

1 - Reflective Overview

The first section of the System's Appraisal Feedback Report is the Reflective Overview. Here the team provides summary statements that reflect its broad understanding of the institution and the constituents served. This section shows the institution that the team understood the context and priorities of the institution as it completed the review.

In the Reflective Overview, the team considers such factors as:

1. Stage in systems maturity (processes and results).
2. Utilization or deployment of processes.
3. The existence of results, trends and comparative data.
4. The use of results data as feedback.
5. Systematic improvement processes of the activities each AQIP Category covers.

Instructions for Systems Appraisal Team

During this stage of the Systems Appraisal, provide the team's consensus reflective overview statement, which should be based on the independent reflective overviews written by each team member. The consensus overview statement should communicate the team's understanding of the institution, its mission and the constituents it serves. Please see additional directions in the [Systems Appraisal procedural document](#) provided by HLC.

Evidence

Overall: Delta College is the primary higher education option for Michigan's Bay, Midland, and Saginaw County area. Student enrollment for the 2018-2019 academic year was 10,260 students, 31.6% of whom were full-time. The majority of students are part-time. Over the past ten years, enrollment has dropped 32%. This has resulted in financial challenges. In addition, the College has faced reduced operational funding from the State and decreased property taxes.

To serve its student base, the College employs 192 full-time faculty, 309 adjunct faculty, 201 administrative/professional personnel, and 132 support staff. As a comprehensive community college, Delta offers certificates and associate degrees as well as transfer course work. The College serves multiple stakeholders through its primary campus and multiple locations.

Delta College has been an AQIP institution since 2005. Delta's quality improvement focus has been on development of infrastructure to support data-based decision-making and implementation of a Guided Pathways model. The data infrastructure is supported by the Data Cookbook to help distinguish between different terms that require a nuanced understanding and a common data language and the implementation of Data Ambassadors to help promote and facilitate the use of the Data Cookbook and associated reports. Delta College appears to recognize its shortcomings from the past five years dating back to the 2014 portfolio and reports that it has embraced solutions that inform decision making and change.

Other noted improvements reported by the College include attention to the general education process and assessment, advances of software packages to enhance curriculum management, the college web

President, the Vice Presidents, and Executive Council. The choice of institutional performance measures is informed by environmental scanning data and the strategic plan. Performance data for these measures are reviewed twice annually and are included as part of the College's Strategic Plan and Budget. Yet, these data are not available for reviewers.

Following the trend of previous categories, processes and results for Category 5 vary between systematic and reactive. Use of comparative data and benchmarks are not readily available for reviewers.

Category 6 The College reports that AQIP pathway has been successful and has allowed the College to focus on process improvements. The outcome of this has been a more data-centered institution, yet data the report did not include substantial data. Delta College chooses its quality improvement initiatives through the processes used to identify its mission, vision, values, strategic plan, and budget. The College reports that recent advances in Delta's quality journey include the adoption of process mapping to understand and optimize operations, and ongoing development and refinement of its data reporting infrastructure.

Following the trend of portfolio, processes and results for Category 6 vary and data are limited. Developed processes and results for Category 6 may be limited because previous category processes and results were limited.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2 - Strategic Challenges Analysis

Strategic Challenges are those most closely related to an institution's ability to succeed in reaching its mission, planning and quality improvement goals. Review teams formulate judgments related to strategic challenges and accreditation issues through careful analysis of the Institutional Overview and through their own feedback provided for each AQIP Pathway Category. These findings offer a framework for future improvement of processes and systems.

Instructions for Systems Appraisal Team

Strategic Challenges may be identified on the Independent Category worksheets as the review progresses. The team chair will work with the team to develop a consensus Strategic Challenges statement based on their independent reviews. Please see additional directions in the [Systems Appraisal procedural document](#) provided by HLC.

Evidence

Helping Students Learn is primarily owned by faculty and assessment of student learning is primary to moving forward curriculum and outcomes that benefit students. Yet, comprehensive results of student learning are not reported in the portfolio. The College reports counts of programs that have completed assessment, not student learning results for meeting program outcomes. This does not serve as evidence of student learning. The report lacks comprehensive assessment data, including a complete cycle of assessing the College's general education program. From the information submitted, it appears that faculty have infrequent opportunities to provide feedback on student learning results. The College has the opportunity to provide to the CRQ Visiting Team thorough documented assessment of student learning processes and results for ISLO, GELO, and program assessment.

There is little substance to the results and improvement sections of the portfolio, which makes it difficult to determine how well the institution assesses and functions as an AQIP institution. In this regard, the lack of results and related changes/improvements may be impacting the College's ability to best serve its students, workforce, and community. The College appears to be missing an opportunity to benchmark its programming, its culture, its student satisfaction, its student engagement, its costs, and its overall performance to peer institutions. The reviewers are aware that the institution has joined the Achieving the Dream network of over 200 community colleges, and perhaps the coaches, including the data coach, are assisting the College in benchmarking with similar institutions. Still, the reviewers note the absence of comprehensive results in the report submitted. Given this, it is difficult for peer reviewers to even assess the state of quality of CQI. At a minimum for the CQR Visiting Team, the institution needs to do a better job of documenting and reporting actions and improvements. The College may consider its selection of appropriate tools and measures to gauge effectiveness. The absence of appropriate measures limits the College's ability to evaluate its performance, compare itself to its past and its peers, and constrains its ability to gain insight and plan for improvement. This may be a necessary next step for the College given its composite of enrollment and reduction in workforce.

Delta College appears to be a stable community college and reports that it serves the needs of its community. The institution continually refers to aligning its strategic plan to its mission, vision, values, and, ultimately its budget. Community colleges define institutional work by one primary mission: meeting the needs of the community. The reviewers recognize that Delta College reports that it is an open-access institution, and that the College has experienced a reduction in enrollment and workforce, including more retirements than anticipated. This may mean that historical institutional knowledge of key-work processes are absent at the institution. In the absence of following processes, the College appears to focus on continuing work that is activity based. The primary measurement reported for these activities is employee participation in activities. This does not lead to measuring institutional performance. For example, the College reports participation results for key community partnerships in place of measuring the extent to which community needs are met. The College may consider using internal resources to investigate and measure community need, consider the capacity to which the College may meet this need with its current workforce, and set and budget for these priorities. The priorities that emerge will centered on the College's mission. This is not readily evident in the report submitted. The College's ability to demonstrate its alignment of its workforce and budget to move forward documented key performance processes, measures of performance, and results of institutional performance to meet its mission may be of interest to the CQR Visting Team.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5 - AQIP Category Feedback

The Systems Appraisal Feedback Report addresses each AQIP Category by identifying strengths and opportunities for improvement. Through detailed comments, which are tied to the institution's Systems Portfolio, the team offers in-depth analysis of the institution's processes, results and improvement efforts. These comments should be straightforward and consultative, and should align to the maturity tables. This allows the team to identify areas for improvement and recommend improvement strategies for the institution to consider.

I - Helping Students Learn

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

Instructions for Systems Appraisal Team

In this section, the team should provide a consensus narrative that focuses on the processes, results and improvements for Common Learning Outcomes, Program Learning Outcomes, Academic Program Design, Academic Program Quality and Academic Integrity.

Independent Category Feedback for each AQIP Category from each team member should be synthesized into an in-depth narrative that includes an analysis of the institution's processes, results and quality improvement efforts for each category. Wording from the Stages in Systems Maturity tables for both processes and results should be incorporated into the narrative to help the institution understand how the maturity of processes and results have been rated. The narrative should also include recommendations to assist the institution in improving its processes and/or results. It is from this work that the team will develop a consensus on the Strategic Challenges analysis, noting three to five strategic issues that are crucial for the future of the institution. Please see additional directions in the [Systems Appraisal procedural document](#) provided by HLC.

Evidence

CATEGORY 1: HELPING STUDENTS LEARN

Category 1 focuses on the design, deployment and effectiveness of teaching-learning processes (and the processes required to support them) that underlie the institution's credit and non-credit programs and courses.

1.1: COMMON LEARNING OUTCOMES

Common Learning Outcomes focuses on the knowledge, skills and abilities expected of graduates from all programs. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.B., 3.E. and 4.B. in this section.

1P1 Describe the processes for determining, communicating and ensuring the stated common learning outcomes, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Aligning common outcomes (institutional or general education goals) to the mission, educational offerings and degree levels of the institution (3.B.1, 3.E.2)

Systematic The College has four Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs) that identify broad skills for both academic and non-academic areas. In the academic area, these ISLOs serve as the basis for six General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs). Delta College has followed an inclusive process by including stakeholders, which was modeled after the Lumina Report, AACU, and HLC Statement on Assessment of Student Learning, to develop and approve its four ISLOs and then align them across multiple areas of the institution, including its six GELOs. The College has reports that it follows the process following at timeline that allows a 3-year assessment cycle.

It is not clear how the ISLOs or the GELOs are aligned to the mission of the institution.

- Determining common outcomes (3.B.2, 4.B.4)

Systematic Delta College reports an approach that broad stakeholder input and best practice research focusing on the work of the Lumina Report, American Association of Colleges and Universities Essential Learning Outcomes, and the HLC statement on Assessment of Student Learning. The portfolio states that the original 38 GELOs were cut down to six, but the process for doing so was not described.

In February 2014, the outcomes generated from this process were approved by a full-faculty vote before being reviewed by Curriculum Council and Executive Council. Curriculum mapping took place during academic year 2015-2016. GELO/ISLO assessment has occurred each successive Winter, from 2017-2019, with data review from the assessment happening the following Fall semester. Faculty make changes after data reviews to improve student learning in the GELOs. In academic year 2019-2020, assessment of the six GELOs will be completed.

- Articulating the purposes, content and level of achievement of the outcomes (3.B.2, 4.B.1)

Systematic Delta developed rubrics to measure the expected levels of achievement. This rubric is derived from a model by the Lumina Foundation Degree Qualifications Profile. The process includes how achievement levels are evaluated. This process also includes how the College validates the scores and maintains rigor and integrity of the scores and process.

- Incorporating into the curriculum opportunities for all students to achieve the outcomes (3.B.3, 3.B.5)

Aligned Delta College recognizes students' educational goals range from personal development, to studying for a career or occupation, to transferring to a four-year institution. However, the opportunities described in this section, including the variety of credentials and degrees offered and graduation requirements, only apply to the last two and do not address how opportunities for personal development are incorporated into the curriculum.

Delta reports that the ISLOs and GELOs are included in the curriculum and degrees through mapping process by degrees. Further, it is clear that the College has a process for ensuring that as courses are added/deleted from the curriculum or modified that opportunity to achieve these

outcomes remains for each student.

Every course offered by the College was mapped against GELOs in December of 2016 to identify where each GELO was introduced, practiced, or mastered in the College's curriculum offerings. This audit is used to identify assessment sites and to check that the graduation requirements assure exposure to each ISLO.

- Ensuring the outcomes remain relevant and aligned with student, workplace and societal needs (3.B.4)

Systematic For transfer students Delta College ensures curriculum relevancy through vetting its course through the Michigan Transfer Agreement (MTA). The College reviews programs on an on-going basis by removing outdated curriculum and offering new programs as identified in response to industry need. The College reports a scheduled process for its other degree programs and for workforce certificate programs. The College reports that it works with external stakeholders to ensure relevancy.

However, the process of ensuring non-transfer degrees, as well as certificate programs, are relevant and aligned with student and workplace needs are not discussed in this section.

- Designing, aligning and delivering cocurricular activities to support learning (3.E.1, 4.B.2)

Reacting Delta College provides examples of several co-curricular programs and initiatives that support learning. Faculty, staff and students reach out to the Student and Civic Engagement (SACE) area for assistance with the development and implementation of co-curricular activities, programs, and services that support the learning process. However, the process by which these are actually designed, aligned, and delivered to support learning is not described.

Growth could be achieved by providing greater analysis on how the institution works to create and connect co-curricular activities with the College's ISLOs.

- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess attainment of common learning outcomes (4.B.2)

Systematic The institution has created a process for faculty to assess GELOs within their courses and then to report the results using the assessment rubric. This process has not yet extended to Student and Educational Services, which is currently focused on declining enrollment, nor is there a described process for assessing the ISLOs to show how achievement of the GELOs may differ from achievement of the ISLOs.

Faculty are the primary stakeholders and design the method for mapping. Results from individual courses are aggregated for institutional-level analysis. Clarification beyond the mapping process, which includes the assessment of the outcomes, would add to this response.

- Assessing common learning outcomes (4.B.1, 4.B.2, 4.B.4)

Systematic Delta College has a clearly defined process for assessing the six GELOs. Two GELOs are assessed every year so that at the end of a three-year cycle, all six GELOs have been assessed. Artifacts of student work are assessed in winter semester and data reviewed the following fall semester. The first assessment/data review cycle began in Winter 2017/Fall 2017 and the last set for the first cycle will be completed Winter 2019/Fall 2019 for a total of six GELOs assessed. The

courses that comprise this process are described through the GELO curriculum map.

The College has developed baseline targets for results to ensure the CQI process is followed. Results are aggregated and reported to the GECAC, SLAC, and full-time faculty. Long-term and stretch goals are established. GELO resource groups report findings to GECAC, SLAC, and the full faculty body. Faculty collaborate to make changes when concerns are identified, but no process is described for monitoring the results of these changes. While Delta indicates that courses for assessment are selected through the GELO curriculum map, the selection criteria are not clear.

