1 - Reflective Overview

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

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

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

Instructions for Systems Appraisal Team

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

Evidence

Overall:

A part of the Minnesota system, HCC is a comprehensive community college serving northern Minnesota. The college has been in operation since 1916 and is a member institution of the Minnesota State System. Hibbing is also a member of the Northeast Higher Education District. NHED colleges are served by one president and share services in finance, human resources and institutional research. The college offers 26 degree options including AA, AFA and AS degrees. HCC participates in the Minnesota Transfer Curriculum program. While enrollment continues to decline (current enrollment is 1,200 students), HCC notes a significant increase in dual credit enrollment.

Category 1:

Though HCC developed common learning outcomes twenty years ago and those outcomes have been fully integrated into the curriculum process and appear to be subject to ongoing review. HCC has not had a formal process in place to assess common learning outcomes. In the 2017-2018 academic year, HCC developed and piloted the Assessment and Improvement Method (AIM). Previously, indirect measures such as CCSSE were used to assess the achievement of common outcomes. The portfolio notes that 48% of faculty used the new outcomes assessment process but no data is shared. HCC reports that it has also recently developed a formal, data-driven program review process; however, program review was not completed during the 15-16 academic year. HCC attributes this gap in program review to “administrative turnover.”
Category 2:

HCC’s complaint processes for students and staff are well-established and documented. Complaints are reviewed regularly in shared governance and administrative meetings. HCC acknowledges the institution does not have an established process for collecting and documenting other stakeholder complaints. Further, it appears that HCC does not compare year-to-year complaint data. Completion rates are high at the college but retention rates for part time students are very low compared to peer colleges. The College determines stakeholders’ needs through semi-annual advisory board meetings, a transfer pathways project, and a variety of informal methods which HCC indicates are in need of improvement.

Category 3:

HCC is attempting to increase diversity on campus and is intent upon hiring qualified and certified individuals. Staff development opportunities are available. Employees are encouraged to take part in professional development including MN leadership development. The institution collects data related to hiring, training and evaluation but alsoacknowledges a gap in using hiring, training and evaluation data in its decision-making. The college notes that their contract allows faculty to teach subfields based on expertise but at the direction of HLC they intend to follow the guidance that minimum qualifications be met. It is unclear if they have faculty teaching courses without these minimal qualifications.

Category 4:

Strategic planning appears to be a recurring process and the institution has identified 4 core values. It appears that the college has a process in place to evaluate the mission, vision, and values every 3 years. They have also undergone strategic planning twice in the past 6 years. Survey data is collected about the awareness of the mission and value statements and response rates were high with a large percentage of employees affirming. While processes for developing and maintaining leaders are in place, HCC acknowledges the need to develop formal leadership succession processes. Regular audits ensure compliance and integrity.

Category 5:

Regular program review processes and use of surveys suggest improvement in knowledge management. A resource management system aides in proper and appropriate use of resources that are aligned with strategic plans. This system includes financial, fiscal, technological and other resource areas. Further, an approach to shared governance appears to be in place to support dissemination of appropriate data. The institution’s organizational leadership appears to be organized to support efficient use of resources.

Category 6:

Join Us in Making Progress (JUMP) is an on-going, internal system responsible for ensuring projects are aligned with AQIP categories. Projects come from within the institution, are guided by the JUMP team and are tracked for progress. HCC uses Data Driven Program Review as one example of the effort and the impact of this process. A culture of quality has evolved with more faculty and staff involved in action projects. HCC recognizes that they have not fully integrated the system and have identified benchmarking and use of bigger data as part of their growth and development plan.
Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
2 - Strategic Challenges Analysis

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

Instructions for Systems Appraisal Team

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

Evidence

**Strategic Challenge #1** - Throughout the portfolio, Hibbing Community College describes explicit and repeatable steps for key processes; however, these descriptions fail to adequately articulate methods which the College may be using to periodically evaluate processes for effectiveness. Knowing the level of effectiveness of each key process will help the college make decisions which will lead to improvement in the quality of its outcomes.

**Strategic Challenge #2** - There does not appear to be alignment between stated key processes and the results offered throughout the portfolio. Results appear to be collections of available data rather than key indicators chosen deliberately to demonstrate the effectiveness of key processes which support the strategy and mission of the college. As a member of a larger state-wide system, Hibbing Community College benefits from access to robust data; however, it is not apparent that the College has worked to consider how these data obtained externally measure effectiveness of processes developed internally.

**Strategic Challenge #3** - Hibbing does not consistently use comparative analysis in its evaluation of key processes and results. Rarely in the portfolio does the College articulate internal targets or external benchmarks. Without a framework in place to enable comparative analysis, the College will be challenged to assess current levels of performance or make decisions regarding improvement initiatives.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*
3 - Accreditation Evidence Screening Summary

Systems Appraisal teams screen the institution’s Systems Portfolio evidence in relation to the Criteria for Accreditation and the Core Components. This step is designed to position the institution for success during the subsequent review to reaffirm the institution’s accreditation. In order to accomplish this task, HLC has established linkages between various Process and Results questions and the Criteria’s Core Components. Systems Appraisal teams have been trained to conduct a “soft review” of the Criteria/Core Components for Systems Portfolios completed in the third year of the AQIP Pathway cycle and a more robust review for Systems Portfolios completed in the seventh year. The formal review of the Criteria and Core Components for purposes of reaffirming the institution’s accreditation through the comprehensive evaluation that occurs in the eighth year of the cycle, unless serious problems are identified earlier in the cycle. As part of this Systems Appraisal screening process, teams indicate whether each Core Component is “strong, clear, and well-presented,” “adequate but could be improved,” or “unclear or incomplete.” When the Criteria and Core Components are reviewed formally for reaffirmation of accreditation, peer reviewers must determine whether each is "met", "met with concerns", or "not met".

The full report documents in detail the Appraisal team’s best judgment as to the current strength of the institution’s evidence for each Core Component and thus for each Criterion. It is structured according to the Criteria for Accreditation and the Systems Appraisal procedural document. Institutions are encouraged to review this report carefully in order to guide improvement work relative to the Criteria and Core Components.

Immediately below the team provides summary statements that convey broadly its observations regarding the institution’s present ability to satisfy each Criterion as well as any suggestions for improvement. Again, this feedback is based only upon information contained in the institution’s Systems Portfolio and thus may be limited.

Instructions for Systems Appraisal Team

In this section, the team should create summary statements/suggestions for improvement for each of the Criteria for Accreditation.

Evidence

Hibbing Community College’s evidence is mostly clear and well-presented. Evidence for the following core components is adequate, but could be improved as described in the evidence screening section of this appraisal: 1.A, 1.C, 3.A, 3.B, 5.D. Of concern is evidence for core component 4.B which remains unclear. HCC describes its progress developing processes for assessing student learning. For example, prior to 2017, HCC used the Community College Survey of Student Engagement results to measure the HCC Core Competencies; however, the results offered do not demonstrate direct assessment of student learning was happening at this time. The AIM pilot process as created in the Fall of 2017 and implemented in Spring 2018 to make improvements to the College’s assessment program; however, results from direct assessment of student learning do not yet exist which would provide evidence that the college is assessing common learning outcomes. Likewise, little evidence is provided to indicate that the College is assessing program learning outcomes. Without results such as this in place, reviewers were not able to see clear evidence that HCC uses
information gained from assessment to improve student learning.

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*
4 - Quality of Systems Portfolio

In this System Appraisal, peer review teams should acknowledge any work that the institution has begun toward addressing the Criteria for Accreditation and the Core Components. The more focused analysis remains on the AQIP Categories and the institution’s evidence related to the Process (P), Results (R), and Improvement (I) questions. In cases where there was HLC follow-up stemming from the institution’s previous reaffirmation review, the institution may request closer scrutiny of those items during this Systems Appraisal.

Instructions for Systems Appraisal Team

Because it stands as a reflection of the institution, the Systems Portfolio should be complete and coherent, and it should provide an open and honest self-analysis on the strengths and challenges facing the institution. In this section, the peer review team provides the institution with constructive feedback on the overall quality of the Systems Portfolio, along with suggestions for improving future Systems Portfolio submissions.

Evidence

Hibbing Community College's portfolio is written with clarity and precision. Reviewers noted that it was easy to obtain a clear picture of the processes the College has in place. Reviewers did notice that responses throughout the portfolio failed to address explicit and repeatable processes describing how the College evaluates the effectiveness of its key processes even though summary results seemed to indicate that some level of evaluation is occurring. The issue here is not one of clarity; rather, it is a question of completeness and whether or not Hibbing Community College's responses address the entirety of the AQIP Category prompts.

An additional issue related to the quality of the Systems Portfolio involves the relationship between the results sections and the corresponding processes sections. Much of the summary results presented seem to be lists of reports and results which are accessible or available rather than an intentional presentation of key results aligned with key processes. Reviewers often struggled to understand how summary results were linked to processes described in the preceding section.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
5 - AQIP Category Feedback

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

I - Helping Students Learn

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

Instructions for Systems Appraisal Team

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

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

Evidence

CATEGORY 1: HELPING STUDENTS LEARN

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

1.1: COMMON LEARNING OUTCOMES

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

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

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

HCC’s approach for aligning common outcomes to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution is **systematic**. HCC operates within the framework of the State system and uses advisory boards, Transfer and Technical Curriculum Committees and Academic Affairs and Standards Council. It is not clear if the process is evaluated for effectiveness.

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

HCC has **systematically** defined five core competencies, four of which were determined 20 years ago and another more recently. These competencies are vetted through research and internal committees and are reviewed every five years. The MN system and HCC have a well-articulated transfer process that is responsive to the large number of non-traditional students. A more detailed approach to the continued monitoring of results would move HCC to a higher level of maturity.

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

State system goals help define purpose, content and level of achievement in liberal arts and sciences courses, as well as courses in special technical areas. HCC’s common learning outcomes are articulated in all course syllabi. HCC might move beyond the **systematic** level by incorporating process evaluation in its operation.

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

HCC has a **systematic** and well-established curriculum committee process to ensure that all students seeking a degree at the College are exposed to both HCC Core Competencies as well as State general education outcomes. There are multiple student support systems available such as internships, tutoring programs and community service learning opportunities. It is unclear whether the institution regularly evaluates the process for improvement which could take them from **systematic** to alignment.

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

Institutional guiding principles and core concepts create a framework for accountability as it relates to ensuring that outcomes remain relevant and aligned with student, workplace, and societal needs. For technical programs, advisory board review and regular program review appear to provide **systematic** approaches to ensuring that outcomes are relevant.

Equally mature approaches do not appear to be in place for liberal arts programs, though academic advisors do meet with students a minimum of once per semester to guide course selections. The pilot project initiated in spring 2018 to review HCC’s common outcomes may provide improvement in this area, and HCC will need to consider ways to formalize periodic evaluation of outcomes to reach alignment with student, workplace, and societal needs.

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

HCC **systematically** provides an appropriate array of co-curricular activities supporting student
learning, and documentation demonstrates how certain co-curricular programs support specific HCC Core Competencies. The institution provides opportunities for student organizations to express themselves and also provides programs such as TRIO and Veteran’s support groups. They do not appear to look at students who may not fit eligibility guidelines for those programs, such as the non-traditional students they serve.

HCC may benefit from developing processes for periodically evaluating the effectiveness of these co-curricular endeavors in supporting learning. HCC acknowledges this need and is currently developing a co-curricular assessment process which would help them close the loop and move them toward the aligned maturity level

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

Faculty are responsible for selecting tools, methods and instruments for assessing general education outcomes. Faculty assign targets, results and action items for improvement within the TracDat system. HCC has recently expanded beyond the use of the CCSSE to determine success towards achieving learning objectives. The AIM process appears to be systematic in nature. In order to move toward alignment, the College might consider a process whereby coordination and communication among and between units are emphasized and the process is evaluated for improvement.

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

HCC’s newly developed process for assessing common learning outcomes is operating at the reacting level. There is no consistent process in place to ensure faculty participation in assessing outcomes, nor is there an opportunity to evaluate the process for improvement. While HCC describes a standard data entry process for TracDat they do not identify a consistent process for assessing common outcomes

1R1 What are the results for determining if students possess the knowledge, skills and abilities that are expected at each degree level? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

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

HCC appears to understand the limitations of its current data related to the assessment of common outcomes, and recently facilitated pilot projects aimed at providing direct assessment of student learning outcomes. Other metrics provided here, such as faculty participation in assessment processes, also do not provide direct measures related to determining if students possess the knowledge, skills, and abilities expected at all degree levels. Assessment results emerging from HCC’s new AIM project will determine whether the College is preparing to move results for this area past the reacting level.

- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

CCSSE results are presented with an indication of trends but it now appears that the institution is terminating its use. There is little in the way of comparative data except for pass rates for nursing and pharmaceutical technicians. In order to move from reacting to systematic HCC might consider developing both internal and external benchmarks to help determine whether students are meeting the
Interpretation of results and insights gained

It does not appear that significant insights are systematically achieved. Data are presented in this section and some simple analysis is offered when apparent; however, HCC appears to be reacting to the data available rather than utilizing the data to achieve insight about current performance and drive future performance.

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

Improvements planned in the area of Inclusion and Equity seem appropriate, but it is unclear how they are related to Category 1: Common Learning Outcomes. The College is refining the process for collecting data on Core Competencies using the AIM process which will also begin to include co-curricular activities as well. Making sure that assessments are in alignment with learning outcomes and the use of appropriate benchmarks will likely lead beyond reacting to greater maturity in this category.

1.2: PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

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

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

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

HCC is currently at the systematic level of maturity for aligning program learning outcomes to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution. HCC follows the Minnesota State Transfer Curriculum process for determining associate degree outcomes. Outcomes for the technical programs are dictated by certification and licensing requirements. For liberal arts, successful completion of courses which meet MnTC goal areas determine successful completion of program outcomes. The College will move to higher levels of majority by establishing a process that is clearly shared across the college and can be evaluated for efficiency.

- Determining program outcomes (4.B.4)

HCC liberal arts outcomes are set by the State system, and in the professional – technical areas by program advisory boards and related standards. Faculty work within this framework to develop program outcomes. Systematic processes appear to be in place for both types of degrees; in order to move towards alignment, the college could benefit from a way to evaluate their current process of determining program outcomes.

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

HCC has a well-established, systematic process of using program plans, course syllabi, and course outlines to articulate the purposes, content, and level of achievement for program outcomes for both
CTE and liberal arts courses. Evaluating the processes could assist the institution in moving to higher level of maturity.

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

HCC achieves alignment by ensuring relevancy through three means: the connection with MN State system and the 10 core goals, the use of advisory committees that meet twice per year, and a three-year rotation on program review. Assessment results using TracDat help to evaluate the effectiveness of programs.

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

The review process for student organizations and student activities seeks to connect to the HCC educational focus, and follows State guidelines so that review of proposals occurs within higher levels of the organization. Processes are systematic and may be enhanced by regular evaluation.

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

HCC describes a very siloed process for selecting tools to gauge attainment of program learning outcomes. Faculty select the tools and report course level data into TracDat; and it appears that successful completion of coursework is what dictates the attainment of program outcomes. While there are links to results in some programs, they do not clearly describe how this is addressed across all program. HCC is operating at the reacting level and could benefit from a well-defined, repeatable and documented process that can be shared across institutions.

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

HCC notes that for some CTE programs, external state and national certifications are used to determine successful completion of program outcomes. For liberal arts, successful completion of courses which meet MnTC goal areas determine successful completion of program outcomes. The College is operating at the reacting level and doesn’t appear to have a well-established process in place that is shared across the college and can be evaluated for effectiveness.

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

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

No data is provided to indicate levels of deployment. No mention is made of liberal arts programs. It is unclear why HCC elected to report results from the five programs identified in the response. The institution is at the reacting level and will benefit from efforts in this area.

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

HCC appears to have longitudinal data about success of students in the reported programs. In some cases it is noted that pass rates are low and a plan is being developed at the State level, but for other
programs it is unclear how the institution uses the data to drive change or improvement making them largely systematic in maturity. Evaluation of results in all programs and reference to the core curriculum would help to move the institution towards alignment.

- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Where benchmarks are available from external sources, HCC appears to engage in comparative analysis in reaction to what is available from these sources. There does not appear to be any attempt to establish internal targets or conduct trend analysis of direct assessment results associated with stated program learning outcomes.

