



230 South LaSalle Street, Suite 7-500  
Chicago, IL 60604  
312.263.0456 | 800.621.7440  
Fax: 312.263.7462 | [hlcommission.org](http://hlcommission.org)

August 1, 2023

Dr. James Genandt  
President/CEO  
Manhattan Area Technical College  
3136 Dickens Ave.  
Manhattan, KS 66503-2499

Dear President Genandt:

Manhattan Area Technical College's interim report has been reviewed. The staff analysis of the report is attached.

On behalf of the Higher Learning Commission, staff received the report on assessment of student learning outcomes.

No further reports are required.

The institution's next Mid-Cycle Review is scheduled for 9/16/2024.

The institution's next reaffirmation of accreditation is scheduled for 2030-31.

For more information on the interim report process, contact HLC at [interimreports@hlcommission.org](mailto:interimreports@hlcommission.org).  
Your HLC staff liaison is Jeffrey Rosen.

Thank you,  
Higher Learning Commission

cc: Sarah Phillips, Accreditation Liaison Officer  
Jeffrey Rosen, HLC Staff Liaison

**STAFF ANALYSIS OF INSTITUTIONAL REPORT**

DATE: 7/30/2023

STAFF LIAISON: Jeffrey Rosen

REVIEWED BY: Lee Bash

**INSTITUTION:** Manhattan Area Technical College, Manhattan, KS**EXECUTIVE OFFICER:** James Genandt, President/CEO**PREVIOUS HLC ACTION AND SOURCES:**

A report on assessment of student learning incomes (4B).

**REPORT PRESENTATION AND QUALITY:** The Manhattan Area Technical College interim report is a seven-page narrative that is organized around subsections addressing concerns specified in the Interim Report Focus section from the 2021 HLC Final Team Report. Each subsection begins with a paragraph from the final report detailing interim report requirements. Therefore, the interim report is well-organized, responsive, and thorough. Its design ensures that all aspects requested in the Team Report have been addressed. In addition to the narrative, the interim report also contains six appendix citations that total 218 pages supporting and providing evidence to the information contained in the narrative.

**REPORT SUMMARY:** The Manhattan Area Technical College interim report, as noted above, is designed to respond to a specific area of concern expressed in the Team Report. Accordingly, this summary will use the heading for each subsection to describe the content in order to capture the work in its entirety. The first section is titled, “Documentation with data and analysis of changes resulting from assessment results,” The institutional response begins by addressing May 2021 prior to the comprehensive visit, when the institution “acknowledged the need to adapt the assessment process to the entire institution.” This allowed additional time to respond to this concern and through a collaborative effort, the institution developed a process for assessment of the core abilities in dual enrollment courses and the Adult Learning GED programs during the fall 2021 semester. As supported by an appendix citation, the process was piloted and fully implemented for the fall 2022 term. This subsection also notes a change in procedure when the institution created an encompassing Annual Assessment Report that included the model and data for each of the four parts of the model, that was intended to allow relevant stakeholders to view the assessment results holistically. This initiative continues to expand and evolve, in terms of how it is utilized today.

The next section is titled, “Documentation demonstrating that the data collected through the Student Satisfaction and Course Evaluation Surveys.” The response begins by noting that the institution administers the Student Satisfaction Survey each spring term. Relevant faculty and committees review survey questions and provide feedback prior to administering the survey each year. The subsection provides examples of changes made to questions within the survey. After the survey is completed each spring, senior administrators review the results before writing brief reports noting their responses to data and recommendations for change. When necessary, recommendations for follow up are noted. Also, the Faculty Senate review portions of the Student Satisfaction Survey to determine how “faculty can participate in campus-wide initiatives to enhance student satisfaction.” Examples of these processes and the accompanying document modifications are provided within the extensive appendices. A final portion of this subsection addresses academic course evaluations that are administered each fall and spring term for any faculty or adjunct teaching 3 or more students. The current course evaluation was developed by a sub-

committee of the Assessment Committee and at the end of each term, once final grades are submitted, and then, instructors meet with their Deans to receive and review results of the course evaluations.

The next subsection is titled “Documentation of the assessment of the Co-Curricular outcomes in Co-Curricular Activities.” The subsection begins by noting that the institution has adopted a definition of “co-curricular” that refers to activities, programs and learning experiences that reinforce the institution’s mission, vision, and values while complementing the formal curriculum. This led to three areas of co-curricular assessment: student engagement, student enrichment, and student leadership, however due to complications, particularly COVID-19, the institution struggled and needed to find new methods to function within new structures and expectations.

The institution began with an action best described as “transformative” since new training to faculty and staff began on co-curricular outcomes. The institution focused on student engagement, as an important factor, created two additional surveys, broadened the amount of activities and actions associated with co-curricular and, in general arrived at a “more robust continuous improvement process,” supported by an Annual Assessment Report “to look at assessment results for an academic year as a whole.” In closing this subsection, the institution asserts that its “Assessment Committee is also expanding plans to use this report to launch a follow-up process.”

