

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2010-15 Performance Funding
Summary of Points Recommended**



Year 1: 2010-11

Roane State Community College	Maximum Points	Recommended Points
STANDARD ONE - QUALITY OF STUDENT LEARNING AND ENGAGEMENT		
Standard 1A: General Education Assessment	15	15
Standard 1B: Major Field Assessment	15	15
Standard 1C: Academic Programs: Accreditation and Evaluation	15	15
Standard 1D: Satisfaction Studies (<i>Student Engagement</i>)	10	8
Standard 1E: Job Placement	10	10
Standard 1F: Assessment Implementation	10	10
STANDARD TWO - QUALITY OF STUDENT ACCESS AND STUDENT SUCCESS		
Standard 2: Student Access and Student Success	25	25
Total Points	100	98

Institutional Comments:

Please place any comments in this text box.

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2010-15 Performance Funding
Standard 1A: General Education Assessment**

The General Education standard is designed to provide incentives to institutions for improvements in the quality of their undergraduate general education program as measured by the performance of graduates on an approved standardized test of general education.

Roane State Community College



Year 1: 2010-11

**Maximum Points: 15
Recommended Points: 15**

Test Type: ETS Proficiency Profile

Graduates Tested: All or Sample? All

Total Eligible Graduates: 773

No. Graduates Tested: 780

Percent Tested: 101%

National Norm Comparison (Maximum 15 points in Years 1-3 and 10 points in Years 4-5)

Mean Score	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Institution	441.7				
National	437.5				
Diff (I-Nat'l)	4.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
% Institution to National Average	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Institutional Trends Comparison (Maximum 5 points in Years 4-5)

Mean Score		2013-14	2014-15
Institution			
3 Yr Average			
Diff (I-Avg)		0.0	0.0
% Institution to National Average		0%	0%

Institutional Comments:

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2010-15 Performance Funding
Standard 1B: Major Field Assessment**

The Major Field standard is designed to provide incentives for institutions to improve the quality of academic programs as evaluated by the performance of graduates on approved examinations.

Roane State Community College

Year 1: 2010-11

Maximum Points: 15

Recommended Points: 15



Licensure Programs Reported Annually (Sorted by CIP Code)

2000 CIP	Academic Program	Degree	Test Year	Test Type	No. Grads	No. Tested	No. Passed	% Tested	Inst. Score	Comp. Score	% Inst to Comparison Score
1 31.51.0602.00	DENTAL HYGIENE TECHNOLOGY	2.3.AAS	2011	NBDHE	12	12	10	100%	83%	96%	87%
2 31.51.0803.00	OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY ASST	2.3.AAS	2010	OTRE	20	20	20	100%	100%	84%	100%
3 31.51.0806.00	PHYSICAL THERAPY ASSISTANT	2.3.AAS	2010	NPTE	19	19	18	100%	95%	84%	100%
4 31.51.0907.00	RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY	2.3.AAS	2010	ASRT	33	31	27	94%	87%	92%	95%
5 31.51.0908.00	RESPIRATORY THERAPY	2.3.AAS	2010-11	NBRCE	11	11	11	100%	100%	77%	100%
6 31.51.1601.00	NURSING	2.3.AAS	2010	NCLEX	99	99	95	100%	96%	82%	100%
7 31.51.1801.00	OPTICIANRY	2.3.AAS	2010-11	NOCE	21	21	18	100%	86%	53%	100%

Programs Reported Once During 5 Year Cycle (Sorted by Reporting Year)

2000 CIP	Academic Program	Degree	Test Year	Test Code	No. Grads	No. Tested	% Tested	Inst. Score	Comp. Score	% Inst to Comparison Score
1 32.52.0201.01	BUSINESS MANAGEMENT TECH	2.3.AAS	2010-11	Local	32	31	97%	74.61	70	100%
2 32.52.0299.01	CONTEMPORARY MANAGEMENT	2.3.AAS	2010-11	Local	27	24	89%	65.79	70	94%
3 31.51.0707.00	MEDICAL RECORDS TECHNOLOGY	2.3.AAS	2011-12	RHIT						
4 27.43.0107.00	CRIMINAL JUSTICE	2.3.AAS	2012-13	Local						
5 14.22.0302.00	LEGAL ASSISTING	2.3.AAS	2013-14	Local						
6 08.13.0101.00	TEACHING	2.3.AST	2014-15	TBD						