- Interpretation of assessment results and insights gained

HCC systematically uses data to make improvements. This is evident in areas where they fall below national benchmarks as in the dental assistant program. Where they are exceeding standards they continue improvement efforts through annual assessment and three-year program review. An evaluation of existing processes might help to move them forward.

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

HCC plans to continue to work on improving course-level assessments and towards a more consistent process for developing learning outcomes among courses and departments. They are also working on a standard program assessment process for all programs. The response indicates that the College is attempting to be more focused on identification of 6-10 learning outcomes for each course outline, but this does not suggest that the College has developed a clear understanding of the difference between course learning outcomes and program learning outcomes. Further, there is no indication that the College understands the difference between indirect indicators of program learning outcomes attainment (i.e. external certification exams) and more direct indicators which would be developed by aligning specific assessments to individual program learning outcomes.

1.3: ACADEMIC PROGRAM DESIGN

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

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

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

Multiple sources of data from the state and NHED help the institution identify stakeholders as well as labor market and regional demand. The institution has a robust process in place, but lacks a method to evaluate the effectiveness of the process and therefore are operating at the systematic level.

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

HCC has partnerships with local schools (17), 5 NHWS colleges and with industry partners involved in advisory boards. These partnerships allow them to identify and determine key stakeholder needs. In addition, the transfer network supported by the State serves to systematically support students. Their key leadership is also involved in community organizations and participates in the Applied
Learning Institute, Advanced Minnesota, and similar associations. Though this process appears to be driven by explicit and repeatable steps, there is no indication that it is being evaluated periodically to determine effectiveness.

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

HCC is systematic in developing and improving responsive programming to meet all stakeholders’ needs. Faculty and program leaders meet semi-annually with advisory boards to ensure technical education aligns with employers’ needs. It is unclear if the institution has a process to evaluate the effectiveness of this multifaceted approach.

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

The State systems provides data to HCC which offers State level comparisons. Data is reviewed annually by the President and the Provost as well as other appropriate faculty and staff. The three year program review process was developed by an AQIP action project. This systematic process is well documented and may be enhanced with an intentional evaluation process to move the college from systematic to aligned.

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

The institutional processes for reviewing programs and courses is clearly identified. The Transfer or Technical Review Committee analyzes data, as does academic administration, to determine the viability of programs and courses for continuation or for elimination where appropriate. Evaluation of this systematic process may drive the institution toward alignment.

1R3  What are the results for determining if programs are current and meet the needs of the institution’s diverse stakeholders? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P3. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

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

Twice yearly advisory board meetings as well as comprehensive program review has allowed for input in the continuation, revision or discontinuation of programs. Several specific examples are included alluding to the fact that results are shared and used for decision making. Evaluation of this systematic process may help move the institution toward alignment.

- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Results for internal targets and external benchmarks are systematic. The SFPM reports indicate that HCC has exceeded the Minnesota State’s performance goals for related employment rates by an average of 8.2%.

- Interpretation of results and insights gained

There are examples of changes made based on data from surveys and reports, such as the JUMP program. Data and analytical processes such as program review suggest HCC is systematic in this
consideration. The data seems limited to system provided data and HCC might benefit by furthering its use of benchmarks.

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

Improvements described appear to be appropriate and focused on the needs of students and other key stakeholders. HCC describes the implementation of a new program as a result of data driven processes. They follow systematic processes including State system information, partnership information, and the involvement of faculty to make program decisions. However, this section should focus on 1I3 and should more clearly describe how data is used in the improvement process.

1.4: ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUALITY

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

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

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

HCC follows Minnesota state policy for open admissions institutions. The College requires students to complete Accuplacer to determine appropriate placement into college level or developmental coursework. Industry standards and faculty determine student preparation for CTE programs. The preparation guidelines are shared with students via program plans in the catalog and on the institutional website. Common course outline templates also note course outcomes and prerequisites. The institution has many systematic processes in place to determine and communicate preparation required of students, but lacks a process to evaluate the efficiency of the processes which would allow the College to move toward alignment.

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

Standard syllabi and course outlines are utilized regardless of delivery method to ensure consistency in courses. Course outlines are reviewed every five years through a systematic review process and the Quality Matters process is used to evaluate online courses. Concurrent enrollment instructors are paired with faculty to ensure communication and consistency. The College appears to have multiple systematic processes in place but may benefit from more extensive evaluation of effectiveness of processes for ensuring rigor. HCC may also wish to consider how advisory boards are utilized in processes for ensuring program rigor.

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

Systematic processes for the evaluation of prior learning and transfer credit are primarily dictated by Minnesota State Policy and implemented at the institutional level. Advanced Placement, CLEP and International Baccalaureate Credit are ways in which prior learning credit is supported. HCC may benefit from more extensive evaluation of effectiveness of its current processes for ensuring students’ needs are met.

- Selecting, implementing and maintaining specialized accreditation(s) (4.A.5)
Program leaders are tasked with determining, implementing and maintaining specialized accreditations and utilize established state and national board standards to select appropriate accrediting bodies. While a systematic process may be in place it is unclear from the portfolio whether there is a standard process that each program follows or whether it is left up to each individual program in a siloed manner. Because the institution doesn’t describe the process they are currently operating in a reacting manner.

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

HCC utilizes employment rates, certification pass rates, and graduate surveys to determine whether graduates are attaining appropriate levels of outcomes, but it is unclear if there is a standard process for determining how changes will occur through the utilization of this data. In order to move from reacting toward systematic, the institution would benefit from establishing a repeatable process that is shared across units to evaluate the data collected and make data informed decisions.

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

Multiple systematic methods for assessing program rigor are used by HCC including program review process, external certifications, advisory boards, and a Strategic Framework Performance Measures report. It appears the college uses multiple tools and instruments but it is unclear whether there is a well-defined, repeatable, and periodically evaluated process that is shared across the institution or whether each program chooses independently. Because of this the institution the operating at the systematic level. Also unclear is how program review provides meaningful evidence to support program rigor. HCC may benefit from designing an explicit process that sets clear expectations for program rigor along with metrics and targets for programs that do not have a certificate exam.

1R4 What are the results for determining the quality of academic programs? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P4. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

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

HCC systematically addresses all areas of specialized accreditation which are currently approved. HCC would advance by finding and using standards beyond areas of special accreditation. HCC notes it reviewed 35 programs between 2010 and 2016; reviews appear to have yielded several changes. It remains unclear, however, whether all programs were reviewed during that time period.

- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

The college notes a comparison of their institutional completion rates to the Minnesota State goal, but does little to describe data for specific programs. HCC also notes that overall they have exceeded state goals for employment but again provide no program level data analysis. In order to move from reacting to systematic the college might consider collecting and analyzing data on specific programs for comparison purposes.

- Interpretation of results and insights gained

HCC’s interpretation of results and insights gained are systematic. Implementing a data-driven program review process is a primary focus for the institution. The College is revising concurrent
enrollment policies to meet NACEP accreditation standards.

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

HCC does well in areas of special accreditation, and they have established standards in some other areas. The College plans to continue to use TracDat and will begin utilizing it for program level data and also notes that it has joined NACEP and will revise concurrent enrollment policies to meet the standards of NACEP accreditation.

1.5: ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

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

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

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

There are multiple policies which ensure freedom of expression and integrity of research and scholarly practice. The student handbook describes the process for the student code of conduct. The commitment by the college to academic freedom is noted in the college catalog and also laid out in the MSCF contract. HCC utilizes the NHED Institutional Review Board to provide oversight and support for faculty research. These processes are well established and shared across the institution but it is unclear whether they are evaluated periodically for effectiveness indicating a **systematic** maturity level.

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

The Student Handbook and course syllabi provide information on ethical practices for students. Students who violate the policy are referred to the Student Conduct Officer who investigates using an established process. Some programs, such as nursing, have additional policies which are enforced at the program level. HCC has an opportunity to move from **systematic** to the next maturity level by creating and evaluating current processes to determine if institutional needs are met.

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

Processes ensuring ethical teaching and research practices of faculty are **systematic**. Faculty are guided by the policy related to academic freedom in the MSCF contract, and newly hired faculty are required to complete training on the code of conduct and data privacy within 10 days of hire. The state of Minnesota has an established code of ethics for employees. Faculty who wish to pursue research utilize the process by the NHED institutional review board. As evidenced above with students, there are many processes in place at the institution but it is unclear if the processes are regularly assessed for effectiveness.

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

The institution provides several examples of tools that support academic integrity but there is no description of a process used to determine the selection of the tools or policies making the process
reacting in nature.

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

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

HCC is approaching systematic in regards to summary results of measures. HCC reports over 100 informal student complaints and two formal complaints during the 2017-2018 academic years and no discipline issues for violations of academic integrity. The institution has some but little longitudinal data on academic integrity, and it is unclear how these data are shared with internal stakeholders for decision making and improvement. It appears no faculty conducted research during this period.

- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

It appears HCC has not developed internal targets or external benchmarks; hence, results for internal/external benchmarks are reacting. HCC may find it beneficial to establish internal targets and identify external benchmarks as a way of utilizing results for this area in decision making and for continuous quality improvement initiatives.

- Interpretation of results and insights gained

While results are linked in the response along with brief description to establish a context for the summary, any formal or informal interpretation of these results is not apparent. It remains unclear how the institution has utilized the data collected to inform change. Interpretation of results, then, is currently at the reacting stage of maturity. HCC may realize an opportunity to improve as it works to develop trend analysis and compare current performance levels against internal targets and/or external benchmarks.

1I5 Based on 1R6, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

The College notes its data driven review process has helped them identify a new diploma program in Industrial Systems Technology and partner with other schools to develop cohorts of students in Dental Assisting and Nursing.

CATEGORY SUMMARY

Hibbing Community College has developed a number of systematic processes and practices that address student learning and related outcomes. The College is part of a larger system of colleges and appears to work well with both the state and their regional group. They identify several instances where improvements are made using data, though that process is not clearly described. There are adequate student support systems in place to support student learning. HCC has participated in CCSSE and appears to have established other process and systems including TracDat. They are actively addressing enrollment issues and diversity issues though they appear to be in the early stages.

While some results are systematic, much of what is presented is reflective of a reacting maturity level. The College may benefit from establishing baselines, benchmarks, and strategies for ongoing data gathering, analysis, and decision-making; such a framework will enable comparative analysis.
Evaluation of their processes will help them move to higher levels of maturity.

**CATEGORY STRATEGIC ISSUES**

Hibbing Community College lacks data and results related to assessment of student learning outcomes. Reviewers note that processes for assessing learning outcomes have been recently developed, and it will be imperative for these processes to yield meaningful data or information which can be used to improve student learning.

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*
II - Meeting Student and Other Key Stakeholder Needs

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

Instructions for Systems Appraisal Team

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

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

Evidence

CATEGORY 2: MEETING STUDENT AND OTHER KEY STAKEHOLDER NEEDS

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

2.1: CURRENT AND PROSPECTIVE STUDENT NEED

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

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

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

HCC has multiple systematic processes for identifying underprepared and at-risk students, and determining their academic support needs. HCC begins assessing students’ needs through its Accuplacer testing and TRiO SSS program applications. Students who place into developmental courses are registered in a Learning Community cohort; the College also determines academic support needs for international students and military veterans. HCC has an opportunity to become aligned by incorporating an evaluation component to their current processes.
- Deploying academic support services to help students select and successfully complete courses and programs (3.D.2)

HCC uses multiple **systematic** processes to help students successfully complete courses including mandatory advising, referrals to free peer tutoring services through the Academic Center, and faculty completion of Academic Intervention forms for students who are struggling. There is no information in the response to indicate that HCC is working to evaluate these processes to ensure their effectiveness which could move them to the next maturity level.

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

HCC’s process for ensuring faculty are available for student inquiry is currently at the **systematic** level of maturity. Faculty post scheduled office hours on their door and on each course syllabus. HCC has an opportunity to mature to the next level by periodically evaluating for improvement to ensure that faculty office hours are meeting student needs.

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

HCC’s processes for determining and addressing the learning support needs of students and faculty are **systematic**. HCC’s response makes it clear that ample learning support needs are in place; for example, the College addresses a number of features related to library services, tutoring, counseling, labs, and simulation environments. Needs are determined through the admission process, assessment and course placement and student support processes. In order to move to the aligned maturity level the college should consider a systematic process for coordinating or reviewing these processes.

- Determining new student groups to target for educational offerings and services

HCC has developed **systematic** processes for determining new student groups to target, including identifying and attracting diverse students as a goal in its strategic plan, developing an Inclusion and Equity Plan, and partnering with other NHED colleges to develop a regional advancement strategy. It appears that goals to target new student groups were determined during the strategic planning process. As the strategic plan is implemented HCC has an opportunity to move to the next level in maturity by assessing the recruitment and targeting processes to determine effectiveness.

- Meeting changing student needs

HCC’s response provides a list of various sources from which the College may be able to gain insights regarding changing student need. For example, the New Student Survey most likely elicits information about student need. While the College notes that the results of this survey are used to place students in support groups, there is no description of a process the College uses to understand student needs, analyze trends which may lead to insights about changing student needs, and evaluate the degree to which interventions (e.g. student support groups) are effective in meeting changing needs. Rather than offering explicit and repeatable steps in a process, the response seems to offer a number of inputs to which stakeholders at the college are reacting.

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

HCC is **systematic** with regard to identifying and supporting student subgroups with distinctive needs. The college identifies subgroups through ISRS Operational Data collected during the
admissions process and orientation. Student Services provides services through its veterans’ center, disability coordinator, testing center, and online help desk. HCC has an opportunity to move to the next level in maturity by establishing and assessing processes to determine if student subgroups with distinctive needs are being met.

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

As in other areas of 2P1, HCC appears to have in place an appropriate array of non-academic support services; however, the response does not offer explicit and repeatable steps which include periodic evaluation for effectiveness. While processes are likely systematic, HCC may wish to more explicitly document and evaluate processes to ensure continued maturation.

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

HCC has systematic processes for ensuring staff members are well-qualified, trained, and supported beginning with position posting and continuing through hiring, evaluating, providing professional development support, involvement in share governance, and employee appreciation events. Assessing whether employee development opportunities meet staff needs would help move HCC to the next level of maturity.

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

HCC is systematic with regard to communicating the availability of non-academic support services. Communication regarding the availability of non-academic support services begins during the recruitment process and continues through the student orientation. Assessing whether current communicating processes meet student needs would help move HCC to the next level of maturity.

- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess student needs

While the response does not make it clear that there is an explicit and repeatable process in place to drive the selection of tools, methods, and instruments used for assessing student need, there does appear to be appropriate initiatives in place to do so. For example, HCC uses a New Student Survey, a Satisfactory Academic Progress procedure, the CCSSE, and student evaluation of instruction as tools and methods. These procedures are systematic, and HCC may be able to increase maturity in this area by periodically evaluating each of these tools/methods to determine if they are effectively providing the insights and results the College needs to drive improvement.

- Assessing the degree to which student needs are met

HCC notes that results from key institutional assessments including CCSSE, New Student Surveys, Gradate Surveys and other indicators are reviewed by leadership and benchmarked from year to year. This is an aligned process which should yield insights to drive improvement over time.

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

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
Comparative analysis is presented where external benchmarks are available, and some results are shared as trends. Provided that these data are shared across work units at the College, this represents an aligned stage of maturity. As the response is not entirely clear regarding ways that the data are shared, HCC may wish to strengthen its presentation of these data by describing how results are disseminated to appropriate stakeholders to provide input into decision making.

- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Narrative analysis, though brief, appears to indicate that HCC is working to interpret results in alignment with identified targets and benchmarks. For example, the College notes a comparison of its results for satisfaction with instructional and non-instructional services a “high” in most areas but “low” for childcare services. From this analysis, HCC has gained the insight that there is “strong student need for a service that HCC does not currently offer.” Interpretation at this level is a positive indicator that HCC has the capacity to mature its results in other areas.

- Interpretation of results and insights gained

Narrative analysis, though brief, appears to indicate that HCC is working to interpret results in alignment with identified targets and benchmarks. For example, the College notes a comparison of its results for satisfaction with instructional and non-instructional services a “high” in most areas but “low” for childcare services. From this analysis, HCC has gained the insight that there is “strong student need for a service that HCC does not currently offer.” Interpretation at this level is a positive indicator that HCC has the capacity to mature its results in other areas.

