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Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
2010-15 Performance Funding  

Summary of Points Requested  

Year 3: 2012-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pellissippi State Community College</th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
<th>Requested Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STANDARD ONE - QUALITY OF STUDENT LEARNING AND ENGAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1A: General Education Assessment</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1B: Major Field Assessment</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1C: Academic Programs: Accreditation and Evaluation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1D: Satisfaction Studies <em>(Employer Satisfaction Project)</em></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1E: Job Placement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1F: Assessment Implementation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STANDARD TWO - QUALITY OF STUDENT ACCESS AND STUDENT SUCCESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2: Student Access and Student Success</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutional Comments:
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pellissippi State Community College</th>
<th>Year 3: 2012-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Points:</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested Points:</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test Type: CBase  
Graduates Tested: All  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Eligible Graduates:</th>
<th>1256</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. Graduates Tested:</td>
<td>1135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Tested:</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>280.0</td>
<td>266.0</td>
<td>265.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>275.0</td>
<td>276.0</td>
<td>277.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff (I-Natl)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
<td>-12.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Institution to National Average</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Yr Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff (I-Avg)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Institution to National Average</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 31, 2013

Dr. Lois Reynolds
Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs
Pellissippi State Community College
10915 Hardin Valley Rd.
Knoxville, TN 37933-0990

Dear Dr. Reynolds:

Enclosed is information for your institution regarding student performance on the College Basic Academic Subjects Examination (College BASE) during the 2012-2013 academic year. The 2012-2013 results for Pellissippi State Community College are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013 institutional composite mean</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students (net*)</td>
<td>1186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of subjects tested per student</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of 2012-2013 reference group</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Students who did not meet all of the selection criteria are excluded from the final performance data. Please note that of the students who took College BASE, 17 were excluded in the final data because of one of these reasons: scores below chance, less than four subjects taken, or an indication that they were in a year of school other than sophomore.

Please refer to the performance funding standards provided by the Tennessee Higher Education Commission for additional details on how points are awarded for the General Education Standard.

Enclosed is an Extract Summary Report reflecting your students’ performance for 2012-2013 and a booklet indicating the performance of the reference group. If you have any questions regarding these reports please call me at 1-800-366-8232.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Pamela A. Humphreys
Senior Coordinator

cc: Dr. Betty Dandridge-Johnson, THEC
    Joan Newman
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.

### Licensure Programs Reported Annually (Sorted by CIP Code)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010 CIP</th>
<th>Academic Program</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Test Year</th>
<th>Test Type</th>
<th>No. Grad</th>
<th>No. Tested</th>
<th>No. Passed</th>
<th>% Tested</th>
<th>Inst. Score</th>
<th>Comp. Score</th>
<th>% Inst to Comparison Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31.51.3801.00</td>
<td>NURSING * 2.3.AAS</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>NCLEX</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010 CIP</th>
<th>Academic Program</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Test Year</th>
<th>Test Code</th>
<th>No. Grads</th>
<th>No. Tested</th>
<th>% Tested</th>
<th>Inst. Score</th>
<th>Comp. Score</th>
<th>% Inst to Comparison Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08.13.0101.00</td>
<td>TEACHING 2.3.AST</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>PRAXIS</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>176.7</td>
<td>172.0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.22.0302.00</td>
<td>PARALEGAL STUDIES 2.3.AAS</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.52.0201.01</td>
<td>BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION 2.3.AAS</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.52.0401.00</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL TECH 2.3.AAS</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>OPAC</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.10.0105.00</td>
<td>MEDIA TECHNOLOGIES 2.3.AAS</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.11.0101.00</td>
<td>COMP SCIENCE &amp; INFO TECH 2.3.AAS</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>Brainbench</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.50.0408.00</td>
<td>INTERIOR DESIGN TECHNOLOGY 2.3.AAS</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Programs Exempt During 5 Year Cycle (Sorted by Exemption)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010 CIP</th>
<th>Academic Program</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Exemption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06.11.0801.00</td>
<td>WEB TECHNOLOGY (RODP) 2.3.AAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Producing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.15.0000.00</td>
<td>ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY 2.3.AAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Producing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.19.0706.00</td>
<td>EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION 2.3.AAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Producing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.32.0111.00</td>
<td>GENERAL TECHNOLOGY 2.3.AAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Producing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.24.0101.01</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY PARALLEL 2.3.AS, AA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Multidisciplinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.24.0102.02</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL STUDIES 2.3.AAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Multidisciplinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.43.0104.00</td>
<td>CRIMINAL JUSTICE (RODP) 2.3AAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>New program Aug 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.50.0903.00</td>
<td>FINE ARTS 2.3.AFA</td>
<td></td>
<td>New program Aug 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.51.9999.01</td>
<td>HEALTH SCIENCES 2.3AAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>New program Aug 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Nursing program was approved in 2009 and first class admitted in 2010*

198 205 100% 85.84 84.65 101%
# 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 3: 2012-13

### Pelissippi State Community College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
<th>Undergraduate Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requested Points</th>
<th>Number of Non-Accreditable Programs:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Accreditation