The next section is titled, “Documentation of the assessment of Core Ability outcomes in dual enrollment and courses offered at off-campus locations.” This subsection begins by noting that in the fall 2021, the institution began a development and trial process for core abilities assessment in dual enrollment courses, along with the GED program in the Adult Learning Center. The core abilities include oral communication, written communication, critical thinking/problem solving, and quantitative literacy. A pilot was developed to test core ability assessment implementation in the spring 2022 term. Various stakeholders assessed the pilot, and the module was adjusted based on the feedback provided by all parties before retesting. The process was implemented in fall 2022 while continuing to be analyzed to obtain follow up activities designed to further improve the process during spring 2023. At the end of the term, faculty will review action items to assess status and effectiveness.

The next subsection is titled, “Documentation of the assessment of learning outcomes in the program in the Adult Learning Center, including GED and adult basic education courses/programs.” At the start of the fall 2021 semester, the assessment committee and Adult Education instructors began implementing core abilities assessment for the program, but given some factors that reflect the more unconventional aspects of Adult Education, after two trial terms, the data collected and students assessed were unable to provide an accurate picture of the students’ skills in the program, though the institution remains committed to continue use of the state-controlled platform for assessment of student success. In addition, in the spring of 2022, ESL became involved in this process as well. Training for ESL faculty that included the overall context for the institution’s assessment plan, best practices shared from other faculty and programs, and technical training Canvas to support the college-wide assessment rubric and further faculty reflection. The subsection concludes with the observation that, “Continuous support is provided to the ESL team and all Manhattan Tech faculty, through Assessment Committee mentors as well as the IDDE Coordinator.”

The final subsection is titled, “Evidence that MATC has clearly defined how its General Education Outcomes are related to its curriculum and fit within its overall assessment efforts.” This subsection begins by indicating that it is coordinated by the Kansas Board of Regents, with what the institution is authorized to provide and the limits that are placed on it, in regards to general education curriculum. As a result, the institution uses the concept of core abilities designed to enhance students’ critical thinking, problem solving, and communication skills in their technical and general education courses. But since the HLC team report, the Assessment Committee, administration, and campus community have had extensive conversations, assisted by relevant research, to achieve an updated General Philosophy, a General Education program

review, and increased involvement of General Education faculty in processing core abilities. The institution confirms that it believes that general education concepts should be integrated and woven throughout the technical curriculum to provide students with a “foundation for lifelong learning.” As a result, four core abilities have been identified as the general education outcomes. The institution believes these skills are essential and necessary to ensure success in life and in the workplace. The four core abilities include quantitative literacy, critical thinking/problem solving, oral communication, and written communication. As noted previously in this summary, these four core components are not new to the institution, but they generated further and deeper, more meaningful conversations among all stakeholders that resulted in the use of institution-wide rubrics. The institution has continued to expand the use of shared data, program reviews, and data, for a. specific department data and outcomes, compared with overall data used in the past.

**REPORT ANALYSIS:** The Manhattan Area Technical College interim report has been careful and intentional about responding with great detail and focus on the charges articulated by the team report from its 2021 visit. The material provided is extensive, comprehensive, and appropriately detailed, since the interim report is extensive and somewhat complex. The responses are clear and unambiguous so that they fully satisfy the expectations noted by the team report. The interim report makes especially clear that the community of stakeholders have participated in extensive discussions, resulting in some transformation but also some affirmations that relate back to the institution when the HLC visit took place. The result appears to be a much stronger institution that has a better sense of how it is responding to the areas of focus identified by the team.

**ANALYSIS CONCLUDING STATEMENT:** The Manhattan Area Technical College interim report serves as a reminder that all institutions of higher education are not simple products of a cookie cutter approach. The document reinforces that there are some rather unique aspects of the institution’s operation, with controls and expectations from the state that are not as likely to be encountered by other institutions. While this situation poses some original challenges for the institution to resolve, this report makes it clear that it has managed, while also presenting solutions to HLC that appear to serve it well as it prepares for its next HLC visit next year. As the institution continues to refine the work it has already accomplished in this area, it’s responses for the next visit will be strengthened significantly and serve the institution well. Good luck.

**STAFF FINDING:**

Note the relevant Criterion, Core Component(s) or Assumed Practice(s) 4.B.

Statements of Analysis (check one below)

- ☒ Evidence demonstrates adequate progress in the area of focus.
- ☐ Evidence demonstrates that further organizational attention is required in the area of focus.
- ☐ Evidence demonstrates that further organizational attention and HLC follow-up are required.
- ☐ Evidence is insufficient and a HLC focused visit is warranted.

**STAFF ACTION:** Receive the report on assessment of student learning outcomes.

No further reports are required.

The institution’s next Mid-Cycle Review is scheduled for 9/16/2024.

The institution’s next reaffirmation of accreditation is scheduled for 2030-31.