It will be important to extend this assessment process to Student and Educational Services, as well as to include the ISLOs, to reach a higher maturity level with this process.

IR1 What are the results for determining if students possess the knowledge, skills and abilities that are expected at each degree level? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)

Reacting Delta College has begun assessment its GELOs, with data from four of the six provided. Delta College has established best practices for programming learning outcomes utilizing mandatory program accreditation standards and Perkins guidelines for occupational programs. However, it's not clear how achievement of the ISLOs is assessed outside the GELOs that comprise them, nor is there a discussion of the impact of many area of rater reliability where the goal was not met.

While this comparison finds some discrepancies, overall agreement is within the goal of $\pm 10\%$. Student performance data includes success rates for all students sampled, for students receiving a degree, and for students receiving an AA or AS. For all groups, success is highest for Think Civically and Cultivate Wellness, and slightly lower for Utilize Technology and Reason Quantitatively, although performance by all groups on all GELOs exceeded the college's initial internal target of 70%. Following the initial assessments, the college revised its long-term goal to 80%. Using this target, Think Civically and Cultivate Wellness still exceed the long-term goal, while Utilize Technology and Reason Quantitatively are 2 and 4 percentage points short. No data are yet available for the GELOs of Communicate Effectiveness and Think Critically, and because the college is still completing its first cycle of assessment, no trend data is available.

No follow up data concerning the effects of assessment-driven changes are presented within this section.

Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting Delta College is still in the early stages of determining targets and external benchmarks. At this stage no external benchmarks have been identified, internal targets are still being adjusted based upon the first round of data collection, and long-term goals are defined as the next assessment cycle (the next time the goal is measured).

Interpretation of results and insights gained

Reacting The institution recognizes the current assessment process has not been in place long enough to show trends in student learning. The first three-year cycle of assessment of the six GELOs

will be completed in Fall 2019 and the next three-year cycle will begin with lessons learned from the first cycle. The paring down from 38 learning outcomes to six has required time dedicated to identifying the appropriate GELOs going forward, which has resulted in delaying the implementation of the assessment cycle.

In addition, the meaning of some of these results, such as not meeting several targets for rater reliability, and the reasons for changing several targets for the GELOs after one data point are not described.

Reference is made to the challenges that have occurred in the collection of data and why some of the data is limited. Even with these factors still no interpretation is included with the data that was available.

111 Based on 1R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years? (4.B.3)

The assessment of student learning falls mostly in the systematic level, with some areas bordering on reactive. This is due to the incomplete cycle of the six current GELOs due to the delay in implementation of the GELO assessment cycle. Although still early in this new assessment process, it appears Delta College is beginning to lay the foundation for a solid process to assess its GELOs. However, there is not a process to assess the ISLOs, as it appears the working assumption is mapping GELOs onto the ISLOs means assessing one means assessing the other, but this could be a misguided assumption to make. Therefore, it would benefit the institution to develop a process to assess the ISLOs as well. In addition, the results are presented here with no insights gleaned, despite changes to targets that were made and several rater reliability targets that were not attained. These are all areas for improvement as the college moves forward with its assessment process.

1.2: PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

Program Learning Outcomes focuses on the knowledge, skills and abilities graduates from particular programs are expected to possess. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.B., 3.E. and 4.B. in this section.

1P2 Describe the processes for determining, communicating and ensuring the stated program learning outcomes and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Aligning learning outcomes for programs (e.g., nursing, business administration, elementary teaching, etc.) to the mission, educational offerings and degree levels of the institution (3.E.2)

Systematic Delta College aligns program learning outcomes through curriculum development, which begins with identifying the need for a new program or course or the need to change existing programs or courses. The need for changes may come from program advisory committee input, changing course requirements at four-year universities, or industry requests. It could be clearer as to what level of input the program advisory committee provides as part of this process.

Delta College appears to have a systematic process for approving new programs or revisions to current curriculum. However, the process by which learning outcomes are aligned to the mission is not clear in this process, nor is this an explicit element of the new program application.

Determining program outcomes (4.B.4)

Systematic Curriculum proposals are voted on by Curriculum Council as a recommendation for adoption. This recommendation gets approval from the Vice President of Instruction and Learning Services and the President. The President brings new programs and programs for elimination to the Board of Trustees for final approval. The program advisory committee reviews program learning outcomes. This committee consists of program faculty, the Academic Associate Dean of the area, the Dean of Career Education and Learning Partnerships, and 10-16 community members working in related occupations.

The advisory committee provides input regarding a variety of program design elements including drafting the program learning outcomes. Advisory committees meet one to three times annually and meeting minutes are documented and distributed.

The Systems Portfolio states they are determined and adopted through the curriculum process, and may be reviewed by the program advisory committee, but how and where in the process that actually occurs is not clearly delineated.

Articulating the purposes, content and level of achievement of the outcomes (4.B.1)

Reacting The College did not address this question; instead the College provided how faculty are involved in the process. The Systems Portfolio states “faculty who are responsible for assessing a particular program learning outcome develop the assessment tool that defines the purpose, content, and level of achievement expected of the student.”

However, this process appears to be inverted, as the purpose, content, and level of achievement expected should be defined first, followed by the creation of the assessment tool and not vice versa. It is not clear how the level of achievement is determined and communicated to faculty, students, and other stakeholders.

Ensuring the outcomes remain relevant and aligned with student, workplace and societal needs (3.B.4)

Systematic The process in place for outcomes notes a five-year cycle that is relevant. Other process appear erratic. There does not appear to be any type of systematic process for ensuring the outcomes remain relevant and aligned with stakeholder needs. Instead, faculty may submit changes at any time, advisory committees may make recommendations, or a concern of some type (i.e., lapse in comprehensive review, enrollment decline, relevancy of the program to current workforce needs) may trigger the process, all of which indicate the outcomes are no longer relevant.

Designing, aligning and delivering cocurricular activities to support learning (3.E.1, 4.B.2)

Reacting Delta College develops co-curricular activities for programs using the same process described for developing co-curricular activities for ISLOs and GELOs. The Systems Portfolio indicates co-curricular activities are “acted on” following faculty and student recommendations, which is a maturity level, particularly since earlier references only provide examples of activities and not defined processes.

Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess attainment of program learning outcomes (4.B.2)

Reacting The College provides a limited response in this section. The process for selecting assessment tools, methods, and instruments is “integrated with the same processes used to articulate purpose, content, and expected levels of outcomes.” However, as noted above, the assessment tool dictates those items, instead of the items informing the assessment instrument. The College does report that some programs with external accreditation may be using a prescribed form. The college might benefit from describing in more detail the process for selecting assessment tools and methods.

Assessing program learning outcomes (4.B.1, 4.B.2, 4.B.4)

Systematic Program learning outcomes are assessed on a three- to five-year cycle, with program faculty meeting with the (SLAC) on a four-year rotation for face-to-face discussion regarding questions or issues pertaining to their assessment activities and the quality of the assessment projects. Faculty meet with the SLAC committee every four years to discuss assessment activities and receive feedback regarding data results. OATS is used to monitor observance of assessment schedules and generate annual assessment reports that are provided to the Vice President of Instructional and Learning Services.

It is not certain from the narrative how the assessment data are shared with faculty, how the results are used to form judgments about learning interventions and academic offerings, and how the resulting changes are monitored.

1R2 What are the results for determining if students possess the knowledge, skills and abilities that are expected in programs? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P2. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Overall levels of deployment of the program assessment processes within the institution (i.e., how many programs are/not assessing program goals)

Reacting The college provides data for the number of programs participating in the assessment process. At this time 77.3% of Delta College’s programs have a filed assessment schedule. The institution indicates progress is being made, although the percentage of programs with filed assessment reports was higher in the 2015-17 period than it was in 2018. Reviewers are aware that not all programs had time to submit before the portfolio was submitted.

Missing from the narrative is reference to direct assessment of student learning at the student learning/program learning outcome level. There is no evidence of Program Learning Outcomes being assessed beyond counts of programs participating. Delta might benefit from describing how it plans to continue this upward trend.

Summary results of assessments (include tables and figures when possible)

Reacting The summary data provide are tallies of the number of participating programs. While these are important indicators of process deployment, they are not representative of student learning as it relates to program outcomes. Missing in the program results are actual results. The lack of program assessment data as of 2015 is problematic.

Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting The Program Learning Outcomes are not directly assessed or compared to internal targets or external benchmarks. Internal benchmarks for deployment are 100% for all programs. It is not clear if any external benchmarks are identified nor is it clear what the internal benchmarks for deployment are specifically.

Interpretation of assessment results and insights gained

Reacting The institution recognizes it needs to improve participation in program assessment. The institution is not yet at the point where it can provide an interpretation of assessment results and insights gained as they do not even have all programs participating in assessment at this time.

For all programs where assessment results were flagged to be of concern, remediation plans have been filed with SLAC. However, the portfolio does not describe the insights that formed the basis of the plans. The narrative acknowledges low faculty participation rates and lists a number of efforts to increase rates. While these efforts are important to the future of assessment at Delta, this information does not replace the need for interpretation of results and insights gained from data collected from programs over the most recent review period.

1I2 Based on 1R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years? (4.B.3)

The College provides an improvement narrative that is not related to collecting direct results for student assessment of program outcomes. A noted opportunity exists to articulate program outcomes, design tools for assessment, and move forward a process that ensures measuring and assessing direct results of student learning.

The improvements listed here are either still waiting to be fully implemented, such as the Vice President of Instruction and Learning Services collaborating with Deans and Academic Associate Deans to define areas for improvement, or are related to recent restructuring. It is clear the institution is not yet at a stage where it can implement improvements that stem from assessment results of its program learning outcomes.

1.3: ACADEMIC PROGRAM DESIGN

Academic Program Design focuses on developing and revising programs to meet stakeholders' needs. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 1.C. and 4.A. in this section.

1P3 Describe the processes for ensuring new and current programs meet the needs of the institution and its diverse stakeholders. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Identifying student stakeholder groups and determining their educational needs (1.C.1, 1.C.2)

Systematic The primary methods that Delta uses to identify student stakeholder groups and their needs are through advisory committee input, placement testing, student instructional feedback forms, transfer partners, and relationships with area employers. In addition, the college has an advising process that is part of the student intake procedure which provides relevant information to assess student needs.

The narrative provided identifies how students are served through the college, not necessarily how student stakeholder groups are identified. Simply listing mandatory college processes makes it

difficult for reviewers to provide an evaluative response. It is unclear from the information presented how the college seeks to identify student stakeholder groups and identify their needs beyond placement testing, advising, and offering programming.

Identifying other key stakeholder groups and determining their needs (1.C.1, 1.C.2)

Systematic Delta College describes how it works with current partners, mainly local employers and four-year institutions, through advisory committees and the Articulation Office. However, the exact process by which these entities determine the needs of these stakeholders is unclear. Additionally, it is also not clear how key stakeholder groups are identified and if there are other stakeholders outside the two mentioned here, such as community members, parents, state officials, etc.

Developing and improving responsive programming to meet all stakeholders' needs (1.C.1, 1.C.2)

Systematic Delta College uses the curriculum change process to improve responsive programming for all stakeholders. Advisory committees, employers, transfer partners, research of employment databases, and the College's academic assessment cycle are contributors to addressing stakeholders' needs. Curriculum proposals are reviewed by faculty, Student and Educational Services, and administration. It could be clearer as to what extent these reviews address any changes in implementation.

There is no discussion on how programming is developed and improved outside the curriculum process, such as for co-curricular learning. It is not clear how the college assures that its programming is being responsive to stakeholders' needs.

Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess the currency and effectiveness of academic programs

Reacting Delta claims to use feedback from program advisory committees, direct assessment of student learning, and program review as a primary means to monitor program effectiveness. Yet no results for these processes are reported in the portfolio.

The college might benefit from soliciting feedback from students and employers.

Reviewing the viability of courses and programs and changing or discontinuing when necessary (4.A.1)

Systematic Delta College has a process for reviewing the viability of programs, which includes caveats for determining the need for full-time faculty positions. Program vitality study results may lead to program elimination, course changes, increase or decrease of resources or reaffirmation that the program is meeting stakeholder needs. Based on this internal review and research, the committee members make recommendations to the Vice President of Instruction and Learning Services on ways to grow or eliminate the program.

This process would be further strengthened by identifying a cycle for reviewing this overall process, as well as identifying a process for determining whether a course should be eliminated, as the only discussion in the Systems Portfolio is if the course needs to be updated.

1R3 What are the results for determining if programs are current and meet the needs of the institution's diverse stakeholders? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P3.

All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Summary results of assessments (include tables and figures when possible)

Reacting The college lists the percent of new students that meet with an advisor, the percent of programs with advisory boards, the number of articulation and transfer agreements, and the names of discontinued and newly created programs. These data points are not tied to a process as much as they are a collection of data elements that the college collects. Simply enumerating the actions taken regarding program changes without providing the rationales does not rise higher than the reactive level of documentation.

Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting The institution is required to review state approved programs every five years. However, beyond this information there are no internal targets or external benchmarks provided, such as approved and discontinued programs at peer institutions.

Interpretation of results and insights gained

Reacting

There is very little, if any, interpretation of results for program review and program assessment.

1I3 Based on 1R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Delta College is continuing to identify ways to improve its vitality studies, which is an important component in academic program design. These improvements appear logical and important in the institution's curricular development. Yet, the connection between these changes and the information reported is not readily evident.

1.4: ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUALITY

Academic Program Quality focuses on ensuring quality across all programs, modalities and locations. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.A. and 4.A. in this section.

1P4 Describe the processes for ensuring quality academic programming. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Determining and communicating the preparation required of students for the specific curricula, programs, courses and learning they will pursue (4.A.4)

Systematic Delta College has a process in place to determine appropriate prerequisites for curriculum, which begins with the curriculum proposal process. The proposal is reviewed by faculty experts and academic advisors to assure that the proposal is appropriate given the course content and the College's testing and placement criteria. These prerequisites are communicated to students through the college catalog and the advising process.

The College does not report a process for Academic Program Quality.

Evaluating and ensuring program rigor for all modalities, locations, consortia and dual-credit programs (3.A.1, 3.A.3, 4.A.4)

Systematic The Systems Portfolio describes how curriculum rigor is established through the curriculum design process, assessment practices, and instructional quality.

It could be clearer to what extent the online sections of courses are included in the assessment of student learning.

It is not clear to what extent the dual credit faculty are included in assessment, instructional quality, and credentialing. It could also be clearer to what extent course curriculum and credentialing are addressed/evaluated for online courses and programs.

Awarding prior learning and transfer credits (4.A.2, 4.A.3)

Systematic The College follows internal processes to award credit for prior learning through the registrar's office with input from faculty when necessary, experiential learning, and high school articulation. The Registrar's Office evaluates credit for military training. Academic Associate Deans are responsible for evaluating portfolio work for the areas in their division, and the College offers a number of standardized tests that allow for advanced placement and for students to gain credit by exam. It is unclear if CLEP, DANTES, AP, or other means are accepted.

Details of how this information is communicated to prospective students is unclear. Additionally, it is not clear from the information presented if there is a maximum amount of credit hours that can be earned by examination or experiential learning.

Selecting, implementing and maintaining specialized accreditation(s) (4.A.5)

Reacting There is not a well-articulated process for selecting and implementing specialized accreditation. Although there is a Faculty Senate policy on program accreditation, this only applies to reaccreditation. Additionally, the Systems Portfolio indicates decisions to seek accreditation are made through interactions with stakeholders and if it is of benefits to the student's employment, but employers is not listed as one of the stakeholder groups.

Assessing the level of outcomes attainment by graduates at all levels (3.A.2, 4.A.6)

Reacting This section might be incomplete. The processes referred to earlier in the portfolio primarily focus on assessing the current GELO's for current students. The only delineation for second year students is those that have completed 45 or more credit hours, but no comparison with those that have actually graduated.

Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess program rigor across all modalities

Systematic Delta College provides two methods for assessing program rigor – grades and third-party accreditation exams. Accreditation exams are an appropriate method for assessing rigor, while grades are an imperfect indirect measure. Limited information is provided concerning the selecting of tools, methods and instruments used to assess program rigor across all modalities. The college may benefit from a more defined process.

1R4 What are the results for determining the quality of academic programs? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P4. All data presented should include the population

studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Summary results of assessments (include tables and figures when possible)

Systematic Articulation agreements with secondary and post-secondary partners are provided. Results of third-party accreditation exams are presented for the 2018 year. The College may consider providing data for multiple years. .

The college's use of grades rather than learning assessment data in its analysis of program rigor produces conclusions of questionable validity. Delta may wish to consider a more systematic and formal method of measuring the quality and rigor of its academic programs.

Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting The institution indicates results from national and credentialing exams show 95% of programs are above the national benchmark, although these data are not provided nor is there a discussion of what the benchmark is nor which programs failed to meet the benchmark.

The college might benefit from identifying comparison data from national cohorts and other external sources to establish benchmarks, locate areas of concern, and identify best practices.

Interpretation of results and insights gained

Systematic If a program does not meet the national benchmark for credentialing examination, faculty research the gaps in performance and change curriculum to improve the students' preparation for the assessment. The most recent program not reaching the performance benchmark was the Paramedic to RN program which is currently under review for areas of needed improvements in curriculum and support systems. It could be clearer if this approach to the RN program is representative of other programs not meeting the required accreditation benchmarks.

Although there is an interpretation of some of the results provided, there are no true insights that show how the institution is learning from the results in a way that could help inform continuous quality improvement.

1I4 Based on 1R4, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

The improvements listed in this section largely describe macro-level initiatives underway external to Delta College but in which the institution participates. There is not a discussion of internal improvements being undertaken by the College. This is likely a result of a lack of insights gained from the data noted above.

1.5: ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Academic Integrity focuses on ethical practices while pursuing knowledge. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 2.D. and 2.E. in this section.

1P5 Describe the processes for supporting ethical scholarly practices by students and faculty. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Ensuring freedom of expression and the integrity of research and scholarly practice (2.D., 2.E.1, 2.E.3)

Systematic Delta College addresses institutional academic freedom and intellectual property in its published Senate policies. The college also has an institutional review board (IRB) that reviews and monitors human subjects research to ensure ethical standards are met. However, there is no discussion of how the institution utilizes these existing structures to actually ensure the freedom of expression and integrity of research and scholarly practice is protected by giving power to them and ensuring they are operating as designed.

Ensuring ethical learning and research practices of students (2.E.2, 2.E.3)

Systematic The Delta College Senate has established policy for student rights of expression and academic integrity for student work. It is not clear, however, where these policies are published for students beyond the mandatory student orientation nor is it clear how students are oriented to research practices beyond using Turnitin.

Ensuring ethical teaching and research practices of faculty (2.E.2, 2.E.3)

Systematic The Delta College Senate has policies governing ethical teaching, including academic freedom and scholarship and professional integrity. How faculty are oriented to these policies and evaluated on ethical teaching practices is not included in the narrative.

Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to evaluate the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of supporting academic integrity

Reacting The college utilizes Maxient and Turnitin as tools to monitor student academic integrity. Additional methods for recording and evaluating violations of academic integrity, student conduct, and incident occurrences, including for faculty, would provide insights into trends and areas for focused intervention but are not included in the narrative.

1R5 What are the results for determining the quality of academic integrity? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P5. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Summary results of measures (include tables and figures where appropriate)

Reacting The college provides summary results from Maxient that shows a decrease in academic integrity concerns moved forward by faculty. There are no results reported from turnitin.com, nor are there data provided on academic integrity for faculty.

Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting Delta College does not provide internal targets or external benchmarks.

Interpretation of results and insights gained

Reacting Overall, the reported results do not support insightful interpretation. The college provides a narrative that attempts to link a reduction in academic integrity violations to new student orientation

but does not provide a process that validates this cause/effect relationship by providing data on students who completed the new student orientation and did or did not receive academic integrity violations.

115 Based on 1R6, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Maxient has been implemented and used for the past three years, which appears to be an asset to the college in terms of tracking student concerns and academic integrity issues. To move forward the college might consider an analysis of the academic integrity process, beginning with a centralized log of all types of issues, including plagiarism and incidents resolved at the faculty level, followed by a subsequent incident analysis. This may yield valuable insights into ways the academic integrity process can be further strengthened.

CATEGORY SUMMARY

Processes under Category One fall primarily under the systematic level of maturity. It is evident that any gaps in helping students learn dating back to 2014 have been recognized, identified, and addressed. However, a number of actions related to the assessment of student learning are still in the formative stage at the College. The college has made strides in streamlining its General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs) assessment plan, but deployment of the plan is in its initial cycle. It is not clear that direct, formative and summative data related to course- and program-defined outcomes for student learning are regularly collected and analyzed, and it is unclear how data have been used to lead to the changes and actions that have occurred.

Results for Category One are largely at the reacting to systematic level. There are limited results for direct measures of learning outcomes present, particularly at the program level. Although there are some references to goals, there are few specific internal targets or external benchmarks noted.

In order to move to a higher rating of maturity, Delta College needs to be clearer on what results it has for direct measures of student learning at the program and institutional level, what insights have been gleaned for these data, and how the information has been used to create change within the institution.

CATEGORY STRATEGIC ISSUES

The overall assessment process needs to be fully implemented and could be strengthened in multiple ways:

1. The college is encouraged to directly assess its program learning outcomes at the skill level instead of limiting it to the ISLO, GELO and course-level.
2. The college is encouraged to align its data collection sets to its assessment processes and focus on program improvement measures that are informed by internal targets and external benchmarks. Repeatedly, the College does not include internal targets, while peer institutions could be used for external benchmarking and the identification of best practices.

The College provides no evidence of informing students of programming and policies. There is a need to develop an assessment process for co-curricular activities.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

II - Meeting Student and Other Key Stakeholder Needs

Focuses on determining, understanding and meeting needs of current and prospective students and other key stakeholders, such as alumni and community partners.

Instructions for Systems Appraisal Team

In this section, the team should provide a consensus narrative that focuses on the processes, results and improvements for Current and Prospective Student Needs, Retention, Persistence and Completion, Key Stakeholder Needs, Complaint Processes, and Building Collaborations and Partnerships.

Independent Category Feedback for each AQIP Category from each team member should be synthesized into an in-depth narrative that includes an analysis of the institution's processes, results and quality improvement efforts for each category. Wording from the Stages in Systems Maturity tables for both processes and results should be incorporated into the narrative to help the institution understand how the maturity of processes and results have been rated. The narrative should also include recommendations to assist the institution in improving its processes and/or results. It is from this work that the team will develop a consensus on the Strategic Challenges analysis, noting three to five strategic issues that are crucial for the future of the institution. Please see additional directions in the [Systems Appraisal procedural document](#) provided by HLC.

Evidence

CATEGORY 2: MEETING STUDENT AND OTHER KEY STAKEHOLDER NEEDS

Category 2 focuses on determining, understanding and meeting needs of current and prospective students and other key stakeholders, such as alumni and community partners.

2.1: CURRENT AND PROSPECTIVE STUDENT NEED

Current and Prospective Student Need focuses on determining, understanding and meeting the non-academic needs of current and prospective students. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.C. and 3.D in this section.

2P1 Describe the processes for serving the academic and non-academic needs of current and prospective students. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Identifying underprepared and at-risk students, and determining their academic support needs
(3.D.1)

Systematic Delta College utilizes standardized tests such as Accuplacer and SAT to determine a student's academic readiness for courses. Delta also utilizes multiple measures for placement in courses. The multiple measures used include HS GPA, SAT scores, and previous course completion. Standards have been set for each multiple measure to ensure students are placed appropriately.

Students who do not meet the minimum reading, writing, and math skill levels will enroll in developmental course work to improve their skills. Successful completion (C or better) of developmental courses meet the requirements to enroll in college level course work.

Growth could be achieved by providing additional discussion of how the academic needs of these students are supported beyond academic placement.

Deploying academic support services to help students select and successfully complete courses and programs (3.D.2)

Systematic Delta College has adopted a “Guided Pathways” model for academic advising and career development. When prospective students make initial contact, they are immediately asked about their career plans and goals. Students with identified goals discuss them with admissions advisors and apply directly to the academic program of their choice.

Ensuring faculty are available for student inquiry (3.C.5)

Systematic Full-time faculty are expected to maintain office hours for at least five hours each week. Delta College offers Adobe Connect and Zoom as video conference tools that are made available to faculty by request. Faculty also have synchronous chat tools and asynchronous discussion boards available to them through the College’s learning management system (LMS), Brightspace (formerly D2L or Desire2Learn) which is managed by eLearning. It could be clearer as to if/how the office hours are monitored to ensure availability as well as the LMS usage.

Determining and addressing the learning support needs (tutoring, advising, library, laboratories, research, etc.) of students and faculty (3.D.1, 3.D.3, 3.D.4, 3.D.5)

Systematic For instructors, departmental budgets support faculty instructional needs. Technology and one-time purchases are prioritized based on need through the Instructional Material, Equipment and Technology (IMET) process. The IMET faculty and staff team review purchasing requests from across all instructional units of the College.

The College systematically addresses learning support needs of students and communicates the services available through a required orientation. These services include the Advising Center, Counseling Center, Career Development Center, Office of Disability Resources, Library Learning and Information Center, Tutoring Center, WRIT Center, and Testing Center. However, the learning support needs of faculty beyond technology purchases is less well defined. Clarifying how Delta determines the needs of faculty and decides what actions will be taken to address these needs may advance maturity of this process.

Determining new student groups to target for educational offerings and services

Systematic Delta identifies new student groups by reviewing data from community research and surveys, placement tests, and documentation regarding disability accommodations. Additionally, student self-disclosure on college documents and recommendations from faculty and staff may identify other segments of the student populations, such as military veterans and minority males. Additional information could be provided that expands on the process used to gather the information.

Meeting changing student needs

Systematic Students provide direct feedback to all levels of the College through instructional

feedback forms, general comment tickets and complaints, Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), and other surveys. This data are reviewed by stakeholders at the executive level who move forward decision making.