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

HCC is working to develop an AQIP Action Project “Attention to Retention Through Early Intervention” that will provide an early intervention process for at-risk students and the Action Project “Mapping and Assessing Student Support Processes for Incoming students that will contribute to a flowchart and list of support practices. Beyond the Classroom groups are being implemented in Fall 2018 and digital course evaluations are being created.

2.2: RETENTION, PERSISTENCE AND COMPLETION

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

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

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

HCC is aligned with regard to collecting student retention, persistence, and completion data. The NHED Office of Institutional Research collects and reports HCC data in an annual Fact Book that is posted on the College’s website. NHED OIR also provides program data sheets to college leadership. HCC has an opportunity to consider whether the data provided by the NHED OIR is sufficient for internal decision making.

- Determining targets for student retention, persistence and completion (4.C.1, 4.C.4)
HCC’s response indicates an aligned process whereby targets are determined by the Minnesota State systems and shared as a part of the SFPM Dashboard. While benchmarks are noted, this process doesn’t describe how or whether HCC plays a role in a state-wide evaluation of the effectiveness of these targets. The institution might consider a process for evaluating whether the state targets and data provide the institution with appropriate data to support decision making.

- Analyzing information on student retention, persistence and completion

It appears that appropriate stakeholders and groups are analyzing student retention, persistence, and completion data. For example, the SFPM report is reviewed by the president and provost; further analysis includes the Minnesota State chancellor; the JUMP team consults these data frequently as well. The most aligned use of retention, persistence, and completion data involves its use during the program review.

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

HCC is operating at the systematic level of maturity for meeting targets for retention, persistence and completion. HCC has designed several Action Projects to assist in meeting the targets. The College could benefit from a process to evaluate the effectiveness of the measures implemented related to retention, persistence, and completion.

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

HCC is systematic regarding selecting tools/methods/instruments used to assess attainment of program learning outcomes. Minnesota State performance metrics are selected by the Minnesota State Systems Office. While HCC has selected internal metrics to measure perceived academic and personal progress and availability of non-instructional resources, the College does not provide detail on how these instruments were selected nor a process to evaluate their effectiveness which would move them toward the next maturity level.

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

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

HCC is able to provide summary results of the SFPM report which indicates that HCC is exceeding many of the benchmarks established at the state level. Where performance lags expectations, HCC provides some indication that they are aware of the gap. Reviewers noted, however, a large gap between part-time retention rates (19%) against the peer group (42%). This seems to be a gap which needs further explanation or interpretation. Results appear to be aligned with appropriate benchmarks.

- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

HCC is aligned in comparison of results with internal and external benchmarks. The college has set targets for transfer and completion rates that it compares to other Minnesota community colleges and
has trend data for comparison longitudinally.

- Interpretation of results and insights gained

HCC’s interpretation of results and insights gained is **systematic**. “Data” will be a standing agenda item during Admin Leadership, AASC and Shared Governance meetings. The College discussed some insights gained but may benefit from additional detail here.

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

HCC has initiated several new Action Projects to identify and address student needs and to add new support services. An action project “Mapping and Assessing Student Support Processes for Incoming Students” and the “Attention to Retention through Early Intervention” action project will be implemented in 2018-2020.

2.3: KEY STAKEHOLDER NEEDS

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

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

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

HCC’s **systematic** determination of external stakeholder groups is guided by its mission, goals, and values. HCC acknowledges its role as an important community asset in the rural community it serves and understand the ways in which its determination of external stakeholder groups such as high schools is constrained by its sister NHED colleges. HCC also recognizes the program-level accreditors for its educational programs as stakeholders. In order to move toward an aligned maturity level HCC might consider a method to evaluate effectiveness.

Determining new stakeholders to target for services or partnership

**Systematic** processes appear to be in place to determine new stakeholders; for example, the response indicates that individual faculty members are empowered to partner with business and industry stakeholders in response to emerging need. As the College works to build more mature processes in this area, some attention may be warranted to developing explicit and repeatable steps to guide efforts. For example, the response indicates that determining new stakeholders begins as a reaction to “environmental change or an emerging need;” however, there is no description of methods that HCC uses to continually monitor and identify these changes and emerging needs.

Meeting the changing needs of key stakeholders

HCC is **systematic** with regard to meeting the changing needs of key stakeholders. Regular contact with stakeholders provides HCC to identify opportunities and needs related to college operations. While these interactions provide the institution with information on the needs of key stakeholders, it is not clear if they are documented and the information gathered is shared throughout the campus. HCC has an opportunity to advance in maturity by evaluating the effectiveness of these methods to ensure the needs of stakeholders are being met.

Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess key stakeholder needs
HCC’s response identifies a variety of processes the College uses to meet the changing needs of key stakeholders, and each of these processes appears to be operating at a **systematic** stage of maturity. The addition of steps to ensure periodic evaluation of effectiveness and sharing across work units may assist in moving these processes to the next stage.

Assessing the degree to which key stakeholder needs are met

HCC is **reacting** with regard to assessing the degree to which key stakeholder needs are met. HCC gathers information from a number of sources, but does not indicate the processes by which the data and information are used to determine whether the needs of the key stakeholders are met. HCC has hired a consultant in non-profit board development to conduct a board self-assessment.

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

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

HCC is **systematic** regarding summary results for determining if stakeholder needs are met. To determine if its diverse key stakeholders’ needs are being met, HCC tracks data such as growth in concurrent enrollments, usage of HCC facilities by community groups, certificates and degrees awarded, hours of training provided, and accepted transfer rates.

- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Overall HCC is **reacting** with regard to comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks. Except for employment of graduates, it is unclear from the narrative what targets have been established by the campus and what the institution has deemed to be a strategic priority. The College may be better served to determine what measures are the most crucial and develop a strong analysis and initiatives related to addressing these concerns. Setting internal targets and identifying external benchmarks is an opportunity for HCC to advance in maturity.

- Interpretation of results and insights gained

HCC appears to be at the **systematic** stage of maturity. HCC acknowledges the need to develop a formal process for measuring results to determine if stakeholder needs are indeed met without a formal process meaningful interpretation is limited. As HCC matures in this subcategory, it will have access to more target data and information which will improve its ability to make meaningful changes as needed.

**2I3** Based on 2R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

The JUMP committee is tasked with incorporating (and developing?) assessment tools for measuring stakeholder satisfaction. Following its self-assessment process, the HCC Foundation Board is developing a strategy for identifying stakeholder needs.

**2.4: COMPLAINT PROCESSES**
Complaint Processes focuses on collecting, analyzing and responding to complaints from students or key stakeholder groups.

**2P4** Describe the processes for collecting, analyzing and responding to complaints from students and stakeholder groups. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Collecting complaint information from students

HCC’s **systematic** processes for collecting, analyzing, and responding to complaints from students include a student complaint form available on the HCC website and a description of the process for submitting a complaint in the Student Handbook. In addition, the College uses system-wide procedures developed by the Minnesota State college system to collect, analyze and respond to complaints on discrimination or harassment, sexual violence, code of conduct violations, and other grievances. The College also has a formal grade appeal process. HCC has an opportunity to move to the next level in maturity by assessing its complaint processes to determine effectiveness.

- Collecting complaint information from other key stakeholders

HCC’s processes for collecting complaint information from other key stakeholders appear to be **reactive**, as no specific methods of collecting, analyzing, and responding to complaints are described.

- Learning from complaint information and determining actions

HCC is **systematic** regarding learning from complaint information and determining actions. Complaints are reviewed during bi-weekly admin meetings, AASC and Shared Governance meetings. Actions for preventing similar complaints are discussed at department and admin meetings and approved by AASC and/or Shared Governance. In order to move to an aligned maturity level the college might consider adding an evaluation component to their process.

- Communicating actions to students and other key stakeholders

HCC is **systematic** regarding communicating actions to students and other key stakeholders through a built in notification system. An example is provided for the Grade Appeals process and an assumption can be made that other processes are similar. HCC does not address communicating actions to other key stakeholders directly. It is unclear how students are notified of actions that have been submitted via the Student Complaint Form. In order to move toward an aligned maturity level, the college might wish to include some evaluation to determine the effectiveness of this process.

- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to evaluate complaint resolution

HCC’s processes for selecting tools, methods, and instruments to evaluate complaint resolution are aligned with Minnesota state board policies.

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

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
HCC is operating at the **aligned** maturity level. The institution has processes in place to collect complaint data in areas such as formal complaints and grade change complaints. Data appears to be tracked over time and a process exists for the sharing of data with appropriate stakeholders for review.

- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

HCC has an **aligned** process whereby they have identified internal targets and summarized results which provide the opportunity for comparative analysis and interpretation related to complaints. In fact, the college notes that actual performance did not meet targets for many areas reported.

- Interpretation of results and insights gained

HCC’s interpretation of results and insights gained is **reacting**. HCC provides only minimal interpretation of results from tracking complaint data and offers no discussion of insights gained from analyzing and responding to complaints. An evaluation of the data and a linkage to specific actions would move them toward the systematic maturity level.

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

HCC’s new processes for tracking student complaints appears to be a well-conceived approach which will not only document complaints but also enable comparative analysis (actual performance compared to internally established targets) as well as trend analysis. This measurement framework has great potential in terms of interpretation and insights gained, but it appears that HCC may not yet be capitalizing on the strengths of its measurement framework for complaint information.

**2.5: BUILDING COLLABORATIONS AND PARTNERSHIPS**

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

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

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

HCC has **systematic** processes in place for selecting partners for collaboration. The institution is guided by the Core Concepts to Build Relationships and Serving Community Needs. HCC has an opportunity to move to the next level in maturity by assessing its processes to determine effectiveness.

- Building and maintaining relationships with partners

Rather than describing a process with explicit and repeatable steps, HCC offers a list of examples to demonstrate **systematic** approaches to building and maintaining relationships with partners. Participation on area boards and committees is likely effective; however, there is no indication that formal steps are built into these processes to periodically evaluate the effectiveness of this approach to building and maintaining relationships with partners which would move the institution to the next level of maturity.
Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess partnership effectiveness

HCC is systematic in selecting tools/methods/instruments used to assess collaborations and partnerships. While HCC presents a listing of various tools used to measure partnership effectiveness it is unclear who is responsible for selecting the tools. HCC does not provide detail on how tools, methods, and instruments are selected to measure partnership effectiveness.

Evaluating the degree to which collaborations and partnerships are effective

HCC is reacting regarding evaluating the degree to which collaborations and partnerships are effective. The college acknowledges that more formality is needed to assess the degree to which results align with stakeholder needs. HCC has an opportunity to move to the next level in maturity by developing formal evaluation processes.

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

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

HCC is reacting regarding summary results for determining the effectiveness of building collaborations and partnerships. While the institution lists several activities, there is no discussion in the narrative of review of processes for determining, institutionally, what partnerships are best pursued by the institution.

- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

HCC is reacting with regard to comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks. It is unclear from the narrative what partnership targets have been established by the campus and what the institution has deemed to be a strategic priority. Setting internal targets and identifying external benchmarks is an opportunity for HCC to advance in maturity.

- Interpretation of results and insights gained

As in other areas for this category, HCC provides a list of various reports or other information which can be interpreted as results. While these bits of information provide some indication that HCC is building partnerships and collaboration, they do not provide opportunities for the College to achieve insights which may drive quality improvement efforts or inform decision making, putting them at the reacting stage of maturity. For example, no comparative analysis is provided, and there is no indication that internal targets or benchmarks are identified. Building into these processes formal steps for periodic evaluation of effectiveness may lead to improved results for this category.

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

HCC will engage in a process driven at the system level to work toward determining partnerships in the areas of workforce solutions and academic partnerships.

CATEGORY SUMMARY
HCC is operating primarily in a **systematic** manner with regard to its processes related to meeting student and stakeholder needs and is **systematic to reacting** in its results. In cases where HCC is provided with data through state processes the college is able to be aligned in interpreting data. When data is collected and determined solely at the college level the processes are more reactive in nature. Processes in general are explicit and repeatable but generally are not evaluated for efficiency. By collecting and analyzing data, creating and using valid and reliable performance measures, setting internal targets, and identifying external benchmarks, HCC can evaluate the success of its meeting students and other key stakeholder needs processes that may lead to positive results.

**CATEGORY STRATEGIC ISSUES**

HCC is lacking in a process for evaluating their performance, the identification of explicit repeatable systems to improve performance will help them gain insights for improvement.

---

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*
III - Valuing Employees

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

**Instructions for Systems Appraisal Team**

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

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

**Evidence**

CATEGORY 3: VALUING EMPLOYEES

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

3.1: HIRING

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

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

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

HCC is operating at the **systematic** level with a well-defined process for hiring that is guided by a district wide Hiring Procedures Handbook and is a collaborative effort across faculty, staff, and administration. A variety of stakeholders are included in the screening process and committee membership is reviewed for diversity balance. HCC developed an Active Peer Mentorship Program for all new employees. As HCC works toward aligned maturity for this area, the college may wish to incorporate an evaluation of the effectiveness of these processes into its cycle.

- Developing and meeting academic credentialing standards for faculty, including those in dual credit, contractual and consortia programs (3.C.1, 3.C.2)
Institutional processes for developing and meeting academic credentialing standards for faculty are aligned with policy documentation from the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities system. Evaluation occurs as qualifications and credentials for faculty are submitted to the Minnesota State System Office. The institution has a plan in place to ensure concurrent enrollment instructors are fully credentialed by 2022.

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

HCC’s processes for ensuring sufficient numbers of faculty are systematic. The College assesses program hiring needs each semester through class and program enrollment. Enrollment trends are analyzed during the program review process. As HCC works toward aligned maturity for this area, the college may wish to incorporate an evaluation of the effectiveness of these processes into its cycle.

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

HCC’s processes for ensuring sufficient numbers of staff are systematic. Enrollment and strategic planning processes determine needs for staffing. As HCC works toward aligned maturity for this area, the college may wish to incorporate an evaluation of the effectiveness of these processes into its cycle.

- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

HCC has a systematic process in place that includes the use of IPEDS data for comparison purposes as well as campus climate surveys for tracking outcomes; however, there is no description of how these tools were selected or how the college evaluates the effectiveness of these tools in measuring performance.

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

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

HCC is systematic in its approach to employees. Summary results from the 2018 Climate survey indicate levels of employee satisfaction which match averages of other colleges in the district. Other summary results suggest, too, that processes are operating at an average level of performance. HCC notes typically sufficient applicant pools, for example. However, the College lacks an evaluative system to tell how well their approach is working.

- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Summary results indicate that the College is using the Climate Survey to compare performance against other community colleges in its district. Further, HCC notes that it meets certain benchmarks established in the state-wide collective bargaining agreement for faculty. Staffing needs are tracked in comparison to enrollment. These comparative analyses demonstrate results in this area aligned.

- Interpretation of results and insights gained

HCC’s interpretation of results and insights gained is currently at the systematic level of maturity.
HCC could benefit moving forward by developing a stronger understanding of what data is important in evaluating recruitment, hiring and orientation processes, and what data needs to be tracked for trending results.

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

HCC has identified the need to increase diversity of its staff and faculty and will do so through a new NHED Inclusion and Equity Plan which includes a dashboard and benchmarks for comparison purposes. HCC also plans to continue the use of surveys internally to gain information which can be used to further improvement.

### 3.2: EVALUATION AND RECOGNITION

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

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

- Designing performance evaluation systems for all employees

Processes for designing performance evaluation systems for all employees are currently at the **systematic to aligned** maturity level with a consistent system that is driven at the State level for staff, faculty and administrators. This process is repeatable, and well defined but it is unclear whether the institution has included as part of the process a method for evaluating its efficiency.

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

Committees are in place to ensure that faculty, staff, and administrators can provide input in to the decision making process. Committee meeting minutes are used to communicate to internal stakeholders; additionally, newsletters and information sessions are used **systematically** to ensure communication. What is not described is a process which HCC may use to evaluate the effectiveness of its efforts to solicit input from and communicate expectations to faculty, staff, and administrators.

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

HCC notes it connects the employee evaluation system to the institutional objectives and notes a survey is utilized to gauge involvement and satisfaction but does not describe the process. While HCC appears to understand the alignment, there do not appear to be explicit and repeatable steps in place to ensure that the process operates beyond a **reacting** stage of maturity.

