

This confirms that your 2012-2013 Annual Report to ACCJC was submitted by Dr. Francisco Rodriguez <frodriguez@miracosta.edu> on 03/31/2014. Below is a copy of the information submitted. You may also re-print the report by logging on at <https://www.accjc.org/annualreport>.



Western Association of Schools and Colleges
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

2014 Annual Report
Final Submission
 03/31/2014

MiraCosta College
 One Barnard Drive
 Oceanside, CA 92056

General Information

#	Question	Answer
1.	Confirm logged into the correct institution's report	Confirmed
2.	Name of individual preparing report:	Robert Pacheco
3.	Phone number of person preparing report:	7607956846
4.	E-mail of person preparing report:	rpacheco@miracosta.edu
5a.	Provide the URL (link) from the college website to the section of the college catalog which states the accredited status with ACCJC:	http://catalog.miracosta.edu/aboutmiracosta/accreditation/
5b.	Provide the URL (link) from the college website to the colleges online statement of accredited status with ACCJC:	http://catalog.miracosta.edu/aboutmiracosta/accreditation/
6.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment:	Fall 2013: 16,129 Fall 2012: 16,206 Fall 2011: 16,138
7.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in degree applicable credit courses for fall 2013:	14,557
8.	Headcount enrollment in pre-collegiate credit courses (which do not count toward degree requirements) for fall 2013:	1,543
9.	Number of courses offered via distance education:	Fall 2013: 152 Fall 2012: 147 Fall 2011: 144

10.	Number of programs offered via distance education:	n/a
11.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in all types of Distance Education:	Fall 2013: 5,787 Fall 2012: 5,507 Fall 2011: 4,966
12.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in all types of Correspondence Education:	Fall 2013: n/a Fall 2012: n/a Fall 2011: n/a
13.	Were all correspondence courses for which students enrolled in fall 2012 part of a program which leads to an associate degree?	No

Student Achievement Data

#	Question	Answer									
14a.	What is your Institution-set standard for successful student course completion?	72.2%									
14b.	Successful student course completion rate for the fall 2013 semester:	69%									
15.	<p>Institution Set Standards for program completion: While institutions may determine the measures for which they will set standards, most institutions will utilize this measure as it is core to their mission. For purposes of definition, certificates include those certificate programs which qualify for financial aid, principally those which lead to gainful employment. Completion of degrees and certificates is to be presented in terms of total numbers. Each student who receives one or more certificates or degrees in the specified year may be counted once.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>a.</td> <td>If you have an institution-set standard for student completion of degrees and certificates combined, what is it?</td> <td>2444</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b.</td> <td>If you have separate institution-set standards for degrees, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of degrees, per year?</td> <td>1077</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c.</td> <td>If you have separate institution-set standards for certificates, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of certificates, per year?</td> <td>1367</td> </tr> </table>		a.	If you have an institution-set standard for student completion of degrees and certificates combined, what is it?	2444	b.	If you have separate institution-set standards for degrees, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of degrees, per year?	1077	c.	If you have separate institution-set standards for certificates, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of certificates, per year?	1367
a.	If you have an institution-set standard for student completion of degrees and certificates combined, what is it?	2444									
b.	If you have separate institution-set standards for degrees, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of degrees, per year?	1077									
c.	If you have separate institution-set standards for certificates, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of certificates, per year?	1367									
16a.	Number of students (unduplicated) who received a certificate or degree in the 2012-2013 academic year:	1,307									
16b.	Number of students who received a degree in the 2012-2013 academic year:	1,011									
16c.	Number of students who received a certificate in the 2012-2013 academic year:	345									
17a.	If your college has an institution-set standard for the number of students who transfer each year to 4-year colleges/universities, what is it?	873									
17b.	Number of students who transferred to 4-year colleges/universities in 2012-2013:	873									
18a.	Does the college have any certificate programs which	Yes									