Delta College could benefit from more direct feedback from students regarding their needs.

Identifying and supporting student subgroups with distinctive needs (e.g., seniors, commuters, distance learners, military veterans) (3.D.1)

Systematic Support provided to student subgroups with distinctive needs is prioritized by the group's size and the urgency of the need. One example of a subgroup identified and supported through this process is the Men of Delta student organization, which supports at-risk males. It is not clear how individual support needs are identified and addressed. The portfolio does not mention support for distance learners although Delta offers several online learning options.

Deploying non-academic support services to help students be successful (3.D.2)

Systematic Non-academic support services are identified into four sets of processes. Each set has its own milestones and metrics. These stages reflect the needs of students at various stages of the academic career and include: Pre-Orientation On-Boarding, New Student Orientation, Continued Enrollment and Retention, and Graduation and Transition Services.

While providing this information there is limited discussion of a process to deploy non-academic support services longitudinally and consistently throughout a student's educational career. Including such information could assist with a growth in maturity.

Ensuring staff members who provide non-academic student support services are qualified, trained and supported (3.C.6)

Systematic The Student and Educational Services staff are qualified, trained, and supported through the staffing procedures maintained by the Delta College Human Resources Office including job descriptions, recruitment, training, evaluation, and discipline.

Communicating the availability of non-academic support services (3.D.2)

Systematic Communication of non-academic support services appears to be heaviest at the beginning of a student's career through pre-orientation and on-boarding and to new student orientation. After enrolling this communication is more informal and primarily through advising, registration, financial aid, and student engagement activities.

Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess student needs

Systematic Delta College went through a process to move from classic Accuplacer to NextGen and did so in an involved and systematic process to determine rubrics and levels students would need to achieve placement into the correct college courses.

SACE reviews the effectiveness and satisfaction of their offerings, programs or workshops through surveys. Delta also utilizes Maxient for student complaints.

Assessing the degree to which student needs are met

Systematic At the end of each semester a series of reports are run to indicate student success and retention rates. Students who do not meet the standards are contacted and invited in to see an advisor, counselor, or career counselor. Referrals are made as appropriate. It could be clearer as to what processes are in place, if any, in the event that students do not see an advisor or counselor. It also could be clearer as to what processes are in place to evaluate how student needs are identified.

Beyond the reviewing of grades, information is limited for additional efforts that are made to ensure that student needs are met. The review of grades alone is an indirect measure and the college would benefit from developing more direct measures of student needs being met.

2R1 What are the results for determining if current and prospective students' needs are being met? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 2P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)

Systematic Delta presents trended results for a number of measures related to current and prospective student needs. Delta tracks placement testing results and students' declared areas of study so as to better align resources with demand. Over the past five years, 98% of first-semester students have complied with college policy by meeting with an academic advisor to develop a curriculum schedule. Direct measures of student satisfaction with the WRIT and testing centers indicate more than 92% of students found the WRIT center to be very helpful, and 96% found the Testing Center to have enough seating. Ratios of students to staff in admissions, financial aid, counseling and advising, career services, student activities, and testing are also presented with comparisons to national and state figures. Student success rates in developmental courses and in math and English classes following developmental classes, completion in gateway courses, academic progress, and retention rates provide additional perspectives on the degree to which Delta meets student needs. CCSSE data provides national comparisons.

While several pieces of data are provided growth in maturity could be achieved by explaining the relationship between the data and its overall meaning for the institution.

Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Systematic Delta presents a wide range of data with trends and comparisons to other institutions and state or national averages, thereby providing a meaningful context for interpretation, but the college is limited in explicitly identifying internal targets or external benchmarks. Setting a target that is specific and clearly identified provides the opportunity to measure progress, sustain focus, provide feedback, and, most importantly, know when achievement has occurred.

Interpretation of results and insights gained

Reacting The narrative provides a brief explanation of the data, but is limited to provide interpretative insights that could be used to derive meaningful change.

2I1 Based on 2R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

The Leadership Program will study the impact on student, faculty, staff, and community involvement in working together to improve student achievement in their courses and completion of their academic goals in 2019-20. It could be clearer throughout this section as to how many of the processes and results came to be established, compared, and defined.

A student survey under development by the Student Retention Committee may provide the college with valuable insights into improving services and supporting students.

2.2: RETENTION, PERSISTENCE AND COMPLETION

Retention, Persistence and Completion focuses on the approach to collecting, analyzing and distributing data on retention, persistence and completion to stakeholders for decision making. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 4.C. in this section.

2P2 Describe the processes for collecting, analyzing and distributing data on retention, persistence and completion. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Collecting student retention, persistence and completion data (4.C.2, 4.C.4)

Aligned The college collects information regarding academic placements, academic and career goals, financial data, and academic advising to assist in understanding factors impacting student retention, persistence, and completion. The college measures persistence as its Primary Retention Cohort (PRC) making satisfactory academic progress, defined as 67% of more of first-time degree/certificate-seeking students completing their attempted course credits. Retention is represented by multiple measures, including fall-to-fall retention and passing rates of the PRC, disaggregated by various student characteristics such as age, FT/PT status, race/ethnicity, gender, college readiness, Federal Pell status.

Determining targets for student retention, persistence and completion (4.C.1, 4.C.4)

Aligned Delta has established a primary retention cohort (PRC) to study for retention, persistence and completion. For this data study, six characteristics have been identified and a target of 2% increase has been established.

In 2016, Delta College's Achieve the Dream coaches determined that a continuing problem for the College had been the lack of centralized data. Multiple stakeholders including Institutional Research, administration,

division chairs, and developmental education faculty were using different methodologies to measure student success including academic performance and retention.

In the Winter 2017 semester, the President appointed an *ad hoc* committee, Data Ambassadors. The Data Ambassadors met during the Winter 2017 semester and defined five milestones to track student success from enrollment through graduation. The ambassadors defined quantitative metrics to measure student success through these milestones. The milestones included:

1. Completion of developmental coursework
2. Completion of gateway classes in college level English and math
3. Fall to fall retention

4. Student success (cumulative grade point average and satisfactory academic progress)
5. Timely graduation (two year, four year, six year)

Analyzing information on student retention, persistence and completion

Systematic Within the Achieving the Dream pathway, the data identified is used to help develop clear curriculum paths and help students access and complete those curriculum paths. Guided Pathways are used to track student progress. This set of data is used to guide Delta College's responses to student needs for scheduling, curriculum, preparation and ultimately job placement or transfer.

The college might benefit from a more detailed description of the underlying processes linking data to changes.

Meeting targets for retention, persistence and completion (4.C.1)

Systematic The ATD Guided Pathways model is Delta College's primary strategy for improving retention, persistence, and completion rates. Implementation of the Guided Pathways model is therefore the most immediate target involving retention. Career and transfer pathways are completed for full-time students, and pathways for part-time students are being developed. Research has prompted the College to develop a plan to change its admission and orientation processes. The Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) model is in the process of being implemented so as to enhance the efficiency of the numerous processes that make up Guided Pathways.

In the Spring 2018 semester, a random sample of 300 Delta College students with a declared Associate of Arts degree were identified and a deep analysis was done to determine their success in moving toward graduation. At orientation, the advisors will assist students in setting up a multi-semester plan or Guided Pathway that will take them through their full program and prepare them for work or transfer.

The process outlined in this section pertains heavily to the admission process and early stages of a student's educational career. It is not clear what the process is for meeting targets throughout the educational lifecycle as it pertains to retention, persistence, and completion.

Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess retention, persistence and completion (4.C.4)

Systematic Delta College has identified a primary retention cohort of first-time in college degree-seeking students that includes subgroups of students. To move to a higher level of maturity it will be important to measure students who enter via other avenues, such as transfer-in students and students beginning in spring, as well, to create a broader understanding of student retention and completion.

2R2 What are the results for student retention, persistence and completion? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 2P2. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)

Aligned The college uses multiple retention measures over time and appears to be primarily stable in its retention. In fact, most of the time Delta's numbers are higher than for other Michigan colleges. Internal graduation and completion rates are tracked and measured. They appear to improve and decline in unpredictable patterns.

Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Systematic Delta College's retention and completion rates can be compared to state and national rates. Delta has recorded internal goals.

Interpretation of results and insights gained

Systematic Delta acknowledges that it would like to increase retention rates.

2I2 Based on 2R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years? (4.C.3)

A new goal of a 2% increase each in recruitment, retention, and completion has been set with detailed action projects to support each area that are included in the 2019-2023 Strategic Plan. It is not clear how the 2% level was reached and also unclear as to when it should be achieved.

2.3: KEY STAKEHOLDER NEEDS

Key Stakeholder Needs focuses on determining, understanding and meeting needs of key stakeholder groups, including alumni and community partners.

2P3 Describe the processes for serving the needs of key external stakeholder groups. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Determining key external stakeholder groups (e.g., alumni, employers, community)

Systematic Delta College defines external stakeholders as businesses, economic development organizations, chambers of commerce, and employment agencies in the Great Lakes Bay Region. Business partnerships are identified based on number of employees, industry and geographic location. Delta College Corporate Services reviews reports provided by area chambers of commerce and economic development organizations. Professional associations that have business members with more than 40 employees are also identified as key stakeholders.

Determining new stakeholders to target for services or partnership

Systematic Corporate Services identifies new stakeholders that meet the 40-employee criteria through relationships with economic development organizations and chambers. Annual printed materials are reviewed to identify new and expanding businesses. The process for identifying new stakeholders is not clearly delineated. Delta may wish to clarify the criteria used in determining where it targets outreach to create new stakeholders.

Meeting the changing needs of key stakeholders

Systematic Needs of academic and corporate stakeholders are evaluated on feasibility and

sustainability criteria. Non-credit stakeholders job training needs are met by modifying the non-credit course offerings to add or delete learning objectives after a discussion with the business and after alignments to mandatory state or industry requirements.

Both academic and corporate services work together as an example provided showed this collaboration. If

a need is outside of the scope of training, a referral is made to the Dean of Career Education and Learning Partnerships, the Dean of Students and Educational Services, or the President. Follow-up on the lead is done via a phone call to the Dean or President to confirm contact was made. If stakeholder needs are not for credit courses, Academic Services will refer the stakeholder to Corporate Services for follow up with the business

Delta has an opportunity to better define the process for assessing the extent to which it is meeting the changing needs of key stakeholders and to explore additional opportunities for stakeholder input to be incorporated into programs.

Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess key stakeholder needs

Systematic Delta College Corporate Services surveys its business training class participants to determine whether they feel that their needs were met. Feedback from other stakeholders is collected in formal and informal surveys and discussions. Salesforce CRM tracks the closure rates on proposals. The college may be missing opportunities to solicit input from other key stakeholder groups, such as alumni, employers, and the community at-large.

Though data is collected Delta College has the opportunity to grow in maturity by establishing a more systematic approach to surveying external stakeholders

Assessing the degree to which key stakeholder needs are met

Systematic Delta determines the degree to which stakeholder needs are met by tracking participation numbers for articulation and dual enrollment agreements and by periodic comprehensive reviews of each agreement. However, these are indirect measures of the extent to which stakeholders perceive their needs as being met. The college might consider more direct measures, such as feedback solicited directly from external partners, community organizations, alumni, and accrediting agencies. Corporate Services compiles its surveys into annual reports tracking quality changes, and reviews whether current goals need to be revised. Comments written on surveys are considered, and repeat training sales and close rates of proposals are examined as indicators of stakeholder satisfaction.

2R3 What are the results for determining if key stakeholder needs are being met? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 2P3. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)

Reacting In the academic area, the portfolio presents a list of its current and renewing articulation/transfer agreements, and its new and pending post-secondary articulation agreements. These tallies are indirect measures that do not provide a sound basis for formulating actionable recommendations for improvements. In the Corporate Services area, the closure rate for qualified

proposals peaked at 89% in 2018. The percent of repeat business fluctuated more than 49 percentage points between 2014 and 2018, with 63% recorded in 2018. Delta also presented the hire rate of students into related fields.

This section lacks a true summary. The evidence provided needs further context and a summary of what the data provides.

Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting Academics have not identified any internal targets or benchmarks and the Corporate Services side has identified only internal targets that include solely course reviews.

Interpretation of results and insights gained

Reacting Corporate Services interprets its above-benchmark close rates as indicating its proposals are fair market value. The college attributes the increase in repeat business in 2018 to a focus on retention of current accounts. As a result, a formal retention plan was added to the 2019-2020 business plan for Corporate Services. Only limited interpretation or insights are offered regarding whether the needs of stakeholders in the academic area are being met.

2I3Based on 2R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Delta College has not comprehensively implemented initiatives for external stakeholders. They do state future plans. Yet, these do not appear to be a priority as dates and timelines are not clearly outlined.

Academics is solely relying on partners bringing concerns or ideas forward to them rather than being more proactive in identifying stakeholders and their needs. Delta mentions that they have experienced undermining by other colleges and universities, which they plan to assess and address with the goal to implement beginning in the summer and fall and is included in the 2019-2023 Strategic Plan.

Corporate Services plans to continue to develop annual comprehensive business plans inclusive of client business plans that include goals, actions and metrics. Adding efforts to improve retention and increase repeat business rate will help improve metrics moving forward.