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

HCC has clear processes for using established institutional policies and procedures to regularly evaluate all employees, indicating they are currently at the **systematic** level of maturity. It is less clear whether this system is evaluated for efficiency on a regular basis, which would move them toward the aligned maturity level.
Establishing employee recognition, compensation and benefit systems to promote retention and high performance

Processes for establishing employee recognition, compensation, and benefit systems to promote retention and high performance are currently at the systematic level of maturity. Salaries are contract negotiated by bargaining units. HCC is intentional in recognizing employees through various means such as the Board of Trustees Award for Excellence in Teaching awards and the RESPECT awards. In order to move toward an aligned maturity level the institution might consider a process for evaluating the efficiency of the stated methods.

Promoting employee satisfaction and engagement

Though they are not formally evaluated for effectiveness, systematic efforts are in place at HCC to promote employee satisfaction and engagement. For example, faculty collaborated to build class schedules; opportunities are in place for professional growth and development; and regular celebrations of achievement occur. Periodic evaluation of these processes may help the College determine if they are functioning effectively.

Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

HCC’s processes for tracking outcomes are systematic. HCC utilizes a New Employee Support Survey for employees hired within the last five years to rank support they’d received. Other feedback surveys and campus climate surveys are used to assess employee recognition and campus culture. As the College works to mature processes and results in this area, it may be helpful to more explicitly establish the link between systematic surveying and methods for evaluation (which appear lacking in responses throughout the portfolio). For example, HCC may benefit from aligning specific items in the campus climate survey with specific processes described throughout Category 4. Doing so will help the College interpret its performance and arrive at important insights which may inform improvement efforts.

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

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

Summary results from IPEDS are presented, and those results appear aligned with processes described in this section. Other results shared seem relevant; however, it is less clear how the College determined that these results are indicators of performance for processes described here. A greater sense of alignment between results reported and stated processes may help the College move beyond systematic for summary results.

Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

HCC is operating at a systematic level for using benchmarks. Several external benchmarks have been identified and some comparisons are drawn. However, no additional comparative analytics such as trend data and analysis appear to be in place to demonstrate more mature comparison of performance against benchmarks or targets. With so little ability to compare current performance against targets and benchmarks, HCC may be challenged to gain insights from interpretation.
Interpretation of results and insights gained

HCC is **systematic** regarding interpretation of results and insights gained. For The RESPECT award program was discontinued due to lack of interest and the College is now reviewing other approaches to recognize high performance. The College may be able to move toward the aligned stage if they conduct additional trend analyses and interpretation of results for data they are collecting in processes such as the Climate Survey.

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

Beginning in the 2017-2018 fiscal year HCC implemented a new faculty review rotation to ensure all faculty receive periodic evaluations. HCC also plans to develop a formal list that documents employee involvement in the community.

**3.3: DEVELOPMENT**

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

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

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

HCC’s processes for providing and supporting regular professional development for its employees are at a **systematic** level of maturity. HCC and the Minnesota State system provide a variety of different professional development opportunities, delivered in multiple formats. It is unclear if any of these opportunities are evaluated for feedback. HCC could advance in maturity if faculty and staff have the chance to provide feedback on their professional development programs for continuous improvement.

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

HCC has multiple **systematic** processes in place to ensure instructors are current in instructional knowledge and pedagogy. The institution has recently switched from a one-year to a three-year Professional Development Plan process as part of the faculty review process. It is unclear whether the institution evaluates these processes for effectiveness which could move them toward a higher maturity level.

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

HCC’s processes for supporting staff professional development are at the **systematic** level of maturity. HCC supports employees through orientations and meetings, funding conference attendance, and internal professional development. As this process matures, periodic evaluation will help determine if current processes and offerings are aligned with the College’s stated goals and are meeting the needs of staff members.

- Aligning employee professional development activities with institutional objectives
There is clear alignment between the College’s efforts to provide diversity training in support of stated goals and objectives in the NHED Equity and Inclusion Plan. Indicators and outcomes in the plan also provide an opportunity to evaluate these processes for effectiveness.

- Tracking outcomes/measure utilizing appropriate tools

Outcomes/measure for determining if employees are supported in their professional development are currently at the systematic level of maturity. HCC describes the tools that are utilized but does not describe the process for selecting and evaluating those tools. Establishing a clear relationship between the evaluation tool and the stated processes would move the College beyond systematic and toward aligned in this area.

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

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

As in other categories throughout the portfolio, HCC appears to be listing an array of activities related in some way to development of employees. While the items presented may be indicators of performance, they do not appear to be indicative of any systematic approach to evaluating performance in relation to processes stated in this section. Summary results remain at the reacting stage of maturity.

- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

HCC is currently at a reacting level of maturity. HCC has an opportunity to identify benchmarks and set targets for improvement in employee satisfaction, motivation, and engagement. Explicit targets in these areas will allow HCC to establish metrics and then choose appropriate tools to measure the success of the process.

- Interpretation of results and insights gained

Outside of summarizing activities related to development of employees, the portfolio does not offer interpretations of summary results to gain insight into the effectiveness of processes described in this section. This is the reacting stage of maturity.

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

A revised faculty review process will provide additional conversation and feedback. A survey to gauge training and involvement has also been created. Annual surveys will be developed to track perceived support. The college will increase the amount provided for professional development per person and change to a rotation system as opposed to an annual system.

CATEGORY SUMMARY

HCC is primarily operating a systematic maturity level in its processes related to hiring, evaluation and recognition, and development of employees. Most processes are well defined and repeatable but most are not evaluated for effectiveness. HCC ranges from reacting to systematic in maturity level in
utilizing results. In some areas data is widely shared, benchmarks are well defined, and data drives change. A structure for such evaluation seems to be in place. For example, the Campus Climate Survey appears to be an excellent tool for evaluating processes related to Valuing Employees, and HCC notes its systematic use. What is not clear is how the College is interpreting individual items from the survey results specifically to gain insights about stated key processes. A more focused evaluation process will enable more sophisticated interpretation of results which may lead to greater insights into the need for improvement.

**CATEGORY STRATEGIC ISSUES**

As in other categories, HCC has not fully described how the College evaluates its processes for effectiveness. For example, HCC needs to show that they are continuously evaluating whether the training processes they are using are providing the most useful results for their employees remaining current in their methods and able to contribute fully and effectively throughout their careers at the institution.

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*
IV - Planning and Leading

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

Instructions for Systems Appraisal Team

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

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

Evidence

CATEGORY 4: PLANNING AND LEADING

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

4.1: MISSION AND VISION

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

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

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

HCC’s processes for developing, deploying, and reviewing its mission, vision, and values statements are well-aligned not only with the College’s strategic planning cycle but also with Minnesota State policy. The mission was last reviewed during the strategic planning process which took place in 2015, and the process described for doing so appears to be explicit and repeatable.

- Ensuring that institutional actions reflect a commitment to its values

Linked evidence in the response appears to indicate that “deployment strategies” and AQIP projects
are appropriate to the institution’s values; further, HCC is systematically identifying actions as a part of its strategic planning. To move beyond this systematic stage, HCC may wish to more explicitly identify direct relationships between the “core concepts” identified in strategic planning and the institution’s mission, vision, values statements.

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

HCC’s process for communicating the mission, vision, and values is systematic. Signage near the entrance, as well as the college’s website communicate the mission, vision, and values. While the college recently conducted a survey of faculty and staff to gather input about how to take a wider approach for dissemination, it is not entirely clear that this activity represented an explicit and repeatable evaluation of processes in this area. HCC could advance in maturity by evaluating this process for effectiveness and improvement.

- Ensuring that academic programs and services are consistent with the institution’s mission (1.A.2)

HCC’s process for ensuring that academic programs are consistent with the college’s mission is aligned on the transfer side with the Minnesota Transfer Curriculum and through articulations with transfer institutions and the Minnesota State Transfer Pathways project. Career tech programs are monitored annually by industry boards to ensure programming remains relevant and connected to industry need. While the response does not explicitly address how this process is periodically evaluated, previous responses make it clear that strategic planning is in place to ensure that programs remain in alignment with the institutional mission. HCC’s participation in Minnesota’s Transfer Pathways project also provides appropriate evaluation in relation to its liberal arts programming.

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

HCC’s response provides clear indication that systematic processes are in place at all levels of the College to drive budget development and communication related to allocation of resources. HCC is coping with declining enrollments through a robust program review process, increased use of data for decision-making, and has made discussion of the budget a standing item on shared governance agendas in order to keep everyone conscious of and focused on the challenges. There is less indication that these processes are evaluated on a periodic basis, and HCC may wish to consider methods for doing so. Broad inclusion across college stakeholders likely results in resource allocations which adhere to the institution’s values; however, there is no description in the response to suggest methods for evaluating the degree to which resource allocations uphold these values. To advance in maturity, HCC could benefit from explicit goals related to resource allocation and then finding measures that accurately reflect how well the allocation meets those goals.

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

HCC’s process is systematic as they are in the beginning stages of a repeatable process for improvement. The College implemented a climate survey in 2015 and 2018 related to the mission and goals; in addition an internal survey has been designed in an attempt determine employee awareness of and effectiveness of the mission and values. It is unclear whether the survey has been implemented and what changes have been made from the data collected. Taking this next step would help the institution reach alignment. HCC, too, may wish to more specifically consider how tools, methods, and instruments are selected or who is involved in selecting the instruments.
4R1 What are the results for developing, communicating and reviewing the institution’s mission, vision and values? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 4P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

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

Survey results presented in the response indicate that maturity for these results is fully systematic and approaching aligned. To ensure continued maturation in this area, HCC may wish to continue to explore how metrics included in these results are understood and used by all relevant stakeholders. For example, the response indicates that some areas “receiving less positive results” indicate a degree of uncertainty. Outside of this insight, the response does little to demonstrate how the results are being used to drive decision making and improvement.

- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

The institution has collected data but has not identified internal or external benchmarks to measure progress, making the process reacting. The identification of benchmarks and a clear, repeatable process for comparing collected data to the benchmarks would take the College from a reacting to systematic maturity level.

- Interpretation of results and insights gained

While HCC’s systematic administration of the Climate Survey provides results available for interpretation, it does not appear that the College has yet begun to develop its interpretation of the results at any depth of complexity. There is little to suggest that the College has obtained significant insights. Outside of some discussion of “uncertainty during challenging times,” there is no sense that HCC has used results in this area as a way of considering improvement. HCC is in the early stages of systematic maturity for this area. To maintain improvements, HCC may wish to ensure that periodic evaluation of the climate survey results moves beyond interpretation and works toward insights gained. Utilizing comparative analysis of trended data (i.e. through the use of internal targets or benchmarks) may enable deeper insights.

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

HCC has used results from its processes to inform its plans to improve communication about current and future challenges through existing channels such as email updates, information sessions and committee meetings. Appropriately, HCC has identified not only improvements in areas related to communicating its mission, vision, and values, it has also identified potential improvements to the institutional mission. HCC may also have an opportunity to improve processes related to interpretation of results by linking results to stated key processes in this area.

4.2: STRATEGIC PLANNING

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

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

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

HCC’s 2015 strategic planning process involved a small group of cross college employees who participated in creating a draft that yielded new core concepts and objectives. This was shared out across the college for additional input in a **systematic** manner. Only brief mention is made regarding “external partners,” so it remains unclear how external partners are brought into the planning process. Maturity for this process will remain **systematic** until HCC has explicit procedures for evaluating its current performance as it relates to both internal and external stakeholders and the engagement of both groups throughout the entire planning process.

- Aligning operations with the institution’s mission, vision and values (5.C.2)

There are **systematic** processes in place to ensure that operations and resource allocations are approved only if they are determined to be in support of the core concepts and objectives. The college doesn’t appear to evaluate this process for improvement which could move HCC to the aligned level of maturity.

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

HCC’s response articulates a large number of groups, committees, and teams which meet regularly to review various college efforts and determine whether resources are used for optimum effectiveness and efficiency. The College is clearly operating at the **systematic** stage of maturity as these processes appear to be explicit and repeatable. The response makes no mention, however, of periodic evaluation and the degree to which these procedures are achieving alignment of efforts.

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

While HCC identifies many connections they have which allow the College to capitalize on strengths, it is less clear what process is used to identify potential threats. As strong as this approach is, it remains unclear how HCC determined these “core concepts” to be the right categories to drive planning. In other words, do the core concepts relate specifically to identified opportunities/threats and strengths/weaknesses? If so, how did the College determine these to be opportunities/threats and strengths/weaknesses? Does planning include a SWOT analysis at some stage? The response indicates that a well-aligned process is likely in place to guide HCC’s efforts at capitalizing on opportunities/strengths and countering the weaknesses and threats. The College appears to be operating at the **systematic** level and could benefit from explicit, repeatable, and periodically evaluated processes to identify not only strengths but also weaknesses and threats.

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

The College has a well-established and aligned process in place for connecting departmental goals to institutional goals and reviewing departmental budgets for priority and to ensure they fit with the institutional priorities. For example, budget development and departmental goals setting appear to be explicit and repeatable. A system for periodic evaluation is alluded to in the response, and metrics appear to be in place to evaluate the effectiveness of this process. The evaluation itself is not fully described in the response, so HCC is encouraged to bolster its support for these metrics as a periodic
evaluation of effectiveness so that this process remains at the **aligned** stage of maturity.

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

A wealth of data is presented in this response which indicates that HCC has abundant results to review and analyze as it relates to category 4 as well as other AQIP categories. Data sources appear to be varied and numerous. The challenge HCC will have in moving beyond this **reacting** stage will be to articulate the methods and procedures the College utilizes to determine which measures among the many presented here are aligned with the College’s own core concepts or objectives. Rather than simply reacting to the many data sets available to them as an institution, HCC may realize some benefit to prioritizing certain metrics in alignment with their stated goals and objectives. An additional opportunity exists to be more explicit in describing how tools, methods, and instruments are selected and who is involved in this selection process. Reviewers acknowledge that these processes may be driven by external stakeholders, and this is worth mentioning in the response if it is true. To move toward a systematic level of maturity the College would benefit from a well-established, repeatable process for identifying appropriate measures related to institutional goals.

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

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

The College systematically collects and communicates data related to its objectives. Some trend data is noted but only two data points for each area are indicated even though many years may have passed between data points; hence it is unclear if data are collected on a regular basis which would enable trend analysis. While these results address many of the College’s priorities; it remains unclear what results, specifically, the College associates most closely with “communicating, planning, implementing, and reviewing the institution’s operational plans.” This appears to be a **systematic** process and may benefit from more focused alignment of metrics to processes being measured.

- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

There is very little comparative analysis offered in the response. Some of the many data sets include trends; however, it remains unclear if HCC is using these trends to conduct comparative analysis. The College could move from **reacting** to systematic after some work to prioritize measures in alignment with specific processes and then comparing current performance against past performance and/or established targets.

- Interpretation of results and insights gained

The College appears to have data that can be connected to initiatives at the College, but it is unclear if results have provided insights which have led to decision making. HCC recognizes that by only focusing on advisory board member input, external stakeholder feedback was too disconnected in the planning process. HCC would benefit by evaluating the entire strategic planning process for effectiveness; this evaluation may yield opportunities to move beyond the **systematic** stage of maturity in this area.
4I2 Based on 4R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

While HCC has taken steps to address enrollment decreases, resource management decisions such as program closures appear to be more carefully aligned with HCC’s Core Concepts than efforts to increase enrollments such as developing concurrent enrollment programs and recruiting students from outside the region. The only process improvement identified in this section is improving external stakeholder input during the strategic planning process. This additional attention to external stakeholder engagement in the process may result in improved insights to drive goal setting and action planning.

4.3: LEADERSHIP

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

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

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

Leadership for HCC includes leadership at the State and District level as well as the campus level, as HCC is part of the Minnesota State System and the Northeast Higher Education district. The governor appoints the 15-member Board of Trustees. This level of oversight helps ensure systematic governance; however, it is not clear what processes HCC has in place to support a strong relationship with leadership of these systems or how the College periodically evaluates performance in this area.

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

HCC has a well aligned process for establishing oversight responsibilities as dictated by the Minnesota State Board of Education. Board of Trustees policies are in place to guide all Minnesota State Colleges and Universities. As a matter of policy, then, HCC’s processes for establishing oversight responsibilities and policies of the governing board are aligned. Policy documents make them explicit and repeatable, and the processes are evaluated at the state level.

