

Systems Appraisal Feedback Report

Completed in Response to a Systems Portfolio Submitted by

JOHNSON COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE 1285

August 31, 2017

TEAM CHAIR
PAMELA MONACO
TEAM MEMBERS
TONETTE BALDIN
MICHAEL BERNDT
ELLEN RIELY HAUSER
ROBERT STANLEY
DONNA WOODS

Higher Learning Commission

Contents

I. Reflective Overview	1
II. Strategic Challenges Analysis	1
III. AQIP Category Feedback	1
IV. Criteria for Accreditation Evidence Screening	1
V. Quality of the Systems Portfolio	1
VI. Using the Systems Appraisal Feedback Report	1
APPENDIX A: Stages in Systems Maturity	1
APPENDIX B: AQIP Category Feedback	1
APPENDIX C: Criteria for Accreditation & Core Component Evidence Screening	1

I. Reflective Overview

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

Reflective Overview Statement

The population of Johnson County, KS, is among the most highly educated in the country; 52% of the residents have a bachelor's degree or higher, compared to a national average of 28%. Within the state, Johnson County Community College (JCCC) is the largest community and technical college with a credit FTE of over 10,493 and a credit headcount over 19,000. 76% of the students reside in the county, and 68% attend school part-time. The institution offers approximately 116 associate degree and certificate options in approximately 50 areas of study. JCCC also serves the county through its large continuing education division, offering the largest workforce development program in the region, as well as high school equivalency and English as a Second Language programs.

Category Summary Statements

1. **Helping Students Learn:** In 2014 JCCC implemented strategic goals and tasks to support its mission to "transform lives and strengthen communities." The strategic focus since 2014 has been on 1) student success, 2) agile responses to stakeholder needs, 3) communication of JCCC's program offerings, and 4) efficient use of college resources. The College defines student success through a series of metrics that include student satisfaction, retention, persistence, graduation, and transfer rates. When planning curricula, JCCC is expected to adhere to a state curriculum alignment program required by the Kansas Board of Regents Recent. CQI efforts have focused on assessment of course and general education learning outcomes, program review, and transfer processes. Structures exist to facilitate these processes including an Office of Outcomes Assessment. Despite extensive program review and assessment processes, the collection and use of assessment data for continuous improvement has not been uniformly carried out.
2. **Meeting Student & Other Key Stakeholder Needs:** As a comprehensive, open access, public institution, JCCC serves a wide variety of stakeholders that include degree-seeking students, business and industry partners, students with less than a high-school diploma, and community members looking for personal enrichment or career updates. The College is also expected to align with the Kansas Board of Regents goals for enrollment. Recent CQI efforts

have focused on strategic enrollment management, a guided pathway program to increase student access to counseling and advising, and stronger external partnerships within the Division of Continuing Education. Key performance indicators (KPIs) and monthly scorecards monitor progress.

- 3. Valuing Employees:** JCCC employs 310 full-time faculty, 561 part-time faculty, and 588 full-time and 844 part-time staff. In the past few years, JCCC has implemented a variety of new processes to analyze employee satisfaction, engagement, and credentialing. Recent improvements include an updated faculty onboarding experience, a new performance management system, and a credentialing compliance audit of all faculty. In response to HLC feedback, the Employee Engagement Survey was implemented in 2014 (p 75 says 2015) and its second iteration was completed spring 2017. Budgeting for faculty positions is integrated within the program review process. A collective bargaining institution, JCCC was recognized by *The Chronicle of Higher Education* in 2013 as a top institution of higher education to work for in the country.
- 4. Planning and Leading:** The College completed a comprehensive update of its mission, vision, values, and strategic plan in 2013-14, with extensive input from the community, students, faculty and staff, resulting in 13 specific initiatives. In addition to internal communication of the mission, vision, and values, the College's annual report is shared with the external community. Overseen by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Planning, and Research, strategic planning for 2017-2020 was in process as the portfolio was being written. The Office of General Counsel oversees the Policy and Procedures Committee and multi-level review process of all new or revised college policies and procedures. Standing and governing committees make recommendations to the Board of Trustees. It is not entirely clear that AQIP projects and strategic planning are fully integrated.
- 5. Knowledge Management & Resource Stewardship:** JCCC utilizes an array of tools to foster data-driven decisions. These tools include a SEM dashboard, KPIs, regular program review data sets, a College scorecard, and multiple enterprise data systems where centralized storage of data occurs. Cabinet meetings include scheduled CQI time. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Planning and Research has the primary responsibility of distributing data reports, and budgeting data are provided monthly by the Office of Financial Services. Snapshots of data for in-process metrics are generated monthly and distributed to campus leadership. JCCC's primary sources of revenue are local property taxes, State of Kansas funding, and student tuition and fees. The College's Board of Trustees has authority to set the tax levy amount and to set tuition rates. A five-year budget projection is used for

longer-range planning purposes. While these tools would seem to focus the College on its performance, it is unclear whether the College has identified measures for the processes for knowledge management and resource stewardship.

6. **Quality Overview:** A 2014 strategy forum served as a platform for committing to the alignment of KPIs and AQIP efforts to strategic planning. Leaders across the institutions are highly involved with the development and revision of processes tied to this alignment. AQIP projects are now created from KPI initiatives and strategic planning goals and tasks. Linking these processes has given the College a better mechanism to concentrate resources on common needs. It is unclear, however, whether the College has identified measures for evaluating both its CQI culture and the process of alignment. A cross walk of AQIP projects to the strategic goals/tasks would be helpful in seeing this alignment.

II. Strategic Challenges Analysis

In reviewing the entire Systems Portfolio, the Systems Appraisal team was able to discern what may be several overarching strategic challenges or potential issues that could affect the institution's ability to succeed in reaching its mission, planning, and overall quality improvement goals. These judgments are based exclusively on information available in the Systems Portfolio and thus may be limited. Each item should be revisited in subsequent AQIP Pathway reviews, such as during the comprehensive evaluation in Year 8.

Strategic Challenge: The College collects data but does not provide sufficient indication that it uses data systematically to provide continuous improvement in its operations. It is not consistently clear how the College determines what data to collect, how to analysis and share the data, and how to incorporate the data analysis into a continuous improvement plan. Johnson County Community College may wish to expand its use of internal targets and external benchmarks across all its operations in order to provide meaningful milestones for achievement and celebration. The College may also wish to expand the type of tools it uses to gather data. The Program Review appears to be the favored tool by which to gather information and is being used as a model for developing processes for areas beyond the academic. The College may want to consider that a single tool limits the analysis that can be performed, and this limitation could impede the College's ability to gain a global picture of operations and performance

Strategic Challenge: The College had developed processes, procedures, and protocols to guide operations, direct resources, and provide a supportive and appropriate environment and facilities for its various stakeholders to participate in the mission of the college. The College has not demonstrated, however, that it explicitly and periodically reviews its own processes for improvement. Establishing processes that are explicit and repeatable is an important accomplishment in the effective and efficient operations of a complex organization. Processes result in outcomes, and these outcomes must be analyzed to determine if the processes led to the outcomes intended. In other words, the loop must be closed. The Systems Portfolio provided evidence of the development and implementation of processes. Various types of data were also presented. Not clearly evident was evidence that the College made explicit connections between the two and determined how the process led to the results, or did not lead to the results. For example, a change could be made in registration processes. The change was implemented with the expectation of achieving certain outcomes. Some of the outcomes may have been achieved, some not. A review of the changes to the processes *and* the results could suggest some additional changes that yield additional results. This constant review and readjustment based on results “closes the loop.” The periodic review of processes allows the institution to collect meaningful data to continue the cycle of continuous improvement. An institution cannot know that it is a high performing organization if it does not periodically and consistently evaluate its methods of operation.

Strategic Challenge: As the third largest higher education institution in the state of Kansas, Johnson County Community College is an organization with complex horizontal and vertical hierarchies and structures. In such a structure, silos are almost inevitable. Being mindful of this challenge, JCCC may find it beneficial to more intentionally increase and improve its communication strategies. It is not clear from the systems portfolio how the entire community shares information across teams and functions. Periodic information from the president’s office is not enough to create and sustain a cohesive community that feels invested and engaged with the college. The good work of teams and units can be shared as best practices that can improve the efficiency of all units, and cross functional communication builds stronger units as it improves morale.

III. AQIP Category Feedback

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

Results, and Improvement items included in the institution's Systems Portfolio. The summary feedback below, and the detailed feedback offered in Appendix B, is based only upon evidence conveyed in the Systems Portfolio. It is possible that the institution has additional information on specific processes, results and improvements that was not included in the Systems Portfolio. In such instances, the institution should plan to provide this evidence in a future AQIP Pathway review process.

Category 1: Helping Students Learn

JCCC's current level of maturity is **systematic**. JCCC operates with the intent to help students learn. Processes and policies are aligned to support the mission and goals of the institution. The College recognizes the need to collect data, communicate results and analyze information for improvement. JCCC strengths include well defined processes for assessment at the program level. JCCC uses an established program design and review process for adding new or changing programs and courses. The College also maintains strong academic support programs, and is planning initiatives to further enhance counseling and advising. JCCC values academic integrity, quality, and rigor as demonstrated by established policies and procedures for faculty and students.

The College could improve the processes for institutional and general education outcomes. JCCC's challenges in this area are clearly defining and communicating the different student outcomes and aligning course, program, general education and institutional outcomes. The College has the opportunity to further refine the assessment of College and program level outcomes and to establish both benchmarks and targets to provide direction on next steps in the continuous improvement cycle. Although JCCC has many excellent activities listed, activities are not the same as a complete process. For example, many of the activities in this category do not have clear evaluation methods to guide improvements, which is an essential requirement of a **process**. Reported results are often shared at high levels within the College, and it is unclear how those results are informing planned improvements. In order to be effective in increasing maturity levels, processes must include clear evaluation methods to help guide future improvements. JCCC has shown commitment to the use of AQIP projects to improve some of these processes.

Each of the categories in the AQIP Systems Portfolio is designed to encourage institutions to articulate the goals of their processes; describe the processes; present the outcome, process, and satisfaction measures used to evaluate performance; and share the insights gained through analysis of results that then inform further planned improvements. The connections between these sections of each category were often unclear in this portfolio. For example, planned improvements were often based on general best practices rather than an understanding of the College's own performance results.

Definition and connection of institutional outcomes, common outcomes, general education outcomes, and program outcomes were not clearly defined. Most JCCC processes in Category 1 did not show clear evaluation procedures nor how the results are used to inform improvements.

Category 2: Meeting Student & Other Key Stakeholder Needs

JCCC is committed to student success and to meeting the needs of its external communities. The College recognizes the importance of quality academic programs and uses the measures of retention, persistence and completion to track program viability at the College. The academic programs across the College are aligned to improve processes used to meet the needs of the students and key stakeholder. The KBOR Performance Agreement provides pertinent information on initiatives that have been taken to address student persistence and support, yet none of these initiatives were included in the portfolio.

The College has a number of processes and systems, but JCCC does not provide a process for evaluating these processes or systems. However, the College is making strides to improve the process for receiving, resolving, and learning from student complaints. The College has a formalized complaint process for students along with other constituents. Providing an avenue for individuals other than students with informative access on the complaint website could not only improve the process but also provide valuable insights for strengthening services. Unfortunately, the Portfolio provides limited clarity regarding how processes across the College are evaluated. Providing more detail about key initiatives that address identified areas for improvement and providing evidence that processes are evaluated for continuous improvement will enable the College to improve its maturity level beyond the **systematic**.

The complaint process needs to continue as a priority. The lack of process on how to handle complaints leaves the College vulnerable in our current environment. Distributing lessons learned will help the entire College respond most appropriately and continue to make improvements. Equally, the College would be well served to determine meaningful benchmarks and targets for most of the work it performs. It is hard to celebrate success when there are no goals to compare results against. People and institutions are motivated by goals, and resources, human and otherwise, can be best utilized when results can be measured against expectations.

While the College demonstrates and uses results for each item in Category 2, JCCC should consider evaluation methods for **processes** that are in place.

Category 3: Valuing Employees

JCCC has shown strengths in developing opportunities for professional development for faculty and staff. The commitment of an Office for Staff/Organizational Development demonstrates the College believes in the value of development. The College structure enhances the growth, retention, evaluation, and recruitment of its employees through a number of opportunities and benefits. It appears, however, that the College has focused more on the opportunities and less on building an entire process that includes an evaluation for implementing future improvements. The next step would be to provide an overall analysis of the alignment of all of these activities with their strategic planning, targeting, and benchmarking.

JCCC is encouraged to review AQIP's principles of process improvement and the need for evaluation of all processes. Developing the means of evaluation of all processes would move the College from a **systematic** to an **aligned** stage of maturity

Category 4: Planning and Leading

JCCC provides a number of activities and initiatives that address the level of the College's strategic planning, mission and vision, leadership, and integrity processes that occur at the College-wide scope. However, there is a consistent pattern of unclear evaluations of the processes. The Portfolio could add detail to better address and describe how the processes and results provide detailed evidence of compliance. The College could benefit by providing a broader scale of evidence for results of continuous quality improvement.

In addition, the College appears to use the College's program review process extensively as evidence of improvement in this section and throughout the Portfolio. The Systems Portfolio would be more complete if the College provided information about how the College, its divisions and the departments align and function to improve processes and results. Additionally, JCCC could have expanded its discussion about its integrity practices and how these specific policies and guidelines are established. It is not clear how the College monitors compliance by faculty, staff, and students with the various policies, and it is not clear how new employees are made fully aware of codes of conduct.

This category lacks substance regarding its processes and its collection of data. Patterns of activities and initiatives are provided for various sub-categories, but the process descriptions often do not include how the processes are assessed for effectiveness. JCCC does not make use of setting benchmarks and targets as a means for continuous improvement. Establishing these could help the College in goal setting and realizing successes. The level of maturity for Category 4 is **systematic**.

Category 5: Knowledge Management & Resource Stewardship

The College has made improvements in processes like program review and budget development and in supporting technologies like an enterprise data warehouse. These improvements may strengthen the College's ability to manage knowledge and campus resources. It is unclear, however, whether the college aggregates measures of effectiveness and reviews them regularly to inform planning and improvement; current effectiveness processes appear to be *ad hoc* or in the early stages of becoming regular and systematic.

JCCC has a number of commendable activities and procedures included in this Category that are moving the College into greater financial, physical, and technological security. Evaluating and analyzing these areas for effectiveness are essential to a complete process cycle. It appears in some cases that this evaluation and analysis may actually be happening; however, it is not always clear from the portfolio narrative that this is the case, and this reflects a **systematic** level of maturity. JCCC demonstrates evidence for evaluation and communication of their budget and other financial processes. The College is improving processes and incorporating tools that will help inform decision-making for their technological and facilities areas. Their emergency preparedness operations provide processes for informing the College community.

A consistent theme is the lack of thoroughly demonstrating an evaluation of processes the College is implementing. In addition, the College does not provide evidence that it is actively engaged in benchmarking and targeting in this category. Establishing protocols for evaluating the effectiveness of processes periodically, consistently, and with the outcome of using this evaluation of given processes to improve the processes and systems would move the College from a **systematic** to an **aligned** system of maturity.

Category 6: Quality Overview

Overall, Johnson County Community College operates at a **systematic** level of maturity. JCCC demonstrates a strong commitment to continuous quality improvement. Senior administration and the Board devote time and resources to the implementation and monitoring of projects intended to improve College operations and the student experience. Including measures of the culture and infrastructure may help the College to evaluate and improve its quality systems. Such measures may include understanding of CQI and the AQIP Pathway, stakeholder participation, process satisfaction and outcomes, and so on.

While JCCC provides several examples of areas engaged in continuous quality improvement, it does not describe the college-wide systems that provide the CQI infrastructure for these examples. The portfolio states that these systems exist, but they are not described as processes. For example,

clarifying the larger processes through which CQI initiatives are identified, and how information about those projects is communicated beyond the Cabinet may help to illustrate the mechanisms through which JCCC fosters a CQI culture. Addressing these strategic issues would establish an **aligned** level of maturity.

IV. Criteria for Accreditation Evidence Screening

The Systems Appraisal team screened the institution's Systems Portfolio evidence in relation to the Criteria for Accreditation and the Core Components. This step is designed to position the institution for success during its comprehensive evaluation in Year 8. In order to accomplish this task, HLC has established linkages between the Systems Portfolio's Process and Results items and the Criteria's Core Components. Systems Appraisal teams have been trained to conduct a "soft review" of the Criteria and Core Components for Systems Portfolios completed in the third year of the AQIP Pathway cycle and a more robust review for Systems Portfolios completed in the seventh year. The formal review of the Criteria and Core Components for purposes of reaffirming the institution's accreditation occurs only in the eighth year of the cycle and is completed through the comprehensive evaluation, unless serious problems are identified earlier in the cycle. As part of this Systems Appraisal screening process, teams indicate whether each Core Component is "Strong, clear, and well-presented"; "Adequate but could be improved"; or "Unclear or incomplete." When the Criteria and Core Components are reviewed formally for reaffirmation of accreditation, peer reviewers must determine whether each is "Met," "Met with concerns," or "Not met."

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

Criterion 1. Mission:

JCCC is one of the leading community colleges in the nation. As a comprehensive community college, the mission reflects its commitment to meeting the needs of the diverse audience it serves: full and part-time students seeking certificates, associate degrees, or skill enhancement; community and work-force training and education; online and on-ground students; and community education and enrichment. The interdisciplinary Strategic Enrollment Team (SET) assists the College in addressing

the needs of these populations and meeting enrollment goals. The College operates within the Kansas Board of Regent system. The College has recently reviewed its mission and vision, and its operations reflect its mission to “inspire learning to transform lives and strengthen communities.”

Criterion 2. Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

Johnson County Community College has systems and processes in place to guide and maintain ethical conduct in the behavior and actions of staff, students, faculty, administrator, and its Board of Trustees. Through contracts with outside vendors, the College provides the opportunity for both internal and external constituencies to report concerns about the behavior and actions of representatives of the College. The College may wish to develop processes that enhance the College’s ability to collect and analyze data such as student integrity violations and hearings, hotline reporting, Title IX complaints, and other concerns expressed and reported with regards to ethical and responsible conduct. It is not clear that the College systematically reviews all such inquires and complaints with the intention of determining systemic improvements. Setting benchmarks and targets for improvement could help the College achieve this purpose.

Criterion 3. Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support

JCCC provides descriptions of the various communities it serves and the constantly changing environment in which it operates. Its support for teaching and learning reflects the needs of the contemporary workforce, the faculty (both full and part-time), and the types of students it serves, from the academically underprepared to the honor student, from the on ground to the online student, from the technical certificate student to the community member engaged in an enrichment class. The College offers a variety of resources and support for all its students, staff, and faculty. The College could enhance its operations and efficiencies, however, by assessing how these resources and services are used and whether the use of these services and resources improves student learning. It is unclear how the College encourages use of services other than by making the resources known to students, faculty and staff. If the College does have processes to improve the usage of services by those who most could benefit, the College may want to determine if these processes do in fact ensure services are being used. Likewise, it is unclear if students actually benefit from the services provided. Developing the process to determine student success and persistence as tied to use of resources and then collecting the data would enable the College to direct its efforts to those resources that seem to most improve student learning. Likewise, capturing data on orientation and staff development would provide the College the opportunity to tailor its programs to the ever-changing needs and interests of its workforce.