Programs Exempt During 5 Year Cycle (Sorted by Exemption)

2000 CIP	Academic Program	Degree	Exemption
1 06.11.0801.00	WEB TECHNOLOGY (RODP)	2.3.AAS	Low Producing
2 12.19.0706.00	EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION	2.3.AAS	Low Producing
3 16.24.0102.02	PROFESSIONAL STUDIES	2.3.AAS	Low Producing
4 28.45.0702.00	GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEMS	2.3.AAS	Low Producing
5 31.51.2202.00	ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH TECH	2.3.AAS	Low Producing
6 13.21.0101.01	GENERAL TECHNOLOGY	2.3.AAS	Multidisciplinary
7 16.24.0101.01	GENERAL EDUCATION	2.3.AA, AS	Multidisciplinary
8 31.51.9999.01	ALLIED HEALTH SCIENCES	2.3.AAS	New
274 268 98% 16.32 16.19 101%			

Institutional Comments:

Opticianry: Two additional students have taken the National Opticianry Competency Exam. Their scores will be submitted to THEC when they are received by RSCC. The national pass rate was 53% in May, 2010. (Note: The Performance Funding report for 2009-10 inaccurately stated the national pass rate for this exam as 94%.) Score reports received October 27 2011)

Business Management Technology: One student was granted approval for an exemption.

Contemporary Management: Two students were granted approval for exemptions. One additional student previously took the test in 2007.

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2010-15 Performance Funding
Standard 1B: Major Field Assessment**



Year 1: 2010-11

Roane State Community College

Academic Program	BUSINESS MANAGEMENT TECH	CONTEMPORARY MANAGEMENT
Test Code	Local	Local
Test Type	Other	Other
Previous Mean	70	70
2010-11 Average	74.6	65.8
% Inst to Comparison Score	100.0%	94.0%
No. Student Scores	31	24
Student Scores	BUSINESS MANAGEMENT TECH	CONTEMPORARY MANAGEMENT
1	73.0	65.0
2	81.0	71.0
3	76.0	51.0
4	71.0	53.0
5	55.0	71.0
6	71.0	74.0
7	78.0	63.0
8	66.0	61.0
9	71.0	58.0
10	74.0	70.0
11	80.0	69.0
12	70.0	64.0
13	73.0	55.0
14	81.0	59.0
15	77.0	69.0
16	73.0	66.0
17	71.0	74.0
18	78.0	76.0
19	70.0	65.0
20	85.0	72.0
21	74.0	53.0
22	90.0	71.0
23	93.0	68.0
24	61.0	81.0
25	69.0	
26	68.0	
27	78.0	
28	63.0	
29	78.0	
30	89.0	
31	76.0	
32		
33		
34		
35		
36		
37		
38		
39		
40		
41		
42		
43		
44		
45		



**Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2010-15 Performance Funding
Standard 1C: Academic Programs: Accreditation and Evaluation**

The Academic Programs standard is designed to provide incentives for institutions to achieve and maintain program excellence and accreditation.

Year 1: 2010-11

Roane State Community College			
Maximum Points	15	Undergraduate Programs	
Recommended Points	15	Number of Non-Accreditable Programs:	11
		Points Recommended:	10

Accreditation	
Number of Accreditable Programs:	16
Number of Programs Seeking Accreditation	1
Number of Accredited Programs:	15
Percent Accredited:	100%
Points Recommended:	5