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

Board of Trustees Policy 4.2 describes processes for board oversight of the appointment of the College president and the manner in which the management responsibilities is delegated to the president. Processes are described comprehensively in this policy, and they are explicit and repeatable. Though nothing in the policy or the response articulates the process by which this policy and the processes it describes are evaluated for effectiveness, this likely remains an activity that occurs at the state level. This is an aligned process.

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

HCC’s processes for ensuring open communication are systematic. HCC has formal and informal communication within the College ranging from structured meetings to casual meetings between the president and faculty, students, and community. There is no indication, however, that the college is
periodically evaluating effectiveness of its approach.

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

HCC’s processes for collaborating across all units to ensure the maintenance of high academic standards are **systematic**. HCC maintains a well-developed committee structure, and the primary function for each committee is articulated clearly. Regular meetings and technology tools, such as SharePoint and One Drive, are used to enable collaboration across units. The college may benefit from identifying best practice strategies for collaboration and communication across the institution. HCC could advance in maturity by evaluating the shared services at the NHED level for effectiveness.

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

Leadership structures are presented in the response in explicit fashion, and it appears that leadership at HCC is a **systematic** process by which a district president provides oversight for a provost who acts as the chief executive officer for the college. HCC’s Provost leads the campus-level team that manages day-to-day operations, including the dean of academics, facilities, director student services director, and TRiO director. Faculty provide support and input through shared governance. No discussion is provided to describe a system of periodic evaluation which may determine if this process is operating effectively. Adding this step to the process may move it from **systematic** to aligned.

- Developing leaders at all levels within the institution

HCC has well-established processes in place to train new administrators as well as provide professional development to those who wish to move into a leadership role. Examples include external leadership academies and a mentorship program. Each of these processes is described in explicit fashion, and they appear repeatable. The college does not describe a process of evaluating the effectiveness of this approach, and the inclusion of such a process would move the institution from **systematic** to aligned.

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

As has been the case for many processes in Category 4, HCC describes explicit and repeatable methods for ensuring the institution’s ability to act in accordance with its mission and vision. Monthly and bi-weekly administrative meetings are surely effective in this regard; however, any formal steps for periodically evaluating this process are not provided in the response. The College references a “review every three years;” however, the response does not adequately describe what constitutes a review. This is the **systematic** stage of maturity.

- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

The College lists a multitude of tools used to track the effectiveness of leadership at the institution, and the list of tools appears to be appropriate. Performance reviews, surveys, and system office reports are apparently explicit and repeatable steps in a **systematic** process. The response, however, does not indicate that HCC has worked to align specific metrics which these tools make available with the outcomes/measures they’ve identified as indicators of effectiveness for processes described in this category. Such alignment would enable the College to move processes from **systematic** to aligned.

**4R3** What are the results for ensuring long-term effective leadership of the institution? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 4P3. All data presented should include the
population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

While the College notes that some improvement was made from the 2015 to 2018 communication survey, no benchmarks are identified. Because much of the data offered here is simply reported in its raw format, it appears that the College is simply reacting to what data is available. A more mature approach may involve aligning data collected to key processes and then establishing trends to measure performance over time or internal targets to enable comparative analysis of current performance with desired performance. In order to move toward a systematic process HCC might consider setting institutional benchmarks to determine who effective the institution is operating.

- Interpretation of results and insights gained

HCC provides no interpretation of the data; rather, the response provides simple report of available data. To move from reacting to systematic, the College would benefit from closing the loop and using data collected to drive institutional change. Improvement may stem from efforts to articulate specific targets and benchmarks which could be used to determine whether the current level of involvement is sufficient to meet the future leadership needs of the college.

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

The College is working to develop a formal succession plan that includes the other NHED colleges. HCC’s scope and scale of efforts to improve leadership development are supported by its participation in NHED and the Minnesota State System; however, the College is seeking to address the lack of a formal means of input from staff that would parallel shared governance for faculty.

4.4: INTEGRITY

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

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

- Developing and communicating standards
HCC has multiple standards at the institutional as well as district level for which the College communicates, evaluates and seeks feedback for in an aligned manner. Alignment with the Minnesota system is apparent, and the College openly shares standards on the web as well as in faculty, staff, and student handbooks. Policies appear to be evaluated regularly at the system level.

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

Required training is in place which addresses ethics, harassment, safety and data privacy; in addition, employees have access to self-service modules which aid in the completion of required training. These procedures appear to be explicit and repeatable; however, there is no discussion offered in the response to indicate that HCC is periodically evaluating the degree to which this training is effective. HCC could advance in maturity if these processes are reviewed and evaluated periodically to determine effectiveness. This is the systematic maturity level.

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

As a member institution of the Minnesota State System, HCC participates in well-established systematic financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions that help to ensure integrity, including a thorough vetting process, an extensive auditing department, and a well-defined process for academic review. There is no mention of an evaluative method for determining improvement which would move the college from systematic toward aligned.

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

HCC’s systematic processes for making information available include websites, newsfeed, calendar, along with a Facebook page and Twitter account for communicating information on a regular basis. In addition a new-student orientation and a “right-to-know” email each semester helps ensure that students are aware of policies/procedures as well as available resources. These efforts are explicit and repeatable, and they are likely working effectively. However, no mention is made in the response of procedures to evaluate effectiveness on a periodic basis. HCC could advance in maturity if these processes are reviewed and evaluated periodically to determine effectiveness.

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

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

Summary results as presented appear to indicate positive performance in relation to processes described in this section. These results, however, remain at the systematic stage of maturity because there is no indication that the College is beginning to show improvement over time. Further, no process is identified for determining how data are utilized to inform decision making. HCC may see improved results in this area by enabling comparative analysis of its stated results.

- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
The use of internal targets and benchmarks is currently at the **reacting** level of maturity. Without stated targets or benchmarks, however, there is no indication of the degree to which HCC is meeting expectations for results in this area.

- Interpretation of results and insights gained

While the response does offer some narrative description of its summary results, there is no apparent exploration of insights gained specifically from consistent analysis of performance indicators. The development of a method for comparative analysis (for example, identifying targets and benchmarks) may yield important insights for HCC as they work to improve processes and results in this area. Maturity for interpretation of results and insights gained is currently **reacting**.

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

HCC’s plans for providing cross-training for existing employees will help ensure it maintains Integrity in times of decreased staffing. The transition to the Minnesota State System-sponsored ELM system for employee training, replacing HCC’s D2L online learning platform will make providing this training more efficient. HCC is also working to foster a shared business model as an analogue to the shared governance model in place for faculty.

**CATEGORY SUMMARY**

Processes appear to be strongly **systematic** in areas related to Category 4, and HCC is able to articulate explicit and repeatable processes for most areas in this category. Many processes have not yet achieved an aligned state of maturity as a result of what appears to be a lack of methods for conducting periodic evaluation of process effectiveness. This challenge may be a result of the HCC’s maturity levels as it applies to results. In presenting results, the College is able to provide a wealth of data from various internal reports, survey results, and the state’s system reporting tools. The data reported here do little else but show what the College has collected; for example, very little comparative analysis is apparent. Likewise, there are not internal targets or external benchmarks established for results aligned with key processes. Such improvements may illuminate strategies and tactics for conducting ongoing and periodic evaluation of key processes. Results, while voluminous, are currently at the **reacting** stage of maturity. Focusing on improving in this area will likely lead to improved maturity for processes as well.

**CATEGORY STRATEGIC ISSUES**

HCC is consistently able to demonstrate that appropriate data are collected; however, it is not clear how these data are shared across units or used to inform decision making at all levels. Articulating internal targets or external benchmarks will enable comparative analysis in ways that lead to insights gained.

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*
V - Knowledge Management and Resource Stewardship

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

Instructions for Systems Appraisal Team

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

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

Evidence

CATEGORY 5: KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT AND RESOURCE STEWARDSHIP

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

5.1: KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

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

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

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

HCC’s processes for selecting, analyzing and sharing data and performance information are at an aligned maturity level. The Minnesota state system maintains an institutional research function which supplies HCC with a wealth of data to measure performance and provide comparative analysis with the other colleges in the system. In addition, HCC requests customized reporting through the system’s IR office to inform decision making at the local level. HCC has also leveraged partnerships with the Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development to acquire data from external sources. Data appear to be shared regularly; notable steps in this process include the program review cycle, management reports, weekly enrollment reports, and financial updates. HCC may strengthen its response here by more explicitly describing steps in the process used to evaluate the effectiveness of
the data and performance information used in decision making.

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

HCC is operating at a reacting maturity level for determining data, information and performance results needed for planning and management. HCC’s processes appear to be decentralized. It’s unclear how units are informed about the multiple kinds of data available for their use or given guidance in selecting types of data that can inform their decision-making. HCC may realize some improvement if a formal evaluation process was in place to determine if data selected in each department are appropriately linked to stated institutional goals and strategies; if such alignment is already occurring, the response offered does not make it apparent.

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

Processes for making data, information, and performance results readily available to units and departments are at a systematic level of maturity. Numerous explicit processes are in place to ensure that data are available to key stakeholders. For example, the College creates a Fact Book, regular financial reports, website pages, newsletters, program review reports, and other communications to make performance information available throughout the College. HCC may advance in maturity if a formal evaluation process was implemented to determine if data provided to departments is sufficient for ensuring operational effectiveness, planning and improvements.

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

HCC’s processes for ensuring timeliness, accuracy, reliability, and security of knowledge-management systems are aligned through the College’s participation in the Minnesota State system. User/advisory groups from the member colleges and universities meet regularly with System Office staff to evaluate processes related to the timeliness, accuracy, reliability, and security of the institution’s knowledge management functions.

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

HCC’s processes for tracking outcomes/measure with appropriate tools are aligned through the College’s participation in the Minnesota State system. The system level Office of Institutional Research is primarily responsible for tracking outcomes/measures of the member colleges. Tools utilized appear to be appropriate and include an integrated statewide system, a strategic framework, and IPEDs.

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

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
HCC’s summary results of measures indicate the institution is at the **systematic** level in using data, information, and performance results. HCC provides a variety of reports such as course-level enrollment, results from a faculty survey, and budget data. Additionally, the response offers narrative summary of various activities such as AQIP action projects, efforts to map processes, and curriculum development. What is not available in this response is any distinct set of summary results which may measure effectiveness of those processes described in 5P1 or, more specifically, summary results to show effectiveness for how HCC uses data, information, and performance results in the decision-making processes. For example, HCC may consider ways that it can use items in the survey referenced to measure the degree to which employees have access to the information they need to do their job. The information provided here is an indication that HCC is effectively using performance information to make decisions; however, the College is not considering evaluating the overall effectiveness of its knowledge-management processes.

- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

While tables, charts, and other figures provided in the portfolio demonstrate that the College has developed or has access to data, information, and performance results, the portfolio does not provide comparisons of results with internal targets or external benchmarks that would move the institution beyond the **reacting** stage.

- Interpretation of results and insights gained

The portfolio provides several examples of the way data, information, and performance results have been **systematically** analyzed and interpreted, leading to specific actions such as strategic downsizing of staff and faculty, curriculum revisions, and contributions to HCC’s strategic plan. However, the brevity of these interpretations makes it difficult to determine how the data led to the improvement initiative; more importantly, there is little to suggest that deeper and more sophisticated levels of interpretation are occurring. For example, there is no indication that follow-up analysis seeks to determine whether interventions and improvements such as those described had a positive impact on the performance measures which created the need to intervene. HCC does not seem to have in place a way to determine whether its revised application intake process improved enrollment trends. Likewise, there does not seem to be an intent to determine if the installation of wall plaques has resulted in higher levels of HCC employees being aware of the institution’s core values.

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

HCC notes the size of its institution as a barrier to “creating data instruments.” While HCC should continue ensuring that it has the data it needs, reviewers note that an abundance of data is already available to the College to use in decision making. Data available from the Minnesota system appear to be robust and nuanced, complete with benchmarks. Rather than focus on creating new sources for data, HCC may benefit from developing its ability to use comparative analysis to seek more complete interpretations of its performance results against benchmarks and targets. It is in these interpretations that the College will gain insight into priorities for improvement, and the College will be able to monitor performance over time to determine whether efforts are successful.

**5.2: RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**

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

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

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

HCC is operating at an aligned maturity level for managing fiscal, physical, and technological infrastructures. Processes at the system level are complemented by internal processes at the college. For example, HCC uses well described processes for development of its bi-annual operating budget which is submitted to the Minnesota State Board of Trustees for evaluation and approval. Explicit steps are also in place as a part of budget development to request funding for new building projects or renovation of existing physical infrastructures. Process steps also address “repair and restoration” resources allocated in HCC’s general fund as well as the use of private and local government sources in the form of grants or donations to support physical infrastructure. In terms of its technological infrastructure, HCC indicates that it has entered into an agreement with the Minnesota State System Office to share responsibility for maintenance of HCC’s technological infrastructure. This agreement clearly delineates responsibilities. The agreement requires some level of periodic evaluation by the Minnesota State Board of Trustees.

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

HCC is operating at an aligned maturity level for setting goals aligned with the institutional mission, resources, opportunities and emerging needs. The institution uses a three-level approach to goal-setting for managing resources involving oversight at the system, district, and college levels. The processes include periodic meetings convened by administrators/managers with departments to review goal setting, program review, and resource allocation. HCC may benefit from greater clarity regarding methods used by administrators and managers in these periodic meetings to evaluate alignment of goals with mission, opportunities, and emerging needs.

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

HCC is operating at an aligned maturity level for allocating and assigning resources to achieve organizational goals. Explicit and repeatable steps describe processes for allocation and assigning resources. This process begins at the department level through budget requests to the HCC leadership team. Though not specifically described here, some degree of periodic evaluation of this process is apparent in the response; for example, HCC has noted its attempts over the last six years to experiment to process enhancements which have not resulted in improved results.

- Tracking outcomes/measure utilizing appropriate tools

HCC uses multiple systematic processes to track outcomes/measure using appropriate tools such as the HCC Fact Book, the Personnel Roster Planning Document, and the Space Utilization Report. However, it is not clear how the College determined these tools to be the most effective means of measuring performance and whether their effectiveness is evaluated periodically. Reviewers note, too, that some of these measures (e.g. Composite Financial Index, Budget Control Documents, etc.) are likely mandated by external forces who assumes the responsibility for evaluating their effectiveness.
Even in such a context, it may be helpful for HCC to be clear regarding its role in the selection and evaluation of tools used to track institutional outcomes and measures for this and other categories

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

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

HCC’s summary results of measures indicate the institution is at the systematic level in using data to improve its educational programs and operations. Data such as enrollment trends and cost efficiency are used to develop the annual budget. However, it is not clear how the College perceives each of these results to link specifically to stated processes described in 5P2. For example, it may be helpful to align any formal financial audit to processes for budget development which will provide HCC with an opportunity to measure performance of budgeting processes with audit results. The response does provide indication that systematic results are in place, but greater maturity of results may be possible as HCC considers linking key results directly to stated key processes.

- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

HCC appears to be operating at the reacting stage as the portfolio does not include much information about internal targets or external benchmarks. While HCC reports an impressive list of changes stemming from its use of appropriate data, it is unclear whether the institution had set internal or external benchmarks by which to measure progress; more deliberate efforts to conduct comparative analysis may result in advancing maturity of processes and results in this category.

- Interpretation results and insights gained

HCC provides numerous examples of ways it has systematically used results for resource management to inform planning decisions such as the mechanical/air quality renovation and the funding of the Firearms Simulation and Training system.

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

Real-time access to information about budget responsibilities and to multi-year personnel rosters have allowed for more timely decision-making. Improvements related to Web Accounting and personnel rosters appear to be appropriate; however, reviewers are unable to ascertain how these improvements may have been driven or informed by insights gained from interpreting performance results in alignment with key processes. More focused attention to periodic evaluation of processes may help the College demonstrate how it makes decisions which lead to these improvements. Such a framework for periodic evaluation may also help the College determine how these improvements have impacted performance in relation to internal targets or external benchmarks.

