QUALITY HIGHLIGHTS REPORT

West Shore Community College (WSCC) has been accredited via the Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP) since 2002. In June of 2013, WSCC submitted a third systems portfolio. In many ways, we are fundamentally the same institution we were in 2013. As noted in the 2013 feedback appraisal report the reviewers stated the college is very responsive to local communities and hold abundant collaborative relationships within those communities. They noted that we have a strong commitment to valuing people, and to the development of a data-informed culture, and that we have a strong financial base on which to move forward. All of these observations are true.

This quality highlights report describes our response to the AQIP Systems Appraisal Feedback Report and our institutional improvement efforts since 2013 as part of our preparation for the March 2016 Comprehensive Quality Review team visit.

Transitions

Since the 2013 review, WSCC has experienced a number of unexpected transitions. On the evening of August 6, 2014, the College President was involved in an incident in a College vehicle. On August 11, 2014, the Board placed him on administrative leave, and placed the Executive Leadership Team (VP Administrative Services, VP Academic and Student Services, and Director of College Relations) in charge of the institution on an interim basis. The leadership team met weekly with the Executive Committee of the Board to ensure continuity in leadership of operations. Over time, the President decided to retire, and at the November 2014 Board meeting, his retirement became official. This was an extremely public event in a small rural area, generating front-page media coverage, much public comment, and was a difficult time of transitions for the College, the Board, the community, and the President.

The Vice President of Administrative Services was appointed Acting President on September 15, 2014 and Interim President of WSCC on December 15, 2014. A national Presidential search was launched in November, the profile publicized in January 2015, and Dr. Kenneth Urban was hired in May 2015 as only the fourth President of West Shore Community College since 1967. He officially began July 13, 2015.
During the transition year, the priorities were to continue the institution’s forward progress and to improve community connections. At the same time, the leadership transition slowed implementation of a number of important initiatives, including full implementation of the new strategic plan, the action project linking planning and budgeting, and the launch of an updated dashboard with metrics and goals for success. Also during this same period, the Director of the Foundation position was vacated, and the Director of College Relations stepped to serve in a dual role. The rest of the leadership team (Vice-Presidents and Deans) has remained stable. Although challenging, this transitional situation led to growth in the Board and the leadership team; team engagement has continued since then.

**PACE Survey Administration**

As part of an ongoing commitment to data-informed decision making, the College decided to continue with the planned administration of the PACE climate survey in Winter 2015 despite a fair amount of organizational uncertainty and transition under interim leadership. As noted in Figure 1. WSCC ratings fell in all categories. This provides helpful information to the new President, who invited PACE consultants to campus to lead focus group conversations about moving forward.

**Figure 1. PACE Results, 2005 – 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Structure</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Relationships</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Focus</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The suggestions of the consultants, were compiled into four categories following those sessions: communication, decision-making and influence, organizational structure and performance evaluation.

Since that time, the President has announced the creation of a new advisory council, the College Liaison Group, made up of one administrator, one full-time liberal arts faculty member, one full-time occupational faculty member, one adjunct faculty member, one ESP (staff) member, one student, and one custodial/facilities staff member. Both Vice Presidents and the Director of Human Resources attend the meetings in a staff role (i.e. they are not members of the CLG). The CLG is currently meeting every other week.

In addition, the President has also developed new monthly forums for campus input:
- Popcorn with the President for students and the general public; and
- President’s office hours for staff

Finally, the President announced organizational structure changes, which will take effect in January 2016. The Director of College Relations will become the Executive Director of Communications.
and Community Engagement. He will lead marketing and outreach efforts including the Foundation, the Business Opportunity Center, Community Education, and our Performing and Creative Arts. His work will strengthen institutional relationships with our communities and stakeholders.

The Academics and Student Services Unit is also redesigned. The Director of the Business Opportunity Center will now report to the Executive Director of Communications and Community Engagement. The Dean of Instruction position has been split into two positions: a Dean of Arts and Sciences and a Dean of Occupational Programs. A portion of the work of the former Director of Student Success Services, who has been named the Dean of Occupational Programs, will be distributed to other supervisors within the unit. The Dean of Student Services remains as well.

**Highlights of process and focus since June Systems Portfolio**

Even during the transition in leadership, WSCC continued to seek quality improvement. An analysis of the systems appraisal report, led by the Institutional Effectiveness Team (IE) was carried out using the same team-based model that created the portfolio. The IE team (administrators, staff and faculty members) recognized significant strategic challenges noted in the appraisal feedback report, which stated:

1. Identifying and using key performance indicators
2. Building processes for strategic involvement in the upcoming strategic planning process
3. Continuing to build student learning assessment process

In addition, the September 2013 appraisal feedback report identified key areas across all AQIP categories that would strengthen WSCC’s continuous quality improvement model. In particular, three general themes emerged from the assessment of the appraisal feedback.

- Identification of goals and measurement of achievement
- More intentional work around formalized processes and improvement of processes
- Stronger data for decision making and assessment of results

Because these themes represented institutional-level issues rather than departmental or unit issues, the IE team took a leadership role in moving forward to address them. In addition, the College took note of the five accreditation criteria which were rated as “adequate” rather than as “strong”: 1.A. Planning and Budgeting aligned with Mission, 4.B. Program Review, 4.C. Retention, Persistence and Completion, and 5.A. Resource Management. Since 2013, WSCC has taken significant strides toward strengthening its commitment to continuous quality improvement (CQI) efforts by creating and implementing data-informed decision making processes, aligned with major components of both the strategic plan and accreditation requirements. The following sections share details of each of these efforts, as indexed on the following page:
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Strategic Planning – 1A

WSCC noted in its June 2013 systems portfolio that it planned to engage in revision of a new strategic plan in the upcoming year, and that work was developed and approved during the 2013-2014 school year. The Institutional Effectiveness (IE) team assembled in August at an in-service to discuss the connection between strategic planning and student success, with the keynote speaker, Dr. Mark Milliron. The team met again in November 2013 and reviewed the charge of the team and developed an action strategy. The College President told the team he wanted a plan that was bigger, bolder, and more aspirational.

The IE team was joined by additional staff to form the Strategic Planning team, made up of 26 individuals, who convened for a day-long workshop in January 2014. At the end of the day, the team had evaluated external and internal environmental scanning with both qualitative and quantitative data (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats, or SWOT process), reviewed the mission, reaffirmed the values, and brainstormed goals for the future. Numerous quality tools were employed during the workshop, such as affinity diagramming, gallery walks, multi-voting, and creative visioning.

A small writing team was assembled and the team met weekly from January through April to transform the brainstormed goals into a new strategic plan. The large group convened again in late February to review and critique the draft strategic plan to date. The group provided significant
input that was considered, and informed change to the plan by the writing team. The sub team kept meeting. In March, the draft plan was sent to all College staff for input and feedback, and that feedback was again reviewed and incorporated by the writing team. In early April, two panels were held with external constituents, one in each county the College serves. Participants provided more feedback about the goals, which was again incorporated into the plan.

Figure 2: Key Strategic Directions, Strategic Plan Adopted May 2014

The resulting plan identifies four key strategic directions, two of which are externally focused: Foster Student Success and Serve our Communities, and two of which are internally focused: Strengthen our Organization and Innovate & Collaborate. Within each strategic direction, there are a number of three-year goals intended to represent work that will drive the focus of the organization for the next three years.

Annually, the College would develop shorter-term priorities that would break down three-year goals into achievable, actionable objectives for the upcoming year. Those annual priorities could then be used by teams and departments to create operational objectives and individual goals, thus ensuring that the work of individuals, departments, and teams was aligned with institutional priorities and to the achievement of the strategic plan goals and mission.

The draft plan was presented to the Board for first reading in April 2014 and discussed. It was formally approved by the Board at their May meeting. The plan was lauded by the Board and staff for being both forward thinking and pragmatic. The plan is published on the College’s website: WSCC Strategic Plan. The plan, as approved, did not address assessment of achievement of strategic directions, but that work was to take place as part of the implementation of the plan, in alignment with work on an institutional dashboard. (See page 12 for an update on that work.)

Concurrently, the IE team was working to develop a strategic planning process and met several times during the month of March to create a planning model. The model was attached to the plan and became part of the whole plan that was approved. The large team convened again in late April to brainstorm annual priorities for the upcoming year. That brainstorming formed the basis for the annual priorities that were approved by the IE team and President during the summer months and published in the 2014-2015 planning manual (which was also available on the website: Planning Manual for 2014-2015).
Several members of the IE team attended the HLC Strategy Forum in May 2014 with the goal of developing a planning process linked to budgeting and assessment. The forum discussions were lively and challenging because team members had several different ideas about how to move forward to achieve the goals. By the end of the forum, however, the team had a plan and a charter for an ambitious action team project to develop and operationalize the planning process. In alignment with that team charter, during the fall semester, operational departments and teams were asked to write operational goals for the current year. It was understood that planning was off pattern – that is, plans are usually written before the year starts, but the team wanted to begin operational planning. The 2013-2014 operational plan was compiled, and served as a model for departmental planning that had not occurred formally in the past.

As the winter semester began, the IE team began development of annual focus strategies for the upcoming year to be ready to launch the planning process in spring before the budgeting process. The Interim President suggested that the College adopt four three-year goals for the upcoming year, matching the Presidential profile challenges, and not to create any additional focus strategies. In addition, he tasked a project team to create a project prioritization tool, discussed in the section on resource management, which was intended to serve as the institution’s new planning tool. As is discussed later, the development of the tool took longer than anticipated, but has been launched as of December 2015. It will serve to drive planning and prioritization for the 2016-2017 year. (See page 30 for a discussion of the prioritization model).

