

**Performance Funding Annual Report  
2005-2006**

**Points Awarded: 93 out of 100**

**Summary of Points Awarded**

<b>STANDARD ONE - Student Learning Environment and Outcomes</b>		<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>
<b>Standard 1.A:</b>	Student Learning - General Education	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Standard 1.B:</b>	Student Learning - Major Field Assessment	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Standard 1.C.1:</b>	Accreditation - Academic Programs	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Standard 1.C.2:</b>	Undergraduate Program Review	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>STANDARD TWO - Student Satisfaction</b>			
<b>Standard 2.A:</b>	Student Engagement Survey (CCSSE)	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>STANDARD THREE - Student Persistence</b>			
<b>Standard 3.A:</b>	Retention and Persistence	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Standard 3.B:</b>	Student Success	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Standard 3.C:</b>	Student Persistence Planning Initiative	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>STANDARD FOUR - State Master Plan Priorities</b>			
<b>Standard 4.A:</b>	Institutional Strategic Planning	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Standard 4.B:</b>	State Strategic Planning	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Standard 4.C:</b>	Job Placement	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>STANDARD FIVE - Assessment Outcomes</b>			
<b>Standard 5.A:</b>	Assessment Pilot	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Standard 5.B:</b>	Assessment Implementation	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
2005-06 Performance Funding Report  
Standard 1.A: Student Learning - General Education**

**Roane State Community College**

**Points Requested: 15**

**Test Type: Academic Profile**

**Graduates Tested: All or Sample? All**

**Total Eligible Graduates: 665**

**No. Graduates Tested: 626**

**Percent Tested: 94%**

**-10 Cycle Data Trends**

Mean Score	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Institution	442.9				
National	440.8				
Diff (I-N)	2.1				
% Institution to National Average	100.0%				

**Institutional Comments (Optional):**

A copy of institutional scores is provided.

<u>Percent</u>	<u>Points</u>
0	0
69%	0
70%	1
71%	1
72%	2
73%	2
74%	3
75%	3
76%	4
77%	4
78%	5
79%	5
80%	6
81%	6
82%	7
83%	7
84%	8
85%	8
86%	9
87%	9
88%	9
89%	10
90%	10
91%	10
92%	11
93%	11
94%	12
95%	12
96%	13
97%	13
98%	14
99%	14
100%	15

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
2005-06 Performance Funding Report  
Standard 1.B: Student Learning - Major Field Assessment**

**Roane State Community College**

**Points Requested: 10**

Major Code	Major Name	Degree	Test Year	Test Code	No. Grads	No. Tested	% Tested	Inst. Score	Comp. Score	% Inst to Comparison Score
1 31.51.0602.00	DENTAL HYGIENE TECHNOLOGY*	2.3.AAS	Annually	42	12	12	100.0%	89.1	75	100.0%
2 31.51.0806.00	PHYSICAL THERAPY ASSISTANT*	2.3.AAS	Annually	34	14	14	100.0%	100	74.88	100.0%
3 31.51.0907.00	RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY*	2.3.AAS	Annually	36	35	35	100.0%	86.9	75	100.0%
4 31.51.1601.00	NURSING *	2.3.AAS	Annually	29	109	109	100.0%	93.58	82.8	100.0%
5 31.51.1801.00	OPTICIANRY*	2.3.AAS	Annually	62	17	15	88.2%	80.33	70	100.0%
6 31.51.0707.00	MEDICAL RECORDS TECHNOLOGY	2.3.AAS	2005-2006	37	3	3	100.0%	104.67	90.21	100.0%
7 27.43.0107.00	CRIMINAL JUSTICE	2.3.AAS	2007-2008	1						
8 32.52.0201.01	BUSINESS MANAGEMENT TECH	2.3.AAS	2007-2008	1						
9 32.52.0299.01	CONTEMPORARY MANAGEMENT	2.3.AAS	2007-2008	1						
10 12.19.0706.00	EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION	2.3.AAS	2009-2010	TBD						
11 14.22.0302.00	LEGAL ASSISTING	2.3.AAS	2009-2010	1						

**190 188 99% 89.982 75.536 119%**

\* Licensure programs are required to be tested annually.

**Associate Programs Exempt from Major Field Assessment**

Major Code	Major Name	Degree	Exemption
1 15.23.1101.00	TECHNICAL COMMUNICATIONS	2.3.AAS	07
2 27.44.0201.00	SOCIAL SERVICES	2.3.AAS	07
3 31.51.1004.00	MEDICAL LABORATORY TECH	2.3.AAS	07
4 16.24.0102.02	PROFESSIONAL STUDIES	2.3.AAS	07
5 31.51.2202.00	ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH TECH	2.3.AAS	07
6 32.52.0401.00	OFFICE INFORMATION TECH	2.3.AAS	07
7 28.45.0702.00	GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEMS	2.3.AAS	07
8 31.51.0803.00	OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY ASST.	2.3.AAS	07
9 31.51.0908.00	RESPIRATORY THERAPY	2.3.AAS	07
10 16.24.0101.01	GENERAL EDUCATION	2.3.AA, AS	10
11 13.21.0101.01	GENERAL TECHNOLOGY	2.3.AAS	10

**Exemption Codes**  
01 - New Program  
04 -- Phase out  
07 - Low producing  
10 - Interdisciplinary or Multidisciplinary

**Institutional Comments (Optional):**

**Dental Hygiene Program:** All 12 graduates for this reporting period passed the National Board of Dental Hygiene examination on the first attempt. A score of 75 is passing. Supporting documentation is included.

**Physical Therapy Assistant Program:** There were 14 graduates that took the Federation of State Boards of Physical Therapy examination; 12 passed on the first attempt (institutional first-time pass rate =85.71) and the remaining 2 passed on the second attempt. The 2005 national pass rate is 74.88%. Supporting documentation is included.

**Radiologic Technology Program:** All 35 graduates passed the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists examination on the first attempt, with a total mean scaled score of 86.9. A total scaled score of 75 or greater is required to pass. Supporting documentation is included.

**Nursing Program:** There were 109 graduates that took the National Council Licensure Examination for Registered Nurses; 102 passed the exam on the first attempt (pass rate = 93.58) and the remaining 7 passed on the second attempt. Please note there is no fixed percentage for a passing exam score. NCLEX scores are reported on a pass/fail basis. The national first attempt pass rate is 82.8 and 42.6% for second attempts. A graduate's score is determined by comparing the individual's performance to an established standard for safe and effective entry-level nursing practice. Supporting documentation is included.

**Opticianry Program:** There were 17 graduates and 15 have taken the National Opticianry Competency Examination (NOCE) and all have passed the exam except for one student. A passing score of 70 is required on this exam. The remaining three (one second attempt) graduates will be taking the exam at the next available test date (Nov. 19, 2006). These scores will be forwarded upon receipt. Documentation is included.

**Medical Records Technology Program (Health Information Technology):** All three graduates passed the Registered Health Information Technical examination. Supporting documentation is included.

Percent	Points
0	0
69%	0
70%	1
74%	1
75%	2
78%	2
79%	3
81%	3
82%	4
84%	4
85%	5
87%	5
88%	6
90%	6
91%	7
93%	7
94%	8
96%	8
97%	9
99%	9
100%	10

ENTER PROGRAM INFORMATION HERE

Institution:

Program name:

Test name:

Test type:   
(P=pass rate or leave blank)

National Mean/  
Pass Rate:

OR

Previous Mean/  
Pass Rate:

Begin entering  
scores here ==>

<input type="text" value="80"/>	1
<input type="text" value="89"/>	2
<input type="text" value="82"/>	3
<input type="text" value="80"/>	4
<input type="text" value="86"/>	5
<input type="text" value="92"/>	6
<input type="text" value="88"/>	7
<input type="text" value="105"/>	8
<input type="text" value="89"/>	9
<input type="text" value="91"/>	10
<input type="text" value="83"/>	11
<input type="text" value="104"/>	12
<input type="text"/>	13
<input type="text"/>	14
<input type="text"/>	15
<input type="text"/>	16
<input type="text"/>	17
<input type="text"/>	18
<input type="text"/>	19
<input type="text"/>	20
<input type="text"/>	21
<input type="text"/>	22
<input type="text"/>	23
<input type="text"/>	24
<input type="text"/>	25
<input type="text"/>	26
<input type="text"/>	27
<input type="text"/>	28
<input type="text"/>	29
<input type="text"/>	30
<input type="text"/>	31
<input type="text"/>	32
<input type="text"/>	33
<input type="text"/>	34
<input type="text"/>	35
<input type="text"/>	36
<input type="text"/>	37
<input type="text"/>	38
<input type="text"/>	39
<input type="text"/>	40
<input type="text"/>	41
<input type="text"/>	42
<input type="text"/>	43
<input type="text"/>	44
<input type="text"/>	45
<input type="text"/>	46
<input type="text"/>	47
<input type="text"/>	48
<input type="text"/>	49
<input type="text"/>	50
<input type="text"/>	51

MAJOR FIELD TEST RESULTS	
Institution:	Roane
Program name:	Dental Health Tech
Test Name:	Test Code 42
Test Type:	Pass Rate
Number of student scores:	12
National Mean/Pass Rate:	75
OR	
Previous Mean/Pass Rate:	#N/A
Institutional Mean:	89.08
Inst'l Mean - Nat'l Mean:	14.08
Final Score:	
Final Score (Pass Rate):	
<b>% Inst to Comparision Score</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

	52	
	53	
	54	
	55	
	56	
	57	
	58	
	59	
	60	
	61	
	62	
	63	
	64	
	65	
	66	
	67	
	68	
	69	
	70	
	71	
	72	
	73	
	74	
	75	
	76	
	77	
	78	
	79	
	80	
	81	
	82	
	83	
	84	
	85	
	86	
	87	
	88	
	89	
	90	
	91	
	92	
	93	
	94	
	95	
	96	
	97	
	98	
	99	
	100	
	101	
	102	
	103	
	104	
	105	0
	106	0
	107	0
	108	0
	109	0
	110	0
	111	0
	112	0
	113	0
	114	0
	115	0
	116	0
	117	0
	118	0
	119	0
	120	0
	121	0
	122	0
	123	0
	124	0
	125	0
	126	0

127		0
128		0
129		0
130		0
131		0
132		0
133		0
134		0
135		0
136		0
137		0
138		0
139		0
140		0
141		0
142		0
143		0
144		0
145		0
146		0
147		0
148		0
149		0
150		0
151		0
152		0
153		0
154		0
155		0
156		0
157		0
158		0
159		0
160		0
161		0
162		0
163		0
164		0
165		0
166		0
167		0
168		0
169		0
170		0
171		0
172		0
173		0
174		0
175		0
176		0
177		0
178		0
179		0
180		0
181		0
182		0
183		0
184		0
185		0
186		0
187		0
188		0
189		0
190		0
191		0
192		0
193		0
194		0
195		0
196		0
197		0
198		0
199		0
200		0





ENTER PROGRAM INFORMATION HERE

Institution: **Roane**  
 Program name: **Physical Therapy Asst**  
 Test name: **Test Code 34**  
 Test type: **P**  
 (P=pass rate or leave blank)  
 National Mean/  
 Pass Rate: **74.88**  
 OR  
 Previous Mean/  
 Pass Rate:

Begin entering  
 scores here ==>

85.7	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
	10
	11
	12
	13
	14
	15
	16
	17
	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24
	25
	26
	27
	28
	29
	30
	31
	32
	33
	34
	35
	36
	37
	38
	39
	40
	41
	42
	43
	44
	45
	46
	47
	48
	49
	50
	51

MAJOR FIELD TEST RESULTS	
Institution:	Roane
Program name:	Physical Therapy Asst
Test Name:	Test Code 34
Test Type:	Pass Rate
Number of student scores:	1
National Mean/Pass Rate:	74.88
OR	
Previous Mean/Pass Rate:	#N/A
Institutional Mean:	85.70
Inst'l Mean - Nat'l Mean:	10.82
Final Score:	
Final Score (Pass Rate):	
<b>% Inst to Comparision Score</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

	52	
	53	
	54	
	55	
	56	
	57	
	58	
	59	
	60	
	61	
	62	
	63	
	64	
	65	
	66	
	67	
	68	
	69	
	70	
	71	
	72	
	73	
	74	
	75	
	76	
	77	
	78	
	79	
	80	
	81	
	82	
	83	
	84	
	85	
	86	
	87	
	88	
	89	
	90	
	91	
	92	
	93	
	94	
	95	
	96	
	97	
	98	
	99	
	100	
	101	
	102	
	103	
	104	
	105	0
	106	0
	107	0
	108	0
	109	0
	110	0
	111	0
	112	0
	113	0
	114	0
	115	0
	116	0
	117	0
	118	0
	119	0
	120	0
	121	0
	122	0
	123	0
	124	0
	125	0
	126	0

127		0
128		0
129		0
130		0
131		0
132		0
133		0
134		0
135		0
136		0
137		0
138		0
139		0
140		0
141		0
142		0
143		0
144		0
145		0
146		0
147		0
148		0
149		0
150		0
151		0
152		0
153		0
154		0
155		0
156		0
157		0
158		0
159		0
160		0
161		0
162		0
163		0
164		0
165		0
166		0
167		0
168		0
169		0
170		0
171		0
172		0
173		0
174		0
175		0
176		0
177		0
178		0
179		0
180		0
181		0
182		0
183		0
184		0
185		0
186		0
187		0
188		0
189		0
190		0
191		0
192		0
193		0
194		0
195		0
196		0
197		0
198		0
199		0
200		0



**ENTER PROGRAM INFORMATION HERE**

Institution: **Roane**  
 Program name: **Radiologic Technology**  
 Test name: **Test Code 36**  
 Test type: **P**  
 (P=pass rate or leave blank)  
 National Mean/  
 Pass Rate: **75**  
 OR  
 Previous Mean/  
 Pass Rate:

*Begin entering scores here ==>*

-----  
**86.9** 1  
 2  
 3  
 4  
 5  
 6  
 7  
 8  
 9  
 10  
 11  
 12  
 13  
 14  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28  
 29  
 30  
 31  
 32  
 33  
 34  
 35  
 36  
 37  
 38  
 39  
 40  
 41  
 42  
 43  
 44  
 45  
 46  
 47  
 48  
 49  
 50  
 51

MAJOR FIELD TEST RESULTS	
Institution:	Roane
Program name:	Radiologic Technology
Test Name:	Test Code 36
Test Type:	Pass Rate
Number of student scores:	1
National Mean/Pass Rate:	75
OR	
Previous Mean/Pass Rate:	#N/A
Institutional Mean:	86.90
Inst'l Mean - Nat'l Mean:	11.90
Final Score:	
Final Score (Pass Rate):	
<b>% Inst to Comparision Score</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

	52	
	53	
	54	
	55	
	56	
	57	
	58	
	59	
	60	
	61	
	62	
	63	
	64	
	65	
	66	
	67	
	68	
	69	
	70	
	71	
	72	
	73	
	74	
	75	
	76	
	77	
	78	
	79	
	80	
	81	
	82	
	83	
	84	
	85	
	86	
	87	
	88	
	89	
	90	
	91	
	92	
	93	
	94	
	95	
	96	
	97	
	98	
	99	
	100	
	101	
	102	
	103	
	104	
	105	0
	106	0
	107	0
	108	0
	109	0
	110	0
	111	0
	112	0
	113	0
	114	0
	115	0
	116	0
	117	0
	118	0
	119	0
	120	0
	121	0
	122	0
	123	0
	124	0
	125	0
	126	0

127		0
128		0
129		0
130		0
131		0
132		0
133		0
134		0
135		0
136		0
137		0
138		0
139		0
140		0
141		0
142		0
143		0
144		0
145		0
146		0
147		0
148		0
149		0
150		0
151		0
152		0
153		0
154		0
155		0
156		0
157		0
158		0
159		0
160		0
161		0
162		0
163		0
164		0
165		0
166		0
167		0
168		0
169		0
170		0
171		0
172		0
173		0
174		0
175		0
176		0
177		0
178		0
179		0
180		0
181		0
182		0
183		0
184		0
185		0
186		0
187		0
188		0
189		0
190		0
191		0
192		0
193		0
194		0
195		0
196		0
197		0
198		0
199		0
200		0





**ENTER PROGRAM INFORMATION HERE**

**Institution:**

**Program name:**

**Test name:**

**Test type:**   
(P=pass rate or leave blank)

**National Mean/Pass Rate:**

**OR**

**Previous Mean/Pass Rate:**

*Begin entering scores here ==>*

<input type="text" value="93.58"/>	1
<input type="text"/>	2
<input type="text"/>	3
<input type="text"/>	4
<input type="text"/>	5
<input type="text"/>	6
<input type="text"/>	7
<input type="text"/>	8
<input type="text"/>	9
<input type="text"/>	10
<input type="text"/>	11
<input type="text"/>	12
<input type="text"/>	13
<input type="text"/>	14
<input type="text"/>	15
<input type="text"/>	16
<input type="text"/>	17
<input type="text"/>	18
<input type="text"/>	19
<input type="text"/>	20
<input type="text"/>	21
<input type="text"/>	22
<input type="text"/>	23
<input type="text"/>	24
<input type="text"/>	25
<input type="text"/>	26
<input type="text"/>	27
<input type="text"/>	28
<input type="text"/>	29
<input type="text"/>	30
<input type="text"/>	31
<input type="text"/>	32
<input type="text"/>	33
<input type="text"/>	34
<input type="text"/>	35
<input type="text"/>	36
<input type="text"/>	37
<input type="text"/>	38
<input type="text"/>	39
<input type="text"/>	40
<input type="text"/>	41
<input type="text"/>	42
<input type="text"/>	43
<input type="text"/>	44
<input type="text"/>	45
<input type="text"/>	46
<input type="text"/>	47
<input type="text"/>	48
<input type="text"/>	49
<input type="text"/>	50
<input type="text"/>	51