Criterion 4. Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

JCCC demonstrates an appreciation for course, program, and institutional assessment. The program review process has been developed and guides curriculum to keep it current and appropriate to the academic field and the needs of its students. Learning outcomes exist at the course, program, and institutional level. However, the College has the opportunity to more broadly determine educational goals, to develop consistent assessment processes, and to use data effectively. The Systems Portfolio appears to conflate general education and College-wide learning outcomes. Although general education learning outcomes will support institutional outcomes, they are discrete and separate and should be assessed differently. The College may want to use curriculum mapping to determine the alignment of course, program, and institutional learning outcomes. As the College continues its commitment to data collection and analysis, it may wish to track the assessment of student achievement of outcomes across the career pathway to gain better insights into the barriers to student persistence. These types of assessments may allow the College to set benchmarks of performance across many different levels of achievement and dedicate targeted resources to consistently raising the expectations for student performance and persistence rates.

Criterion 5. Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

Johnson County Community College is to be commended for the tight alignment of the budgeting process with strategic priorities and the College planning process. JCCC endeavors to use KPIs for greater effectiveness in assessing presidential performance, in reviewing requests, and in planning facility and technology updates and usage. As noted elsewhere, however, the College could improve its planning and institutional effectiveness by adjusting some processes. One of the key opportunities is through communication. Throughout the Systems Portfolio, it was clear that important conversations occur at various levels, but the conversations appear to be along horizontal structures, and less frequently is important information filtered consistently throughout the organization. When employees believe transparency is in place, they begin to develop more trust and feel more invested in the institution.

The College may also benefit from the further development of key metrics, including establishing benchmarks and targets. It is much harder to demonstrate improvement if baseline performance metrics are not in place. These baseline performance numbers can be crucial in terms of resource allocation and strategic planning, as timelines for growth, improvement, or economizing can be tied to changes to the baseline. Likewise, setting concrete numbers of percentage change can keep an institution on target for success, as guesswork in terms of change is largely eliminated. As the

College continues to grow and venture into new academic offerings or new modalities, setting targets become crucial for project planning and realizing success.

Finally, a strong recommendation: use more than one model for evaluation in diverse areas. As demonstrated in the Portfolio, this process allows programs to thoughtfully plan for the future, to provide data for requests for change, and to be held to the same standards as other programs. The program review model may be successfully use in one area, but triangulation of methods may provide strength in building a culture of assessment and accountability across all units. As this feedback should make clear, evaluating the effectiveness of any process is a key part of continuous improvement, and carefully evaluating the effectiveness of one approach to another unit or function would be an important step for reflection. The same might be said for online education. The College has developed comprehensive support services for the on-ground student. As the College moves deliberately into online, careful reflection on how appropriate services could be offered to students physically removed from campus would be prudent.

V. Quality of the Systems Portfolio

The challenge when completing a systems portfolio is sharing the good work of a college that reflects the complexity of populations served, the processes for meeting the mission, the results for all the processes, the governance structure that includes the administrative hierarchy and shared governance, and the collection and analysis of data that indicate the dedication to continuous improvement. This must all be done comprehensively yet concisely. The task is not easy. Johnson County Community College has provided the review team a solid Systems Portfolio that reflects the comprehensive nature of a large, urban community college that enjoys a national reputation.

There are, however, numerous opportunities to improve the overall quality of the Portfolio. Perhaps the most basic suggestion is the careful reading and reflection of what is being asked in each category and section of the Portfolio. At times, the narrative and data do not align with the process or result statement. For example, in Category One, the College notes that no general education courses chose to assess student learning outcome number two, collaborate respectfully with others, yet the table indicates the outcome not assessed is “writing clearly and effectively.” Such inconsistency that can easily be eradicated challenges the review team to understand the process and interpret the results.

Similarly, the College could present its data in ways that support the narrative more effectively and allow the review team to interpret the data with greater appreciation of what is being reported. At times, the data and narrative do not match. For example, when discussing benchmarks regarding student learning

outcomes, JCCC provides a figure 1.14. Unfortunately, that figure is on page 36 and the title of that figure is Academic Resource Center's success rate by center. The data referenced does not match the narrative or the figure. At other times, the College provides a table for the summary, comparison, or evaluation sections of the Results section, but no context is provided. Without context, the review team is unable to understand the importance and meaning of the chart. Sometimes simple improvements, such as providing the "n" when indicating survey responses, helps the team understand the value of a single data point. Sometimes the improvement may be as simple as rechecking that the links to pertinent evidence related to the narrative description can be followed.

Given the page limitations under which the College must complete the Systems Portfolio, it is understandable that the College does not want to repeat information discussed in a previous category or section. However, without connections being made between sections, the College loses an opportunity to demonstrate how processes are linked across the College or how data can be used for continuous improvements in myriad ways. Providing a crosswalk of processes or brief references to other sections of the Portfolio that are related would help the College tell its story with greater impact.

Finally, good Systems Portfolios reflect the hard work and contributions of many authors and participants. A single editor can help the College maintain a singular voice, look for inconsistencies, and provide the scaffolding recommended above.

VI. Using the Systems Appraisal Feedback Report

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

APPENDIX A
Stages in Systems Maturity: *Processes*

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

Stages in Systems Maturity: *Results*

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

APPENDIX B AQIP Category Feedback

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:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Aligning common outcomes to the mission, educational offerings and degree levels of the institution	Aligned – JCCC's serves a broad community. College offerings reflect the mission to "transform lives and strengthen communities." The College describes a defined, repeatable, evaluated process including market research, curriculum review and approval by department, division, dean, and Educational Affairs Committee with final approval required by the College's Board of Trustees and the Kansas Board of Regents.
Determining common outcomes	Aligned – JCCC has had defined general education outcomes since 2004. Strengthening and assessment of these outcomes were the focus of a 2014 AQIP action project which has now delivered three years of data. A subcommittee of the Education Affairs Committee, the Assessment Council, uses extensive collaboration with faculty to develop, review, and approve outcomes and assessments. The College is just beginning a 2017 action project to further define institutional learning outcomes and the process.
Articulating the purposes, content and level of achievement of the outcomes	Systematic - The College has established student learning outcomes which are articulated through the general education faculty. It is not clear, however, how the content and level of achievement is determined for these outcomes or how these levels are communicated to students.

	<p>Although the Office of Outcomes Assessment widely distributes reports, there is no evidence of how the information is used for improvement or whether the process is evaluated</p>
<p>Incorporating into the curriculum opportunities for all students to achieve the outcomes</p>	<p>Aligned - Learning outcomes are mapped to general education coursework with baseline performance rubrics established for all outcomes. Students completing an associate degree are expected to have met all general education requirements. A task force of the Educational Affairs Committee recommended changes to general education requirements in 2015.</p>
<p>Ensuring the outcomes remain relevant and aligned with student, workplace and societal needs</p>	<p>Systematic - The College uses the academic program review process and program accreditations to review relevancy, demand, and student success. Advisory boards and employer focus groups are used in part of these processes. It is unclear, however, how the program review process specifically evaluates and informs the College’s general education outcomes and process.</p>
<p>Designing, aligning and delivering cocurricular activities to support learning</p>	<p>Systematic - Although JCCC has well-established clubs and organizations, the College recognizes the opportunity to link co-curricular activities to learning as indicated by the recent AQIP project on co-curricular alignment. Alignment of co-curricular activities is now a required part of the program review process. This approach will assist departments in determining how student clubs, international activities, and service learning extend and support student learning</p>
<p>Selecting tools, methods and instruments used to assess attainment of common learning outcomes</p>	<p>Systematic - JCCC uses direct and indirect assessment methods to assess attainment of common learning outcomes. Methods of direct assessment appear to fall into three categories—pre/posttests, rubrics, and embedded assignments. Indirect assessment of general education outcomes is conducted through the Noel Levitz Student Success Inventory and the College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). It is unclear, however, how these direct and indirect methods align or are part of a process.</p> <p>To increase maturity of this process, JCCC could consider clearly showing alignment of institutional outcomes, common learning outcomes, program outcomes, and course outcomes</p>
<p>Assessing common learning outcomes</p>	<p>Systematic - Faculty use direct methods of common learning assessment and results are aggregated using a</p>

	<p>common rubric. A 2017 AQIP project will develop institutional learning outcomes that will align with general education outcomes. This will provide a mechanism for assessing learning outcomes for programs that do not deliver general education courses. The College will want to ensure that a common rubric will allow for the comparison of achievement of institutional outcomes for all programs at the College. JCCC should consider steps to ensuring general education, program specific, institutional, and common learning outcomes are clearly defined, documented, shared and understood with all relevant stakeholders.</p>
Other identified processes	

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

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
<p>Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)</p>	<p>Systematic - JCCC reports that over the past two years, 19,262 student assessments of general education outcomes were completed. The level of achievement ranges from low to progressing to mastery. While results for general education outcomes are provided and targets set for expected performance, it is unclear how levels of mastery align with the students' level of study, how student performance aligns with expectation, and how JCCC will use these data for improvement. Clarifying how the learning assessments align with a students' progression through the curriculum may provide greater clarity on whether students are moving from low to mastery in their levels of learning.</p>
<p>Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks</p>	<p>Systematic - JCCC has set institutional benchmarks for student learning outcomes and have begun to collect data on those results. It is unclear how targets were set and why these levels are aspirational for the institutional. Each program individually determines mastery, so it is unclear how institutional data is collected. General education outcomes would seem to by definition be uniform for all students, and a level of student achievement at the mastery and progressing stages should be expected throughout all students with the same degree. Results show students are performing</p>

	higher than expected, but this is attributed to a need to recalibrate the assessments.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	<p>Systematic - JCCC has determined that two learning outcomes are not well represented in assessment data. It is not stated why these outcomes were not being assessed. The College could benefit from a more detailed assessment plan that provided assurance that all programs had courses and assignments that addressed each outcomes and an assessment schedule each year. It may be challenging for the College to interpret and use results and insights if most outcomes are not generating assessment data each year.</p> <p>Reacting - JCCC is appropriately using the data to reflect on process improvements; however, it is unclear what larger insights are being gleaned from the data on general education performance itself.</p>

111 Based on 1R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
<p>JCCC is committed to engaging faculty in measuring common learning outcomes though the College should consider clarifying the differences between program, general education and institutional outcomes so that outcomes can be properly assessed and analyzed.</p> <p>The College may benefit from a more thorough review of how much data and what kind of data are collected to determine if the College is capturing the data it needs.</p> <p>The College recognizes the need to more fully integrate CTE programs, so it is launching an AQIP action project to create institutional learning outcomes and aligning them with the current general education outcomes. The College recognizes that faculty need to address how the data will be used which is critical to ensuring the collection of these data are intentional and illuminate aspects of the students' learning experience for College evaluation and improvement.</p>

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:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Aligning program learning outcomes to the mission, educational offerings and degree levels of the institution	<p>Systematic - To meet the needs of the community it serves, JCCC uses transfer agreements, advisory group feedback, employer input, and external employment projections and trends to develop its curriculum and align with the public higher education system in Kansas. It is unclear, however, what <i>processes</i> are used by the institution to ensure this alignment. A standard template for curriculum proposal might be considered to ensure this alignment across all units. Clarifying how these expectations are enforced may help to ensure that JCCC is effectively aligning program outcomes with the mission, educational offerings and degree levels.</p>
Determining program outcomes	<p>Aligned - Redesigned in 2014, JCCC uses Comprehensive Program Review as a method for determining program level outcomes and the review of its curriculum. The College also acknowledges that the process is influenced by specialized accrediting agencies, the Kansas Board of Regents, and industry advisory boards as well as the needs of its transfer students.</p> <p>Systematic - While JCCC uses its academic program review process to review and update program outcomes, it is unclear how this process works within the context of the review. It is also unclear whether the College has developed program outcomes for all programs, and whether there is coordination and communication among all units. Providing a visual in future portfolios could assist the College in clarifying this process.</p>
Articulating the purposes, content and level of achievement of these outcomes	<p>Systematic - Although JCCC uses the program review process to review data and update program outcomes, it did not state in the portfolio how it articulates the purposes, content, and level of achievement of those outcomes. While the program data include completion, attrition, graduation, follow-up surveys, and other program outcomes data, it is unclear whether and how specific program <u>learning</u> outcomes are articulated. More clarity on the processes themselves may help to demonstrate that these processes are systematic and robust.</p>
Ensuring the outcomes remain relevant and aligned with student,	<p>Systematic - The Kansas Board of Regents strategic plan sets the framework for ensuring the state's higher education system aligns with goals of the economy. In</p>

workplace and societal needs	addition, the College uses program reviews, advisory boards, specialized accreditation agencies, and research to maintain currency of outcomes to meet the needs of students, employers, and community. It is not clear, however, how this process is regularly evaluated on an institutional basis.
Designing, aligning and delivering cocurricular activities to support learning	<p>Systematic - As part of a strategic plan action item, JCCC has a taskforce that has begun the process of documenting and aligning co-curricular activities with program learning and including these activities as part of the program review process.</p> <p>Reacting - This process appears currently limited in its scope and the College is considering an AQIP action project in this area. There was not enough information provided in the portfolio to understand how the organizations of Honors, Service Learning, and International Education serve as co-curricular experiences. The AQIP action project may help the College clarify this topic.</p>
Selecting tools, methods and instruments used to assess attainment of program learning outcomes	<p>Systematic - The explanation in the portfolio for general education outcomes assessment and program assessment appears to be identical, so it was not clear if the narrative was about program outcomes. Faculty is able to select goals from within their program and general education outcomes that align with their areas of interest or concern. Tools allow some flexibility for meaningful assessment while allowing for aggregation beyond the program. The College also identified external certifications or national exams that are used to capture competency by discipline, but did not identify what programs require specialized accreditation: such as state level exams or other national measures. To increase maturity of this process, JCCC could consider clearly showing alignment of common Institutional learning outcomes to program outcomes and then to course outcomes.</p>
Assessing program learning outcomes	<p>Systematic - The Program Review process includes qualitative and quantitative assessment data. It is unclear; however, from the description provided how JCCC integrates assessment of program learning outcomes into the broader framework of program review, which includes measures of program vitality and student success. The portfolio also states that the deans provide programs with a summative assessment of program vitality; however, this assessment and its connection to assessing program learning outcomes is not clear. A</p>

	process that documents how assessment data impact the outcomes, the kinds of assignments, and pedagogy would indicate ways JCCC uses assessment as part of the quality commitment.
Other identified processes	

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:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Overall levels of deployment of the program assessment processes within the institution (i.e., how many programs are/not assessing program goals)	Systematic - JCCC indicates a combined total of 12 programs conducting program assessment, which includes academic and career/technical programs. The information provided only suggested assessment data for the College learning outcomes and not the program learning outcomes. It appears that the deployment of program outcome assessment across the institution is sporadic and not consistent across all programs. JCCC would benefit from a program assessment plan that indicates the timeline for all program level assessment. Including in that timeline a method of analyzing the data would allow the College to thoughtfully plan assessment support and training.
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Reacting - Some direct and indirect measures of student learning are provided with some targets and trend data. JCCC has identified its summary of assessment through Ruffalo Noel Levitz SSI data (Figure 1.4), as well as an internal College surveys used for program completers. Although JCCC provided examples of assessment data, program completers, and student satisfaction results in charts for the technical education programs, the tables provided focused on the general education outcomes, despite the label indicating otherwise. The College summarizes data for its career and technical programs using figure 1.3, yet the table says non-general education assessment. There is also limited analysis regarding either figure on page 18. Providing a narrative that summarizes the tables and figures would assist the review team in knowing how the College interprets and understands the data.

<p>Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks</p>	<p>Systematic - No program information indicated internal targets by program. It is unclear what constitutes partial satisfaction of internal targets; it is also unclear what external benchmarks are used in Figure 1.5 for program completers. The College notes that most programs focused on capstone or other projects completed toward the end of the program, and attributed the high rate of "mastery" to the type of project used for assessing student learning. The College may want to build a process and curricular map that will allow the College to demonstrate how the curricula contributed to students' achievement of mastery. It is unclear if students began the program with the same "mastery" level knowledge. It is also not clear how the College determined the 50% percentile was the best external benchmark for all programs. Perhaps providing benchmarks by program based on national norms could be helpful</p>
<p>Interpretation of assessment results and insights gained</p>	<p>Systematic - JCCC's interpretation of assessment results and/or insights gained is limited. JCCC recognizes the importance of faculty support on designing assessment tools and using the data effectively. The statement "As faculty become more adept at developing assessment instruments and data trends become available, the programs should be able to focus on curriculum changes that are based on student learning outcomes" is an important one for the College to understand and pursue. The College is encouraged to pursue the AQIP project on Institutional Learning Outcomes, and to consider how that project can assist with program learning outcome assessment.</p>

112 Based on 1R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

<p>Evaluation of Improvement Efforts</p>
<p>JCCC has a documented program review process for academic programs to assess student learning. However, the assessment strategies are inconsistent and do not appear to contain much reflection. The College as it matures in assessment could show examples of the results of the program review, the next steps of the process, and how the data collected is used to improve the curriculum within the program and student learning in the classroom. The College could provide examples of program improvements and the impact those changes had on improving student learning. JCCC understands the importance of assessment at the College and program level, but it is not clear how the College distinguishes between the assessment and use of these different sets of data. The College has indicated the value an AQIP Project may</p>

have on achieving its goal of building a more robust assessment culture, and the College articulates the importance of additional support for faculty who undertake this work.