2.4: COMPLAINT PROCESSES

Complaint Processes focuses on collecting, analyzing and responding to complaints from students or key stakeholder groups.

2P4Describe the processes for collecting, analyzing and responding to complaints from students and stakeholder groups. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Collecting complaint information from students

Systematic Complaints can be reported both formally and informally. Formal complaints are logged

in the Maxient system. Reporting is done by completing the appropriate complaint form from the Delta College public website. Those reports are forwarded to Student and Educational Services. Once received, the reports are routed to the appropriate person or area for follow up and resolution. Informal student complaints most often occur face-to-face, by phone or email. Faculty and staff are asked to also log these complaints in Maxient using the complaint form. Faculty and staff members who report informal complaints in Maxient also have the ability to share if the complaint was resolved. Complaints that have not been resolved are routed to the appropriate person or area for follow-up and resolution.

The narrative is limited in details for the processes for students to follow, how and when students are informed of results, or how to appeal decisions. Additional information would make growth possible.

Collecting complaint information from other key stakeholders

Systematic Delta College collects information from stakeholders through various methods including: peer educational institutions, high schools, community employers, and the general public may speak to individuals within the College or offer their concerns through our public website. These comments are routed to a common desk to assure that the concerns are sent to the appropriate area of the College.

The institution has identified methods for several external stakeholder groups to submit complaints. These generally appear to be informal in nature and suggest a lack of clarity in the details of how such complaints are tracked.

Learning from complaint information and determining actions

Systematic Improvement suggestions or action items gathered from academic program advisory committees are recorded in the minutes during each advisory committee meeting. These are reviewed periodically to ensure progress before the next advisory committee meeting by the faculty, coordinator, Academic Associate Dean, and Dean of Career Education and Learning Partnerships. It is not clear how any progress is ensured through this process.

Communicating actions to students and other key stakeholders

Systematic Information on the results of a complaint is shared when appropriate. Resolutions are shared with students in face-to-face communication, by email and via phone conversations. Resolutions that have a large systematic effect on others, such as safety awareness, are communicated across the College via meetings, emails, posting on the College's internal portal system.

Additional information could be provided detailing the process that exist to determine when sharing a complaint resolution is defined as appropriate.

Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to evaluate complaint resolution

Systematic Maxient provides a vehicle by which Delta can track complaints as well as their resolutions.

Advisory committee action items are voted on and resolved at the advisory meeting. Each member completes an evaluation form after the meeting to allow for input on all aspects of the discussion, conclusions, and meeting. It could be clearer how the advisory committee is put together, who is

included, etc.

2R4 What are the results for student and key stakeholder complaints? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 2P4. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)

Reacting Complaints are simply tallied by topic and year. There are not qualitative data pieces provided. The total number of entries in 2018-2019 was 21, a number so low that it raises the question whether the Maxient system is being utilized to its intended potential.

Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting Delta does not indicate that they have identified any internal or external benchmarks for this section. They do mention in the process that they can look for trend data, but there is no indication as to the thresholds they are comparing to internally.

Interpretation of results and insights gained

Reacting The College indicates the low number of complaints means they need to encourage better use of the software

2I4 Based on 2R4, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Action goals for the complaint system have been identified. The curriculum changes, course activity changes, admission requirements, program creation, and program inactivation that have been identified need more clarity and depth. Additional information could be provided to what extent these changes have taken shape or are scheduled to take place.

2.5: BUILDING COLLABORATIONS AND PARTNERSHIPS

Building Collaborations and Partnerships focuses on aligning, building and determining the effectiveness of collaborations and partnerships to further the mission of the institution.

2P5 Describe the processes for managing collaborations and partnerships to further the mission of the institution. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Selecting partners for collaboration (e.g., other educational institutions, civic organizations, businesses)

Systematic When selecting partners for collaboration, Delta College recognizes the need to support its mission. Other criteria for determining partners include the expected mutual benefits and positive economic impact for Delta College's students and the community. While the College provides a list of actions and examples for building and expanding partnerships, no clear approach that is data informed is identified. It is not clear how partnership alignment is defined and assessed.

Building and maintaining relationships with partners

Systematic Academic partners meet regularly to maintain and build relationships. While attendance and participation in key events offered by partners is undoubtedly important, they are informal in nature and there is no clarification of how these activities are evaluated. Delta College may achieve a greater level of maturity with more frequent, deliberate, and not-entirely-informal contacts with partners.

Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess partnership effectiveness

Systematic The tools used to assess the effectiveness of partnerships appear to be largely indirect measures that assess the quantity of the relationship (e.g., number of individuals trained, number of clients) but not the quality or effectiveness of the relationship. Delta does not clearly define how tools are selected or deployed. Instead, the College reports individualized approaches in selection of tools. Further, the process for analyzing and acting upon information collected is not clear.

Evaluating the degree to which collaborations and partnerships are effective

Systematic Measures collected include the job training programs' employment rates and participation in advisory committees. However, these are indirect measures of partnership effectiveness. There appears to be no process for evaluating partnerships, their maintenance, and their value to the College.

2R5 What are the results for determining the effectiveness of aligning and building collaborations and partnerships? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 2P5. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)

Systematic Delta College's Corporate Services report employment rates for Fast Start training program graduates and satisfaction of partners with SBDC, both of which exceed the thresholds established by the College's partners. The information in Corporate Services' business plans represent discreet activities rather than empirical evidence regarding the effectiveness of partnerships. In the academic area, the College reports the recent loss of two major agreements involving dual enrollment.

Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting The narrative and a linked data document refer to several thresholds established and used by Fast Start, SBDC, and other entities as standards of performance. However, the College itself has identified no internal targets or benchmarks.

Interpretation of results and insights gained

Systematic The College reports that it is satisfied with counts for determining the success of its corporate training. Delta has an opportunity to move beyond participation rates as a measure of the extent to which partner relationships are meeting the needs of those involved, including those of the College itself.

2I5 Based on 2R5, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Delta College recognizes several areas in need of improvement for the processes and results for collaboration and partnerships. The College's Executive Council has developed a plan for outreach to its community partners, which includes attending planning meetings and requesting feedback specific for Delta College.

The surprise expressed by the College at its loss of two dual enrollment partnerships suggests that the tools used to assess the effectiveness of partnerships fail to provide decision-makers with the information needed to support agile and timely responses to concerns of collaborators.

CATEGORY SUMMARY

The College appears to have focused primarily on meeting the needs of first time, full-time students and adult learners. Ties to external stakeholders exist by virtue of workforce training, but the College does not appear to prioritize stakeholder groups that may need services beyond existing businesses. The student complaint process and related policies are not clearly defined in the report. For many of the processes in this category, the College has an opportunity to define approaches and deploy processes that assure new activities and changes are clearly related to results.

CATEGORY STRATEGIC ISSUES

Identifying external stakeholder groups who may be served by the College.

Identifying and publishing student complaint information.

Moving beyond participation rates as a measure of the extent to which partnerships are meeting the needs of those involved, including those of the College itself.

Expanding tools for measuring effectiveness, including identification of targets and benchmarks.

Expanding interpretation and discussion of actions to be initiated as a result of data analysis.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

III - Valuing Employees

Explores the institution's commitment to the hiring, development, and evaluation of faculty, staff and administrators.

Instructions for Systems Appraisal Team

In this section, the team should provide a consensus narrative that focuses on the processes, results and improvements for Hiring, Evaluation and Recognition and Development.

Independent Category Feedback for each AQIP Category from each team member should be synthesized into an in-depth narrative that includes an analysis of the institution's processes, results and quality improvement efforts for each category. Wording from the Stages in Systems Maturity tables for both processes and results should be incorporated into the narrative to help the institution understand how the maturity of processes and results have been rated. The narrative should also include recommendations to assist the institution in improving its processes and/or results. It is from this work that the team will develop a consensus on the Strategic Challenges analysis, noting three to five strategic issues that are crucial for the future of the institution. Please see additional directions in the [Systems Appraisal procedural document](#) provided by HLC.

Evidence

CATEGORY 3: VALUING EMPLOYEES

Category 3 explores the institution's commitment to the hiring, development and evaluation of faculty, staff and administrators.

3.1: HIRING

Hiring focuses on the acquisition of appropriately qualified/credentialed faculty, staff and administrators to ensure that effective, high-quality programs and student support services are provided. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 3.C. in this section.

3P1 Describe the process for hiring faculty, staff and administrators. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Recruiting, hiring and orienting processes that result in staff and administrators who possess the required qualification, skills and values (3.C.6)

Aligned

Delta College has processes in place that address position approvals, requests, recruitment, hiring, and orientation. Policies and manuals are in place that include screening processes for employees, job listings, and position descriptions. It could be somewhat clearer how these processes became established and who was included in their creation.

New employee orientation, which is self-paced, includes developed modules that range from

institutional culture and polices to ethical, integrity performance accountability. Faculty orientation is managed through the Faculty Center for Teaching Excellence (FCTE).

Developing and meeting academic credentialing standards for faculty, including those in dual credit, contractual and consortia programs (3.C.1, 3.C.2)

Aligned

Faculty were involved in developing credentialing standards that were approved by the Vice President of Instruction and Learning Services. All faculty who teach credit-bearing courses meet the same set of credentialing standards for their area and are screened through the hiring process for faculty regardless of the nature of the faculty position – full-time, adjunct, dual enrollment, on-campus, or off-campus. It could be clearer how these requirements were established and are monitored.

Ensuring the institution has sufficient numbers of faculty to carry out both classroom and non-classroom programs and activities (3.C.1)

Systematic

Academic Associate Deans monitor full-time and adjunct faculty staffing levels based on enrollment data, but it is not clear what the process is for identifying how enrollment numbers are correlated with faculty position needs. Faculty positions are replaced according to budget models which retrospectively list five years of enrollment data, full-time faculty loads, and adjunct staffing

There is limited information on how the Academic Associate Deans use these data to determine that both classroom and non-classroom activities can be sufficiently completed at current staffing levels or that changes would be needed.

Ensuring the acquisition of sufficient numbers of staff to provide student support services

Systematic Delta College states that student support positions are filled based upon student demand for services. However, it is not clear how student demand is identified or calculated. There is no evidence provided that identifies the number of student support staff positions and how that correlates to the student population/enrollment. It is also not clear what the process is for determining the true need of these positions.

Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

Reacting

Delta College identifies which outcomes are tracked regarding the hiring process, but there is no explanation of what the process is for the tracking itself, as well as how these outcomes have been identified or monitored.

3R1 What are the results for determining if recruitment, hiring and orienting practices ensure effective provision for programs and services? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 3P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)

Systematic Delta College states that the Human Resources Office has nearly 100% compliance with its processes. While documents are provided that identify the number of positions currently in place, it is not quite clear how 100% compliance with its processes was determined.

It is assumed that the College relies on success counts to measure performance of these processes.

Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting

Delta College states that its internal benchmarks of 100% have been met regularly for processes that support developing Delta College's diverse workforce. However, there is no evidence or explanation provided to support this. There is no comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks.

Interpretation of results and insights gained

Reacting

While the College provided a broad statement that reports it wants to continue to meet the goal of hiring a diverse workforce that reflects its community composite, no processes were identified that established this was an institutional priority. It is not clear what these initiatives are or how they will increase the number of offers made.

3I1 Based on 3R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Training and hiring practices are identified as an area of improvement for Delta College. However, it is not clear how these practices are designed to actually sustain and strengthen Delta College's commitment to a culture of diversity and inclusion. Evidence and explanation is needed to support this claim.

3.2: EVALUATION AND RECOGNITION

Evaluation and Recognition focuses on the assessment and recognition of faculty, staff and administrators' contributions to the institution. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 3.C. within this section.

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

Designing performance evaluation systems for all employees

Aligned

Delta College has implemented four evaluation systems for employees. The position classifications include faculty, staff, food service, and facilities employees. Senate Policies describe the process for annual performance reviews for full-time faculty, with an in-depth performance review administered at least every fourth year. Adjunct faculty and all staff are also evaluated annually, with

administrative professional and support staff receiving a mid-year and year-end performance appraisal.

Soliciting input from and communicating expectations to faculty, staff and administrators

Systematic

Faculty promotion, review, and employee evaluation are described, but little evidence is provided that provides details about how input is solicited during the employee evaluation process. It could be clearer as to how the expectations of faculty, staff, and administrators are communicated, as well as the process for if and when these processes are not deemed effective.

Aligning the evaluation system with institutional objectives for both instructional and non-instructional programs and services

Systematic

Delta College creates annual professional development plans that align with faculty interests as well as advance the College's strategic plans. It could be clearer what the process is for determining which aspects of these plans become aligned and how they are identified. Beginning with academic year 2017-2018 the professional development plans were further aligned with institutional objectives. It appears that this alignment process has only been in place for a relatively short period of time.

Utilizing established institutional policies and procedures to regularly evaluate all faculty, staff and administrators (3.C.3)

Aligned

Both faculty and staff are evaluated through established policies that are published in procedural manual(s) and linked to ongoing systems. It is inferred that Human Resources oversees the administration of the policies and maintains the calendar for required evaluations.

Delta could benefit from describing how these policies are utilized to evaluate employees.