	are not career-technical education (CTE) certificates?																													
18b.	If yes, please identify them:	Certificate of Achievement in CSU General Education Certificate of Achievement in IGETC																												
19a.	Number of career-technical education (CTE) certificates and degrees:	107																												
19b.	Number of CTE certificates and degrees which have identified technical and professional competencies that meet employment standards and other standards, including those for licensure and certification:	3																												
19c.	Number of CTE certificates and degrees for which the institution has set a standard for licensure passage rates:	3																												
19d.	Number of CTE certificates and degrees for which the institution has set a standard for graduate employment rates:	107																												
20.	<p>2011-2012 examination pass rates in programs for which students must pass a licensure examination in order to work in their field of study:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Program</th> <th>CIP Code 4 digits (##.##)</th> <th>Examination</th> <th>Institution set standard</th> <th>Pass Rate</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Nursing (RN)</td> <td>51.38</td> <td>state</td> <td>96 %</td> <td>96 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Licensed Vocational Nurse (LVN)</td> <td>51.39</td> <td>state</td> <td>87.4 %</td> <td>87.4 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Certified Nursing Assistant</td> <td>51.39</td> <td>state</td> <td>96 %</td> <td>96 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Surgical Tech</td> <td>51.09</td> <td>state</td> <td>73 %</td> <td>73 %</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					Program	CIP Code 4 digits (##.##)	Examination	Institution set standard	Pass Rate	Nursing (RN)	51.38	state	96 %	96 %	Licensed Vocational Nurse (LVN)	51.39	state	87.4 %	87.4 %	Certified Nursing Assistant	51.39	state	96 %	96 %	Surgical Tech	51.09	state	73 %	73 %
Program	CIP Code 4 digits (##.##)	Examination	Institution set standard	Pass Rate																										
Nursing (RN)	51.38	state	96 %	96 %																										
Licensed Vocational Nurse (LVN)	51.39	state	87.4 %	87.4 %																										
Certified Nursing Assistant	51.39	state	96 %	96 %																										
Surgical Tech	51.09	state	73 %	73 %																										
21.	<p>2011-2012 job placement rates for students completing certificate programs and CTE (career-technology education) degrees:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Program</th> <th>CIP Code 4 digits (##.##)</th> <th>Institution set standard</th> <th>Job Placement Rate</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					Program	CIP Code 4 digits (##.##)	Institution set standard	Job Placement Rate																					
Program	CIP Code 4 digits (##.##)	Institution set standard	Job Placement Rate																											
22.	<p>Please list any other institution set standards at your college:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Criteria Measured (i.e. persistence, starting salary, etc.)</th> <th>Definition</th> <th>Institution set standard</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Persistence (fall to fall)</td> <td>Re-enrollment in the CCC system</td> <td>47.5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					Criteria Measured (i.e. persistence, starting salary, etc.)	Definition	Institution set standard	Persistence (fall to fall)	Re-enrollment in the CCC system	47.5																			
Criteria Measured (i.e. persistence, starting salary, etc.)	Definition	Institution set standard																												
Persistence (fall to fall)	Re-enrollment in the CCC system	47.5																												
23.	<p>Effective practice to share with the field: Describe examples of effective and/or innovative practices at your college for setting institution-set standards, evaluating college or programmatic performance related to student achievement, and changes that have happened in response to analyzing college or program performance (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).</p> <p>The MiraCosta Student Success Committee, the governance body charged with setting the institution standards, used multiple methods to triangulate the metrics. First, the college examined the five-year running average to get a stable internal measure. Second, the college compared the performance to the state-wide average. In this way, the team could</p>																													

discover institutional performance in relation to the entire system. Finally, MiraCosta used peer group analysis to regress factors irrelevant to the measures (e.g. socio-economic status) to make meaningful inter-institutional comparisons. All three methods were considered to the maximum extent possible.

Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

Note: Beginning fall 2012, colleges were expected to be at the proficiency level of Student Learning Outcomes assessment (see the ACCJC Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness, Part III, Student Learning Outcomes). At this time, colleges are expected to be in full compliance with the Accreditation Standards related to student learning outcomes and assessment. All courses, programs, and student and learning support activities of the college are expected to have student learning outcomes defined, so that ongoing assessment and other requirements of Accreditation Standards are met across the institution.