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:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Identifying student stakeholder groups and determining their educational needs	Systematic - JCCC has identified student groups according to educational goals and learning needs. Applicants indicate educational intent through the admission process where students are grouped into four different student stakeholder groups. Potential service needs are also identified through the admissions process. A Personal Admissions Plan and Success Advocate are in place for each degree-seeking student. These processes, however, do not appear to include any data collection or evaluation for improvement.
Identifying other key stakeholder groups and determining their needs	Reacting - While a number of different areas—academic programs; the Foundation; Continuing Education; and the Department of Institutional Effectiveness, Planning, and Research—are involved in identifying key external stakeholders, it is unclear if the college has processes through which this information is synthesized and profiles of these groups and their needs are developed to guide institutional planning.
Developing and improving responsive programming to meet all stakeholders' needs	Systematic - The College relies on a variety of relationships to maintain currency in its offerings. Groups work closely with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research and Planning to stay current with employer needs, and Continuing Education uses its partnership to suggest new opportunities. These groups maintain internal processes through which needs are identified and prioritized. It is not clear if all these groups meet on a regular basis, how information received is acted upon, how processes evaluated for improvement, and how coordination and communication is implemented. A developed process and timeline could be helpful for the College

<p>Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess the currency and effectiveness of academic programs</p>	<p>Systematic - Program review for credit programs and a portfolio evaluation for non-credit programs are used to assess currency and effectiveness of academic programs. The portfolio does not state, however, what specific processes are used within the program review to assess currency and effectiveness nor how lessons learned were shared across the institution. In addition, since program reviews occur every three years, and to date not all programs have undergone such a review, it is not clear if the responsiveness of the College is as proactive as might be useful. The review process of noncredit programs appears to be clearer, with identified measures like operating costs, retained revenue, and gross margin. As mentioned previously, designing a master timeline to complete and use all program review data might help the College be responsive to its many stakeholders.</p>
<p>Reviewing the viability of courses and programs and changing or discontinuing when necessary</p>	<p>Systematic - JCCC publishes summary data about program reviews on the website and has policies in place for the revitalization and discontinuance of programs which is encouraging. It is not clear, however, based on the program review data provided, how these data help to determine the viability of courses and programs. It is also not clear what metrics are used to establish thresholds of viability and the process followed to revitalize or discontinue programming. Viability assessment documents were not included in the portfolio and links were not active.</p>
<p>Other identified processes</p>	

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

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
<p>Summary results of assessments (including tables and figures when possible)</p>	<p>Systematic - The College tracks several measures within program review and it tracks elements of the program review process itself (e.g., # of programs that have been modified or closed through the review). It is unclear, however, how the institution evaluates the effectiveness of its Academic Program Design process other than through the number of changes made to programs and courses. Since 2015, JCCC has updated or approved 797 courses. While the number of program</p>

	<p>changes is tracked, it is unclear if performance levels are reported and/or how the results are communicated across the institution. There appeared to be a spike of deactivation of courses in 2015; however, this deactivation was not explained. Clarifying what measures it uses to evaluate the effectiveness of its new program review system may help to ensure it meets the program design criteria</p>
<p>Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks</p>	<p>Systematic - JCCC shows a five-year trend on the College's program and course activity. Those results indicate that programs are modified, are new, or are being deactivated. KPIs for program viability have been determined and include nationally accepted indicators, although no information on progress is provided. Targets are set based on internal performance expectations and externally on the 75th percentile of community colleges' performance. It is not wholly clear how an external benchmark of 75% percentile of other community colleges with respect to transfer, persistence, and transfer GPA provides as robust a picture that is as helpful as it could be. Establishing individual targets by program and external benchmarks by program could be helpful for the College in increasing its maturity level in this area.</p>
<p>Interpretation of results and insights gained</p>	<p>Systematic - JCCC describes the academic program review process as the primary mechanism to analyze and interpret results. However, it is not always clear how the data are being used to enhance and support continuous improvement. A more detailed narrative about the use of results would help the College chart its use of data in decision making. It might be beneficial to the College to incorporate additional methods that will enable the College to compare itself with other like programs.</p> <p>The college will complete a full cycle of the academic program review process in 2016-17. Some areas of improvement have been identified for the next cycle (e.g., full implementation of a data warehouse) but it is still unclear whether the process itself is evaluated against, for example, the critical features of its design. Evaluating the process itself may help to drive future improvements.</p>

next one to three years?

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
<p>JCCC has demonstrated that changes are occurring due to their Academic Review process. While the College cites a number of improvements within the area of program development, it is unclear whether those improvements were prioritized based on a systematic approach to evaluating program development processes. It would appear that improvements came from a variety of sources—new technologies, general data on student retention, best practices within the field, and so on. This section lacked evidence that stakeholders and students are involved in the process. The College could also look at technology tools to improve the turnaround time for the entire process.</p> <p>The College benefits from its many ties to organizations and boards, including the Kansas Board of Regents, advisory boards, and partnerships through continuing education. JCCC has the opportunity to explore more fully the process it is developing to demonstrate how data of all kinds inform in a timely basis its ability to stay current and proactive as it serves its many stakeholders.</p>

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:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Determining and communicating the preparation required of students for the specific curricula, programs, courses and learning they will pursue	Systematic - The College uses multiple methods for determining the preparation required for students through placement testing, established prerequisites and/or co-requisites for coursework. Faculty are thoroughly engaged in the design and development of courses and programs, and a multi-step process assures that appropriate sequencing and development occurs for all programs. It is unclear, however, if the process includes an evaluation for continuous improvement.
Evaluating and ensuring program rigor for all modalities, locations, consortia and dual-credit programs	Systematic - The Kansas City Board of Regents has also outlined stipulations and requirements of the College must adhere to in the development of courses and programs. JCCC's faculty are responsible for establishing and maintaining quality. Faculty follow a standardized course outline regardless of modality and all sections of a course use the same syllabi and assessment. Online faculty complete a course on online teaching, faculty must meet minimum qualifications, and

	<p>the dual-enrollment program follows NACEP accreditation standards. It is not clear how high school teachers in dual-credit programs are prepared to assess at the college level. It is also not clear how standards are maintained over time and whether the process includes evaluation to ensure consistent rigor. More information about the evaluation process would be helpful</p>
<p>Awarding prior learning and transfer credits</p>	<p>Aligned - The College maintains several processes for awarding prior learning, transfer credit, and reverse transfer credit. Processes appear to be well documented and function systemically to recognize multiple ways through which students can demonstrate learning. However, it is unclear how these strategies are evaluated and how often.</p>
<p>Selecting, implementing and maintaining specialized accreditation(s)</p>	<p>Aligned - JCCC maintains an approval process through which it determines which programs can seek specialized accreditation. Sixteen programs require specialized accreditation and undergo a rigorous process of a comprehensive self-study with programs providing updates on specialized accreditation including status, self-studies and other documents. Program reviews provide an opportunity for the inclusion of additional specialized accreditation by program as appropriate. Including information on which programs require specialized accreditation would assist in understanding of this area.</p>
<p>Assessing the level of outcomes attainment by graduates at all levels</p>	<p>Aligned - JCCC describes college-level KPIs as the measure of assessment for graduate outcomes. The Office of Institutional Research provides the data results for program completers. Data on degrees/certificated awarded, employer satisfaction, assessment of student learning, and others are used within the program review process to identify opportunities for improvement programmatically. Some of these data sets are benchmarked against other peer institutions. The information attained is used for decision-making and prioritization of academic initiatives; however, the process for this prioritization is not clear.</p> <p>Systematic - It was also not clear from the portfolio, how the College determines the level of student achievement within each program. For example, the College may find it helpful to track how many students in a given program score at what rates on national licensure exams or earn what grades on key assignments or courses within a program. The College could compare these outcomes to students'</p>

	performance on placement exams or could review student performance according to the need for remediation or not. These types of data sets would allow for further opportunity to refine degree and/or course requirements.
Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess program rigor across all modalities	<p>Aligned - The College provides academic quality review through the program review process. Faculty select from among a set of approved assessment tools and reflecting within the program review process on a standard data set. The results are aggregated and reported College-wide on the levels of mastery, progression, or little/no skill attainment.</p> <p>Reacting - The College may want to consider specific tools or methods of assessment that would demonstrate how students in an online version of a course compare to a section taught face-to-face to a section of dual enrollment students. It is not clear that the College has begun to assess program rigor across modalities</p>
Other identified processes	

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:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of assessments (including tables and figures when possible)	<p>Systematic - The College summary of results describe full and part-time graduation and transfer rate and persistence and retention rates and the College develops a set of improvement strategies to help achieve specific targets. However, the information shared in this section did not address how assessments of programs and courses by modality is aggregated and reviewed. In several cases JCCC presents figures with very little analysis. While graduation and transfer rates are defined by full- and part-time, for example, it is unclear whether other key measures like student learning and persistence are defined to reflect other breakdowns to measure program quality comprehensively. As the College continues to add to its assessment, it may wish to develop a process for collecting and reviewing data to determine that rigor and consistency are maintained across all modalities and demographics.</p>

<p>Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks</p>	<p>Systematic - As noted elsewhere, the College has implemented a robust program review process and is collecting valuable data about persistence, transfer success, and other like measures. Too often the same data are reported throughout the portfolio. In this case, targets and benchmarks, when provided, do not relate to program qualities measures. The College may wish to consider establishing targets that focus on completion by modality, or grade distribution by modality, or student success rates based on placement scores. Likewise, external benchmarks could also be established that directly support initiatives related to program rigor and consistency.</p> <p>For some measures, the College compares results with other organizations and sets performance benchmarks based on the 75th percentile of community colleges nationally. Other measures like program vitality are not yet compared with those of other organizations. Consistency in the use of benchmarks may help the College in appreciating accomplishments. Incorporating data from the National Higher Education Benchmarking Institute may provide further context for reflecting on program quality.</p>
<p>Interpretation of results and insights gained</p>	

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

<p>Comments</p>
<p>JCCC values academic quality across credit programming as demonstrated by the program review process, maintenance of specialized accreditations and opportunities to gain college credit outside the classroom. JCCC describes a thorough and detailed account of recommendations for improvement. In addition, JCCC has done research into national best practices to inform strategies for improving student success and academic program quality. It is unclear, however, whether these best practices triangulate with the College’s own program data to determine if these best practices will make a difference at JCCC. Clarifying insights gained from analyzing program vitality data, assessment results, and other evidence may help to ensure that practices implemented will actually get to the root drivers of JCCC’s current levels of performance</p> <p>JCCC uses the nationally recognized tools for awarding prior learning credit, offering dual enrollment, and offering courses in multiple modalities or locations. The portfolio could have demonstrated program and course consistency and rigor by the inclusion of more relevant data. The College has begun some good assessment practices and good plans for the use of data, but evidence that directly demonstrates program quality would be an important next step.</p>



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:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Ensuring freedom of expression and the integrity of research and scholarly practice	<p>Aligned - At JCCC the full authority of academic freedom is practiced except for the adoption of course descriptions outline and learning outcomes. The College provides academic integrity policies through the JCCC Policies and Procedures handbook. Faculty at JCCC are not required to conduct research; however, if research is conducted, a Research Participant Protection Program and Institutional Review Board provides guidelines for human research subjects. Both Turnitin.com and the LMS are tools used to teach and maintain the integrity of student work.</p> <p>While these activities are in place and are described, it is unclear how these processes are evaluated and whether the College proactively communicates these expectations through new employee orientations, performance reviews, or other mechanisms</p>
Ensuring ethical learning and research practices of students	<p>Systematic - The Student Code of Conduct provides definitions of academic integrity, plagiarism, and expectations of behavior. The consequences of suspected violations of these expectations are provided. No mention is made of how this code specifically relates to ethical learning and research practices of students. There is also no process provided for how these procedures are communicated to students or evaluated for effectiveness.</p>
Ensuring ethical teaching and research practices of faculty	<p>Systematic - Processes for ensuring ethical teaching and research appear to be at a systematic level of maturity with some topics covered in new employee orientation and annually through harassment and information security training. New faculty orientation</p>

	includes focus on ethical usage of primary and secondary sources, copyrights, and other ethical violations as well as FERPA. The College also maintains an ethics reporting hotline, the results of which are reviewed by a cross-functional team. There is no evidence, however, of how these activities are evaluated.
Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to evaluate the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of supporting academic integrity	Systematic - Processes for selecting tools, methods and instruments to evaluate academic integrity appear to be at a systematic level of maturity with some tracking of ethical violations and usage of originality checkers. It is unclear what process was used to select the various tools and what role faculty and administration share in this selection. There is also no description of how these activities are evaluated. Clarifying the goals of JCCC's system for ensuring academic integrity and aligning tools and processes with those goals may help to ensure JCCC's approach is more systematic and integrated with other systems like performance management
Other identified processes	

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:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Reacting - The College does not appear to have a clear process for determining what results to track, and if something is tracked, how to make use of that information. For example, the College receives information on the number of papers submitted to Turnitin.com, but it does not appear to review the results of the papers submitted nor have defined measures. No information was provided on the number of plagiarism cases investigated per year. Gathering and analyzing data may assist the College in recognizing how best to help ensure academic integrity in faculty and students.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Reacting - JCCC has not established internal targets and external benchmarks for academic integrity. Tracking violations of various academic integrity guidelines and comparing to external benchmarks would help the College understand the extent of a problem or the lack of a problem. Responding to the data collected could help the College

	understand abnormalities, such as the spike in 2015 in Turnitin.com submissions. The College recognizes an opportunity to compare performance in this area with other organizations and to define targets for performance and may wish to consider researching processes from other institutions to find best practices.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Reacting - JCCC faculty have full authority to address academic dishonesty and plagiarism. The College recognizes an opportunity to track cases of academic dishonesty. Providing a more robust set of measures for processes that promote academic integrity may help to provide more meaningful insights in this area.

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

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
JCCC recognizes that it still needs to create more robust processes in this area, including an Academic Freedom Policy. The College may also want to look at developing measures to assess the effectiveness of current mechanisms for ensuring academic integrity, so improvements in this area are guided by feedback.

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

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Identifying underprepared and at-risk students, and determining their academic support needs	Systematic - The College has hired additional staff to strengthen the process for assisting underprepared students and military students. A variety of offices provides targeted services which includes a series of placement tests. Similarly, JCCC has an established Early Alert program for faculty to request assistance for students currently enrolled. It is less clear how JCCC

	<p>addresses or identifies the preparedness of online students.</p> <p>Other areas could also benefit from greater clarity. For example, it is unclear how these processes and policies are periodically evaluated. One suggestion is sharing results across campus, which may engage the community in suggestions for ways to improve the processes. It is further uncertain how proactive the services are in identifying personal, financial, or academic issues before these concerns become persistence issues. Finally, the College may wish to explicitly coordinate services to provide a systemic approach to identifying and assigning support needs to students with unique needs.</p>
<p>Deploying academic support services to help students select and successfully complete courses and programs</p>	<p>Systematic- Students at JCCC receive an array of support through various student support centers: Student Success Center, the Academic Counseling and Advising Services, the Academic Resource Center, and the Educational Technology and Distance Learning Department. The College’s Student Support Center offers academic counseling and advising services which provide support for helping students with academic timelines, placement, graduation status and degree requirements as well as transfer options. Also faculty job descriptions were updated as part of the 2014-2015 strategic initiative as they also play a critical in academic support services for all students.</p> <p>The College is less clear on how it encourages students to make use of these services. Often students who need academic support are the least aware of what is available and how to access these services. Perhaps JCCC may consider how it communicates these services to students to maximize their utility, particularly the on-line population.</p>
<p>Ensuring faculty are available for student inquiry</p>	<p>Systematic- JCCC ensures that its faculty provide opportunities for students to interact with them during their office hours or through appropriate online means. Faculty also communicate through websites and online communities. The College also uses the CCSSE to measure student perceptions around the extent of faculty-student interaction.</p> <p>Although faculty contracts outline expectations for availability to students, no information indicates expectations for office hours or how students actually are able to contact faculty and what constitutes timely responses.</p>

<p>Determining and addressing the learning support needs (tutoring, advising, library, laboratories, research, etc.) of students and faculty</p>	<p>Systematic- The College provides learning support through various services such as disability services, tutoring, learning support, the Billington Library, video tutorials, and the Educational Technologies and Distance Learning Department. The Access Services Department is set up to assist those students with accommodations. The College could consider similar services to commuters, seniors and the military veterans. It is unclear how the College evaluates these services to provide for continuous improvement</p>
<p>Determining new student groups to target for educational offerings and services</p>	<p>Systematic- JCCC identifies student groups according to its mission and in alignment with the Kansas Board of Regents goals. The College also uses community perception surveys, advisory boards, enrollment data, demographic and workforce data in order to identify new student groups. Similarly, the continuing education branch uses information from EMSI, CERI and MARC. JCCC has developed a Strategic Enrollment Plan to propose enrollment targets for sub-populations.</p> <p>The portfolio states that continuing education teams meet on a regular basis; however, it does not list the membership of these teams or what is meant by “regular basis.” It is unclear whether the College has engaged in evaluation of these processes. Without evaluation of its processes, it is unclear how the College improves its processes and services</p>
<p>Meeting changing student needs</p>	<p>Systematic- In order to meet students’ needs, the College relies on the Ruffalo Noel Levitz (SSI) to assist them with meeting the needs of students. The administration meets with the Student Senate in order to gather information and hear student needs. The College president meets with students informally, and student representatives are included in College committees. It is unclear how the College processes or handles the suggestions students provide. A transparent process that informs students about the information received and the responses to the requests may encourage student participation in these opportunities.</p>
<p>Identifying and supporting student subgroups with distinctive needs (e.g., seniors, commuters, distance learners, military veterans)</p>	<p>Aligned- The College has dedicated services for differing population needs. The Veteran and Military Student Resource Center runs multiple programs supported by the federal government through its designation as a Principles of Excellence program. Particularly noteworthy is the priority registration provided to students and the veterans-focused sections of general education courses. Support for distance learners is still in progress, and two</p>

	<p>advisors for distance students have recently been hired. Support for students in career and trade programs, those working on the GED, and those in the Bridge program for students not ready for college-level material are all provided with support and scheduling to encourage focus on completion.</p> <p>The process used to support veteran and military students can also be used as an exemplar for strengthening the utilization of other areas across the College particularly when identifying support needs of other student and areas of the campus.</p>
<p>Deploying non-academic support services to help students be successful</p>	<p>Systematic- JCCC offers a variety of services to its student population, and is commended for including services to address transportation and child care challenges experienced by many students. Resource information is provided through the Student Success Center. Even students enrolled in non-credit courses can access career and financial planning information through the partnership with the Kansas. However, the information provided was somewhat limited. For example, the process for referring students to the Student Success Center is not described, and the portfolio does not describe their process for evaluation and whether these processes and methods have been evaluated for success.</p>
<p>Ensuring staff members who provide academic and non-academic student support services are qualified, trained and supported</p>	<p>Aligned-Processes for ensuring qualified staff appear to be at an aligned level of maturity. JCCC ensures staff members meet minimum posted requirements through documents provided to Human Resources Office. The College provides opportunities for professional development through professional organizations, Professional Development Days, and other trainings. A staff and organizational development office offers both mandatory and optional learning and development opportunities through each year. Several of the support service areas at the College maintain accreditation with the College Reading and Learning Association. Results for students using the centers are tracked, and satisfaction measures are used to gauge student perceptions of the centers.</p> <p>Systematic- However, the portfolio does not describe the process for evaluation and whether these processes and methods have been evaluated for success. JCCC does not describe a process for the evaluation of the processes for onboarding of staff or staff mentoring. A process for evaluating onboarding and mentoring could enable the College to tailor the offerings to the continuing</p>

	changing needs of a workforce and emphasis that which has been determined the most helpful.
Communicating the availability of non-academic support services	Systematic- The primary method by which the College reaches its wide audiences is through the JCCC website; this also includes a user-centered website, video monitors, print materials, student group meetings and by faculty. However, no processes are listed for determining what is communicated and in which form(s). The College also requires students to attend a new student orientation that provides information about the services available, student handbook and the student portal. Faculty are encouraged to verbally share information with students. It is unclear, however, how systematic these communication efforts are, and the ways the College may communicate through an intranet or through the learning management system.
Selecting tools, methods and instruments to assess student needs	Aligned- Processes for selecting tools, methods, and instruments to assess student needs appear to be at an aligned level of maturity. JCCC uses the SSI, CCSSE and the NCCBP to gather data for improvement and to use for benchmarking to assess student needs. It is less clear how the College seeks to continue its investigation into other areas of student needs. The College may find it useful to gain additional insights through high level survey feedback from students. The result of input from students might help the College better select additional tools.
Assessing the degree to which student needs are met	Aligned- Processes for assessing the degree to which student needs are met appear to be at an aligned level of maturity. The College uses SSI, CCSSE, NCCBP as well as KPIs for feedback on a wide variety of conditions that contribute to student satisfaction and engagement. However, the College may want to consider a more systemic approach that incorporates qualitative feedback as well. Although the College states that the surveys (CCSSE and NCCBP) are in “regular use,” the portfolio does not identify the actual timeline and frequency of use, not is it clear how the data are analyzed.
Other identified processes	