Establishing employee recognition, compensation and benefit systems to promote retention and high performance

Systematic

Delta College has established numerous awards that are determined through a committee process and are presented in the Spring at their annual awards banquet that is held off campus. While the list of awards for recognition and compensation is clear, it could be clearer how the processes for determining these awards were designed to promote retention and high performance.

Promoting employee satisfaction and engagement

Systematic

The processes identified to promote employee satisfaction include equity in pay and benefits, the ability to reward/recognize employees for excellent performance and opportunities for professional development and career growth. Delta College utilizes employee rewards, recognition, professional

development, and employee engagement opportunities contribute to the positive culture and low turnover rate. It could be clearer how these processes have been established.

Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

Systematic

PACE was administered in 2011, 2014, 2016 and 2018. It is not clear how this process and its appropriateness was determined. There is no indication of how these separate data are collected, aggregated or analyzed to make improvements.

3R2 What are the results for determining if evaluation processes assess employees' contributions to the institution? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 3P2. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)

Systematic

Limited narrative is provided to detail the data that is supplied. Delta administers the PACE survey every other year to monitor employee engagement and satisfaction. For the past three administrations, Delta College's overall PACE score was nearly identical to the National Initiative for Institutional Effectiveness's (NIIIE) norm base. The narrative does not clarify whether Delta distributes the PACE survey to all employees, including part-time staff and adjunct faculty, or whether the survey is distributed only to full-time personnel. No sample sizes are provided and it is not clear if, or how, the College utilizes segmented PACE data in addition to the broad overall score.

Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting

The College indicates that no internal or external benchmarks have been established. The NIIIE Normbase is provided for the PACE and could be used to benchmark from previous years and other institutions.

Interpretation of results and insights gained

Reacting

Delta College has identified PACE results as overall positive, but it is not clear how these results have been interpreted in terms of a comparison to previous PACE results. The College provides no insight as to how its PACE results have been used to contribute to continuous quality improvement.

3I2 Based on 3R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Within the past year, the College implemented a new performance management software used for the evaluation of staff. One of the key improvements offered by the software is the ability to establish employee goals that move forward into the next year to track employee progress

toward completion. The new system will also be able to track the percentage of employees who have completed their professional development hours annually. However, it is not clear how this connects to the results and insights gained.

3.3: DEVELOPMENT

Development focuses on processes for continually training, educating and supporting employees to remain current in their methods and to contribute fully and effectively throughout their careers at the institution. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.C. and 5.A. in this section.

3P3 Describe the processes for training, educating and supporting the professional development of employees. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Providing and supporting regular professional development for all employees (3.C.4, 5.A.4)

Systematic

Professional development plans for all employees are tied to the College's mission through the strategic plan as well as to the employee's performance evaluation. The professional development plans are approved by supervisors and administration and housed within Human Resources. Types of professional development offerings include New Faculty Orientation, New Employee Orientation, and College-Wide Fall and Winter Learning Days. Full-time faculty and staff have access to tuition reimbursement as a means for pursuing additional professional development. Additional funding sources are available through the Senate Assembly for Sabbatical Leaves and Grants. It could be clearer how the processes work for determining funding allocation.

Ensuring that instructors are current in instructional content in their disciplines and pedagogical processes (3.C.4)

Systematic

A list of EDU courses are provided for faculty professional development and pedagogical improvement, but it could be clearer as to how faculty are selected/eligible for these courses. The EDU courses are briefly described in the portfolio, but Delta does not provide clear evidence that they ensure faculty are current in their instructional and disciplinary content.

Supporting student support staff members to increase their skills and knowledge in their areas of expertise (e.g. advising, financial aid, etc.) (3.C.6)

Systematic

Delta College appears to provide multiple opportunities for on-campus professional development. As of July 1, 2017, employees are required to participate in annual professional development. The hours of required development activities are twelve for full-time and six for part-time employees. These hours may be fulfilled by activities offered on campus by COS or outside of Delta with a supervisor's approval. It is not explicitly stated if this would include professional conferences or training opportunities within the discipline to ensure staff stay up-to-date within their area of expertise.

It is also not clear how the effectiveness of training activities is evaluated.

Aligning employee professional development activities with institutional objectives

Systematic

Professional development plans are developed during the year-end annual performance review for all employees. The professional development plans are reviewed by administration, Human Resources, and the COS. It could be clearer how this review process is established and how feedback is provided to the employee as a result.

Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

Systematic

The College tracks the percent of staff completing the professional development requirements as well as trends in the number of COS and FCTE offerings and attendance at each event. Limited analysis is provided concerning the process for tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools.

3R3 What are the results for determining if employees are assisted and supported in their professional development? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 3P3. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)

Reacting

The College does not yet have data on the new required professional development standards that were established last academic year. This will be an important element for the CQR team to verify in its visit next year.

Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting

Delta College does not have internal or external targets for this data.

Interpretation of results and insights gained

Reacting

Due to the lack of data and results there are no true interpretation of results or insights provided. The College does note that faculty and staff are seeking rich professional development opportunities.

3I3 Based on 3R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Delta College continues to look for subject matter experts (internally and externally) to provide content rich professional development for all employees. It could be clearer what the process currently is for seeking such subject matter experts. Delta believes it has improved the offering of professional development. The College is encouraged to gather data and monitor if the

designed system is achieving its desired outcome.

CATEGORY SUMMARY

Overall, Delta appears to be intentional in its focus on hiring and developing internal talent at all levels of the institution. The College has systems in place to hire, evaluate and offer professional development to its faculty and staff. The College is to be commended for its initiative on developing systems to hire a diverse workforce. There are several mechanisms in place to recognize employee performance, and professional development plans are aligned with institutional objectives through the annual performance evaluation. The college has developed systems to ensure institutional goals are included in its planning and evaluation systems. Still, it is difficult to determine how employee engagement and satisfaction is measured beyond the aggregate results for PACE.

There is an opportunity for Delta to identify and utilize peer comparisons and benchmarking, establish performance targets, and expand data analysis and interpretation.

CATEGORY STRATEGIC ISSUES

Generally, results are lean and are limited in terms of providing quality information that can be used to advance the institution.

The College would benefit from using its PACE results to provide a comprehensive view of employee needs and areas of opportunities.

The College has not identified a process for benchmarking its employee compensation and/or benefits to other area colleges or similar institutions. The College may find this beneficial especially in moving forward its recruiting and hiring of a diverse workforce initiative.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

IV - Planning and Leading

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

Instructions for Systems Appraisal Team

In this section, the team should provide a consensus narrative that focuses on the processes, results and improvements for Mission and Vision, Strategic Planning, Leadership and Integrity.

Independent Category Feedback for each AQIP Category from each team member should be synthesized into an in-depth narrative that includes an analysis of the institution's processes, results and quality improvement efforts for each category. Wording from the Stages in Systems Maturity tables for both processes and results should be incorporated into the narrative to help the institution understand how the maturity of processes and results have been rated. The narrative should also include recommendations to assist the institution in improving its processes and/or results. It is from this work that the team will develop a consensus on the Strategic Challenges analysis, noting three to five strategic issues that are crucial for the future of the institution. Please see additional directions in the [Systems Appraisal procedural document](#) provided by HLC.

Evidence

CATEGORY 4: PLANNING AND LEADING

Category 4 focuses on how the institution achieves its mission and vision through direction setting, goal development, strategic actions, threat mitigation and capitalizing on opportunities.

4.1: MISSION AND VISION

Mission and Vision focuses on how the institution develops, communicates and reviews its mission and vision. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 1.A., 1.B. and 1.D. within this section.

4P1 Describe the processes for developing, communicating and reviewing the institution's mission, vision and values, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Developing, deploying, and reviewing the institution's mission, vision and values (1.A.1, 1.D.2, 1.D.3)

Systematic The mission, vision, and values are updated every four years or more frequently when an annual review identifies the need for a significant change. The need for change is prompted by data collected through regular environmental scanning. The response would have been strengthened had the institution included more details describing the process by which the mission, vision and values are developed and reviewed.

Ensuring that institutional actions reflect a commitment to its values

Systematic The College's values are reinforced through its administrative policies and procedures that are listed in handbooks and procedures manuals. In some cases, proactive programs educate employees and students about the institution's values. The institution indicates that it supports values; however, how that is accomplished beyond activities is not clear.

Communicating the mission, vision and values (1.B.1, 1.B.2, 1.B.3)

Systematic The mission, vision, and values are available through a number of public documents, including Delta College's annual strategic plan and budget document, course catalog, and website. The College also communicates it during orientation days for new employees and students and other campus gatherings. Academic programs and services are consistent with the institution's mission (1.A.2)

Ensuring that academic programs and services are consistent with the institution's mission

Systematic All curriculum recommendations from the development and vetting process are reviewed by the Vice President of Instruction and Learning Services, who also notifies the President of any new developments or changes. The President, then the Board of Trustees approves new programs and the elimination of old programs. Additional description of the process would be helpful to further ascertain the level of maturity for this process.

Allocating resources to advance the institution's mission and vision, while upholding the institution's values (1.D.1, 1.A.3)

Systematic Delta's Budget Cabinet and Executive Council prioritize resource requests based on the mission, vision, and values. The finalized budget is reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees each year. However, the process by which this is accomplished is unclear. Delta may have strengthened this response by describing the budget process in greater detail. The report does not address how the college allocates resources to support current educational offerings or services provided, how longer-term projects are incorporated, or how existing facilities are maintained.

Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (e.g. brand studies, focus groups, community forums/studies and employee satisfaction surveys)

Systematic The College coordinates and references data from its environmental scanning reports, SWOT analysis, and strategic planning sessions to develop a long-term strategic plan that is ultimately approved by the Board of Trustees. The College mission, vision, and values are communicated through publicly accessible documents and websites. However, the documents and activities that are listed are not measures of outcomes and they do not track implementation and adherence to the institution's mission and vision.

4R1 What are the results for developing, communicating and reviewing the institution's mission, vision and values? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 4P1. All data

presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)

Reacting Delta College provides evidence of Board of Trustees action, environmental scans, the strategic plan cycle, and how the mission, vision, and values are communicated. However, there are not direct measures provided to show the success of this process.

Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting The College has no internal or external targets for these processes.

Interpretation of results and insights gained

Reacting Delta College indicates it has learned the original strategic planning cycle was occurring too quickly. Delta College has the opportunity to provide more information about how this process has resulted in change across the campus.

4I1 Based on 4R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Delta College plans to move forward its strategic plan and work in environmental scanning. As Delta College moves into this new strategic plan, they will revisit the use of its institutional score card, using third party survey data as part of the environmental scanning process, and implementing internal surveys through the Institutional Research Office. The improvements reported are not directly associated with continued work on mission, vision, and values. The College may move to a more systematic maturity by developing measures of the commitment to mission and vision across the institution.

4.2: STRATEGIC PLANNING

Strategic Planning focuses on how the institution achieves its mission and vision. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 5.B. and 5.C. in this section.

4P2 Describe the processes for communicating, planning, implementing and reviewing the institution's plans and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Engaging internal and external stakeholders in strategic planning (5.C.3)

Systematic External stakeholders, community leaders, employers, and peer educational institutions are part of the employee summit. The mission, vision, and values developed from this summit serve as the basis for the College's strategic plan. This process also includes College employees and members of the Board of Trustees. Delta College's strategic planning process appears to involve internal and external stakeholders, yet little is reported on the process of how these stakeholders are engaged. Aligning operations with the institution's mission, vision and values (5.C.2)

Aligning efforts across departments, divisions and colleges for optimum effectiveness and efficiency (5.B.3)

Systematic Delta has identified four strategic focus areas and action projects that support each area. Several of the College's operating areas have developed their own multi-year plans to better support, guide, and align with the College's planning process. These include a multi-year financial projection and a master facilities plan. These plans are also reflected in the College's strategic planning and budget document. The Strategic Plan is aligned with the yearly budget. However, there is limited explanation detailing the direct link to the institution's mission, vision, and values.

Capitalizing on opportunities and institutional strengths and countering the impact of institutional weaknesses and potential threats (5.C.4, 5.C.5)

Systematic Environmental scanning data are used as the basis for development of the mission, vision, values, and the strategic plan through SWOT analysis carried out by the Board of Trustees, Executive Council and the Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Steering Committee. While the College indicates that it conducts SWOT analysis, it could be clearer how the information is used to establish strategic directions and targets for improvement.

Creating and implementing strategies and action plans that maximize current resources and meet future needs (5.C.1, 5.C.4)

Systematic Delta College uses a SWOT analysis to understand strengths and future threats, which are incorporated into the four-year planning cycle and operationalized through strategic focus areas, initiatives, and action plans that are aligned with the budget. The annual budget and strategic plan, including the mission, vision, and values are all approved by the Board of Trustees. It could be clearer how Delta College addresses how fiscal considerations impact academic and student support, and how other factors impact the institution.

Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (e.g. achievement of goals and/or satisfaction with process)

Systematic The Institutional Effectiveness Report serves as a scorecard reporting an overall rating on the progress toward each focus area's goals. Each strategic focus area has multiple measures and target values. The overall rating of the focus area is determined by the College's ability to meet measured goals associated with that focus area. While the rating paradigm is described in detail, the measures are not identified.