#### Number of Accreditable Programs:
7

#### Number of Programs Seeking Accreditation:
3

#### Number of Accredited Programs:
4

#### Percent Accredited:
80%

#### Points Requested:
1

---

### Accreditation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010 CIP</th>
<th>Academic Program</th>
<th>Degree Level</th>
<th>Accrediting Agency</th>
<th>Accredited?</th>
<th>Accreditation Cycle</th>
<th>Next Site Visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06.11.0101.00</td>
<td>COMP SCIENCE &amp; INFO TECH</td>
<td>2.3.AAS</td>
<td>ACBSP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2012-2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.22.0302.00</td>
<td>PARALEGAL STUDIES</td>
<td>2.3.AAS</td>
<td>ABA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2009-2016</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.52.0201.01</td>
<td>BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>2.3.AAS</td>
<td>ACBSP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2012-2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.52.0401.00</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL TECH</td>
<td>2.3.AAS</td>
<td>ACBSP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2012-2022</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.15.0000.00</td>
<td>ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>2.3.AAS</td>
<td>ATMAE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Site visit expected March/April 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.51.3801.00</td>
<td>NURSING</td>
<td>2.3.AAS</td>
<td>NLNAC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Site visit expected spring 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.19.0706.00</td>
<td>EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION</td>
<td>2.3.AAS</td>
<td>NAEYC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Site visit expected spring 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Program Evaluation: Non-Accreditable Programs

**PSCC - 5 Year Review Cycle**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010 CIP</th>
<th>Academic Program</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Year Reviewed</th>
<th>Evaluation Type</th>
<th>Total No. Standards</th>
<th>&quot;NA&quot; Standards</th>
<th># Stand. Met</th>
<th>% Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30.50.0408.00</td>
<td>INTERIOR DESIGN TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>2.3.AAS</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.11.0801.00</td>
<td>WEB TECHNOLOGY (RODP)</td>
<td>2.3.AAS</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.11.0801.00</td>
<td>WEB PAGE AUTHORING (RODP)</td>
<td>2.2C1</td>
<td>Embedded certificate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.13.0101.00</td>
<td>TEACHING</td>
<td>2.3.AST</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.32.0111.00</td>
<td>GENERAL TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>2.3.AAS</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.24.0101.01</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY PARALLEL</td>
<td>2.3.AS, AA</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.24.0102.02</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL STUDIES</td>
<td>2.3.AAS</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.50.0401.00</td>
<td>GAME &amp; SIMULATION DESIGN</td>
<td>2.1C1</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.50.0602.00</td>
<td>VIDEO EDITING</td>
<td>2.1C1</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.10.0105.00</td>
<td>MEDIA TECHNOLOGIES</td>
<td>2.3.AAS</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.43.0104.00</td>
<td>CRIMINAL JUSTICE (RODP)</td>
<td>2.3.AS</td>
<td>New program effective Jan 2013</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.50.0903.00</td>
<td>FINE ARTS</td>
<td>2.3.AFA</td>
<td>New program effective Aug 2012</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.51.9999.01</td>
<td>HEALTH SCIENCES</td>
<td>2.3.AAS</td>
<td>New program effective Aug 2012</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PR* denotes traditional Program Review with checklist of 24 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:**

Site visits for both Nursing and Engineering Technology programs took place in March 2013. The NLNAC (now renamed ACEN) committee recommended accreditation.
Academic Audit Report

Associate of Science in Teaching

Pellissippi State Community College

I. Introduction

On April 17, 2013, an Academic Auditor Team consisting of Diane Ward, Dean, Social Science, Business and Education at Roane State Community College; Norma Hogan, Professor, Curriculum and Instruction and Coordinator of Secondary Education at East Tennessee State University; and Charlie Coffey, Director, Education Department, Motlow State Community College; conducted a site visit for the Associate of Science in Teaching (AST) program at Pellissippi State Community College. The Academic Auditor Team members had received copies of the AST self-study report on February 27, 2013, for review prior to the site visit. The program’s self-study addressed many aspects of the Associate of Science in Teaching (AST) program but focused on assessment, student outcomes, and student academic support.

Prior to the visit, the Academic Auditor Team held multiple conference calls during which the self-study report was discussed. These conference calls were followed-up with multiple e-mails drafting questions to ask, areas to address, and areas of responsibility for each team member. Each team member drafted a list of questions for each group of stakeholders to be interviewed on the day of the visit. The evening prior to the visit, team members met to finalize details and assignments for the visit. A list of questions was provided to the liaison at Pellissippi so that stakeholders would be prepared to provide the necessary information.

The site visit began with an opening session attended by faculty and administrators involved with the program including the AST Program Leader, the Dean of Natural and Behavioral Sciences, and the Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Academic Auditor Team. The answers to Academic Auditor Team questions were provided to the team and the informal discussion that followed set the tone for conferences with individual stakeholder groups throughout the morning and afternoon sessions. After the opening session, team members met separately with faculty teaching multiple disciplines in the program.

After meeting with faculty, the Academic Auditor Team moved to the Education area where they were invited to tour the facilities and met with a large group of students in the Teacher Education Center. This session was followed by a meeting with AST staff and stakeholders, a working lunch, and former Pellissippi State students who are now enrolled with Tennessee Technological University (TTU) through the 2+2 program on the Pellissippi State campus. After a work session to finalize evidence gained from the day’s sessions, the Academic Auditor Team met in an exit session with Pellissippi State representatives including the President. The Academic Auditor Team presented the Performance Funding Summary Sheet report and the Recommendations, Affirmations, and Commendations to college and program representatives.
2. Overall Performance

It is obvious that the AST program at Pellissippi State is and important and ample resources are dedicated to it. This is evidenced by the commitment of faculty teaching the program courses and positive responses both from currently enrolled students and former students. Further evidence was observed in the commitment of human resources to the success of the program. Examples of commitment to the success of the program include full-time staff in advisement and cohort management, as well as an AST Program Leader who manages the overall direction of the program.

During the self-study faculty and staff identified strengths of the program to include the strong, logically-sequenced curriculum, early field experience, professional development, service learning requirements, qualified faculty, and academic support activities. The visiting team’s discussions throughout the visit confirmed these strengths and identified strong administrative support as well. Further, the faculty and staff identified a recurring theme indicating a need for broader collaboration among faculty teaching in the program. The visiting team’s conversations with stakeholders affirmed the accuracy of the self-study findings and the value of the academic audit process. This report reflects the findings of the Academic Audit Team based upon the self-study report and the site visit discussions.