MAJOR FIELD TEST RESULTS	
<b>Institution:</b>	Roane
<b>Program name:</b>	Nursing
<b>Test Name:</b>	Test Code 29
<b>Test Type:</b>	Pass Rate
Number of student scores:	1
National Mean/Pass Rate:	#N/A
OR	
Previous Mean/Pass Rate:	#N/A
Institutional Mean:	93.58
Inst'l Mean - Nat'l Mean:	93.58
Final Score:	
Final Score (Pass Rate):	
<b>% Inst to Comparision Score</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

	52	
	53	
	54	
	55	
	56	
	57	
	58	
	59	
	60	
	61	
	62	
	63	
	64	
	65	
	66	
	67	
	68	
	69	
	70	
	71	
	72	
	73	
	74	
	75	
	76	
	77	
	78	
	79	
	80	
	81	
	82	
	83	
	84	
	85	
	86	
	87	
	88	
	89	
	90	
	91	
	92	
	93	
	94	
	95	
	96	
	97	
	98	
	99	
	100	
	101	
	102	
	103	
	104	
	105	0
	106	0
	107	0
	108	0
	109	0
	110	0
	111	0
	112	0
	113	0
	114	0
	115	0
	116	0
	117	0
	118	0
	119	0
	120	0
	121	0
	122	0
	123	0
	124	0
	125	0
	126	0

127		0
128		0
129		0
130		0
131		0
132		0
133		0
134		0
135		0
136		0
137		0
138		0
139		0
140		0
141		0
142		0
143		0
144		0
145		0
146		0
147		0
148		0
149		0
150		0
151		0
152		0
153		0
154		0
155		0
156		0
157		0
158		0
159		0
160		0
161		0
162		0
163		0
164		0
165		0
166		0
167		0
168		0
169		0
170		0
171		0
172		0
173		0
174		0
175		0
176		0
177		0
178		0
179		0
180		0
181		0
182		0
183		0
184		0
185		0
186		0
187		0
188		0
189		0
190		0
191		0
192		0
193		0
194		0
195		0
196		0
197		0
198		0
199		0
200		0



ENTER PROGRAM INFORMATION HERE

Institution:

Program name:

Test name:

Test type:   
(P=pass rate or leave blank)

National Mean/  
Pass Rate:

OR

Previous Mean/  
Pass Rate:

Begin entering  
scores here ==>

<input type="text" value="75"/>	1
<input type="text" value="80"/>	2
<input type="text" value="76"/>	3
<input type="text" value="82"/>	4
<input type="text" value="82"/>	5
<input type="text" value="80"/>	6
<input type="text" value="72"/>	7
<input type="text" value="79"/>	8
<input type="text" value="89"/>	9
<input type="text" value="85"/>	10
<input type="text" value="75"/>	11
<input type="text" value="91"/>	12
<input type="text" value="86"/>	13
<input type="text" value="90"/>	14
<input type="text" value="63"/>	15
<input type="text"/>	16
<input type="text"/>	17
<input type="text"/>	18
<input type="text"/>	19
<input type="text"/>	20
<input type="text"/>	21
<input type="text"/>	22
<input type="text"/>	23
<input type="text"/>	24
<input type="text"/>	25
<input type="text"/>	26
<input type="text"/>	27
<input type="text"/>	28
<input type="text"/>	29
<input type="text"/>	30
<input type="text"/>	31
<input type="text"/>	32
<input type="text"/>	33
<input type="text"/>	34
<input type="text"/>	35
<input type="text"/>	36
<input type="text"/>	37
<input type="text"/>	38
<input type="text"/>	39
<input type="text"/>	40
<input type="text"/>	41
<input type="text"/>	42
<input type="text"/>	43
<input type="text"/>	44
<input type="text"/>	45
<input type="text"/>	46
<input type="text"/>	47
<input type="text"/>	48
<input type="text"/>	49
<input type="text"/>	50
<input type="text"/>	51

MAJOR FIELD TEST RESULTS	
Institution:	Roane
Program name:	Opticianry
Test Name:	Test Code 62
Test Type:	Pass Rate
Number of student scores:	15
National Mean/Pass Rate:	70
OR	
Previous Mean/Pass Rate:	#N/A
Institutional Mean:	80.33
Inst'l Mean - Nat'l Mean:	10.33
Final Score:	
Final Score (Pass Rate):	
<b>% Inst to Comparision Score</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

	52	
	53	
	54	
	55	
	56	
	57	
	58	
	59	
	60	
	61	
	62	
	63	
	64	
	65	
	66	
	67	
	68	
	69	
	70	
	71	
	72	
	73	
	74	
	75	
	76	
	77	
	78	
	79	
	80	
	81	
	82	
	83	
	84	
	85	
	86	
	87	
	88	
	89	
	90	
	91	
	92	
	93	
	94	
	95	
	96	
	97	
	98	
	99	
	100	
	101	
	102	
	103	
	104	
	105	0
	106	0
	107	0
	108	0
	109	0
	110	0
	111	0
	112	0
	113	0
	114	0
	115	0
	116	0
	117	0
	118	0
	119	0
	120	0
	121	0
	122	0
	123	0
	124	0
	125	0
	126	0

	127		0
	128		0
	129		0
	130		0
	131		0
	132		0
	133		0
	134		0
	135		0
	136		0
	137		0
	138		0
	139		0
	140		0
	141		0
	142		0
	143		0
	144		0
	145		0
	146		0
	147		0
	148		0
	149		0
	150		0
	151		0
	152		0
	153		0
	154		0
	155		0
	156		0
	157		0
	158		0
	159		0
	160		0
	161		0
	162		0
	163		0
	164		0
	165		0
	166		0
	167		0
	168		0
	169		0
	170		0
	171		0
	172		0
	173		0
	174		0
	175		0
	176		0
	177		0
	178		0
	179		0
	180		0
	181		0
	182		0
	183		0
	184		0
	185		0
	186		0
	187		0
	188		0
	189		0
	190		0
	191		0
	192		0
	193		0
	194		0
	195		0
	196		0
	197		0
	198		0
	199		0
	200		0





ENTER PROGRAM INFORMATION HERE

Institution: **Roane**  
 Program name: **Medical Records Tech**  
 Test name: **Test Code 37**  
 Test type:   
 (P=pass rate or leave blank)  
 National Mean/  
 Pass Rate: **90.21**  
 OR  
 Previous Mean/  
 Pass Rate:

Begin entering scores here ==>

104.67	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
	10
	11
	12
	13
	14
	15
	16
	17
	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24
	25
	26
	27
	28
	29
	30
	31
	32
	33
	34
	35
	36
	37
	38
	39
	40
	41
	42
	43
	44
	45
	46
	47
	48
	49
	50
	51

MAJOR FIELD TEST RESULTS	
Institution:	Roane
Program name:	Medical Records Tech
Test Name:	Test Code 37
Test Type:	Other
Number of student scores:	1
National Mean/Pass Rate:	90.21
OR	
Previous Mean/Pass Rate:	#N/A
Institutional Mean:	104.67
Inst'l Mean - Nat'l Mean:	14.46
Final Score:	
Final Score (Pass Rate):	
<b>% Inst to Comparision Score</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

	52	
	53	
	54	
	55	
	56	
	57	
	58	
	59	
	60	
	61	
	62	
	63	
	64	
	65	
	66	
	67	
	68	
	69	
	70	
	71	
	72	
	73	
	74	
	75	
	76	
	77	
	78	
	79	
	80	
	81	
	82	
	83	
	84	
	85	
	86	
	87	
	88	
	89	
	90	
	91	
	92	
	93	
	94	
	95	
	96	
	97	
	98	
	99	
	100	
	101	
	102	
	103	
	104	
	105	0
	106	0
	107	0
	108	0
	109	0
	110	0
	111	0
	112	0
	113	0
	114	0
	115	0
	116	0
	117	0
	118	0
	119	0
	120	0
	121	0
	122	0
	123	0
	124	0
	125	0
	126	0

127		0
128		0
129		0
130		0
131		0
132		0
133		0
134		0
135		0
136		0
137		0
138		0
139		0
140		0
141		0
142		0
143		0
144		0
145		0
146		0
147		0
148		0
149		0
150		0
151		0
152		0
153		0
154		0
155		0
156		0
157		0
158		0
159		0
160		0
161		0
162		0
163		0
164		0
165		0
166		0
167		0
168		0
169		0
170		0
171		0
172		0
173		0
174		0
175		0
176		0
177		0
178		0
179		0
180		0
181		0
182		0
183		0
184		0
185		0
186		0
187		0
188		0
189		0
190		0
191		0
192		0
193		0
194		0
195		0
196		0
197		0
198		0
199		0
200		0



**Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
2005-06 Performance Funding Report  
Standard 1.C.1: Accreditation - Academic Programs**

**Roane State Community College**

**Number of Accreditable Programs:** 13

**Number of Accredited Programs:** 13

**Percent Accredited:** 100%

**Points Requested:** 5

**Roane State Community College**

	2000 CIP	Program	Degree Level	Accrediting Agency	Accredited?	Accreditation Cycle - Begin Date	Accreditation Cycle - End Date	Next Site Visit
1	14.22.0302.00	LEGAL ASSISTING	2.3.AAS	ABA	Yes	2005	2012	2012
2	31.51.0602.00	DENTAL HYGIENE TECHNOLOGY	2.3.AAS	ADA	Yes	2001	2006	2006-2007
3	31.51.0707.00	MEDICAL RECORDS TECHNOLOGY	2.3.AAS	CAHIIM	Yes	2001	2005	2005-2006 Paper-review process only-unless concerns warrant site-visit
4	31.51.0803.00	OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY ASST.	2.3.AAS	AOTA	Yes	2004	2006-2007	2006-2007
5	31.51.0806.00	PHYSICAL THERAPY ASSISTANT	2.3.AAS	APTA	Yes	2001	2010	2009
6	31.51.0904.00	EMT/PARAMEDIC	2.2.C1	CAAHEP	Yes	2000	2005-2006	2005-2006
7	31.51.0907.00	RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY	2.3.AAS	JCERT	Yes		2006-2007	2005-2006
8	31.51.0908.00	RESPIRATORY THERAPY	2.3.AAS	CAAHEP	Yes	2001	2011	2011
9	31.51.1601.00	NURSING	2.3.AAS	NLNAC	Yes	1999	2006-2007	2007
10	31.51.1801.00	OPTICIANRY	2.3.AAS	COA	Yes	2003	2009	2009
11	31.51.3501.00	SOMATIC THERAPY	2.1.C1	COMTA	Yes	2005	2010	2010
12	32.52.0201.01	BUSINESS MANAGEMENT TECH	2.3.AAS	ACBSP	Yes	2004	2014	2014
13	32.52.0299.01	CONTEMPORARY MANAGEMENT	2.3.AAS	ACBSP	Yes	2004	2014	2014
14	31.51.1099.01	POLYSOMNOGRAPHY TECHNOLOGY	2.1.C1	CAAHEP				Seeking Accreditation 2007-2008

**Please submit copies of accreditation letters and summary material with the template. Additionally, please provide updated information for all data in RED font on the template.**

**Institutional Comments (Optional):**

**Health Information Technology (listed above as Medical Records Technology):** Formerly the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs (CAAHEP) was the accrediting body under AHIMA for this program. As of March 1, 2005, the newly formed Commission on Accreditation for Health Informatics and Information Management Education (CAHIM) is the accrediting body for this program. An annual report was submitted on 10/31/05 for CAHIIM's review. CAHIIM evaluates the annual report to determine if the thresholds/requirements have been met and outcomes achieved. At this time, the program manager has not received any feedback from CAHIIM regarding the annual report submission. A copy of the annual report and CAHIIM's annual program assessment flowchart is included for review. The outcome of this review will be sent to THEC upon receipt.

**Radiologic Technology:** The Joint Review Committee in Radiologic Technology (JRCERT) reaffirmed accreditation for the Radiologic Technology program for a period of eight years in May 2006. The next site visit is tentatively scheduled for the fourth quarter of 2013. Documentation is included.

**EMT/Paramedic:** The Committee on Accreditation of Educational Programs for the Emergency Medical Services Professions (CoAEMSP) conducted a site visit in February 2006. The site visit report will be evaluated at the next CoAEMSP Board meeting on September 8-10, 2006. At that time, the committee will make its accreditation recommendation. The Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs (CAAHEP) will send notification of this decision in the fall 2006. Documentation is included.

**Table 3**

Percent	Score
0%	0
74%	0
75%	1
81%	1
82%	2
87%	2
88%	3
93%	3
94%	4
99%	4
100%	5

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
2005-06 Performance Funding Report  
Standard 1.C.2: Undergraduate Program Review**

**Table 4**

Score	Points
0%	0
49%	0
50%	1
60%	1
61%	2
70%	2
71%	3
80%	3
81%	4
90%	4
91%	5
100%	5

**Roane State Community College**

**Points Requested: 5**

CIP Code	Major Field Name	Degree	Year Reviewed	Evaluation Type *	Total No. Standards	"NA" Standards	# Stand. Met	% Met
31.51.2202.00	ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH TECH	2.3.AAS	2005-2006	AA	20		20	100.0%
16.24.0101.01	GENERAL EDUCATION	2.3.AA, AS	2006-2007	AA				n/a
28.45.0702.00	GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEMS	2.1.C1 & 2.3.AAS	2006-2007	AA				n/a
27.43.0107.00	POLICE MANAGEMENT (C1) & CRIMINAL JUSTICE (AAS)	2.1.C1 & 2.3.AAS	2007-2008	PR				n/a
31.51.0805.00	PHARMACY TECHNICIAN	2.2C1	2007-2008	PR				n/a
32.52.0401.00	OFFICE INFORMATION TECH	2.2C1	2007-2008	AA				n/a
13.21.0101.01	GENERAL TECHNOLOGY	2.3.AAS	2008-2009	PR				n/a
31.51.0708.00	MEDICAL TRANSCRIPTION	2.1.C1	2008-2009	PR				n/a
31.51.0999.01	DIAGNOSIS & PROCEDURAL CODING	2.1.C1	2008-2009	AA				n/a
06.11.9999.02	COMPUTER ART & DESIGN	2.1.C1	2009-2010	PR				n/a
12.19.0706.00	EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION	2.3.AAS	2009-2010	PR				n/a
08.13.0101.00	TEACHING	2.3.AAS	Scheduled for review when program becomes mature					
16.24.0102.02	PROFESSIONAL STUDIES	2.3.AAS	TBR Statewide Review					
					<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100%</b>

\* Evaluation Type: Academic Audit (AA) or Program Review (PR)

**Please submit copies of the peer review documentation, summary material and reviewers' vitas with the template.**

**Institutional Comments (Optional):**

**Environmental Health Technology Program:** The Environmental Health Program's Academic Audit Summary Sheet and narrative report documentation is included.

**Office Information Technology (certificate):** The Office Information Technology Certificate Program is scheduled to undergo academic audit during the 2007-2008 academic year.

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
2005-06 Performance Funding Report  
Standard 2.A: Student Engagement Survey (CCSSE)**

**Roane State Community College**

Did institution administer the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) to students in randomly selected classes during 2005-06?	Y
Please send an electronic copy of the CCSSE Survey Results	

**POINTS REQUESTED:**

**10**

**Institutional Comments (Optional):**

A random sample of 1,167 students was targeted for in-class survey administration during spring semester 2006; 707 (61%) students completed the survey.



**Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
2005-06 Performance Funding Report  
Standard 3.A: Retention and Persistence**

**Roane State Community College**

<b>Number</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Benchmark - Internal or External</b>	<b>Attain - RSCC</b>	<b>Percent Attained</b>
1	Proportion of 2004 cohort who returned to any Tennessee public institution (institutional comparison)*.	64.8%	61.4%	95%
2	Proportion of 2004 cohort who returned to any Tennessee public institution (external comparison - NCCBP)	47.0%	44.0%	94%
3	Proportion of 1999 cohort who graduated from any Tennessee public institution within six years (institutional comparison)*	27.8%	36.3%	100%
4	Proportion of 1999 cohort who graduated from any Tennessee public institution within three years (external comparison - NCCBP)	19.0%	12.0%	63%

**Average Attainment: 88%**

**Total Points Requested: 2**

**Notes:**

\*Benchmark institutional comparison is based on a three year rolling average.

The 3 year rolling average for the retention indicator is based on 2001, 2002, and 2003 cohorts.