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:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
<p>Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)</p>	<p>Systematic- As noted in previous sections, JCCC provides information that does not always demonstrate the success of the processes described. Targets are well established and include utilization, external survey of satisfaction, KPIs on student success, and enrollment goals. The SSI shows improvement in instructional effectiveness, registration effectiveness, academic advising, and safety and security. The five year trend lines provide the College with indicators set against benchmarks to measure success. In addition JCCC has shown positive results in PTAC, the Adult Education Program, Accelerating Opportunity and various grants</p> <p>It would have been helpful to find information that detailed whether students were using the tutoring center, or how many students sought advising, or how many students attended opportunities to interact with administration. The information about the Adult Education program provided good data but did not focus on the results of this program</p>
<p>Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks</p>	<p>Systematic- The College uses national surveys to measure satisfaction with services and, for at least some measures, sets a benchmark of the 50th percentile of those institutions also using the surveys. However, benchmarks are provided for only a few of these support services and processes described in this category.</p> <p>Collecting and using other data may allow the College to realize its successes and utilize its resources more efficiently. For example, determining how many veterans make use of services and what kinds, and then comparing these data with actual usage rates could help the JCCC focus on the services that call for greater demand by students. The College could also look at the percentage of students in remediation and then look at the persistence of this population. Correlating these data to the usage of student support services would allow the College to better target those who might benefit, and having a target for usage would provide staff with an additional incentive to reach out to students.</p>
<p>Interpretation of results and insights gained</p>	<p>Systematic- The portfolio discusses efforts to address some issues in its distance learning program, the registration process and billing practices. The College has also indicates improvements to the distance learning website and the positive effects gathered from student feedback. However, the results that led to these interpretations are not provided. Results provided for</p>

	<p>services like Institutional Effectiveness are not interpreted (e.g., why do students express high satisfaction with Institutional Effectiveness?).</p> <p>The information about student demand for online learning and the student frustration with registration and billing were good examples to provide, but these examples did not particularly align with processes for student support and services outlined in the portfolio. More holistic interpretation, such as how well services are being communicated and used, would provide results that support the topics being probed.</p>
--	--

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

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
<p>The College takes an active role in intervention strategies and technology tools to support student success, and JCCC pro-actively creates services based on data and to serve students who are most at risk. The College plans to expand programs to veteran and military students. To address student support, JCCC has implemented a pathways program for first-time, degree-seeking students that includes a number of first semester activities and follows with an assignment of a counselor for the second semester. A Peer Advisor for Veteran Education (PAVE) program is being added to current veteran’s services. Despite these many initiatives, results of current processes were not provided that would illustrate these actions as natural priorities for the institution.</p>

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:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Collecting student retention, persistence and completion data	Aligned- JCCC uses an Ellucian student information system to collect student retention, persistence and completion data. Institutional Research is responsible for timely and valid data retrieval, and these data are posted on the JCCC website The College states that it has developed mature processes for data retrieval and reporting; however, the portfolio does not explain those processes nor the data collection and its integrity..
Determining targets for student retention,	Aligned- Processes for setting retention, persistence, and completion targets appear to be at an aligned level of

<p>persistence and completion</p>	<p>maturity. Within the most recent strategic planning cycle, the College identified key performance indicators related to persistence and completion and set targets at the 75th percentile for all community colleges participating in the NCCBP. The College regularly reviews performance and initiatives intended to positively impact these KPIs. Six goals are identified with KBOR'S FORESIGHT 2020, and JCCC has committed to these for three years.</p>
<p>Analyzing information on student retention, persistence and completion</p>	<p>Integrated-For analyzing student retention, persistence and completion data appear to be at a systematic level of maturity with both departments and College-wide committees reviewing trends and identifying improvement initiatives. The information provided indicates that the President's Cabinet, the Board of Trustees, and the State regularly review and discuss retention, persistence and completion data. These data are also reviewed in the annual budget process. The Strategic Enrollment Team reviews data monthly to explore trends.</p> <p>Systematic- It is unclear if the College as a whole reviews initiative and changes. Furthermore, it is also unclear how the institution determines which improvement initiatives to focus its energies. Clarifying the kind of analysis beyond a review of trend data may help to illustrate how JCCC gains actionable insight from the results reviewed.</p>
<p>Meeting targets for retention, persistence and completion</p>	<p>Aligned- The Cabinet members at JCCC meet regularly with division leadership on targets for retention, persistence and completion measures. College leadership aligns budgeting processes with the KPIs and KBOR performance agreements to ensure resources go to high priority projects. Including a sample of how a program with low rates has developed strategies to improve these rates would have been helpful. The College may already document a totality of efforts by program and chart improvements by program, and if so, this could be helpful information for other programs as well.</p>
<p>Selecting tools, methods and instruments to assess retention, persistence and completion</p>	<p>Systematic- JCCC uses a monthly scorecard, Pulse, to monitor key metrics. the President's Cabinet reviews the scorecard weekly and distributes data to other campus leadership to guide decision making on an ongoing basis. The IR Office also produces an Enrollment Tracking Report. At this time, it is unclear if faculty and staff are provided this information. The College may want to consider a wider distribution on a regular schedule to all offices that impact persistence, retention, and completion.</p> <p>Clarifying <i>how</i> tools, methods, and instruments are selected may help the institution ensure that it uses data</p>

	collection methods that are valid and useful in decision making.
Other identified processes	

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:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Aligned- JCCC provides targeted results of data on certificates, graduates employed, 1 st to 2 nd year retention, 1 st to 2 nd year retention rates for non-college ready, student success index, and three year graduation and transfer rate at a 5 year trends for persistence, graduation/transfer, retention, student success, and graduates employed. However, no narrative explaining these data was provided. It is also unclear how the data are used for decision-making, planning, and collaboration. A summary of overall College response to these data would provide a good context for understanding the data, as well as advance the level of maturity.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Aligned- The Colleges provides a context for understanding the results on several retention and completion measures by comparing with external community colleges through the NCCBP. Targets are set by the KBOR based on a three-year average and tied to performance-based funding. JCCC did not meet the target only the student success index. The section would be more robustly helpful if additional comparison results were provided.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Systematic- The maturity level for interpreting results and insights gained is at the systematic level. The College provided minimal interpretation and did not provide insights other than the probable impact of a project related to improving the graduation rate by identifying students who had left the College without applying for graduation. More information on this and other areas where the College does not meet targets would be helpful. Additionally, it is unclear what analysis has been done on metrics where JCCC is performing well. Insights gained from studying successes may guide the institution in leveraging effective strategies or further enhancing successful interventions

2I2 Based on 2R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
<p>The College uses its Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Student Success and Engagement and Information Services for data analytics to identify early intervention for high-risk students. ZogoTech is being used extensively for increased analytics as drawn from the implementation of a data warehouse. It is unclear, however, what measures are in place for retention- and persistence-related processes that have guided the institution to these enhancements.</p>

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:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
<p>Determining key external stakeholder groups (e.g., alumni, employers, community)</p>	<p>Systematic- The College contributes to the economic development of the region through partnerships with key stakeholder groups and advisory groups. JCCC has a robust approach to building relationships. Partnerships through the government, area councils and chambers, and participation in community organization by members of the entire College keep the College engaged in the community. The College recognizes the limit in building alumni relations, which is notoriously difficult for community colleges. The College also serves the community through numerous arts programs open to the public.</p> <p>The Continuing Education division develops external partners and provides classes for youth, personal enrichment and performing and visual arts. JCCC uses alumni connections as resources, and facilities are shared with the community. It is unclear whether these processes are evaluated. The processes in this area appear to be at a systematic level of maturity with multiple areas of the College interacting with external agencies and developing deeper partnerships as opportunities might arise.</p> <p>It is unclear how the process is evaluated. Through the external plan, it is assumed there is an evaluation process but is not clearly articulated within the portfolio. Perhaps providing a crosswalk of who engages various constituencies, with what frequency, and how the</p>

	<p>College’s various units work together to share vital information in ways that enhance and not harm engagement with stakeholders could illustrate the ways the College builds, supports, and evaluates its many ongoing and developing community relations.</p>
<p>Determining new stakeholders to target for services or partnership</p>	<p>Systematic- The College seeks stakeholders through the Academic Division, the JCCC Foundation, the performance arts series, the Carlsen Center, and athletics. The Foundation uses a volunteer structure to identify and cultivate new candidates for engaged service or donations to the College. By making the campus buildings available to the community the College continues to bring new organizations to the campus as it also proves itself as a partner to the metropolitan community. The College could have enhanced this section of the portfolio by articulating the <i>process</i> for evaluating how it determines new stakeholders and partnerships. It is unclear, for example, how each of these units communicate with one another, the strategy used to determine whom to approach and when, and how final decisions are reached.</p>
<p>Meeting the changing needs of key stakeholders</p>	<p>Systematic- JCCC describes the activities involved in meeting the needs of key stakeholders, although the information is limited in scope and does not provide information that explains the approach to the very different stakeholder groups. It is unclear how information on these changing needs is captured and shared across units and how the processes are evaluated.</p>
<p>Selecting tools, methods and instruments to assess key stakeholder needs</p>	<p>Systematic- The College uses three primary tools to assess how well it is serving the public: environmental scans, activity and attendance reports, and community market penetration reports provided by the national benchmarking project to which JCCC belongs. Current tools are described, but it is unclear how those tools were selected or how they are evaluated for effectiveness.</p> <p>The College may also wish to use satisfaction surveys for those receiving workforce training, for those attending events, and by Foundation members. New ideas could develop from satisfaction surveys.</p>
<p>Assessing the degree to which key stakeholder needs are met</p>	<p>Systematic- The College has recently employed the services of Economic Modeling Specialists International to assist in an overview and gap analysis for the regional workforce. The College also has completed local career and technical needs analysis to determine future faculty hires. There does not appear to be a defined, regular process for assessing the degree to which key stakeholder needs are met. If the College is not currently doing so, it</p>

	may wish to use satisfaction surveys to learn what the College is doing well and where additional improvements or opportunities exist.
Other identified processes	

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:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Systematic- The College has tracked the usage of the Carson Center performances and scholarships award for the last five years. Though gifts have fluctuated over the years, the contribution amount to scholarships continues to increase. No information was provided with respect to whether workforce training is increasing or not, whether the College leads in the region for types of training, or the level of satisfaction with their offerings. NCCBP shows JCCC’s market penetration above the 75 th percentile for the last four years. JCCC uses few direct and indirect measures of meeting key stakeholder needs, but the College does appear to be strongly connected to identifiable stakeholder groups so that actionable information might be derived from the results.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Systematic- JCCC recognizes the importance of its facilities through the Carlsen Center performing arts series, the Regnier Center, and the Nerman Museum of Contemporary Arts. In addition, the College offers programs and activities within the community it serves. The College has set targets for facility utilization and market penetration within the community, highlighting the commitment to meet stakeholder needs. However, JCCC may benefit from comparing the results of processes in this area with the results of other organizations and establishing overall targets for performance.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Systematic- The interpretation of results is limited and few insights are shared. No mention is made of contracts for workforce development, information about camps and athletics, or insights into offerings. Similarly, JCCC has shown growth in community engagement and fundraising activities. The results of some of those initiatives have resulted in a new facility, the Wylie Hospitality and Culinary Academy, and other special projects. Overall, it is

	unclear what actionable information the College has extracted from its data to drive continuous improvement
--	---

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

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
<p>It is notable that the College has completed an economic gap analysis and an environmental scans, and has collected advisory committee feedback, all of which provided useful data for future planning and programming. The College has developed a master facilities plan. JCCC continues to show improvements to enhance the quality of advisory committees and evaluate the local workforce employment trends and the labor markets.</p> <p>The EMSI study and improvements to programs are cited as examples of improvements in this area, but it is unclear how these areas of improvement were identified and prioritized. For example, program advisory groups are not included in a discussion of processes as mechanisms for identifying key stakeholder groups or capturing information on changing stakeholder needs. It would be helpful to link these changes to the information within the portfolio that suggested the need for a different approach to the boards or the need for the EMSI material. Providing more detail about challenges would then suggest how these changes more fully support the College’s commitment to continuous quality improvement through data analysis.</p>

2.4: Complaint Processes

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

2P4 Describe 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:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Collecting complaint information from students	Aligned- The College follows a student complaint policy that was updated in 2015. The policy establishes procedures and responsibility for collection, review, and communication of complaints. The College uses a number of avenues for student complaints, from the website complaint system, College personnel, the Ethics Report Line, the KOPS watch module, and the Student Complaint Portal. Also, the College provides an online software system to students and employees to file complaints and has the processes in place specific to address the complaint. In addition to the student complaint online module, an Ethics Report Line, and a safety and security module complete the multiple opportunities for collecting complaint information. Several

	<p>mechanisms are available to students and some redundancy is built into the system to ensure concerns are routed to the right individual or office. Complaints entered into any module are reviewed and directed appropriately.</p> <p>Systematic: It is unclear whether the College evaluates these processes.</p>
<p>Collecting complaint information from other key stakeholders</p>	<p>Aligned- The College collects complaint information from key stakeholders through the Ethics Report Line, the KOPS Watch module, Navex Global, formerly Ethics Point. Processes for collecting complaint information from students are clear; stakeholders with “other types of concerns” are expected to locate designated College personnel.</p> <p>Systematic-It is unclear whether the College evaluates these processes or how others would know about KOPS Watch for other complaints, or how stakeholders would find the ethics hotline information, as it is on the Apply Now section. A link is found on the Community section of the webpage, but this directs the person to a page for student complaints. An outsider would not know where to turn next.</p>
<p>Learning from complaint information and determining actions</p>	<p>Systematic- The College uses complaint information to improve processes and take appropriate action. The portfolio does not describe a clear process for how analyses of students’ complaints are used to determine future actions. Although the ethics and safety systems are reported quarterly to the Audit Committee, it is not stated how this is used to determine actions. Similarly, the portfolio provides no information as to how actions are determined. Given the environment on all campuses, having a more formal structure for reviewing complaints, determining actions, and learning from and disseminating information may present future problems from occurring.</p>
<p>Communicating actions to students and other key stakeholders</p>	<p>Systematic- The College’s software allows complainants to log in and receive updates on the complaint. The status and outcome of the complaint resolution is communicated to those who provide contact information in the complaint system. Stakeholders, however, can also remain anonymous. There is no other communication mentioned in the portfolio at this time. The College may want to consider an annual report with general information on complaints and overall resolutions.</p>
<p>Selecting tools, methods and instruments to evaluate complaint resolution</p>	<p>Systematic- Although the electronic system and a portal are listed as a tool to collect information, the portfolio does not mention the process for evaluating complaint resolution. No information is provided that indicate how these particular tools and instruments were selected and by whom. The</p>

	College does not provide information regarding how the processes are evaluated. Also, it is hard to determine whether all complaints receive a follow up or if there is a comprehensive year to year analysis report on the types of complaints received. Greater compilation of complaint types and results that can be shared more broadly may help the College to make adjustments that result in fewer complaints
Other identified processes	

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:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Systematic- The portfolio provides one chart for key external stakeholder complaints and the trend data of key external stakeholder complaints is given (Figure 2.12). The student complaints totaled 239 issues between AY2009-2010 and Spring 2016; however, no results of the evaluation and handling of these complaints is provided within the portfolio. Results are reported during a quarterly audit committee meetings. As noted elsewhere, providing more in-depth contextualization of the results allows for greater insight into patterns that can be addressed and adds to the culture of continuous quality improvement.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Reacting- Ethics Report Line complaints (some of which are filed by students and non-employee stakeholders) are annually benchmarked against other organizations and reviewed by the audit committee. JCCC does not provide any detail on the benchmarks or organizations used for comparison. The College realizes that no internal or external comparisons are being used for student complaints and may want to consider this for future action. The College does not have measures in place to compare students complaints received with external benchmarks. Nor has the College set data for external stakeholder complaints that would enable target-setting and benchmarking. The College may want to study the nature of all complaints and determine a target by type, with the goal of steadily decreasing the number of complaints.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Systematic- The College acknowledges that analysis of complaints has been historically decentralized within units. New software will enable the institution to look at

	complaints more holistically. Student Success and Engagement deans are beginning to review student complaints at meetings twice/month. There remains no record keeping of the results and insights. The College is aware of the need for better documentation and has begun a process to correct this problem. The College also realizes that the development and implementation of reporting and analyzing data will increase the maturity level in this area.
--	---

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

Comments
<p>The College has aligned the processes of student complaints, shows commitment and has invested in a software tool to track complaints. Training was provided to academic and support services personnel who will interact with students. The College is aware of the need for further implementation and documentation.</p> <p>The College has not identified a method for evaluating its processes.</p>

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:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
<p>Selecting partners for collaboration (e.g., other educational institutions, civic organizations, businesses)</p>	<p>Aligned- JCCC notes the significance of partnerships to its mission and its values. The leadership of the College values collaboration as a key College value: “JCCC respects diversity of thought in building a culture of collaboration.” The College’s collaborations are focused on students’ needs when selecting partners. Partnerships are pursued through area high schools, advisory board memberships, health care facilities, and transfer partners.</p> <p>Systematic- It is unclear; however, what processes the College uses to select partners. Although health care is noted, little additional information is provided in this section about collaboration with work force development or civic organization. From other sections of the portfolio, JCCC appears to use the Foundation, Continuing Education, and its academic staff to build appropriate partnerships, but that information is not provided consistently throughout the portfolio</p>

<p>Building and maintaining relationships with partners</p>	<p>Systematic- Although the portfolio states that collaborative relationships with partners for federal, state entities, high schools, 4-year schools are reviewed annually, it does not state the process for this review. JCCC liaisons have responsibility for attending and reporting on key activities, but it is not clear who these liaisons are and what process is used in using these to build and maintain relationships.</p> <p>The portfolio provides no evidence as to whether the reviews are formal or informal. Articulating the goals of partnerships and assessing the accomplishment of those goals may help the College determine how to adjust their investment in these ongoing partnerships. The entire College community is encouraged and supported to engage with the County through volunteer and professional opportunities.</p>
<p>Selecting tools, methods and instruments to assess partnership effectiveness</p>	<p>Aligned- The College evaluates partnerships annually at the Cabinet level. It uses a customer relationship management process CRM to maintain records. The Cabinet reviews partnership on an annual basis.</p> <p>Systematic-The portfolio fails to describe the process used to select tools, methods, and instruments for assessment. It would be helpful, for example, to understand why qualitative evaluation methods are preferred for reviewing partnerships at the College level.</p>
<p>Evaluating the degree to which collaborations and partnerships are effective</p>	<p>Systemic- JCCC uses a number of evaluations and surveys to gauge the effectiveness of partnerships, such as satisfaction of students, participations numbers, feedback, and President’s Cabinet annual review. The processes for evaluating the effectiveness of collaborations and partnerships appear to be at a systematic level of maturity with a variety of mechanisms chosen, from a criterion-based evaluation to general student satisfaction. It is unclear whether these options are selected when partnerships are formed or have evolved out of convenience or other reasons. Given the size of the College and the continuing growth of its reach, the College may want to have more qualitative measures to determine the value of the collaborations and partnerships. This will allow the College to deploy its resources most effectively.</p>
<p>Other identified processes</p>	

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:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Systematic- JCCC uses a follow-up graduate survey to measure satisfaction of career graduates. The College also provides comparison of program completers to employee satisfaction including a specific career curriculum example of the changes made in curriculum that resulted in higher satisfaction rates with graduates. The information provided is positive, but very limited. The College has an opportunity to share more results from the multiple methods used to assess partnership effectiveness. Although results shown are positive, there does not appear to be a correlation between these results and the processes described.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Reacting- JCCC strives to improve and has made plans based on feedback. The College maintains multiple files on advisory boards which provide opportunities to track trends and measure effectiveness. Yet, there is no mention within the portfolio of benchmark performance, nor are set specific targets provided.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Reacting- The College provides extremely limited interpretation of results and insights gained. The narrative does not provide an opportunity to learn how the College is making strategic decisions about partnerships and collaborations.