III. Performance in the Focal Areas

A. Learning Objectives

As a system-wide two-year program designed to facilitate transfer to TBR university teacher education programs, the learning objectives for the AST degree have evolved from a broad consensus regarding the foundational knowledge and skills needed by future teachers. These include the general education competencies needed for transfer as well as the strong theoretical foundation/framework in elementary teaching. Although learning objectives are stated in the master syllabus for each individual course, during the self-study AST program faculty recognized a decline in the collaboration among faculty regarding the review and revision of learning objectives. During the course of the self-study, the A.S.T. program faculty determined that the majority of the students believe the current learning objectives adequately prepared them in three areas: future academic success, job preparation, and preparation to become a responsible citizen. AST students have the opportunity to demonstrate achievement of learning objectives through exams, including the Praxis I, portfolio evaluations, class projects and demonstration, and journals and reports, including those derived from in-field observations. The self-study team and the audit team discussed the benefit of common assessments of student competency that can be aggregated to provide data leading to continuous improvement of student learning.

B. Curriculum and Co-Curriculum

The faculty members responsible for the AST degree program at Pellissippi State collaborated extensively in developing the original curriculum in 2002. The process was supported in part by the
National Science Foundation, and the program was designed to support the development of teachers who were highly literate in mathematics and science. Since that time faculty have maintained and updated the curriculum through ongoing course revisions; and the curriculum for the AST is organized, sequenced, well-staffed, and supervised. Responsibility for the program and the individual courses is clear, and the integrity of the curriculum is monitored. For example, each course has a master syllabus, and new instructors are supervised to ensure that the curriculum is implemented as intended. The administration shows clear commitment to the AST and to allocating resources to support its faculty and students.

While faculty members involved in the AST do collaborate constantly, they naturally communicate most within their disciplines and organizational units. As part of their preparations for the Academic Audit process, faculty identified an initiative to “establish a structured plan for AST faculty (PSCC) from all subject area disciplines to meet and discuss the following: current trends and changes in education, state and national initiatives and mandates for college teacher preparation programs, test teaching practices, and possible changes in learning objectives and/or curriculum.” The team affirmed this initiative and suggested, in addition, that the process be formalized to allow for curriculum review and revision.

The self-study report also identified the need to improve collaboration and communication also with faculty members from other colleges and universities. The team suggested that the initiative on collaboration also expand to include all the primary transfer universities, with the goal of improving the student transition experience.

The team did note that the content in the program regarding Special Education should be revised specifically to cover grades K-6.

C. Teaching and Learning

As noted in the section on curriculum, faculty members in all disciplines continually revise and update their courses. They work with other AST faculty within their disciplines and, to some extent, across disciplinary lines; they identify best practices from other institutions and throughout their disciplines to incorporate in their instruction. Faculty in the AST program use a wide variety of appropriate instructional methods, materials, and technology, including visual aids, various lab exercises, computer-based instructional applications and multimedia equipment, and a diverse array of hands-on, reality-based activities. Given that the program prepares future K-6 teachers, it also includes appropriate early field experience in K-6 settings.

D. Student Learning Assessment

The AST program faculty acknowledge the importance of using multiple means of assessing student learning outcomes. One measure used in the AST degree program is the Praxis I exam. The offering of Praxis I workshops over the summer as well as the in class overview during the Intro to Teaching course are evidence of the support provided by the AST faculty. Students interviewed during
the site visit were keenly aware of the importance of the Praxis exam and expressed great interest in the resources provided to help them prepare for the test.

Other types of assessments are used within the individual courses and the self-study showed those assessments to be revised each semester. In the course of discussions with the visiting team, the AST faculty members agreed that the development of common assessments would be a useful tool to provide data for the continuous improvement of student learning outcomes.

E. Quality Assurance

The team’s review of the AST self-study revealed several quality assurance measures currently in place to ensure the viability and relevance of the program. It was obvious throughout the visit that faculty and staff are committed to the academic audit process as a means for introspection and improvement of the overall quality of the program. The emphasis on customized advisement and cohort management—and the commitment of corresponding resources to support these initiatives—is evident in the organizational structure and level of service to students. The discovery of the need for broader collaboration among faculty and the development of a plan to execute this collaboration is further evidence of the commitment of the faculty and staff.

IV. Conclusions

The overall assessment of the Academic Auditor Team is that the faculty and staff in the AST Program at Pellissippi State conducted an honest and candid self-study and identified areas for improvement that will enhance the quality of instruction and assessment of the program. Discussions with program faculty and administrators confirmed their commitment to both the self-study process and the integrity of the AST program. Their approach was logical, systematic, and consistent with the spirit of the academic audit process. In support of the continuous quality improvement philosophy, the Academic Auditor Team offers the following recommendations, affirmations, and commendations which were presented at the site visit:

Recommendations

Recommendation #1 – The team recommends that the program faculty use course rubrics to develop some key common assessments of student competency that can be aggregated to provide data leading to continuous improvement of student learning.

Recommendation #2 – The team recommends the revision of the curriculum to include the special education content for grades K-6.

Affirmations

Affirmation #1 – The team affirms the Plan for accomplishing Initiative 1 and suggests that the process be formalized to allow for curriculum review and revision.
Affirmation #2 – The team affirms the plan for improvement of student scores through PRAXIS I preparation initiatives and suggests that data be gathered to monitor and evaluate these initiatives.

Commendations

Commendation #1 – The team commends the faculty and administration for the obvious commitment to the improvement of the AST program and the Academic Audit process.