5.3: OPERATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

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

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

- Building budgets to accomplish institutional goals

HCC is operating at an **aligned** maturity level for operational effectiveness. HCC notes a transparent and well-designed system for building budgets which include departmental level personnel, leadership team, and the NHED VP of Finance. Budget at the departmental level is tied to annual goals. The leadership team subsequently ties the budget to the mission of the College. The budget development process includes periodic evaluation as a standing item at Shared Governance meetings and is approved by the Minnesota state system.

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

HCC is operating at an **aligned** maturity level for monitoring financial position and adjusting budgets. The VP of Finance is primarily responsible for monitoring financial position and adjusting budgets. Explicit steps are in place to ensure that the provost receives frequent updates which are disseminated to leadership teams regularly. Evaluation of the process occurs at the System Office where the College’s budget is also monitored.

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

HCC’s processes for maintaining a reliable, secure and user-friendly technological infrastructures are **aligned** with the Minnesota State system through a formal agreement. Processes for responding to technology requests internally; however, appear to be more **systematic**. Steps are clearly in place to respond to and review requests; however, no procedures appear to be in place to determine whether internal processes for technology requests are operating effectively. The College may already be using employee surveys to determine the effectiveness of processes in this area, but HCC’s response does not indicate so.

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

The maintenance of facilities at HCC is operating at the **aligned** maturity level. The HEAPR process supports statewide views on the campus and helps to maintain the infrastructure. HCC has some campus level processes in place for specialty work and repair and restoration and follows direction from the State system for capital bonding. HCC is required to report on facilities conditions to the state annually but has an internal process driven by the facilities director and leadership team for determining priorities. However, HCC does not specifically address any efforts to periodically evaluate performance in this area.

- Managing risks to ensure operational stability, including emergency preparedness

HCC is operating at an **aligned** maturity level for managing risks to ensure operational stability. The institution has a clearly defined process and an established safety committee lead by a safety director. The efforts of HCC’s Safety Director appears to be guided by explicit and repeatable steps including safety walkthroughs, trainings, and documentation. These processes are evaluated, presumably, as they culminate in the College’s Emergency Response Plan.

- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

HCC appears to be at the **reacting** stage of maturity in tracking outcomes and utilizing tools. A list of appropriate tools is provided which are used by the institution. What is not clear is how the College determined these tools to be appropriate and how the College evaluates their effectiveness. Clearly
defining the process may help move the institution to a higher maturity level.

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

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

HCC has several summary results which show some degree of attention to measuring performance in explicit and repeatable ways. However, reviewers are not able to determine direct relationship between reported results and processes described in 5P3. More explicit relationships between key processes and summary results may result in alignment; however, results appear **systematic** at this time.

- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

The manner in which HCC presents summary results does not enable comparative analysis. Some trend data is available (i.e. the OSHA recordable incidents report is provided for the past five years); however, it does not appear that comparative analysis is occurring for all the summary results the College uses to measure its performance. Until the College can measure performance against targets or benchmarks it will also struggle to conduct interpretations and gain insights at a level beyond **reacting**.

- Interpretation of results and insights gained

HCC provides several examples of actions taken in response to **systematic** analysis and interpretation of results of measures for ensuring effective management of operations such as the 2018 Climate Survey.

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

HCC notes that it has gained insights related to employee confidence in the institutional budgeting process by interpreting the results from the 2018 Campus Climate Survey. This is an indicator that the College is maturing its ability to align performance results with identified key processes in a way that leads to insights gained. HCC will wish to learn from this experience and replicate the process in other areas. Using 2018 results, the College can now identify an internal target and work to compare future results of the Campus Climate survey items to determine whether improvements are helping.

**CATEGORY SUMMARY**

Overall, HCC is mostly **aligned** in its knowledge management and resource stewardship processes and **reacting** to **systematic** in its results. Processes aligned at the state and district level appear to be explicit and repeatable. HCC benefits from systematic data collection and analysis processes for operational effectiveness at the Minnesota State system level. HCC demonstrates it is mindful that it is critical for these processes and results to be aligned with strategic goals in the face of difficult budgetary decisions that might need to be made if enrollments continue to decline.

The portfolio responses hint at HCC’s emerging understanding of how processes, results, and improvements can be aligned (notably, the response for 5I3). HCC is encouraged to continue
developing these approaches as it seeks to mature processes and results for Category 5.

**CATEGORY STRATEGIC ISSUES**

Rather than providing a focused presentation of summary results in alignment with stated key processes, HCC’s tendency is to share lists of various reports which appear to be an aggregation of what is available. Because summary results seem to be assembled in ad hoc fashion, there is little indication that more systematic efforts are in place to formally link results with processes and, subsequently, set internal targets or identify external benchmarks for performance. In the absence of such a framework, the College also struggles to interpret results and achieve insights regarding performance or effectiveness of key processes.

The lack of internal targets and external benchmarks prohibit any comparative analysis. Without a framework in place to enable comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks, the College struggles to interpret performance results in a way that leads to insights gained.

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*
VI - Quality Overview

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

Instructions for Systems Appraisal Team

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

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

Evidence

CATEGORY 6: QUALITY OVERVIEW

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

6.1: QUALITY IMPROVEMENT INITIATIVES

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

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

- Selecting, deploying and evaluating quality improvement initiatives

The process of selecting, deploying and evaluating quality improvement initiatives by HCC is systematic and approaches aligned. HCC uses its strategic plan, NHED’s principles and Minnesota State’s Strategic Framework to guide processes for determining CQI initiatives. Since 2005, 100% of AQIP action projects appear to align with system, district and campus values and goals. While there appears to be widespread support and stakeholder input and involvement in CQI initiatives as well as dissemination of results, it is not clear how HCC evaluates these processes for effectiveness. In order to move toward alignment, the college should identify a repeatable process that can be used across the college and that is periodically evaluated for improvement.
Aligning the Systems Portfolio, Action Projects, Comprehensive Quality Review and Strategy Forums

HCC is aligned in its approach to aligning the Systems Portfolio, Action Projects, Comprehensive Quality Review and Strategy Forums. The Join Us in Making Progress (JUMP) team, which represents administration and employees across the campus and regularly communicates with community stakeholder groups, works to ensure that data and evidence collected are aligned with strategic plans at the College, district, and state system levels. JUMP uses feedback to provide periodic evaluation which informs the need for AQIP action projects and other quality improvements.

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

HCC noted several AQIP processes where data was collected and utilized to make improvements in areas of the college. For example, summary tables demonstrate on-going commitment to evaluating results related to student loan default, the Holistic Student Experience, and the Graduation and Beyond action project. Cross college teams appear to be involved in all cases discussed in the response. While data presented show changes from one academic year to the next, no discussion is provided to indicate explicit and repeatable processes. As an example, it is unclear if data analysis of the now annual Cruisin’ into the Future was a one-time occurrence or if analysis occurs each year. Also unclear is how results are disseminated throughout the institution. The institution is performing at the systematic level and should consider setting benchmarks as a way improve maturity level and developing a formal plan to share results widely across units at the College.

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

HCC has identified five areas for improvement (job shadowing, learning communities, student evaluation, tobacco-free status, and program review). HCC acknowledges that it needs to do more to analyze and use the data it collects to inform planning and decision-making and appears to have appropriate plans in place to make these improvements.

6.2: CULTURE OF QUALITY

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

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

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

HCC is at a systematic level of maturity for developing an infrastructure and providing resources to support a culture of quality. Explicit and repeatable processes for collecting ideas for improvement and change include Duty Day activities, district newsletters, and Provost Information Sessions. The JUMP committee regularly reviews these ideas and chooses projects that fit with College, district, and system goals. While HCC provides numerous opportunities for stakeholder involvement in current projects and to provide input for new projects, it is unclear if there is a formal process for reviewing
the overall process for effectiveness. It is also unclear if JUMP also assesses the infrastructure for effectiveness. The addition of formal procedures guiding periodic evaluation of these processes for effectiveness may elevate maturity beyond systematic.

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

Explicit and repeatable processes such as Duty Day activities, regular email updates, and information sessions helps to ensure that students, employees, and community stakeholders are aware of changes taking place as a result of AQIP action projects and other CQI initiatives. Hence, this process is functioning at the **systematic** maturity level, and the College may benefit from a formal method of evaluating the process to determine improvement to move toward the aligned maturity level.

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

HCC appears to have a committee structure in place which includes staff, faculty, administrators, and students across the College; this feature ensures that everyone is included in the CQI process and is engaged in planning for the future. While this committee structure implies an informal method for obtaining feedback, there is no indication of a clear, repeatable process for ensuring the institution learns from its experiences with CQI initiatives. The College could benefit from a clearly defined, repeatable, and well documented process which may assist HCC in moving beyond the **reacting** stage of maturity in this area.

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

The JUMP committee appears to have primary responsibility in coordination and sharing of AQIP related efforts. Since the committee is representative of the breadth of employee roles it is well situated to carry out this charge. Processes in place to ensure that the JUMP committee engages stakeholders in reviewing, reaffirming, and understanding the role and vitality of the AQIP Pathway within the institution make this process **systematic** in maturity. Further, HCC appears to embrace the continuous quality improvement approach expected of AQIP schools. CQI processes are embedded into the culture through employee participation in AQIP projects. The institution could move beyond **systematic** if an evaluation tool for all its CQI processes was developed and implemented.

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

HCC summarizes results from several CQI Initiatives including the Active Peer mentorship program, the Data-Driven Review Process project, and the Graduation and Beyond action project which have helped in renewing campus commitment to **systematic** collection of data and analysis of results to inform planning. Most projects resulted in the creation of new activities, but little data is shared about the evaluation of the activities and their success over time. This level of periodic evaluation may enable a higher level of maturity for results in this area.

**6I2** Based on 6R2, what process improvements to the quality culture have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three year?
HCC is becoming more data-focused in its decision-making. The JUMP committee is developing a tracking system for collection and assessment of AQIP project outcome data, which will support their efforts to systematically evaluate projects as well as increase campus-wide awareness of the projects and understanding of CQI principles. This improvement appears to be appropriate and has potential to mature processes and results related to category six.

**CATEGORY SUMMARY**

Overall, HCC exhibits a **systematic** level of maturity for processes and results in the Quality Overview category. Responses make it clear that HCC takes seriously the importance of continuous quality improvement which is to be expected from an AQIP college. The structure for quality improvement exists at the college, appropriate stakeholders are regularly engaged, and the College is able to report success of numerous CQI projects. HCC also acknowledges the need for more systematic efforts to track and review results of CQI initiatives; indeed, HCC has an opportunity to demonstrate more clearly how data are used in the decision making process. As HCC works on these improvements, it may wish to consider the use of internal benchmarking, target setting, and the use of comparative analysis. These mechanisms may also create opportunities for more periodic evaluation of processes and results in this area; thus, the college may see stronger maturity for category six.

**CATEGORY STRATEGIC ISSUES**

While HCC appears to understand the importance of collecting data to determine effectiveness of processes, it remains unclear how the College is using these data in the decision making process. Data are collected and presented, but often the presentation of data is not accompanied by internal benchmarks and/or external targets. Without such features in place, the college may struggle to utilize collected data significantly.

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*
1 - Mission

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

1.A - Core Component 1.A

The institution’s mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operations.

1. The mission statement is developed through a process suited to the nature and culture of the institution and is adopted by the governing board.
2. The institution’s academic programs, student support services, and enrollment profile are consistent with its stated mission.
3. The institution’s planning and budgeting priorities align with and support the mission. (This sub-component may be addressed by reference to the response to Criterion 5.C.1.)

Rating

Adequate

Evidence

HCC formally reviews the mission statement every three years. In addition, HCC also reviews the mission as part of strategic planning efforts. Twice in the past six years the mission has been reviewed, most recently the process included a cross functional planning team (representative of all areas of the college) and input was sought through advisory boards for external stakeholders. Stronger evidence may be provided by the institution that the board reviews the adopted mission statement on a regular basis through the inclusion of meeting minutes or other means.

HCC is a comprehensive community college whose stated mission indicates that the college provides “life changing education and opportunities in a dynamic learning environment.” The College has a wide variety of programs including liberal arts transfer courses defined by the Minnesota Transfer Curriculum, and CTE programming that is designed with feedback from industry partners with the goal of preparing students for employment. HCC also provides credit and non credit training.

Budget is monitored and discussed at shared governance meetings as a standing agenda item. As part of the program review process the college is able to collect data on current and projected enrollment, and program costs to determine program health. In order to continue offering programming which supports the mission during a time of budget shortfall, the college focuses on potential changes in personnel due to retirements, and shares employees with other colleges and high schools. A campus wide system for input into the strategic planning process helps ensure that budget is aligned with and supports the mission.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)
No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
1.B - Core Component 1.B

The mission is articulated publicly.

1. The institution clearly articulates its mission through one or more public documents, such as statements of purpose, vision, values, goals, plans, or institutional priorities.
2. The mission document or documents are current and explain the extent of the institution’s emphasis on the various aspects of its mission, such as instruction, scholarship, research, application of research, creative works, clinical service, public service, economic development, and religious or cultural purpose.
3. The mission document or documents identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the higher education programs and services the institution provides.

Rating

Clear

Evidence

The institution promotes its mission on the public website accessible to both internal and external stakeholders. Recently the institution also purchased two large marketing displays of the mission, vision, and values which are located at the 2 prominent entrances.

The institution involved all employees to review and give input into the mission, vision, and values during a professional development day. The mission is well articulated through the institution’s four core concepts which are connected to the institution’s strategic plan.

The institution identifies its purpose to provide life changing and quality educational opportunities to constituents in the community and strives to be a leader for economic development and community vitality. The institution clearly articulates the goal to provide quality educational, cultural, economic, environmental, and technological leadership.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
1.C - Core Component 1.C

The institution understands the relationship between its mission and the diversity of society.

1. The institution addresses its role in a multicultural society.
2. The institution’s processes and activities reflect attention to human diversity as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves.

Rating

Adequate

Evidence

HCC is using demographic data to develop an understanding of the educational needs of the students it serves; these data are provided through the NHED Office of Institutional Research. Locally, the data are used to develop the College’s Fact Book which analyzes student information as it relates to gender distribution, age groups, ethnicity, and academic placement. It is not entirely clear how the College specifically addresses these data in its planning processes, and Hibbing Community College may benefit from strengthening its evidence related to this issue and its role in a multicultural society. The College’s website does present a formal “Inclusion and Equity Plan 2016-2017,” which provides some evidence that the College is attending to human diversity appropriately within its mission. The plan was last updated, it appears, in May of 2017. HCC may wish to strengthen its efforts related to its continued attention to human diversity. While evidence is adequate for this criterion, HCC may wish to strengthen evidence in this area.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
1.D - Core Component 1.D

The institution’s mission demonstrates commitment to the public good.

1. Actions and decisions reflect an understanding that in its educational role the institution serves the public, not solely the institution, and thus entails a public obligation.
2. The institution’s educational responsibilities take primacy over other purposes, such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests.
3. The institution engages with its identified external constituencies and communities of interest and responds to their needs as its mission and capacity allow.

Rating

Clear

Evidence

Throughout the portfolio, HCC provides ample evidence that the College works closely with the Minnesota state system which has in place ample policy and guidelines to ensure that HCC’s actions and decisions reflect an understanding of its educational role. The institutional mission and vision statements reflect a focus on HCC’s educational responsibilities as well. Advisory boards are in place which represent external constituencies and communities of interest. Evidence is clear that HCC’s mission demonstrates commitment to the public good.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
2 - Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

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

2.A - Core Component 2.A

The institution operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions; it establishes and follows policies and processes for fair and ethical behavior on the part of its governing board, administration, faculty, and staff.

Rating

Clear

Evidence

HCC provides ample evidence that it operates with integrity. The College adheres to all of the policies and procedures adopted at the Minnesota State system level, which are view-able on a public website and undergo regular review. All interested employees can give input to the development and revision of policies. These include policies related to academic, financial, and personnel functions, which are described in the Minnesota Transfer Curriculum, in the Employees Guidebook, and other documents. Likewise, at the campus level, HCC has a policy development and revision process that allows anyone to propose a policy or a revision to policy. Compliance with Federal regulations regarding Civil Rights, Students Right-to-Know, and the Clery Act is reviewed regularly. All HCC employees complete training related to legal and ethical behavior through the Enterprise Learning Management system. Information about programs, requirements, faculty and staff, and costs is available on the College website and is regularly updated.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
2.B - Core Component 2.B

The institution presents itself clearly and completely to its students and to the public with regard to its programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships.