Accreditation								
	2000 CIP	Academic Program	Degree Level	Accrediting Agency	Accredited?	Accreditation Cycle		Next Site Visit
						Begin Date	End Date	
1	14.22.0302.00	LEGAL ASSISTING	2.3.AAS	ABA	Yes	2005	2012	2012
2	31.51.0602.00	DENTAL HYGIENE TECH	2.3.AAS	ADA	Yes	2007	2013	2013
3	31.51.0707.00	MEDICAL RECORDS TECH	2.3.AAS	CAHIIM	Yes	2005	On-going	--
4	31.51.0803.00	OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY ASST.	2.3.AAS	AOTA	Yes	2007	2014	2014
5	31.51.0805.00	PHARMACY TECHNICIAN	2.2C1	ASHEP	Yes	2009	2015	2015
6	31.51.0806.00	PHYSICAL THERAPY ASSISTANT	2.3.AAS	APTA	Yes	2010	2020	2019
7	31.51.0904.00	EMT/PARAMEDIC	2.2.C1	CAAHEP	Yes	2006	2011	Sep-11
8	31.51.0907.00	RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY	2.3.AAS	JCERT	Yes	2006	2014	2014
9	31.51.0908.00	RESPIRATORY THERAPY	2.3.AAS	CAAHEP	Yes	2001	2011	Jun-11
10	31.51.1099.01	POLYSOMNOGRAPHY TECH	2.1.C1	CAAHEP	Yes	2010	2014	2014
11	31.51.1601.00	NURSING	2.3.AAS	NLNAC	Yes	2007	2015	2015
12	31.51.1801.00	OPTICIANRY	2.3.AAS	COA	Yes	2008	2014	2014
13	31.51.3501.00	SOMATIC THERAPY	2.1.C1	COMTA	Yes	2010	2015	2015
14	32.52.0201.01	BUSINESS MANAGEMENT TECH	2.3.AAS	ACBSP	Yes	2004	2014	2014
15	32.52.0299.01	CONTEMPORARY MANAGEMENT	2.3.AAS	ACBSP	Yes	2004	2014	2014
16	12.19.0706.00	EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION	2.3.AAS	NAEYC		NAEYC decision in 2014-15		



2010-15 Performance Funding
Standard 1C: Academic Programs: Accreditation and Evaluation

The Academic Programs standard is designed to provide incentives for institutions to achieve and maintain program excellence and accreditation.

Year 1: 2010-11

Roane State Community College			
Maximum Points	15	Undergraduate Programs	
Recommended Points	15	Number of Non-Accreditable Programs:	11
		Points Recommended:	10

Accreditation	
Number of Accreditable Programs:	16
Number of Programs Seeking Accreditation	1
Number of Accredited Programs:	15
Percent Accredited:	100%
Points Recommended:	5

Program Evaluation: Non-Accreditable Programs

RSCC - 5 Year Review Cycle

	2000 CIP	Academic Program	Degree	Year Reviewed	Evaluation Type *	Total No. Standards	"NA" Standards	# Stand. Met
1	31.51.2202.00	ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH TECH	2.3.AAS	2010-11	AA	23		23
2	16.24.0101.01	GENERAL EDUCATION	2.3.AA, AS	2011-12	AA			
3	06.11.0801.00	WEB TECHNOLOGY (RODP)	2.3.AAS	2011-12	AA			
4	06.11.0801.00	WEB PAGE AUTHORING (RODP)	2.1.C1	Embedded Certificate				
	28.45.0702.00	GEOGRAPHIC INFO SYSTEMS	2.3.AAS	2011-12	AA			
5	28.45.0702.00	GEOGRAPHIC INFO SYSTEMS	2.1.C1	Embedded Certificate				
	06.110101.00	COMPUTER SCIENCE	2.1.C1	2014-15	AA			
6	08.13.0101.00	TEACHING	2.3.AST	2014-15	AA			
7	13.21.0101.01	GENERAL TECHNOLOGY	2.3.AAS	2013-14	PR			
8	16.24.0102.02	PROFESSIONAL STUDIES	2.3.AAS	2013-14	AA			
9	27.43.0107.00	CRIMINAL JUSTICE (AAS)	2.3.AAS	2012-13	PR			
	27.43.9999.00	HOMELAND SECURITY	2.1.C1	Embedded Certificate				
10	31.51.0708.00	MEDICAL TRANSCRIPTION	2.1.C1	2013-14	PR			
11	31.51.9999.01	ALLIED HEALTH SCIENCES	2.3.AAS	2013-14	AA			
						23	0	23

***PR** denotes traditional **Program Review** with checklist of 25 criteria. Criteria include program outcomes, curriculum, teaching/learning environment, faculty and support.

AA denotes **Academic Audit** with checklist of 20 criteria or 23 criteria for programs undergoing the Academic Audit a second time or more. Criteria include learning objectives, curriculum/co-curriculum, teaching/learning processes, student learning assessment, quality assurance, overall assessment, and support.

Institutional Comments:

Medical Records Technology: A continuation of accreditation letter from CAHIM is attached.

Physical Therapy Assistant: The American Physical Therapy Association voted to continue the program's accreditation on April 19, 2011 (effective through 2020). Documentation is attached.

EMT/Paramedic: A self-study was submitted to CoAEMSP on April 14, 2011. A site visit was requested for September, 2011.

Respiratory Therapy: A self-study was submitted to the Commission on Accreditation for Respiratory Care in February, 2011. A site visit occurred June 27-28, 2011.

Somatic Therapy: The program was reaffirmed by the Commission on Massage Therapy in April, 2010 (effective through 2015). Documentation is attached.

Environmental Health Technology: An academic audit of this program was conducted in April, 2011. All 23 (100%) standards were met. Documentation is attached.

Early Childhood Education: The appointment of a new director will be effective July 30, 2011. An application for accreditation will be submitted to NAECYC by the end of fall, 2011.



2010-15 Performance Funding
Standard 1C: Academic Programs: Accreditation and Evaluation

The Academic Programs standard is designed to provide incentives for institutions to achieve and maintain program excellence and accreditation.

Year 1: 2010-11

Roane State Community College

Maximum Points	15
Recommended Points	15

Undergraduate Programs	
Number of Non-Accreditable Programs:	11
Points Recommended:	10

Accreditation	
Number of Accreditable Programs:	16
Number of Programs Seeking Accreditation	1
Number of Accredited Programs:	15
Percent Accredited:	100%
Points Recommended:	5

==



% Met
100%



—
—

Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2010-15 Performance Funding
Standard 1D: Satisfaction Studies (Student Engagement)

The Satisfaction Studies standard is designed to provide incentives for institutions to improve the quality of their undergraduate programs as evaluated by surveys of undergraduate students, recent graduates, and regional and/or national employers of recent graduates. Highlighted items were noted as successful due to a variance of <.02.

Roane State Community College



Year 1: 2010-11

Maximum Points: 10

Successful Questions: 42

Requested Points: 8

Year	Satisfaction Study
2010-11	Student Engagement Survey (NSSE and CCSSE)
2011-12	Alumni Satisfaction Project
2012-13	Employer Satisfaction Project
2013-14	Student Engagement Survey (NSSE and CCSSE)
2014-15	Comprehensive Satisfaction Project

	RSCC 2011 Mean	Peer Colleges 2011 Mean	Above/Below Mean	Points Awarded for Meeting 2011 Peers	RSCC 2009 Mean	Points Awarded
ACTIVE AND COLLABORATIVE LEARNING						
4a. Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions	2.98	2.93		1	2.92	0.5
4b. Made a class presentation	2.07	2.06		1	2.24	0.0
4f. Worked with other students in projects during class	2.43	2.5		1	2.45	0.0
4g. Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments	2.02	1.89		1	2.10	0.0
4h. Tutored or taught other students (paid or voluntary)	1.37	1.38		1	1.40	0.0
4i. Participated in a community-based project as a part of a regular course	1.22	1.31		1	1.32	0.0
4r. Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (students, family members, co-workers, etc.)	2.64	2.57		1	2.74	0.0
Total Points for Active and Collaborative Learning				7		0.5
STUDENT EFFORT						
4c. Prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in	2.63	2.50		1	2.45	0.5
4d. Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources	2.77	2.76		1	2.77	0.0
4e. Came to class without completing readings or assignments	1.80	1.80		1	1.79	0.0
6b. Number of books read on your own (not assigned) for personal enjoyment or academic enrichment	2.10	2.10		1	2.10	0.0
10a. Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, rehearsing, doing homework, or other activities related to your program)	2.19	1.99		1	2.16	0.0
13d1. Frequency: Peer or other tutoring	1.52	1.48		1	1.40	0.5
13e1. Frequency: Skill labs (writing, math, etc.)	1.64	1.72		1	1.61	0.0
13h1. Frequency: Computer lab	2.36	2.09	↑	1	2.33	0.0
Total Point for Student Effort				8		1.0