Commendation #2 – The team commends the college for their emphasis on customized advisement and cohort management and for their support of these initiatives with appropriate resources.

Commendation #3 – The team commends the faculty and administration for their recognition of the need for collaboration among faculty and suggests that the idea expand to include primary transfer universities with the goal of improving the student transition experience.
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Commendation #1 – The team commends the faculty and administration for the obvious commitment to the improvement of the AST program and the Academic Audit process.

Commendation #2 – The team commends the college for their emphasis on customized advisement and cohort management and for their support of these initiatives with appropriate resources.

Commendation #3 – The team commends the faculty and administration for their recognition of the need for collaboration among faculty and suggests that the idea expand to include primary transfer universities with the goal of improving the student transition experience.

******************************************************************************
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| 2 |

Affirmation #1 – The team affirms the Plan for accomplishing Initiative 1 and suggests that the process be formalized to allow for curriculum review and revision.

Affirmation #2 – The team affirms the plan for improvement of student scores through PRAXIS I preparation initiatives and suggests that data be gathered to monitor and evaluate these initiatives.

******************************************************************************

Onsite Evaluation Checklist 2012-13

2
Recomendation #1 – The team recommends that the program faculty use course rubrics to develop some key common assessments of student competency that can be aggregated to provide data leading to continuous improvement of student learning.

Recomendation #2 – The team recommends the revision of the curriculum to include the special education content for grades K-6.
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### 1. LEARNING OBJECTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>The faculty completed a thorough and candid analysis of their process for developing learning objectives for the program, considering measurability, clarity and what students need to know.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>The faculty documented or proposed a process for developing learning objectives that are based on realistic and appropriate evidence.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>The faculty documented or proposed specific plans to take best practices and appropriate benchmarks into account in the analysis of learning objectives.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. CURRICULUM AND CO-CURRICULUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>The faculty completed a thorough and candid analysis of the extent to which they collaborate effectively on the design of curriculum and planned improvements.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>The faculty documented or proposed a plan for analyzing the content and sequencing of courses in terms of achieving program learning objectives.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>The faculty documented or proposed a plan for the ongoing review of curriculum and co-curriculum based on appropriate evidence including comparison with best practices where appropriate.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. TEACHING AND LEARNING PROCESSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>The faculty completed a thorough and candid analysis of their process for guiding and improving teaching and learning throughout the program.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>The faculty documented or proposed a plan that promotes the effective use of instructional methods and materials for achieving student mastery of learning objectives.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>The faculty analyzed the extent to which there is true, ongoing collaboration in the design and delivery of the teaching and learning processes of the program.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>The faculty documented or proposed indicators of student learning success that are keyed to the learning objectives of the program.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>The faculty documented or proposed assessments of student learning that are grounded in best practices and appropriate comparisons.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>The faculty documented or proposed a plan for using student learning assessments that leads to continuous improvements in the program.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>The faculty documented or proposed a continuous improvement plan that incorporates multiple measures to assess student learning and program effectiveness.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. QUALITY ASSURANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>There is an evident commitment to making continuous quality improvements in the program a top priority.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>The faculty documented or proposed a continuous improvement plan that incorporates multiple measures to assess student learning and program effectiveness.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. OVERALL ASSESSMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>The Academic Audit process was faculty driven.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>The Academic Audit process (self-study and visit) included descriptions of the program’s quality processes including all five focal areas.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>The process resulted in a candid description of weaknesses in program processes and suggestions for improvements.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Overall, the visiting team affirms the openness and thoroughness of the program faculty in completing the academic audit of this program.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>The Academic Audit process included involvement of and inputs from stakeholder groups identified by the program’s faculty.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. FOLLOW-UP OF PREVIOUS AUDIT *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>An action plan was developed as a result of the previous Academic Audit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>There is documented evidence that recommendations made by the Academic Audit Team have been considered and, when feasible and appropriate, implemented and tracked.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>There is documented evidence that the program has implemented and tracked the progress of and use of results from improvement initiatives cited by the faculty in its self-study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. SUPPORT (Note: The Support category is NOT included in the Performance Funding calculation. If the Academic Audit process did not address these criteria, they should be marked “NA.”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>The program regularly evaluates its library, equipment and facilities, encouraging necessary improvements within the context of overall college resources.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>The program's operating budget is consistent with the needs of the program.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>The program has a history of enrollment and graduation rates sufficient to sustain high quality and cost-effectiveness.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Criterion only included in the performance funding calculation for programs undergoing the Academic Audit during the 2010-2013 cycle that also used the Academic Audit in the 2005-10 cycle. Note: please be sure that the "Second Academic Audit" is checked on page 1.
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SITE VISIT INFORMATION

1. INTRODUCTION

Site Visit Team:
Chairperson
Maria Nowicki, PhD, RN
Associate Dean, Division of Nursing
Mercy College of Northwest Ohio
2221 Madison Avenue
Toledo, OH 43604
Telephone: (419) 251-1583
Fax: (419) 251-1570
E-mail: maria.nowicki@mercycollege.edu

Member
Dee Bohnenblust, EdD, ARNP, CNE
Director
Labette Community College
200 S. 14th Street
Parsons, KS 67357
Telephone: (620) 820-1217, ext. 1217
Fax: (620) 421-2786
E-mail: delynab@labette.edu

Member
Deborah K. Fulmer, MSN, RN, CWOCN
Assistant Professor
College of Health Sciences
University of Arkansas-Fort Smith
5210 Grand Avenue
Fort Smith, AR 72913
Telephone: (479) 788-7857
Fax: (479) 424-6857
E-mail: deborah.fulmer@uafs.edu

