

- Analysis of identified data to identify progress of formative measures
- Identification of integration with existing College processes and areas of change
- Progress summaries from workgroups regarding successes and challenges in plan implementation
- Outlined steps to address areas of improvement

The College President will communicate progress and evaluation of the Action Projects to College Council annually and as needed.

The two Action Project Outcomes will be measured in the following formative and summative ways:

#### **Action Project One Evaluation Plan (Holistic Support of Student Learning)**

<b>Action Project One: Formative and Summative Measures by Outcome</b>		
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Formative Measure</b>	<b>Summative Measure</b>
Established baselines and targets for knowledge of assessment techniques	Methodology for baseline and target data is agreed on by Outcomes Assessment Workgroup	Definitions, baseline, and target data are published
Increased understanding of learning outcomes design and measurement	65% of faculty participate in professional development activities related to SLO development, analysis, and/or application to program improvement	65% of faculty who participate in professional development activities document SLO improvement, analysis, or program improvement
Established processes for substantive discussion and evaluation of outcomes assessment leading to program improvement	75% of faculty participate in program discussions, peer review, or program review parties 75% of administrators participate in peer review or program review parties	75% of programs complete the cycle of evaluation
Increased student learning based on program improvement	75% of programs that complete the cycle of evaluation implement program improvements	55% of programs that undergo a full cycle of evaluation document increased student learning

**Action Project Two Evaluation Plan (Clear Educational Pathways)**

<b>Action Project Two: Formative and Summative Measures by Outcome</b>		
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Formative Measure</b>	<b>Summative Measure</b>
Established baselines and targets for student success and retention	Methodology for baseline and target data is agreed on by College Council	Baseline and target data are published Target data align with IEPI goals
Improved intervention for at-risk students	65% of students referred through Early Alert receive support services	Success rates for students referred through Early Alert increase by 3 percentage points
Increased student success and retention rates	75% of students are satisfied with student advising network	Success rates for students who participate in student advising activities increase by 3 percentage points
Published educational pathways with schedules & milestones	Pathways, program schedules, and milestone services are published and shared with students	65% of new students participate in a meta-major orientation
Increased number of students who declare clear educational choices	50% of new students enroll in a meta-major pathway	50% of students in meta-majors enroll in a guided program pathway
Increased student completion rates	65% of students who declare an educational pathway earn 15 credits	53% of students who earn 15 credits complete a certificate, degree, or transfer

Finally, the overarching purpose of the two Action Plans is to increase the applied understanding of the intersection of student learning and achievement evaluation. The College has invested in personnel, technology, and professional development to build capacity in data retrieval, data visualization, and data analysis. MJC is now ready to focus its efforts on evaluating data and applying analysis to program improvements. The Action Plans of Holistic Student Learning and Clear Educational Pathways will increase institutional capacity to improve student learning and its impact on student achievement.

## Actionable Improvement Plans



In addition to the projects outlined in the QFE, the College identified several Actionable Improvement Plans (AIP) throughout the Self-Evaluation. These plans combine to establish the deep institutionalization of the process of evaluation. The table below outlines each AIP with a timeline and assigned responsibility. The plans are listed in chronological order of implementation.

Plan	Standard	Timeline	Responsible
Enhance technology training by developing a campus-wide plan for assessing training needs, coordinating targeted professional development through Professional Learning Network (PLN) and campus resources, and evaluating the effectiveness of training.	III.C.4	Spring 2018	College Technology Committee (CTC); PDCC
Strengthen the college system of engaging in, reporting on, and measuring how professional development supports the mission and priorities of the College.	III.A.14	Fall 2018	Professional Development Coordinating Committee (PDCC)
Design evaluation and communication guidelines to strengthen regular review and assessment of governance and decision-making structures.	IV.A.7	Fall 2018	EAV Workgroup; Office of Institutional Effectiveness (IE)
Develop an evaluation process to strengthen the planning and implementation of processes, structures, and new projects, including improving the communication of evaluation results to campus stakeholders.	IV.A.1	Fall 2018	Office of IE; EAV Workgroup
Improve evaluation processes to: a) increase capacity to assess/analyze results b) institute a clear cycle of evaluation for College processes and structures c) improve the documentation of evaluation results and improvement plans	I.B.7	Spring 2019	<i>Engaging All Voices</i> (EAV) Workgroup; Office of IE
Build on the structures and processes outlined in the EMP to develop a comprehensive cycle of planning, implementation, and evaluation.	I.B.9	Spring 2019	Office of IE
Build on the culture of understanding and discussing data to strengthen the institutionalization of evaluation processes that improve institutional performance.	IV.B.3	Spring 2019	Office of IE