4R2 What are the results for communicating, planning, implementing and reviewing the institution's operational plans? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 4P2. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)

Systematic The annual Strategic Planning and Budget Reports are a result of the strategic planning process. This document is produced annually and includes the strategic plan, supporting initiatives, and budget model for that year.

The long-term planning cycle includes an annual process of identifying goals, outlining initiatives, setting measurable outcomes, and developing a budget to support these activities. This directly supports the strategic planning focus areas, initiatives overview, action plans and additional

initiatives for each year. Although results are provided, there is limited context of what these results mean to Delta College.

Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting Comparison results were not provided in this section. Potential exists to show growth or change within the Institutional Effectiveness Report.

Interpretation of results and insights gained

Reacting Although there is context on a timeline for reviewing the mission, vision, and values, there are no internal targets or external benchmarks provided.

4I2 Based on 4R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

The strategic plan resulting from these activities will be implemented July 1, 2019. Executive Council has determined that the scorecard needs to be revised. The values in the scorecard will be aligned to the indicators of success for each strategic focus area in the new plan. However, it is not clear how Delta College arrived at that determination, particularly as it pertains to the results presented in this section.

4.3: LEADERSHIP

Leadership focuses on governance and leadership of the institution. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 2.C. and 5.B. in this section.

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

Establishing appropriate relationship between the institution and its governing board to support leadership and governance (2.C.4)

Systematic The relationship between the Board of Trustees and the institution is defined under Michigan law. Trustees are elected from each of the college's three county service areas to serve six-year terms. The relationship between the Board and the College is defined in its Bylaws and Operating Parameters.

Establishing oversight responsibilities and policies of the governing board (2.C.3, 5.B.1, 5.B.2)

Aligned The Delta College Board of Trustees conducts business according to its bylaws and operating parameters in compliance with state statutes. The bylaws and operating parameters address board responsibilities, obligations to the institution and conflict of interest disclosures.

Maintaining board oversight, while delegating management responsibilities to administrators and academic matters to faculty (2.C.4)

Aligned Board bylaws delegate management responsibilities for day-to-day operations of the College to the President. Faculty fulfill their responsibility by developing and delivering the curriculum. Curriculum is recommended for adoption by the Curriculum Council and is approved by the Vice

President, President and the Board of Trustees.

Ensuring open communication between and among all colleges, divisions and departments

Systematic The College uses a variety of communication methods to assure open communication. This includes public comment at board meetings, the College Senate, and campus wide communications. Additional information is also provided about different communication channels that are leveraged by the institution.

Collaborating across all units to ensure the maintenance of high academic standards (5.B.3)

Systematic Several groups are recognized with contributing to ensuring the maintenance of high academic standards. Limited information is provided as to how these different groups interact and work to ensure that high academic standards are maintained. The College also has a Senate Policy addressing Academic Freedom and the process someone should take if they believe their institutional academic freedom has been violated.

Providing effective leadership to all institutional stakeholders (2.C.1, 2.C.2)

Systematic The institution identifies how leadership is cultivated at several levels in the College. Additional information could be shared to further show how the levels are more interconnected. An opportunity exists to describe the process of providing effective leadership beyond delegation of authority.

Developing leaders at all levels within the institution

Systematic The institution identifies how leadership is cultivated at several levels in the College. The College encourages leadership among faculty, staff, and administrators in many ways. The College Senate embodies shared governance processes and has been in existence since the College's inception. The Senate includes faculty, administrative/professional staff, students, and support staff. The Senate Presidency is rotated among faculty, administrative/professional staff, and support staff.

Additional information could be shared to further show how the levels are more interconnected.

Ensuring the institution's ability to act in accordance with its mission and vision (2.C.3)

Systematic Delta College utilizes policies at three different levels to ensure it acts in accordance with its mission and vision. At a high-level Michigan state law governs open meetings at the College. The Board of Trustees has bylaws and operating parameters defining how it leads the College. It could be clearer how the College ensures that decisions are aligned with the mission and vision.

Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

Reacting The College lists expected outcomes that are not necessarily measures or tools. It is not clear what specific outcomes or measures are utilized to track the effectiveness of their processes and procedures. The institution might benefit from a set of outcomes, measurements, metrics, and tools to fully assess this area.

4R3 What are the results for ensuring long-term effective leadership of the institution? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 4P3. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation

of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)

Reacting Results provided were limited and data that was provided was limited to current members of the Senate Assembly and a listing of the different trainings that were offered by the Center for Organizational Success Programming.

Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting Delta College has not identified internal or external targets for these data. The institution could benefit from identifying internal targets and benchmarks and making comparisons against them.

Interpretation of results and insights gained

Reacting Limited information is provided and the applicability of such information has limited interpretation of results and insights gained.

4I3 Based on 4R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Delta College notes it has made revisions to the curriculum for the leadership experience program to expand leadership skills for all employees. However, the alignment between the results provided here and how institutional leadership came to that determination is not clear. Improvements in this area also include the revision of the curriculum for the leadership experience program to expand leadership skills for all employees.

4.4: INTEGRITY

Integrity focuses on how the institution ensures legal and ethical behavior and fulfills its societal responsibilities. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 2.A. and 2.B. in this section.

4P4 Describe the processes for developing and communicating legal and ethical standards and monitoring behavior to ensure standards are met. In addition, identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Developing and communicating standards

Aligned The College uses shared governance to develop and communicate operating standards that are recorded in Senate policies and procedure manuals. The Board of Trustees also revises and abides by its own bylaws and operating parameters, which include conflicts of interest policies and operating parameters.

Training employees and modeling for ethical and legal behavior across all levels of the institution

Systematic Training is offered online, and all employees are expected to participate in required training. Human Resources and the Equity Office manage the training offerings. It is not clear how

attendance is documented, when the training is offered, or how often the training is reviewed and updated.

Operating financial, academic, personnel and auxiliary functions with integrity, including following fair and ethical policies and adhering to processes for the governing board, administration, faculty and staff (2.A.)

Systematic Standards for the integrity of employees and students are listed in Senate Policies, and policies regarding transparency in reporting for the Board, campus safety, and budget performance are listed on Delta's website. While the College offers multiple policies as evidence of processes, absent are financial and administrative procedures.

Making information about programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships readily and clearly available to all constituents (2.B.)

Systematic The College reports that transparency is established by listing information on its website and in the college catalog. It could be clearer as to how certain information is identified as well as the process for determining how and when the information is reviewed and updated.

4R4 What are the results for ensuring institutional integrity? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 4P4. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)

Reacting The College believes data that show transparency act as results for this category. One example the college provides is external audits. However, more information may be necessary to gauge of institutional integrity. A more mature process might cite the results such as the number of employees who completed training for ethical or responsible conduct as reported in 4P and identifying trends in the number of disciplinary actions (if any) related to infractions of institutional ethics policies. These are the types of data that would allow the institution to be at a higher level of maturity for this area.

Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting A reference is made to 100% compliance with posting deadlines for required public information. No information is presented that provides a comparison of institutional integrity results with internal targets and external benchmarks.

Interpretation of results and insights gained

Reacting It is unclear what the institution does to interpret and act upon data gathered.

Although Delta College expresses a strong commitment to promoting and ensuring high levels of integrity across the institution, limited evidence is provided in the portfolio. The type of data that would support this claim, such as required employee training, is discussed in the process section, but is not examined further in the results section.

4I4 Based on 4R4, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

While Delta cites improvements with public webpages, these improvements are not necessarily linked to the scope and breadth of this category. Additionally, it is not clear how the webpage improvements flow directly from insights gained from data presented here.

CATEGORY SUMMARY

Overall, Delta College is at a systematic level of maturity in this Category. The College presents some evidence of a strategic planning effort that includes stakeholders from across the campus and the community. The institution has policies for integrity and ethical behavior, but how these behaviors and/or training are deployed and tracked is not clear. The establishment of a collective bargaining agreement for the faculty in January 2019 could have a significant impact on the overall operation of the institution.

The College appears to use the strategic planning process and institutional mission, vision, and values interchangeably in several sections of this Category. Although there should definitely be a close relationship between the two, it is not always clear if one subsumes the other or if there is a closer alignment between operations and the strategic plan than with the mission. Providing greater clarity on some of these processes would allow the institution to move to a higher level of maturity in multiple areas across this Category.

CATEGORY STRATEGIC ISSUES

The College reports several activities that correspond to leading and communicating. The processes often seem to be a series of activities rather than a clearly articulated and repeatable process designed to measure performance and effectiveness.

As has been seen throughout the Systems Portfolio, the College is challenged with defining processes, collecting data, and providing interpretative analyses for potential improvements.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

V - Knowledge Management and Resource Stewardship

Addresses management of the fiscal, physical, technological, and information infrastructures designed to provide an environment in which learning can thrive.

Instructions for Systems Appraisal Team

In this section, the team should provide a consensus narrative that focuses on the processes, results and improvements for Knowledge Management, Resource Management and Operational Effectiveness.

Independent Category Feedback for each AQIP Category from each team member should be synthesized into an in-depth narrative that includes an analysis of the institution's processes, results and quality improvement efforts for each category. Wording from the Stages in Systems Maturity tables for both processes and results should be incorporated into the narrative to help the institution understand how the maturity of processes and results have been rated. The narrative should also include recommendations to assist the institution in improving its processes and/or results. It is from this work that the team will develop a consensus on the Strategic Challenges analysis, noting three to five strategic issues that are crucial for the future of the institution. Please see additional directions in the [Systems Appraisal procedural document](#) provided by HLC.

Evidence

CATEGORY 5: KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT AND RESOURCE STEWARDSHIP

Category 5 addresses management of the fiscal, physical, technological and information infrastructures designed to provide an environment in which learning can thrive.

5.1: KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

Knowledge Management focuses on how data, information and performance results are used in decision-making processes at all levels and in all parts of the institution.

5P1 Describe the processes for knowledge management, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Selecting, organizing, analyzing and sharing data and performance information to support planning, process improvement and decision making

Systematic Delta College's President, Vice Presidents, and Executive Council select assessment data and key performance indicators that are informed by environmental scanning data and the strategic plan. The College reviews these data twice yearly and these data are monitored by specific departments. The College does not include in the response how data are used to inform decision-making and improvements.

Determining data, information and performance results that units and departments need to plan and manage effectively.

Systematic When departments have specific data needs that cannot be addressed within that department, data can be requested through the data report in the Office of Institutional Research. The Office of Institutional Research also works with a group of faculty and staff called the Data Ambassadors who work with other faculty and staff to help them become familiar with data already available and to provide assistance in making data requests. Technology help desk requests are monitored and managed to enable effective support and communication as the usage and the environment evolve. Overall, it does appear that data are shared, although it is not clear what data are used and what data are needed to plan and manage effectively.

Making data, information and performance results readily and reliably available to the units and departments that depend upon this information for operational effectiveness, planning and improvements

Systematic The Office of Institutional Research offers data and performance results through the College's portal as a link. "Delta Data for Decisions" offers an overview of the data types that are available within Delta College and sources that are necessary to make informed decisions. The Delta College dashboard presents key performance measures for quick reference by Delta employees.

Ensuring the timeliness, accuracy, reliability and security of the institution's knowledge management system(s) and related processes

Systematic Delta College continuously works to improve the security of the computer network and information systems that are housed on campus and in the cloud. Delta College evaluates the network and information systems by utilizing information security standards. As new systems are developed and legacy systems updated, the departments within the College work together to test and ensure the accuracy of the systems and the data they collect and distribute. It could be clearer how these processes ensure timeliness of the management system process overall.

Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (including software platforms and/or contracted services)

Reacting Delta College does not provide a response for this item.

5R1 What are the results for determining how data, information and performance results are used in decision-making processes at all levels and in all parts of the institution? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 5P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)

Reacting Delta provides examples of several reports but does not provide measures of its systems. This makes it difficult to determine how the institution is using all of the data that is gathered and determine which data are appropriate for decision makers or how it evaluates the use of the data.

Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting The College uses the data presented to inform all levels of the College. One of the primary uses is to use the dashboard to gauge the credit hour production as compared to established targets for credit hours. While Delta explains how those targets are set, there were no targets or benchmarks provided.

Interpretation of results and insights gained

Reacting Except for a brief interpretation of the data dashboard and an increase in data usage, Delta provides no meaningful interpretations as it relates to performance of its data reporting security and decision-making systems.

5I1 Based on 5R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

With the increasing prevalence of technology and the fact that Delta College outsources information technology operations to Ellucian, the President established a new position, Director of Information Technology Services, to act as a liaison between the College and Ellucian. The iData Data Cookbook continues to make a foothold at Delta College, although it has required a larger than expected culture shift.

Over the next year, the College will be strengthening its data steward model to better reflect the responsibilities. The function will be focusing more on data quality and accuracy than developing and entering definitions into the system.

Similar to other areas of the portfolio, Delta College misses the opportunity to connect the cited improvement to the processes or results presented in this section.

5.2: RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Resource Management focuses on how the resource base of an institution supports and improves its educational programs and operations. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 5.A. in this section.