The 3 year rolling average for the persistence to graduation indicator is based on 1996, 1997 and 1998 cohorts.

Benchmark external comparison is based on peer institutions that participated in the 2005 National Community College Benchmark Project (NCCBP). Peer institutions include public, single-campus institutions with enrollment of 4000-7000 students.

**Provide copy of export files from the NCCBP Peer Reports as supporting documentation.**

**Institutional Comments (Optional):**

Note: Documentation is included for external benchmarks above.

**Table 9**

<b>%Attain</b>	<b>Points</b>
0%	0
80%	1
85%	2
89%	2
90%	3
94%	3
95%	4
98%	4
99%	5
100%	5

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
2005-06 Performance Funding Report  
Standard 3.A: Retention and Persistence**

Table 9

% Attain	Points
0%	0
80%	1
85%	2
89%	2
90%	3
94%	3
95%	4
98%	4
99%	5
100%	5

**Roane State Community College**

Number	Indicator	Benchmark - Internal or External	Attain - RSCC	Percent Attained
1	Proportion of 2004 cohort who returned to any Tennessee public institution (institutional comparison)*.	64.8%	61.4%	95%
2	Proportion of 2004 cohort who returned to any Tennessee public institution (external comparison - NCCBP)	46.8%	43.9%	94%
3	Proportion of 1999 cohort who graduated from any Tennessee public institution within six years (institutional comparison)*	27.8%	36.3%	100%
4	Proportion of 1999 cohort who graduated from any Tennessee public institution within three years (external comparison - NCCBP)	19.1%	12.8%	67%

**Average Attainment: 89%**

**Total Points Requested: 2**

**Notes:**

\*Benchmark institutional comparison is based on a three year rolling average.

The 3 year rolling average for the retention indicator is based on 2001, 2002, and 2003 cohorts

The 3 year rolling average for the persistence to graduation indicator is based on 1996, 1997 and 1998 cohorts.

Benchmark external comparison is based on peer institutions that participated in the 2005 National Community College Benchmark Project (NCCBP). Peer institutions include public, single-campus institutions with enrollment of 4000-7000 students.

**Provide copy of export files from the NCCBP Peer Reports as supporting documentation.**

**Peers for Roane State Community College**

Ashville-Buncombe Technical Community College (NC)	Northeast State Technical Community College (TN)
Broome Community College (NY)	NorthWest Arkansas Community College (AR)
Columbia State Community College (TN)	Orange County Community College (NY)
Corning Community College (NY)	Penn Valley Community College (MO)
Estrella Mountain Community College (AZ)	Raritan Valley Community College (NJ)
Finger Lakes Community College (NY)	Reading Area Community College (PA)
Genesee Community College (NY)	San Juan College (NM)
Highline Community College (WA)	Schenectady County Community College (NY)
Longview Community College (MO)	South Mountain Community College (AZ)
Luzerne County Community College (PA)	Volunteer State Community College (TN)
Nashville State Technical Community College (TN)	Walters State Community College (TN)
Niagara County Community College (NY)	Westmorland County Community College (PA)

**Institutional Comments (Optional):**

Place comments in this text box (double click to begin entering text).

Roane State Community College (IPEDS Enrollment = 5,385)

Peer Selection Criteria

Public  
 Single-campus  
 IPEDS enrollment between 4,000 and 7,000

First-time, full-time completion w/in 3 years: 12.81%  
 Fall-fall persistence: 43.93%

Nineteen non-Tennessee and six Tennessee schools

		% Successfully Completed College-level Courses	% Successfully Completed Comp I	% D/R Completed College- level Math Successfully	Cum 1st-year GPA at Transfer Institution	Fall-Fall Persistence	Completion in 3 Years
	<b>RSCC</b>	<b>85.92%</b>	<b>78.66%</b>	<b>80.15%</b>	<b>3.04</b>	<b>43.93%</b>	<b>12.81%</b>
	TN	85.32%	84.73%	68.00%	2.82	49.11%	16.88%
	TN	89.19%	87.77%	91.55%	2.65	40.59%	12.69%
	TN	83.24%	81.69%	80.53%		51.41%	14.41%
	TN	84.90%	84.17%	71.12%	2.75	50.34%	18.63%
	TN	82.59%	76.51%	71.92%	3.01	44.90%	9.86%
Peers	A	85.39%	81.35%	82.31%		44.84%	28.23%
	B	82.10%	86.51%	72.50%		44.22%	8.31%
	C	87.65%	91.50%	78.63%	2.92	37.43%	17.31%
	D	91.17%	90.54%	90.28%	2.57	34.19%	14.17%
	E	84.99%	86.43%	79.82%		43.55%	18.33%
	F	89.21%	83.66%	77.97%		42.06%	9.77%
	G	80.99%	74.44%	80.00%	2.90	48.26%	13.25%
	H	86.26%	74.69%	90.07%		48.63%	13.44%
	I	86.85%	86.48%	80.25%		60.47%	29.00%
	J	84.77%	84.60%	67.33%		44.37%	25.23%
	K	89.87%	89.56%	87.18%		47.71%	35.20%
	L	82.14%	78.00%	76.76%	2.90	55.35%	26.04%
	M	83.04%	85.81%	72.22%		54.29%	25.02%
	N	79.69%	72.71%	74.11%		48.28%	19.65%
	O	78.91%	71.81%	57.89%		58.23%	19.21%
	P	85.22%	77.60%	90.16%		44.39%	26.30%
	Q	83.92%	84.91%	34.85%		48.42%	18.55%
	R	68.93%	71.11%	65.17%		37.41%	19.63%
	S	83.10%	87.81%	65.06%		43.47%	18.89%
	<b>Average</b>	<b>84.14%</b>	<b>82.27%</b>	<b>75.24%</b>	<b>2.82</b>	<b>46.75%</b>	<b>19.08%</b>

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
2005-06 Performance Funding Report  
Standard 3.B: Student Success**

**Roane State Community College**

<b>Number</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Benchmark - Peers</b>	<b>Attain - RSCC</b>	<b>Percent Attained</b>
1	Completion of college-level courses	84.1%	85.9%	100%
2	Completion of English Composition I course	82.3%	78.7%	96%
3	Completion of D/R course and subsequent completion of Math college-level course	75.2%	80.2%	100%
4	Cumulative first-year grade point average at transfer institution	2.8%	3.0%	100%

**Average attainment: 99%**

**Total Points Requested: 5**

Source: *National Community College Benchmark Project (2005 Report)*

**Provide copy of export files from the NCCBP Peer Reports as supporting documentation.**

**Institutional Comments (Optional):**

<b>Peers for Roane State Community College</b>	
Ashville-Buncombe Technical Community College (NC)	Northeast State Technical Community College (TN)
Broome Community College (NY)	NorthWest Arkansas Community College (AR)
Columbia State Community College (TN)	Orange County Community College (NY)
Corning Community College (NY)	Penn Valley Community College (MO)
Estrella Mountain Community College (AZ)	Raritan Valley Community College (NJ)
Finger Lakes Community College (NY)	Reading Area Community College (PA)
Genesee Community College (NY)	San Juan College (NM)
Highline Community College (WA)	Schenectady County Community College (NY)
Longview Community College (MO)	South Mountain Community College (AZ)
Luzerne County Community College (PA)	Volunteer State Community College (TN)
Nashville State Technical Community College (TN)	Walters State Community College (TN)
Niagara County Community College (NY)	Westmorland County Community College (PA)

**Table 9**

<b>%Attain</b>	<b>Points</b>
0%	0
80%	1
85%	2
89%	2
90%	3
94%	3
95%	4
98%	4
99%	5
100%	5

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
2005-06 Performance Funding Report  
Standard 3.B: Student Success**

Table 9

%Attain	Points
0%	0
80%	1
85%	2
89%	2
90%	3
94%	3
95%	4
98%	4
99%	5
100%	5

**Roane State Community College**

Number	Indicator	Benchmark - Peers	Attain - RSCC	Percent Attained
1	Completion of college-level courses	84.1%	85.9%	100%
2	Completion of English Composition I course	82.3%	78.7%	96%
3	Completion of D/R course and subsequent completion of Math college-level course	75.2%	80.2%	100%
4	Cumulative first-year grade point average at transfer institution	2.82	3.04	100%

**Average attainment: 99%**

**Total Points Requested: 5**

Source: *National Community College Benchmark Project (2005 Report)*

**Provide copy of export files from the NCCBP Peer Reports as supporting documentation.**

**Peers for Roane State Community College**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| Ashville-Buncombe Technical Community College (NC) | Northeast State Technical Community College (TN) |
| Broome Community College (NY)                      | NorthWest Arkansas Community College (AR)        |
| Columbia State Community College (TN)              | Orange County Community College (NY)             |
| Corning Community College (NY)                     | Penn Valley Community College (MO)               |
| Estrella Mountain Community College (AZ)           | Raritan Valley Community College (NJ)            |
| Finger Lakes Community College (NY)                | Reading Area Community College (PA)              |
| Genesee Community College (NY)                     | San Juan College (NM)                            |
| Highline Community College (WA)                    | Schenectady County Community College (NY)        |
| Longview Community College (MO)                    | South Mountain Community College (AZ)            |
| Luzerne County Community College (PA)              | Volunteer State Community College (TN)           |
| Nashville State Technical Community College (TN)   | Walters State Community College (TN)             |
| Niagara County Community College (NY)              | Westmorland County Community College (PA)        |

**Institutional Comments (Optional):**

Place comments in this text box (double click to begin entering text).

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
2005-06 Performance Funding Report  
Standard 3.C: Student Persistence Planning Initiative**

**Roane State Community College**

Did institution provide a self-assessment plan for improvement of student persistence? Plan must include the research objectives, methodology, sample and timeline/benchmarks. Plan should not exceed five pages.	Y
Please provide an electronic copy of the self-assessment plan.	

**POINTS REQUESTED:**

**5**

**Institutional Comments (Optional):**

The plan is included in the appendix of this report.



# **ROANE STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

**2005-2006 Performance Funding Report**

**Student Persistence Assessment Plan  
STANDARD 3.C.**

**Student Persistence Planning Initiative:  
Measuring Student Persistence**

# Performance Funding, Standard 3.C. Planning Initiative

## Measuring Student Persistence

### PHASE 1: (Assessment Plan)

#### Introduction

Student retention is not just about the number of incoming first-time, full-time freshman who make it to their sophomore year and persist to graduation. On one level, it is an indicator of institutional effectiveness in serving our students and assisting them in reaching their goal of graduation or transferring to complete their education. On another level, student retention is about the moral, ethical and financial commitment that the institution, faculty and staff make to each student that enrolls at Roane State.

By every measure, a college graduate has greater potential than a non-retained student or non-graduate in terms of earning potential, quality of life and quality of health. Roane State recognizes that what happens in the semesters or years a student matriculates at the college determines in many ways his or her future. The factors that influence retention and persistence to graduation are as varied and multifaceted as the lives of the students themselves. Retaining students and creating an academic environment that facilitates students' retention and persistence to graduation and/or transfer must holistically address the student and environment.

Standard 3.C. of the Performance Funding Program requires institutions to provide a self-assessment plan that describes the methods of assessment for student retention and persistence to graduation. In developing this persistence plan for the Performance Funding program, Roane State has designed a plan that is grounded in institutional analyses of retention and graduate rates and their correlates and an evaluation of the effectiveness of programs used to improve retention and graduation rates. The goals of this student persistence assessment plan are as follows:

- 1) Explore major barriers to retention and persistence to graduation; and**
- 2) Evaluate the effectiveness of early intervention programs currently in place.**

This plan is based on the following guiding principles:

- Academic services, student services and faculty must collaborate to support student success.
- Integrated and quality academic advisement is a priority.
- Integration of academic support programs (e.g., Learning Center) into the curriculum and overall academic process is important.
- Academic student success is directly linked to retention and persistence.
- Early identification of students' academic majors and career goals is critical.
- Intervention for at risk students is necessary.
- Integration of student services with academic programs is necessary.

This plan sets forth to assess multiple measures of retention and persistence that will yield information that the institution can use to evaluate and to improve initiatives and/or programs.

#### Research Objectives

- 1) During academic year 2006-2007, institutional barriers to retention and persistence to graduation will be identified through an institutional assessment of both quantitative and qualitative measures as set forth in this plan. Recommendations for tracking annual indicators of success will be made.
- 2) During academic year 2006-2007, current programs designed to improve retention and persistence to graduation will be evaluated to determine effectiveness. Recommendations for new interventions will be made.

## **Institutional Benchmarks**

- 1) Meet or exceed the retention rate for both internal (THEC 3-year rolling average) and external (NCCBP peer rate) measures by 2010.
- 2) Meet or exceed the persistence to graduation rate for both internal (THEC 3-year rolling average) and external (NCCBP peer rate) measures by 2010.

## **Significance of Study**

A majority of new students entering higher education institutions leave college without completing their degrees (Tinto, 1993). Retention and persistence rates depict a complex interaction between the characteristics of a higher education institution and the students attending the school. These rates can be viewed as measures of how well an institution is doing. Essential to retaining students and creating an academic environment that facilitates student persistence is the self-study of barriers to persistence and an evaluation of intervention programs. Retention and persistence initiatives designed to help students reach their academic goals should be rooted in empirical-based evidence.

The assessment data generated from this self-study will be used by a number of internal audiences to set internal institutional retention and persistence goals for improvement. The Enrollment Management Task Force, Enrollment Management Retention Committee, Academic and Curriculum Council, academic deans, academic vice president, Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research along with other college committees will use assessment data to formulate recommendations and retention and intervention initiatives. Executive level officers also will use the data for institutional goal-setting, decision-making, and commitment of resources as needed.

The Tennessee Board of Regents and Tennessee Higher Education Commission (Performance Funding) will serve as the primary external audience for this data. Additionally, the general public becomes an audience for this type of assessment data as the institution shares the characteristics and accomplishments of both students through media reports, college guidebooks, and recruiting materials.

## **Methodology**

A mixed-method approach was selected for this assessment. The use of both qualitative and quantitative methods complement each other and yield a richer data set (Creswell, 1994). There are five distinct purposes for selecting a mixed method assessment approach: triangulation, complementarity, development, initiation, and expansion (Worthen, Sanders, Fitzpatrick, 1997). It reduces the likelihood of misinterpretation and generally allows for further clarification of meaning. Mixed methods can serve to address a wide range of research questions in relation to retention and persistence and can serve as a fundamental step in acquisition of objective data to determine institutional areas of improvement, to set priorities, and to establish baselines for assessment and/or evaluation.

## **Research Questions by Area & Assessment Measures**

Three major areas of assessment are outlined in this plan: 1) Retention and persistence rates by student cohorts and demographics; 2) Retention and rates by student success measures; and 3) Retention and persistence by academic advisement. As part of the self study, Roane State will seek answers to the following questions outlined in the next section of this plan.

- ***Area 1- Retention and Persistence Rates by Student Cohorts***

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research in collaboration with Enrollment Management will analyze retention and persistence disaggregated rates for key student cohorts and demographic characteristics to observe any trends and improvement opportunities.

## Questions:

- 1) What is the effect of the academic major choice on retention and persistence rates? Specifically, how do health science cohorts and health science program holds affect our retention and graduation rates?
- 2) What is the effect of demographic characteristics on retention and persistence rates?
  - a. Specifically, how do retention and persistence rates of different racial/ethnic groups compare?
  - b. Specifically, how do retention and persistence rates of traditional and nontraditional students compare?
  - c. Specifically, when is attrition most evident (second, third or fourth semester)?
    - i. Why are student withdrawing or not returning?

**Assessment Measures:** Track fall-to-fall retention rates (fall 2004 & fall 2005) to determine the above effect. Conduct a non-returning student survey.

**Timeline:** Complete retention analyses spring 2007. Conduct a non-returning student survey spring 2007.

### • **Area 2- Retention and Persistence Rates: Student Success**

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research in collaboration with Academic Services, & the Learning Centers will examine student academic success in relation to retention and persistence. Disaggregated rates will be examined for at-risk students and students receiving assistance from the Learning Centers. The National Community College Benchmark institutional indicators of success will also be evaluated in relation to our national peers. These data will be analyzed for any trends and improvement opportunities.

How does academic success affect retention (progression) and persistence to graduation rates? One way in which we can improve both the academic performance and retention of first-year students is by increasing their utilization of academic support services, because research clearly suggests that there is a positive relationship between utilization of campus-support services and persistence to program or degree completion (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991).

## Questions:

- 3) Are we retaining at-risk students?
  - a. Specifically, how effective is the institutional early alert system?
  - b. Specifically, how do retention and persistence rates by students with developmental coursework requirements (two or more courses) compare to those with no requirements?
  - c. Specifically, how many students are retained that are placed on academic probation?
  - d. Specifically, how do students that are referred to the learning center academic support services compare to our general retention rate?
    - i. What percentage of students achieve C grade or better and are retained the next semester?
    - ii. What is the perceived student Learning Center impact on retention as a result of utilizing the Learning Center's resources?