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

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
The College realizes it needs to be more process-oriented in the area of meeting students and stakeholder’s needs. Data and evaluation in this initiative has resulted in the College having an external partnership plan to focus more on its purpose and commitment to this initiative. The College recognizes the need to better define and pursue partnerships while strengthening collaborations in the community. The work done by CE to create an external partnership plan might serve as a model for other areas of the College.

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:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
<p>Recruiting, hiring and orienting processes that result in staff and administrators who possess the required qualification, skills and values</p>	<p>Aligned-JCCC board policies clearly delineates the process for recruiting, hiring, and orientating staff, for mentoring some employees, and for required training. Processes are documented and supplemented through the Supervisors Tool Box, an onboarding resource guide and checklists. Although full-time faculty participate in a yearlong orientation process, adjuncts are not required to participate in any orientation</p> <p>Systematic-The College could demonstrate a higher maturity level being more deliberate in its use of evaluation to make improvements. Limited evidence is provided to indicate how these processes are evaluated and subject to continuous improvement. The College places job postings in national publications, but the process does not include a step to determine if the recruiting process yielded a diverse pool. Orientation for full-time faculty includes a year-long mentoring process, but no evidence is provided to suggest how this mentoring process is evaluated. Orientation appears to be optional for part-time faculty, so it is not clear how the College ensures these instructors are provided orientation and mentoring. An anonymous survey after new staff orientation is aggregated and reviewed by staff and Organizational Development; however, it is not clear how this evaluation is used to inform improvements.</p>
<p>Developing and meeting academic credentialing standards for faculty, including those in dual credit, contractual and consortia programs</p>	<p>Systematic-The institution follows Board Policy for appropriate academic credentialing for faculty. In addition, the dean and faculty determine the credential for each faculty position. Degrees and professional agencies are included for determining credential which are housed in HR for consistency in advertising. It appears from the portfolio; however, that the College has just recently (2016) begun to put education plans in place for faculty who do not meet credentialing standards. It is not clear if all employees are subject to a background check, nor is there evidence of a process for degree verification for full or part-time faculty. Continuing to follow and evaluate the process and results of those education plans will assist JCCC in moving to an aligned maturity level. The College</p>

	<p>may also wish to consider aligning faculty credentials with the HLC guidelines.</p>
<p>Ensuring the institution has sufficient numbers of faculty to carry out both classroom and non-classroom programs and activities</p>	<p>Aligned-The Program Review Process is used to annually review data, including enrollment, workload specifications, student-faculty ratio and other data related to faculty, to determine if new or replacement faculty are warranted. This information is connected to the budgeting process through which new position requests are made within the prioritization of the College through the Instructional Dean’s Council to the Vice President of Academic Affairs.</p> <p>Systematic-This process described above does not fully explain “how or if” the College has a sufficient number of faculty to carry out the duties and responsibilities of its curriculum and courses for both academic and non-academic programs of the College. Rather, it explains the hiring process as initiated by the deans but not the logistics of what goes into guaranteeing that the College as a sufficient number of faculty to deliver the programs at JCCC. More information about the process of meeting this outcome would improve the maturity level</p>
<p>Ensuring the acquisition of sufficient numbers of staff to provide student support services</p>	<p>Systematic-JCCC processes for ensuring the institution maintains sufficient staff include consideration of several factors—regulatory requirements, number of students supported, response time, and priority-related needs The portfolio states that, if existing resources are unavailable, a new position is requested; however, it does not state the process for doing so.</p>
<p>Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools</p>	<p>Systematic-Processes for tracking outcomes and measuring effectiveness appear to be at a systematic level of maturity with the College using a variety of surveys to assess the efficacy of programs like new employee orientation. The College also using surveys to measure new faculty satisfaction after one year and general campus satisfaction. The College may want to further clarify the goals and values of their overall hiring and onboarding process so they can be sure the tools currently used accurately capture relevant feedback.</p> <p>Reacting-The College utilizes surveys to determine satisfaction with new faculty, new staff, and new first year faculty programs, and periodically measures overall employee satisfaction. Again, the portfolio outlines various tools that are used but it provides very little evidence in regards to outcomes or measures tracked. No process is provided for how these surveys are administered,</p>

	aggregated, distributed, and used to inform improvements is provided. The narrative is very broad outlining tools they have used but with little or no substance tracked regarding progress or improvements. Unfortunately, without them the College can set no priorities or identify areas of weaknesses.
Other identified processes	

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:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Systematic -Results for several measures related to employee satisfaction with the orientation and with the LENS training indicate generally high levels of satisfaction. Although multiple measures were listed in processes, only new faculty results were provided. It is unclear whether other measures (e.g., hiring processes) are in place to provide feedback on the effectiveness of those processes relative to the identified goals and underlying values. It appears that some trending of data is beginning to be tracked. There is no evidence that summary results are inclusive of other employee groups in the hiring process.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Reacting -In the area of internal targets and external benchmarks or comparison results, none were mentioned; JCCC only articulates how the College created an early buyout option in 2013. The only analysis given is that the retirement rate for JCCC compared to the national community college of peers is lower. It is unclear whether other measures are benchmarked or given targets for performance.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Reacting -The College notes its strong processes for orienting, mentoring and developing employees, but it is unclear if positive results have been analyzed to learn what has been working well. Without faculty, staff, and administrator development assessments, it is difficult to provide meaningful professional development opportunities Often knowing why processes are working

	well is as important as knowing why they achieve poor results.
--	--

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

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
JCCC operates in a systematic maturity of processes but a reacting maturity of how to interpret the processes and gather results that are meaningful for the organization. The College notes several improvements for these processes, including assessment of recruiting and hiring, and a review of faculty credentials. It is unclear whether these improvements came from feedback collected or from general observation. The College may benefit from reviewing other measures for positive results in addition to lower turnover and low retirement rates. The College has begun to work on faculty credentialing education plans and is encouraged to determine a process for implementation, evaluation, and measurement of results for this new process, as well as others in this subcategory

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:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Designing performance evaluation systems for all employees	Systematic -The College utilizes various tools for evaluating performance of employees, based on employment category. Faculty evaluation processes are determined by the master agreement. These processes are documented and regularly repeated. It is unclear, however, whether these processes are evaluated for other employees (managers, adjunct faculty, staff) that could inform future improvements. The College may want to consider an institutional process for evaluating adjunct faculty
Soliciting input from and communicating expectations to faculty, staff and administrators	Systematic -The College provides a systemic review for staff in the performance management process. Processes for soliciting

	<p>input from and communicating expectations to employees are designed to encourage dialog between the employee and supervisor relative to the employee’s performance goals Faculty depend on the completed three-year review for performance evaluation culminating from an annual review. More clarity might be helpful on how faculty and staff are solicited for input on the performance evaluation system itself. It is unclear how these process evaluations are used for improvement across units. It is also unclear whether the evaluation system is itself evaluated on how authentically it encourages input from employees and clarifies expectations from the supervisor. It is also unclear if administrators also follow the staff evaluation process or participate in a different process of their own</p>
<p>Aligning the evaluation system with institutional objectives for both instructional and non-instructional programs and services</p>	<p>Systematic-JCCC states that the process for aligning the evaluation system with institutional objectives is outlined as an interaction between the employee and the supervisor as they collectively settle on goals during the evaluation process. Although the portfolio states that the evaluation process is directly tied to institutional goals, there is no process explained that defines how this connection is made. It is unclear how this alignment is used for institutional improvement via communication among all College units</p>
<p>Utilizing established institutional policies and procedures to regularly evaluate all faculty, staff and administrators</p>	<p>Aligned -Institutional policies and procedures are in place to ensure that employees are regularly evaluated. Staff are evaluated on an annual cycle, probationary faculty are evaluated each semester for the first three years, and post-probationary faculty are evaluated annually. These processes are established by board policy and the master agreement. These evaluations occur but it is unclear how they are communicated, coordinated and used for institutional improvement.</p>

<p>Establishing employee recognition, compensation and benefit systems to promote retention and high performance</p>	<p>Aligned -Processes based on board policies manage employee recognition, compensations and benefits. The College benefits and leave policy provides additional incentives, and the compensation policies is reflective of the market as carried out by the compensation manager. The Human Resource Office has consulted with Gallagher Benefit Service to maintain quality and equity in order to help promote retention and higher performance across the College for all its employees.</p>
<p>Promoting employee satisfaction and engagement</p>	<p>Systematic-The College outlined a strategy in its 2013 strategic initiatives to not only improve student satisfaction but to also foster employee engagement. In response to HLC’s 2012 feedback report, JCCC launched the Employee Engagement Survey in 2015, which yielded a 50% response rate.</p> <p>Reacting-Although the College has made positive steps towards identifying the engagement level of its employees, there is no process described on how this survey or its results will be used to promote employee satisfaction and engagement. It has been two years since the survey was given to the College’s employees, yet the portfolio is very limited in the process for using the survey or methods for engaging its people.</p>
<p>Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools</p>	<p>Reacting-Apart from the employee engagement survey implemented in spring 2015, it is unclear how JCCC tracks the outcomes of its evaluation and recognition processes. This is an opportunity for the College to better use and track outcomes. Clarifying how measures and tools are selected may help to ensure that feedback systems are robust and relevant to guiding improvements and that evidence across unit is used to meet institutional goals.</p>
<p>Other identified processes</p>	

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:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Reacting- The College, unfortunately, did not address or provide results for this section of the portfolio. Although a link to the president's letter and YouTube presentation were included, narrative and/or charts are expected to be in the body of the portfolio. It is unclear if other measures of evaluation and recognition are in place more specific to these processes
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Reacting- The College did not address this particular section of the portfolio for comparing results of internal or external benchmarks. The portfolio stated that the College scored above its external benchmarks and benchmarks were shown in Fig 3.3; however, nowhere in the processes for this subcategory was it explained that there were benchmarks or how they were determined. Although the portfolio states that there were scores in both 2015 and 2016, this is the first mention that a survey was done in 2016, and Fig 3.3 shows 2017. This makes it challenging to understand the data presented by JCCC.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Systematic- JCCC gained many insights from the 2015 Employee Engagement Survey and has begun to address some areas of potential improvement. The survey identified two particular opportunities for improvement—supporting career development and improving organizational communication. The survey was administered again in 2017 (although the last question says 2016). To increase its maturity level, it would be important for the College to more specifically document its process for administering this survey including timeline and expected targets/benchmarks.

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

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts

The College has made significant progress in addressing improvement plans in both performance processes and measurement of employee engagement. JCCC is encouraged to better define these as part of processes in future portfolios.

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:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Providing and supporting regular professional development for all employees	<p>Systematic-The College provides a number of staff/organizational development programs to meet the needs for each employee group. The opportunities are generated by a Staff/Organizational Development Office, sabbaticals for faculty and staff, and support for travel to external training events. It is unclear how these opportunities are communicated across the institution and the relevance to institutional goals and strategies. It is unclear whether the programs are evaluated for improvement.</p>
Ensuring that instructors are current in instructional content in their disciplines and pedagogical processes	<p>Aligned</p> <p>Processes for ensuring instructors include regular opportunities to participate in continuing education and a five-year portfolio process that requires accumulated evidence of continuous reflection and improvement. The portfolio does not provide evidence for the alignment across the institution and the relationship to institutional goals and strategies and relevant processes, i.e., performance review process.</p>

<p>Supporting student support staff members to increase their skills and knowledge in their areas of expertise (e.g. advising, financial aid, etc.)</p>	<p>Aligned- JCCC appears to put a focus on tutor orientation, training, and certification, which could be an example for other colleges.</p> <p>Systematic-Processes for supporting staff professional development include a variety of opportunities, including professional conferences, on-campus trainings, professional organization memberships, and so on. It is unclear how well these resources align with the priorities of the institution and how systemically these resources are deployed to ensure staff are prepared to enact College and unit strategies. The portfolio does not provide evidence for the communication across the institution and the relationship to institutional goals and strategies, nor is it clear that any evaluative activities are part of these processes.</p>
<p>Aligning employee professional development activities with institutional objectives</p>	<p>Reacting-As part of the strategic plan, JCCC identified a need to survey employees. Through the results of this survey, they identified staff development as a high impact item for employee engagement and managers are developing action plans to encourage greater participation. It is unclear, however, how the college will ensure that any additional professional development provided is aligned with institutional objectives. The College is encouraged to include the evaluation of the processes in these action plans. The implementation of these action plans will help JCCC increase its maturity level in this area.</p>
<p>Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools</p>	<p>Systematic-While the Staff/Organizational Development Office assesses the quality and participation in professional development activities through qualitative and quantitative data, it is unclear how the College uses these results for improvement. It is unclear how the strategic planning objectives align with professional development. The College has an opportunity to measure the learning outcomes</p>

	<p>of these trainings to better gauge whether employees are gaining the knowledge, skills, and aptitudes needed to support the College mission and strategic priorities.</p> <p>Reacting-The College also appears to track the amount of tuition reimbursement as an outcome measure; which was surprising since tuition reimbursement was not mentioned in any of the processes listed earlier in the portfolio.</p>
Other identified processes	

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:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	<p>Systematic- Summary results are provided for the number of participants in several different types of professional development activities. Although there seems to be consistency over the years, it does not state if there are any targets set for participation. As noted elsewhere, adjuncts, although employed by the College, appear not to participate in professional development. The College has an opportunity to measure more than participation, including outcomes measures.</p>
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	<p>Reacting-In regard to comparison of internal targets and external benchmarks, the College recognizes that it has not set targets or benchmarks. Without targets and benchmarks, the College will have limited opportunity to evaluate efforts or to exceed expectations.</p>
Interpretation of results and insights gained	<p>Reacting- This section of the portfolio is very limited in its interpretation of insights gained. It speaks briefly about a faculty academic symposium used to support the College's definition of effective teaching. No insights or interpretation of results were provided on any of the other development activities mentioned in the process portion of this subcategory.</p>

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

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
<p>The College has identified the need to provide more staff sabbaticals and to better benchmark professional development processes. It is unclear, however, whether the insights driving these improvements have come from clear measures of performance. The College did not demonstrate how supporting these activities impact the institutional goals of the institution and student success. Having a more robust framework for evaluating the effectiveness of professional development processes may help to ensure that improvements will directly improve outcomes.</p>

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:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
<p>Developing, deploying, and reviewing the institution’s mission, vision and values</p>	<p>Aligned-JCCC reviewed the mission, vision and values as part of the new strategic plan process during 2013-2014 that the Board of Trustees adopted in July 2014. The College analyzed data from community conversations including students, faculty and staff, listening sessions, and focus groups to draft a new mission, vision, and values.</p> <p>Systematic-It was not clear from the information if a concerted effort to engage the large campus community took place. The listening sessions over two months included over 200 people, but no “N” was provided to determine the percentage engagement of staff, faculty and students and what percentage included other communities. Few details were provided about the process. No details were provided about changes from the previous mission, vision, and value statements or refinement processes based on feedback from constituencies. A more detailed response would provide a better understanding of the process.</p>

<p>Ensuring that institutional actions reflect a commitment to its values</p>	<p>Systematic-JCCC’s leadership is represented across the institution in the President’s Cabinet. In addition, the President is involved in standing meetings with Faculty Senate and Faculty Association. The cabinet members are engaged in community service and their respective professional organization that is supported by the College. While this is a clear picture of engagement and representation, it is unclear how JCCC actions and processes reflect a commitment to its values; how institutional actions reflect a commitment to “integrity”; and how this structure uses data for quality improvement.</p>
<p>Communicating the mission, vision and values</p>	<p>Systematic-JCCC’s mission, vision, and values appear annually on the annual report and a booklet was published and provided to internal and external constituencies. Although these activities show that the information is/was distributed, it does not explain the process used and whether that process included any explanations that would assist in stakeholders’ understanding. In addition, it is unclear whether the communication process is evaluated for effectiveness.</p>
<p>Ensuring that academic programs and services are consistent with the institution’s mission</p>	<p>Systematic-The College’s approval process is described for reviewing academic and service areas’ consistency with the institution’s mission via the various groups’ reviews before final approval by the JCCC Board of Trustees and the Kansas Board of Regents. The College’s processes of program and service area reviews ensure up-to-date curriculum and services. However, there was no description for how these groups are aligned on an institutional level and how and to what extent the program to mission review is applied. Clarifying the actual process can help the institution assess whether it is effective in ensuring the mission is integrated into program and service-area work.</p>
<p>Allocating resources to advance the institution’s mission and vision, while upholding the institution’s values</p>	<p>Systematic-The College provides yearly budget guidelines based on projected revenue and enrollments overseen by the CFO and “informed by ongoing planning and assessment efforts”. As part of their process, faculty</p>

	and staff make recommendations regarding budgetary priorities. Information about the budgeting process is insufficient to determine how the resources are allocated to advance the mission, strategic plan, and institutional values. In addition, it is unclear how this budget process is evaluated for effectiveness. Clarifying the process used can help to demonstrate whether resources are systematically deployed to support the mission and priorities and in a manner, that enacts the College's values.
Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (e.g. brand studies, focus groups, community forums/studies and employee satisfaction surveys)	<p>Systematic-The College describes the data gathering methods that were used as part of the strategic planning processes, based on best practices and the John Bryson model for strategic planning. Based on this framework, the College held listening sessions, surveys, and discussion to develop the strategic plan, and informed gaps for focusing resources.</p> <p>Reacting-It is unclear how those particular measures and methods were selected and how the description provided demonstrates a well-documented, consistent process that is regularly evaluated for improvement.</p>
Other identified processes	

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:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	<p>Reacting-Because measures were not clearly stated, it is also not clear what JCCC would consider a summary result. JCCC states that over 200 students, faculty, and staff contributed to the discussion; however, this was not listed as a measure. The narrative provided here is more process-oriented rather than results-oriented; the College does not appear to have outcome, process, or satisfaction measures for the process used to develop, deploy, and review the mission, vision, and values.</p>

