a potential bond measure in 2018 and should be finalized in spring 2017. (Standard III.B.2)

To ensure the feasibility and effectiveness of physical resources to support institutional programs and services, the College's facilities are visually inspected annually by Keenan and Associates to identify maintenance needs and safety concerns as evidenced by the Statewide Association of Community Colleges (SWACC) reports from 2013-2014 and 2015-2016. The 2016 SWACC Property and Liability Inspection noted that the following program areas were graded as "Effective": Security, Emergency Preparedness, Fire Prevention, Chemical Safety, Forklift/Utility Cart, AHERA (Asbestos awareness), Pest Management, Self-Inspections, and

Injury and Illness Prevention Plan. Playground Safety was noted as “In Progress” with recommendations to reduce trip hazards and splintered surfaces. Results of the annual inspections are addressed quickly. In addition, facilities department employees and security staff are trained to identify needs and to report those needs so they can be addressed. In addition to annual inspections, all employees can participate in the program review process which allows for the identification of needs based on data from individual units. The College uses an annual program review updates/action plan process where staff can note physical resource and facilities needs that can be addressed in short and long-term planning. In addition, the College examines scheduling data through the Facility Utilization, Space Inventory Options Net (FUSION) tool to monitor space utilization and support effective facilities planning. These data are used to evaluate and monitor the use of classroom space and determine areas where space could be used more effectively. Data from Facilities Condition Assessment reports and five-year maintenance plans inform college-wide physical resources planning. (Standard III.B.3)

The College's planning processes and long-range capital plans reflect the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment. Major capital projects are being funded with bond funds. These projects are focused on rehabilitating or replacing existing facilities, and not expanding facilities. Efficiencies and operating savings are expected from upgrading HVAC systems, etc. The Facilities Master Plan provides definitions and processes for determining total cost of ownership and sets standards. In addition, the College has drafted a Board Policy 3260 Sustainability to guide its efforts towards reducing total cost of ownership in areas such as water use and utilities use, and exchanging natural grass for artificial turf on the baseball fields. (Standard III.B.4)

Conclusion

The College meets the Standard.

Standard III.C: Technology Resources

General Observations

The College has worked diligently to enhance and update key technology resources across campus with the 2013-2016 Technology Plan as its guide. The plan is a very detailed and honest review of the college's technology vulnerabilities verified by external experts. The College conducted numerous surveys of its staff and students to determine the prioritization of needed upgrades and they successfully implemented several key fixes. MPC acknowledges there is much more to do and they are working to develop a long range budget plan to address these needs.

Technology needs for instructional programs and support services of the College are identified through Program Reviews and in the annual Action Plans for each department. Read in tandem, the College's Technology Plan and Education Master Plan describe the technology goals and objectives of the College. These plans exemplify the collaborative nature of the shared governance process utilized by the IT Department, the Technology Committee and the Instructional Committee on Distance Education (ICDE).

It should be noted that the College has made great strides in improving its distance education faculty training program. Proactive assistance on the MPC Online site offers faculty technical and pedagogical training in online learning in a multitude of formats.

During the writing of its Institutional Self-Evaluation Report, the College described the major limitations of its Student Information System (SIS). The College plans to implement an Enterprise Resource Planning System (ERP) to replace SIS. This will allow better planning of classes to meet student needs. The implementation of the ERP is one of the three action projects described in the Quality Focus Essay.

Findings and Evidence

Technology resources are used to provide adequate support for the institution's academic programs and support services. MPC's Technology Services and Support experienced a restructuring of administrative personnel in 2012. At that time, due to the growth of the distance education program, the College decided to hire an associate dean of instructional technology who would be responsible for instructional technology and distance education. In addition, a director of information systems was hired to be responsible for institutional computing. Technical services and professional support encompass technical and desktop support, systems and programming, and network and communication infrastructure. These areas report to the Director of Information Systems according the IT organizational chart. Instructional Technology supports faculty and students on the use of technologies related to online instruction. In addition, one-on-one consulting, curriculum design assistance and workshops are offered in the MPC Instructional Technology Center. (Standard II.C.1)

The information technology department is responsible for technology resources at facilities both on and off campus. At the Education Center at Marina, there is one computer lab and one laptop lab for use by faculty and students. The Public Safety Training Center has eight classrooms, seven of which are outfitted with presentation technology. Instructional Support Technicians provide direct support to for these classrooms and labs, including the Education Center at Marina. (Standards III.C.1, III.C.3)

In the 2014 Faculty and Staff Accreditation Survey, MPC's IT personnel scored high satisfaction ratings for being helpful and knowledgeable. Classroom equipment, software and network connections used to support student learning were deemed adequate and 78 percent of respondents indicated that the technology at MPC enhances teaching and achievement of student learning. (Standard III.C.1)

The Information Technology department supports the acquisition, installation and maintenance of hardware and software at all MPC facilities. Replacing out-of-date hardware and software is identified through the Program Review Annual Action plans, the Technology Refresh Plan and the IT Inventory Report. In a 2014 Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey, students rated "the adequacy and accessibility of computer labs on campus" a 5.54 out of 7. This rating is lower than it was in 2009 (5.75 out of 7) and lower than the national average (5.73 out of 7). The College has responded to upgrading some hardware by using one-time funds including Physical Plant and Instructional Support funds and MPC Foundation funds; however, this is not sustainable in the long-term. The College's 2016 Draft Technology Refresh Plan addresses the issue of replacing outdated computers on campus. According to the plan, the total technology refresh would require a one-time expenditure of approximately \$1.8M to make the oldest campus technology efficient again and then require approximately \$450,000 per year for an average five-year refresh cycle, which is the industry standard. The College is currently assessing computing needs on campus to determine if there are public computers in support centers that are not being utilized. This will allow the college to consolidate inventory with the goal of decreasing the number of public workstations. At this time, the College is planning to fund the refresh costs through a combination of bond, general and categorical funds. (Standard III.C.2)

The College acknowledges that it needs a long-term funding plan in order to support technical infrastructure and to give adequate support to its programs and services. At the current time, technology prioritization and purchasing processes have been initiated. Funding the ERP is another challenge for the College. A multi-year approach is being considered using bond funds, debt and the general fund as resources. (Standards III.C.1, III.C.2, III.C.3, III.C.4)

A Student Technology Needs Survey conducted in April 2014, identified two major issues affecting student success: wireless connectivity on campus and the need for a more robust college website. The College responded by upgrading the MPC Website in August 2014 and partially improving the network infrastructure using one-time funds. The College acknowledges that wireless access points need to be added to some of the older buildings on campus. (Standard III.C.2)

Using the 2013-2016 Technology Plan as a guide, the College has evaluated the effectiveness of technology in meeting its range of needs. This has been done through student and employee surveys and audits and assessments from outside expert services. Several positive changes have taken place as noted above. In addition, MPC implemented a common authentication system in Spring 2016 to be able to login with a single username and password to access WebReg, email and MPC Online. The College is also taking advantage of free vulnerability scanning and server monitoring services offered by the California

