



## Institutional Effectiveness Committee

### MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015  
2:30 PM in the Board Room

Members Attending: Dr. Walter Bartlett, Wayne Cohan, Lisa Cooley, Lisa Covington, Rick Farmer, Dr. Joyce Johnson, Brandy Loftis, Cristian McLaughlin, Lionel Parker, Dr. Jeffry Paton, Lee Proctor, Richard Self, Shelly Stone

Members Absent: Dr. Doris Carver, Carolyn Funderburk (*excused*), Debra Harlow

---

Dr. Paton called the meeting to order at 2:36 PM.

**Action Item:** 2015-15 Institutional Effectiveness Plan

Dr. Paton introduced discussion of the IE Plan, briefly describing the contents of the Plan required by North Carolina legislative mandate and by SACSCOC. In addition, Dr. Paton explained that annual approval of the Plan by the IE Committee included, by incorporation in the Plan, approval of the revised College Mission, Values, Vision, and the new PCC 2015-2020 Strategic Plan.

Dr. Johnson inquired about curriculum programs for which the criteria for success are far exceeded by student outcomes performance year after year. The question sparked a lively discussion about setting the success criteria. Dr. Paton recalled that many of the current performance targets were set during the reaffirmation of accreditation process without much discussion. Lisa Covington shared that her recollection of how performance targets were set was somewhat different. The 70% criterion reflected a substantial portion of the area under a normal bell curve surrounding the desired indicator of success. As a result, many of the criteria for success were set at 70% because that is the theoretical passing grade for coursework. Dr. Paton added that he has advised curriculum coordinators that effective criteria should be sampling student performance at the margin of what students are learning in a course or program.

Dr. Johnson observed that most of the student learning outcomes (SLO) assessments included more years of results than the service area outcomes (SAO) assessments. Dr. Paton explained that the majority of SAO assessments were composed during the reaffirmation of accreditation process in AY 2012-13, so fewer years of results have accumulated. Dr. Johnson noted that having multiple years of results for both types of outcomes was helpful for identifying of trends in the outcomes. Dr. Paton added that awareness of typical year-to-year variation in the results was helpful for determining when a result was unusually higher or lower.

Dr. Johnson commented that some of the assessment results included percentages only while others also included the numbers of students upon which the percentages are based. Dr. Paton reported that his efforts to encourage more consistent reporting of both the percentages and the numbers is ongoing. Dr. Paton added that the underlying student numbers are important to distinguish wide variation in the assessment results reflecting very small student numbers.

Dr. Johnson directed attention to two entries for Assessment Results for the Healthcare Management Technology program. The first item indicated that 12 of 19 students achieved the criterion for success for an outcome, but “The remaining students did not attempt/do the assignment.” The second item indicated that an outcome was not assessed because the course in which the assessment had been embedded was removed from the program. Dr. Bartlett commented that it would be interesting to know if the program had changed so much that the outcome that was not assessed was no longer needed or if the assessment of that outcome had moved to another program. Dr. Johnson encouraged follow-up on these items: (1) to understand how/why students could avoid the first assessment, and (2) to determine whether the outcome for the second was determined to be unnecessary or whether the assessment would be moved to a different course. Dr. Johnson observed that SACSCOC reviewers would be likely to focus on these types of unresolved issues if included in the Fifth Year Report. Dr. Paton acknowledged awareness of the items Dr. Johnson pointed out and agreed that avoiding these unanswered issues in SACSCOC submissions is critical. Dr. Paton added that the minimum of three years’ worth of assessment results required for the Fifth Year Report would probably include this year (2015-16) and the next two academic years (2016-17) and (2017-18).

Lisa Cooley reminded the group that we, as a College, are very “young” in terms of the whole assessment process. Dr. Bartlett observed that outcomes assessment has “come a very long way” since his arrival at the College, and commented that the benefits of sustained assessment efforts by staff and faculty are reflected in the maturing assessment process on this campus.

Dr. Paton reported that he had become aware of a number of minor typographical errors and one more significant error that he and Lee Proctor discovered among the assessments for a department in Student Development: the assessment results for 2013-14 and for 2014-15 were simply reversed. Dr. Paton assured committee members that these errors would be corrected and invited the members to recommend the 2015-16 IE Plan to the Executive Council for submission to the Board of Trustees.

**Lee Proctor introduced a motion to recommend the 2015-16 Institutional Effectiveness Plan to the Executive Council with the corrections identified. Richard Self seconded the motion. After brief general discussion, Richard Self called the question. The IE Committee members present voted unanimously to recommend the Plan to the Executive Council. This recommendation includes a recommendation for approval of the revised College Mission, Values, and Vision, as well as the new PCC 2015-2020 Strategic Plan.**

Dr. Paton adjourned the meeting at 3:29 PM.