Rating

Clear

Evidence

HCC provides evidence that it presents itself clearly and completely to its students and to the public with regard to its programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control and accreditation relationships.

HCC maintains a website with areas designated for prospective student, current students, and employees. The website clearly lists costs to students for tuition, fees, program expenses, and housing expenses. The website declares HCC's accredited status with the HLC in the footer of each page and on the About Us page. HCC's program-level accreditations are also listed under About Us. Cost calculators and Gainful Employment information is provided on the website. The website also contains an active News Feed and Calendar reminding students and employees of upcoming drop/add/withdraw dates, registration dates, disbursement dates, and other key financial aid deadlines. HCC utilizes an "Ask Us" function on its website where anyone can ask a question, which gets routed to the appropriate department for response.

Prospective students are invited to campus through individual and group tours, open house days, and technical career days. Admitted students attend a testing and registration learning session and a half-day new-student orientation session where general college policies/procedures, financial, academic, student support, and social support information is presented. A "Right-to-Know" email is sent to all students each semester, with data and contact information related to harassment, sexual violence issues, etc.

HCC is part of the Minnesota State system and conducts its business according to well-established system policies.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
2.C - Core Component 2.C

The governing board of the institution is sufficiently autonomous to make decisions in the best interest of the institution and to assure its integrity.

1. The governing board’s deliberations reflect priorities to preserve and enhance the institution.
2. The governing board reviews and considers the reasonable and relevant interests of the institution’s internal and external constituencies during its decision-making deliberations.
3. The governing board preserves its independence from undue influence on the part of donors, elected officials, ownership interests or other external parties when such influence would not be in the best interest of the institution.
4. The governing board delegates day-to-day management of the institution to the administration and expects the faculty to oversee academic matters.

Rating

Clear

Evidence

HCC is a member of the MN State system and Northeast Higher Education District and as such is well connected and has integrated processes with other institutions. The State system and the 15-member Board understand the roles as established in Minnesota State Statute.

The Board operates within the framework of the State system and is subject to state guidelines and oversight. These powers are delegated to the board by Minnesota State Statute 136F.06 (2.C.4). Processes are clearly spelled out and describe the search process and the use of an appropriate advisory group as presidential searches are needed. This role is clarified Board of Trustees Policy 4.2.

The Board has sufficient autonomy to provide oversight for the institution. Board is appointed at the State level by the governor. The fifteen-member Board is responsible for creating and monitoring policies in areas of system planning, academic programming, financial and personnel management, admissions requirements, and tuition and fees. Board member selection includes student representatives and other stakeholder groups ensuring broad representation and impartiality.

The State system works as a whole for the benefit of students. The day to day operations of the institution is clearly placed in the hands of the president with appropriate accountability processes as exemplified in the reporting and coordinated State planning system. HCC has processes in place that support accountability on the part of its leadership and ensures faculty are leading with overseeing academic matters, such as course outcomes and content, program review, course activities and academic integrity.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
2.D - Core Component 2.D

The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.

Rating

Clear

Evidence

HCC provides ample evidence it is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning. Commitment to academic freedom is stated in the Course Catalog and in the MSCF contract. Students’ rights to freedom of association, freedom of expression, and freedom to learn are articulated in the Student Handbook; students’ right to due process are outlined in the Student Code of Conduct; and course syllabi include information about academic honesty. HCC uses the NHED Institutional Review Board to provide oversight of research and scholarly pursuits. The College has clear procedures for responding to complaints and grievances and is working to improve its processes for tracking types of conflicts and their resolution to allow for year-to-year comparisons.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
2.E - Core Component 2.E

The institution’s policies and procedures call for responsible acquisition, discovery and application of knowledge by its faculty, students and staff.

1. The institution provides effective oversight and support services to ensure the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by its faculty, staff, and students.
2. Students are offered guidance in the ethical use of information resources.
3. The institution has and enforces policies on academic honesty and integrity.

Rating

Clear

Evidence

HCC provides ample evidence that it has effective oversight and support services to ensure the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by its faculty, staff, and students. Ethical teaching and research practices for faculty are outlined in the Academic Freedom section of the MSCF contract and new faculty complete mandatory Code of Conduct and Data Privacy training within ten days of hire. HCC utilizes the NHED Institutional Review Board.

HCC provides ample evidence that students are offered guidance in the ethical use of information resources. The Student Handbook articulates the College’s commitment to assuring that students understand policies regarding academic dishonesty. Course syllabi are required to include a section on academic dishonesty.

HCC provides ample evidence that it has and enforces policies on academic honesty and integrity. Expectations of students are outlined in the Student Handbook and complaints against students are investigated by the Student Conduct Officer, who assures that students are given due processes including formal hearings and avenues for appeal. HCC has established procedures for test proctoring. HCC tracks complaints about academic integrity and grade appeals and their resolution and has begun categorizing complaints and assigning targets, which will make year-to-year comparisons more effective.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
3 - Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support

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

3.A - Core Component 3.A

The institution’s degree programs are appropriate to higher education.

1. Courses and programs are current and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree or certificate awarded.
2. The institution articulates and differentiates learning goals for undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate, and certificate programs.
3. The institution’s program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (on the main campus, at additional locations, by distance delivery, as dual credit, through contractual or consortial arrangements, or any other modality).

Rating

Adequate

Evidence

Evidence is clear that HCC complies with Minnesota State Policy 3.4 which prescribes college admission requirements. Board policy is also in place to articulate assessment standards for course placement. Advisory boards are in place for career and technical education programs and meeting minutes provided show evidence that advisory boards are reviewing courses and programs to ensure they are current and appropriate to the degree and certificate awarded. Description of the College’s curriculum process ensures that courses and programs are reviewed by appropriate stakeholders before approval.

A curriculum committee approves all learning outcomes during the course and program approval process. Outcomes are reviewed periodically during a formal program review cycle. Minimum requirements for syllabi include articulation of learning goals. Responses in the portfolio indicate that programs which have achieved specialized accreditation have in place clear program outcomes. Evidence is less clear that outcomes are in place for all programs. While evidence is adequate in this area, HCC will benefit by providing more specific evidence in the form of actual program level outcomes for each of its career and technical programs. For liberal arts and sciences programs, learning goals are prescribed by Minnesota.

A transfer curriculum committee is in place to assess the rigor for liberal arts courses, and a technical curriculum committee is in place to assess rigor for career and technical courses. Curriculum approval procedures are clearly described which approve courses and programs. If there are specific policies or expectations addressing rigor across modality, they are not explicitly addressed in the portfolio and not immediately available on the website. HCC may wish to strengthen evidence that quality and
learning goals are consistent across instructional modes.

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*

The institution demonstrates that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational programs.

1. The general education program is appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution.
2. The institution articulates the purposes, content, and intended learning outcomes of its undergraduate general education requirements. The program of general education is grounded in a philosophy or framework developed by the institution or adopted from an established framework. It imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess.
3. Every degree program offered by the institution engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments.
4. The education offered by the institution recognizes the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work.
5. The faculty and students contribute to scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge to the extent appropriate to their programs and the institution’s mission.

Rating

Adequate

Evidence

HCC provides evidence that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational programs. HCC is part of the Minnesota State system and thus follows Minnesota State Procedure 3.36.1, which establishes "standards, processes and conditions that enable consistent implementation of academic program policy," including guidelines for program approval and academic awards.

HCC has established Core Competencies that are acquired by every graduate. The Core Competencies are assessed and reviewed every five years. Student learning outcomes are specified on course outlines which include the HCC Core Competencies, MnTC goals, and course-level outcomes.

For liberal arts and sciences programs, the purpose, content, and achievement of outcomes are guided by the MnTC goal areas (3.B.2). This Minnesota State-integrated process shapes all general education program plans at HCC.

The guiding principle of HCC's strategic plan is to strive to "provide quality educational, cultural, economic, environmental and technological leadership." This principle is accomplished through the implementation of four Core Concepts: "Build Relationships," "Provide a Holistic Student Experience," "Champion Inclusion & Equity," and "Secure the Future" (3.B.4).

Students have numerous opportunities to engage the community and apply their knowledge in
changing, real-world environments, including internships, community service, skills
competitions, service-learning, and resale.

Liberal arts students complete coursework in human diversity and global perspective as articulated
by the MnTC criteria. In technical programs, the semi-annual review of course outcomes
by advisory boards ensures the program outcomes meet workplace and societal needs. Regularly
scheduled program reviews facilitate discussion regarding curriculum revisions.

While evidence in Core Component 3.B. is adequate, the Core Component could be strengthened by
addressing Subcomponents 3 and 5.

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*
3.C - Core Component 3.C

The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services.

1. The institution has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out both the classroom and the non-classroom roles of faculty, including oversight of the curriculum and expectations for student performance; establishment of academic credentials for instructional staff; involvement in assessment of student learning.

2. All instructors are appropriately qualified, including those in dual credit, contractual, and consortial programs.

3. Instructors are evaluated regularly in accordance with established institutional policies and procedures.

4. The institution has processes and resources for assuring that instructors are current in their disciplines and adept in their teaching roles; it supports their professional development.

5. Instructors are accessible for student inquiry.

6. Staff members providing student support services, such as tutoring, financial aid advising, academic advising, and co-curricular activities, are appropriately qualified, trained, and supported in their professional development.

Rating

Clear

Evidence

Hiring is conducted through hiring committees that are mandated to follow the Hiring Procedures Handbook for the Northeastern Higher Education District (NHED). Hiring practices also follow appropriate State and Federal guidelines. Faculty qualifications are supported through the Minnesota State system, State Procedure 3.32.1 College Faculty Credentialing, which articulates standards for hiring qualified and credentialed staff.

Staff and administration are hired based on criteria that include meeting the minimum qualifications for the position, which often includes educational background and in-field experience. This practice follows the agreements outlined in the MAPE, MMA, and AFSCME contracts.

HCC compares favorably with other similar institutions in faculty/student ratio and number of full-time faculty. The MSCF contract requires that HCC meet student enrollment demands in the hiring process.

The specific credentials for faculty are described and include the stipulation that full-time faculty members are required to have a Master’s degree in their discipline except for those who teach technical programs. Technical program instructors must have certifications and/or applicable training in their discipline. Dual credit instructors are expected to meet the same standards as full-time instructors.

The system for faculty review is in place to support currency and to ensure a student voice. Faculty
members are provided national and local training opportunities to maintain currency in their field. The MSCF contract makes provision for faculty development at $250 per year. Probationary faculty must take a teaching and learning competence course.

The faculty and staff have contract stipulations that support interaction with students and is grounded in the institutions Core Concepts for providing a holistic experience. Both faculty and staff have taken part in development activities on an average of over 1 per year per employee.

There are employee evaluations and improvement systems. MN system provides development programs to all employees. HCC has a regional organization that has a diversity and inclusion plan that is helping to move the institution forward given the local demographics.

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*
3.D - Core Component 3.D

The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.

1. The institution provides student support services suited to the needs of its student populations.
2. The institution provides for learning support and preparatory instruction to address the academic needs of its students. It has a process for directing entering students to courses and programs for which the students are adequately prepared.
3. The institution provides academic advising suited to its programs and the needs of its students.
4. The institution provides to students and instructors the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning (technological infrastructure, scientific laboratories, libraries, performance spaces, clinical practice sites, museum collections, as appropriate to the institution’s offerings).
5. The institution provides to students guidance in the effective use of research and information resources.

Rating

Clear

Evidence

The institution identifies subgroups and special populations through its application process. Additional support is in place for military veterans, students with disabilities, and online students. The NHED diversity effort drives work by the diversity committee to address inequity and inclusion for underrepresented and underserved populations.

Students needs are assessed in a variety of ways. In the absence of ACT, SAT, MCA scores or prior college level work the institution mandates the Accuplacer Assessment. Students who score below the acceptable range are required to enter a learning community cohort that provides refreshers in reading, English and study skills. All students are also given an application to screen them for eligibility for the TRIO program which provides additional support as determined. International students and veterans are assigned a liaison for additional support.

The institution requires a registration code for all students which is available upon meeting with an academic advisor to discuss appropriate coursework. Priority registration allows TRIO, students with disabilities, and technical students the opportunity to register for schedules that meet their needs.

The institution supports student learning through specialized hands on facilities in the areas of information technology, nursing, medical lab and pharmacy technician, electrical, and heating and cooling technician. The commercial truck driving has a high tech simulator along with tractor trailers. The Dental Assistant program has an onsite clinic. Several science labs, as well as art studios are available to liberal arts students.

Faculty provide instruction to students on effectively using research and information resources in
conjunction with class visits to the library for tutorials from the library technician.

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*
3.E - Core Component 3.E

The institution fulfills the claims it makes for an enriched educational environment.

1. Co-curricular programs are suited to the institution’s mission and contribute to the educational experience of its students.
2. The institution demonstrates any claims it makes about contributions to its students’ educational experience by virtue of aspects of its mission, such as research, community engagement, service learning, religious or spiritual purpose, and economic development.

Rating

Clear

Evidence

Creation of clubs are through HCC student life and are guided by Minnesota State Procedure 2.8.1. As part of the application process a club must ensure it is supporting the mission. Several programs maintain discipline-specific student clubs. Some co-curricular activities are aligned with the HCC Core Competencies.

The institution offers opportunities to engage with the community through internships, community service, skills competitions, and service learning. These directly relate to the part of the mission which promises students the ability to experience “opportunities in a dynamic learning environment.”

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
4 - Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

4.A - Core Component 4.A

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.

1. The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.
2. The institution evaluates all the credit that it transcripts, including what it awards for experiential learning or other forms of prior learning, or relies on the evaluation of responsible third parties.
3. The institution has policies that assure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.
4. The institution maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. It assures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.
5. The institution maintains specialized accreditation for its programs as appropriate to its educational purposes.
6. The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. The institution assures that the degree or certificate programs it represents as preparation for advanced study or employment accomplish these purposes. For all programs, the institution looks to indicators it deems appropriate to its mission, such as employment rates, admission rates to advanced degree programs, and participation rates in fellowships, internships, and special programs (e.g., Peace Corps and Americorps).

Rating

Clear

Evidence

A document dated December 13, 2017, describes Hibbing Community College’s process for Academic Program Review as “a system in place to evaluate new and existing programs by monitoring enrollment, course and degree offerings, graduation rates, and fiscal efficiency.” This same document describes sources used as input during the program review process, which occurs on a regular cycle. HCC provides the “Program Review Schedule” which outlines what programs are under review in FY 2018, FY 2019, and FY 2020. According to the response and the linked AQIP Action Project report, HCC’s process for program review was completed as a result of the action project which was completed in 2017. The Chief Academic Officer of the college is charged with ensuring program reviews are completed. A “Hibbing Community College Program Review”
document is provided in the response and provides indication that technical program faculty are provided guidance in completion of program reviews. A number of completed program reviews are provided in the response, and each appears to have been completed in 2018. What remains unclear is whether or not program reviews were completed prior to 2018. While evidence is clear that HCC currently maintains a process for program review, providing greater clarity in regards to historical program reviews may help HCC strengthen its evidence for 4.A.

HCC articulates policies for evaluation of prior learning credits and transfer credits in its Student Handbook under the heading of “Transfer Information.” This policy addresses alignment which Minnesota’s system policies, credit for prior learning, Advanced Placement (AP), College Level Examination Program (CLEP), DANTES/DSST, International Baccalaureate (IB), Military, Tech Prep, and Credit by Exam. Evidence is clearly presented that HCC evaluates all the credit it transcripts and that it assures the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.

Minnesota State Policies 3.3 and 3.4 address assessment for course placement and undergraduate admissions and prescribe placement scores for certain courses. HCC’s course outlines are approved locally by the curriculum committee; these course outlines include course pre-requisites which suggest that the college maintains authority over prerequisites. Transfer Curriculum Committee meeting minutes from September 5th, 2017, are provided in the response to verify that a regular process for course outline review is in place, and HCC indicates that this process is used to ensure rigor of its courses and expectations for student learning. Minnesota State policies are in place (“Procedures 3.5.1. Post-Secondary Enrollment Options”) to ensure that rigor in concurrent enrollment courses are “college-level courses approved through the college or university curriculum process, shall meet institutional standards required for accreditation, and shall follow the college- or university-approved course outline.” HCC claims to have in place an “extension” which “allows for all current and any new concurrent enrollment instructors until September 1, 2022 to meet the HLC minimum faculty qualification standards.”