In the meantime, the new President used several tenets of the strategic plan at his kick-off presentation about priorities for work in the coming year, and is bridging any gaps between the strategic plan that currently exists and the new project prioritization tool. He will be leading the strategic planning process forward during January 2016 in-service, and is also beginning planning for the formal development of the 2017-2022 Plan, during the 2016-2017 school year.

Data-Informed Decision making – 5D

At the time of the 2013 systems portfolio, a draft of the College’s dashboard was submitted. Rather than setting goals and targets, College leadership sought to develop a continuous improvement approach. However, WSCC did recognize the need to continue to develop data resources for data-informed decision making, particularly related to benchmarking progress against similar colleges. WSCC entered into a relationship with the National Community College Benchmarking Project in spring 2013, receiving the first set of data in Fall 2013 and now has three years of data as a result.
WSCC participated in the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) for the second time in 2014, and added the Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE) in Fall 2014. WSCC learned quickly that it was challenging to compare the results with the previous 2011 cohort, due to the norming process used by CCSSE. As a result, the College sent a team of staff (including the new Institutional Research Director who had not yet started employment) to a CCSSE High Impact Practices Workshop to work with the data. That group returned with new insights that are driving a new direction in Student Success work, called Supplemental Instruction. (See page 17).

WSCC also joined the Voluntary Framework of Accountability (VFA), along with most other Michigan community colleges in 2014. While still operating without official goals and targets, the College did begin sharing data on completion, retention, and persistence. These data were shared at a Fall 2014 in-service session with all staff, in November 2014 to the Board, and again in May 2015 to the Board. Examples of the data shared include: developmental success rates, retention rates, and success rates, as noted below in Figures 4 – 8.

**Figure 4: Developmental English Rates**  
**Figure 5: Developmental Math Rates**

![Developmental English Achievement](image)

![Developmental Math Achievement](image)

As described later beginning on page 14, these data were used to assess priorities and evaluate progress with student success efforts, such as whether the Accelerated Learning Project for developmental writing was successful in achieving intended results. See Figure 17 on page 17. The Dean of Instruction has also shared information with the faculty, such as course success rates by faculty member and by delivery modality, which has been used to help prioritize requests for new faculty. It was also used by the online course criteria team to assess differences in success rates between face-to-face and online sections (figure 9).
Figure 6: Fall-to-Winter Retention Rates

Figure 7: Credit Threshold Rates

Figure 8: Comparison of VFA and IPEDS Success Rates
Figure 9: Success by Modality

Predictive Analytics Adoption - Civitas
Civitas Learning, adopted in January 2014, provides predictive analytics which increases our knowledge of specific student populations. Civitas supports the customization of intervention techniques for student success and student-specific information so the College can intervene during the semester to help before students drop out or fail. The data have indicated a few areas where there are gaps, which has provided opportunities to engage in several campus discussions and howWSCC might best bridge those gaps with our students. In particular, Civitas has identified several areas where our students are below the average success rate or above. Most predictive student characteristics related to persistence identified during the College's initial work with the tool include registration prior to the start of the semester and credit-taking patterns as depicted in Figures 10-12.

Figure 10: Students who register more than two months prior to the start of courses tend to have a higher persistence rate.
Figure 11: Students taking fewer than eight credits per term have a 57% persistence rate.

Figure 12: Students with eight or more credits persisted at 73%.

WSCC understands that these predictive analytics do not explain why certain student groups are more likely to persist than others. However, it does provide awareness of the gaps and offers insight that leads to thoughtful conversations in various campus teams. For example, the use of these data has led to faculty insights that are changing the culture of the institution. For example, one faculty member challenged his peers, “The data show that we are a good four-year college. By that I mean that we do best with traditional age, transfer-focused students. In other words, students just like us. We need to get better at serving students who are not like us.” That challenge has led to significant projects underway about changing course placement procedures, has increased faculty involvement in student advising, and contributed to a recent organizational structure change, creating a new Dean of Occupational Programs position.
Another applicable tool from Civitas is *Inspire for Advisors*. This application allows for additional information on particular students. Using several hundred data points from our Student Information System, the *Inspire* platform identifies particular students who are less likely to persist. That information is used to dig deeper into what might be lessening a student’s likelihood to persist in order to narrow down the possible reasons (late submissions, performing poorly on exams or assignment, etc.). The *Inspire* project was piloted in Fall 2015 with two goals: First, to identify students who had a failing grade at mid-term, reaching out to inform students about options for tutoring support, and second, to identify students who failed to register for the upcoming semester in the first two weeks of open registration and to reach out to remove barriers to registration. The results of those pilots are still being tabulated. The next step will focus on developing a process to integrate the *Inspire* application into the campus early alert work.

To date, key learnings from the review of student success metrics and outcomes have been:

- Proportionally less of our entering population places into developmental education, prompting a review of the math progression and which courses are considered developmental math at West Shore as compared to other institutions.
- Developmental English and Math interventions piloted beginning in 2011-2012 year appear to be successful and are being taken to scale.
- A variety of efforts targeted at retention – such as advising students to take at least six credits if possible, orientation, and tutoring changes, appear to be positively impacting both retention and credit threshold attainment.
- VFA Data appear to hold promise to help assess outcomes, and to better depictWSCC student outcomes, especially using six-year outcomes.

**Institutional Researcher**

In response to opportunities identified in the Systems Appraisal and the College’s interest in expanding data-informed decision making, specifically as it relates to student success, WSCC hired a full-time Director of Institutional Researcher (IR) in June 2015 as the culmination of a year-long search process. The IR is responsible for managing the majority of State and Federal reporting and provides support to staff through the development of metrics, collection, and analysis of data to inform decision making.

Early wins that can be attributed to the creation of the new position include using geographic information systems (GIS) to present enrollment information. Using GIS to characterize enrollments provided the Board of Trustees with a visualization of the geographical locations and demographics of WSCC students (Figure 13). This, in turn, supported the College’s efforts to increase course offerings at selected off-campus locations for Winter 2016, such as the Oceana County Intermediate School District (ISD) building and at Baldwin High School. Board member comments included: “I had no idea we had this many students coming from Oceana County” and “This is very helpful in understanding where our students come from.”

Institutional Research has also augmented the work of the Project Prioritization team - ensuring language was inserted into the new project proposal template that captures performance metrics and data collection procedures as part of the project proposal.
Institutional Dashboard

WSCC developed an updated draft and worked on a more sophisticated dashboard during the 2014-15 year, but without a permanent President, the Board did not want to adopt targets or goals. Now that Dr. Urban is in place, the College is ready to move forward. As seen below in Figure 14 WSCC’s current dashboard demonstrates alignment between the mission and strategies. These data indicate trends from 2012 to the present, including goals for 2015-2016, and the alignment of operations with the vision and mission of the College. It further indicates the direction of the trend, used by the College to make meaningful decisions. The College plans to move forward in creating more advanced performance metrics in the coming year and to connect those metrics with the new 2017 strategic plan, project management, and budgeting.

The dashboard, below in Figure 14, is aligned with both mission outcomes and strategic directions, designed to allow the College to measure both achievement of mission and progress in achieving strategic plan goals. Since the systems appraisal, the College has made progress in using nationally normed data that can be benchmarked (although benchmarked rates are not part of the dashboard yet). Other areas require the assistance of the new Director of IR to establish, collect and report internal institutional data. Nevertheless, the College is making good progress in the use of data to make data-informed decisions and to assess performance. Dr. Urban is committed to the development of a more comprehensive performance metrics instrument in the coming year, as the 2107-2022 strategic plan is developed.
### Figure 14: WSCC Institutional Effectiveness Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEARN</td>
<td>Foster Student Success</td>
<td>Fall to Winter Retention Rate, Main Cohort</td>
<td>VFA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall to Fall Retention Rate</td>
<td>NCCBP</td>
<td>44.31</td>
<td>48.97%</td>
<td>45.82%</td>
<td>&gt;50%</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Progress Rate, % students meeting threshold, main cohort</td>
<td>VFA</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Establish</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course success rate (% C or better)</td>
<td>NCCBP</td>
<td>79.32</td>
<td>82.09%</td>
<td>80.65%</td>
<td>&gt;82%</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing competency score</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Thinking competency score</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Innovate and Collaborate</td>
<td># articulation agreements with educational partners</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Establish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employee satisfaction with direction in alignment with mission</td>
<td>PACE</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td></td>
<td>Establish</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIVE</td>
<td>Serve our Communities</td>
<td># individuals served in continuing education courses</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Establish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td># individuals who attend college sponsored events</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>6,875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Establish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Market Penetration rate from local high schools</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>21.81%</td>
<td>18.21%</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;20%</td>
<td>⇔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student overall satisfaction rate</td>
<td>CCSSE</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;3.3</td>
<td>⇔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK</td>
<td>Foster Student Success</td>
<td>Employment within 6 months of graduation</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>74.60</td>
<td>63.22%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>&gt;70%</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serve our Communities</td>
<td>Employer satisfaction rate</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Establish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthen our organization</td>
<td>Professional Development Expenditures/FTE employee</td>
<td>NCCBP</td>
<td>$32</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;$35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Climate</td>
<td>PACE</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>&gt;4.0</td>
<td>⇔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROSPER</td>
<td>Foster Student Success</td>
<td>% that complete developmental math &amp; first college course</td>
<td>VFA</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;25%</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% that complete developmental English and first college course</td>
<td>VFA</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;35%</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prevalence of placement into developmental education</td>
<td>VFA</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;25%</td>
<td>⇔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduation Rate w/in 6 years</td>
<td>VFA</td>
<td>23.45%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;30%</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer Rate w/in 6 years</td>
<td>VFA</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;30%</td>
<td>⟜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serve our Communities</td>
<td># companies/individuals served in business training</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>122/54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Establish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthen our Organization</td>
<td>Student net price</td>
<td>IPEDS</td>
<td>$3043</td>
<td>$3692</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Enrollment – un dup headcount</td>
<td>IPEDS</td>
<td>2115</td>
<td>2154</td>
<td></td>
<td>2200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Composite Financial Index</td>
<td>HLC</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;5.0</td>
<td>⇔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Success (retention, persistence and completion) – 4.C.
West Shore has been actively engaged in the work of student success since Fall 2011, including an AQIP action project operation since 2012. The numerous outcomes of that team’s work have been implemented since the portfolio was submitted, and represent a major focus of the College’s work during the intervening two years, in alignment with the strategic plan. It has affected advising processes, new student orientation, developmental education and placement, academic policies and practices, and student support services. It is also a strong demonstration project for the College’s increased use of data-informed decision-making.