5P2 Describe the processes for managing resources, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Maintaining fiscal, physical and technological infrastructures sufficient to support operations (5.A.1)

Systematic College's strategic plan is built in the context of a four-year budget forecast which considers long-term plans for the maintenance and advancement of both College facilities and technological capabilities while remaining fiscally sustainable. The four-year budget forecast is built by the Vice President of Business and Finance. The College reports that the budget supports the mission of the College, and that 60% of the general fund expenditures are allocated for instruction and instructional support. The College also reports how technology infrastructure is maintained and that the physical infrastructure is supported. No long-term forecasting or funding source by revenue stream information is provided, however.

Setting goals aligned with the institutional mission, resources, opportunities and emerging needs (5.A.3)

Systematic Executive Council and President's Cabinet are responsible for setting goals and assuring that they are aligned with the College's mission and available resources. This is done in the context of a SWOT analysis and other forms of environmental scanning that are performed as part of Delta College's strategic planning process. It could be clearer how these forms of scanning are aligned with the College's needs and goals and how planning processes and emerging needs are incorporated into the College's approach in setting goals aligned and funding goals to its mission.

Allocating and assigning resources to achieve organizational goals, while ensuring that educational purposes are not adversely affected (5.A.2)

Systematic The strategic planning process is identified and resources are allocated and assigned.

Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

Reacting No tools are identified to measure Delta's effectiveness in managing data and information or in maintaining physical infrastructure. With the exception of the Sustainability Measures table in the Institutional Effectiveness Report, the institutional scorecard and action project information are not relevant to this Category. Long-term approaches are also not included.

5R2 What are the results for resource management? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 5P2. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)

Reacting Delta provides its annual budgets, facilities-specific allocations, and sustainability measures, but no measures are presented to assess the effectiveness of the funding process. No tools are identified, and no data are provided to gauge the timeliness, accuracy, reliability, and security of the knowledge management system.

Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Reacting There is no indication that Delta College has established internal targets for its costs or revenues in each of its functional areas, nor has it identified external benchmarks in its comparisons.

Interpretation results and insights gained

Reacting There is little evidence of interpretation and use of data to make decisions. For example, according to the College's auditors, Delta's instructional and instructional support expenditures average about 5% higher than its peer comparison group. Unfortunately, this statement is not accompanied by any interpretation or insight.

5I2 Based on 5R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Delta College agreed to implement an employee severance package in order to expedite staffing levels through an incentive to exit the College. This incentive initiative is a part of the College's long-term sustainability actions to support College resources available for compensation. Over the next three years, the College will be monitoring total compensation and staffing levels, since this is the largest expenditure of their budget, to align with available revenue sources. However, this

information was not mentioned previous to these improvements.

5.3: OPERATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Operational Effectiveness focuses on how an institution ensures effective management of its operations in the present and plans for continuity of operations into the future. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 5.A. in this section.

5P3 Describe the processes for operational effectiveness, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Building budgets to accomplish institutional goals

Aligned Delta College has a multi-tiered process for establishing its annual budget. Department heads submit funding requests, that must be linked to a strategic focus area, to Budget Cabinet. Budget Cabinet makes prioritized recommendations to the President and Executive Council for budget allocations, changes in tuition, fees, and other budget-related issues, broken down into one-time expenditures and on-going funding needs. The Board of Trustees approved the strategic plan and budget each July, with budget group leaders then providing quarterly expenditure reports throughout the following budget year.

Monitoring financial position and adjusting budgets (5.A.5)

Systematic Delta College reports that its decentralized approach allows for department managers to monitor its expenditures. Real-time online financial reports are available for managers to use in decision making, and a written quarterly and annual budget accountability process ensures accountability and responsibility in financial management at the departmental level. The Board receives monthly reports regarding the College's financial position.

Maintaining a technological infrastructure that is reliable, secure and user-friendly

Systematic Delta College's process for maintaining its technological infrastructures contains tasks that are explicit and routinely conducted. The college relies upon its administrative computing system, Ellucian. Over the past year Delta has made a major migration from Colleague proprietary databases to Microsoft SQL based tables. IT requests are tracked and satisfaction surveys are distributed.

An opportunity for growth may include greater analysis on how the technological infrastructure meets the needs of the students.

Maintaining a physical infrastructure that is reliable, secure and user-friendly

Systematic Delta College's facilities management team files an annual five-year capital outlay plan with the State of Michigan. This five-year plan accounts for the conditions of the College's current facilities, current replacement values and strategic planning initiatives. This is required to qualify for state-based capital outlay funding. The long-term capital outlay plan is developed based on age and condition of the building infrastructure and strategic need.

Additional information could be provided to address how the college maintains a safe and secure campus outside facilities, such as secure access to buildings or accessible to persons with disabilities.

Managing risks to ensure operational stability, including emergency preparedness

Systematic Delta College utilizes a Crisis Management Plan, Crisis Communication Plan, and Behavioral Intervention Review Board, which include procedures to protect students, staff, and employees. These include use of defined protocols to evaluate inclement weather conditions and hostile intruder situations. Communications can be distributed through email, the public address system, and a subscription to Delta College's texting service, Nixle.

Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

Systematic Delta College has a five-year capital outlay plan that is updated annually. However, there is little description of how outcomes and measures are tracked longitudinally to denote long-term progress that is being made in this area.

5R3 What are the results for ensuring effective management of operations on an ongoing basis and for the future? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 5P3. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)

Systematic Evidence documents are provided but there is not summary of results. Delta does have data related to this section that includes tuition and fees, costs per student headcount, etc. This data could also be used in comparison with other institutions. It is unclear how this data is used to make decisions nor a qualitative summary.

Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Systematic The College utilizes various data points to analyze operations. Trends are tracked internally to predict future operational costs and set targets. External data is used to compare Delta College to other Michigan community colleges and those surrounding four-year institutions within or near the Great Lakes Bay Region.

Interpretation of results and insights gained

Reacting The College provides interpretation of a data set that was not presented in 5R3 data sets. There is no indication that processes are in place for all of the measures to be assessed in the aggregate that presents an institutional level of operational effectiveness.

An example that was provided by Delta College was that it needed to realign staffing levels to reflect a smaller student population. However, there are no data in this section provided in these areas, so it is not clear how the institution made this determination from the results provided here.

5I3 Based on 5R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Within the next two years, the Delta College facilities department will have an updated assessment of College facilities. The College implemented a facilities work order system. The system will better provide the College with operating efficiencies and long-term planning as it relates to the infrastructure of our facilities. The collection of data will take approximately a full two to three years

before data can be measured and analyzed.

CATEGORY SUMMARY

The College has infrastructure in place related to technology and facilities.

Delta College has identified processes to create and maintain their budget in what appears to be a difficult funding period for Delta. Budgeting does align with the College's mission, vision, and values and is tracked regularly by Delta.

The Board of Trustees is involved in the review and stewardship process of the College's strategic planning and budgeting.. The processes seem to be at a systematic level but the results sections continue to lack clarity and in some cases any results at all.

CATEGORY STRATEGIC ISSUES

Delta may consider how to transparently report its processes to identify and use data in its decision making, identify internal targets and external benchmarks, and analyze the results for continuous improvement in this area. Results sections appear to indicate that the data and results exist, but they are not clearly described or supported.

Declining enrollment, reductions in state funding, and over-staffing have created financial challenges that the College is seeking to counter through a voluntary severance package for employees. More generally, the College recognizes that it has an opportunity to focus on cost-effective operations. As a cost-effective measure, managers of cost centers have recently gained the ability to track revenues and expenses in real time.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

VI - Quality Overview

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

Instructions for Systems Appraisal Team

In this section, the team should provide a consensus narrative that focuses on the processes, results and improvements for Quality Improvement Initiatives and Culture of Quality.

Independent Category Feedback for each AQIP Category from each team member should be synthesized into an in-depth narrative that includes an analysis of the institution's processes, results and quality improvement efforts for each category. Wording from the Stages in Systems Maturity tables for both processes and results should be incorporated into the narrative to help the institution understand how the maturity of processes and results have been rated. The narrative should also include recommendations to assist the institution in improving its processes and/or results. It is from this work that the team will develop a consensus on the Strategic Challenges analysis, noting three to five strategic issues that are crucial for the future of the institution. Please see additional directions in the [Systems Appraisal procedural document](#) provided by HLC.

Evidence

CATEGORY 6: QUALITY OVERVIEW

Category 6 focuses on the Continuous Quality Improvement culture and infrastructure of the institution. This category gives the institution a chance to reflect on all its quality improvement initiatives, how they are integrated and how they contribute to improvement of the institution.

6.1: QUALITY IMPROVEMENT INITIATIVES

Quality Improvement Initiatives focuses on the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) initiatives the institution is engaged in and how they work together within the institution.

6P1 Describe the processes for determining and integrating CQI initiatives, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Selecting, deploying and evaluating quality improvement initiatives

Systematic Delta College chooses its quality improvement initiatives through the processes used to identify its mission, vision, values, strategic plan, and budget. These are all important components, but the larger process by which quality improvement initiatives are selected, deployed, and evaluated is not clear.

Aligning the Systems Portfolio, Action Projects, Comprehensive Quality Review and Strategy Forums

Systematic Delta College reports that its participation in the AQIP pathway has led to quality work, using AQIP-related activities as tools to support the planning process and many of the strategic action projects have been aligned as AQIP action projects.

6R1 What are the results for continuous quality improvement initiatives? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 6P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared.

Reacting As Delta College identifies its internal targets as being met, the goals were raised to encourage the next round of improvement. In cases where targets were not met, additional data was gathered to gain understanding and plans were modified to include this additional information. However, while Delta College indicates targets were met and raised, these appear to be related to individual initiatives and not the larger quality improvement program as a whole.

6I1 Based on 6R1, what quality improvement initiatives have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Use of the HLC AQIP process has helped the College align, integrate, and document its key quality improvement processes and results. The College reports that it will continue to use an informed approach to meet its Strategic Plan and move forward with action-oriented work. However, many improvements that have been made could be clearer.

6.2: CULTURE OF QUALITY

Culture of Quality focuses on how the institution integrates continuous quality improvement into its culture. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 5.D. in this section.

6P2 Describe how a culture of quality is ensured within the institution. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Developing an infrastructure and providing resources to support a culture of quality

Systematic Delta College's Institutional Research Office reports to the Executive Director of Administrative Services and Institutional Effectiveness to help with data reporting and identify the opportunities for improvement while working within a continuous quality improvement (CQI) framework.

Ensuring continuous quality improvement is making an evident and widely understood impact on institutional culture and operations (5.D.1)

Reacting Delta College indicates the Executive Director of Administrative Services and Institutional Effectiveness directs strategic planning in a manner that supports the institution's scorecard and dashboard. However, the process by which this occurs, and how this makes it evident and widely understood and having an impact on institutional culture and operations is not entirely clear.

Ensuring the institution learns from its experiences with CQI initiatives (5.D.2)

Systematic Through the leadership of the President, Executive Director of Administrative Services and

Institutional Effectiveness, Strategic Planning and Institutional Effective Steering Committee, Executive Council, and President's Cabinet review how CQI tools such as scorecards and institutional success metrics are used to facilitate discussions for identifying, implementing, and reviewing strategic initiatives.

Reviewing, reaffirming and understanding the role and vitality of the AQIP Pathway within the institution

Reacting Delta College's commitment to quality principles and the AQIP Pathway is inculcated by processes supporting the institutional strategic planning process and is reaffirmed through professional development opportunities for College leadership positions that are responsible for helping to apply these principles in the spirit of continuous improvement. However, Delta College does not report a process, but instead a reflection of its commitment to the AQIP Pathway.

6R2 What are the results for continuous quality improvement to evidence a culture of quality? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 6P2. All data presented should include the population studied, the response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared.

Systematic Several examples are provided of quality improvement projects but include limited data illustrating how the projects are implemented or measured. These advances reflect a move away from a siloed operational style and provide evidence that the College is moving toward a more mature culture of quality. However, Delta College could benefit from providing more than a mere description of how the institution is devoted to developing more detailed process maps, identifying College-level measures, and developing a more accessible data reporting system.

6I2 Based on 6R2, what process improvements to the quality culture have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three year?

Recent improvements include professional development opportunities in process mapping and data use, alignment between indicators for the Strategic Plan and the institutional mission, and improved access and use of data. Comparisons have been typically limited to broadly defined measurements that can be found through the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), National Community College Benchmarking Project (NCCBP), and Voluntary Framework of Accountability (VFA). Measures do not always align and thus limits the College's ability to make appropriate inferences about its performance.

CATEGORY SUMMARY

Delta has provided a list of "healthy" projects that fit within the confines of quality improvement. Providing greater details into these projects would further reinforce the institutions commitment but also generate data sets that can be used throughout the portfolio. The data appears to be collected, and more time should be spent on working with the data to see how it can be applied to their quality initiatives. There are also very limited results presented about the actual processes, as any results are more focused to individual quality initiatives highlighted elsewhere within the Systems Portfolio. Delta College is systematic in its processes that support a developing culture of quality across the institution. The College's improvement initiatives have focused on process mapping and improved data reporting. Further maturation will require additional work in strengthening assessment of processes, benchmarking, analysis, interpretation, and reporting.

CATEGORY STRATEGIC ISSUES

Missing from this category are the details of how the work (or direction) of continuous quality improvement is carried out by the institution at the leadership level and the various work groups/committees across the College.

Results are not linked to the College's continuous improvement approach and how it makes institutional quality a priority.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