HCC’s evidence is clearly presented to indicate that the college maintains appropriate specialized accreditation for the following programs: automotive technology, Certified Nursing Assistant, Dental Assistant, Electrical Maintenance, Law Enforcement, Medical Lab Technician, Nursing, and Pharmacy Technician.

HCC does survey its graduates annually in compliance with Minnesota State Policy 3.31 by using the Graduate Follow-up Survey. The state’s system office sets goals for rates of related employment among graduates and the Minnesota State Accountability Dashboard provides evidence that HCC has information to evaluated graduate success.

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*

The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.

1. The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.
2. The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.
3. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.
4. The institution’s processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff members.

Rating

Unclear

Evidence

HCC articulates five “Core Competencies” which are defined in detail in a document last revised in November of 2017. These competencies were articulated through the College’s curriculum process in an effort to “determine the purpose, content, and outcomes that every HCC graduate should possess.” These competencies are also listed in the College Catalog. In addition to these institutionally determined competencies, HCC has adopted “The MN Transfer Curriculum” which states 10 “goal areas” which are also addressed in the graduation requirements offered in the College Catalog. A link provided in the response provides clear evidence that program outcomes are in place for the College’s automotive technology program which align with NATEF standards. No additional evidence of program-specific outcomes is apparent, and HCC may wish to strengthen its evidence in this area.

Evidence provided in the response suggests that assessment of HCC Core Competencies “was achieved primarily through reviewing the Community College Survey of Student Engagement results.” The College has done extensive work to align CCSSE items with its stated Core Competencies; however, it remains unclear how these results demonstrate, in a direct fashion, achievement of learning outcomes. CCSSE responses are provided by students which may not provide an accurate assessment of achievement in relation to curricular program outcomes. HCC also notes a pilot process, implemented in Spring 2018, which is designed to assess achievement of Core Competencies; however, the documentation submitted in the portfolio does not yet contain results from direct assessment of student learning; rather, the metrics appear to track faculty engagement with the designed process. There is in place a plan to assess achievement of all Core Competencies “within a five years cycle;” however, there is no evidence that HCC has engaged in effective assessment of its Core Competencies. A procedures manual for TracDat suggest that tools are in place to support assessment of course level learning outcomes, and a form is linked in the response which appears to drive this process. The response, however, does not provide clear evidence that this process has resulted in results which can be used to improve student learning; in fact, no results from course level assessment practices are provided. Assessment of co-curricular learning outcomes is not addressed. Evidence is unclear in this area.
HCC notes that its historical methods of using CCSSE results to assess achievement of learning outcomes was an insufficient measure. This insight resulted in the development of a new process referred to as the Assessment and Improvement Method (AIM); results from the AIM process are primarily related to faculty participation in the process. The College does include in its Systems Portfolio a list of improvements to “Labs, Shops, and Equipment,” however there is little to suggest that these improvements were driven by information gained from assessment, and there is no information provided to suggest that the improvements led to improved student learning. Evidence is unclear at this time that HCC uses information gained from assessment to improve student learning.

Very little is offered to describe processes and methodology for assessing student learning. A brief outline of the AIM process, titled HCC Core Competency Review Procedure, provides a broad overview which suggests that individual faculty create and submit assessment plans, review assessment measures, and meet to assess student achievement. The full description of activities and procedures amounts to less than one page of text and does not provide sufficient details to offer clear evidence that assessment practices reflect good practice. Survey results offered from spring 2018 related to the “Core Competency Assessment Plan” provide a sense of what faculty may be using to conduct assessments (e.g. the column titled “Answers” suggests a wide range of activities ranging from projects and exams to practical exercises, quizzes, service learning, presentations, etc.); however, reviewers are left to guess what this indicates in relation to a comprehensive assessment program. Hence, evidence is not clear to determine whether or not assessment practices at HCC reflect good practice. The same survey results from spring of 2018 indicate that 48% of faculty members at HCC participated in the pilot project of the AIM process. Since the College has not identified targets or benchmarks for participation, it is unclear whether or not this is an acceptable level of participation of activities supporting the AIM process.

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

Hibbing Community College should submit a report which provides

- a progress report related to implementation of the AIM process,
- representative samples which show results of newly designed assessment of student learning outcomes processes, and
- representative examples describing how the College has used assessment results to improve student learning.

This report should be embedded in the institution's upcoming comprehensive review and will be due on 9/23/19.
4.C - Core Component 4.C

The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs.

1. The institution has defined goals for student retention, persistence, and completion that are ambitious but attainable and appropriate to its mission, student populations, and educational offerings.
2. The institution collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence, and completion of its programs.
3. The institution uses information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs to make improvements as warranted by the data.
4. The institution’s processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs reflect good practice. (Institutions are not required to use IPEDS definitions in their determination of persistence or completion rates. Institutions are encouraged to choose measures that are suitable to their student populations, but institutions are accountable for the validity of their measures.)

Rating

Clear

Evidence

HCC provides evidence it has defined goals for student retention, persistence, and completion that are ambitious but attainable and appropriate to its mission, student populations, and educational offerings. HCC’s targets for retention, persistence, and completion are set by the Minnesota State system based on prior years’ performance and the performance of other institutions in the System. HCC benchmarks internally by comparing year-to-year rates and comparing to other NHED institutions. Graduation rates are benchmarked to IPEDS peers.

HCC provides evidence that it collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence, and completion of its programs. The College has used its analyses of the data it has collected to inform decisions about future AQIP action projects including a project to Map and Access Student needs in 2018-19 and an Attention to Retention through Early Intervention project in 2018-20.

HCC provides evidence that it uses information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs to make improvements as warranted by the data. HCC’s processes and methodologies have contributed to several action projects around Learning Communities, assessing student support practices, improving retention, and performance of male athletes of color.

HCC provides evidence that its processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs reflect good practice. HCC selects tools such as the IPEDS, Minnesota State system performance metrics, and its own New Student Surveys and Graduate Surveys.
Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
5 - Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

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

5.A - Core Component 5.A

The institution’s resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

1. The institution has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered.
2. The institution’s resource allocation process ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas or disbursement of revenue to a superordinate entity.
3. The goals incorporated into mission statements or elaborations of mission statements are realistic in light of the institution’s organization, resources, and opportunities.
4. The institution’s staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.
5. The institution has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expense.

Rating

Clear

Evidence

The MN system is involved with the setting of tuition and fees in order to ensure and control access of students to State institutions. The Higher Education Omnibus Bill supports students through financial oversight and support systems.

The State system has developed a resource Allocation Framework that helps to guide all public institutions. The allocation framework consists of a set of algorithms that distributes over 75 percent of state operating funds to the system’s colleges and universities, providing critical base operating support.

HCC uses budget scenarios, developed by the finance office, to help discern need and to determine allocations within HCC in alignment with the State framework. HCC has clearly stated and aligned allocation systems that include human resources, facilities and IT.

HCC has used peer comparison information to assure that the ratios of instructors and staff to students is sufficient.

HCC has vertically aligned strategic goals, the strategic planning process, and the regional system. The Accountability Dashboard used by HCC allows them to track trends and to adjust resources and
to address opportunities as deemed appropriate by administration and multiple advisory bodies. The regional NHED president, also HCC president, works with and aligns the Regional Academic Plan.

Faculty and staff are hired based on needs of students and they are supported in professional development. Per the MSCF contract, faculty are provided professional development and are encouraged to make use of sabbaticals.

Administrators meet periodically with departments regarding goal setting, program review, and resource allocation as a means of monitoring progress and budget needs.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
5.B - Core Component 5.B

The institution’s governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.

1. The governing board is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight of the institution’s financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities.
2. The institution has and employs policies and procedures to engage its internal constituencies—including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff, and students—in the institution’s governance.
3. Administration, faculty, staff, and students are involved in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort.

Rating

Clear

Evidence

HCC provides evidence that its governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission. HCC is a member of both the Minnesota State system and the Northeast Higher Education District (NHED). Leadership is structured at three levels: the system level, the district level and the campus level. A fifteen-member Board of Trustees (BOT) appointed by the governor is responsible for creating and monitoring policies in areas of system planning, academic programming, financial and personnel management, admissions requirements, and tuition and fees. These powers are delegated to the board by Minnesota State Statute 136F.06.

The system's chancellor is appointed by the BOT. The chancellor leads a system office staff that includes vice-chancellors who are responsible for divisions such as student affairs, diversity and inclusion, academic programming, finance, legal affairs, risk mitigation, information technology, and data and research. The staff in these departments support the work of the system as a whole and are available to each campus.

In fall 2015, HCC underwent a comprehensive strategic planning process. A comprehensive core of faculty, staff, and students were selected to participate in the process of drafting the plan. Community members and a broader group of faculty and staff were engaged in the planning process. The planning process resulted in updated values and objectives as well as four "Core Concepts."

All academic changes initiated by faculty or departments are brought through a centralized process involving curriculum committees and AASC on a monthly basis for vetting by a broader group of stakeholders. Student Services staff also participate in AASC meetings to ensure academic decisions align with program requirements, Minnesota Transfer Curriculum guidelines, etc. Operational decisions are made through monthly Shared Governance meetings. During these meetings, HCC faculty leadership bring forward issues that were raised during monthly faculty meetings.
Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
5.C - Core Component 5.C

The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.

1. The institution allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities.
2. The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.
3. The planning process encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups.
4. The institution plans on the basis of a sound understanding of its current capacity. Institutional plans anticipate the possible impact of fluctuations in the institution’s sources of revenue, such as enrollment, the economy, and state support.
5. Institutional planning anticipates emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization.

Rating
Clear

Evidence

HCC provides evidence that it engages in systematic and integrated planning. Campus-wide input resulted in HCC's current mission/vision/values. Each department or division leader is responsible for working with their staff and faculty to build a budget and determine resource needs based on department goals that align with HCC's mission. These individual budgets are reviewed, modified, and prioritized by the cross-sectional leadership team as needed to fit the overall college budget. Performance reviews, system performance metrics, and academic program efficiency measures are all considered to ensure that HCC is maximizing resources. Individual departments such as Student Services conduct department-level planning that results in objectives aligned with HCC's mission/vision/values.

The provost's leadership team, which includes leaders from the major campus units, considers the results of the strategic plan when making decisions about continuous improvement. HCC's accreditation team, Join Us in Making Progress (JUMP), will only approve an AQIP action project if it meets one or more of the Core Concepts within HCC's strategic plan. Program budgets are approved based on how the requests accomplish goals within the department and how those goals fit within HCC's mission/vision/values. Results are discussed and recognized during department leadership performance reviews.

HCC's Core Concepts provide guidance in HCC's process for taking advantage of emerging factors, understanding shortcomings, and mitigating risk.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
5.D - Core Component 5.D

The institution works systematically to improve its performance.

1. The institution develops and documents evidence of performance in its operations.
2. The institution learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its component parts.

Rating

Adequate

Evidence

CQI processes are integrated into the college environment. Ideas for improvement and change come from all stakeholders. Duty Day activities, district newsletters, administrative email updates, and Provost Information Sessions all provide opportunities to highlight quality initiatives and gather ideas for new projects.

A broad-based JUMP committee reviews these ideas and determines if they need can be resolved with a quick-fix solution or if it requires a more in-depth project.

The key factor that supports the CQI process at HCC is the engagement of those stakeholders nearest the actual impact of action projects. The JUMP committee helps to assure project fit in AQIP categories and that projects support the college, district, and system goals.

HCC learns from their practice through multiple committees involved in projects, administrative involvement and review of activities, and through project monitoring. Stronger evidence might include further detail regarding all processes and how it is determined which make it to the JUMP group.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
## Review Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reflective Overview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Strategic Challenges Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Accreditation Evidence Screening Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Quality of Systems Portfolio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>AQIP Category Feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Helping Students Learn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Meeting Student and Other Key Stakeholder Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Valuing Employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Planning and Leading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Knowledge Management and Resource Stewardship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Quality Overview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.A</td>
<td>Core Component 1.A</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.B</td>
<td>Core Component 1.B</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.D</td>
<td>Core Component 1.D</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.B</td>
<td>Core Component 2.B</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.C</td>
<td>Core Component 2.C</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.D</td>
<td>Core Component 2.D</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.E</td>
<td>Core Component 2.E</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.A</td>
<td>Core Component 3.A</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.D</td>
<td>Core Component 3.D</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.E</td>
<td>Core Component 3.E</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.A</td>
<td>Core Component 5.A</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Component 5.0</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.B</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.C</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.D</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interim Report(s) Required

Due Date
9/23/2019

Report Focus
Hibbing Community College should submit a report which provides

- a progress report related to implementation of the AIM process,
- representative samples which show results of newly designed assessment of student learning outcomes processes, and
- representative examples describing how the College has used assessment results to improve student learning.

This report should be embedded in the institution's upcoming comprehensive review and will be due on 9/23/19.

Conclusion

Overall Recommendations

Criteria For Accreditation
Unclear

Sanctions Recommendation
Not Set

Pathways Recommendation
Not Set
INSTITUTION and STATE: Hibbing Community College, MN  
TYPE OF REVIEW: AQIP Systems Appraisal  
DESCRIPTION OF REVIEW:  
DATES OF REVIEW: 9/10/2018 -  
☐ No Change in Institutional Status and Requirements

Accreditation Status  
Nature of Institution  
Control: Public  
Recommended Change:  

---

Degrees Awarded: Associates  
Recommended Change:  

---

Reaffirmation of Accreditation:  
Year of Last Reaffirmation of Accreditation: 2012 - 2013  
Year of Next Reaffirmation of Accreditation: 2019 - 2020  
Recommended Change:  

---

Accreditation Stipulations  
General:  
Prior Commission approval is required for substantive change as stated in Commission policy.  
Recommended Change:  

---

Additional Location:  
Prior HLC approval required.  
Recommended Change:  

---
Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

Distance and Correspondence Courses and Programs:
Approved for distance education courses and programs. The institution has not been approved for correspondence education.

**Recommended Change:**

Accreditation:
* Note on date of accreditation: Accredited as a separate entity in 1997 following the reconfiguration of Arrowhead Community College, accredited in 1982, and Range Technical College, granted candidacy in 1995.

**Recommended Change:**

**Accreditation Events**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accreditation Pathway</th>
<th>AQIP Pathway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Recommended Change:**

**Upcoming Events**

Comprehensive Evaluation: 09/23/2019

The institution was granted an extension until September 1, 2022 to become compliant to the faculty qualification requirement. HLC will review that the institution is in compliance with the faculty qualification requirement at the comprehensive evaluation following the extension date.

**Recommended Change:**

**Monitoring**

**Upcoming Events**
None

**Recommended Change:**

**Interim Report** embedded in Quality Highlights report for upcoming 9/23/19 Comprehensive Evaluation which provides:
- A progress report related to implementation of the AIM process,
- representative samples which show results of newly designed assessment of student learning outcomes processes, and
- representative examples describing how the College has used assessment results to improve student learning.

**Institutional Data**

**Educational Programs**

Undergraduate

**Recommended Change:**
Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

| Certificate | 20 |  |
| Associate Degrees | 17 |  |
| Baccalaureate Degrees | 0 |  |

**Graduate**

| Master's Degrees | 0 |  |
| Specialist Degrees | 0 |  |
| Doctoral Degrees | 0 |  |

---

**Extended Operations**

**Branch Campuses**

None

*Recommended Change:*

---

**Additional Locations**

Cook County Higher Education, 300 3rd Ave. W., Grand Marais, MN, 55604 - Active

*Recommended Change:*

---

**Correspondence Education**

None

*Recommended Change:*

---

**Distance Delivery**

19.0702 - Adult Development and Aging, Certificate, Adult Development and Aging
24.0101 - Liberal Arts and Sciences/Liberal Studies, Associate, Associate of Arts
51.1004 - Clinical/Medical Laboratory Technician, Associate, A.A.S. in Medical Laboratory Technician
52.0201 - Business Administration and Management, General, Associate, Associate degree in Business Administration

---

**Contractual Arrangements**

None

*Recommended Change:*
Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

Consortial Arrangements
None

Recommended Change: