Institutional Effectiveness Committee
10/05/06
Minutes

Guest: Leslie Shroyer

Denise Wells and Marge Wilson gave a welcome and opening remarks to the committee. Susan Oleson provided an opening exercise that included each member giving a comment about how their work is related to the institution’s responsibilities to COC-SACS (Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of College & Schools). Terri Manning presented a powerpoint (attached) overview of Institutional Effectiveness and SACS to orient committee members to the mission/ responsibility of the IE committee at CPCC. Committee members were asked to use this information as their guide to defining the committee’s direction for 2006-07.

Denise Wells and Marge Wilson presented the recommended committee objectives for 2006-07 and opened the floor to comments. The objectives were accepted and will be presented to the Strategic Planning Committee next week.

Members were asked for suggested meeting days/times. The next meeting will be in November, day and time TBA.
The meeting was adjourned at Noon.
Minutes for IE Committee Meeting November 7, 2006

Present: Jerri Haigler, Dwight Evans, Pat Emch, Terri Manning, Lynn Kilgore, Sally Whitten, Teresa Hall, Marge Wilson, Denise Wells

Marge Wilson handed out an Agenda along with a profile of the Action Report regarding the NC Accountability Measures. We also reviewed a Worksheet for each accountability measure which included the description, standard, how CPCC performed and indicated the proposed action plan. Marge asked that these worksheets be reviewed by committee members and when the committee meets next we will discuss strategies and recommendations to be applied to an action plan. The Action Plan must be submitted to the state based on the accountability measures that have not been met. The state is working on a template for us to follow and we should have that template within the next couple of weeks.

One item that the committee decided that needed immediate attention reflected Accountability measure #12-Program Enrollment. The measure states that a program must have an average of 10 students in a program enrolled over a three year period. This data is pulled from the ICR report that goes to the state on January 15th of each year. The conversion to Datatel has caused a problem with identifying primary program codes for students and at this point in time, Datatel lists several primary program codes for students. If this situation is not cleaned up before the data card goes to the state, we may have a problem with meeting this accountability measure in the future based on inaccurate Datatel data.

RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommended that ITS and Instruction be made aware of the possibility that this technical problem could cause us not to meet this accountability measure for next year.

The committee also looked at Accountability measure #9 which looks at curriculum student retention. Even though this benchmark was passed last year, it was the first time that the measure was met. Denise passed out a listing of the courses with the highest enrollments compared to those classes with the highest negative completions. The committee decided that it would look at this data and start to ask some poignant questions as to how we can improve retention. Denise and Marge will meet with different areas of the college to collect information from other committees that are working on this issue. It was decided that the committee will make recommendations based on evidence based data and further collaboration with college-wide committees by the spring of 2007.

Meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Denise H. Wells
Minutes of IE Meeting
Wednesday
January 26, 2006
10:30 am to 12:00 pm

Present: Mona Baker, Terri Manning, Debbie Bouton, Mary-lynn Mitchell, Susan Oleson, Marge Wilson, Jean Hardy, Sue Mulligan, Libby Vagnoni, Mitchell Hagler
Guest: Rita Dawkins

Rita Dawkins was invited to the meeting to answer questions that the group had about Advising and Counseling services. She also informed us about the Transfer Resource Center that will be opening in February.

Terri handed out a data sheet regarding the top 10 classes at the college with regard to grades, drops and withdrawals. After much discussion, it was decided that the group will get back together on March 2nd to investigate strategies for the future.

I am also attaching the “Top 10 classes” sheet with the percentages included.

Respectfully submitted,

Denise H. Wells, Chairperson
IE Committee
Meeting Minutes from
IE Committee
February 27, 2007
2:00 to 3:30

Present:  M. Wilson, D. Wells, S.Whitten, L.Kilgore, L.Alexander,T.Manning,H.Hall
S.Oleson, Mary-lynn Mitchell, A.Capobianchi, A.Burns, E.Olenik,
Absent:  M.Brooks, D.Evans, R.Wertz, M.Baker, L.Kilgore, J.Burkes, P.Emch,
H.Kolman, A.McIntosh, G.Rubio-Festa, J.JHaigler,

Jim Bazan presented information from the retention committee findings.
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Part I- Institutional Effectiveness Committee Objectives for 2006-07

Objective One was to develop specific outcomes based recommendations on meeting State accountability measures: #5-Performance of college transfer students, #7-Success rate of developmental studies students in subsequent courses, #12-Program enrollment, #9 Curriculum student retention and graduation.

The second committee objective was to initiate collaboration with other college committees investigating student retention issues with the specific objective to develop a document that defines the unique focus of each committee’s work on retention and, as a result of the findings, refine the focus of the IE committee’s work on retention.

The committee’s third objective was to identify and implement a system for presentation of completed program reviews as appropriate to the college community. This will include presentation of completed reviews to the IE committee once the reviews are approved by Instruction. The IE committee will focus specifically on the student outcomes elements of program reviews. The IE committee will review composite reports on selected sections of program reviews to evaluate the efficacy of program reviews.
Part II – Recommendations for State Accountability Measures from 2005-06

Role of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee with regard to State Accountability Measures
Traditionally, the CPCC Institutional Effectiveness Committee makes recommendations to the Learning Unit concerning suggested actions the college could take to address deficiencies indicated by the results of our performance on the Accountability measures. These suggested actions become the core of the action report sent to the State.