<p>Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks</p>	<p>Reacting-No targets or benchmarks are mentioned. \$1.3 million in budget requests were made in 2016, and the College funded approximately half of the requests. It is not clear if 50% funding was a goal or not. The narrative does not explain how these numbers compared with previous numbers or whether there was an expected benchmark.</p>
<p>Interpretation of results and insights gained</p>	<p>Reacting-The narrative is limiting in the explanation and interpretation of results. It is unclear how the insights shared by the College to “reduce the extent of external input.” came from a systematic approach to measuring these processes. More information about how the engagement with the external communities will change and why the College made this decision would be helpful. Embedding measures to evaluate the process may help to guide the improvement of future cycles.</p>

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

<p>Evaluation of Improvement Efforts</p>
<p>JCCC started this subcategory with a focus on mission, vision, and values; however, ended it by discussing the strategic plan. The improvements noted were not directly related to the processes for developing, deploying, and reviewing the mission, vision, and values; the improvements mentioned had to do with strategic planning and budgeting. Having mechanisms for generating feedback on these processes may illuminate opportunities to make this part of the strategic planning process more effective and point the College to a more focused approach for the next plan.</p>

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:

<p>Process</p>	<p>Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement</p>
<p>Engaging internal and external stakeholders in strategic planning</p>	<p>Systematic-JCCC engaged the internal and external stakeholders in the strategic planning process through community conversations externally and internally through surveys. The results were analyzed and shared across the</p>

	<p>institution. Faculty and staff provided input on issues essential to the College’s future. It is unclear how these efforts were evaluated for continuous improvement and to gauge whether the process engaged stakeholders effectively.</p>
<p>Aligning operations with the institution’s mission, vision and values</p>	<p>Aligned-The College’s annual plans are used for analysis and are communicated consistently for the achievement of planned outcomes. The Board of Trustees uses the annual plan performance in which the College’s achievements are documented in the annual outcomes report. It is not clear how carefully and clearly articulated each project is tied to mission, vision, and values.</p>
<p>Aligning efforts across departments, divisions and colleges for optimum effectiveness and efficiency</p>	<p>Systematic-The College’s program review process requires documentation of alignment with mission, strategic plan, and KPIs. However, it does not state how these are aligned with the tasks of the strategic plan or how the program review process is evaluated for effectiveness and efficiency. It is also unclear how these reports are communicated across the institution and used for institutional improvement. The information suggests the College may be siloed in this respect.</p>
<p>Capitalizing on opportunities and institutional strengths and countering the impact of institutional weaknesses and potential threats</p>	<p>Aligned -JCCC used trends in various workforce areas to identify how these trends would affect the College in the next 3 to 5 years. Using this process, the College also used a SWOT analysis to identify its strengths and weaknesses opportunities and threats. Collectively this information was used by the Cabinet to determine College strategic goals.</p> <p>Systematic-While this process was inclusive and seemingly extensive, it is unclear how the internal stakeholders were involved on a College-wide scale. The Board of Trustees reviewed the report, but the communication College-wide was not described. It is not clear how the College determined what opportunities to pursue, which weaknesses to address, or which threats to mitigate. The narrative also did not provide information about the process for tracking progress or modify processes based on the changing dynamics of higher education</p>

<p>Creating and implementing strategies and action plans that maximize current resources and meet future needs</p>	<p>Systematic-Cabinet members identify and fund initiatives that support the strategic plan within the budget development process, but it is unclear how the priorities are established and which action plans are given those priorities. In addition, it is unclear whether strategies and action plans are evaluated for efficiency and impact on the College’s KPIs. Tasks identified appear to be a mix of process improvements and implementation of high impact practices. It is unclear how the College determined that these tasks would maximize resources and meet future needs.</p>
<p>Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (e.g. achievement of goals and/or satisfaction with process)</p>	<p>Systematic-While it is clear JCCC keeps track of progress on project plans, including a weekly review at the Cabinet meetings, it is not clear how ‘progress’ is measured. Measuring improvements in the areas of activity and relative to the goals may help to evaluate whether the tasks undertaken were the right tasks to improve the College’s KPIs. It would be helpful for the College to have clear guidelines about what “satisfaction with process” means across the campus and to have clear guidelines about how to measure and track progress. If the College currently has a method to determine these measures of progress, it was not clear in the portfolio.</p>
<p>Other identified processes</p>	

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:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
<p>Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)</p>	<p>Systematic-The College provided four charts (Figure 4.1) documenting progress on strategic goals of student success, stakeholder needs, communication, and efficient resource use. No details were provided. The narrative describes that in 2014-2015, seven out of thirteen tasks were completed, but there is no information provided on the results of the next two years of the plan or a comparison to previous planning cycles or the implications and meaningfulness to the College community.</p>

<p>Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks</p>	<p>Reacting-The Cabinet reviews and ensures the satisfaction of progress on each task but it is hard to understand how Cabinet determines “satisfactory progress” without an understanding of how progress is measured and determined. The narrative fails to describe the comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks.</p>
<p>Interpretation of results and insights gained</p>	<p>Systematic-The College describes the outcomes of the strategic planning process in that there is greater alignment across the institution; there is accountability at the Cabinet level; and there is a framework for strategic planning and AQIP projects. The extent to which accountability filters to each department for cross-institutionalization is unclear. In addition, it is less clear how this process has affected College planning beyond tactics associated with the strategic plan.</p>

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

<p>Evaluation of Improvement Efforts</p>
<p>JCCC has successfully implemented most of these goals and tasks within the three-year time limit. While the strategic planning process descriptions and accountability measures are provided, the ownership and accountability of the strategic plan appears to be top-heavy with a gap in articulating department and division accountability. The College has also determined that future projects will have staggered implementation of projects in order to use campus resources more efficiently; an opportunity exists to develop more robust measures for evaluating the planning process. It would be helpful to learn from the College the tasks and goals that were not implemented within the time frame, and what the College learned about the difference between those implemented successfully and those that were delayed.</p>

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:

<p>Process</p>	<p>Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement</p>
-----------------------	--

<p>Establishing appropriate relationship between the institution and its governing board to support leadership and governance</p>	<p>Aligned-The relationship between the Board of Trustees and the institution at JCCC appears well defined. A seven-member Board of Trustees is elected by the community to serve four-year terms. Their primary responsibilities are to appoint the president, adopt policies, and set the budget and local tax levies. Board meetings are held monthly, stakeholders can contact Board members and meeting information is available online.</p> <p>Systematic-It is unclear how the College determines whether this configuration supports effective leadership and governance. In addition, it is unclear how board members are appropriately trained and supported in their roles. Several organizations offer guidelines and training for new board members, but it is not clear if the College uses any process to educate board members.</p>
<p>Establishing oversight responsibilities and policies of the governing board</p>	<p>Aligned-The Office of General Counsel (OGC) oversees the Policy and Procedure committee and all College policies including those of the Board itself. Policies are reviewed on a regular cycle and areas affected by policies are consulted in making needed changes. The Board of Trustees approves policies and procedures as a mechanism for establishing the responsibilities of the administration. It is not clear how the OGC determines policies as related to the governing board. It is also not clear the role Kansas Board of Regents may have in establishing responsibilities and policies as related to the board itself.</p>
<p>Maintaining board oversight, while delegating management responsibilities to administrators and academic matters to faculty</p>	<p>Aligned-The policy process mentioned above includes operating procedures that delegate operations to the president and various College departments. The Board works with administration and faculty through five standing Board committees: Collegial Steering that facilitates effective communication, Audit that oversees audits, Human Resources that takes recommendations to the full board for personnel matters, Management that makes recommendations on finance, facilities, IT, and the Foundation, and Learning Quality that makes recommendations on learning engagement process, learning outcomes, faculty and student development, workforce education, etc. These committees make recommendations to the full board as needed; ad hoc committees are also formed.</p> <p>Systematic-It is unclear whether the committee minutes are posted publicly for College-wide communication or only the recommendations for full Board consideration. It is also unclear what processes are used to bring issues to</p>

	<p>the committees' attention and how their actions demonstrate an appropriate delegation of management responsibilities to administrators and faculty. For example, the Learning Quality Committee is empowered to make recommendations on learning outcomes; it is unclear how faculty are involved in that process.</p>
<p>Ensuring open communication between and among all colleges, divisions and departments</p>	<p>Systematic-Two Board members serve on each of the standing committees as well as an administrator appointed by the president although the process for choosing or electing these members is not clear. Staff, faculty, and students may serve on these committees; however, it is not clear if all committees have wide representation to encourage communication among all College, divisions, and departments. Although there are multiple points of communication noted, there does not appear to be a clear process to evaluate to assure communication is occurring.</p>
<p>Collaborating across all units to ensure the maintenance of high academic standards</p>	<p>Systematic-There is a degree of venues for maintaining and assuring academic standards as demonstrated through the Educational Affairs Committee (EAC), the Faculty Senate, the Office of Curriculum and Instruction, and the division curriculum committees. The curriculum is reviewed and evaluated as proposed by the faculty and recommended to the EAC of the Board of Trustees. The EAC has responsibility for curriculum review processes, working with the Office of Curriculum and Instruction on KBOR assessment, and making recommendations of general education and course status. This committee reports to the board level Learning Quality Committee. Five years ago a Faculty Senate was also created to extend faculty influence in educational policy, academic freedom, and resource prioritization. It is unclear what processes exist within or across these groups to ensure that high standards are maintained across all units. For example, what processes are used to review program/course proposals that demonstrates the College's commitment to maintaining high standards? Greater clarity on the relationships among these bodies and the process for maintaining consistency would improve the level of maturity.</p>
<p>Providing effective leadership to all institutional stakeholders</p>	<p>Systematic-A number of executive vice presidents and directors support the College President and Board of Trustees. The faculty have three faculty-run committees, and faculty sit on many campus-wide committees. It is also unclear on how the committee are formed, evaluated or connected and what processes are in place to provide</p>

	<p>effective leadership like chair selection and term lengths. Students have the opportunity to serve on the student senate and a large number of other committees; though it was unclear on whether students participate on the College level committees; what processes are used for students to understand and communicate the views of students; and are students voting or nonvoting members of College committees. Finally, it is unclear what leadership opportunities are available to staff; and if there are committees designed to specifically serve staff, and represent staff concerns. For examples, what is the role of the dean and other leaders at the College with respect to the campus-wide committees? Are staff invited to sit on College committees?</p>
<p>Developing leaders at all levels within the institution</p>	<p>Systematic-JCCC provides leadership training through its Staff and Organizational Developmental Division. The portfolio mentions that those assuming senior level positions must demonstrate leadership abilities, but it is unclear what processes are used to identify and develop leaders at all levels within the institution. It is also not clear how these leadership opportunities are evaluated to determine if new leaders are indeed being developed and how the various training plans are evaluated for effectiveness. The College offers competitive benefits and compensation's, but it lacks in substance how the retirement incentive allowed a transfer of knowledge to new staff.</p>
<p>Ensuring the institution's ability to act in accordance with its mission and vision</p>	<p>Reacting The College did note the importance of AQIP projects and the budgeting process tied to the strategic plan as ensuring the College can operate in accordance with its mission; however, the portfolio does not describe and document the processes through which leadership ensures the institution's ability to act in accordance with its mission and vision. Additional information related specifically to ensuring leadership for the future would be helpful.</p>
<p>Tracking outcomes/measure utilizing appropriate tools</p>	<p>Reacting-The information provided does not address this topic. It is unclear how appropriate tools are selected through which data on these measures can be collected. It is unclear how the College defines the outcomes of its leadership processes and process or outcome measures. For examples, is the new chair model advancing the mission and to develop academic leaders? How does the College track the level of staffing, particularly at the full-time level?</p>
<p>Other identified processes</p>	

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:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Reacting -JCCC provides two charts demonstrating the number of policies that were new, deleted, or revised by either the Board of Trustees or the Cabinet with no analysis regarding the results measured and if this evaluation system is effective.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Reacting -The College does not appear to compare its results for processes in this category with other organizations. It also does not appear to set internal targets; however, the Office of General Counsel is developing a process to review policies and procedures on a rolling calendar basis.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Reacting -No applicable information was provided. Even though the charts provided were not related to this section of the portfolio, the College could have demonstrated how it would make use of the information by addressing the spikes in policy deletion in 2014 and 2016, and the reason for the steady decline in new policies since 2014.

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

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
<p>The information provided did not fully address this part of the portfolio. The narrative did raise some topics that had not been discussed earlier. For example, in determining that the Policy and Procedures Committee membership appointments process needs to be updated to increase diverse representations, it would be helpful to know what led the College to realize this opportunity. The College is working on improvement plans that include completing a policy and operating procedures library with a fixed timeline, and reviewing and updating the Policy and Procedures Committee membership for representation across the College. In addition, under the oversight of the Office of General Counsel, JCCC is making improvements in their policies and procedures processes with more involvement from divisions and departments that is to be commended. It is unclear whether improvements have been planned or implemented in other critical areas of leadership and communication.</p>

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:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Developing and communicating standards	<p>Systematic-JCCC has processes that exist for communicating general standards for programs, policies and procedures, and upcoming events. The College also uses established policies that are congruent with and approved by the Board of Trustees, which in turn reflects the College's commitment to legal and ethical behavior. However, the information provided does not adequately address the ways in which the College develops and communicates integrity standards. It would be helpful for the College to document how it evaluates confidentiality compliance, or FERPA compliance, or sets rules about plagiarism, to offer a few examples. It is not clear, for example, how the code of ethics for Board of Trustees was established, reviewed, and implemented.</p>
Training employees for and modeling ethical and legal behavior across all levels of the institution	<p>Systematic-All employees at JCCC are required to complete mandatory training on ethical standards and behavior. The employee training consists of harassment, FERPA standards, College security and data security. This training is conducted by the use of online mastery tests, but it is unclear on the effectiveness of training sessions. The College also has an established code of ethics that the Trustees and the administrators must abide by to ensure conflict of interest is addressed according to JCCC policy. An Ethics Report Line has been established for making reports of behavior and a quarterly Audit Committee shares the results at monthly board meetings.</p>
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.	<p>Aligned-JCCC employs two attorneys in order to handle day-to-day legal matter across all areas of the College. They are housed in the Office of General Counsel (OGC) ensures that matters related to policy and procedures are consistent with best practices. In the area of business operations the College's audit and Advisory Service Department ensures that the College's practices all level of responsibility with ethical integrity. It is not clear, for example, how Title IX investigations are conducted and how investigators are selected and chosen. The portfolio mentions the OGC provides checklists and forms, but does not suggest how it provides training or builds a culture of integrity and compliance. A department of audit and</p>

	advisory services protects records and the integrity of information, but there is no information as to the process to handle an error or investigate a situation. No mention is made on how someone might report a violation.
Making information about programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships readily and clearly available to all constituents	Systematic -JCCC method of communicating information about its programs and requirements to all constituencies is outlined by the College's website. There is a specific section under the Consumer Information Page where all information is available. No whistleblower information appears to be present. In addition, printed materials are available for programs including academic expectations. It is not clear, however, what processes are used to ensure this information is complete, current, and accessible to constituents and how they are evaluated.
Other identified processes	

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:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Systematic -JCCC provided two reports: one report indicates the annual number of ethics violations reported, and another categorizes the violation reports by type. Context is not provided, and no details are included about other information that could have been collected or investigated beyond that provided through the Navex EthicsPoint system. As many colleges face increased numbers of Title IX investigations, for example, it might have been useful to include this kind of information. It remains unclear exactly what is tracked and what is analyzed.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Systematic -The College notes that the benchmark for Navex EthicsPoint includes data from many industries, not just higher education, but in the larger context of all users of this system, the College is slightly lower than the overall benchmark. An opportunity exists for JCCC to develop more robust measures of its processes in this area that may help it to identify points on which it could compare performance across other education organizations. The College may want to explore benchmarks for other HLC or KBOR community colleges. The College could also be well

	served by establishing targets for different kinds of ethics violations. For example, given the continuing increase in diversity and workplace respect complaints at JCCC, the College may wish to set a target for reduction, tied to a plan, and then evaluate the effect of the plan's implementation based on the number of complaints.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Reacting- The College uses the ethics report line to address issues. However, the data results provide little insights gained and the improvements to pursue. In this rather contentious environment and a landscape of much change in higher education, the College may choose to be more proactive in the ways in which it protects itself with respect to ethics and integrity. The increasing number of diversity and workplace respect complaints appears to offer an opportunity for analysis into the data.

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

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
The College added KOPS watch for reporting safety and security concerns and is consolidating reporting mechanisms in able to monitor trends more closely. It is unclear whether these improvements stemmed from feedback on current processes. Training for Title IX investigators and reporting safety and security concerns have been added for improvements. The College may benefit from using the ethics reports analysis to provide employee training for the increase category issues.

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:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Selecting, organizing, analyzing and sharing data and performance information to support planning, process	Systematic- JCCC uses a four-step process in selecting, organizing, analyzing and sharing data and performance information as shown in Figure 5.1. The College has multiple data systems and is attempting to develop a more centralized system. Without this centralization it becomes

<p>improvement, and decision making</p>	<p>more challenging for a College to ensure that accurate information is received and utilized by all stakeholders on the campus. This will move JCCC to an increased maturity level in the future.</p>
<p>Determining data, information, and performance results that units and departments need to plan and manage effectively</p>	<p>Systematic-Although examples of reports are listed, no process is provided that explains <i>how</i> JCCC determines what data, information, and performance results are needed by units and departments. The reports listed are standard reports used by many institutions; however, no process is shown for determining how to provide other relevant (and perhaps ad hoc) information to units and departments for use in planning and managing effectively.</p>
<p>Making data, information, and performance results readily and reliably available to the units and departments that depend upon this information for operational effectiveness, planning and improvements</p>	<p>Systematic -Currently some reports are provided annually or monthly, with implementation of a data warehouse anticipated to provide easier and more timely access to reports. It is unclear, however, how JCCC determines whether information currently provided is accessible, reliable, and relevant to operational effectiveness, planning, and improvements. Measuring the effectiveness of these information systems may help to ensure that units and departments are making data-informed decisions.</p>
<p>Ensuring the timeliness, accuracy, reliability and security of the institution's knowledge management system(s) and related processes.</p>	<p>Reacting-The College has identified the enterprise data warehouse as a central repository used for its data analysis of the student enrollment data and management. However, it does not speak to the entire span of the institution's knowledge management system(s): several areas are missing such efforts human resources, planning, billing and budgeting, student financial aid information, as well as alumni data.</p> <p>At this time, JCCC is at the beginning of implementation of an enterprise data warehouse including validation of enrollment data elements. As this implementation continues and completes, the College will move to a more systematic ability of ensuring timeliness, accuracy, reliability, and security of knowledge management systems and processes</p>
<p>Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (including software platforms and/or contracted services)</p>	<p>Systematic-It appears that twice a year departments have the opportunity to modify data requests and report generation, as part of the academic program review and the fall review of data from Financial Services. There does not seem to be a process in place that captures changing needs or data requests across the College. For example, it is not clear how a department not undergoing a program review would be able to submit a request for a new report, and it is not clear how all academic departments may collaborate on a review of data reports. It is also not clear how the College may consider outsider vendors to assist with this kind of work</p>

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

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:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	<p>Systematic-The College Cabinet provides data results for improvement strategies on a weekly basis. A review of various college-wide metrics are reviewed once a month. However, it is unclear what follows the review. It may benefit the College community as a whole to be provide these data on a consistent basis.</p> <p>Reacting-The portfolio does not address this statement. The narrative instead speaks to how and where projects are tracked and when the College reviews College-wide metrics. Instead, the College may find it beneficial to analyze how units across campus use data, and what kind of data, to make decisions, and what kinds of decisions. The College may discover that similar units use very different kinds of information to make similar types of decisions, and both would benefit from using the same information and data. Likewise, the College could discover the value in some new metrics that would aid units in their operations.</p>
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	<p>Reacting-The response focused on the use of the Strategic Enrollment Team dashboard. This could be a very helpful example if the narrative discussed how these data informed decisions, particularly with respect to targets and benchmarks. For example, the data on non-traditional students could be used to set targets for the next recruitment cycle. Looking at the trend analysis for this population, the College could determine an appropriate target for this population relative to other populations. Likewise, the College could compare its enrollment trends with other community college and four year schools in the area to determine opportunities with both first year students and transfer students.</p>
Interpretation of results and insights gained	<p>Reacting-The College only offers comments about the use of enrollment data, and even these comments are very general. More helpful would be a discussion of what the College has learned about the College-wide use of data, where there are opportunities for expanded use, and where the College can rethink certain kinds of reporting.</p>

	Even with the sole focus on enrollment data, a more detailed response about what changed in marketing decisions or early alter processes would be helpful. There is little information provided the interpretation of results only a glimpse of insights gained regarding student demographics.
--	---

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

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
JCCC's plans to revise the review processes for administrative and service areas will need support from its knowledge management system. The College will be utilizing grant funds to build additional data sets in costing which will help the College tie resources to activities. It will be important for JCCC to build an evaluation factor into current and new knowledge management processes so they have evidence the systems are effective. While the College has made progress towards implementing its administrative and service areas review process, the narrative for this section falls short in fully explaining processes and results.