	RSCC 2011 Mean	Peer Colleges 2011 Mean	Above/Below Mean	Points Awarded for Meeting 2011 Peers	RSCC 2009 Mean	Points Awarded
ACADEMIC CHALLENGE						
4p. Worked harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor's standards or expectations	2.75	2.59		1	2.68	0.5
5b. Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory	2.94	2.89		1	2.98	0.0
5c. Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information or experiences in new ways	2.80	2.76		1	2.84	0.0
5d. Making judgments about the value or soundness of information, arguments, or methods	2.68	2.58		1	2.69	0.0
5e. Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations	2.71	2.69		1	2.82	0.0
5f. Using information you have read or heard to perform a new skill	2.79	2.80		1	2.91	0.0
6a. Number of assigned textbooks, manuals, books, or book-length packs of course readings	2.97	2.89		1	2.94	0.0
6c. Number of written papers or reports of any length	2.93	2.87		1	2.86	0.5
7. Mark the box that best represents the extent to which your examinations during the current school year have challenged you to do your best work at this college	5.32	5.01	↑	1	5.45	0.0
9a. Encouraging you to spend significant amount of time studying	3.12	3.01		1	3.13	0.0
Total Points for Academic Challenge				10		1.0
STUDENT-FACULTY INTERACTION						
4k. Used email to communicate with an instructor	2.95	2.75	↑	1	2.83	0.5
4l. Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor	2.68	2.57		1	2.64	0.0
4m. Talked about career plans with an instructor or advisor	2.02	2.06		1	2.10	0.0
4n. Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with instructors outside of class	1.79	1.75		1	1.81	0.0
4o. Received prompt feedback (written or oral) from instructors on your performance	2.82	2.68		1	2.86	0.0
4q. Worked with instructors on activities other than coursework	1.37	1.42		1	1.40	0.0
Total Points for Student-Faculty Interaction				6		0.5
SUPPORT FOR LEARNERS						
9b. Providing the support you need to help you succeed at this college	2.99	2.99		1	3.01	0.0
9c. Encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds	2.41	2.53		1	2.33	0.5
9d. Helping you cope with your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)	1.86	1.95		1	1.89	0.0
9e. Providing the support you need to thrive socially	2.10	2.16		1	2.09	0.0
9f. Providing the financial support you need to afford your education	2.56	2.55		1	2.37	0.5
13a1. Frequency: Academic advising/planning	1.66	1.78		1	1.62	0.0
13b1. Frequency: Career Counseling	1.33	1.43		1	1.33	0.0
Total Points for Support for Learners				7		1.0
Points Awarded				38		4.0



**Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2010-15 Performance Funding
Standard 1E: Job Placement**

The Job Placement standard is designed to provide incentives for community colleges to continue to improve job placement of their career program graduates.

Roane State Community College

Total Number Programs: 28
Total Placeable 440
Total Placed 427
Placement Rate 97%