Goal of the IE Committee
This is a transition year for Accountability measures at the State level. Each measure has been reviewed and a new list of measures will be implemented next year. As a result, the State has not requested an action report from colleges in response to the 2005-06 accountability measure results. However, the IE committee made the decision to submit recommendations on the existing accountability measures. We do this because it seems appropriate for the institution to respond internally to the data we received from the State for 2005-06.

CPCC Performance on State Accountability Measures
In July 2006 CPCC received the results of our performance on the State Accountability measures. The 12 accountability measures are a group of measures reported on for each NC community college and are considered indicators of our success as an institution. Usually the State requests that each college submit an action plan to address any accountability measures not met.

Action of the IE Committee
In fall 2006, the committee identified accountability measures not met by the college in the 2005-2006. Four measures were identified for study and to give recommendations for suggested actions.

As a first step the committee determined college initiatives already in place or planned for 06-07 that would positively impact each unmet measure. The committee then reviewed the initiatives in place and evaluated the impact of the current initiatives and the potential need for additional work in order for the college to meet each accountability measure for next year. The committee’s conclusions are in the form of recommendations for suggested actions as a response to each unmet measure.

The committee studied:
Accountability measure #5 – Performance of College Transfer Students
Accountability measure #7 - Success Rate of Developmental Students in Subsequent College-level Courses
Accountability measure #9 Curriculum Student Retention and Graduation
Accountability measure #12- Program Enrollment
Recommendation for Accountability measure #5 Performance of College Transfer Students

The number and scope of college transfer initiatives collectively appear to the committee to be a significant response by the college this year to improve the success of college transfer students and the data reported on this accountability measure.

The college established a Transfer Resource Center in 2006 that focuses on serving CPCC students who intend to transfer to a senior institution. The Transfer Fair and Transfer Tuesdays are two events of the TRC that support transfer students. Also, staff from the Transfer Resource Center plans a research study focused on developmental students who transfer to UNCC. The results of this study should assist in developing strategies to assist the students in this cohort.

Second, the college made the decision to become a member of the National Direct Student Loan Clearinghouse. This clearinghouse will provide CPCC with transfer data from institutions outside the NC State University system. Inclusion of this data is expected to significantly increase CPCC’s results on the measure of performance of college transfer students.

Another project is in the initial stages and involves CPCC Sociology faculty and UNCC Sociology faculty. This project is very targeted toward the success of students who transfer from CPCC to UNCC as Sociology majors.

For more specific information on these initiatives please see appendix A.

The IE committee recommends continuation of these initiatives and supports the possible expansion of current initiatives. The committee further suggests that through these initiatives the college has responded to this unmet measure, no further initiatives are suggested for the specific purpose of responding to this unmet accountability measure.

Recommendation for Accountability measure #7-Success Rate of Developmental Students in Subsequent College-level Courses

The committee suggests continuation of the studies and initiatives currently underway that support developmental student success in subsequent courses.

Current initiatives directly related to this measure include: the Math Division tested modifying their grading practice to match other Divisions. In spring semester Math instructors assigned a W grade to students who “stop attending”
rather than an F grade. It’s anticipated this will make a positive difference in the data for this accountability measure.

Also, the Math Division has implemented a process to assure consistency of instructors. The Math Division assigns an instructor to teach both developmental and transfer level math courses. This allows instructors to be familiar with issues as students progress from developmental to transfer level math courses. This is expected to enhance developmental student success in Math transfer level courses.

The expansion of Learning Communities during 2006-07 is another initiative expected to positively affect the success of developmental students in subsequent courses.

As with the recommendation for accountability #5 it appears to the committee the college is engaged in significant projects this year and for 2007-08 designed to enhance the success of developmental students as they move into college level courses. No further initiatives are suggested for the specific purpose of responding to this unmet accountability measure.

**Recommendation for Accountability measure #9-Curriculum Student Retention and Graduation**

The committee recognizes the excellent work of the college’s Retention Committee. The final report of the Retention Committee was reviewed by the full IE committee. The IE committee supports the recommendations presented in the Retention Committee report.

In addition the IE committee chairs interviewed the chairs and sub-committee chairs of other college-wide committees working with student retention. The IE Committee perceives there are significant initiatives and studies either in progress or recommended as it relates to retention, in particular, retention within a course and some initiatives related to graduation rate. However, there seems to be much less attention to student retention term to term. Therefore, the committee suggests for future action in 2007-08 that the IE committee develop specific recommendations to address curriculum student retention term to term as measured by Accountability measure #9 or its equivalent in the revised accountability measures.

**Recommendation for Accountability measure #12-Program Enrollment**

The committee suggests the college continue to monitor curriculum program enrollments even though this accountability measure will be eliminated as of next year.

State data will not be reported to community colleges on program enrollment in the future however, we recognize the importance of program enrollment to the viability of programs and so we suggest Planning & Research provide program enrollment data to the Learning Unit on a regular schedule. This will allow the
Learning Unit to take appropriate action in regard to program continuation, growth, termination, etc.

It is proposed that internally CPCC continue to use the standard set forth in the State Accountability measure (three-year average program enrollment of 10 students) as a benchmark of program success. CPCC will monitor this with the following process. The Learning Unit will review program enrollment data both by semester and annually. This data will be provided by Planning & Research in a spreadsheet that provides semester data for the current year, and annual data on a three year cycle with a projected three-year average. The Learning Unit will evaluate to determine the appropriate action if the data suggests a curriculum program will not meet the benchmark of a three-year average program enrollment of 10 students.

Program Reviews

The Committee