Student Success Plan
WSCC designed a “Building Capacity Student Success Plan” for 2014-2017 that captures the College’s dedication to student success, aligned with the College’s strategic plan. This three-year plan builds on the work completed between 2012-2014 and lays the groundwork for academic achievement and student success at the College by clearly capturing the support needed to implement the Student Success Plan. The Board of Trustees have committed money to partially fund initiatives within this plan. The Student Success Plan was developed based on research and consultation with teams, faculty, and staff. It was organized using the Loss/Momentum Framework popularized by Completion by Design. The metrics to assess progress are based on the Voluntary Framework of Accountability (VFA).

Eliminating Late Registration
Like many institutions, West Shore allowed students to register through the second week of the semester. The new procedure, implemented in Fall 2013, restricts new students from adding new courses to their schedule if the course has already met, and was implemented in response to the overwhelming research that emphasized the value of attending the course from the first class period. There is a small loophole for returning students who are allowed to make changes in the first week with instructor approval when moving from one section to another because the faculty believed that returning students would be better prepared for last-minute changes. That loophole is being assessed for validity this semester, in part with Civitas data, which shows that the persistence rates for returning students who register at the last minute are not much stronger than for new students. See Figures 15 and 16 on the following page. Both sets are significantly lower than persistence rates for those who plan ahead, at least 60 days before the start of the semester, as previously seen in Figure 10. The Curriculum Team will be reviewing these data in January and making a determination about registration for the upcoming Fall semester in February.

Developing New Student Orientation, and Advising
WSCC was an early adopter in requiring all students to see an advisor. However, an ongoing issue was the consistency and style of advising information delivery. While the main points of an advising appointment were covered by all advisors, each advisor emphasized specific points over others and explained policies and procedures in their own words. This approach left some students feeling like they did not get correct information, or even failed to receive information. This inconsistency led the Student Services office to evaluate the current advising program and look for ways to ensure that all students were getting the right information in a consistent manner, along with improving efficiencies in the process to serve more students. A number of meetings and
discussions with faculty, staff, and students led the way to a new and improved advising and registration process.

**Figure 15: New students who register as the semester begins have a 24% persistence rate.**

![Graph showing new students persistence rate](image)

**Figure 16: Returning students who register as the semester begins have a 36% persistence rate**

![Graph showing returning students persistence rate](image)

The new Advising/Registration program was implemented in Fall 2013. Instead of students meeting individually for an entire hour with an advisor, WSCC developed a group-style orientation. Various days and times are identified and communicated to students to provide opportunities to make advising appointments and register for courses. To ensure that the College does not lose the one-on-one component of the student experience, after completing the two-hour orientation, students meet for 15 – 20 minutes with an advisor to pick out and schedule individual courses. The two-hour group segment of the orientation session includes curricular and program information, faculty and current student presentations, a financial literacy presentation, and a campus tour that identifies the people and departments that offer various services. Since the implementation of the group model and individual orientation session, evaluations have shown that students are very satisfied (over 95% satisfaction) with the orientation program, find the information helpful, and think the program contains everything they need to know for starting courses.
WSCC’s advising model continues to evolve. In an effort to encourage students to register for courses earlier, Student Services developed open advising sessions in Fall 2015. These sessions were widely advertised throughout campus and any current student may drop in without an appointment during the open session. During drop-in sessions there is an advisor available to meet with students and assist with course selection or other advising questions.

A group of faculty interested in learning more about advising were trained by the Director of Advising and the Registrar. These faculty members were then available to meet with students, particularly students who were majoring in a discipline that the faculty members taught. This new model not only allowed for the College to assist more students with their course selection earlier, but served as a pilot for future efforts to involve more faculty in the advising program. The drop-in model has been offered for two semesters and enrollments via drop-in advising continue to increase with each semester it is offered. For Fall 2015, there were 25 registrations over the course of eight sessions. For Winter 2016, there have been 61 registrations in three sessions.

**Accelerated Learning Program (ALP)**
The Accelerated Learning Program (ALP) has been in place at WSCC since Fall 2013. Students who score (we use COMPASS) as college-ready in reading and score within a certain level below college-ready in writing may take English Composition I paired with a Writing Essentials Lab. The focus is on offering the support needed for students to successfully complete English Composition I without having to take a developmental education (Dev Ed) course first. As seen in Figure 17 on the following page, students who take Dev Ed ENG 051 successfully pass at a rate of 71%; however, 34% of those successful students fail to enroll in English Composition I, leading to an overall sequence success rate of 34%. Students taking English Composition I and Writing Essentials simultaneously (the ALP Model) successfully complete ENG 111 at a rate of 69%.

Significant in this data set is the fact that the students in Intro to College Writing are, for the most part, at a significantly lower skill level than those taking Writing Essentials and yet they still pass ENG 111 at about the same rate when they take the course. Decisions will soon be made regarding the scaling of ALP for future years, but the English Department is very supportive of scaling the ALP program for all those who quality (rather than giving them a choice).

**First Year Seminar (FYS)**
The Student Success team spent nearly two years investigating First Year Seminar (FYS)/Experiences prior to adopting the FYS as mandatory for all First Time In Any College (FTIAC) students at WSCC. The team looked at research, at FYS courses in community colleges in Michigan, and sent two representatives to the national First Year Experience Conference. After much consideration and the involvement of both full-time and part-time faculty and administrators, a two-credit FYS course was piloted in Fall 2014. In an attempt to demonstrate rigor, our curriculum planners may have become overzealous in developing course outcomes for the initial semester of FYS.
Figure 17: Comparison of ALP and DEVED success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALP: Writing Essentials (ENG 098) and English Comp I (ENG 111) taken simultaneously</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semester 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take ENG 098 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take ENG 111 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take ENG 098 (90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass ENG 098 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take ENG 111 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Pass ENG 098 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVED: Intro to College Writing (ENG 051) taken first. If successful, English Comp I (ENG 111) taken in the subsequent semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take ENG 091 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass ENG 091 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Pass ENG 091 (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Take ENG 111 (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, B, or C in ENG 111 (83% 85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Take ENG 111 (15%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALP, Fall 2013 - Winter 2014</th>
<th>Overall Success 74/108 = 69%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>ENG 098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takers</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completers</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVED, Winter 2012 - Fall 2014</th>
<th>Overall Success 59/174 = 34%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>ENG 051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takers</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completers</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After considering course evaluations, informal input from students and the faculty who taught, curriculum changes were made for the Winter 2015 semester and more significant changes for Fall 2015. Initial curriculum planning was conducted over the Winter and Summer of 2014 by a large group of those who would teach in Fall 2014. In the Winter of 2015, a second year of pilot status was granted to FYS as the College continues to fine tune the changes necessary to make this course valuable to every FTIAC WSCC student. One of the encouraging data points from the Fall 2014 semester was in regard to fall-to-fall retention; as seen below in Figure 18, retention for the FYS students was 70% as compared to those who did not take FYS who had a retention rate of 32%.

Figure 18: Fall-to-Fall Retention Rates for FYS Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Took FYS Fall 2014</th>
<th># FTIAC Students</th>
<th>Retention Rate Fall 2015</th>
<th>GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) Results and Supplemental Instruction (SI)

The CCSSE Results for 2014 were reviewed by a group of WSCC faculty and administrators who attended the CCSSE High Impact Practices Institute in early 2015. The College sent five representatives to review data and come home with a recommendation for action during the 15-16 academic year. The team focused on the fact students indicated they knew about support services (86.2% for tutoring, 82.6% for writing math, or other skill lab services) but few use the services (93.3% never use tutoring and 78.7% never use the writing, math, or other skill lab services) based on the 2014 Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE) data. CCSSE data indicated that only...
27.3% of students “sometimes or often” use skill labs (writing, math, etc.). Evidence indicated that students do not want to seek out the services therefore, the team discussed bringing the services to the student, and the best model for taking the services to the student was SI. During the High Impact Practices Institute and beyond, a Supplemental Instruction pilot was developed for Fall 2015. It was decided WSCC would choose courses of high enrollment, low success rates in which to place SI Leaders. The five courses chosen for Fall 2015 included Intro to Chemistry, General Chemistry, Desktop Applications, Pre-Algebra and First Year Seminar. Initial results as measured by success rates (grade C or higher) were as follows in Figure 19:

**Figure 19: Supplemental Instruction Success Rates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Pre SI Overall Success Rate Winter 2014</th>
<th>Overall Success Rate Fall 2015</th>
<th>Non SI Success Rate Fall 2015</th>
<th>SI Success Rate Fall 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year Seminar</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desktop Applications</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Chemistry</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Chemistry</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Algebra</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results are very promising for the value of supplemental instruction. In addition, early indicators from faculty of these courses indicate increased engagement and benefits, while students indicated satisfaction with the model as well. The pilot will continue for the Winter 2016 semester.