Year 1: 2010-11
Maximum Points: 10
Recommended Point: 10

2000 CIP	Academic Program	Degree	2010 Grads	Non- Respondents	Grads Adjustment	EXEMPTIONS					Total Placeable	Total Placed	Percent Placed
						Educ	Medical	Family	Military	Volunteer			
1 06.11.0801.00	WEB TECHNOLOGY (RODP)	2.3.AAS	0		0						0	0	n/a
2 06.11.0801.00	WEB PAGE AUTHORIZING (RODP)	2.1.C1	0		0						0	0	n/a
3 06.110101.00	COMPUTER SCIENCE	2.1.C1	1		1						1	1	100%
4 12.19.0706.00	EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION	2.3.AAS	11		11	1					10	10	100%
5 13.21.0101.01	GENERAL TECHNOLOGY	2.3.AAS	56	3	53	11	1				41	41	100%
6 14.22.0302.00	LEGAL ASSISTING	2.3.AAS	7		7	3				1	3	3	100%
7 27.43.0107.00	CRIMINAL JUSTICE	2.3.AAS	20	3	17	10	1			1	5	5	100%
8 27.43.9999.00	HOMELAND SECURITY	2.1.C1	3		3	1					2	2	100%
9 28.45.0702.00	GEOGRAPHIC INFO SYSTEMS	2.3.AAS	8		8	3					5	5	100%
10 28.45.0702.00	GEOGRAPHIC INFO SYSTEMS	2.1.C1	7		7	2					5	4	80%
11 31.51.0602.00	DENTAL HYGIENE TECHNOLOGY	2.3.AAS	12		12	1					11	11	100%
12 31.51.0707.00	MEDICAL RECORDS TECHNOLOGY	2.3.AAS	7		7						7	7	100%
13 31.51.0708.00	MEDICAL TRANSCRIPTION	2.1.C1	11		11			1			10	9	90%
14 31.51.0803.00	OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY ASST.	2.3.AAS	20		20						20	20	100%
15 31.51.0805.00	PHARMACY TECHNICIAN	2.2.C1	14	1	13	3					10	9	90%
16 31.51.0806.00	PHYSICAL THERAPY ASSISTANT	2.3.AAS	19		19						19	19	100%
17 31.51.0904.00	EMT/PARAMEDIC	2.2.C1	36		36						36	36	100%
18 31.51.0907.00	RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY	2.3.AAS	33		33	6	1	1			25	22	88%
19 31.51.0908.00	RESPIRATORY THERAPY	2.3.AAS	11	1	10						10	10	100%
20 31.51.0999.01	DIAGNOSIS & PROCEDURAL CODING	2.2.C1	9	1	8	3					5	4	80%
21 31.51.1099.01	POLYSOMNOGRAPHY TECH	2.1.C1	15		15			1			14	12	86%
22 31.51.1601.00	NURSING	2.3.AAS	99		99						99	99	100%
23 31.51.1801.00	OPTICIANRY	2.3.AAS	22	1	21			2			19	16	84%
24 31.51.2202.00	ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH TECH	2.3.AAS	2		2						2	2	100%
25 31.51.3501.00	SOMATIC THERAPY	2.1.C1	10	2	8	1					7	6	86%
26 31.51.9999.01	ALLIED HEALTH SCIENCES	2.3.AAS	4		4	2					2	2	100%
27 32.52.0201.01	BUSINESS MANAGEMENT TECH	2.3.AAS	45	2	43	6					37	37	100%
28 32.52.0299.01	CONTEMPORARY MANAGEMENT	2.3.AAS	38	1	37	2					35	35	100%

Programs Exempt from Job Placement Standard

2000 CIP	Academic Program	Degree
1 08.13.0101.00	TEACHING	2.3.AST
2 16.24.0101.01	GENERAL EDUCATION	2.3.AA, AS
3 16.24.0102.02	PROFESSIONAL STUDIES	2.3.AAS

Total	520	15	505	55	3	5	1	1	440	427	97%
Percentage of Non-Respondents		3%									

Note: Please report all non-respondents by program. The 2009 graduates will be adjusted to reflect the removal of non-respondents. Maximum of non-respondents is limited to 5% for all programs.

Institutional Comments (Optional):

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2010-15 Performance Funding
Standard 1F: Assessment Implementation**

The Assessment Implementation standard is designed to provide incentives for institutions to develop and sustain a mature and sophisticated assessment process while implementing a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) or Student Learning Initiative (SLI).

Roane State Community College

Year 1: 2010-11

Maximum Points: 10
Recommended Points: 10



Year	QEP or SLI	Stage	Title and Description
2010-11	QEP	Sustaining	The SAILS Project: Students Achieving Improved Learning Strategies
2011-12	QEP	Sustaining	The SAILS Project: Students Achieving Improved Learning Strategies
2012-13	QEP	Sustaining	The SAILS Project: Students Achieving Improved Learning Strategies
2013-14	QEP	Sustaining	The SAILS Project: Students Achieving Improved Learning Strategies
2014-15	QEP	Sustaining	The SAILS Project: Students Achieving Improved Learning Strategies

Scoring Rubric for Assessment Implementation: Sustaining QEP

- (1) Present a short review of the QEP activity. (Why it was undertaken including goals and objectives? AND describe the actions for the year that were taken to
- (2) Describe the assessments taken during the year. (What were they and why were they used? What was the methodology?)
- (3) Present this year's major assessment results with the addition of previous results, as they are available.
- (4) Discuss how the institution is improving the QEP based on the assessment results.
- (5) Evaluate the QP itself (what is working, what is not working AND outline steps for next year (program implementation and assessment related).