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:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Maintaining fiscal, physical and technological infrastructures sufficient to support operations.	<p>Aligned-The College's processes for managing its financial resources physical and technology infrastructure align with the overall operations of the institution. Revenue for the College is generated through property taxes, state of Kansas City operating grant and tuition and fees. This process is also overseen by the management committee of the board. There is also an external auditor who oversees who reviews financial documents. Beginning in December and ending in May the board finalizes the College budget, which had in turn been vetted by faculty, staff, deans, and Department chairs.</p> <p>The physical infrastructure is maintained through an inventory document which is routinely evaluated based on a one, five and 10-year schedule. Technology is handled through the annual Information Technology Planning Process which is also congruent with the institution budget</p>

	<p>process.</p> <p>Systemic-These processes are well documented as they are used to support the College. However, the College does not provide a mechanism for evaluating these processes. Nor does it state how all faculty as well as students bring forth their technology needs.</p>
<p>Setting goals aligned with the institutional mission, resources, opportunities and emerging needs.</p>	<p>Aligned-JCCC develops budgets based on the institution’s mission and goals. The general fund includes contingency funding, and the chief academic officer controls a cost center to develop instructional innovation. The College is known for and committed to sustainability, and facility planning and funding reflects this commitment. Forward thinking, the College commissioned a study to address gaining buildings and a general obligation capital outlay bond was approved to address these concerns. Technology needs are anticipated through collaboration with units across campus.</p> <p>Systematic-The College describes processes that align the mission, resources, opportunities and emerging needs primarily on an annual basis through the budget process which is shared in publication of budget materials on the College website. The physical and technological goals align on an annual basis through technology initiatives and construction projects resulting from capital outlay bond issuances that support goals of the mission and emerging needs. Evaluation of processes are not clear, but certainly are visibly shared with the College community with new buildings</p>
<p>Allocating and assigning resources to achieve organizational goals, while ensuring that educational purposes are not adversely affected.</p>	<p>Aligned-The College allocates and assigns resources from its fiscal area to achieve organizational goals through the budget process. They identify internal and external comparison data for benchmarks for core expenses per FTE. The Physical area uses an annual fixed maintenance costs and capital infrastructure inventory for additional costs. The College identifies an opportunity to better align physical spaces for student support and academic space. The College admits that they could better align physical spaces to support educational purposes and are building that into their master plan. The technological area has identified opportunities for improvement using the Program Review Process and the network infrastructure.</p>
<p>Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools</p>	<p>Systematic-Measures used by JCCC to determine the effectiveness of fiscal, physical, and technological infrastructure include annual financial statement audits and financial ratio analysis, monthly treasurer’s reports budgeted to actual comparisons, bond rating, cost of maintenance per square foot, and percentage of funds</p>

	allocated toward equipment replacement. The College uses separate systems for different areas and recognizes an opportunity to determine how to connect the data for more seamless use in planning. The College did not report if any of these processes are evaluated and improved based on outcomes.
Other identified processes	

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:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Reacting -The information provided by JCCC is helpful yet it does not fully provide a summary of results, including a table or figures. Through a needs analysis, a firm helped the College identify a shortfall regarding its academic spaces as well as academic support spaces. The report uses recommendations for the construction of new facilities for career and technical education and for arts education.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Systematic -JCCC does not appear to set targets but does benchmark using IPEDS data against a determined peer group. JCCC’s core expenses exceed the benchmark group. The College has been reducing this difference for three years. Determining an annual target by which the College wishes to narrow the difference between its expenses and that of the benchmarked group may help the College prioritize budget requests and spending. Further, IPEDS core expenses/FTE by function shows that JCCC consistently is higher than benchmark; however, The College has shown decreases recently. This has been a goal of the strategic plan. Figure 5.7 shows that JCCC’s Composite Financial Indicator is within the target area. It should be mentioned, however, that neither of these items were listed as measures in the process section of this subcategory.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Systematic -The CFI score has continued to improve within “the range,” indicating the College is managing its fiscal outlays well. Other than this, no interpretation or insights were provided. The College may find it helpful to more thoroughly examine annual resource allocation to set resource goals across the College. The College is continuing to use its strategic planning efforts to monitor expenses per FTE.

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

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
<p>JCCC has made multiple recent improvements in fiscal, physical, and technological infrastructure and appears committed to continue these efforts into the future. These efforts and improvements appear to have prioritization and support through the strategic planning and budgeting processes.</p> <p>The College demonstrates efforts to use data results for continuous quality improvement. They have gained external funding for a performance management system. They have incorporated a Facilities Master Plan. They have established a task force to review the College’s existing classroom design. The College employed a consulting firm to assess Information Services resulting in recommendations for improvements in specific areas of IT, including the hiring of a full-time IT security officer and adding an advisory group for such. The College implemented an Enterprise Data Warehouse which provides enrollment management data reports.</p> <p>With these accomplishments, it is still prudent that the College clearly identifies and articulates its processes as related to its knowledge management, tracking outcomes for both information technology and academic support as aligned to the College goals and mission.</p>

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:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Building budgets to accomplish institutional goals	Systematic -While the College has a cross-functional team, it is not clear how the teams are represented, to provide oversight for the budget development process. They also provide regular training to budget managers. Decisions on the budget are made by the President’s Cabinet, but it is unclear how those decisions are made. Clarifying how budget requests are prioritized relative to the strategic plan or other considerations may help to ensure that employees support the decision-making process.
Monitoring financial position and adjusting budgets	Aligned -The College monitored and adjusted its processes based on feedback from surveys and focus groups in 2014. They provided additional data to align planning and budget development for technology. In addition, the budget managers were provided more data from program reviews before budgets were developed. These processes were

	<p>evaluated and the results were shared with the respective department or division.</p> <p>Systematic-The College budgeting, strategic planning, and program review processes are systematic. Numerous reports were created to assist with monitoring of budgets throughout the year. That information is shared with administrators.</p>
<p>Maintaining a technological infrastructure that is reliable, secure and user-friendly</p>	<p>Aligned-Information Services maintains details as it tracks its effectiveness and services regarding help desk calls and close tickets, projects completed and systematic satisfaction surveys. Also, the Office of Institutional Research and Planning measures internal client evaluations through surveys as well. To ensure security across the infrastructure Information Technology uses both internal and external audits to maintain its security and the integrity of the system. The College recognizes an opportunity to extend a more systematic document retention review to all relevant areas of the campus.</p>
<p>Maintaining a physical infrastructure that is reliable, secure and user-friendly</p>	<p>Systematic-Activities are in place for work orders and a prioritization procedure is used to respond to operational needs. However, no specifics on who oversees these procedures or how they are evaluated for improvement are provided by JCCC in the portfolio.</p>
<p>Managing risks to ensure operational stability, including emergency preparedness</p>	<p>Aligned-JCCC has multiple departments and collaborations in place for risk management including a College-wide risk assessment. The College has identified an emergency preparedness manager who oversees the College’s Crisis Management Team and reports to JCCC’s chief of police. It might be assumed that an emergency management program such as this has evaluation built into it since there are logs and reports. Explaining how the evaluation and analysis is handled would clarify a complete process.</p>
<p>Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools</p>	<p>Systematic-“Budget administrators used Self-Service Budget Development and Salary Planner ‘for the first time,’ entered justifications for all line items, and developed budget requests based on the prior year’s actual expenditures rather than carrying forward previously budgeted amounts.”</p> <p>This in turn allowed the College to more accurately determine its budget based on projections. The findings were also followed up with a survey to gauge how budget managers felt of the new process.</p> <p>The new budget development process for 2016-17 has shown alignment with a Program Review process. The managers are able to see historical data as it relates to expenditures over the preceding three months.</p>

	There are some activities listed for tracking outcomes and measures and the College has implemented some processes, but it appears there is little connectivity for a robust budget development process.
Other identified processes	

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:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Reacting -A number of improvement activities are shared for the areas in Operational Effectiveness, including ongoing training in emergency preparedness and the development of a behavioral intervention team. Summary results are not provided, however, for the many measures described within the portfolio.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Reacting -JCCC financials' staff provides annual trend analysis and information that is reported to the management committee of the board. The narrative further explains the composite financial indicators but the narrative does not articulate how the institution compares its results with internal targets or benchmarks. The narrative provides limited information regarding results.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Reacting -The College does continue to work on establishing processes and selecting tools that enable it to make decisions. The narrative does not articulate any interpretation regarding its insights gained. It does speak, however, of the Activity Base Costing efforts funded through the Gates Foundation Grant which enable the College to gather more data, it needs for more transparency and operational effectiveness. Outside of that, the narrative is limited.

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

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
The College provided examples of implemented projects in this category including a Facilities Master Planning process, a Change Management board and a technology governance structure. The College expanded emergency preparedness and added cameras to campus facilities. The Cabinet continues to improve processes to align resources strategically.

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:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Selecting, deploying and evaluating quality improvement initiatives.	<p>Systematic - JCCC describes several initiatives that demonstrate broad participation in continuous improvement. These areas include the Counseling Center, the Bursar’s Office, Warehouse and Central Receiving, and the Center of Sustainability. The improvements align with the College’s strategic plan and at least some of them were identified through student satisfaction surveys or other feedback mechanisms. While the College describes a strategic planning process that integrates planning, budgeting, and quality improvement initiatives, it is unclear from the examples provided how improvement initiatives are selected. Some projects were selected through the strategic planning process, while others were selected prior to the Strategy Forum at which the new process was developed. More information about how the College determines which quality initiatives to pursue at any given time may help to demonstrate that JCCC has selection processes that are explicit, repeatable, and evaluated for improvement.</p> <p>Improvement initiatives appear to be deployed by creating a committee or task force. Clarifying how these groups engage students and other stakeholders in defining the project requirements may help to ensure that improvements address stakeholder needs. Additionally, it is unclear how lessons learned through these initiatives are shared among institutional units to build capacity for further improvements.</p>

<p>Aligning the Systems Portfolio, Action Projects, Comprehensive Quality Review and Strategy Forums</p>	<p>Systematic- The College used its 2014 Strategy Forum to redesign its strategic planning process and to align key performance indicators and AQIP mechanisms with the plan. Action projects are identified through the strategic planning process and approved by the president’s cabinet. Action project examples—academic program review and administrative and service area program review—demonstrate intentional efforts to mature College processes and improve alignment at various levels. While these processes demonstrate movement toward stronger integration, some aspects of AQIP’s alignment are unclear. It is unclear how projects become AQIP action projects and how College leaders identified the strategic planning process as a priority for the Strategy Forum. It is also unclear how feedback from systems appraisals, comprehensive quality reviews, and action project reviews are incorporated into planning and improvement. Finally, it is unclear whether these continuous improvement mechanisms are evaluated regularly for feedback and improvement. Clarifying these aspects of AQIP’s integration may help to ensure that JCCC’s quality improvement infrastructure maximizes the value of its participation in accreditation activities.</p>
<p>Other identified processes</p>	

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.

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
<p>What are the results for continuous quality improvement initiatives?</p>	<p>Aligned- JCCC provides positive results from several continuous quality improvement initiatives. The results show improvements in usage or satisfaction with the College Counseling Center and the Bursar’s Office, and results show reductions in waste from the Warehouse and Central Receiving and the Center for Sustainability. Most of these results are trended over time, and some are benchmarked against results from other community colleges.</p> <p>Systematic- While the initiatives described demonstrate efforts to align with the College’s strategic plan, it is unclear whether these examples demonstrate a system of measures, metrics, and benchmarks that are broadly understood within the College. For example, it is unclear how the institution measures the tasks associated with</p>

	Goal 4, which could help to illustrate how Warehouse improvements in facility utilization support the mission of the institution. Demonstrating how these initiatives contribute to the higher level measures and targets associated with the strategic plan goals may help to demonstrate that continuous quality improvement is well aligned at JCCC.
--	---

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

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
JCCC describes completed or planned improvements for several areas of the College. Counseling Services is moving towards predictive analytics, the Bursar’s Office is improving its billing process for outside entities and reviewing the effectiveness of student communications, and the Center for Sustainability is integrating sustainability into master facilities planning. The College is also planning upgrades to classrooms and the Performing Arts Center. As it continues to build an infrastructure that supports continuous quality improvement, JCCC may want to further clarify what process is used to identify, prioritize, and integrate CQI initiatives; it is currently unclear from the examples provided whether efforts are pockets of good practice or examples of a pervasive culture of quality. Identifying and tracking measures of a CQI culture may help to guide the College in evaluating and improving its CQI culture and infrastructure.

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:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Developing an infrastructure and providing resources to support a culture of quality	Systematic- JCCC’s newly improved three-year strategic planning process provides a high-level framework for its CQI initiatives that includes some KPIs and a leadership infrastructure that monitors outcomes, allocates resources, and directs staff. Development of an Enterprise Data Warehouse also demonstrates improvements to the College’s decision-making infrastructure. It is unclear, however, how the examples provided illustrate processes for maintaining a CQI infrastructure that are explicit, repeatable and periodically evaluated for improvement. Processes for coordinating, communicating, funding, and evaluating these initiatives are also unclear.

<p>Ensuring continuous quality improvement is making an evident and widely understood impact on institutional culture and operations</p>	<p>Systematic- JCCC aligns AQIP projects and other CQI initiatives to strategic planning goals. The President's Cabinet monitors progress reports on these projects and adjusts resources and personnel. College leaders also hold regular listening sessions on campus for feedback. Academic and administrative program review is a key mechanism through which CQI is practiced at the College. It is unclear, however, what processes are in place to ensure that these many CQI activities are making an evident and widely understood impact on institutional culture and operations. Clarifying the process connections between program review and strategic planning and budgeting, for example, may help to illustrate that JCCC maintains a CQI infrastructure with processes that are explicit, repeatable, and evaluated for improvement. Additionally, developing measures for the CQI culture and infrastructure may help the College determine whether CQI is widely understood among campus stakeholders.</p>
<p>Ensuring the institution learns from its experiences with CQI initiatives</p>	<p>Systematic- All AQIP and strategic planning project teams make regular presentations to the President's Cabinet and subcommittees of the Board of Trustees. Best practices are identified in these presentations and shared across the College. It is unclear, however, how these lessons learned are shared, and it is unclear whether the College evaluates the impact of its mechanisms for organizational learning, like having cross-functional membership on project teams. Clarifying the processes used to disseminate what JCCC learns from its CQI initiatives, and evaluating those processes for effectiveness may help College leaders determine how best to strengthen the CQI culture.</p>
<p>Reviewing, reaffirming, and understanding the role and vitality of the AQIP Pathway within the institution</p>	<p>Systematic- JCCC describes how regular presentations to the campus community, the Faculty Senate, Faculty Association, Learning Quality Committee and the Board of Trustees have aided in disseminating information about the AQIP Pathway. It also identifies the AQIP Steering Committee, campus-wide processes for identifying AQIP projects, and Cabinet approval processes as mechanisms for ensuring ongoing support. Further information about the processes through which the AQIP Pathway is reviewed, reaffirmed, and understood may help to clarify how effectively the AQIP Pathway supports the College in meeting its mission and goals.</p>
<p>Other identified processes</p>	

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.