## Assessment Measures:

- Compare fall-to-fall retention rates for those students required to take a study skill developmental course (two or more developmental courses are needed if a student is required to take study skills) versus those student with no requirements.
- Compare fall-to-fall retention rates for those students placed on academic probation. Determine any needed interventions.
- Compare retention outcomes of students utilizing the learning center compared to those that are not.

- Assess students' perceptions of improvement as a result of utilizing learning center through a student survey.
- 4) The National Community College Student Benchmark student success indicators selected for standard 3.B will be compared to our national peers to determine if we have met or exceeded the national average. The following student success indicators were selected:
- a. Completion of college-level courses;
  - b. Completion of English Composition I Course;
  - c. Completion of developmental course and subsequent completion of a math college-level course;
  - d. Cumulative first-year grade point average at transfer institutions.

**Timeline:** Complete spring 2007.

- ***Area 3- Retention and Persistence Rates: Academic Advisement***

Quality advisement is an important institutional tool in retaining students. The purpose of academic advising is to assist the student to make critical judgments in planning educational goals. National survey data indicate that institutions which make improvements in their academic advising programs experience substantial gains in their student retention rates (Metzner, 1989, Cartensen & Silberhorn, 1979). Although, there appears to be a long-standing logical connection between high quality advisement and high rates of student retention, the empirical relationship or direct causal connection between advising and retention has yet to be established. However, a strong case can be made that academic advising exerts a significant impact on student retention through its positive association with, and mediation of, variables that are strongly correlated with student persistence, namely: (1) student satisfaction with the college experience (advisement a large factor here), (2) effective educational and career planning and decision making, (3) student utilization of campus support services, and (4) student mentoring (Cuseo, 2003). Therefore, the effect of academic advisement and mentoring on retention and persistence to graduation rates will be assessed in this self-study.

- 5) How effective is the current academic advisement structure in retaining students?
- 6) How effective is the current student mentoring program (designed to link student support, academic support services and advisement)?

**Assessment Measures:**

- Conduct student and faculty focus groups to assess the perceived impact on institutional retention and persistence.
- Implement a mentoring program exit evaluation component to determine program impact.

**Timeline:** Complete focus groups (Sept. 06) and implement mentoring program evaluation by spring 2007.

**Implementation/Reporting of Results**

These retention and persistence assessment activities will be implemented and completed over the course of the academic year 2006-07. A comprehensive report of findings, limitations, assessment tools/ instruments, data collection methods used to investigate student persistence will be submitted to TBR/THEC for review in the 2006-07 Performance Funding report. Recommendations for institutional interventions will be made. Findings will be shared with internal and external stakeholders. We will collaborate with stakeholders to generate a response and/or action plan if needed with explanation (e.g., recommendations for change, intervention programs and/or annual monitoring measures). Assessment data will only be used to make evaluative judgments as deemed appropriate after proper review of the findings. Please see Table 1.0 for a summary of this assessment plan.

**Table 1.0 – Assessment Methods**

<b>Assessment Area</b>	<b>Data Collection</b>	<b>Oversight</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
RETENTION RATES BY COHORTS	Fall-to-Fall Retention Rates (fall 2004 & 2005) by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traditional vs. non-traditional</li> <li>• Academic Majors</li> <li>• Racial/Ethnic Groups</li> </ul>	Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research (OIER) Enrollment Management Retention Task Force	Spring 2007
STUDENT SUCCESS	Fall-to-Fall Retention Rates by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development requirements (study skills course) vs. no requirements</li> <li>• Academic Probation</li> </ul> Conduct a non-returning Survey  Learning Center Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student Survey</li> <li>• Determine percentage of students achieving a C or better and examine retention</li> </ul> NCCBP Student Success Indicators	OIER Enrollment Management Learning Centers	Fall 2006  Non-Returning Survey Spring 2007
ADVISEMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student Focus Groups</li> <li>• Faculty Focus Groups</li> <li>• Mentoring Program Evaluation</li> </ul>	OIER Distance Education Enrollment Management Student Service	Fall 2006 (Focus groups) Spring 2007 (Evaluation)

## References

- Cartenson, D.J. & Silberhorn, C.A. (1979). A National Survey of Academic Advisement (final report). American College Testing: Iowa City, Iowa.
- Creswell, J.W, (1994). Research Design Qualitative & Quantitative Approaches, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Cuseo, J. (2003). Academic Advisement and Student Retention: Empirical Connections & Systemic Interventions. (Unpublished Manuscripts).
- Metzner, B.S. (1989). Perceived quality of academic advisement: The effect on freshman attrition. American Educational Research Journal, 26(3), 422-442.
- Pascarella, E.T.& Terenzini, P.T. (1991). How College Affects Students: Findings and Insights From Twenty Years of Research. Josey Bass: San Francisco, CA.
- Tinto, V. (1993). Leaving College: Rethinking the Causes and Cures for Student Attrition (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- Worthen, B.R., Sanders, J.R., & Fitzpatrick, J.L. (1997). Program Evaluation: Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines. Addison Wesley Longman: Colorado Springs, CO.

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
2005-06 Performance Funding Report  
Standard 4.A: Institutional Strategic Planning**

**Roane State Community College**

Goal No.	2005-10 Institutional Strategic Planning Goals	Benchmark	Attain	Percent Attained
1	By the end of the cycle, 20 academic/academic support disciplines or programs will use (SPOL) Strategic Planning Online to document planning, assessment measures, and improvement activities.	4	26	100%
2	Increase by at least 1 percent per year the number of campus activities designed to enhance student awareness of and exposure to cultural diversity and social issues	3	7	100%
3	By the end of the cycle, 15 courses will integrate and international component into the curriculum	2	5	100%

**Average Attainment: 100%**

**Total Points Requested: 5**

**Institutional Comments (Optional):**

**Goal 1:** Twenty-six academic/academic support disciplines or programs utilized (SPOL) Strategic Planning Online to document planning, assessment measures, and improvement activities. Supporting documentation is included and/or evidence of utilization can be accessed @ <http://rscs.strategicplanningonline.com> .

**Goal 2:** The college offered seven new activities designed to enhance student awareness of and exposure to cultural diversity and social issues. Supporting documentation is included.

**Goal 3:** Five courses integrated an international component this past academic year. Supporting documentation is included.

**Table 15**

%Attain	Points
0%	0
80%	1
85%	2
89%	2
90%	3
94%	3
95%	4
98%	4
99%	5
100%	5





**Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
2005-10 Performance Funding Cycle  
Goal/Objective Submission Form: Institutional Strategic Planning**

This form is used to submit institutional strategic planning goals and supporting measurable objectives for review by governing board and Commission staff as measures of performance. These goals should state the institution's aspirations to improve the quality of its academic programs and services and directly support its mission. Institutions are required to submit a minimum of two and maximum of four specific goals related to their institutional strategic plans and declare at least two measurable objectives for each goal. A separate form is needed for each goal submitted.

**Institution:** Roane State Community College

Give the goal a brief name and numerical sequence number to identify it.

**Goal Name:** Model best practice for planning and institutional effectiveness      **Goal No.:** 4.A.1

**Goal from Institutional Strategic Plan:**

Roane State Community College will demonstrate its use of benchmarking and best practice to manage resources, its pursuit of alternative sources of institutional support, and its establishment of collaborative and entrepreneurial partnerships and improvement initiatives.

**Measurable Objective:** Please state in measurable terms (e.g., Enrollment of transfer students will increase by 500 students over the cycle.)

By the end of the cycle, 20 academic/academic support disciplines or programs will use SPOL (Strategic Planning Online) to document planning, assessment measures, and improvement activities. (RSCC is partnering with Indian River Community College and 9 other college/universities through a FIPSE grant to pilot the use of SPOL.)

**Annual Benchmarks for Objective:**

Baseline:	New initiative; all users will be new.
Year 1: 2005-06	Four academic programs, disciplines, or support services will use SPOL.
Year 2: 2006-07	Eight academic programs, disciplines, or support services will use SPOL.
Year 3: 2007-08	Twelve academic programs, disciplines, or support services will use SPOL.
Year 4: 2008-09	Sixteen academic programs, disciplines, or support services will use SPOL.
Year 5: 2009-10	Twenty academic programs, disciplines, or support services will use SPOL.

**Rationale for selecting goal and objective(s).** Because the partnership with IRCC will result in significant cost savings to RSCC, this is one of the college's Resourcefulness goals. However, adoption of this award-winning online planning and institutional effectiveness system will help the college "define, monitor, improve, and communicate the quality of its programs and services" also linking it to the RSCC/TBR Quality goal.

Signatures of the appropriate personnel from the institution, governing board and Commission staff are necessary for the goal and supporting objective(s) to be approved for measurement under the performance funding program.

**Approvals:**

Institution	Date
Governing Board	Date
Commission Staff	Date



**Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
2005-10 Performance Funding Cycle  
Goal/Objective Submission Form: Institutional Strategic Planning**

This form is used to submit institutional strategic planning goals and supporting measurable objectives for review by governing board and Commission staff as measures of performance. These goals should state the institution's aspirations to improve the quality of its academic programs and services and directly support its mission. Institutions are required to submit a minimum of two and maximum of four specific goals related to their institutional strategic plans and declare at least two measurable objectives for each goal. A separate form is needed for each goal submitted.

**Institution:** Roane State Community College

Give the goal a brief name and numerical sequence number to identify it.

**Goal Name:** Increase student access to diversity **Goal No.:** 4.A.2

**Goal from Institutional Strategic Plan:**

Demonstrate leadership in promoting positive racial relations and enhanced awareness of social issues and cultural diversity through development and implementation of annual plan of activities to benefit campus and community.

**Measurable Objective:** Please state in measurable terms (e.g., Enrollment of transfer students will increase by 500 students over the cycle.)

RSCC will increase by at least one per year the number of campus activities designed to enhance student awareness of and exposure to cultural diversity and social issues.

**Annual Benchmarks for Objective:**

Baseline:	College conducts annual Multicultural Day, Black History event (2)
Year 1: 2005-06	RSCC will conduct three campus social awareness events/activities
Year 2: 2006-07	RSCC will conduct four campus social awareness events/activities
Year 3: 2007-08	RSCC will conduct five campus social awareness events/activities
Year 4: 2008-09	RSCC will conduct six campus social awareness events/activities
Year 5: 2009-10	RSCC will conduct seven campus social awareness events/activities

**Rationale for selecting goal and objective(s).** CCSSE results indicated need to improve student exposure to a greater diversity of people and ideas.

Signatures of the appropriate personnel from the institution, governing board and Commission staff are necessary for the goal and supporting objective(s) to be approved for measurement under the performance funding program.

**Approvals:**

Institution	Date
Governing Board	Date
Commission Staff	Date



**Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
2005-10 Performance Funding Cycle  
Goal/Objective Submission Form: Institutional Strategic Planning**

This form is used to submit institutional strategic planning goals and supporting measurable objectives for review by governing board and Commission staff as measures of performance. These goals should state the institution's aspirations to improve the quality of its academic programs and services and directly support its mission. Institutions are required to submit a minimum of two and maximum of four specific goals related to their institutional strategic plans and declare at least two measurable objectives for each goal. A separate form is needed for each goal submitted.

**Institution:** Roane State Community College

Give the goal a brief name and numerical sequence number to identify it.

**Goal Name:** Demonstrate educational leadership by promoting global awareness      **Goal No.:** 4.A.3

**Goal from Institutional Strategic Plan:**

Leadership Goal: As the higher education center of choice for its service area, RSCC will demonstrate patterns of evidence attesting to its leadership in promoting and communicating the value and benefits of higher education to the economic development and quality of life for the citizens of its communities.

**Measurable Objective:** Please state in measurable terms (e.g., Enrollment of transfer students will increase by 500 students over the cycle.)

By the end of the cycle, 15 courses will integrate an international component into the curriculum.

**Annual Benchmarks for Objective:**

Baseline:	Global concepts are integrated into (5) courses in Literature, Humanities, Geography, & Philosophy.
Year 1: 2005-06	International component added to two courses.
Year 2: 2006-07	International component added to two courses.
Year 3: 2007-08	International component added to two courses.
Year 4: 2008-09	International component added to two courses.
Year 5: 2009-10	International component added to two courses.

**Rationale for selecting goal and objective(s).** Globalizing the curriculum will expose students to international concepts and concerns enhancing their citizenship in an increasing interdependent global community.

Signatures of the appropriate personnel from the institution, governing board and Commission staff are necessary for the goal and supporting objective(s) to be approved for measurement under the performance funding program.

**Approvals:**

Institution	Date
Governing Board	Date
Commission Staff	Date

**Roane State Community College  
Standard 4.A.1 Strategic Planning**

**Goal Name:** *Model best practice for planning and institutional effectiveness*

**Objective:** *By the end of the cycle, 20 academic/academic support disciplines or programs will use SPOL (Strategic Planning Online) to document planning, assessment measures, and improvement activities. (RSCC is partnering with Indian River Community College and 9 other college/universities through a FIPSE grant to pilot the use of SPOL.*

<b>Benchmark: 2005-06</b>	<i>Four academic programs, disciplines, or support services will use SPOL.</i>
<b>Progress Toward Goal: <u>Attained 26</u></b> The following academic/academic support disciplines utilized SPOL this past year: <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Art</li><li>2. Audio Visual Services</li><li>3. Biology</li><li>4. Business Management</li><li>5. Chemistry</li><li>6. Developmental Studies</li><li>7. Distance Learning/Advising</li><li>8. Education</li><li>9. EMT/Paramedic</li><li>10. Engineering Technology</li><li>11. English</li><li>12. General Science</li><li>13. Instructional Technology support</li><li>14. Interactive Instruction</li><li>15. Library Services</li><li>16. Math</li><li>17. Medical Transcription</li><li>18. Nursing</li><li>19. Occupational Therapy</li><li>20. Opticianry</li><li>21. Paralegal Studies</li><li>22. Pharmacy Technology</li><li>23. Physical Therapy</li><li>24. Polysomnography</li><li>25. Radiologic Technology</li><li>26. Speech</li></ol>	
Note: Evidence of SPOL utilization can be accessed at <a href="http://rsccl.org/strategicplanningonline.com">http://rsccl.org/strategicplanningonline.com</a>	

**Roane State Community College  
Standard 4.A.2 Strategic Planning**

**Goal Name:** *Increase Student Access to Diversity*

**Objective:** *Demonstrate leadership in promoting positive racial relations and enhanced awareness of social issues and cultural diversity through development and implementation of annual plan of activities to benefit campus and community.*

<b>Benchmark: 2005-06</b>	<i>RSCC will increase by at least one per year the number of campus activities designed to enhance student awareness of and exposure to cultural diversity and social issues.</i>
<p><b>Progress Toward Goal: <u>Attained 7</u></b></p> <p>The following student campus activities were conducted this past academic year:</p> <p>27. Multicultural Day Issues Forum: Afghanistan Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences Division Presenters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Dr. Don Windham, Professor of Psychology- "Cultures of Afghanistan, Emphasis on the Pashtun"</li> <li>b. Sharon Cordell, Associate Professor of Education, "The Status of Education in Afghanistan"</li> <li>c. Stella Gomezdelcampo, Associate Professor of History, "The Last 50 Years in the History of Afghanistan"</li> </ul> <p>28. Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences Spring 2006 Faculty Forum: "Live Well: Health and Wellness Issues in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Johnny Jones, Associate Professor of Physical Education</li> <li>b. Todd Wright, Assistant Professor of Physical Education</li> <li>c. Susan Garner, Associate Professor of Physical Education</li> <li>d. Shaun Simpson, Adjunct Faculty</li> </ul> <p>29. "Exploring the Impact of Gas Prices: Economic, Environmental and Historical Perspectives"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Dan Hyder, Associate Professor, Environmental Health Technology Program Director</li> <li>b. Bill Hoagland, Associate Professor of History and Political Science</li> <li>c. Dr. Bill Schramm, Assistant Professor of Economics</li> </ul> <p>30. "Get Informed: Drug Awareness &amp; Prevention Community Forum"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Dr. Bill Bennett, Roane County Coroner, Prescription Pain Medication Abuse</li> <li>b. Dr. Tom Boduch, Family Physician, Drug Use and Abuse Patterns</li> <li>c. Jack Stockton, Chief of Harriman Police, Methamphetamine Use and Abuse</li> <li>d. Donna Forostrom &amp; Doug Jackson, Roane County Anti-Drug Coalition, Sharing of Personal Familial Loss of Children to Drug Overdose</li> </ul> <p>31. Arts &amp; Lectures Committee: "Cures for the Future? Stem Cell Research: Belief in the Sanctity of Life?"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Professors: Robert Barth, Vickie Harris &amp; Saeed Rahmanian</li> </ul> <p>32. Arts &amp; Lectures Committee: "Intelligent Design as Science?"</p> <p>33. Geologic Basis for the Disaster on the Gulf Coast</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Professor: Bill Schramm</li> </ul>	

**Roane State Community College**  
**Standard 4.A.3**  
**Strategic Planning**

**Goal Name:** *Demonstrate Educational Leadership by Promoting Global Awareness*

**Objective:** *Leadership Goal- As the higher education center of choice for its service area, RSCC will demonstrate patterns of evidence attesting to its leadership in promoting and communicating the value and benefits of higher education to the economic development and quality of life for the citizens of its communities.*

<b>Benchmark: 2005-06</b>	<i>By the end of the cycle, 15 courses will integrate an international component into the curriculum. International component added to <u>two</u> courses for this year.</i>
<p><b>Progress Toward Goal: <u>Attained 5</u></b></p> <p>The following 5 courses have integrated an international component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>34. Probability &amp; Statistics: Math 1530- Students review proper application and interpretation of applied statistics in international news.</li><li>35. Chemistry: 1110 &amp; 1120-Students review American Chemical Society Publications to discover/report international chemistry developments.</li><li>36. Microbiology: BIOL-2230 –Students study microorganisms or etiological agents linked to global pandemics.</li><li>37. Human Resource Management: MGT-203 – Students learn global human resources management and the internationalization of business.</li><li>38. Management- Interpersonal Communication: MGT-209 – Students learn effective interpersonal and intergroup communication concepts in relation to a diverse and global environment.</li></ul>	

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
2005-06 Performance Funding Report  
Standard 4.B: State Strategic Planning**

**Roane State Community College**

State Partnership	2005-10 State Strategic Planning Goals	Benchmark	Attain	Percent Attained
Access	Enrollment of students from Morgan & Fentress counties will increase by 22 students to 450 over the cycle	433	410	95%
Student Preparation	Enrollment of Students in dual enrollment programs will increase by 102 over the cycle.	150	181	100%
Affordability	Increase the number of need-based institutional scholarships by 15 over the cycle	82	85	100%
Educational Excellence	Gifts to RSCC Foundation over the five-year cycle will total \$5,500,000.	\$1,100,000	\$1,801,831	100%

**Average Attainment: 99%**

**Total Points Requested: #N/A**

**Institutional Comments (Optional):**

**Access Goal:** The benchmark for 2005-2006 was to increase enrollment from these counties to meet or exceed the baseline of **428 rather than 433 (2006-2007 benchmark)**. Documentation is included.