**Tutoring Center Improvements**

Previously, WSCC had limited students to two hours of tutoring services per week. While this practice was not considered “hard and fast”, students received this message, clearly. In Fall 2014, WSCC changed the messaging on all marketing material and the website to encourage all students to use the tutoring center as needed. While a small change, it provided a message of assistance based on need and not a randomly selected allotment of time.

In addition, WSCC opened a Writing Center and a Math Center. While the Writing Center is discussed elsewhere as a primary contributor to academic integrity (see page 36), the Math Center was added as a result of assessment of success rates for Math students. Please review Figure 5 on page 7, which indicates that our math success rates, while improving, still lag behind benchmark colleges.

The Math Center began in Winter 2015 as a branch of the Tutoring Center. The Center is open 24 hours per week and in the Fall 2015 semester served 102 students, requesting assistance in courses ranging from Pre-Algebra to Calculus. Most sessions are conducted during the day, but one late-afternoon session per week is set aside for those students taking evening courses. Both the Writing and Math Centers are located on the Upper Level of the Schoenherr Campus Center building, close to other support services like the Tutoring Center and Disability Access Services (DAS) office, the
Testing Center and the SI Leader Office. The Tutoring, Writing and Math Centers work collaboratively to ensure students were receiving services at the appropriate place. Even with the addition of the Math and Writing Centers, the numbers of students being served at the Tutoring Center have remained consistent, meaning that more students are seeking tutoring for other subjects. Finally, the Tutoring Center has begun using a software package called ZOOM for tutoring students in online environments. While demand for use of the software has been limited thus far, early ratings from students show satisfaction with this service.

**Student Commons**
Currently, all faculty members are required to have an online course shell that includes at least the gradebook and course syllabus. Because this means that virtually all students are using Canvas for their coursework, WSCC created a new course in the Canvas LMS called Student Commons, in which all students are enrolled. When students join Canvas for their courses, they are required to set up their communication options. One option of extreme importance to the College is how a student wants to receive information – via email, text messaging, phone calls, etc. Over the past several years, we have noticed email messaging has been a less effective means of communication. Now, when the College sends information to students, Canvas is used and the student receives messages by the means they requested. Since implementation of the Student Commons for messages to students, response to messages that request feedback from students appears to have improved. The College is working on ways to quantify that improvement.

**Student Learning Assessment**
At the time of the Systems Portfolio, WSCC described its work in developing its three core abilities: written communication, critical thinking, and professionalism. Since that time, the Student Learning Assessment Team (SLAT) comprised of faculty (arts & science and occupational), and academic and student service administrators created a model for core abilities review and assessment (see Figure 20). It is also helping to develop a culture of assessment and data-informed instructional decision making and serves as a model (with appropriate modifications) for conducting assessments in programs where faculty are new to assessment processes.

**Figure 20: The Assessment Process**
Assessment Methods: Core Abilities – Communicate Clearly (Writing)
The Systems Portfolio also reported the results of the pilot writing assessment (conducted in Winter 2013 by a writing panel on blind student papers submitted by volunteer faculty) of the written communication core ability. SLAT also reviewed the results of the pilot and made language revisions to the rubric to be better understood by non-experts in the field of writing and to the process by being more specific about the type of writing prompt that should be used for papers that would be submitted to the writing panel. Further, SLAT added responsibilities for themselves: how to assess documents, including how to 1) norm the assessors who came from a variety of disciplines and roles on campus, 2) tabulate and read the results, 3) share results with staff, and 4) develop strategies to improve performance. Changes were implemented and a formal assessment was then conducted during the Fall 2013 semester. Results from that assessment, which were taken directly from the assessment report for 2014 (and shaded in blue), are described below.

Figure 21 shows the frequencies of score ranges obtained by the whole sample. To put these scores in perspective, a “highly competent” rating on all six writing criteria would result in a score of 24 (the maximum possible), a “competent” rating on all six criteria would result in a score of 18, and an “emerging” rating on all aspects would result in a score of 12. The lowest score possible was six.

Figure 21: Fall, 2013 Writing Assessment Scores

We were especially interested in how writing ability differed according to the number of credits that students had earned. Because 29 credits or fewer versus 30 credits or more traditionally distinguishes freshman from sophomore status, we selected this as the most natural division. Figure 22 (on next page) shows the difference in score averages for these two groups. While 2.5 points seems a small difference for a 24-point scale, it is still significant, especially considering that all but five of the samples yielded scores between 10 and 22 (i.e., the ends of the scale were seldom used). Such scores do indicate that decisions need to be made about what scores we want to strive for in future assessments of writing and what steps need to be taken to assure campus-wide success in this endeavor.
A further analysis broke down students’ scores by credits earned (<30 or >30) and by writing criterion (audience and purpose, content, etc.). As can be seen in Figure 23, the differences in scoring for those with more versus fewer credits is small, ranging from only around .3 to .5 on the 4-point scale. However, the numbers do indicate some initial conclusions by showing that the least amount of growth between students’ freshmen and sophomore years appeared in the following categories: 1) Structure and Organization, and 2) Sources and Evidence. Sources and Evidence was also the second-lowest average score for those with >30 credits. These results coupled with the results from the initial pilot indicate students’ abilities in the area of using evidence and specific supporting material to develop or support their opinions is an area of weakness that requires further attention as we move forward.

SLAT, using the results of the writing scores by criterion and credits earned, identified two areas of weaknesses in student writing: 1) use of sources and evidence, and 2) writing structure and organization.

The team, especially the Director of the Writing Center (launched in Fall 2013 as part of a sustained effort to improve student writing) planned and conducted “close-the-loop” strategies in an effort to improve student performance in these areas. These interventions included:

- Class presentations on Writing Center and Library services, including APA and MLA formatting, integrating sources, evaluating evidence, developing research questions, and
evaluating sources by applying the CRAAP (evaluation criteria: Currency, Relevance, Authority, Accuracy, Purpose) test;

- Workshops for faculty on creating effective writing prompts;
- Development of an online forum and resource page in Canvas, to help faculty develop rubrics, evaluate student writing, help students understand research, and create effective writing prompts; and
- Individual request for feedback or consultation from faculty

Key data on strategies to date to support quality writing, include writing center usage, measured in terms of coaching sessions offered and number of unique students served, and EBSCO Database usage, as seen below in Figures 24 and 25:

The next step was reassessment of Fall semester student work, conducted in January 2016, to determine if there had been any improvement in the specific areas identified, and to assess whether other writing deficits should be addressed. Early results from that reassessment suggest that there has been positive movement in student writing results since 2013. The average writing score increased from 14.4 to 16.6 (out of a maximum score of 24). The range of scores also increased from 2.27 – 2.48 in 2013, to 2.65 – 2.88 in 2015. A full report on these results and implications for new and continuing improvements will be available to the team at the March visit.

Figure 24: Writing Center Usage

Figure 25: EBSCO Database Usage

To move forward with additional core ability assessment, SLAT also created and published an assessment timetable, as seen below in Figure 26.
Figure 26: Assessment Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall: (all faculty)</td>
<td>Select Core Abilities to Assess</td>
<td>CE-W</td>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Analyze and Revise</td>
<td>AP Develop</td>
<td>CE-W</td>
<td>TC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter: (all faculty)</td>
<td>CE-W (Pilot)</td>
<td>TC (Pilot)</td>
<td>TC*</td>
<td>Analyze and Revise TC</td>
<td>AP (Pilot)</td>
<td>CE-W</td>
<td>TC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CE-W= Communicate Effectively- Writing, TC= Think Critically, AP= Act Professionally

Assessment Methods: Core Abilities – Critical Thinking

Beginning in Fall 2014, SLAT attempted to copy the process used in the successful writing assessment for assessing critical thinking, but found out that it did not work as well. The team conducted pilot studies, revised the assessment instrument, and collected data on students’ critical thinking skills. The rubric was designed to measure the degree to which students understand, analyze, evaluate, and draw conclusions. These skills reflect the popular levels proposed by Bloom. (The rubric also included criteria for higher-order critical thinking skills such as synthesize and create, but these were not used because they were not applicable to most of the student works submitted.) The team noted that students with 30 or more credits appeared to make gains, most notably in analysis and evaluation. See Figure 27 below. However, the team also found that those results did not point to specific improvements that faculty members could make to their instruction.

Figure 27: Scores on Components of Critical Thinking

Based on the results and on the recommendations from institutions that have attempted to assess critical thinking, the team decided to change the process and consider a move toward a more program/discipline-based assessment of critical thinking. Discussion has ranged from a plan for discipline-specific rubrics to discipline-scored standard rubrics to using the beginning concepts,
such as analysis, to do institutional scoring followed by disciplinary assessment of higher-order critical thinking skills. This discussion and the implications for how to discover institution-wide opportunities for action and improvement took the majority of the fall 2015 semester. Under the overall direction of the SLAT, the faculty engaged in another discussion during the Winter 2016 semester in-service.