#	Question	Answer	
24.	Courses		
	a.	Total number of college courses:	844
	b.	Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes	844
	Auto-calculated field: percentage of total:		100
25.	Courses		
	a.	Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs as defined by college):	80
	b.	Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes	80
	Auto-calculated field: percentage of total:		100
26.	Courses		
	a.	Total number of student and learning support activities (as college has identified or grouped them for SLO implementation):	45
	b.	Number of student and learning support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes:	45
	Auto-calculated field: percentage of total:		100
27.	URL(s) from the college website where prospective students can find SLO assessment results for programs:	http://www.miracosta.edu/instruction/slo/cpslo.html	
28.	Number of courses identified as part of the GE program:	254	
29.	Percent of GE courses with ongoing assessment of GE learning outcomes:	100%	
30.	Do your institution's GE outcomes include all areas	Yes	

	identified in the Accreditation Standards?	
31.	Number of GE courses with Student Learning Outcomes mapped to GE program Student Learning Outcomes:	254
32.	Number of Institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined:	5
33.	Percentage of college instructional programs and student and learning support activities which have Institutional Student Learning Outcomes mapped to those programs (courses) and activities (student and learning support activities).	100%
34.	Percent of institutional outcomes (ILOs) with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes:	100%
35.	<p>Effective practice to share with the field: Describe effective and/or innovative practices at your college for measuring ILOs, documenting accomplishment of ILOs in non-instructional areas of the college, informing college faculty, staff, students, and the public about ILOs, or other aspects of your ILO practice (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).</p> <p>MCC measures ILOs using multiple assessment methods to triangulate analysis. Faculty host graduating student focus groups to assess mastery of the ILOs. MCC also administers a graduation survey and the CCSSE to measure student perceptions of their learning. Finally, faculty assess ILOs through collaboratively designed rubrics in course-embedded assignments. The College documents non-instructional outcomes' progress in the internal tracking system and through student services and administrative divisional meetings. Two ILO success areas include the service learning program and student government council. In administrative units, MCC has developed a model to evaluate AUOs/ILOs apart from key performance indicators of program efficiency. MiraCosta's SLOAC collects, analyzes, and presents results to the college community at an annual assembly organized by the administration and SLOAC. MCC ran an "Assessment Day" where the entire college came together to evaluate results and improve practice. This work has resulted in new ways to capture, combine, and apply the data and develop new tools in instruction and student services. Students know MCC's ILO practices through course syllabi, the catalog, and classroom discussions.</p>	
<p>Each of the following narrative responses is limited to 250 words. As you develop your responses, please be mindful of success stories that can be reported in the last question of this section. We look forward to including this information from colleges in our report to the Commission and the field in June.</p>		
36.	<p>Please discuss alignment of student learning outcomes at your institution, from institutional and course to program level. Describe your activities beyond crosswalking or charting all outcomes to courses in a program (often called "mapping"), to analysis and implementation of alignment in the planning of curriculum and delivery of instruction. Discuss how the alignment effort has resulted in changes of expected outcomes and/or how students' programs of study have been clarified. Note whether the described practices apply to all instructional programs at the college (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).</p> <p>MCC expects each course SLO (CSLO) to be mapped to program (degree, certificate, or pathway) and ILOs. Information about their alignment and</p>	