**Student Preparation:** Enrollment of students in dual-enrollment programs increased to 181 students. Documentation is included.

**Affordability:** The institution **benchmark for 2005-2006 of 79 rather than 82 (2006-2007 benchmark)**. The institution increased the number of need-based institutional scholarships by 6 this past academic year. Documentation of the scholarships and the associated dollar amounts are included.

**Educational Excellence:** The Roane State Foundation had a total of \$1,801,830.80 million in gifts to the college for this past fiscal year. Documentation is included.

**Table 16**

<b>%Attain</b>	<b>Points</b>
0%	0
69%	0
70%	1
74%	1
79%	3
81%	3
82%	4
84%	4
85%	5
87%	5
88%	5
90%	5
91%	7
93%	7
94%	8
96%	8
97%	9
98%	9
99%	10
100%	10





**Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
2005-10 Performance Funding Cycle  
Goal/Objective Submission Form: State Strategic Planning**

This form is used to submit state strategic planning goals for review by governing board and Commission staff. Institutions are required to submit a minimum of four and maximum of eight measurable objectives supporting at least one goal from each of the four priority areas: (1) Access, (2) Student Preparation, (3) Affordability, and (4) Educational Excellence. A separate form is needed for each goal submitted.

**Institution:** Roane State Community College

Give the goal a brief name and numerical sequence number to identify it.

**Goal Name:** Increase participation in Morgan & Fentress counties **Goal No.:** 4.B.1

**Please check the State Master Plan goal that is directly related to the objective.**

<p align="center"><b>PARTNERSHIPS FOR ACCESS</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Increase rate and participation for specific population and/or geographical area enrolled in higher education</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Increase number of African American and Hispanic students enrolled in higher education.</p>	<p align="center"><b>PARTNERSHIPS FOR STUDENT PREPARATION</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Increase the number of students in dual-enrollment programs.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Enhance academic success and student engagement of freshmen by creating and/or expanding first-year studies programs, learning communities, and academic support initiatives.</p>
<p align="center"><b>PARTNERSHIPS FOR AFFORDABILITY</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Promote affordability via an increased institutional focus on need-based financial aid.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Create partnerships that expand and diversify institutional revenues through a combination of state, student, federal and private revenue streams.</p>	<p align="center"><b>PARTNERSHIPS FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Re-invigorate the centers and chairs of excellence so that they enhance institutional and state priorities.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Increase extramural research and development funding through partnerships.</p>

**Measurable Objective:** Please state in measurable terms (e.g., Enrollment of transfer students will increase by 500 students over the cycle.)

Enrollment of students from Morgan and Fentress counties will increase by 22 students to 450 over the cycle.

**Annual Benchmarks for Objective:**

Baseline:	Average enrollment from these counties for the 3-yr. period from 2002-2004 is 428
Year 1: 2005-06	Enrollment from these counties will meet or exceed the baseline (428)
Year 2: 2006-07	Enrollment from these counties will increase to 433
Year 3: 2007-08	Enrollment from these counties will increase to 440
Year 4: 2008-09	Enrollment from these counties will increase to 445
Year 5: 2009-10	Enrollment from these counties will increase to 450

**Rationale for selecting objective.**

Morgan and Fentress counties are among the most underserved in the RSCC service area and among the highest on the Educational Needs Index (ENI).

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
2005-10 Performance Funding Cycle  
Goal Submission Form: State Strategic Planning Goals**

Signatures of the appropriate personnel from the institution, governing board and Commission staff are necessary for the goal and supporting objective(s) to be approved for measurement under the performance funding program.

**Approvals:**

_____	_____
Institution	Date
_____	_____
Governing Board	Date
_____	_____
Commission Staff	Date

Goal Submission Form.doc (June 18, 2007)



**Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
2005-10 Performance Funding Cycle  
Goal/Objective Submission Form: State Strategic Planning**

This form is used to submit state strategic planning goals for review by governing board and Commission staff. Institutions are required to submit a minimum of four and maximum of eight measurable objectives supporting at least one goal from each of the four priority areas: (1) Access, (2) Student Preparation, (3) Affordability, and (4) Educational Excellence. A separate form is needed for each goal submitted.

**Institution:** Roane State Community College

Give the goal a brief name and numerical sequence number to identify it.

**Goal Name:** Increase students in dual enrollment **Goal No.:** 4.B.2

**Please check the State Master Plan goal that is directly related to the objective.**

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PARTNERSHIPS FOR ACCESS</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Increase rate and participation for specific population and/or geographical area enrolled in higher education</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Increase number of African American and Hispanic students enrolled in higher education.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PARTNERSHIPS FOR STUDENT PREPARATION</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Increase the number of students in dual-enrollment programs.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Enhance academic success and student engagement of freshmen by creating and/or expanding first-year studies programs, learning communities, and academic support initiatives.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PARTNERSHIPS FOR AFFORDABILITY</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Promote affordability via an increased institutional focus on need-based financial aid.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Create partnerships that expand and diversify institutional revenues through a combination of state, student, federal and private revenue streams.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PARTNERSHIPS FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Re-invigorate the centers and chairs of excellence so that they enhance institutional and state priorities.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Increase extramural research and development funding through partnerships.</p>

**Measurable Objective:** Please state in measurable terms (e.g., Enrollment of transfer students will increase by 500 students over the cycle.)

Enrollment of students in dual-enrollment programs will increase by 102 students over the cycle.

**Annual Benchmarks for Objective:**

Baseline:	In fall 2004, 103 students were enrolled in dual-enrollment programs
Year 1: 2005-06	Increase students in dual-enrollment programs to 150
Year 2: 2006-07	Increase students in dual-enrollment programs to 175
Year 3: 2007-08	Increase students in dual-enrollment programs to 185
Year 4: 2008-09	Increase students in dual-enrollment programs to 195
Year 5: 2009-10	Increase students in dual-enrollment programs to 205

**Rationale for selecting objective.**

Interaction through P-16 Council has led to increased interest in dual-enrollment among area high schools as a means of enhancing the transition from K-12 to postsecondary enrollment for their students.

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
2005-10 Performance Funding Cycle  
Goal Submission Form: State Strategic Planning Goals**

Signatures of the appropriate personnel from the institution, governing board and Commission staff are necessary for the goal and supporting objective(s) to be approved for measurement under the performance funding program.

**Approvals:**

_____	_____
Institution	Date
_____	_____
Governing Board	Date
_____	_____
Commission Staff	Date

Goal Submission Form.doc (June 18, 2007)



**Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
2005-10 Performance Funding Cycle  
Goal/Objective Submission Form: State Strategic Planning**

This form is used to submit state strategic planning goals for review by governing board and Commission staff. Institutions are required to submit a minimum of four and maximum of eight measurable objectives supporting at least one goal from each of the four priority areas: (1) Access, (2) Student Preparation, (3) Affordability, and (4) Educational Excellence. A separate form is needed for each goal submitted.

**Institution:** Roane State Community College

Give the goal a brief name and numerical sequence number to identify it.

**Goal Name:** Increase need-based scholarships **Goal No.:** 4.B.3

**Please check the State Master Plan goal that is directly related to the objective.**

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PARTNERSHIPS FOR ACCESS</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Increase rate and participation for specific population and/or geographical area enrolled in higher education</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Increase number of African American and Hispanic students enrolled in higher education.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PARTNERSHIPS FOR STUDENT PREPARATION</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Increase the number of students in dual-enrollment programs.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Enhance academic success and student engagement of freshmen by creating and/or expanding first-year studies programs, learning communities, and academic support initiatives.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PARTNERSHIPS FOR AFFORDABILITY</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Promote affordability via an increased institutional focus on need-based financial aid.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Create partnerships that expand and diversify institutional revenues through a combination of state, student, federal and private revenue streams.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PARTNERSHIPS FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Re-invigorate the centers and chairs of excellence so that they enhance institutional and state priorities.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Increase extramural research and development funding through partnerships.</p>

**Measurable Objective:** Please state in measurable terms (e.g., Enrollment of transfer students will increase by 500 students over the cycle.)

Increase the number of need-based institutional scholarships by 15 over the course of the cycle.

**Annual Benchmarks for Objective:**

Baseline:	79 need-based scholarships were awarded in 2004-05
Year 1: 2005-06	Add 3 need-based scholarships
Year 2: 2006-07	Add 3 need-based scholarships
Year 3: 2007-08	Add 3 need-based scholarships
Year 4: 2008-09	Add 3 need-based scholarships
Year 5: 2009-10	Add 3 need-based scholarships

**Rationale for selecting objective.**

To increase access for financially needy students and to reduce their necessity of acquiring debt through loans.

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
2005-10 Performance Funding Cycle  
Goal Submission Form: State Strategic Planning Goals**

Signatures of the appropriate personnel from the institution, governing board and Commission staff are necessary for the goal and supporting objective(s) to be approved for measurement under the performance funding program.

**Approvals:**

_____	_____
Institution	Date
_____	_____
Governing Board	Date
_____	_____
Commission Staff	Date

Goal Submission Form.doc (June 18, 2007)



**Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
2005-10 Performance Funding Cycle  
Goal/Objective Submission Form: State Strategic Planning**

This form is used to submit state strategic planning goals for review by governing board and Commission staff. Institutions are required to submit a minimum of four and maximum of eight measurable objectives supporting at least one goal from each of the four priority areas: (1) Access, (2) Student Preparation, (3) Affordability, and (4) Educational Excellence. A separate form is needed for each goal submitted.

**Institution:** Roane State Community College

Give the goal a brief name and numerical sequence number to identify it.

**Goal Name:** Increase private giving **Goal No.:** 4.B.4

**Please check the State Master Plan goal that is directly related to the objective.**

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PARTNERSHIPS FOR ACCESS</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Increase rate and participation for specific population and/or geographical area enrolled in higher education</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Increase number of African American and Hispanic students enrolled in higher education.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PARTNERSHIPS FOR STUDENT PREPARATION</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Increase the number of students in dual-enrollment programs.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Enhance academic success and student engagement of freshmen by creating and/or expanding first-year studies programs, learning communities, and academic support initiatives.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PARTNERSHIPS FOR AFFORDABILITY</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Promote affordability via an increased institutional focus on need-based financial aid.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Create partnerships that expand and diversify institutional revenues through a combination of state, student, federal and private revenue streams.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PARTNERSHIPS FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Re-invigorate the centers and chairs of excellence so that they enhance institutional and state priorities.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Increase extramural research and development funding through partnerships.</p>

**Measurable Objective:** Please state in measurable terms (e.g., Enrollment of transfer students will increase by 500 students over the cycle.)

Gifts to the Roane State Foundation over the five-year cycle will total \$5,500,000. (Annual benchmarks are based on a three-year rolling average of \$1.1 million to account for fluctuations among yearly gifts and variations in institutional giving priorities.)

**Annual Benchmarks for Objective:**

Baseline:	The five year total of gifts to the RSCC Foundation from June 2001- June 2005 was \$5,079,372.
Year 1: 2005-06	Gifts to the RSCC Foundation will meet \$1.1 million 3-yr. rolling average.
Year 2: 2006-07	Gifts to the RSCC Foundation will meet \$1.1 million 3-yr. rolling average.
Year 3: 2007-08	Gifts to the RSCC Foundation will meet \$1.1 million 3-yr. rolling average.
Year 4: 2008-09	Gifts to the RSCC Foundation will meet \$1.1 million 3-yr. rolling average.
Year 5: 2009-10	Total gifts to the RSCC Foundation, including 2009-010, will be \$5,500,000.

**Rationale for selecting objective.**

The Roane State Foundation has historically been a rich source of funding and community support for college facilities, initiatives, and student scholarships.

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
2005-10 Performance Funding Cycle  
Goal Submission Form: State Strategic Planning Goals**

Signatures of the appropriate personnel from the institution, governing board and Commission staff are necessary for the goal and supporting objective(s) to be approved for measurement under the performance funding program.

**Approvals:**

_____	_____
Institution	Date
_____	_____
Governing Board	Date
_____	_____
Commission Staff	Date

Goal Submission Form.doc (June 18, 2007)



**Roane State Community College**  
**Standard 4.B.1**  
**Strategic Planning**

**Goal Name:** *Increase Participation in Morgan & Fentress Counties*

**Objective:** *Enrollment of students from Morgan and Fentress counties will increase by 22 students to 450 over the cycle.*

<b>Benchmark: 2005-06</b>	<i>Average enrollment from these counties for the 3-yr. period from 2002-2004 is 428. Enrollment from these counties will meet or exceed the baseline (428)</i>
<b>Progress Toward Goal:</b> <u><b>Unattained-</b></u> Enrollment for these counties was only 410 for this past academic year.	

**Roane State Community College  
Standard 4.B.2  
Strategic Planning**

**Goal Name:** *Increase Students in Dual Enrollment*

**Objective:** *Enrollment of students in dual-enrollment programs will increase by 102 students over the cycle.*

<b>Benchmark: 2005-06</b>	<i>In fall 2004, 103 students were enrolled in dual-enrollment programs. Increase students in dual-enrollment programs to 150 during academic year 2005-06.</i>
<b>Progress Toward Goal:</b> <u><b>Attained</b></u> – Enrollment for students in dual-enrollment programs increased to 181 students.	

**Roane State Community College  
Standard 4.B.3  
Strategic Planning**

**Goal Name:** *Increase Need-Based Scholarships*

**Objective:** *Increase the number of need-based institutional scholarships by 15 over the course of the cycle.*

<b>Benchmark: 2005-06</b>	<i>In 2004-2005, 79 need-based scholarships were awarded. <u>Add 3 need-based scholarships</u> during academic year 2005-2006.</i>
<b>Progress Toward Goal: <u>Attained 6</u></b> The Roane State Foundation established the following 6 new need-based scholarships: <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Houston Davis Emergency Management Technology (EMT) Scholarship – Annual Award Amount = \$500.00</li><li>2. Priidu Ellam Memorial Nursing Scholarship – Annual Award Amount = \$1,500</li><li>3. Reagan Goff Scholarship (any academic major) – Annual Award Amount = \$2,000</li><li>4. James (Buddy) Scott Jr. Memorial Scholarship (Paralegal Studies Program) – Annual Award Amount = \$550.00</li><li>5. George &amp; Doris Strasser Memorial Scholarship Endowment (any academic major) – Annual Award Amount = Establishing the annual award. Total donor contribution/gift to date = \$25,000.00</li><li>6. Paralegal Studies Program Scholarship – Annual Award Amount = \$500.00</li></ol>	

**Roane State Community College  
Standard 4.B.4  
Strategic Planning**

**Goal Name:** *Increase Private Giving*

**Objective:** *Gifts to the Roane State Foundation over the five-year cycle will total \$5,500,000. (Annual benchmarks are based on a three-year rolling average of \$1.1 million to account for fluctuations among yearly gifts and variations in institutional giving priorities.)*

<b>Benchmark: 2005-06</b>	<i>The five year total of gifts to the RSCC Foundation from June 2001- June 2005 was \$5,079,372. Gifts to the RSCC Foundation will meet \$1.1 million 3-yr. rolling average.</i>
<b>Progress Toward Goal:</b> <u><b>Attained</b></u> Roane State Foundation had a total of \$1,801,830.80 million in gifts to the college for this past fiscal year.	