Assessment Methods: Core Abilities – Professionalism
Beginning in Fall 2015, the team is in the early stages of developing rubrics, assessment targets, processes, and instruments for Professionalism. Efforts to assess students’ professionalism, the result of which should suggest improved pedagogy in this area, have moved more slowly than expected because of the changes being made to the assessment of critical thinking. Nevertheless, SLAT expects to pilot an assessment of students’ professionalism during the Winter 2016 semester.

The Core Abilities Project is among the highest priority projects at the College. The project helps demonstrate accountability within the teaching and learning processes. This is a revitalized effort to operationalize our core abilities, to provide definition to our competencies, and implement assessment of learning outcomes for programs and general education departments. This project is directly related to one of the three key challenges cited in the last systems appraisal feedback report, in which we were urged to continue our efforts to formalize assessment of student learning, with a focus on attending to general education. While the College is not as far along in demonstrating results for all core abilities as planned, there has been a great deal of progress in supporting core abilities through success in working with student writing. We believe our progress to date demonstrates the seriousness with which we undertake this responsibility and dedication to using the results of student learning assessment to improve student learning.

Program Review – 4B
The Systems Appraisal Feedback Report noted that there was somewhat little detail in the assessment of student learning outcomes in general and that there was little information on program review for liberal arts/transfer programs in particular. Until recently, only WSCC’s occupational programs have been required to conduct program reviews, once every five years. They were all completed during the 2011-2012 year, as noted in the Systems Portfolio, so they will complete the new process in 2016-2017. Since June 2013, WSCC continues to make quality improvements toward institutionalizing processes to conduct program reviews in liberal arts/transfer programs. The following are highlights since June 2013.

During 2014, a guide was developed by a faculty member and the Dean of Instruction. Two programs, one in liberal arts and one in occupational (Communications and Early Childhood Education, respectively), agreed to serve as pilot programs, and are completing their reviews and will be submitted to the Curriculum and Academic Policy Team by February 2016. Following this, the plans will be reviewed by the VP for Academic and Student Services and will be revised as requested before full implementation. Key criteria in the new model include:

- Identifying stakeholder and employer needs;
- Identifying likely transfer institutions and alignment with their requirements;
- National Student Clearinghouse data on transfer success;
- External measures of student success, such as licensure or exam pass rates;
• Student enrollments, course success, student completions, placement rates; and
• Assessment of student learning outcomes and program outcomes.

As this is being written, each division is signing up for program review and planning. That schedule will be available to the HLC team in March. In the meantime, the following chart (Figure 28) lists examples of documented programmatic review, assessment and improvements.

**Figure 28. Selected Program Based Assessments and Improvements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Program Based Assessment and Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liberal Arts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| English                  | Communications Division Program Review            | • A new competency needed to be added to the composition sequence to add 21st Century multimodality skills for all students. For example, all speech classes are implementing a required Skype presentation as part of the curriculum for 2016-2017.  
  • The program identified a consistent disparity between student performance in sections taught by adjuncts and those taught by full-time faculty. Various data and methods are now being used to identify and evaluate the source of the disparity. |
| Music                    | New Music faculty member conducted community assessment of program | • Community wanted more music offerings, both for students who love music but don’t plan a career and for students who plan a career in music. Added new music courses:  
  o Music Technology I and II  
  o History of Popular American Music |
| Occupational Programs    |                                                   |                                                                                                           |
| Early Childhood          | NOCTI outcomes testing                             | • NOCTI testing identified that student performance outcomes for Observation, Documentation, and Assessment were found to be less than desirable. It prompted a change in textbooks, training materials, and assignments. This resulted, within two years, in an increase of more than 22 points in the same third-party testing. While WSCC students performed on average above national norm (75 vs 66) even at the start, WSCC’s students jumped to 94 vs 62 with the changes in instruction. |
| Police Academy           | Advisory Committee recommendation                 | • In their annual assessment of the program at the Fall 2014 advisory committee, the committee noted the challenges of contracting for the required curricular component of using a skid car for defensive driving training for the Policy Academy. The skid car was purchased with grant funds in 2015, and will be used with the January 2016 Academy class. |
| Accounting               | Graduate Follow up survey; Internship site feedback| • Internship sites and other employers noted that students needed additional exposure to advanced use of spreadsheets for accounting-related applications. A new course was developed and offered for the first time in 2015. NOCTI testing for 2016 graduates, and the Spring survey will be the first opportunity to test improved outcomes. |
General Education Review
During 2014-2015, WSCC began a process of examining general education driven by several converging factors, including the development of the Michigan Transfer Agreement (MTA), by which a block of nine courses (a minimum of 30 general education credits) would be accepted by community colleges and by most four-year Michigan colleges and by the recognition that general education distribution requirements had not been reviewed for more than a decade.

As of Fall 2015, a review of general education is underway. As part of that project, looking at the general education requirements and the goals of the general education program has been initiated. In doing so, the chairs of the general education areas are discussing the addition of overarching general education program outcomes. Again, this is a necessary step in order to conduct an assessment of how well students are learning what we believe is important for them to learn through the general education program. As a part of this process, we are also assessing how the MTA’s 30 general education credit hours are embedded within the College’s 38-40 general education credit hours for the AA and AS degrees, and what components of general education are essential for applied degrees and certificates.

Student Learning Outcomes Project
As a means of creating a culture where program review is an integral activity, WSCC initiated a Student Learning Outcomes Project in Fall 2015 to replace the student objectives currently used in all courses. The faculty determined that assessment of outcomes would benefit greatly from strong outcomes, which administration enthusiastically encouraged. Through this project, faculty will review and revise, as needed, all course descriptions and course outcomes this academic year. As those are written, divisional faculty will then meet and discuss what outcomes are shared among the disciplines and will identify outcomes at the program (divisional) level. (Starting with the discipline, rather than the divisional or program level, is an approach inspired by Barbara D. Wright in "The Way to a Faculty Member’s Head is Through the Discipline," 2005, Vol 17, No 3, Assessment Update.) Movement to course outcomes for students (rather than objectives) has been occurring incrementally. During summer 2015, a collaborative team of faculty and administration identified this project—to ensure that, as a start, all course syllabi include outcomes—as an important one for it contributes to institutional, academic, divisional, and disciplinary goals and is simultaneously focused and achievable. (To be clear, all courses have outcomes, but some are not listed on syllabi.)

The team developed the following implementation plan:
- The project, including management through the curriculum committee, would span a three-semester effort, Fall 2015, Winter 2016, and Fall 2016.
- The project was designated as a primary focus for Fall 2015 in-service. Multiple sessions at in-service allowed WSCC’s full-time faculty to have time to wrangle about definitions and then to get on the "same page" about the move from objectives to outcomes. Portions of faculty meetings in both Fall 2015 and Winter 2016 semesters, together with at least one workshop during Winter in-service, will also provide time for faculty to work on the project.
- The team outlined that each faculty member would start the process by focusing on one course revising and updating the course description if needed and updating outcomes (or moving from objectives to outcomes, where outcomes don't currently exist).
Figure 29: Learning Outcomes Alignment

- By the end of the project in Fall 2016, course descriptions will have been reviewed for all courses and all courses will include course outcomes (rather than objectives).
- As faculty complete course outcomes, they will revise/create program outcomes during this period. This is intended to position faculty, especially liberal arts/transfer faculty who are new to program review, for conducting program reviews and mapping out how their programs will advance over the next three to five years in order to meet students’, transfer institutions’, and societies’ needs.
- Joint meetings give faculty the opportunity to discuss this work in greater depth and such meetings reduce silos. Because WSCC’s full-time faculty is small, many disciplines are served by a single full-time faculty member. Of the 43 disciplines taught at WSCC: two disciplines include four faculty; two disciplines include three faculty; four disciplines include two full-time faculty; and 25 disciplines include just one full-time faculty. A further ten disciplines are taught solely by adjuncts under the leadership of a divisional chair.
- This work of revised course descriptions and student learning outcomes will be submitted to the Curriculum and Academic Policy Team (and, once approved by CAPT, this work will then be reviewed by the VP of Academic and Student Services and approved, returned for revisions, or declined). The work will be completed and made public in the 2017-2018 Curriculum Guide.

Community Engagement

The College and the people of the Mason and Manistee County area share a rich history of working together and that history has led to strong relationships with community stakeholders. That said, College employees felt that improvement opportunities related to public perception and student recruitment were possible, led by a faculty member seeking support for programmatic marketing. Created during the 13-14 academic year, the Community Connections Team provided valuable community outreach. The team is organized to explore the ways and means to improve marketing, student recruitment, community outreach, and awareness. The team membership is comprised of a diverse group of faculty, staff, and administrators, and supported by the work of many different departments, as appropriate to the event at hand.

During the period that the former President was on leave, public perception was also an issue of concern as a number of community members expressed dissatisfaction with the level of interaction between the President and the community. They were looking for a more active “face of the College” in the community in addition to the fact that many College employees were already active in the community. Community members also expressed an interest in broader community participation events beyond the already very successful performing arts series.

As a measure of the public perception, the College used their news cycle metrics to measure public opinion. Normally the College hovers in the very positive range, but during the height of the negativity surrounding the President’s leave and retirement, our rating dropped significantly.
The community connections teams refocused their efforts on public events, including:

- Participation in the July 4th parades in Ludington and Manistee with our Veterans Club, and the Sleigh Bell parade in Manistee in December.
- Scholarships to incoming freshman were awarded at local high school honors programs rather than at the College’s award program. Various administrators attended all 14 events across the College district during Spring 2015. This was very well-received by the schools, the students, and parents.
- This past spring and summer, the team promoted and sponsored a unique show to various K-12 partners in the College district featuring the distinctive talent of a musician whose custom drum-driven electronic music show focuses on the development of STEAM skills (Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Math). He has performed for over 4,000 students in West Michigan demonstrating why STEAM skills are important and how they have affected his job as a musician.
- During the summer months, the team and the Recreation Center staff helped organize a community wellness event. The well-attended family-friendly 5K mud run with a boot-camp style obstacle course on the campus benefited the WSCC Foundation student scholarship fund.
- The team also participated in community street fairs with the College mascot. Faculty demonstrations from various academic departments were a highlight at each street fair.
- This fall, the Community Connections Team attended area high school football games and homecoming celebrations to attract prospective students.

Based on these events, support from the media in running a number of positive articles about the College and the good work we do, as well as the well-received handling of the former President's leave and transition by the Board, our public perception positivity rating, which typically hovers in the 90's, returned from a low of negative 60 (in September 2014) to over 90% (by July 2015) as depicted in Figure 30 below.

**Figure 30: Public Perception Meter**

Another significant measure of positive perception by our community is our periodic millage renewal. In August 2015, the capital millage levy, which comes to a public vote every ten years, was renewed by a two-to-one margin. This level of support speaks volumes about the value the community sees in the college. The capital millage helps provide funding for up-to-date classroom facilities and the latest technology. More information on millages can be found on page 29.

Finally, the team plays an advisory role in the development of the College’s annual Performing Arts Series. Long known for its tradition of providing a showcase for the very best in regional, national, and international talent, the Performing Arts Series is a vital outreach activity that boosts the cultural and economic climate of our area. Musicians, dancers, actors, comics, and other artists who have performed in the series over the years have made west-central Michigan a more vibrant place to live.
Organized by the faculty-led Academic Projects Team, the opening event in the series had an academic feel and kicked off a year-long program designed to help students and members of the community encounter the delightful, playful side of mathematics and to overcome the bane of many students - “math anxiety.” Another part of the current series is West Shore’s multi-year participation in the Great Michigan Read. This year is particularly special because students and faculty from the College served on the nominating committee that chose the book which is being read across the state of Michigan. This year, all of the Performing Arts Series events have had sold-out audiences.

The College is making plans to celebrate its fiftieth anniversary in 2016 and 2017, which will be yet another opportunity to recognize the valuable role the College plays in the community.

**Strategic resource management – 5A**

**Fiscal Resource Planning**

During 2014, the Board asked for a ten-year fiscal sustainability model and projections as one of the President’s goals. Developed by the Vice President of Administrative Services, the plan was a major topic at the Spring 2014 Board Retreat, at which time the Board devoted considerable time to exploration based on the Excel-based sustainability model, considering a variety of what-if projections – such as changes in enrollment, property taxes, tuition, state funding, and millage renewals.

Based on that plan, the Board recommended continuance with the current model, which has seen moderate tuition increases (typically 2 – 3%), and strives to maintain a fund balance approaching 30% of the general fund balance, some of which is restricted for capital projects only. The rather large fund balance was important because if only one of our two renewable millages would fail, it would significantly affect College operations within a ten-year time frame.

**Millage Votes**

The College’s funding sources include an operating millage (about a third of the operating budget) and a capital millage that generates equipment and capital facilities funding. Both millages were up for renewal in the two years since the Systems Portfolio and passed with significantly positive district voting results. The operational millage was on the ballot in August 2013, with 69.8% voting to approve the millage, and is secure through 2021. The capital millage passed in Fall 2015 with over 60% positive votes, through 2025. Based on the sustainability model, the conservative approach of the Board, and the positive millage results, the College is well-positioned for sound fiscal operation for the foreseeable future.

**Bargaining Contracts**

WSCC successfully negotiated a new three-year contract with faculty, approved in September 2014. The negotiation took over a year, and represented the first time in many years that the entire contract was reviewed and negotiated. The contract contains major changes to the compensation model in terms of the way faculty overload is paid, which will yield much more predictable budget forecasts and increases. It also includes changes to faculty evaluation, faculty responsibilities, division chair responsibilities and compensation, hiring practices, workload for online coursework, and more. It was bargained in an interest-based model, and is seen as a win-win effort.
WSCC also successfully negotiated with the Educational Support Staff, culminating in a new contract effective in July 2014.

**Project Prioritization Management System**

In early 2015, the Interim President approved the Institutional Effectiveness Team recommendation to develop a project prioritization process. This recommendation was to ensure projects aligned with strategic objectives and that projects would receive adequate resources, both human and fiscal. Another aspect of strategically prioritizing and devoting resources to projects was to address and mitigate the overwhelming workload felt by employees across the campus. A cross-functional team, led by a faculty member, was tasked with development of the process.

The new Project Management Proposal Process was launched with training for select staff in November 2015 and implemented on December 1, 2015. Additional faculty and staff training will occur during in-service in January 2016. Project prioritization provides a framework and process for selecting new projects that best support the College's strategic interests and directions and maximize value. The intended results of the Project Prioritization process are to:

- Build consensus on the most important projects;
- Assure project alignment with strategic objectives;
- Add transparency to the prioritization of projects;
- Ensure efficient and effective coordination with all College resources and activities; and
- Increase collaboration across the campus and improve workflow for employees.

Key features of the project management proposal system are:

- Projects are temporary, require 20+ hours, and two or more people;
- Projects may be proposed by anyone;
- Projects are proposed with the Project Proposal Form;
- Projects are prioritized with a public rubric; and
- Projects are scheduled according to priority and available resources.

In short, the project proposal process is simple. An initiator collaborates with end users, possible team members, and those who would need/provide support for the project and then submits a proposal form online. The proposal is scored by the Project Management Team members, who then forward those results to the Executive Team, which makes the final decisions on which projects will move forward. All proposals, their scores, and status are available to the entire campus community on the College SharePoint site. This process will reoccur frequently throughout the year. A flowchart of the process is depicted in Figure 31 below: The project form itself is a narrative document and is several pages long. To offer a sense of the key components of the proposal, the scoring rubric is shown below in Figure 32.
Figure 31: Project Management Process

**Initiator Phase**
- Project initiator has idea
- Discusses with potential team members, sponsor, and users
- Checks alignment with mission, plan and AQIP
- Completes and submits proposal form

**Project Management Team Phase**
- PMT reviews and scores proposal
- Project added to portfolio or returned to initiator

**Executive Team Phase**
- Reviews recommended projects and assigns resources and funding based on availability

**Project Manager**
- Project Manager assembles team and begins project

**Project Portfolio**
- Project Portfolio for all projects and status maintained on College share site for all employees

Figure 31: Project Proposal Scoring Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name:</th>
<th>[Your Project Title]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Scoring Values</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required Service/Product (are any of these true?)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0: none are true 1: one is true 2: two are true 3: all are true</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Alignment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0: aligns with none 1: aligns with one 2: aligns with two 3: aligns with three 4: aligns with all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0: no value 1: low value 2: moderate value 3: high value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value to End Users</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0: no improvement to users ability to perform tasks 1: moderate improvement 2: significant positive improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Disclosure of Costs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0: lots of unknown or hidden costs 1: some costs are known 2: many costs are known 3: all costs, direct &amp; indirect, are known and tabulated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What users will benefit?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0: none 1: a single division, department, or program 2: multiple divisions, departments, or programs 3: entire campus community, all staff, all faculty, or all students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Aligning Planning with Budgeting Process**

The project prioritization process was also developed to align planning with the budgeting process by, for the first time, having campus projects prioritized prior to the budget cycle. Project prioritization will ensure that projects are planned adequately and when approved will have adequate resources, both human and fiscal, which can be incorporated in the budget process.

In the FY2016 budget a student success fund was established for the incoming president to have $200,000 readily available to devote to student success initiatives. As previously indicated, student success is a leading strategic goal and was continually emphasized by the Board and campus constituents throughout FY2015. Hiring an Institutional Researcher was part of the student success planning that was incorporated in the budget process.

**Facilities Management**

In 2013, WSCC contracted for an update to its Facilities Assessment and Deferred Maintenance Capital Planning Report. The Association of Higher Education Facilities Officers recommends that the Facilities Condition Index (FCI) for any given building should not exceed 5% for the building to be considered in “Good” condition. The report summarized that good maintenance and timely replacement practices have improved the overall FCI. The 2010 cumulative 5-year FCI of 3.9% improved to 3%. Priority issues also improved, reducing the immediate needs to be addressed from 1.2% to well under 1%.

Through the resources provided from the capital millage, WSCC is able to budget $1.8M annually for ongoing maintenance and repairs. Based on industry standards the annual maintenance fund for the value of WSCC buildings is $1.2M, an amount many campuses find difficult to maintain. Major campus improvements since 2014 include:

- Recreation Center Locker Room/Pool Renovations, $830K;
- Music Rooms Flooring Replacement, $117K;
- Campus Dam Replacement, $200K;
- Parking Lot/Walkway Light Replacement, $99K; and
- Ice Arena Glass Replacement, $19K.

WSCC annually submits a Capital Outlay Request to the State of Michigan. In 2014, the Governor rated WSCC’s request as the highest amongst all community colleges and was only one of three higher education projects recommended by the Governor. In December 2015 the Governor approved a bill which provides planning authorization for an addition to, and remodeling of, the Technical Center, a project estimated to cost $4.3M. With final approval from the State, WSCC will receive a 50% match from the State for construction costs. This project is planned in 2018.

**Faculty Qualifications**

To ensure WSCC faculty meet the HLC Standards for qualified faculty promulgated October 1, 2015, the College has carried out the following:

- Both the President and the Vice President of Academic and Student Services have had frequent consultations with HLC staff regarding the guidelines.
During Summer-Fall 2015: the VP of Academic and Student Services began a review of all full-time and most adjunct faculty qualifications against guidelines, consulting with faculty to review transcripts where qualifications appeared unclear.

During Fall 2015 In-service, the Vice President discussed HLC draft guidelines, and the process that will be followed:

- A credentials audit for all faculty;
- Development of a grid detailing requirements for each discipline/course taught at WSCC developed collaboratively between faculty in that discipline and administration, and led by the team below;
- Matching of credentials to requirements to determine gaps. College-wide and individual development plans created and implemented; and
- Conversation included statement of WSCC’s commitment to work with faculty where current faculty may not meet HLC guidelines.

November 10, 2015 an all faculty meeting with the President and senior administration was held on implementation of the faculty qualifications process.

The Director of Human Resources has been tasked with leading a team in the development of detailed qualifications for specific disciplines as well as the process by which tested experience will be evaluated. The team is faculty-centric and also includes the VP of Academics and Student Services.

Other Projects of Note

Implementation of New Learning Management System (LMS), Canvas
Faculty and administration selected a new LMS in Winter 2013. The migration from Moodle to Canvas was mapped out over a year's time. Training workshops began for faculty in Summer 2013, with faculty able to migrate at will following the training; training was also held during Fall 2013, Winter 2014, and Summer 2014. All faculty were required to move to the new LMS by Fall 2014. Workshops were set up for students as well, and academic technology and online program staff were made available for mini-workshops in classrooms. Finally, a new faculty contract took effect Fall 2014, which required all faculty members teaching in all modalities to use the LMS for the syllabus and gradebook. Due to the popularity of Canvas (with students and with faculty), all full-time faculty and over 90% of adjunct faculty now use Canvas to supplement their face-to-face courses.

Data from Canvas will automatically migrate to the Civitas Inspire app, beginning in February 2016. This will allow advisors immediate access to current course grades and level of engagement as indicated through attendance and activities completed online (such as discussion forums). This information will allow advisors to triage students who truly need help and support as part of the satisfactory academic progress review, freeing them to provide differentiated support to students based on need.

Method of Evaluation of Faculty
The new full-time faculty contract (effective Fall 2014 through Winter 2017) added refinements to the faculty evaluation process in support of pedagogy for continuous growth. Faculty at West Shore
have long developed professional development plans, now called Individual Annual Plans (IAP). As part of that process, completed every fall, a faculty member has options about how to complete the observation component of the annual evaluation cycle. A new, untenured faculty member will be reviewed by his/her supervisor and will also participate in teaching circles. A tenured faculty member may choose to have a traditional supervisor class observation, or opt to participate in a teaching circle with peers. The process requires circles of two or more faculty members, approved by the administrative supervisor, and must include at least one peer observation in any modality. The teaching circle/peer observation process will generally stand in lieu of class observation by the immediate supervisor, although the supervisor may also observe classes as needed. Modalities (face-to-face, hybrid, or online) must rotate at least every two years, if applicable. Finally, faculty summarize learning from observing and from being observed. The vast majority of the full-time faculty (75%) selected the teaching circle option for 2015-2016.

Other changes that relate to the use of student course evaluations include: Students will provide feedback on two courses per semester (it was one course previously), plus a third class if one section selected as fewer than 12 enrolled students. Faculty must also include results of student evaluations in an end-of-year report to their administrative supervisor.

**Formalization of Rubric, Training, and Professional Learning of Online Teaching**

As outlined in the new contract, online courses will meet standards in alignment with best practices in the field of online education. Furthermore, the contract states the process for identifying and implementing the standards is a collaboration by the Administrative Supervisor with the faculty. During Winter 2015, the Online Teaching and Best Practices Team recommended a set of standards for online teaching. Currently, the team is recommending processes to implement the online rubric as well as training and continued professional learning. Implementation of the rubric, training, and professional learning is anticipated next academic year, 2016-2017.

**Off-Site Educational Center**

As enrollment has increased in the courses offered at the Manistee Education Center, a Director of Manistee Education Center was appointed, via release time to a faculty member, in Winter 2014 to ensure smooth management and scheduling of classes. Furthermore, a student worker was added to provide staff assistance at class time and to provide additional access to computers. The overall offerings at the Manistee Education Center are currently under review to ensure that appropriate coursework is offered so that a student can obtain an AA degree in three years from the Center.

**Institutional and Academic Integrity 2.E.**

**Academic Policies revised and approved**

All Board Policies for Instruction were reviewed and approved in 2013, through an iterative process that moved the discussion between the Board Policy and Personnel Committee and the Curriculum and Academic Policy Team. This included new language on the educational philosophy and general education program, as follows:
A commitment to excellence in higher education for the community it serves is a core value of West Shore Community College. The College recognizes the importance of high quality, learning-centered, education and training opportunities, which will result in meaningful roles for the student in life, work, and society. Basic to these roles is the student’s ability to be productive through the acquisition of appropriate skills and to be adaptable in a changing, complex society.

As such, the College will create a general education program that conforms to accreditation guidelines and is designed to provide students with a broad yet integrated and coherent introduction to the skills, knowledge, and insights that are the foundation of a college education, the basis for career development, and the motivation for lifelong learning. Within this framework, and across programs and disciplines, the intent is to cultivate in each student the ability to communicate clearly, think critically and creatively, behave professionally and ethically, and adapt to our changing, complex, multicultural, and global world. The College will maintain a current listing of general education requirements for the associate degree and certificates and make them publically available to students and the community.

Further, the College recognizes the dignity, importance and uniqueness of each student, and therefore endeavors to provide the necessary opportunities for students to achieve social and personal goals. To this end, the College strives to create an environment conducive not only to intellectual growth but also to offer cultural and social experiences that contribute to the development of an educated individual. (Policy 3001)

Additional changes to the policies included the definition of a credit hour and the raising of graduation requirements so that a student must have no more than 2 C- grades in required courses, plus a 2.0 GPA to be eligible to graduate. Additionally, language was added about academic integrity:

> **Academic dishonesty is regarded as any act of deception, benign or malicious in nature, in the completion of any academic exercise. Examples of academic dishonesty include cheating, plagiarism, collusion, and other academic misconduct. (Policy 3010)**

Finally, the Board adopted a new policy on Student Success, policy 3050.

> **West Shore Community College is committed to the success of its students. This commitment is demonstrated in the College’s foundational documents (mission, vision, and core values); in its strategic plan and budget; and in its employee’s everyday behavior.**

> **The Board relies on the faculty, the administration, and the educational support staff to support the work of identifying and implementing promising and proven pathways to student success at West Shore Community College through a focus on evidence and inquiry, through engaging in courageous conversations, and through periodic monitoring of progress. The Board acknowledges that learning is a shared responsibility for students and for the College, and expects and supports strong student engagement, high expectations and persistence.**

> **The President is charged with establishing the organization, leadership, and structures to promote collaboration across the College and among all stakeholder groups, stressing that student success is everyone’s responsibility; to apply appropriate technological innovations to create, implement, and monitor student success; to conduct ongoing assessment of student learning; and, to evidence a commitment to educational improvement and student success.**
VP, Dean, Chairs and Directors reviewed and drafted revised existing academic procedures for the academic code of conduct, academic misconduct, and academic grievances. The new procedures are currently in the final stages of approval, and should be fully approved in early 2016.

In addition, Student Services Board Policies are currently in revision and are slated to be approved by the Board in early 2016. And new/revised procedures on student code of conduct, misconduct, grievances, Title IX compliance, non-discrimination, disabilities process and grievances, and service animals have been drafted and are also in the final stages of approval. They too are slated for full approval in early 2016.

Respondus
WSCC explored an online tool used for detecting academic misconduct by students. Although faculty did not feel it improved upon practices in place for individual faculty testing, the Respondus lockdown browser is now used in the Testing Center to help ensure integrity in the testing process.

Writing Center
The creation of the Writing Center has also assisted in promoting strong and ethical writing practices. The Center has grown since it started as a pilot in Fall 2013.

- 777 Writing Center sessions serving 555 students since Fall 2013 to mid-term Fall 2015 in group and one-to-one tutoring by peer tutors and faculty;
- Hours increased from 14-16 hours per week in Fall 2013 to 28 hours Fall 2015;
- Peer coaching staff increased from one-two peers in Fall 2013 to seven in Fall 2015;
- Faculty (a total of 23) participating in one-to-one consultations;
- Class presentations and workshops (a total of 50) on such topics as the use of the Writing Center, discipline-specific writing, evaluating sources and the use of the CRAAP test, grading effectively and efficiently, writing requests for scholarships;
- Workshops conducted by professional staff in classrooms; and
- Additional services include a newsletter, online video for use in Canvas, rubrics presentation at all faculty meeting, online resources for faculty including sample rubrics, evaluating student writing, helping student work with research, and creating writing prompts.

Library Modules in support of academic integrity
The Director of Library Services developed and published two open educational resource modules, available to all faculty to add to their Canvas Shells. One deals with identifying valid sources, and the other addresses citations and referencing. The modules were demonstrated at Fall In-Service.