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
<p>What are the results for continuous quality improvement to evidence a culture of quality?</p>	<p>Systematic- JCCC describes generally positive outcomes for its program review process, AQIP processes, and KPIs. Positive results for graduation and transfer rates and student satisfaction are described, and improvements to the program review process are identified. Providing trended results for the CQI culture and infrastructure that include feedback on stakeholder participation, targets for improvement and benchmarks may help to demonstrate a mature system and guide improvements.</p>

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

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
<p>The College describes four improvements to the quality culture that include 1) a Collaboration Center to focus on interdisciplinary projects, 2) a Facilities Master Plan, 3) an Enterprise Data Warehouse that will provide data for decision making, and 4) a three-year program review process that includes easier access to data reports, integration of budgets, activity-based costing, and inclusion of nationally benchmarked cost and productivity data. The College may want to clarify why these improvements were identified and prioritized and how information on these improvements is shared across the campus.</p>

APPENDIX C Criteria for Accreditation & Core Component Evidence Screening

Criterion 1. Mission

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

Core Component	Evidence	Screening Feedback
<p>1.A. The institution’s mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operations.</p> <p>1. The mission statement is developed through a process suited to the nature and culture of the institution and is adopted by the governing board.</p> <p>2. The institution’s academic programs, student support services, and enrollment profile are consistent with its stated mission.</p> <p>3. The institution’s planning and budgeting priorities align with and support the mission.</p>	<p>2013-14, the College implemented a planning process that incorporated the input of multiple stakeholder groups. The updated mission, vision, and value statements were approved by the Board of Trustees in July 2014. Strategic planning items are included with operational items in the budgeting process. The budget development process includes mechanisms for College faculty and staff to communicate priorities informed by ongoing planning efforts, the strategic plan, program review, and KPIs.</p> <p>Academic Program, Administrative, and Service Area Reviews include mechanisms for ensuring alignment to the mission. The curriculum approval process includes multiple levels of review to help ensure alignment to the mission, including approval by the Board of Trustees and the Kansas Board of Regents.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>
<p>1.B. The mission is articulated publicly.</p> <p>1. The institution clearly articulates its mission through one or more public documents, such as statements of purpose, vision, values, goals, plans, or institutional priorities.</p> <p>2. The mission document or documents</p>	<p>The mission document is articulated publicly, and distributed to internal and external stakeholders in a pamphlet and in the College’s annual report, which is distributed to civic leaders, legislators, and community members. The strategic planning process includes a review of mission, vision, and values in its scheduled process. There is no mention of the mission and vision statement being communicated through the website.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>are current and explain the extent of the institution's emphasis on the various aspects of its mission, such as instruction, scholarship, research, application of research, creative works, clinical service, public service, economic development, and religious or cultural purpose.</p> <p>3. The mission document or documents identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the higher education programs and services the institution provides.</p>		
<p>1.C. The institution understands the relationship between its mission and the diversity of society.</p> <p>1. The institution addresses its role in a multicultural society.</p> <p>2. The institution's processes and activities reflect attention to human diversity as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves.</p>	<p>JCCC in Section 1.3 does not clearly address its role in "a multicultural society and the institution's processes and activities reflect attention to human diversity" within this section. JCCC does use advisory committees to review currency in curriculum and the Department of Institutional Effectiveness, Planning and Research conduct student surveys, advisory board surveys, tracks graduation, persistence and success rates. From their website, there is an Office of Outcomes Assessment Annual Report shows that the College has eight learning outcomes with the fourth one being "Demonstrate an understanding of the broad diversity of the human experience."</p> <p>If a student indicates he/she may be part of a special needs population, prompts are provided for additional relevant information. The College provides counseling and specialized services to student stakeholder groups, including international and second-language students, veterans, students placed in developmental courses, and students needing classroom accommodations like those governed by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>1.D. The institution’s mission demonstrates commitment to the public good.</p> <p>1. Actions and decisions reflect an understanding that in its educational role the institution serves the public, not solely the institution, and thus entails a public obligation.</p> <p>2. The institution’s educational responsibilities take primacy over other purposes, such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests.</p> <p>3. The institution engages with its identified external constituencies and communities of interest and responds to their needs as its mission and capacity allow.</p>	<p>JCCC is a public not-for-profit institution and has a clear mission. During the 2013-2014 academic year, the College re-examined the core statements regarding its mission, vision, and values and approved changes in May 2014. As part of the overall planning process, the College re-examined the core statements regarding its mission (what the College does), vision (what the College aspires to), and values (what the College believes in), which are significant components of the strategic plan. The College surveyed examples from other institutions and considered the findings from "community conversations" and other focus groups. More than 200 students, faculty and staff contributed to the discussion, and community conversations allowed the public to engage in the discussion. The College communicates to the community in print with an annual report and on the College website. Program advisory committees provide input into program relevancy and currency.</p> <p>The Office of the Chief Financial Officer develops budget guidelines for each fiscal year, and the Cabinet and the Board of Trustees approve them. The College’s budget follows historical budget allocations and is informed by the strategic plan, KPIs, and ongoing planning and assessment efforts.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

Criterion 2. Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

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

Core Component	Evidence	Screening Feedback
<p>2.A. The institution operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions; it establishes and follows policies and processes for fair and ethical behavior on the</p>	<p>JCCC follows a Code of Ethics policy and has an Ethics Report Line and process as a confidential reporting tool. The Board Audit Committee reviews ethics data that are communicated in a quarterly audit committee report. JCCC has an Office of General Counsel that works proactively with</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>part of its governing board, administration, faculty, and staff.</p>	<p>departments to ensure that policies and procedures are followed consistently</p> <p>The College’s department of audit and auxiliary services works with other College departments to ensure that College assets and records are protected, information is reliable, and College actions are compliant with laws and regulations</p> <p>Training in ethical standards and behaviors is required of all employees at JCCC. The College has established a code of ethics that trustees and certain administrators must abide by to ensure conflicts of interest are addressed early and appropriately.</p>	
<p>2.B. The institution presents itself clearly and completely to its students and to the public with regard to its programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships.</p>	<p>JCCC’s website communicates all aspects of programming requirements and accreditations for both credit and non-credit offerings. In addition, printed materials are available to communicate expectations to students and external constituencies.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>
<p>2.C. The governing board of the institution is sufficiently autonomous to make decisions in the best interest of the institution and to assure its integrity.</p> <p>1. The governing board’s deliberations reflect priorities to preserve and enhance the institution.</p> <p>2. The governing board reviews and considers the reasonable and relevant interests of the institution’s internal and external constituencies during its decision-making deliberations.</p> <p>3. The governing board preserves its</p>	<p>The College is governed by a seven member Board of Trustees elected at-large from the community to four-year terms. The Board governs the College through the appointment of a president and setting the budget and local tax levy. In odd calendar years, three or four trustees face re-election. Contact information for the trustees is made public on the College website</p> <p>The Board governs the College by adopting recommended College policies regarding students, personnel, administrative services, information services, safety and security, and the trustees themselves</p> <p>The Office of General Council (OGC) is responsible for oversight of the Policy and Procedure Committee and facilitation of updates to the policy and procedures library. The OGC periodically recommends updates</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>independence from undue influence on the part of donors, elected officials, ownership interests, or other external parties when such influence would not be in the best interest of the institution.</p> <p>4. The governing board delegates day-to-day management of the institution to the administration and expects the faculty to oversee academic matters.</p>	<p>when necessitated by new laws and/or regulations that affect the College.</p>	
<p>2.D. The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.</p>	<p>One of JCCC core values is “Responsiveness - We respond to the needs of our students and communities through relevant offerings.” The College provides an environment for teaching and learning by ensuring quality and rigor in courses, programs and services. Programs are evaluated using a Program Review process and from that analysis, programs are realigned, improved or changed to reflect needs of the community and students.</p> <p>Published policies and procedures are referenced; however, nothing specific to freedom of expression nor pursuit of truth in teaching and learning is evident.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>
<p>2.E. The institution’s policies and procedures call for responsible acquisition, discovery and application of knowledge by its faculty, students, and staff.</p> <p>1. The institution provides effective oversight and support services to ensure the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by its faculty, staff, and students.</p>	<p>Faculty maintain office hours for student inquiries. Student Support services are available for students including tutoring, accommodative services, online learning support and resource center and library. Students are aware of services through orientation, faculty and other College communications including website. Processes are in place for informing students about academic integrity and honesty, including classroom instruction, and a process for reporting and responding to suspected violations of academic integrity and honesty are clear. The College may want to consider collecting data on these cases</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>2. Students are offered guidance in the ethical use of information resources.</p> <p>3. The institution has and enforces policies on academic honesty and integrity.</p>	<p>and setting targets to reduce the number of incidents of academic integrity and honesty</p>	
---	--	--

Criterion 3. Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support

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

Core Component	Evidence	Screening Feedback
<p>3.A. The institution’s degree programs are appropriate to higher education.</p> <p>1. Courses and programs are current and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree or certificate awarded.</p> <p>2. The institution articulates and differentiates learning goals for its undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate, and certificate programs.</p> <p>3. The institution’s program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (on the main campus, at additional locations, by distance delivery, as dual credit, through contractual or consortial arrangements, or any other modality).</p>	<p>The College maintains and uses placement testing for all degree-seeking students. The College maintains a large dual-credit enrollment with the dual-credit course using the same assessment methods and instruments as courses offered on campus or online. A curriculum management process reviews and approves existing curricula changes, and new programs and courses are reviewed and approved through same process and then approved by the College’s Board of Trustees and by the Kansas Board of Regents.</p> <p>Faculty hold the primary responsibility for establishing and maintaining the high standards of quality and rigor of curricula at JCCC. Faculty members work collaboratively with each other and with chairs and deans to ensure consistency in offerings regardless of delivery modality, location, or dual-credit purpose.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>3.B. The institution demonstrates that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational programs.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The general education program is appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution. 2. The institution articulates the purposes, content, and intended learning outcomes of its undergraduate general education requirements. The program of general education is grounded in a philosophy or framework developed by the institution or adopted from an established framework. It imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess. 3. Every degree program offered by the institution engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments. 4. The education offered by the institution recognizes the human and cultural diversity of 	<p>The College’s statement for general education was developed by the Educational Affairs Committee, 2005. General education requirements are distributed across 33 departments, these requirements include communications, humanities, social sciences, and math and/or science. All students are required to complete a diversity course.</p> <p>In 2014 the College opened an AQIP project focused on assessment of general education. Faculty teaching a general education course are required to participate in assessment of the common learning outcomes. The Office of Outcomes Assessment provides annual reports on division-level and College-level results for general education and CTE outcomes.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>
---	--	---

<p>the world in which students live and work.</p> <p>5.The faculty and students contribute to scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge to the extent appropriate to their programs and the institution’s mission.</p>		
<p>3.C. The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services.</p> <p>1. The institution has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out both the classroom and the non-classroom roles of faculty, including oversight of the curriculum and expectations for student performance; establishment of academic credentials for instructional staff; involvement in assessment of student learning.</p> <p>2. All instructors are appropriately credentialed, including those in dual credit, contractual, and consortial programs.</p> <p>3. Instructors are evaluated regularly in accordance with established institutional policies and procedures.</p> <p>4. The institution has processes and resources for assuring that instructors are current in their disciplines and adept in</p>	<p>JCCC maintains College policies for recruiting and hiring of faculty and staff. When new employees join the College, they participate in on-boarding training. Administrators approve qualifications by creating a job description for all positions. Program faculty positions are determined by enrollment, attrition, class size, new programs and are justified and approved; little information is provided on what happens if positions are not filled. Staff positions are aligned to institutional goals and strategic priorities; the College does not provide information on what happens if the positions are not staffed.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>their teaching roles; it supports their professional development.</p> <p>5. Instructors are accessible for student inquiry.</p> <p>6. Staff members providing student support services, such as tutoring, financial aid advising, academic advising, and co-curricular activities, are appropriately qualified, trained, and supported in their professional development.</p>		
<p>3.D. The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.</p> <p>1. The institution provides student support services suited to the needs of its student populations.</p> <p>2. The institution provides for learning support and preparatory instruction to address the academic needs of its students. It has a process for directing entering students to courses and programs for which the students are adequately prepared.</p> <p>3. The institution provides academic advising suited to its programs and the needs of its students.</p> <p>4. The institution provides to students and instructors the infrastructure and</p>	<p>JCCC provides both general student services and services specific to student subpopulations, including services for international students, veterans, students with learning differences, English language learners, distance learners, ABE students, and so on.. Also, the College offers a host of services and centers for students who need assistance: there is the Student Success Center, Academic Counseling, Academic Services as well as a host of centers such as a Math and Science Centers to assist students in their academic needs.</p> <p>The College uses a placement test to help ensure correct placement of students. It also provides a Student Success Center with tutoring, financial aid, career development, ACCESS services, child care, transportation, and other services.</p> <p>The College provides a performing arts center, library, technology support center, laboratories, clinical spaces, and so on. One mechanism for communicating these resources to students is the Smart Start mini sessions, provided through the Academic Achievement Center</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning (technological infrastructure, scientific laboratories, libraries, performance spaces, clinical practice sites, museum collections, as appropriate to the institution's offerings).</p> <p>5. The institution provides to students guidance in the effective use of research and information resources.</p>		
<p>3.E. The institution fulfills the claims it makes for an enriched educational environment.</p> <p>1. Co-curricular programs are suited to the institution's mission and contribute to the educational experience of its students.</p> <p>2. The institution demonstrates any claims it makes about contributions to its students' educational experience by virtue of aspects of its mission, such as research, community engagement, service learning, religious or spiritual purpose, and economic development.</p>	<p>The College's commitment to community engagement, service learning, and economic development are reflected in the mission, vision, and values statements. The College incorporates service learning, international education, and an honors program into its curricular offerings. Through an AQIP project on co-curricular alignment, the College collected data on all students organizations, defined "co-curricular" and "extracurricular" activities, and conducted a pilot with several academic units. Following the AQIP project, the process was embedded into the Comprehensive Academic Program Review, and programs and departments align co-curricular activities during the comprehensive cycle of review.</p> <p>The Academic Program Review process includes the expectation that programs align their curriculum with relevant co-curricular activities. Co-curricular clubs and organizations are well established, but assessment is still evolving.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

Criterion 4. Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through

processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

Core Component	Evidence	Screening Feedback
<p>4.A. The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.</p> <p>1. The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.</p> <p>2. The institution evaluates all the credit that it transcripts, including what it awards for experiential learning or other forms of prior learning, or relies on the evaluation of responsible third parties.</p> <p>3. The institution has policies that assure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.</p> <p>4. The institution maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. It assures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.</p> <p>5. The institution maintains specialized accreditation for its programs as appropriate</p>	<p>JCCC faculty hold the primary responsibility for establishing and maintaining quality and rigor. Quality faculty meet and maintain minimal qualifications. Though this information was stated, JCCC does not explain the process for ensuring this qualification is correct and who sets those qualifications. JCCC has launched a Program Review Process to align with strategic priorities and budgeting processes.</p> <p>Published and standardized course outlines identify course objectives, competencies, prerequisites and corequisites, and methods of evaluation that apply to all sections regardless of the mode of delivery or location. The dual-credit program is accredited by the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP)</p> <p>The College supports specialized accreditation requirements for those programs and careers where specialized accreditation leads to appropriate licensure or nationally standardized tests for career requirements</p> <p>Additionally, career and technical programs maintain strong ties with advisory committees. The College monitors graduate attainment of skills is through the employer survey conducted through the Office of Institutional Research</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>to its educational purposes.</p> <p>6. The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. The institution assures that the degree or certificate programs it represents as preparation for advanced study or employment accomplish these purposes. For all programs, the institution looks to indicators it deems appropriate to its mission, such as employment rates, admission rates to advanced degree programs, and participation rates in fellowships, internships, and special programs (e.g., Peace Corps and AmeriCorps).</p>		
<p>4.B. The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.</p> <p>1. The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.</p> <p>2. The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.</p> <p>3. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to</p>	<p>JCCC states it has defined program and general education outcomes for all programs. Those outcomes are on a continuous cycle of inquiry, assessment and improvement with the data produced helping stakeholders make evidence-based decisions related to curriculum, instruction and resources. In 2014-2015, the CAO requested that the Educational Affairs Committee examine the College's general education requirements for associate degrees and make recommendations.</p> <p>The process for assessing the co-curriculum is evolving; some co-curricular programs like service learning, honors, and international education participate in the Comprehensive Program Review process which has included investigating effective assessments for their programs.</p> <p>The College defines learning outcomes for general education, CTE programs, and all courses. These outcomes are reviewed regularly through Methods for assessing common learning outcomes include</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>improve student learning.</p> <p>4. The institution's processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff members.</p>	<p>pre/posttests, rubrics, and embedded assignments. The College also assesses student learning indirectly through the CCSSE. A new AQIP Project was initiated in 2017 to further improve this area.</p>	
<p>4.C. The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs.</p> <p>1. The institution has defined goals for student retention, persistence, and completion that are ambitious but attainable and appropriate to its mission, student populations, and educational offerings.</p> <p>2. The institution collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence, and completion of its programs.</p> <p>3. The institution uses information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs to make improvements as warranted by the data.</p> <p>4. The institution's processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion of</p>	<p>The College tracks persistence, retention, completion and student success data; sets targets and monitors progress each year. The Kansas Board of Regent determines the College internal target and external benchmarks for the College with those measures set to the state's performance based funding model. JCCC uses KBOR performance agreements and College KPIs to monitor and assess retention, persistence, and completion.</p> <p>The IR Office distributes an Enrollment Tracking Report that lists enrollments by a number of characteristics, including student population. JCCC shares this information with the College constituents and recently acquired a data warehouse to store the information.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>programs reflect good practice. (Institutions are not required to use IPEDS definitions in their determination of persistence or completion rates. Institutions are encouraged to choose measures that are suitable to their student populations, but institutions are accountable for the validity of their measures.)</p>		
--	--	--

Criterion 5. Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

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

Core Component	Evidence	Screening Feedback
<p>5.A. The institution’s resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.</p> <p>1. The institution has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered.</p> <p>2. The institution’s resource allocation process ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas or disbursement of revenue to a superordinate entity.</p> <p>3. The goals incorporated into</p>	<p>JCCC provides regular professional development opportunities for all employees (full-time and part-time faculty and staff) These opportunities and support include new faculty orientation, the JCCC leadership institute, and opportunities to take additional courses.</p> <p>The College’s fiscal infrastructure is maintained to support operations and reserve levels in accordance with the Board’s cash reserve policies. Resource planning is tied to the budget planning process. The College uses a variety of tools for capital planning and budgeting purposes, including a replacement inventory tracking system, a capital schedule application, a remodel request application, and software for work order requests</p> <p>Instructional and administrative programs identify opportunities for improvement using the Program Review Process.</p> <p>Each budget unit maintains a dashboard of expenses and receives monthly updates on</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>mission statements or elaborations of mission statements are realistic in light of the institution's organization, resources, and opportunities.</p> <p>4. The institution's staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.</p> <p>5. The institution has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expenses.</p>	<p>expenditures. The budget office provides training and monitoring for all units.</p> <p>The College uses detailed job descriptions to determine the qualifications required for position and hires according to these descriptions.</p>	
<p>5.B. The institution's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.</p> <p>1. The governing board is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight of the institution's financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities.</p> <p>2. The institution has and employs policies and procedures to engage its internal constituencies—including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff, and students—in the institution's governance.</p> <p>3. Administration, faculty, staff, and students are involved in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for</p>	<p>The College maintains a seven member Board of Trustees elected from the community for a four-year term. It meets monthly and provides oversight on all financial and operating matters. The College's Office of General Council is responsible for oversight of the Policy and Procedure Committee and facilitates updates to the policy and procedures. Members of faculty, staff and administration sit on five standing Board committees, and faculty senate leadership meets with the College president on a regular basis. Students are also involved in campus wide committees. However, the process is unclear on how all the Committees work together to change policy and procedures.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>contribution and collaborative effort.</p>		
<p>5.C. The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.</p> <p>1. The institution allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities.</p> <p>2. The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.</p> <p>3. The planning process encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups.</p> <p>4. The institution plans on the basis of a sound understanding of its current capacity. Institutional plans anticipate the possible impact of fluctuations in the institution's sources of revenue, such as enrollment, the economy, and state support.</p> <p>5. Institutional planning anticipates emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization.</p>	<p>In 2013-2014, the College created a new strategic plan and is updating that plan by engaging internal and external stakeholders in the process that is aligned to the mission and vision of the College. The program review process is aligned with the College's mission along with other strategic initiatives and key performance indicators. Program changes are aligned with the College's annual budget planning process that is also linked into the strategic plan. Various committees and the cabinet members analyze all operating and strategic planning initiatives. A primary outcome of the strategic planning process was the alignment of planning and AQIP processes on campus. The alignment provided greater focus for the College community and allowed for investment of time, resources, and buy-in by the campus community. While not every project achieved all of its outcomes, all of the projects moved the campus forward in important activities focused on student success.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>
<p>5.D. The institution works systematically to improve its performance.</p> <p>1. The institution develops and documents evidence of</p>	<p>Initiatives described in Category 6 include results that demonstrate improvement in student participation, satisfaction, waste reduction, and so on. It is unclear how pervasively this practice is used by the College, as many other initiatives described within the portfolio either do not include</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>performance in its operations.</p> <p>2. The institution learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its component parts.</p>	<p>performance results or positive results are stated but not provided.</p>	
--	---	--