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
2005-06 Performance Funding Report  
Standard 4.C: Job Placement**

**Roane State Community College**

**Points**

**10**

**Total Number Programs:** 30  
**Total Placeable** 450  
**Total Placed** 433  
**Placement Rate** 96%

2000 CIP	Major Name	Degree	2004 Grads	EXEMPTIONS					Total Placeable	Total Placed	Percent Placed
				Educ	Medical	Family	Military	Volunteer			
06.11.9999.02	COMPUTER ART & DESIGN	2.1.CI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
12.19.0706.00	EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION	2.3.AAS	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	100%
13.21.0101.01	GENERAL TECHNOLOGY	2.3.AAS	54	10	1	1	0	0	42	36	86%
14.22.0302.00	LEGAL ASSISTING	2.3.AAS	19	3	0	2	0	1	13	13	100%
15.23.1101.00	TECHNICAL COMMUNICATIONS	2.3.AAS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
27.43.0107.00	POLICE MANAGEMENT	2.1.CI	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	100%
27.43.0107.00	CRIMINAL JUSTICE	2.3.AAS	32	5	0	0	1	0	26	26	100%
27.44.0201.00	SOCIAL SERVICES	2.3.AAS	0	Phase-out					0		n/a
28.45.0702.00	GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEMS	2.1.CI	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	100%
28.45.0702.00	GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEMS	2.3.AAS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
31.51.0602.00	DENTAL HYGIENE TECHNOLOGY	2.3.AAS	12	0	0	0	0	0	12	12	100%
31.51.0707.00	MEDICAL RECORDS TECHNOLOGY	2.3.AAS	12	2	0	0	0	0	10	10	100%
31.51.0708.00	MEDICAL TRANSCRIPTION	2.1.CI	19	1	1	1	0	0	16	15	94%
31.51.0803.00	OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY ASST.	2.3.AAS	14	0	0	0	0	0	14	14	100%
31.51.0805.00	PHARMACY TECHNICIAN	2.2.CI	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	67%
31.51.0806.00	PHYSICAL THERAPY ASSISTANT	2.3.AAS	14	0	0	0	0	0	14	14	100%
31.51.0904.00	EMT/PARAMEDIC	2.2.CI	19	0	0	0	0	0	19	19	100%
31.51.0907.00	RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY	2.3.AAS	36	2	0	0	0	0	34	34	100%
31.51.0908.00	RESPIRATORY THERAPY	2.3.AAS	10	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	100%
31.51.0999.01	DIAGNOSIS & PROCEDURAL CODING	2.1.CI	23	12	1	1	0	0	9	7	78%
31.51.1004.00	MEDICAL LABORATORY TECH	2.3.AAS	0	Phase-out					0		n/a
31.51.1099.01	POLYSOMNOGRAPHY TECHNOLOGY	2.1.CI	14	0	0	0	0	0	14	14	100%
31.51.1601.00	NURSING	2.3.AAS	109	3	0	0	0	0	106	106	100%
31.51.1801.00	OPTICIANRY	2.3.AAS	13	1	0	1	0	0	11	11	100%
31.51.2202.00	ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH TECH	2.3.AAS	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	100%
31.51.3501.00	SOMATIC THERAPY	2.1.CI	18	1	0	2	0	0	15	13	87%
32.52.0201.01	BUSINESS MANAGEMENT TECH	2.3.AAS	33	5	1	0	0	0	27	24	89%
32.52.0299.01	CONTEMPORARY MANAGEMENT	2.3.AAS	49	3	0	2	0	0	44	42	95%
32.52.0401.00	OFFICE INFORMATION TECH	2.2.CI	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	n/a
32.52.0401.00	OFFICE INFORMATION TECH	2.3.AAS	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	100%

<b>Total</b>	<b>516</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>450</b>	<b>433</b>	<b>96%</b>
--------------	------------	-----------	----------	------------	------------	------------

**Institutional Comments (Optional):**

**Social Services & Medical Laboratory:** Both of these programs are in phase-out status.

**Table 19**

<u>Percent</u>	<u>Points</u>
0	0
63%	0
64%	1
65%	1
66%	2
67%	2
68%	3
69%	3
70%	4
71%	4
72%	5
75%	5
76%	6
78%	6
79%	7
82%	7
83%	8
86%	8
87%	9
91%	9
92%	10
100%	10

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
2005-06 Performance Funding Report  
Standard 5.A: Assessment Pilot**

**Roane State Community College**

Did institution provide a report provide evidence of usage of the Kansas Cost Study for institutional planning and improvement? Report format should include the following sections: introduction, problem statement, summary of findings, interpretation of findings, and recommendations/conclusions. Report should not exceed 10 pages, including narrative and appendices.	Y
Please provide an electronic copy of the Assessment Pilot report.	

**POINTS REQUESTED:**

**5**

**Institutional Comments (Optional):**

A copy of the report is included in the appendix.

# **ROANE STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

**2005-2006 Performance Funding Report**

**ASSESSMENT PILOT  
STANDARD 5.A**

**Kansas Cost Study Report**



## **Introduction:**

Roane State Community College is a comprehensive, public, two-year institution with a primary service area in east Tennessee that consists of eight counties -- Roane, Anderson, Campbell, Cumberland, Scott, Loudon, Morgan, and Fentress. During the first seventeen years of its operation, the college served the higher education needs of its service area at its primary campus in Roane County and at a branch campus in Oak Ridge (Anderson County). Since the late 1980's, however, Roane State has made a significant commitment to serve students in the six outlying counties of its 100-mile diameter service area. Because these counties are primarily rural, economically disadvantaged and, in places, geographically remote, the need to make education more easily accessible to residents of these areas was determined to be a critical factor in serving these communities effectively and in truly fulfilling the college's mission to improve the quality of life in the service area. As a result, in addition to the main campus in Roane County and the Oak Ridge Branch Campus, Roane State currently has staffed teaching centers in Cumberland, Campbell, Scott, Loudon, and Fentress counties (as well as Knoxville for the delivery of health technologies) and has received TBR approval for the establishment of a teaching center in Morgan County.

In addition to delivering postsecondary education through traditional classes at these satellite campuses, Roane State has been a pioneer in the delivery of two-way interactive instruction and currently has nine interactive distance education classrooms broadcasting to seven of the college's eight campus locations. The college has also significantly expanded the development and delivery of Web courses, from 13 in fall 2000 to 60 in fall 2005.

Whether through the use of instructional technologies or with traditionally delivered teaching, Roane State continues to place the greatest mission priority on "bringing the highest standards of educational quality within the reach of students wherever they live and work." As the following report will demonstrate, Roane State's mission to maximize accessibility to higher education throughout its primary eight-county service area has informed its approach to the Kansas Cost Study for analysis of instructional costs and productivity – from the development of its central "problem statement" to its conclusions regarding the results of its analysis of trend and peer data.

## **Problem Statement:**

Serving the postsecondary education needs of Roane State's outlying counties is not only an institutional priority but also an imperative for the future productivity of the state of Tennessee. The Education Needs Index (ENI), a national study of county-level educational, economic, and population factors that can be studied to inform sound educational planning from local to state and regional levels, has identified 55% of Tennessee's 95 counties as "most critical" with respect to the education capacity factor and another 31% as "critical."

In Roane State's service area, four of its counties are categorized as "most critical," and a fifth as "critical." In fact, Fentress County is listed as the 5<sup>th</sup> most critical in the state based upon the education factor; Scott County is listed as the 4<sup>th</sup> most critical by virtue of its overall ENI score. In comparing Tennessee to national peers, the ENI report for the state concludes "clearly the challenge for many states such as Tennessee is how to create and sustain policy initiatives that expand access to postsecondary education across each of their respective counties."

For Roane State, this challenge to expand access is compounded by the need to weigh the costs of resource allocation in a time of ongoing financial constraint. For the college's academic administrators, institutional mission commitment to off-campus access must be balanced with fiscal responsibility and the teaching and learning needs of all students. With respect to the allocation of faculty resources, the problem can be stated: How does the institution ensure that the curricular needs of students at all teaching centers are being met in a manner that is educationally sound, fiscally reasonable, and accountable to the overall strategic mission and goals of the institution?

The Kansas Cost Study has provided Roane State with data to study ways in which it has addressed this issue through allocation of faculty over a three-year period. Data on the following indicators were analyzed:

- Percentage undergraduate SCH taught by full-time faculty
- FTE students taught by FTE instructional faculty by discipline
- SCH by FTE faculty as a percentage of national norm by discipline
- Instructional costs per SCH by discipline

Based upon the protocol recommended by the *ad hoc* Committee on the TBR System use of the Delaware/Kansas cost models, Roane State studied data on the four indicators from the perspective of the following questions:

- What significant changes can be detected over the last three years?
- How does this three-year profile compare to that of institutional peers?
- What factors have contributed to changes at your institution; to your current profile?
- Are you satisfied with the current profile or if not, how do you plan to alter it?
- Does the current profile represent an allocation of faculty resources that meets mission-driven instructional needs of the institution?

Also, where available, institutional data were compared to Tennessee peers (all community colleges) and non-Tennessee peers (5,000-9,999 enrollment) in order to gain additional insight to assist in the interpretation of peer comparisons.

### **Summary and Interpretation of Findings:**

Roane State Community College has participated in the (Kansas) National Study of Community College Instructional Costs and Productivity for a pilot year in 2002-03 and annually for the official reporting period from 2003-04 through the recent submission in 2005-06. In order to facilitate analysis of internal trends over the three-year reporting period as well as peer comparisons, data for each of the four indicators has been consolidated into the following tables (see appendices 1-4):

- Table 1-2 Percentage SCH taught by full-time faculty (Appendix 1)
- Table 2-2 FTE Student per FTE Faculty (Appendix 2)
- Table 3-1 SCH by FTE Faculty as a percentage of national norm (Appendix 3)
- Table 3-2 Instructional Costs per SCH (Appendix 4)

Reference to these data tables will be made throughout the following report of findings.

### **Indicator 1: Percentage undergraduate SCH taught by full-time faculty:**

As indicated in Table 1-2 (Appendix 1), there are few significant changes over the three-year period in percentage of SCH taught by full-time faculty, with the exception of two disciplines. In the case of Occupational Therapy, the reporting period coincided with the resignation of the program director who had been working on an 82.1% contract and her replacement with a full-time director. The retirement of the program director in Radiologic Technology is also reflected in the trend data. The significant drop in percentage of full-time faculty in the Art department in the 2004-05 reporting period coincided with the program director's sabbatical leave. Other anomalies are the result of decisions to consolidate reporting of certain disciplines (Drama into Speech; Anthropology/Sociology/Political Science and Geography into Social Sciences) after the first reporting year to better reflect institutional patterns. (This consolidated reporting is reflected across all indicators as reflected in the data tables.)

Roane State is fortunate to have a faculty roster that includes many long-time, highly qualified, full-time teachers. As compared to national and state peers, this is evident in disciplines such as Accounting, Criminal Justice, Administrative Services, Biology, Dental Hygiene, Education, Engineering, English, Foreign Language, Math, Nursing, Physical Sciences, and Social Sciences

(see Appendix 1). As these long-time faculty members approach retirement, a number of them are opting to continue to serve the institution through post-retirement appointments, a factor that is not readily observable in the data.

In other disciplines there are notable exceptions as compared to national and state peers. Early Childhood Education classes are primarily taught by adjunct faculty with program coordination (and instruction) by the college's TECTA coordinator who holds professional rather than faculty status. The large number of individual performance classes taught by adjunct faculty in the Music department result in a lower percentage of full-time faculty as compared to peers. Roane State's Paralegal Studies Program has only one full-time faculty member. Chris Whaley is founding program director and also serves as Dean of the Social and Behavioral Sciences division. Under his continuing direction, the program is ably served by a number of highly qualified area professionals who teach in the program as adjunct faculty.

Roane State has long attributed the success of its students (demonstrated by such measures as higher GPAs than native students at transfer institutions) to their access to excellent full-time faculty. In order to confirm commitment to this characteristic of the institutional culture, Roane State's five-year strategic plan contains an objective "to increase the number of full-time faculty for new and existing programs." On the basis of this first three-year analysis of percentage full-time faculty, the college is satisfied with the current profile.

#### **Indicator 2: FTE Student per FTE Faculty Instructional Faculty by Discipline:**

Table 2-2 (Appendix 2) indicates few notable changes with the exception of Radiologic Technology which significantly increased the number of students accepted into the program during the reporting period.

A comparison to peers finds that a majority of disciplines, particularly in the area of general education and transfer programs, have comparatively lower FTE student to FTE faculty ratios. A variety of factors contribute to this profile. A number of classes providing instruction in foundational written and oral communication (ENGL 1010, ENG 1020 & SPCH 201), for example, have long-standing restricted enrollment maximums to allow effective faculty assessment of student work. Other courses, such as Calculus-based Physics, Organic Chemistry, Differential Equations, etc are allowed to meet with low enrollments because they are necessary for students' timely completion of certain transfer programs.

In addition to General Education survey courses in Music and Art that enroll an average of 20-30 students, these disciplines also offer many individual performance as well as practicum and seminar classes with small enrollment. Even when several Art specialty classes are combined for lab instruction, for example, the combined enrollment does not typically exceed 10 students.

The primary contributing factor to a profile of comparatively lower enrollment classes, however, is the college's commitment to provide instruction at its satellite campus centers. These centers were established to improve access to higher education for students in rural areas. For these students, travel expenses associated with long distance commutes and hazardous weather conditions in winter months are significant barriers. To maximize efficiency and provide effective allocation of faculty resources at these satellite campuses, Roane State has equipped two-way interactive audio-video classrooms that permit an instructor to physically meet a class at one location while broadcasting live to additional classrooms at off-campus centers. This system allows as few as 2-3 students per broadcast site to enroll in courses that would never be permitted to meet as stand-alone traditional classes.

In many cases, however, the interactive option is not available and academic deans allow traditional classes with smaller-than-normal enrollment to meet at the satellite centers. Since the mid-1990's, the Vice President for Academic Services, the academic deans, and the satellite campus directors have worked together to develop course rotation schedules that will maximize

efficiency of faculty resources yet meet the curricular needs of students. The availability of Kansas Cost Study data provides an additional tool to facilitate decision making regarding scheduling of traditional and interactive classes to support satellite campus enrollment.

Analysis of the current three-year reporting period has also revealed the effect of growth in Web classes. When Roane State first began developing Web classes five years ago, students would enroll in these sections as a last resort. Currently, Web classes fill up first, and demand for more sections of existing courses and development of new Web courses is strong. Enrollment in these classes, however, is currently capped at 20 students, and deans consistently adhere to this cap since full-time faculty cannot be paid at adjunct rates for teaching an overload. A strong Web class component contributes to a significant disparity compared to peers in Philosophy/Religion, Psychology, and Social Science courses, where some Web sections have replaced traditional lecture sections. After analyzing this aspect of the Kansas Study results, two considerations that academic administrators will weigh will be raising the enrollment cap on Web classes to 25 and training/mentoring more adjunct faculty to teach Web classes.

Data reporting FTE student per FTE faculty also likely reflects an increase in the number of typically smaller dual enrollment classes scheduled in collaboration with service area high schools. Certain programs, such as Paralegal Studies and Contemporary Management, also have a significant proportion of part-time students taking between 6-9 credit hours.

### **Indicator 3: SCH by FTE faculty as a percentage of national norm by discipline:**

Table 3-1 (Appendix 3), "SCH by FTE faculty as a percentage of national norm by discipline," confirms many of the interpretive analyses of the data reported in Table 2.2 above. Art and Music are significantly low as a percentage of national norm after factoring for seminar and individual performance classes. Paralegal Studies, which uses interactive instruction extensively to offer classes to small cohorts of students across the college's service area also features enrollment by many part-time students. History, Psychology, Philosophy/Religion and Social Science disciplines at Roane State include a number of Web classes to meet student needs for scheduling flexibility as well as smaller classes to accommodate curricular needs of students at satellite campuses.

These data also demonstrate growth in programs such as Occupational Therapy and the robust nature of classes such as Biology which support the college's large Nursing Program. A downward trend in Business related disciplines is likely the result of fluctuations in enrollment in the Contemporary Management Program, which was developed to meet the needs of working adults seeking upgraded skills and job opportunities. Enrollment in this program can be significantly impacted by employer reimbursement for students' educational expenses. The college's strategic initiatives to increase adult enrollment include the identification and development of targeted options for the Contemporary Management Program that would provide training in specific skills areas in high demand in the service area. Kansas Cost Study data will continue to facilitate analysis of the effectiveness of this program in recruiting working adults.

### **Indicator 4: Instructional Costs per SCH**

Although not required by the Performance Funding reporting protocol for Standard 5.A, Roane State decided to augment its analysis of the Kansas Cost Study data by reviewing three-year data on Instructional Costs per SCH (Table 3-2, Appendix 4). In general, the review of three-year changes did not reveal any unexplained circumstances. Changes in instructional costs for the Respiratory Therapy Program, for example, can be attributed to a combination of reduction in class size and increase in faculty salaries (as approved by the state legislature).