Quality Overview
WSCC has been committed to AQIP and focusing on continuous quality improvement efforts since 2002. Since 2002, the College has completed 12 Action Projects and currently has three active Projects. Additionally, the College has submitted three Systems Portfolios, attended four Strategy Forums, and hosted an on-site check-up visit in 2009. In its efforts to perpetuate quality improvement and capitalize on the opportunities suggested in the last feedback appraisal report, the
College has internalized a strategic planning cycle of action consisting of the following steps (evident in the aforementioned initiatives and strategies):

- Embed tools to collect and analyze data;
- Establish priorities;
- Set goals;
- Create processes to identify strategies to improve student success;
- Determine result indicators and antecedents of success; and
- Continuously monitor and evaluating results.

**AQIP Action Projects Advancing Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI)**

WSCC currently has three active Action Projects. Since the last Comprehensive Quality Review visit in 2009, WSCC has successfully completed an additional six Action Projects. The Institutional Effectiveness (IE) team is the oversight body for all Action Project teams. The IE team determines what action project ideas are implemented. Each action team has an administrative liaison whose role it is to provide oversight to the project, remove barriers, and facilitate the progress. All action projects have complied with annual reporting requirements and have received annual feedback through the action project portal, which has been used to adjust project plans.

Each year, WSCC’s Vice President of Academic and Student Services (also the Accreditation Liaison Officer) collaborates with new teams to create the team charter; the team chair and the VP write the annual updates that are due to the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) and shares the feedback received from the HLC. Each team is also responsible to provide an annual report to the Board, usually every May. In past years, WSCC has also done a team fair in February for the whole campus and the Board as a means to keep people informed and current about work on campus.

**Current Action Projects:**

**Develop and Implement a Comprehensive Plan for Student Success Practices**  
**AQIP Category:** Helping Students Learn  
**Project Start:** October, 2012  
**Anticipated Finish:** May, 2016

The goal of this project is to review and refine the College’s work in defining what student success looks like, then move forward with that definition in determining how student success is measured, and the extent to which College practices, policies, and procedures are aligned with student success. From that assessment, the team will create a list of recommendations for future action to increase student success at WSCC and then go forward with implementation.

Accomplishments of the Action Project include:

- First Year Seminar - implementation and thoughtful modifications;
- Multiple placement measures in progress this year;
- New vendors: Voluntary Framework for Accountability [VFA], and Civitas;
- Completion and analysis of CCSSE survey leading to data-informed decision making resulting in the Supplemental Instruction program;
- Discontinuation of late registration;
- Accelerated Learning Program;
- Small Group Advising;
- CCSSE and SENSE Surveys;
- Math Center;
- Development of Writing Center;
- TRIO Grant application (first-time applicant, not awarded);
- Advocate for full time IR position;
- Student Success Plan;
- Small Group Orientation;
- Developmental Education innovations; and
- Increases in varied modalities of courses (hybrids, online, etc.).

While this Action Project has seen significant progress, WSCC extended the completion date to September, 2016 to complete portions of the project that are significantly underway. WSCC has defined student success for the College and has developed a student success plan addressing a student’s point of connection through a student’s completion.

Planned next steps for 2015-2016 include:
- Continue to build capacity with the existing student Success Plan;
- Roll-out Supplemental Instructional Program;
- Determine multiple measures for placement;
- Seek commitment from the Board of Trustees to fund Phase II of the plan; and
- Full implementation of Phase II of plan.

Design for Career Services
AQIP Category: Helping Students Learn

WSCC currently has components of career services decentralized across a number of departments, including Advising, Business Opportunity Center, Student Resource Center, First Year Seminar, and the Writing Center. This creates confusion and fragmented services for students and employers. The goal of this project is to design and scope a new career services model, recommend where it should sit in the organizational structure, and propose at least two staffing models to implement the plan: one that implements the plan in a preferred way, and another that implements the plan in a phased or achievable way.

WSCC is using student input, via the CCSSE survey, which suggests that career/placement services are important to them and students are less than satisfied as demonstrated in Figure 33 on the next page.

**Figure 33. CCSSE Survey Career/Placement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Use Services</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Counseling</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Placement</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The College has already taken steps to incorporate an additional unit to the FYS course about career planning, but realizes that it is insufficient for some students. Additionally, local employers are consistently requesting more support for employment and internships.

Timeline for going forward:

- January 2016 – Seek input on career services;
- March 2016 – Draft plan for career services;
- April 2016 – Seek feedback and revise plan and forward to decision making body;
- May 2016 – Develop a process for the 6-month graduate follow up survey; and
- December 2016 – Develop a process for graduating student survey.

This is a project that evokes interest and enthusiasm on campus. Career placement has been handled piecemeal for years, and many individuals have indicated an interest in better services for students and employers. The College anticipates challenges in the process along the way; however staff members are anxious to get started.

**Develop and Implement Assessment Methods and Outcome Measures for Graduation in General Education Based on Core Abilities**

AQIP Category: Helping Students Learn  
Project Start: October, 2012  
Anticipated Close: May, 2017

The goal of this project is to use the previously defined institutional general education competencies (core abilities) and related outcome measures and implement them as part of our practices. Steps in the action project include:

- Provide a core standard of achievement for all students who earn associate degrees.
- Determine what processes will be used to measure outcomes and levels of proficiency for each core ability.
- Establish assessment methods for each outcome, at the classroom and institutional levels.
- Develop a plan for using assessment results to achieve programmatic and institutional improvements (details provided in Category One)

As described previously, the College has made excellent progress in implementing assessment of writing competency across the curriculum, in making improvements based on results, and is in the process of reassessment to determine progress. Lessor progress has been made on critical thinking because the process that works so well for writing did not work as well for critical thinking. So, the team is reassessing plans to move forward with a new process. And the core ability of professionalism will be piloted in Winter 2016 semester.

All Action Projects align with goals of the strategic plan, and evidence distinct and continuous effort and dedication to improvement. These initiatives and how they are integrated, provide evidence of Continuous Quality Improvement on the part of WSCC and contribute to the overall improvement of the College.

**Action Projects begun but delayed and closed awaiting new direction:**

Establish College Priorities
Completed Action Projects Since 2009:
- Improve Learning and Testing Center;
- Implement a Comprehensive Academic Advising Model;
- Redesign Westshore.edu;
- Strategic Technology Plan; and
- Develop and Implement a Comprehensive Plan for Adjunct Faculty Development.

Maturity Continuum Assessment by AQIP Categories

**Figure 34: Maturity Continuum Assessment 2013 to 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013 Category</th>
<th>2013 Status</th>
<th>2016 Category</th>
<th>2016 Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helping Students Learn</td>
<td>Instruction processes are stable, consistent and aligned. Student Services processes are significant, well-established and strong. Improvements needed in assessment and evaluation.</td>
<td>Helping Students Learn</td>
<td>Instruction and Student Services processes are aligned, and moving toward full integration. WSSC is considered a leader in Michigan for Student Success. Our assessment and evaluation programs are systematic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Distinct Objectives</td>
<td>Increasingly systematic processes, but no data or benchmarking. No performance measures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student and Stakeholder Needs</td>
<td>Moving from systematic to aligned processes, but some departmental silos. Data collection improving.</td>
<td>Student and Stakeholder Needs</td>
<td>We are still systematic moving toward aligned, but more at the organizational level. Fewer silos. Major focus on using data for improvement, now systematic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing People</td>
<td>Well-aligned processes. New wellness program; employees at risk for burnout. Need to improve support for adjuncts and employee evaluation.</td>
<td>Valuing Employees</td>
<td>Well-aligned processes. We have improved adjunct hiring and support practices. Full-time faculty evaluation is revised. Employee evaluations remain a priority for future action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading &amp; Communicating</td>
<td>New organizational structure. Burgeoning momentum for change. Teams model is systematic process. Need for new strategic plan. Strong and stable Board.</td>
<td>Planning and Leading</td>
<td>New revision to organizational structure. New strategic plan in place; implementation focus has been on Student Success. Performance measures in place; stronger performance metrics program planned. Significant momentum. Strong and stable Board. Project Management system to prioritize action and ease overload.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measuring Effectiveness

| High side reacting in terms of processes, but trying to centralize. Reactive to data requests. Little benchmarking. | Major expansion of services in Library Services, Testing Center, and Tutoring. Full time IR office is moving quickly to systematic; increased responsiveness to requests for data. Significant increases in data collection and benchmarking. |

Planning Continuous Improvement


Building Collaborative Relationships

| Moving toward systematic | |

**Summary and Links**

In closing, West Shore Community College continues to make progress in achieving its mission and strategic goals. We believe we demonstrate, in this document, significant effort and progress in all of the stated strategic challenges cited in the Systems Appraisal Feedback report. Even so, we recognize that we still have work in progress and work to do. We are committed to:

- Analysis of stakeholder relationships, their importance, and their quality
- Development of key performance indicators and targets for improvement
- Improvement in employee evaluation processes
- Full implementation of our revised program review process
- Program evaluation embedded in planning, via a new program viability process
- Achieving full compliance with the HLC’s new faculty qualifications requirements
- Continued migration along the maturity continuum, moving from systematic to aligned and integrated in both processes and results

We are proud of our College and our accomplishments. We acknowledge we still have work to do, and we look forward to your visit and your evaluation of our College.

**Links:**

- College Catalog: [WSCC 2015-2016 College Catalog](#)
- Curriculum guide: [2015-2016 Curriculum Guide](#)
- Board Policy Manual: [WSCC Board Policy Manual](#) See section II for Personnel Policies, especially those that govern administrative employees
- Faculty Contract: [WSCC 2014-2017 Faculty Contract](#)
- Educational Student Personnel Agreement: [WSCC ESP Agreement 2014-2017](#)
- Adjunct Faculty Handbook: [Adjunct Handbook](#)