Faculty Evaluators' Comments:

- 1. Present a short review of the QEP/SLI activity (Why it was undertaken including goals and objectives?) AND describe the actions for the year that were taken to accomplish goals and objectives. [0-2 points]**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 points	The report provides a concise, yet thorough review of the activity to date and its rationale. The actions for this year are moving the project forward toward its goals and objectives.
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 point	The report provides an adequate review of the activity and the actions for this year.
<input type="checkbox"/> 0 point	The report gives a weak review of the activity or describes limited actions moving the activity forward, or both.

Comments: *The report demonstrated research-based learning strategies and the faculty training component was very strong.*

- 2. Describe the assessments taken during the year, (What were they and why were they used? What was the methodology?). [0-1 points]**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1 point	The report describes a clear link between the assessments conducted and the stated objectives and goals of the QEP/SLI. The methodology used is appropriate to the measurement of stated goals and objectives.
<input type="checkbox"/> 0 point	The report shows a weak link between the assessments conducted and aspects of student learning they measure, or the methodology used is not appropriate to the measurement of stated goals and objectives, or both.

Comments: *The assessments were very clearly defined and written in very clear language which easily communicated what the institution was trying to accomplish.*

communicated what the institution was trying to get accomplished.

3. Present this year’s major assessment results with the addition of previous results, as they are available. [0-2 points]

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 point	The report clearly presents the major results from this year’s assessments and, if applicable, incorporates these with the previous results so that the reader can follow the assessments over time.
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 point	The report presents the major findings and, if applicable, incorporates these with previous findings. Information provided could be improved with a greater clarity of presentation.
<input type="checkbox"/> 0 point	The assessment findings are lacking detail, difficult to understand, vague, or are minimally presented.

Comments: *The institution clearly identified the processes that were in place and addressed any missing data issues with a corrective action plan.*

4. Discuss how the institution is improving the QEP/SLI based on the assessment results. [0-3 points]

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 points	The report clearly describes how the institution plans to improve its QEP/SLI in response to a thoughtful analysis of assessment results. Or, based on an analysis of assessment results, the report justifies that no improvement actions are required at this time.
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points	The report describes how the institution plans to improve its QEP/SLI and gives a general indication of how those improvements are related to assessments results.
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 point	The report describes planned improvements to the QEP/SLI, but the improvements are difficult to understand or vague; or the report does not linked to improvements to assessment findings; or both.
<input type="checkbox"/> 0 point	The report does not describe any planned improvements to the QEP/SLI, nor does it justify that improvement actions are not required at this time.

Comments: *The plan for improvement is very straight forward and easy to follow.*

5. Evaluate the QEP/SLI itself (what is working, what is not working) AND outline steps for next year (program implementation and assessment related). [0-2 points]

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 points	The report provides a thoughtful analysis of its QEP/SLI with observations about what is effective and what is not going as planned. The activities for next year are clearly described.
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 point	The report shows some reflection on the QEP/SLI at this stage. The activities for next year are listed.
<input type="checkbox"/> 0 point	The report shows a lack of reflection or a weak reflection of the QEP/SLI at this stage. The activities for the next year are not adequately identified.

Comments: *The future plan is clear and concise.*

Overall the document was very well done and the project seemed to have great benefits for the students and the institution.

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission
2010-15 Performance Funding
Standard 2: Student Access and Student Success**

The Student Access and Success standard is designed to provide incentives for institutions to increase the number of graduates from select subpopulations. Each institution selected five subpopulations particularly important to their mission and this standard measures the quality of its services dedicated to those subpopulations. The measure of the institution's commitment will be student subpopulation success – greater number enrolled, retained, and graduated.

Roane State Community College



**Maximum Points: 25
Recommended Points: 25**

Year 1: 2010-11

No.	Sub-Population	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	3 Yr Avg Benchmark	2009-10 Attainment	Percent Attained	Pts Recommended
1	Adults	459	406	373	413	432	100%	5
2	Low Income	395	378	366	380	411	100%	5
3	Males	226	204	187	206	240	100%	5
4	Health Programs	309	289	288	295	314	100%	5
5	High Need Fields: Teaching AST and Contemporary Management	35	32	62	43	83	100%	5

Institutional Comments:

Please place any comments in this text box.