As expected, a profile characterized by the use of a strong core group of long-time faculty at Associate Professor and Professor rank, by a mission-driven commitment to ensuring student access to classes at satellite campuses, and by policies to cap some class sizes to optimize student-faculty engagement results in comparatively higher instructional costs than those of peers in some disciplines. Two areas that should be closely monitored are the relatively low comparative instructional costs in Nursing and Radiologic Technology. In Nursing, particularly, where the

college has a number of impending retirements, the need to remain competitive in the recruitment of qualified faculty is essential.

One program that has demonstrated major disparity compared to peers on all three indicators is the Administrative & Secretarial Services Program. As basic computer skills have become a necessity across disciplines and more specialized secretarial courses have been co-opted by the Technology Centers, the demand for associate's degree level curricula has decreased and enrollment has declined precipitously. This has been especially problematic for Roane State, since the program's two full-time faculty members hold Associate Professor and Professor rank. In order to make necessary changes to maintain relevance of the program, the A.A.S. degree program in Office Information Technology was terminated in 2004 and integrated as a concentration into the Business Management A.A.S. degree. Students may now also enroll in a one-year Certificate program that is offered entirely on a "flex" schedule. With the retirement of Professor Delorise Barnes in June 2006, the college has made the decision to allocate funds from her salary to support a new faculty position for a proposed associate's degree program in Nanotechnology that is being developed based on needs of the emerging industry at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory and other research facilities in Oak Ridge.

### **Recommendations/Conclusions:**

With staffed teaching centers in seven of its eight primary service area counties, and an eighth in development, Roane State academic administrators must continually monitor the allocation of faculty resources for sound curricular decision making. The availability of the Kansas Cost Study data can be a valuable tool for analysis of internal trends and peer comparisons; however, these data must be carefully considered in relation to institutional mission and the college's need to respond to critical state priorities. As the *ad hoc* Committee on the Delaware/Kansas Models noted in its report to the TBR President's Council, the central goal of such benchmarking tools is to answer key questions such as the following: "Can the institution make the case that it is effectively using its faculty as a resource with respect to peers to address the state's priorities and fulfill its distinctive mission?"

The 2005-2010 Master Plan of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission includes "partnerships for access" as one of its four major goals for addressing state needs and priorities. Citing the link between educational attainment and economic prosperity echoed in the Education Needs Index and the relative poor performance of Tennessee compared to national averages, the plan concludes that "unless greater attention and resources are brought into the fold to provide a foundation for expanding access to postsecondary education, the economic future of Tennessee is at risk."

Roane State Community College, with the extraordinary financial support of private, corporate, and local government agencies in its service area communities, has made a strong commitment to extending access to counties in critical need of increasing the educational attainment of its residents. This commitment has led to decisions regarding allocation of faculty that often puts the college out of proportion with respect to its peers as reflected in the attached summaries of Kansas Cost Study data. A review of all non-Tennessee institutions participating in the 2005 data collection, however, reveals that only five of these 56 two-year colleges serve counties with "critical" education needs as identified by the Education Needs Index. Thus, at this point in the development of the Kansas Cost Study as a tool for national peer comparison, it is too early to draw conclusions that might lead to a change in direction with respect to institutional priorities.

Through its analysis of faculty resource allocation summarized by the three-year data tables attached as appendices to this report, Roane State Community College is satisfied that it can make the case that its decisions are in line with its mission to bring the highest standards of educational quality within reach of students wherever they live and work in the service area. In thus fulfilling its institutional mission, the college can also conclude that its faculty resource decisions effectively address ongoing state needs and priorities.

**APPENDIX 1- (Table 1-2) Percentage SCH taught by full-time faculty**

<b>Academic Discipline</b>	<b>03-04 RSCC</b>	<b>03-04 Natl Mean</b>	<b>03-04 TN Peers*</b>	<b>04-05 RSCC</b>	<b>04-05 Natl Mean</b>	<b>04-05 TN Peers</b>	<b>04-05 non-TN**</b>	<b>05-06 RSCC</b>
Accounting, Bookkeeping	75	72	74	80	71	78	67	72
Administration of Justice, Criminal Justice	70	44	54	65	51	50	64	57
Administrative & Secretarial Services	91	64	61	79	69	65		91
Anthropology (moved to social science 05)	100	49		See S/S				See S/S
Art –Art Studies, General	40	43	49	17	50	54	41	37
Biological Sciences – Life Sciences	79	69	72	86	66	73	67	82
Business Administration & Mgt, General	59	59	63	75	62	73	58	63
Computer & Information Sciences, General	53	55	64	55	65	68	56	57
Dental Hygienist	91	73		48	82			100
Developmental English – Reading	41	45	48	45	44	44	33	32
Developmental Math	49	44	57	69	49	65	36	61
Drama/Theatre Arts, General (moved to SPH)	100	61	87	See SPH				See SPH
Early Childhood Education (pre-elem)	0	62		2	39			1
Education, General	46	35	47	46	52	47		55
Engineering Related Technologies	100	70		100	80			86
English Language and Literature	58	54	63	75	58	66	52	62
Foreign Languages and Literature	52	44	58	64	43	58	46	55
Geography	20	40	46	See S/S				See S/S
Health Information – Medical Records	45	54		78	73			82
Health Professions & Related Clinical Sciences	43	48	46	46	40			62
History	50	54	58	50	56	57		43
Mathematics	76	67	82	88	70	84	65	79
Medical Radiologic Technology	49	81		100	84	91	83	100
Music, General	25	40	45	18	47	42	50	18
Nursing	100	88	95	100	87	91	86	100
Occupational Therapist Assistant	0	61		0	70			33
Paralegal, Legal Assistant	29	47		28	52		58	29
Philosophy and Religion	34	36	51	38	46	53		36
Physical Sciences	81	66	80	73	63	73	51	79
Physical Therapist Assistant	89	87		89	83			86
Political Science	68	48	57	See S/S				See S/S
Psychology	53	55	58	45	55	62	56	55
Respiratory Care	100	93		100	99		90	100
Social Sciences	100	52		63	68			81
Sociology	48	57	59	See S/S				See S/S
Speech and Rhetorical Studies	40	43	49	47	50	54		40

\* TN Peers = All TN two-year colleges    \*\* Non-TN Peers = All non-TN participating institutions with enrollment 5,000 – 9,999

**APPENDIX 2 - (Table 2-2) FTE Student per FTE Faculty**

<b>Academic Discipline</b>	<b>03-04 RSCC</b>	<b>03-04 Natl Mean</b>	<b>03-04 TN Peers*</b>	<b>04-05 RSCC</b>	<b>04-05 Natl Mean</b>	<b>04-05 TN Peers</b>	<b>04-05 non-TN**</b>	<b>05-06 RSCC</b>
Accounting, Bookkeeping	15.1	18.60	18.29	17.2	18.7	18.74	19.28	
Administration of Justice, Criminal Justice	14.5	19.35	19.3	20	20.9	21.29	20.78	
Administrative & Secretarial Services	4	13.43	12.9	5	14	13.8		
Anthropology (moved to Social Science)	5.9	22.49						
Art –Art Studies, General	8	16.55	15.4	9.2	16.6	18.05	14.16	
Biological Sciences – Life Sciences	25.1	22.97	25.65	24.7	23.1	25.43	18.78	
Business Administration & Mgt, General	12.7	18.99	17.57	11.5	18.2	16.38	20.81	
Computer & Information Sciences, General	14	15.85	17.55	13.2	15.5	17.13	15.73	
Dental Hygienist	10.1	10.87		10.5	10.2			
Developmental English – Reading	12.8	17.87	18.06	16.9	17.7	19.58	16.52	
Developmental Math	16.3	21.92	21.13	18.3	21.3	22.88	19.69	
Drama – Theatre Arts (moved to Speech)	10.9	18.16	19.43	See SPH				
Early Childhood Education	23.4	16.81						
Education, General	17.1	18.28	19.52	17.2	19.3	19.76		
Engineering Related Technologies	5.4	8.98		7.5	11.1			
English Language and Literature	14.6	19.73	19.92	15.3	20.3	20.21	17.44	
Foreign Languages and Literature	16.5	18.23	19.35	14.9	17.9	19.02	17.67	
Geography	6.1	19.51	20.29	See S/S				
Health Information – Medical Records	14.8	16.01		13.4	17.4			
Health Professions & Related Clinical Sciences	12.3	17.06	17.65	14.6	18.8			
History	14.6	24.19	25.24	14.8	24.7	24.93		
Mathematics	17.8	20.97	21.11	20.2	21.7	21.65	20.57	
Medical Radiologic Technology	6	16.29		32.8	20.7	26.87	21.95	
Music, General	5.9	15.32	15.28	8	16.1	17.63	17.13	
Nursing	28.4	14.94	28	27.1	17.9	26.03	13.93	
Occupational Therapist Assistant	6.3	10.24		8.8	8.6			
Paralegal, Legal Assistant	8.8	13.98		9.3	16.5		18.59	
Philosophy and Religion	5.7	24.59	22.11	8.7	25.4	25.71		
Physical Sciences	19.3	18.89	21.75	21.4	20	22.91	17.70	
Physical Therapist Assistant	7.4	8.57		11	10.6			
Political Science (moved to Social Science)	21.2	20.06	21.59	See S/S				
Psychology	12.5	26.37	24.01	13	27	26.12	24.59	
Respiratory Care	10.8	9.53		15.9	13		13.58	
Social Sciences	5.5	18.66		11.3	19.5			
Sociology (moved to Social Science)	16.5	24.87	23.93	See S/S				
Speech and Rhetorical Studies	20.8	20.97	22.04	21.4	21.2	20.95		

\* TN Peers = All TN two-year colleges    \*\* Non-TN Peers = All non-TN participating institutions with enrollment 5,000 – 9,999

**APPENDIX 3 - (Table 3-1) SCH by FTE faculty as a percentage of national norm by discipline**

<b>Academic Discipline</b>	<b>03-04RS</b>	<b>03-04NM</b>	<b>% of NM</b>	<b>04-05RS</b>	<b>04-05NM</b>	<b>% of NM</b>	<b>05-06RS</b>
Accounting, Bookkeeping	227	279	81	258	281	92	269
Administration of Justice, Criminal Justice	218	290	75	300	314	96	333
Administrative & Secretarial Services	60	201	30	74	209	35	124
Anthropology	89	337	26			See S/S	
Art –Art Studies, General	119	248	48	137	249	55	165
Biological Sciences – Life Sciences	376	345	109	371	347	107	364
Business Administration & Mgt, General	363	285	127	172	273	63	183
Computer & Information Sciences, General	210	238	88	198	232	85	242
Dental Hygienist	152	163	93	157	152	103	152
Developmental English – Reading	191	268	71	254	265	96	259
Developmental Math	245	329	74	275	320	86	295
Drama – Theatre Arts, General	164	272	60			See SPH	
Early Childhood Education	351	252	139	262	275	95	164
Education, General	257	274	94	258	290	89	303
Engineering Related Technologies	80	135	59	113	167	68	117
English Language and Literature	218	296	74	229	304	75	276
Foreign Languages and Literature	248	273	91	223	268	83	312
Geography	92	293	31			See S/S	
Health Information – Medical Records	222	240	93	201	261	77	208
Health Professions & Related Clinical Sciences	184	256	72	220	283	78	264
History	220	363	61	223	370	60	330
Mathematics	267	315	85	304	325	94	292
Medical Radiologic Technology	90	244	37	491	311	158	208
Music, General	88	230	38	121	241	50	171
Nursing	426	224	190	406	268	151	344
Occupational Therapist Assistant	94	154	61	131	128	102	241
Paralegal, Legal Assistant	132	210	63	140	247	57	125
Philosophy and Religion	86	369	23	130	382	34	247
Physical Sciences	289	283	102	321	300	107	298
Physical Therapist Assistant	111	129	86	164	158	104	338
Political Science	318	301	106			See S/S	
Psychology	188	396	30	195	406	48	362
Respiratory Care	162	143	113	238	195	122	203
Social Sciences	83	280	30	170	292	58	319
Sociology	248	373	66			See S/S	
Speech and Rhetorical Studies	311	315	99	322	318	101	357



**APPENDIX 4 - (Table 3-2) Instructional Costs per SCH**

<b>Academic Discipline</b>	<b>03-04 RSCC</b>	<b>03-04 Natl Mean</b>	<b>03-04 TN Peers*</b>	<b>04-05 RSCC</b>	<b>04-05 Natl Mean</b>	<b>04-05 TN Peers</b>	<b>04-05 non-TN**</b>	<b>05-06 RSCC</b>
Accounting, Bookkeeping	115	83	90	125	85	84	108	129
Administration of Justice, Criminal Justice	77	69	74	70	66	68	78	86
Administrative & Secretarial Services	132	92	93	102	113	83		169
Anthropology	89	53		See S/S				See S/S
Art –Art Studies, General	74	65	63	50	68	61	77	46
Biological Sciences – Life Sciences	77	66	72	84	66	71	81	90
Business Administration & Mgt, General	91	79	80	103	76	85	103	116
Computer & Information Sciences, General	81	88	83	87	101	87	112	92
Dental Hygienist	270	279		299	334			320
Developmental English – Reading	88	70	77	82	74	70	88	72
Developmental Math	75	58	64	76	60	68	66	89
Drama – Theatre Arts, General	77	92	73	See SPH				See SPH
Early Childhood Education	31	76		45	168			59
Education, General	63	82	97	71	77	79		83
Engineering Related Technologies	123	132		150	131			276
English Language and Literature	86	68	68	76	66	65	76	83
Foreign Languages and Literature	63	63	58	67	67	59	82	70
Geography	132	68	61	See S/S				See S/S
Health Information – Medical Records	131	90	72	121	98			150
Health Professions & Related Clinical Sciences	104	85		94	58			113
History	56	52	51	56	50	49		58
Mathematics	82	74	87	93	70	81	83	106
Medical Radiologic Technology	73	168		70	143	115	143	87
Music, General	95	87	79	82	95	66	121	86
Nursing	166	228	224	169	210	194	213	204
Occupational Therapist Assistant	379	287		291	245			170
Paralegal, Legal Assistant	79	99		79	89		96	102
Philosophy and Religion	48	45	45	44	55	61		37
Physical Sciences	109	87	89	106	86	93	86	113
Physical Therapist Assistant	181	200		144	300			148
Political Science	71	50	47	See S/S				See S/S
Psychology	74	50	53	60	47	45	58	67
Respiratory Care	288	334		246	220		228	316
Social Sciences	66	63		77	68			76
Sociology	41	51	64	See S/S				See S/S
Speech and Rhetorical Studies	45	54	53	47	53	50		52

\* TN Peers = All TN two-year colleges

\*\* Non-TN Peers = All non-TN participating institutions with enrollment 5,000 – 9,999

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
2005-06 Performance Funding Report  
Standard 5.B: Assessment Implentation**

**Roane State Community College**

**Provide title of Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) or Student Learning Initiative (SLI):**

An Evaluation of Institutional Processes in Support of a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)

**QEP or SLI?**

**STANDARD OVERVIEW**

Standard 5B evaluates the maturity and effectiveness of an institution's assessment processes as they relate to one of two types of student learning quality initiatives: (1) an institution-defined Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) in response to SACS reaffirmation processes or (2) an alternate student learning initiative (SLI) of comparable weight.

**REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**

- Make case that its assessment protocols in support of a QEP/SLI are mature and effective in an essay not to exceed 10 double-spaced pages.
- Address the essay to an audience of peer examiners.
- All claims in the narrative are supported by documented evidence.
- Encourage to use hyperlink to send the reader from the text to supportive data and evidence.
- Provide a "bibliography" of hyperlinked documents, data, evidence cited that follows the essay.
- Submit report on a CD which captures all linked documentation.
- Submit 6 CD copies of the report (for distribution to the peer readers)

**PEER SCORING AND POINT ALLOCATION**

Reports will be assigned values based on a holistic evaluation conducted by trained peer readers applying these rubrics:

- A (10 points) Based on the evidence provided, the institution consistently does all of the following:
- B (8 points) Based on the evidence provided, the institution consistently does all of the following:
- C (6 points) Based on the evidence provided, the institution does most of the following:
- D (4 points) Based on the evidence provided, the institution does some of the following:
  - Employs an effective process for identifying and selecting assessment tools that will yield reliable data and information directly related to the QEP or SLI;
  - Accurately analyzes and interprets evidence, data, and assessment results before using them in the decision-making stages of the QEP or SLI; provides a clear chronology of the processes leading to decision making;
  - Declares goals and benchmarks that are readily assessable; draws warranted conclusions based on documented evidence.

**POINTS REQUESTED:**

**Institutional Comments (Optional):**

A copy of this report is included in the appendix.

# **ROANE STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

**2005-2006 Performance Funding Report**

**ASSESSMENT IMPLEMENTATION  
STANDARD 5.B**

**Evaluation of Institutional  
Assessment Processes  
To Support a QEP**

## Introduction

Standard 5B for the 2005-2010 Performance Funding cycle asks institutions to conduct a self-evaluation of their assessment processes in support of a SACS Quality Enhancement Plan or similarly significant student learning initiative. For Roane State Community College the timing of this project is particularly meaningful because almost exactly ten years ago the college was engaged in a similar exercise in support of its application to SACS to conduct the alternate model process for reaffirmation of accreditation. The model that subsequently evolved into the current Compliance Letter/QEP process was, at the time, an option that an institution could choose based upon providing evidence that it had met several threshold requirements. Among these requirements was evidence of a “functioning institutional effectiveness program” that addressed planning, programmatic assessment, and the use of assessment results to improve programs and services.