Community Colleges Information Security Center. Still to be implemented from the Plan are two items of immediate concern: updating firewall security and developing a disaster preparedness/recovery plan. The 2016-2019 Technology Plan is in draft form and being reviewed by the Technology Committee. (Standards III.C.1, III.C.2, III.C.3, III.C.4)

The College provides appropriate instruction and support for faculty, staff and administrators through MPC Online. Formal online training is available to faculty through the MPC Online Teaching Certification Program and the Online Course Design Certificate. Other types of training include on-campus workshops, online tutorials and one-on-one instruction. With the migration to Canvas, the College's new Learning Management System, the Instructional Technology Center is beginning the process to re-engineer all the help tools created under the old platform (Moodle) to Canvas. Other support for faculty and staff include the development of self-serve user guides on how to use general campus systems such as CurricUNET, and the Student Information System (SIS) among others. The 2014 Faculty and Staff Accreditation Survey show that 54 percent agreed that MPC Online faculty training and professional development are sufficient to support their work. Sixty-four percent agreed that MPC provides quality training in the use of its technology to employees and students.

Instruction and support for students is available face to face at the various labs on campus as well as the library. E-mail assistance is available from student support departments such as Financial Aid and Counseling. For students taking classes online, there is the MPC Online Student Orientation and Support page. (Standard III.C.4)

The College successfully moved to the fully hosted Google Apps for Education in spring 2016. Students and staff are on the platform using the mpc.edu domain and benefit from secure access to Google's cloud based products and resources. (Standard III.C.2)

The College publishes guidelines for the acceptable use of technology in teaching and learning processes in the Technology Plan, Faculty Handbook and in its support resources for online teaching and learning. The Faculty Handbook contains a section on the appropriate use of college resources and copyright policy. The document *Effective Strategies for Online Teaching and Learning* discusses the importance of complying with copyright regulations when sharing instructional materials with students.

The majority of the Board Policies on the appropriate use of technology are outdated. Board Policy 2155 (College Resources), 2163 (Electronic Mail Policy), 2164 (Electronic Mail Code of Practice) and 2225 (Use of Copyright Materials) were last updated over 15 years ago. (Standard III.C.5).

Conclusion

The College meets the Standard except for Standards III.C.1, III.C.2, III.C.3, III.C.5.

Recommendations to Meet the Standard

Recommendation 16: In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the college immediately address network vulnerabilities starting with implementing a firewall solution in order for the College to ensure its technology infrastructure are appropriate and adequate to support the institution's management and operational functions. (Standards III.C.1, III.C.3)

Recommendation 17: In order to meet the standards (compliance), the team recommends that the college complete and roll out the Information Technology Disaster Preparedness / Recovery Plan in order to recover data and system functionality for the college to operate in the event of a disaster. (Standards III.C.1, III.C.2)

Recommendation 18: In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the College completes the revisions and implementation of all board policies. The Board should fully implement the newly adopted board policies review cycle. The College should ensure that all existing, new, and revised Governing Board policies and administrative regulations are easily accessible through the College's website and other methods it deems appropriate for the college community and the public. (Standards III.C.5, IV.C.6, IV.C.7)

Standard III.D: Financial Resources

General Observations

Financial resources are sufficient to support and sustain student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. The distribution of resources supports the development, maintenance, allocation and reallocation, and enhancement of programs and services. The institution plans and manages its financial affairs with integrity and in a manner that ensures financial stability. (ER 18)

The College has slowed its expenditure growth and to date has maintained sufficient reserves to provide a funding cushion. Cash resources outside of the general fund have been called upon to maintain fiscal stability.

The College has identified and communicated with its constituencies relative to the presence of a long-term structural budget deficit and has engaged in strategic planning to address this issue. At the request of the College, the Collaborative Brain Trust (CBT) recommended actions to help ensure that resources remain sufficient to ensure continued fiscal solvency over the long-term. The College intends to implement the CBT recommendations or alternative strategies to close the structural budget deficit and improve the resource allocation process.

The College publishes an annual budget calendar and follows processes and timelines for resource allocation and budget development. A Tentative and a Final Budget are approved by the Board of Trustees each year and adjustments to the Final Budget are approved by the Board of Trustees. The Board reviews budget-to-actual reports. Bond funded capital outlay projects are reviewed with the Facilities Planning Committee and the Budget Planning Committee prior to budget approval by the Board of Trustees. The Budget Committee reports items to the College Council. College Council agendas, minutes and related planning documents are publicly posted to the College's website. In addition to established committee recommendations, the College conducts budget open forums to inform and solicit feedback from College constituencies.

The College is following an annual budget planning process developed with input from the Budget Committee and College Council and is updated periodically. The College developed a long-term financial plan and has made minor updates to the plan. Budgets and financial reports are publicly available for review.

The College's audit reports do not include significant findings relative to internal controls and financial reporting. The College has reviewed the effectiveness of past fiscal planning with assistance from the Collaborative Brain Trust.

Financial reports and discussions occur with committees during the year. The College has received only Unmodified "clean" audit opinions and only one audit finding in recent years, and that finding has been corrected. In addition to established committee recommendations, the College conducts budget open forums to inform and solicit feedback from College constituencies.

Board policy requires the College to maintain a general fund budgeted reserve of 10 percent although the final budget report notes the fund balance is slightly below 10 percent. In previous years, the College has participated in Tax and Revenue Anticipation Notes (TRAN) to provide for adequate cash flow.

Financial transactions are managed by the office of fiscal services under the oversight of the vice president for administrative services, and all financial transactions are included within the scope of the annual financial audit.

The annual budget includes resource allocations to cover short-term obligations. Administration notes that a structural budget deficit has been accumulating since 2008 and has grown to \$2 million. The annual financial audits disclosed no material weaknesses relative to financial obligations. The College prepared a long-term financial plan and recently collaborated with the Collaborative Brain Trust to create strategies to address identified issues. Implementation of a portion of the recommendations will require changes to the faculty collective bargaining agreement. The last collective bargaining agreement expired in 2011, and negotiations have been ongoing for several years without a resolution.

The College recently transferred OPEB funds to an irrevocable trust which has provided about 36 percent of the funds necessary to cover this liability. The College has begun to make good progress relative to this obligation. The College has completed an actuarial study which provides an estimate for this obligation. The administration has committed to funding the actual required contribution (ARC) each year to continue funding its OPEB obligation. Through collective bargaining agreement the College continues to make these benefits available to new employees, so the College's OPEB liability will continue to grow annually. Implementing a plan to continue to provide annual set-asides toward funding the OPEB liability will help the College to increase its funded percentage for this liability.

The College pays \$22,100 in annual debt service on a \$62,700 balance in lease revenue bonds for the Student Union through the collection of a student fee. The Final budget includes an allocation to service this debt obligation. The annual financial audit discloses \$141.7 million in general obligation bonds where debt repayment resources will come from local property tax assessments. The audit itemizes total long term obligations of \$173 million.

Annual audits are completed each year, and no material findings were noted relative to debt instruments. The Citizen's Bond Oversight Committee provides another layer of review for general obligation bond expenditures.

The Department of Education requires schools with a default rate equal to or greater than 30 percent to submit a Default Prevention Plan. The College's default rates were below that threshold during the most recent three years reported to the Department of Education.

The 2014-15 annual financial audit identified a finding relative to the timeliness of providing financial aid refunds. The finding only related to a relatively short delay in providing refunds and did not find any problems relative to funds involved. The College concurred with the

finding and took corrective action to enhance procedures in their efforts to provide assurance that financial aid refunds will be provided to students in a timely manner. The College also recently upgraded its financial aid management system to better manage the \$10 to \$12 million dollars per year in financial aid awarded per academic year. The new system is expected to facilitate better management and technical compliance over financial aid funds.

Contractual agreements are standardized through legal counsel approved templates and contain appropriate provisions to assure the integrity and quality of the College's programs, services, and operations. Board policy delegates authority and responsibility for the administration of contracts to the Superintendent/President and provides appropriate direction relative to contracts. The Vice President for Administrative Services reviews each completed contract before recommending approval to the Superintendent/President who in turn recommends contracts to the Board for approval or ratification. Contract templates include an Independent Contractor Agreement and an Instructional Agreement. Board Policy references requirements relative to public bidding rules. The Superintendent/President coordinates grant applications with the Foundation Director.

Findings and Evidence

The multiyear budget projection provides evidence of reduced expenditure budgets from \$41.7 million in 2015-16 to \$40.7 million in 2016-17. The multiyear forecast projects revenues at \$38.5 million in 2016-17, so that expenditures reductions were less than revenue losses.

The College's multi-year budget projection, assuming no actions are taken to balance revenue and expenditures, is unbalanced due to the structural budget deficit identified by College Administration. Administration estimates a \$2 million annual structural budget deficit has been accumulating over several years dating back to perhaps 2008. The College has used one-time funds and tactical moves to balance the budget each year. However, Administration recognizes that permanent, ongoing expenditures (faculty and staff payroll, utility costs, insurance costs, routine repair and maintenance, etc.) must be tied to permanent, ongoing revenues (current service level State Apportionment funding) to assure the College's long term fiscal stability. Their current use of temporary position vacancy savings and other favorable, but one-time budget items, are not fiscally sustainable because these savings can evaporate from one year to the next. Administration further acknowledges that this structural budget deficit will continue to grow if it is not addressed and could eventually grow to exceed the capacity of the Administration to balance budgets with these unsustainable, one-time tactical maneuvers from year-to-year.

The College engaged the Collaborative Brain Trust consultants to provide advice and recommendations relative to eliminating the structural budget imbalance. The multiyear budget plan is being updated to integrate the new recommendations and budget planning tools are being updated as well.

The multiyear forecast begins each year with the prior year's current service level and then makes incremental adjustments for step and column pay increases, health and welfare benefits cost increases, pension cost increases, and miscellaneous increases. The optimistic

case forecast shows a scenario where the College can balance the budget while funding salary increases. The Administration has also published a less optimistic or worst case scenario as well which shows less favorable results.

By 2018-19 enrollments and Apportionment revenue are expected to grow. Challenges to the enrollment growth forecast include the recent history of flat or declining enrollments and recent changes to Federal financial aid rules. Administration noted that the structural budget deficit, which dates back to perhaps 2008 and has grown since then, could be in the \$2 million range.

Certain additional costs are not itemized in the multiyear budget plan. Administration noted that in addition to the \$2 million in budget savings noted on the forecast, another strategy to ensure fiscal stability is to use a portion of the funds from the current general obligation bond funds, future bond funds, and other funds for projects that will result in favorable savings in general fund operating expenditures.

This layered approach to balancing the budget over the long-term represents a conservative approach and recognizes that balancing the budget over the long-term requires multiple initiatives.

The College has not yet realized the increased revenue and expenditure reductions necessary to eliminate the structural budget deficit over the long-term and balance the budget. At the request of the College, the Collaborative Brain Trust (CBT) recommended actions to help ensure that resources remain sufficient to ensure continued fiscal solvency over the long-term. The CBT also made recommendations to improve the resource allocation process.

Negotiations on the faculty collective bargaining agreement have continued for years without agreement. The last collective bargaining agreement expired in 2011. The College has begun to execute plans to close the budget gap. The College is reducing its reliance on unrestricted general fund by using other funds to cover certain costs.

The 2017-18 savings target is \$1.5 million. If permanent savings are not achieved, then \$1.5 million in one-time resources will be needed in 2017-18. For 2018-19 the permanent savings target is another \$500 thousand. If permanent savings cannot be achieved, then one-time funds would again be needed. Therefore, to cover both years with one-time funds will require \$3.5 million (\$1.5 million in 2017-18 and \$2 million in 2018-19). At present, there is not sufficient fund balance in unrestricted general funds to cash flow \$3.5 million and maintain the fund balance above the 5 percent Chancellor's Office recommended prudent minimum fund balance.

The version of the multiyear budget forecast with \$1.5 million budget savings in 2017-18 and an additional \$500 thousand budget savings in 2018-19 is not a worst case scenario. It assumes FTES enrollments will be on stability funding during 2017-18, and an \$800 thousand favorable cost savings is included due to reducing enrollments through instructional contracts. However, the 2018-19 forecast, assumes Apportionment funding for 7,000 FTES

which is more than a 500 FTES increase over the 2015-16 and 2016-17 FTES budgets. Given multiple years of enrollment declines, the 2018-19 FTES forecast may be optimistic. The 2018-19 Apportionment revenue assumes that one of its centers grows to 1,000 FTES center status which will increase the basic center funding. However, additional costs related to operating a 1,000 FTES center are not included in the expenditure section.

The multiyear forecast does not include additional budget to fund annual OPEB costs and to continue to make transfers to the OPEB irrevocable trust. The College maintains certain reserves outside of unrestricted general funds. However, the College has been drawing these funds down for several years. Drawing down certain balances, such as funds set-aside for OPEB obligations will reduce the District's ability to meet other Accreditation Standards, such as Standards III.D.11 and III.D.12. It is unclear if the College has solidified such plans for 2017-18 and 2018-19. Some of the budget balancing options identified require, changes to collective bargaining agreements. All grant applications are reviewed by the President prior to applying. (Standard III.D.1)

The College maintains adequate workers compensation, property, and liability coverage. The College's self-funded medical plan has raised certain cash flow challenges that have been managed internally. The College is prepared to seek short-term borrowing if necessary for cash flow needs. (Standard III.D.2)

The College participates in JPAs for workers compensation, property, and liability coverage, so those programs are not self-funded by the College. Medical insurance coverage is self-funded. Administration notes that timing differences exist between cash inflows and cash outflows for the medical insurance program. This has resulted in internally managed short-term cash flow borrowings by the insurance fund. To better manage its cash flows, the College plans to restructure operations to reduce reliance on interfund borrowings. To manage medical program fiscal risks, the College obtains stop-loss coverage to provide reimbursement for extraordinary claims. At present the College covers the full cost of medical benefits for eligible employees. (Standard III.D.2)

Constituent input is solicited at both the Budget Committee and College Council for the tentative and final budgets. Also, tentative and final budgets as well as all budget adjustments through the fiscal year are ratified by the Board of Trustees during open session. This provides an opportunity for constituent input. The College Council's publicly available webpage publishes resource planning documents, the Collaborative Brain Trust final report, and related documents and information. Bond project budgets are reviewed by the Facilities and Budget Committees and initial budgets and budget adjustments are approved by the Board of Trustees. (Standard III.D.3)

The Budget Committee reviews the final budget. Then, College Council reviews and recommends the Final Budget to the superintendent/president who in turn presents it to the Board of Trustees for approval. Copies of annual budgets, annual financial reports, general obligation bond audit reports, and the actuarial study are available to the public on the fiscal services webpage. Administration reviews and assures that budget assumptions are appropriate. Then, the budget assumptions are reviewed by the Budget Committee and College Council. Chancellor's Office reports are available as well. (Standard III.D.4)

Three years of audited financial statements were reviewed and no material findings relative to internal controls or financial reporting were noted. Tentative and final budgets are prepared each year. Budget adjustments occurring after the final budget approval date are ratified by the Board of Trustees monthly, for example, the May 25, 2016 notes several budget adjustments approved by the Board of Trustees. (Standard III.D.5)

College Council receives feedback from the Budget Committee relative to the annual resource allocation process. College Council maintains a detailed budget preparation calendar and updates the calendar as needed. The College is currently implementing a major conversion to a new enterprise resource planning (ERP) system, including budget and financial recordkeeping. (Standard III.D.5)

Tentative and final budgets are prepared each year and discussed at the Budget Committee and College Council prior to the Superintendent/President presenting these action items to the Board of Trustees for approval. Budget adjustments occurring after the final budget approval date are ratified by the Board of Trustees monthly, for example, the May 25, 2016 notes several budget adjustments approved by the Board of Trustees. (Standard III.D.6)

Annual financial audits are placed on the Board of Trustees agenda for approval and acceptance in open session. The College Council reviews the Final Budget. For example the 2016-17 Final Budget was reviewed during the August 23, 2016 meeting and the prior year's budget was reviewed at the August 25, 2015 meeting. In both years, the College Council voted to recommend the Final Budget for approval to the superintendent/president. Other examples include the College Council's review of a finance report on May 10, 2016, and a fiscal report from the Collaborative Brain Trust on April 26, 2016. (Standard III.D.6)

Based upon review of the 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15 annual financial reports, only the most recent audit cited an audit finding. The finding related to the timeliness of providing financial aid refunds, but the auditors did not question the financial integrity of those transactions. The College responded that it has updated office procedures and is implementing a new software system to manage financial aid and allow for timely refunds. (Standard III.D.7)

Annual financial audits are placed on the Board of Trustees agenda for approval and acceptance in open session. The College Council reviews the final budget. For example the 2016-17 final budget was reviewed during the August 23, 2016 meeting and the prior year's budget was reviewed at the August 25, 2015 meeting. In both years, the College Council voted to recommend the Final Budget for approval to the superintendent/president. Other examples include the College Council's review of a finance report on May 10, 2016, and a fiscal report from the Collaborative Brain Trust on April 26, 2016. (Standard III.D.7)

For fiscal years 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15, the auditors issued an "Unmodified" report and found no material weaknesses or significant deficiencies relative to financial reporting internal controls. The 2014-15 general obligation bonds audit and performance audit produced no material findings. To assist with updating its Board Policies and Administrative Procedures, the College subscribes to a legal service that provides templates. Also, the

College has worked directly with the legal service to customize updates to policies and procedures. Discussion with administration supported the auditor's findings of appropriate internal controls. (Standard III.D.8)

According to the 2015-16 final budget the College is maintaining a fiscal reserve of \$3.8 million in the unrestricted general fund. The final budget includes this comment, "Unrestricted General Fund expenses are shown to equal revenues, resulting in an ending fund balance of \$3,802,947, a little below the Board established fund balance reserve of 10 percent although higher than the Chancellor's Office minimum prudent reserve of 5 percent." The College does not need to participate in a TRAN to meet its current year cash flow requirements. The 2014-15 Annual 311 report showed over \$9.4 million in general fund cash balances, up from \$3.9 million in the prior year. (Standard III.D.9)

Outside of the unrestricted general fund, the actuary recommended maintaining \$1.2 million in cash in the self-insurance fund for 95 percent confidence of meeting cash flow needs. The College is holding about \$2 million in cash in this fund. To assure that cash flow needs through 2017-18 and 2018-19 do not reduce available balances below the Chancellor's Office 5 percent minimum requirement, the College will need to implement its budget reduction plans. (Standard III.D.9)

The office of fiscal services maintains financial oversight under the direction of the vice president for administrative services. All financial transactions, including Foundation transactions, are within the scope of the annual financial audit. Financial audits have been completed annually. The most recent audit cited one finding related to the timeliness of providing financial aid refunds, but the auditors did not question the financial integrity of those transactions. The College is implementing a new software system to manage financial aid and allow for timely refunds. The College is also engaged in planning for implementation of an ERP system to replace their aging computer systems. The new system will further enhance financial tracking and reporting. For compliance with Federal requirements, the College maintains the majority of these funds in restricted or fiduciary funds, as appropriate, and these records are within the annual audit scope. (Standard III.D.10)

Unpaid student accounts resulting in bad debts were \$295 thousand in 2012-13, \$82 thousand in 2013-14, and \$186 thousand in 2014-15. These amounts are then eventually partially collected by the College. The College's procedures for writing off bad debts have been reviewed as part of the annual financial audits. The College blocks a student's ability to register for classes, if their account has a past due balance. Also, the Catalog notes that tuition and fees must be paid at the time of registering for classes. The fiscal services department sends out collection letters to students with unpaid accounts. The College's bad debt write-offs shows a neutral trend. In addition to fiscal services collection efforts, the College participates in the Chancellor's Office Tax Offset Program (COTOP) which allows the State to divert a student's State income tax refund to pay down their outstanding debt to the College. Also, the College refers unpaid parking fines to an outside collection agency. Previously, the College has used a collection agency for student debts, and that option remains available. (Standard III.D.10)

The College prepared a long term financial plan and makes minor adjustments to their plans annually. The Collaborative Brain Trust consultants helped identify long-term issues and helped the College with plans to address those issues. For example, one of the items the College is in the process of implementing relates to multi-year budget planning, “The College will implement new tools for multi-year budget planning and monitoring...to improve its budget development and resource allocation processes to reflect enrollment projections, state apportionment, and increasing mandated costs.” However, should the College need to draw on one-time resources to close the \$1.5 million budget gap in 2017-18 and an additional \$500 thousand in 2018-19 for a \$3.5 million total one-time burn rate (\$1.5 million in 2017-18 plus \$2 million in 2018-19), the College will be challenged to maintain the unrestricted general fund balance above the Chancellor’s Office 5 percent minimum fund balance. Since administration has been negotiating with its faculty bargaining unit for over three years without resolution, it is unclear if the contract can be implemented in time to realize the savings target. (Standard II.D.11)

The College has prepared a recent actuarial study of its OPEB liability and is placing funds into an irrevocable trust to partially fund the liability. Only one long term debt instrument draws debt service from College funds. This is a \$62,700 lease revenue bond related to the Student Center that will be fully paid off by 2018-19. Other long term obligations are covered through resource allocations in the annual budget. ERP conversion costs are planned to be funded from bond funds, borrowings, and general fund. However, the multiyear plan does not include costs for debt service and one-time conversion costs. The multiyear plan does include a \$500,000 budget for ongoing ERP costs. (Standard III.D.12)

The lease revenue bond is paid from a student fee and not general funds and is nearly fully paid down. The College plans to fund its ERP conversion through a combination of bond funds, debt, and general funds. The annual debt service on any borrowings needs to be added to the multiyear forecast once the loan package is sized. (Standard III.D.13)

Grant requests are managed through the Foundation. The foundation director meets with the superintendent/president prior to submitting a grant application. Grant applications are reviewed by the area administrator, the research office, a vice president and the superintendent/president prior to submittal. Board policy requires the Board to approve all matching funds and other College commitments relative to grants.

Three recent annual audits disclosed no audit findings relative to management of debt, auxiliaries, grants, and Foundation activities.

Financial audits are performed each year which includes a review of debt instruments. The auditors produce a supplemental document relative to general obligation bonds each year. There were no general obligation bond audit findings for the four years of reports included in evidence. The Citizen’s Bond Oversight Committee provides an additional review function for general obligation bonds. (Standard III.D.14)

The Department of Education’s website published the following default rate information for the College: **(III.D.15)**

Monterey Peninsula College			
Fiscal Year (FY)	FY 2013	FY 2012	FY 2011
Default Rate	20.6%	21.4%	23.3%

Evidence provided by the College included copies of Independent Contractor Agreement and Instructional Agreement templates along with relevant Board policies, including public bidding rules. The College notes that contract templates include quality standards and termination provisions, and the College notes that it has terminated contracts for quality control from time to time. The templates include indemnity clauses to help legally protect the College’s assets.

The Foundation assists the College with grant activities. The Foundation submits grant applications on behalf of the College and in the name of the Foundation. The foundation director meets with the Superintendent/President to review each application before it is submitted.

The vice president for administrative services reviews completed contracts and is responsible for recommending contracts to the Superintendent/President who in turn presents contracts to the Board for approval or ratification. Contracts are reviewed for consistency with the mission and goals and for compliance with Board policies and state and federal guidelines. By using standard contract templates, compliance is streamlined. (Standard III.D.16)

Conclusion

The College meets the Standard and related Eligibility Requirements except for Standards III.D.1, III.D.2, III.D.11, III.D.12, and ER 8.

Recommendations to Meet the Standard

See **Recommendation 4**.

Recommendation 19: In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the College discontinue deficit spending by adopting budgets that match ongoing revenue and expenditures in the unrestricted general fund without the need to make significant draws against unrestricted fund balance, one-time resources or transfers from other funds. (Standards III.D.1, III.D.11, ER 18)

Recommendation 20: To meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College develop a funding plan and set-aside funds each year in the multiyear budget to fund the OPEB actual required contribution (ARC) each year. (Standard III.D.12)

STANDARD IV LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE

Standard IV.A: Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations

Board Policies 1030, 2010, 3010, and 5320 have clearly defined the roles and responsibilities of individuals in making recommendations about their areas of expertise and concerns. Board Policy 2010 names the Academic Senate as representative of faculty in making recommendations regarding academic and professional matters such as curriculum, degree and certificate requirements, grading policies, etc. While MPC's current processes allow for adequate input from faculty, staff, administrators, and students based on their areas of expertise, the college recognizes that it neither has an effective mechanism to document the decision-making process nor has a mechanism to communicate decisions across the campus community. Furthermore, MPC does not have a process to regularly evaluate its board policies and procedures, which has been put on hold due to turnovers.

Finally, MPC was in the middle of revising its 2009 Shared Governance document, however prior to the completion of this task, MPC employed CBT to conduct a review of college's operations, decision-making and governance structures. Based on recommendations from CBT, the college is developing a new handbook that anticipates resulting in improving the effectiveness of governance structures and decision-making processes.

Monterey Peninsula College has policies in place that define and explain the roles and responsibilities of administrators, faculty, staff, and students as relates to college decision-making (Board Policies 3010, 1007, 1050, 1415, 1045). College's senior administration, through the structure authorized by Board Policy 2010 Shared Governance has created an environment in which members of academic affairs, student services, administrative services, and students are encouraged to take initiatives for improving practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. Monterey Peninsula College attempted to revise its 2009 Shared Governance Handbook to document and communicate participatory governance practices. However, the College decided to contracted an external firm, Collaborative Brain Trust (CBT) for a review of the College's governance structures during its Institutional Self Evaluation Report. From that external review, CBT recommended the College to restructure its participatory governance process. The College expects that it will complete handbooks to document decision-making processes, governance structures, and integrated planning processes. While discussion outcomes are posted on committee minutes and communicated through all-users email, the College recognizes that it does not have an effective process of making decisions and communicating resulting decisions across the institution. The College anticipates that by implementing CBT's recommendations, it will meet this standard.

Monterey Peninsula College counts on its participatory governance process to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation of ideas and policies that have significant implications across the campus. The College Council is the main decision making body at the College. It leads the planning and resource allocation process at the College, and relies

on recommendations from Academic Senate, Curriculum Advisory Committee, Academic Affairs Advisory Group, Student Services Advisory Group, and Administrative Services Advisory Group. The College Council also relies on summaries from program reflections and other shared governance committees to make planning and budget decisions. Students' voice is represented by the Student Trustee who has an advisory vote on all decisions before the Governing Board.

College Council's bylaws provides evidence that the college ensures appropriate consideration of viewpoints by providing two readings of each action items, where the first reading provides for dialogue and the second reading allows for making decision regarding the action items.

In spring 2012, the President's Office conducted an evaluation of Board Policy review process and determined that the College needed a more efficient approach, and the superintendent/president recommended that MPC adopt policy to streamline the policy review process. However, the College was experiencing challenges from administrative turnover and the policy update process was put on hold.

In 2013, the college Superintendent/President asked College Council, a decision-making body, to facilitate discussions on balancing the College's budget. The College Council gathered feedback from various groups through campus survey and brainstorming sessions, and provided nine recommendations to the college superintendent/president. There is evidence of that the Superintendent/President accepted the recommendations. There is limited evidence of outcomes being communicated to the campus community. While MPC documents and communicates decisions and information through campus emails, College Council minutes, and departmental reports, it struggles to communicate decision-making and results across campus. However, MPC is working with CBT to improve the effectiveness of its governance structures and decision-making processes, including adoption of handbooks for decision-making procedures, evaluation of processes, and communication of results of the evaluations to the institution.

Evidence that the college governance structure relies on its employees' expertise and input for decision-making include information from a 2014 Faculty and Staff Survey, where 83.7 percent of respondents indicated that they know how to participate and provide input to the planning process; and 80.4 percent of respondents agreed with the statement "I know my area's program review and action plans are integrated into the College's planning and resource allocation process."

The college was in the middle of revising its 2009 Shared Governance document, however prior to the completion of this task, it employed CBT to conduct a review of college's operations, decision-making and governance structures. Based on recommendations from CBT, college is developing a new handbook that anticipates resulting in improving the effectiveness of governance structures and decision-making processes.

Findings and Evidence

MPC, through its Shared Governance and leadership, empowers its members to demonstrate innovation leading to institutional excellence. Authorized by Board Policy 2010, MPC leaders have created an environment in which members of Academic Affairs, Student Services, and Administrative Services, as well as students are encouraged to consider and implement changes in support of the mission and Institutional Goals. (Standard IV.A.1)

MPC encourages its administrators, faculty and staff in participating in decision-making process through its board policies, curriculum handbook, and governance committees, which include College Council and the Academic Senate. MPC inspires its students to also participate in decision-making process where students have direct and reasonable interest. (Standard IV.A.2)

Board Policy 2010 defines a clear and strong role for college administrators in the governance processes, where they exercise a substantial voice in policies, planning and resource allocation that relate to their areas of responsibility. The three vice presidents of academic affairs, student services, and administrative services also serve on one or more leadership groups depending on their expertise. Finally, through membership in such committees of College Council, Academic Senate, and Curriculum Advisory Committee; faculty have the opportunity to participate in the governance processes at MPC. (Standard IV.A.3)

Faculty and academic administrators, through Board Policy 3010, recommend curriculum, courses, and programs. Faculty and academic administrators also design and implement programs, assess student learning, evaluate effectiveness of students' learning. Furthermore, Board Policy 5320, outlines duties and responsibilities of teaching faculty in reference to syllabus, grading system, submission of necessary reports related to learning among others. (Standard IV.A.4)

MPC through its system of board and institutional governance ensures the appropriate consideration of relevant perspective; decision-making aligned with expertise and responsibility; and timely action on institutional plans, policies, curricula changes, and other items for key consideration. (Standard IV.A.5)

While the college documents and communicates decisions and information through campus emails, College Council minutes, and departmental reports, it struggles with communicating decision-making and results across campus. The process for decision-making and the resulting decisions are not documented or widely communicated across the institution. (Standard IV.A.6)

MPC's Leadership roles and the Institution's governance and decision-making policies, procedures, and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution does not widely communicate the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement. (Standard IV.A.7)

Conclusion

The College meets the Standard except for Standard IV.A.6, IV.A.7.

Recommendation to Meet the Standard

Recommendation 21: In order to meet the standard, the team recommends MPC clarify Board, administrators, classified and faculty roles in the decision-making process and routinely evaluate and monitor these roles. These roles are not distinctly differentiated at faculty level between Academic Senate and the faculty bargaining unit's role in participatory governance and labor relations. (Standard IV.A.6)

Recommendation 22: In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that MPC should develop a calendar to regularly evaluate its policies, procedures, and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness (Standard IV.A.7)

Standard IV.B: Chief Executive Officer

General Observations

By policy, the Monterey Peninsula College District Board delegates full responsibility and authority to the superintendent/president to ensure the institution offers quality programs and services to its students. The superintendent/president has ensured an administrative structure to allow for effective leadership, management and operations. The president engages in a series of structured meetings with senior leadership, direct reports, management and participatory governance groups in order to allow for broad participation in institutional planning and resource allocation. The president engages the community and communicates effectiveness to the community through the President's Address to the Community. It appears that the process of accreditation while emphasized during the ISER process is not communicated throughout the institution as a continuous improvement effort. Further, while planning occurs, the efforts do not appear to be consistent, systematic or integrated. The college might benefit from implementing the recommendations provided by the College Brain Trust regarding a committee to facilitate planning and institutional effectiveness.

The college has structures in place to allow for broad participation and information sharing. The superintendent/president leads the college through its established processes and is the final decision-maker at the college level for hiring, delegation of operation, budget and expenditures, and educational programs based on appropriate participatory or administrative input.

Findings and Evidence

The MPC superintendent/president ensures regular and participatory standing meetings with senior leadership, College Council, director of institutional research, accreditation liaison officer, SLO coordinator, and other key personnel as needed. The College Council serves as the participatory governance body for the college and serves to facilitate MPC planning and resource allocation processes. The superintendent/president participates on the council as an ex officio member and uses the council to both inform the college of administrative and college-wide efforts and to inform administration of efforts within the college from the different areas. The superintendent/president uses the College Council as a platform to have college-wide discussions on planning, goals, and progress on goals for the college. Each fall, the superintendent/president shares his planning assumptions for the upcoming year, which

guides and informs the budget development and resource allocation planning throughout the year. The assumptions reflect broad college-wide goals and information to direct planning activities for the upcoming year.

The superintendent/president monitors institutional effectiveness indicators including institutional-set standards, student achievement, SLOs, progress on institutional goals, and accreditation-related reports. The director of institutional research works closely with the superintendent/president to ensure the indicators are shared with College Council, senior leadership, the Board, and the college. (Standard IV.B.1)

The institution is organized into three primary areas: academic affairs, student services, and administrative services. The vice presidents, who report directly to the superintendent/president, have been delegated primary responsibility for the operations of each of their respective areas. Additional areas of human resources, institutional research, and foundation also report directly to the superintendent/president to allow the superintendent/president direct oversight and evaluation authority. The MPC organizational chart and administrative organization are clarified in board policy to communicate roles, responsibility and delegation of authority both internally and externally. The superintendent/president meets weekly with the vice presidents in the President/Vice President (PVP) meeting where conversations on institutional issues and new, developing, or on-going issues occur. The superintendent/president also meets regularly with all direct reports and monthly with all managers to ensure all college administration have an opportunity to discuss institutional issues.

The college implements an institutional action plan for each unit that holds primary responsibility for any strategic goal. An annual update inclusive of measurable progress, recommended actions, and necessary resources are shared with College Council as a part of the annual planning and budget development process.

Through the combined efforts of PVP, standing direct report and manager, and College Council meetings as well as the Institutional action plan annual update, the institution's organizational structure is evaluated by the PVP group to ensure adequate staffing and structure exists for the institution's size, purpose, and complexity. (Standard IV.B.2)

The superintendent/president guides the planning processes that incorporate multiple venues for input to guide institutional improvements. While the college is in development of integrated planning, all existing planning activities are tied directly to the institutional goals that operationalize the college mission. Two primary and inter-relational planning cycles exist: long-term six-year strategic planning and annual planning and resource allocation. The superintendent/president ensures the process is implemented and evaluated through the structure of the College Council.

The college has identified student learning as paramount to its mission. As such, the college lead by the superintendent/president is currently developing processes to ensure educational planning and resource allocations are linked through program planning or identified areas of improvement. Throughout the processes at the unit, program, or institutional level, the

superintendent/president ensures that the college identifies key performance indicators and that each planning effort and evaluation of effectiveness be tied to high quality research. The director of institutional research has developed a research agenda and calendar of reports. Information is shared with College Council, program/unit areas, Academic Senate and Board. In a recent effort to better organize, use, and communicate the multi-level information and to help illustrate efforts on student learning and achievement, the superintendent/president recommended the college move to TracDat as an integrated information, planning, and tracking platform. (Standard IV.B.3)

By board policy, the superintendent/president has the responsibility to ensure that the institution complies with all regulations and requirements. The college has a designated ALO who meets regularly with the superintendent/president to discuss accreditation-related topics. The superintendent/president has provided leadership and has empowered members of the college to play a role in the accreditation process. Specifically, the superintendent/president has included accreditation-related information in his campus address, during weekly PVP meetings and in written and oral board updates. He has also hosted campus events such as forums and a kick-off for the ISER writing teams, and he has attended ACCJC trainings and served on an ACCJC accreditation site visit. However, it does appear that the college approach to accreditation is compliance focused and episodic around the ISER rather than for the purposes of continuous improvement and high quality. Currently, the college uses the ALO as the sole conduit for accreditation within the institution. The ISER development occurred through a steering committee model solely for the purposes of writing the report. It appears that the ALO is then responsible for coordinating all other reports. Further, it appears that the process of accreditation is separate from the work around institutional effectiveness. As recommended by College Brain Trust, the college is exploring how to ensure integrated planning and institutional effectiveness become a consistent and systematic component of college operations through a new committee tentatively identified as the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness committee. (Standard IV.B.4)

The MPC board policy clearly identifies the superintendent/president as the position responsible to carryout adopted policies and duties including expectations for budget development and effective budgetary controls for expenditures and processes. The superintendent/president delegates day-to-day oversight and management to the vice president of administrative services. Although not integrated, the college's planning process and annual budget and resource allocation planning process are transparent and incorporates the superintendent/president additional budget planning assumptions when warranted such as cost-cuts, FTES projections, and position vacancies and considerations. The Board reviews fiscal information and financial reports including monthly budgets, transfers, bills, and warrants. (Standard IV.B.5)

The MPC superintendent/president acts as a visible ambassador to the communities served. He regularly provides written and oral reports to the Board and regularly works with the Board and MPC Foundation to raise awareness of the college. The Superintendent/President regularly attends community events and hosts the annual "President's Address to the Community" in which he highlights institutional success in the last year, awards the

President's Award to a community member, and outlines the upcoming year's challenges and directions. (Standard IV.B.6)

Conclusion

The college meets the Standard and related Eligibility Requirements.

Standard IV.C: Governing Board

General Observations

The Governing Board consists of five members and one student member. Through extensive involvement in activities at the local, regional, and state level, the Governing Board stays informed about concerns and issues relevant to governing Monterey Peninsula College. This involvement enhances Governing Board members' understanding of education policy and practice.

Through establishing policies aligned with the College's mission statement, the Governing Board has ultimate authority for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity. The Governing Board assures the quality, integrity and effectiveness of student learning programs and services by publishing its policies, protocols, and code of ethics; participating in professional development; assessing its own performance, staying informed and involved with accreditation, and selecting and evaluating the superintendent/president.

The superintendent/president reports directly to the Governing Board and has delegated authority to implement and administer board policies. The superintendent/president is held accountable for the operations of the College through regular performance evaluations.

Findings and Evidence

BP 1007: Board Duties and Responsibilities, established that the Governing Board has authority over and responsibility for policies to assure the academic quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution. Additionally, BP 2010; Shared Governance outlines the Board's commitment to participatory governance. Evidence of the Governing Board's authority and responsibility is found in meeting calendars, meeting agendas, supporting documents, reports, and meeting minutes. (Standard IV.C.1, ER 7)

BP 1000: Governing Board Code of Ethics and Conduct require Board members to "abide by and uphold the final majority decision of the Board" and to "understand and remember that individual Board members have no legal authority to represent the College outside of Board meetings." BP 1000 outlines a method of censuring board members for misconduct if needed, however the team found no evidence that an individual Governing Board member did not support a decision of the Governing Board. A review of Board meeting minutes reveals a united board that frequently votes unanimously on key issues. (Standard IV.C.2)

BP 1007: Board Duties and Responsibilities, authorized the Governing Board to select, appoint, and evaluate the superintendent/president of the College. The process for the evaluation of the superintendent/president is prescribed in the superintendent/presidents employment contract. The process calls for constituent group feedback that is reviewed and discussed by the Board. (Standard IV.C.3)

BP 1007: Board Duties and Responsibilities sets forth the responsibility of the Governing Board to advocate for and defend the institution, protecting it from undue influence or political pressure. The Board has demonstrated that it is an independent, policy-making body

that reflects the public interest in the institution's educational quality. The role of the Governing Board as an independent policy-making body is consistently demonstrate through review, development, and approval of new and revised district policies. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or political pressure. BP 1000: Code of ethics and Conduct calls on each Board member to "resist every pressure and temptation to use their position as a Board member to benefit either themselves or any individual or agency apart from the welfare of the college district." (Standard IV.C.4, ER7).

BP 2410: Board Policies and Administrative Procedures establish the process for review, development, and approval of BP's and AR's. A number of the BP's and AR's have not been developed and many are in need of review and revision. The governing board establishes policies consistent with the college mission statement to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them. (Standard IV.C.5)

Several policies specify the Governing Board's size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures. These policies are published on the College's web site under Chapter 2 – Board of Trustees. (Standard IV.C.6)

Governing Board policies and administrative procedures are developed, reviewed, and/or modified through the process outlined in BP/AP 2410: Board Policy and Administrative Procedures. The college is in the process of renumbering its board policies and a number of its BP's have not been reviewed or updated in a significant amount of time. Its administrative procedures are not readily available on its website. The College subscribed to the board policies and procedures service offered by the California Community College League (CCLC) to have access to sample policies with legally recommended language since 2005. The Policy and Communications Committee (PACC) was created and assigned the role of disseminating proposed updates and new policies to constituent groups for review and comment. The team found no inconsistency between Governing Board actions and its policies. (Standard IV.C.7)

The Board is made aware of and reviews the key indicators of student learning and achievement annually through presentations on the California Community Colleges' Scorecard as well as other presentations on establishes student success measures. The board is being kept appraised of ongoing progress through regular presentations from Institutional Research. (Standard IV.C.8)

BP 1008: Governing Board Orientation and Development establishes policy for ongoing professional development of Governing Board Members including orientation for new members.

BP 1005: Composition and authority of the Governing Board establishes a policy for insuring continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office. (Standard IV.C.9)

BP 1009: Board Self Evaluation clearly defines the Board's self-evaluation process for assessing the board's effectiveness. The process provides for an evaluation every year. The Boards self-evaluation results in the development of goals, objective and identification of professional development needs. The results of the Governing Boards self-evaluation are made public. The Board is involved in ongoing training through the Community College League of California. (Standard IV.C.10)

BP 1000 Code of Ethics provides a code of ethics for the Governing Board and includes a clearly defined process for handling violations of the code. BP 1300: Conflict of Interest, establishes a conflict of interest policy. The team found no evidence of any violations of the code of ethics or the conflict of interest policy. (Standard IV.C.11, ER 7)

B P 1050: Executive Officer of the Governing Board delegates full responsibility and authority to implement policies and is accountable for the operations of the College. The superintendent/president is held accountable by the Governing Board through regular performance evaluations and the establishment of goals related to the operation of the College to the superintendent/president as the chief executive officer of the institution. (Standard IV.C.12)

The Board has demonstrated engagement with accreditation through receiving regular reports about accreditation progress, participating in the institutional self-evaluation for Standard IV and participating in training workshops related to accreditation. As one of its goals adopted in January 2016, the Board works to support the college in preparing for accreditation by focusing on six areas of concern. The Governing Board reviews and approves the Institutional Self Evaluation Report, and substantive change proposals. The Board's self-evaluation included items related to its roles and functions in the accreditation process. (Standard IV.C.13)

Conclusion

The College meets the Standard and related Eligibility Requirements except for Standard IV.C.6, IV.C.7.

Recommendation to Meet the Standard

See **Recommendation 22.**

Monterey Peninsula College Quality Focus Essay Feedback

Monterey Peninsula College's Quality Focus Essay (QFE) is a concise document that provides adequate reasoning as to the approaches the College is taking to address its self-identified actionable improvement plans. Through the QFE, the College provides a framework of how the three Action Projects will strengthen connections to student success and have a positive effect on institutional effectiveness, particularly as it relates to ease of collecting, reporting, and accessing data. For example, implementation of the TracDat system the College intends to improve student learning and achievement by compiling the program review and SLO/SAO assessment data to improve the assessment of SLOs and SAOs to enhance student learning and provide resources through program review to identified areas. Student achievement of degrees and certificates will be enhanced through the use of an Enterprise Resource Planning system to communicate waitlist information to students and will also include a degree audit program to more effectively track student progress toward successful program completion. The College's implementation chart provides a timeline of when each measurable outcome would be accomplished as well as individuals and committees who are responsible for completing the projects. Additionally, the implementation charts for the three Action Projects also provide expected outcomes based on completion of each specific tasks/activities.

The College's selection of 1) Enrollment Management System (EMS) 2) TracDat implementation and 3) Enterprise Resource Planning as their APs provide insights into the challenges that the College is experiencing with getting relevant and accurate data for decision making. The APs relate to accreditation standards and emerged from the College's self-reflection of its processes. While these APs will help with providing the College's with relevant and accurate data to make decisions that will hopefully improve student success and access, the APs don't address all areas of accreditation compliance concerns based on review of College's ISER. For an example, while TracDat will certainly help with data collection of student learning outcomes, the College does not address in its AP2, how it plans to use TracDat to disaggregate student learning, which is an area where the College is not meeting standard. Another area of serious concern is the College's decision-making process, which was indicated as not meeting standard, yet the College did not address it in its QFE.

Certain projects and outcomes seem to have more realistic timelines (i.e. TracDat implementation) while others have either ambiguous or overly ambitious (i.e. implementation of ERP when the College has yet to identify a funding source and also vendor). While the three Action Projects will help certain operations and processes of the College such as ease of collecting and analyzing data, improving data collection and integrity, developing course schedule that meets student needs and demands, these products do not address how the College will have to modify its assessment processes, its decision-making processes, and the staffing capacity that it will need to realistically leverage the technology being implemented to increase student learning and achievement. Additionally, given that the College's highlights its structural budget deficit in its ISER, the QFE does not make mention of the anticipated resources that it will cost to implement these three products, other than in its Action Project 3 where it briefly mentioned the College still need to identify the funding source to implement an ERP.

For each of the APs, timelines and assigned responsible parties for the projects were identified. For the AP1 (EMS implementation), main responsible parties include office of academic affairs, MPC EMS workgroup, MPC IT, and vendor implementation team. Timeline for implementation of EMS spans from Spring 2016 to Fall 2018, with evaluation of implementation effectiveness during 2017-2018 academic year. The timeline seems ambitious; given the College only has summer 2016 to pilot the program and one term for training (Fall 2016) before beginning to evaluate the project. The College should also consider identifying actual individual (e.g. vice president of academic affairs) as responsible parties instead of assigning groups of individuals as responsible parties since it is not clear who would be the lead and who would ultimately be accountable for successful implementation of project.

For the AP2 (TracDat implementation), main responsible parties include TracDat team, Learning Assessment Committee, TracDat team, and office of institutional research. The College vice-presidents and institutional research office are responsible for launch of program review tools. Finally, College Council and TracDat team are responsible for evaluation of implementation. The timeline for implementation of TracDat spans from spring 2016 to fall 2017, which evaluation taking place during 2017-2018 academic year. While implementation of TracDat focuses on developing user guides and providing training, the timeline does not consider the use of collecting feedback during implementation and roll out that would impact actual timeline for completion of project. As stated earlier, the College should also consider identifying actual individual as responsible parties instead of assigning groups of individuals as responsible parties since it is not clear who would be the lead and who would ultimately be accountable for successful implementation of project.

For the AP3 (ERP implementation), main responsible parties include vice president of administrative services, director of financial aid, superintendent/president, vice president of academic affairs, academic deans. While this AP identifies individuals responsible for certain aspects of ERP implementation, the timeline is ambiguous and somewhat ambiguous, given again that the College has yet to identify the funding source and the vendor for the project.

The QFEs provide observable outcomes as a result of completing certain tasks and activities. The QFE can be strengthened by integrating actual key performance indicators to demonstrate the actual impact that implementation these action plans will have on student learning and achievement.