Institutional Effectiveness Committee

MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, September 29, 2016
3:00 PM in the Board Room

Members Attending: Dr. Walter Bartlett, Richard Self, Dr. Libbie McPhaul-Moore, Carolyn Funderburk,
Lisa Cooley, Lisa Covington, Stephen DeSimone, Kathy Duncan, Dr. Jeffry Paton

Members Absent: Dr. Doris Carver, Dr. Joyce Johnson, Debra Harlow, Shelly Stone, Joelle Carter,
Rick Farmer, Libia Gaviria

Dr. Paton called the meeting to order at 3:03 PM and invited the committee members present to introduce themselves.

Paton then shared a brief history of the Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Plan initially required by action of the State Legislature in 1989. Paton described the principal required components of the IE Plan: (1) compliance with requirements of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC), and (2) collecting and monitoring data for the annual NC Community Colleges System (NCCCS) report, *Performance Measures for Student Success.* Paton briefly recounted the evolution through multiple versions of the NCCCS report, beginning with the original *Critical Success Factors* reports, then the *Performance Measures* reports, and finally the current *Performance Measures for Student Success* employed in the performance-based funding model.

Dr. Paton reminded the Committee that their review of the IE Plan included, by incorporation in the Plan, review and approval (or approval with revisions) of the College Mission, Values, and Vision, as well as the College goals and objectives of PCC 2015-2020 Strategic Plan. Paton also explained his decision to reduce the length of the IE Plan this year, inserting fewer examples of the outcomes assessments.

Dr. Paton invited questions and/or suggestions about the Plan from the Committee members present. The general discussion that ensued comprised multiple observations, comments, questions, general suggestions, and typographical corrections:

- Kathy Duncan questioned the licensure pass rate, because it was lower than her recollection of the Nursing pass rate. Drs. Bartlett and Paton explained that the rate was based on results of several different first-time licensure and certification exams, not just the Nursing exam, and some of the other results pulled the overall average down.

- Responding to an observation by Dr. Paton about increasing performance targets, Stephen DeSimone inquired whether it is always appropriate to raise a target simply because nearly everyone achieved the target performance year after year, especially if the content of the learning outcome is unchanged. Dr. Bartlett offered that elevating the performance level might be proper even if the content of the SLO does not change. Dr. Paton clarified the typical two-part statement of performance targets, according to which: (1) a target percentage of enrolled students expected to achieve a level of performance (2) the actual target level (a percentage or other numerical rating) for

performance of an exercise, examination, paper, or other course activity. Paton asserted that raising the 2nd target rating might be advisable to ensure that the assessment is sampling student achievement nearer the "boundary" of what students are learning, particularly if nearly all students are regularly exceeding the current target.

- Dr. Paton recalled frequent faculty comments about the assessment process rather than the courses and programs being assessed in the SLO assessment reports he received as recently as 2-3 years ago, and shared a sense of relief that assessment competence at PCC has out-grown this early habit. Lisa Cooley observed that the improving quality of faculty discussions about SLO assessment results reflects the growing sophistication of assessment efforts at the College, together with increasing faculty willingness and comfort levels discussing assessment. Ms. Cooley emphasized the contributions of these faculty conversations to improving teaching and learning. Ms. Cooley also expressed enthusiasm about the explanation of interpolation on the final page of the IE Plan.)

- Referring to Dr. Paton's earlier comments about shortening the IE Plan, Stephen DeSimone asked whether simply including in the IE Plan examples of Service Area Outcomes (SAO) assessments and Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) assessments was sufficient to satisfy the SACSCOC reviewers. Dr. Paton explained that the intent of the IE Plan is simply to illustrate the processes used for outcomes assessments, to demonstrate that the assessments address the College mission, goals, and objectives and that the results are used to improve services, teaching, and learning. Our Compliance Certification reports for the decennial reaffirmation of accreditation and for the Fifth-Year Interim report include the SAO and SLO assessment plans and results for all service departments and academic programs. Dr. Bartlett added that the SACSCOC reviewers are most interested to determine that the assessment activities we actually execute are consistent with our description of the assessment processes—that we do what we claim we do.

Action Item: Approval of the 2016-17 Institutional Effectiveness Plan

Committee Action: Following the general discussion Dr. Paton reviewed the IE Plan page-by-page identifying the corrections and/or revisions requested by members of the Committee. After reviewing these amendments, Paton invited Committee action about the Plan.

1. Lisa Cooley introduced a motion to recommend the 2016-17 IE Plan, as amended, to the Executive Council for approval and submission to the Board of Trustees.

2. Libbie McPhaul-Moore seconded the motion.

3. Dr. Paton invited additional discussion. Hearing none, Dr. Paton asked for a vote.

4. The IE Committee members present voted unanimously to recommend the 2016-17 Institutional Effectiveness Plan, as amended, to the Executive Council.

Dr. Paton adjourned the meeting at 3:38 PM.

GJP/ms