Roane State’s application described an institutional effectiveness system supported by a five-year strategic plan developed in coordination with the TBR system, the Performance Funding program of assessment standards, four years of experience using TQM processes for improvement, and unit planning documented in IEPDs (Institutional Effectiveness Planning Documents). [Sample IEPDS](#)

In hindsight, although these elements provided adequate evidence of a well-functioning institutional effectiveness program, they did not provide the most effective data and information to support the selection, development and implementation of the strategic self-study (the alternate model’s QEP). As a result, the 1999-2000 strategic self-study of student success factors (learning outcomes, distance learning, student support services and technology) was undoubtedly too broad and was selected based upon the anecdotal interests of multiple college constituencies rather than documented evidence of a focal issue of significance to the entire college community.

## Use of Performance Funding Data for Improvement

As Roane State prepares to select the QEP topic for its 2010 reaffirmation, the institution has more highly integrated planning and assessment processes in place and more widely-shared experience in using the kind of data and assessment results that support student learning quality initiatives. In 2000, at the beginning of the previous Performance Funding cycle, the college centralized its strategic planning, institutional effectiveness, SACS liaison, and institutional research functions into an Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research (OIER) ([OIER Webpage](#)). Since its inception, the OIER has served as a lead resource for the collection, analysis, and dissemination of data to support assessment efforts throughout the institution and has placed particular emphasis on increasing faculty awareness of and participation in evaluation initiatives to improve student outcomes.

Chief among these assessment initiatives is the Performance Funding program. Since the beginning of the 2000-2005 cycle, Performance Funding data from all of the assessment standards has been widely and regularly shared with the faculty during division meetings. This process of semiannual information-sharing, supported by easily accessible web resources for current and longitudinal data, has provided faculty with information regarding learning outcomes [Academic Profile Scores](#), student success following graduation, and perceptions of educational value by enrolled students, alumni, and employers. [Performance Funding Reports](#)

For many years, of course, Roane State has administered the schedule of satisfaction surveys that are included in the Performance Funding program of assessments; however, the results of these surveys were not carefully analyzed nor used for improvement. As part of the self-study for the 2000-2005 Performance Funding assessment implementation plan, enrolled student and alumni survey results for current and previous years were studied to determine patterns of weakness upon which to base improvement initiatives. This study revealed two areas with a pattern of less than satisfactory responses; (1) global and cultural experience and (2) academic advisement.

Strategies for improvement in these areas were developed to meet goals and objectives established for the five-year period. [Performance Funding 4.B Summative Report](#) (p.p. 12-22) Among these strategies were: curricular and co-curricular activities associated with an annual Multicultural Day; increased opportunities to explore social and cultural issues through social science faculty forums and Arts and Lectures Series presentations; opportunities for in-depth study of global/cultural issues through student Honors project contracts; theatre productions of dramatic works studied in college English courses; and the establishment of a Social Awareness Committee charged with development of an annual calendar of activities and events to augment social and cultural learning in the classroom.

The effectiveness of these strategies in meeting the goals and objectives set for enhancing students' global and cultural experience was evaluated through comparison between responses on the baseline enrolled student and alumni surveys (2001, 2002) and the subsequent surveys administered in 2004 (enrolled student) and 2005 (alumni). Benchmarks for increases in positive responses on all items related to global and cultural experience were exceeded in both the enrolled student and alumni surveys. [4.B Report](#) (p. 22); Satisfaction Surveys [2001-02](#), [2004-05](#)

Similarly, goals and objectives were established to improve academic advisement based upon trend data from enrolled student and alumni surveys. [4.B Report](#) (p.p. 23-37) Additional confirming data on perceptions of satisfaction and importance regarding advisement were provided from the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory and accompanying Institutional Priorities surveys administered in fall 2001. [Noel-Levitz Data](#) Among the improvement strategies implemented were technology enhancements through the introduction of Web for Students and Web for Faculty; changes in the process of assigning advisors; online options for changing majors and declaring intent to articulate; advisor training workshops for faculty; the development of a new Faculty Advisor Manual available in hard copy and online; and establishment of a Freshman Experience event for new students. Since its inception in August

2003, the Freshman Experience event has continually evolved based upon feedback solicited each year from student and faculty/staff participants. [4.B Report](#) (p.p. 34-35); [Freshman Experience Survey Data](#)

Enrolled student and alumni surveys administered in 2004 and 2005 respectively were used to evaluate the effectiveness of advisement improvement initiatives. [4.B Report](#) (p. 36) Although measurable gains were made on all survey items, improvement of academic advisement continues to be an area of institutional concern. The college administered the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) in spring 2005 in order to gather some baseline data prior to the official introduction of the survey instrument into the 2005-2010 Performance Funding program standards. [2005 CCSSE Data](#) A dearth of questions related to advisement on the original CCSSE instrument appears to have led to the addition of five supplemental advisement questions on the 2006 administration. Results from the 2006 survey will be used to set benchmarks for ongoing improvement through comparison with national peers.

---

#### Assessment of General Education

An important means by which Roane State engages faculty in more in-depth analysis and interpretation of Performance Funding and other assessment data related to student outcomes is through the General Education and Assessment Committee, formed during the previous SACS strategic self-study process. For a number of years, this faculty committee has worked with the OIER to analyze information and data to support decisions, including replacement of the College Base exit exam of graduating students' general education competencies with the Academic Profile exam. A sample of committee minutes over the past five years demonstrates their involvement in assessment initiatives such as the alternative assessment of General Education (Standard IB, Performance Funding 2000-2005), the critical

thinking pre-and-post test project, review of the General Education mission and outcomes, and program evaluation of General Education. [General Education Committee Minutes](#)

Undoubtedly the most significant project undertaken by the General Education and Assessment Committee was leadership for the alternative assessment of general education through which Roane State participated in Standard 1B of Performance Funding for 2000-2005. Having experimented with Portfolio Review as part of the previous SACS strategic self-study with less than satisfactory results, faculty members were interested in finding a means of assessing general education outcomes in Roane State courses that could be more easily implemented while yielding quantifiable results. Following reports of successful pre-and-post-testing conducted by developmental reading faculty, the committee began to develop an assessment plan based upon pre-and-post-tests in key general education courses. To assist with the development of the exams, the committee engaged the services of Dr. John Ray, Associate Director of the Institute for Assessment and Evaluation at UT/Knoxville College of Education to consult with them on effective test construction.

A summative report of the project's chronology from 2001 to 2005 describes revisions made during the pre-planning phase, details of test administration, and key findings, including gain scores. [Performance Funding 1.B Summative Report](#) (p.p. 1-7) The report also describes ways in which the Institutional Research Director worked with participating faculty to gather and interpret data through test item analysis to improve the reliability and validity of the assessment project. [1.B Report](#) (p.6); [General Education Pre-and-Post-Test Data](#)

The General Education and Assessment Committee and the Institutional Effectiveness and Research Office have also provided leadership for a project to determine gains in students' critical thinking skills by means of a pre-test administered during Freshman Experience and a post-test administered to a matched cohort after three semesters. [1.B Report](#) (p.p. 7-8); [Critical Thinking Test Data](#) Test item analysis conducted after the first test administration has already resulted in revisions to the test. As the college begins to develop potential QEP topics, data



from the Critical Thinking Exam will be a valuable resource for dialogue about a learning outcomes issue of importance across disciplines.

---

### 2005-2010 Strategic Goals Impacting Student Learning

During the course of the 2000-2005 Performance Funding cycle, faculty awareness of and participation in assessments directly related to student learning significantly increased. In order to sustain faculty involvement and continue the process of integrating these assessment measures into the institutional culture, a number of Performance Funding related assessment initiatives have been included in the college's 2005-2010 strategic plan. Each of the following assessment initiatives involves issues of significance related to student learning and will yield valuable data to support the selection, development, and eventual implementation of the college's upcoming QEP project: [RSCC Strategic Plan 2005-2010](#) see Objectives: 4.3; 4.10; 4.11; 4.2

- Improvement in academic advisement will be evaluated through trend data comparisons with CCSSE peers (Objective 4.3)
- Peer comparison using the National Community College Benchmark Project (NCCBP) will be used to identify success indicators related to student learning outcomes and to establish benchmarks for improvement (Objective 4.10)
- Peer comparison using CCSSE will be used to set benchmarks for exceeding national mean scores on a majority of factors for at least two categories of student engagement (Objective 4.11)
- The Academic Audit will be used to evaluate two academic program areas per year toward a goal of establishing a regular, ongoing process of faculty-driven assessment of teaching and learning in all disciplines. (Objective 4.2)

---

### 2005-2010 Strategic Planning and Assessment Initiatives

In addition to the assessment processes described above, Roane State has begun a number of initiatives that will improve critical assessment processes in the college's current

institutional effectiveness system. Each of these initiatives to be undertaken in 2006-2007 will provide beneficial data in support of a QEP.

Academic Audit: With twelve accreditable programs, Roane State has many faculty members with experience in the process of programmatic self-study in preparation for reaffirmation of professional accreditation. While the majority of Roane State's career programs undergo periodic evaluation through the accreditation process, several others regularly conduct self-studies as part of the peer review process of non-accreditable programs required for Performance Funding. With the exception of a five-year peer review of the General Education program for Performance Funding, however, individual academic disciplines within the transfer curriculum have traditionally not engaged in this kind of thorough self-assessment. In 2004, Roane State's English and Biology departments joined programs at 12 other TBR institutions to pilot the Academic Audit process of program review. This faculty-driven process yielded excellent results, including enhanced faculty collaboration and a series of ongoing initiatives to improve student outcomes. Based upon the success of this pilot, Roane State has committed in its strategic plan to expand the use of Academic Audit and has chosen this mode of program review to assess the effectiveness of its General Education Program in 2006-2007. The General Education and Assessment Committee has already developed a plan for this comprehensive self-study and is looking forward to college-wide conversations that will undoubtedly yield issues of significance to selection of a QEP. [Academic Audit Activities and Surveys](#)

IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction: One of the greatest benefits of the Academic Audit peer review process is the sharing of best practices system-wide. During a site visit to Northeast State Technical Community College, several auditors from Roane State discovered the IDEA system for evaluation of courses and faculty teaching. As utilized by faculty and academic administrators at NSTCC, the IDEA system seemed to be a much more effective, and faculty-driven, method of assessing not only teaching effectiveness but also student learning

outcomes, engagement, and perceptions of the added value of the course itself. Since a faculty committee was already investigating ways to improve the evaluation process, the IDEA system was suggested for their consideration. A pilot of the system was conducted fall 2005 through summer terms 2006. [IDEA System Data](#) Following some revisions in survey administration during the pilot period to improve response rate, Roane State's Faculty Senate approved administration of the system by all faculty for 2006-2007. Not only is this evaluation system a more effective means of gaining substantive and relevant information for personnel decisions, but, more importantly, it is also a highly effective means of compelling faculty to identify critical learning objectives for their courses and for demonstrating the link between student engagement and perceptions about their own mastery of those objectives. The link between the IDEA system categories of effective teaching methods and the CCSSE categories of student engagement will also yield some valuable data that faculty may consider when evaluating topics for the QEP.

CCSSE/NCCBP: As noted above, enhanced data from the CCSSE survey regarding student use, satisfaction, and perception of importance regarding academic advisement will be forthcoming from the spring 2006 administration. The Advisement Committee of Roane State's Enrollment Task Force will use this data as well as data gathered from planned focus groups to develop new or revised interventions to improve student success through better academic advisement. [Advisement Focus Groups](#)

Data from the NCCBP regarding under-performance of Roane State students against national peers in the area of successful completion of English Composition I courses has led to the establishment of a subcommittee of the General Education and Assessment Committee. This faculty group has begun to work with the research office to analyze data on failures in Comp I and develop strategies to improve student success in this core area of study – another potential topic for the strategic QEP. [English 1010 Data](#)

SPOL: Since 1994, Roane State has engaged in a planning process in which administrative, service, and academic units develop objectives and action strategies in support of institutional goals included in the college's strategic plan. Although the current process meets threshold requirements to demonstrate institutional commitment to planning, linking planning to budgeting, assessment, and use of assessment for improvement; it is not particularly transparent to all units within the college in a way that might facilitate internal benchmarking, collaboration, and increased accountability for assessment. In 2005, Roane State seized the opportunity to partner with Indian River Community College and eight other colleges and universities around the country in piloting the use of SPOL (Strategic Planning Online), an award-winning system of web-based planning, budgeting, and documentation of assessment developed at Indian River. Currently, Roane State has trained planning unit managers across the college in basic use of the system, and preliminary entries of 2006-2007 planning objectives (primarily those associated with new funding requests) have been made. [Strategic Planning Online \(SPOL\)](#) The web-based flexibility and visibility of SPOL as well as its reporting capabilities make the system a significant improvement in Roane State's ability to engage all units in the planning and assessment process. As activities and assessment projects associated with the QEP are developed, SPOL will be a centralized means of sharing information and progress college-wide.

---

#### 2006-2007 Benchmarks in Support of the QEP

Roane State has set the following benchmarks which will incorporate processes of data collection and analysis, faculty collaboration and dialogue, and study of peers and best practices to support the selection of a QEP topic by August 2007:

- Complete Academic Audit of the General Education Program
  - Generate faculty dialogue regarding student learning issues of interest, importance, and concern

- Develop 3-5 improvement initiatives based upon assessment results of Academic Audit
- Begin implementation of improvement initiatives based upon recommendations/affirmations of Academic Audit peer review team
- Complete fall 2006 administration of IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction system
  - Conduct fall 2006 faculty evaluations using IDEA system
  - Evaluate effectiveness of IDEA system through analysis of response rate, faculty perceptions/satisfaction, and data regarding faculty use of results, etc.
  - Develop revisions as needed per faculty feedback
  - Obtain Faculty Senate approval for permanent adoption
- Develop improvement strategies for selected student success factors based upon analysis of NCCBP, CCSSE, and internal data
  - Conduct advisement focus groups based upon data from 2005 and 2006 CCSSE results and previous trend data
  - Develop improvement initiatives based upon advisement focus group results
  - Complete analysis of factors affecting failure in Composition I courses
  - Develop improvement initiatives based upon interpretation of Comp I student data
- Select QEP topic
  - Gather feedback across college constituencies regarding issues of interest, importance, and concern related to student learning
  - Develop and implement method for submitting QEP topics incorporating data analysis, best practice review, and draft ideas for development plan
  - Select QEP topic by August 2007

**Roane State Community College  
Standard 5.B Assessment Implementation**

**“Evaluation of Institutional Assessment Processes in Support of a QEP”**

**Bibliography of Hyperlinked Documents**

1. [Sample Institutional Effectiveness Documents \(IEPDS\) - 2002-2005](#)
2. [RSCC Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research Webpage](#)
3. [Overall Academic Profile Scores](#)
4. [Performance Funding Reports – 2000-2001 through 2004-2005](#)
5. [Performance Funding 4.B Summative Report](#)
6. Satisfaction Surveys 2001-2005
  - a. [Enrolled Student Survey 2001; Alumni Survey 2002](#)
  - b. [Enrolled Student Survey 2004; Alumni Survey 2005](#)
7. [Noel-Levitz Data \(fall 2001\)](#)
  - a. Data Tables
  - b. Survey Findings
8. [Freshman Experience Survey Data](#)
  - a. Survey Instrument
  - b. Survey Findings
9. [CCSSE Data \(2005 survey administration\)](#)
10. [Sample General Education and Assessment Committee Minutes](#)
  - a. 2.11.02
  - b. 9.24.03
  - c. 4.1.04
  - d. 9.26.05
  - e. 2.27.06
  - f. 4.10.06
11. [Performance Funding 1.B Summative Report](#)
12. [General Education Pre-and-Post-Test Data](#)
  - a. Pre-and-Post-Test Results
  - b. Test Item Analysis – Chemistry
  - c. Test Item Analysis – College Algebra
  - d. Test Item Analysis – English 1020

13. [Critical Thinking Test Data](#)
  - a. Critical Thinking Test
  - b. Test Item Analysis
  - c. Revised Test
  - d. Pre-and-Post-Test Results
  
14. [RSCC Strategic Plan 2005-2010](#)
  
15. [Academic Audit Activities and Surveys](#)
  - a. Schedule of Activities
  - b. Humanities Survey
  - c. Math Survey
  - d. Science Survey
  - e. Communication Survey
  - f. History Survey
  
16. [IDEA System Data \(2005\)](#)
  - a. Institutional Summary fall 2005
  - b. Institutional Summary spring 2006
  
17. [Advisement Focus Groups](#)
  - a. Interview Protocol
  - b. Follow-up Questions
  
18. [English 1010 Data](#)
  
19. [Strategic Planning Online \(SPOL\)](#)