	<p>an assessment of their degree of alignment are identified in an Assessment Documentation Matrix. Aligning each CSLO to ILOs has allowed MCC personnel to filter assessment data from various disciplines that apply to one specific ILO. Faculty discuss the combined data used to identify student success with respect to a program SLO (PSLO) or ILO and collectively review curriculum along with teaching and learning methods used. MCC's integrated planning model folds outcomes assessment results into program review for faculty decision-making and resource allocation. Discipline-level program improvement plans are mapped to program outcomes and the larger institutional objectives. This faculty interaction has played out in many ways across campus. For example, evaluation of SLO assessment data resulted in the recent addition of prerequisites being placed on some courses. Faculty expect both increased retention in these courses and greater student success in subsequent, related courses, which will potentially lead to greater program success in terms of degree or certificate completion.</p>
37.	<p>Describe the various communication strategies at your college to share SLO assessment results for usage by internal and external audiences. Explain how communications take into account how the information is expected to influence the behavior or decisions of particular audiences. Discuss how communication of student learning outcomes assessment information and results impacts student behavior and achievement (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).</p> <p>Instructors report CSLO and PSLO results to their colleagues at the beginning of each semester. Faculty develop action plans designed to improve student success in specific courses, and review previously implemented action plans. All full-time instructors have access to SLO assessment data for courses that lead to those degrees. MCC expects an annual interdepartmental discussion of results and program improvements. Recommended curriculum modifications are proposed; approved modifications are reflected in the official course outline of record. SLO modifications are proposed to SLOAC for approval; once approved, they are updated on SLOAC's website. Departments report program modifications through MCC's annual program review process. Semi-annual department chair meetings focus on the collaborative development ILO assessments. SLOAC sponsors faculty focus groups, professional development workshops, and college-wide assemblies. Topics include SLO measurability, authenticity, alignment, and alternative assessment processes. Instructors are embedding more authentic, direct assessments into their curriculum. Students become more aware of their instructor's expectations as assessments develop their skills to achieve mastery.</p>
38.	<p>Explain how dialog and reporting of SLO assessment results takes place at the departmental and institutional levels. Note whether practices involve all programs at the college. Illustrate how dialog and reporting impact program review, institutional planning, resource allocation, and institutional effectiveness (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).</p> <p>SLO assessment is one of the driving factors in the College's annual program review. Departmental discussions take place each semester on the results of course SLO assessment. These discussions lead to action plans, which are reported in the program review. When resources are requested to improve student success, they are reviewed and prioritized by MCC's Budget and Planning Committee (BPC), which is comprised of faculty, staff, and administrative representatives. Members of SLOAC participate on BPC, the Student Success Committee, and the Program Review Committee (IPRC) by explaining process changes to better report and integrate SLO assessment data into the program review process. For example, the SLO coordinator, Office of Institutional Effectiveness and IPRC are developing a separate review area in the program review forms to report SLO assessment results. This new area will streamline the reporting process and the College's ability to inform the community about program outcome results. Results of institution-wide SLO assessment also are used in developing objectives that are intended to improve institutional</p>

	effectiveness. These objectives are incorporated into MCC's integrated planning processes.
39.	<p>Please share with us two or three success stories about the impacts of SLO practices on student learning, achievement, and institutional effectiveness. Describe the practices which led to the success (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).</p> <p>Biology: General Biology faculty desired to improve SLO achievement by increasing consistency in instruction across sections. "Bio Showcases" shared successful teaching practices, archived for future use, especially by adjunct instructors. The department hired a full-time lead instructor and placed eligibility requirements on enrollment. The department has seen a 10 percent increase in the number of students achieving the course SLO benchmark. Automotive Tech: Assessment results revealed a need for more interactive electrical and engine performance related diagnostic skills. The department requested through program review specialized electronic test boards and laptop computers. The department realized immediate gains in student achievement. Theoretical comprehension is greatly improved by facilitating hands-on exercises to reinforce theory presented in lecture and text. Library: In response to community's information literacy needs, the library staff and faculty have created a website tutorial. The interactive website has successfully assisted online users in acquiring important research skills. Users of this website are also asked to take a survey as to their awareness of this ILO. (http://library.miracosta.edu/tutorial).</p>

Substantive Change Items

#	Question	Answer
40.	Number of submitted substantive change requests:	2012-13: 0 2011-12: 0 2010-11: 0
41a.	Is the institution anticipating a proposal for a substantive change in any of the following change categories? (Check all that apply)	Delivery mode (Distance Education or Correspondence Education)
41b.	Explain the change(s) for which you will be submitting a substantive change proposal:	The substantive change proposal was deemed appropriate by the Commission in the summer of 2013 and currently under review.

Other Information

#	Question	Answer
42a.	Identify site additions and deletions since the submission of the 2013 Annual Report:	None.
42b.	List all instructional sites other than the home campus where 50% or more of a program, certificate, or degree is offered:	San Elijo, Community Learning Center
43.	List all of the institution's instructional sites out of state and outside the United States:	None.

The data included in this report are certified as a complete and accurate representation of the

reporting institution.

If you need additional assistance, please contact the commission.

Sincerely,

ACCJC
10 Commercial Blvd., Suite 204
Novato, CA 94949
email: support@accjc.org
phone: 415-506-0234