Member
Selma A. Verse, MEd, RN
Faith Community Nurse
Affiliated with the Sanctuary
Second Presbyterian Church
Palm Beach Community College
1400 N. Federal Highway
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33304-1495
Telephone: (954) 629-7865
Fax: (954) 568-5936
E-mail: verses5@aol.com

NLNAC Criteria Used: 2008

Program Demographics:

Year nursing program established: 2010

Faculty:
Number of faculty teaching full-time in the associate program: 8
Number of faculty teaching part-time in the associate program: 15

Students:
Total enrollment: 107
Full-time: 39
Part-time: 68

Length of program:
66 credits; five (5) semesters, including one (1) summer semester of non-nursing courses

Additional program options/tracks:
No additional program options/tracks

Additional locations:
Nursing courses are delivered at Blount Campus, approximately 22 miles from the main campus
and Magnolia Campus, 20 miles from the main campus
Third Party Comment
The nursing unit had a reasonable process for soliciting third party comments. The methods used to announce the accreditation visit to the program’s communities of interest were an announcement posted on the College website; notices published in two (2) local papers; and notices posted on campus bulletin boards. There were no attendees at the public meeting. One (2) (1) newly admitted student, who arrived late, met with the site visitors in the resource room. He was very positive about the College and the chance to start the program in the fall. There were no third party written comments received.

Interviews:
Individual Conferences
Jim Kelley, PhD, Dean of Natural and Behavioral Sciences
Peter Nerzak, MLS, Director of Library Services
Kristen Bass, MLIS, Instructor, Librarian
Melanie Paradise, MS, Registrar
L. Anthony Wise, PhD, President
Larry W. Goins, EdD, RN, APRN-BC, NE-BC

Blount Campus Tour
Holly Burkett, MS, Campus Dean

Group Conferences
Senior Administration
Ron Kesterson, BS, Vice President, Business and Finance
Betsy Boyd, EdS, Counseling
Jerry Bryan, MS, Vice President of Information Services
Peggy Wilson, MS, Vice President of College Advancement & Human Resources

Support Services Personnel
Elizabeth Firestone, PhD, Counseling
Lois Reynolds, MAT, MLS, Advisement
Heather Hatfield, BS, Enrollment Services
Melanie Paradise, MS, Registrar
Brittany Mixon, BA, Financial Aid Manager
Arlene Davis, AS, Financial Aid Supervisor

General Education Faculty
Robert Osteen, MD, DDS, Natural and Behavioral Sciences Department
Lawana Day, PhD, English Department
Ashley Boone, MA, Mathematics Department
Brenda Ammons, MS, Mathematics Department
Casey Lambert, MA, English Department

Nursing Faculty
Darneta Brown, MSN, APRN, RN
Patricia Crotty, MSN, APRN, RN
Moré Herington, MSN-Ed, RNC
Marshay James, MSN, RN, CNE
Beverly Rogers, MSN, RN
Ann Sherman, MSN, RN, CNE, NEA-BC
Jake Terry, MSN, RN
Kimberly Wilks, MSN, RN
Magnolia Campus Tour
Rosalyn Tillman, MS, Campus Dean
Gary Loftis, MA

Classes Attended:
NURS 1160 Lifespan I, Level 1 (Freshman)
NURS 2160 Lifespan III, Level 2 (Sophomore)

Clinical Agencies and Facilities Visited:
Parkwest Medical Center
Sharon Monday, BSN, RN, Parkwest Medical Center
Sue Ellyn Van Antwerp, MSN, RN, APRN-BC, Parkwest Medical Center
Mickey Harchis, RN, Loudon County Health Department

Graduates
Simon Njoroge, MS, RN
Donna Serna, RN

Documents Reviewed:
Catalogs, Handbooks, Manuals
PSCC Catalog, 2013
PSCC Student Handbook, 2013
Organizational Charts, 2013
PSCC Faculty Handbook, 2013
Policy and Procedure Manual, current
Nursing Student Handbook
Clinical Instructor Reference Manual

External Constituencies
Tennessee Board of Nursing Reports (all)
SACS Report

Nursing/Governing Organization Documents
Mission Statement, 2013
All Clinical Contracts
Articulation Agreements
List of Committees and Members, 2013
Nursing Faculty Files, (Transcripts, Vitae, Evaluations)
Position Descriptions
Student Orientation Materials
Admission Criteria and Advising Information
Student Files
Student Nurses Association Pellissippi State (SNAPS) Information
Skills Lab Inventory and Purchase Orders
Faculty Assignments, 2010-2013
Grade Rosters
Graduate and Employer Surveys
Budgets Summaries and Analyses, 2010-present
Library Inventory
Nursing Unit Minutes
Advisory Board Minutes, All
Nursing Division Minutes, All
Curriculum Committee Minutes, All

Course Materials
Student Learning Outcomes, Current
Course Notebooks for Each Campus for all Nursing courses, 2011-2013
Class Lecture, Lab and Clinical Schedules, 2010-2013
II. EVALUATION OF THE STANDARDS AND CRITERIA

STANDARD 1
Mission and Administrative Capacity

The nursing education unit’s mission reflects the governing organization’s core values and is congruent with its strategic goals and objectives. The governing organization and program have administrative capacity resulting in effective delivery of the nursing program and achievement of identified outcomes.

1.1 The mission/philosophy and outcomes of the nursing education unit are congruent with those of the governing organization.

1.2 The governing organization and nursing education unit ensure representation of students, faculty, and administrators in ongoing governance activities.

1.3 Communities of interest have input into program processes and decision-making.

1.4 Partnerships exist that promote excellence in nursing education, enhance the profession, and benefit the community.

1.5 The nursing education unit is administered by a nurse who holds a graduate degree with a major in nursing.

1.6 The nurse administrator has authority and responsibility for the development and administration of the program and has adequate time and resources to fulfill the role responsibilities.

1.7 With faculty input, the nurse administrator has the authority to prepare and administer the program budget and advocates for equity within the unit and among other units of the governing organization.

1.8 Policies of the nursing education unit are comprehensive, provide for the welfare of faculty and staff, and are consistent with those of the governing organization; differences are justified by the goals and outcomes of the nursing education unit.

1.9 Records reflect that program complaints and grievances receive due process and include evidence of resolution.

For nursing education units engaged in distance education, the additional criterion is applicable:

1.10 Distance education, as defined by the nursing education unit, is congruent with the mission of the governing organization and the mission/philosophy of the nursing education unit.

Commentary:

The mission/philosophy and outcomes of the nursing education unit are congruent with those of Pellissippi State Community College (PSCC). The vision, mission, and student outcomes are found on the College website and in the SSR (pp. 19-20). Congruence between the College and the nursing program is demonstrated in the comparison seen on Table 1 (SSR, pp. 19-20). Interviews with the College administration and faculty confirmed that the mission of the College is congruent with the nursing program. Examples include emphasis on lifelong learning; excellence in education; service to the
community; and assisting students to achieve their learning goals. During interviews with College administration, there was evident support for the program. Expenditures to provide equal resources for each campus nursing program, monies for advanced education, and increased salaries for nursing faculty have been provided.

Faculty participation on committees of the governing organization is addressed in the SSR (p. 87) and was confirmed by the faculty. Faculty participate in College-wide committees including Faculty Senate; College Curriculum; Tenure/Promotion; Safety and Discipline and committees in the Department of Nursing which include Curriculum and Testing; Admission/Promotion/Retention; Program Evaluation; and Student Affairs. Discussions with the administration, nursing faculty, and general education faculty confirmed that the nursing faculty contribute to and participate on assigned committees.

The SSR states and review of faculty meeting minutes confirmed that faculty members attend and participate in nursing faculty meetings. Review of minutes reflected information sharing and program faculty leadership demonstrated by voting and decision-making.

Elected student representatives participate in governance by attending faculty meetings and through the Nursing Student Organization. Students can bring concerns, questions, and recommendations to faculty meetings. The Student Organization makes recommendations and decisions regarding fundraising and student events. Site visitors verified participation during interviews.

The communities of interest are defined as “individuals and agencies who actively participate in the clinical education of the nursing students.” They have input into program processes and decision-making. The SSR (p. 24) states that the Advisory Board, formed in May 2010, convenes twice each year to discuss operations, curriculum, student outcomes, and program evaluation. Discussions with the nursing administration and faculty confirmed that the Board members are clinical agency partners (SSR, Appendix E). Minutes of the Advisory Board were available onsite for 2011 and January 2013. Review of minutes confirmed attendance and information sharing by the Dean of Nursing regarding current healthcare practice and trends in the community. There are currently no graduates of the program serving on the Board.

The nursing education unit has many formal agreements with clinical agencies to ensure students receive a rich and varied clinical experience. The program also maintains formal articulation agreements with area colleges and universities to help students pursue higher degrees in nursing.

The Dean of Nursing is Dr. Larry Goins. Dr. Goins was verified to be academically and experientially qualified to function in the role of Dean of Nursing. He holds baccalaureate and master’s degrees in nursing and a doctorate in higher education administration and is currently enrolled in a DNP program at East Tennessee State University. Dr. Goins has over 35 years of nursing experience and is licensed in the state of Tennessee. He is a certified clinical specialist in gerontological and adult health nursing and holds certification as a nurse executive. Review of his curriculum vitae reflected participation in a variety of activities at the local and state levels. Discussions with the faculty and administrators in the College and community confirmed that Dr. Goins is well respected as a professional nurse educator and leader. Dr. Goins is assisted by a site coordinator at the Blount and Magnolia Campuses. The Tennessee Board of Nursing (TBN) mandates the nurse administrator have no more than a 20% teaching workload. The nurse administrator does not have a teaching role. Site visitors verified sufficient time and resources to fulfill the role.

The job description for the Dean of Nursing includes program administration; program evaluation; curriculum supervision; budget management; faculty and laboratory supervision; faculty and laboratory staff evaluation and hiring; and management of affiliation contracts.
The Dean of Nursing prepares the budget and capital requests. The completed budget is submitted to the Vice President of Academic Affairs, who in turn submits completed budgets to the President. Interviews with the faculty confirmed that they have input into the budgeting process.

Policies of the nursing education unit are comprehensive, provide for the welfare of faculty and staff, and are consistent with those of the governing organization. Personnel policies governing all faculty members were verified and are included in each faculty member’s contract. Policies specific to the nursing program are included in the Faculty Information and Orientation Handbook. A review of documents and interviews with the faculty confirmed that personnel policies for the nursing faculty are the same as those for all College faculty with the exception of policies that are usually seen for nursing faculty to meet clinical site requirements.

Records reflect that there is a formal grievance procedure in place that students were able to articulate. The policy outlines due process. Students who have individual concerns or complaints related to a course, program curriculum, tests, faculty, or program issues are urged to follow the chain of command starting with the faculty member. There were no grievances on file.

The program engages in synchronous presentation of lecture content between the Blount and Magnolia Campuses. Lectures are rotated each week, and the students have faculty members present in the classroom every other week. The College views this as distance education, but the nursing program does not. When interviewed, the faculty stated that because there is a faculty presence in the classroom each week, it is not distance education. Further discussion with the faculty confirmed that it actually is distance education. The College mission speaks to meeting the needs of students in the area as well as the growing need for healthcare workers. Use of this teaching modality by the Department of Nursing assists in meeting this part of the College mission.

The nursing education unit currently uses Desire to Learn (D2L) to enhance courses by posting course materials and for communication. PSCC does not utilize online learning.

**Summary:**

**Compliance:**

The program is in compliance with the Standard with the following areas needing development:

- Consider expanding the Nursing Advisory Board to include graduates of the program and employers of graduates.
- Develop a definition of distance learning for the Department of Nursing and ensure congruence with the governing organization’s definition.
STANDARD 2
Faculty and Staff

Qualified faculty and staff provide leadership and support necessary to attain the goals and outcomes of the nursing education unit.

2.1 Full-time faculty are credentialed with a minimum of a master’s degree with a major in nursing and maintain expertise in their areas of responsibility.

2.1.1 The majority of part-time faculty are credentialed with a minimum of a master’s degree with a major in nursing; the remaining part-time faculty hold a minimum of a baccalaureate degree with a major in nursing.

2.1.2 Rationale is provided for utilization of faculty who do not meet the minimum credential.

2.2 Faculty (full- and part-time) credentials meet governing organization and state requirements.

2.3 Credentials of practice laboratory personnel are commensurate with their level of responsibilities.

2.4 The number and utilization of faculty (full- and part-time) ensure that program outcomes are achieved.

2.5 Faculty (full- and part-time) performance reflects scholarship and evidence-based teaching and clinical practices.

2.6 The number, utilization, and credentials of non-nurse faculty and staff are sufficient to achieve the program goals and outcomes.

2.7 Faculty (full- and part-time) are oriented and mentored in their areas of responsibilities.

2.8 Systematic assessment of faculty (full- and part-time) performance demonstrates competencies that are consistent with program goals and outcomes.

2.9 Non-nurse faculty and staff performance is regularly reviewed in accordance with the policies of the governing organization.

For nursing education units engaged in distance education, the additional criterion is applicable:

2.10 Faculty (full- and part-time) engage in ongoing development and receive support in distance education modalities including instructional methods and evaluation.

Commentary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Academic Credentials – (Highest Degree Only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are eight (8) full-time faculty teaching in the nursing program, all of whom are credentialed with a minimum of a master’s degree with a major in nursing. Two (2) full-time faculty members are currently enrolled in DNP programs, and two (2) are currently enrolled in PhD programs. Interviews with the faculty confirmed that they are encouraged and supported with some tuition reimbursement to pursue higher degrees. The faculty also stated that they maintain expertise in their respective teaching areas through participation in faculty development conferences, clinical practice, and certification programs. Official transcripts were verified onsite by the site visitors. The Dean shared his goal of developing a pool of qualified part-time faculty to be utilized as needed for clinical teaching.

The SSR (p. 35) states that “the part-time faculty have been reorganized to meet the NLNAC required MSN percentage of 51%.” Updated faculty profiles for the part-time faculty were supplied to the site visitors by the Dean, and changes made since the submission of the SSR are reflected in the table above. The majority of the part-time faculty are credentialed at the master’s degree level with a major in nursing. Of the fifteen (15) part-time faculty currently being utilized, eight (8) hold a master’s degree with a major in nursing, and one (1) holds a doctorate of nursing practice. Six (6) of the part-time faculty currently being utilized are credentialed with a minimum of a baccalaureate degree in nursing. Two (2) of the BSN-prepared part-time faculty are currently enrolled in master’s of nursing programs. Official transcripts were verified onsite by the site visitors for all but one (1) part-time faculty member, whose file did not contain the transcript.

The nursing faculty are in compliance with the PSCC faculty requirements as evidenced by a review of the faculty criteria listed in the PSCC Faculty Handbook. The credentials of the nursing faculty are also in compliance with the Tennessee Board of Nursing (TBN) requirements as evidenced by approval for initial accreditation received in September 2009. Academic rank is assigned to nursing faculty who meet the minimum rank criteria under Tennessee Board of Regents Policy 5:02:02:30, Guidelines for Faculty Promotion Recommendations at Tennessee Board of Regents Community Colleges, and according to the Pellissippi State Policy No. 06:03:00, Faculty Promotion.

One (1) full-time MSN-prepared faculty member serves in the position of coordinator of the nursing skills/simulation laboratories (SSR, p. 36). This individual’s job responsibilities were verified in a review of the position description and include providing expertise in the planning and implementation of laboratory experiences with the assistance of the level coordinator and an additional part-time MSN-prepared nurse. These faculty members, with the assistance of other full-time faculty, validate and verify student ability and success in performance of all skills and simulation experiences.

In addition to the coordinator of the nursing skills/simulation laboratories, there is a technical coordinator of nursing and simulation laboratories who holds a BA degree and is responsible for the technical aspects of the simulation experiences using the latest technologically advanced simulators. A meeting with the technical coordinator confirmed that she is not responsible for any student evaluations but has expertise in loading and running the simulation scenarios. She records the students completing the simulations for evaluation and debriefing purposes by the faculty. The Blount and Magnolia Campuses each employ an instructional assistant with current nursing and patient care experience. One (1) assistant holds an MSN, and the other assistant holds an AAS in nursing and is currently enrolled in a BSN program. The instructional assistants assist the faculty and coordinators with technical and clinical support in operating the simulators, setting-up for skills demonstrations and simulations, and bringing current best practices to the laboratory environment.

The number and utilization of the full- and part-time faculty ensure that program outcomes are achieved. Interviews with the Dean and faculty confirmed that the current number of faculty is adequate to meet the
program outcomes. The SSR (Table 2, p. 37) outlines the classroom, skills practice laboratories, simulation laboratory, and clinical setting faculty-to-student ratios. These ratios were verified through review of the current class schedule as published in the Banner system on the College website. The faculty-to-student ratio in the classroom is 2:34. The faculty-to-student ratio for skills practice laboratory is 1:12 with a master’s-prepared faculty member(s) and a nursing instructional assistant in the skills/simulation laboratory setting. The faculty-to-student ratio in the simulation lab is 1:10 and 1:6 or 1:8 in the clinical setting.

Full- and part-time faculty performance reflects scholarship and evidence-based teaching and clinical practices. Interviews with the faculty and review of faculty records onsite confirmed that the College values advanced education and provides the full-time faculty with financial support through the Tennessee Board of Regents for pursuit of advanced degrees. Tuition fee waivers and reimbursement are available for full-time faculty members who choose to continue pursuing formal education. All full-time and part-time faculty members are encouraged to attend seminars, workshops, and professional meetings and to participate in other scholarly activities to help maintain expertise. All full-time faculty members have attended various webinars that deal with nursing education as well as the incorporation of technology into the nursing program. Prior to each fall semester, all full-time College faculty attend a two-day conference on student success. The conference agendas from 2010-2012 outline a wide range of topics presented such as use of technology; ADA requirements; curriculum development; teaching tools; stress reduction; and other faculty issues such as discrimination, harassment, and professional boundaries.

A review of faculty files verified applicants for nursing faculty positions have an analysis performed using their official transcripts to identify graduate courses completed that qualify them to teach in the program. The faculty profiles included in Appendix I (SSR, pp. 104-109) further identify areas of clinical expertise, academic teaching assignments, and other areas of responsibility such as participation on College and Department of Nursing committees. The SSR (pp. 39-40) further validates that several faculty members continue to practice in healthcare, which requires ongoing continuing education.

The SSR identifies two (2) non-nursing employees in the Department of Nursing, the full-time technical coordinator of skills/simulation laboratories and a full-time secretary. These employees were identified as valuable assets. The nurse administrator has stated that these positions are supported by the College administration and that additional secretarial support will be added as the program continues to grow. In meeting with the faculty, they voiced a need for additional secretarial support and a dedicated information technology staff member to assist with education, training, and operations of the two-way audio video (TWAV) technology, online education delivery system efforts, and high-fidelity simulators. The current secretary travels between campuses.

The full- and part-time faculty are oriented and mentored in their areas of responsibility through a formal College and Department of Nursing orientation process as described in the SSR (p. 41). Upon initial hiring, all faculty members attend a mandatory College new hire orientation. An orientation checklist is provided with each new hire packet and serves as a guide for new faculty orientation to the Department. The new faculty member meets with the nurse administrator, and the checklist is used as a guide to cover policies and procedures for the College and the Department. In addition, an orientation/training session specific to the roles of nursing faculty is conducted, during which time the Nursing Faculty Handbook and the PSCC Clinical Notebook are distributed and discussed. Review of Department meeting verified this process for new part-time clinical faculty members. In a meeting with the faculty, they identified a need for a more formal mentoring process for new faculty members.

Systemic assessment of full- and part-time faculty performance demonstrates competencies that are consistent with the program goals and outcomes. The PSCC annual evaluation of full-time faculty consists of student evaluations, self-evaluation, and an administrative evaluation. Annual evaluations are used as a means of performance improvement, a method for enhancement of communication, and an
ongoing method for improving the quality of the faculty and student experience at the College. Part-time faculty are evaluated annually using a different form from the full-time faculty; a copy of the form is attached to this report. Faculty file reviewed onsite contained evidence of yearly evaluation of the full- and part-time faculty by students and the Dean.

Student course evaluations are anonymous and are completed online. Self-evaluation is described in the Faculty Handbook. The administrative evaluation is performed by the nurse administrator or a level coordinator appointed to perform the evaluation, which includes visitation of both the classroom and clinical sites. The clinical faculty are also evaluated by the nursing staff at each clinical site as an objective means of program improvement, giving the hospital staff an opportunity to provide valuable feedback to the faculty members. Review of faculty files demonstrated evidence that the annual evaluation process is being followed.

The non-nurse staff for the nursing program come under complete supervision of the nurse administrator. The secretary and the technical coordinator of the skills/simulation laboratories are evaluated by the Dean in accordance with College and Tennessee Board of Regents policies utilizing the performance appraisal system. They have been found to be strong performers.

The faculty stated that there are opportunities to receive support for distance education modalities and that they are now more comfortable with the TWAV system; however, they feel that a dedicated IT person is needed at the Magnolia Campus to assist when problems arise. A support person is available by phone. The faculty also confirmed that they have been oriented on the use of the TWAV system.

Summary:

Compliance:

The program is in compliance with the Standard with the following areas needing development:

- Develop strategies to ensure faculty files consistently contain evidence of faculty credentials.
- Provide additional secretarial support to meet the needs of both campus locations.
- Review and revise the faculty mentoring method to develop a more formal process.
- Provide IT support on each campus during class times to support TWAV and simulation technology.
STANDARD 3
Students

Student policies, development, and services support the goals and outcomes of the nursing education unit.

3.1 Student policies of the nursing education unit are congruent with those of the governing organization, publicly accessible, non-discriminatory, and consistently applied; differences are justified by the goals and outcomes of the nursing education unit.

3.2 Student services are commensurate with the needs of students pursuing or completing the associate program, including those receiving instruction using alternative methods of delivery.

3.3 Student educational and financial records are in compliance with the policies of the governing organization and state and federal guidelines.

3.4 Compliance with the Higher Education Reauthorization Act Title IV eligibility and certification requirements is maintained.

3.4.1 A written, comprehensive student loan repayment program addressing student loan information, counseling, monitoring, and cooperation with lenders is available.

3.4.2 Students are informed of their ethical responsibilities regarding financial assistance.

3.5 Integrity and consistency exist for all information intended to inform the public, including the program’s accreditation status and NLNAC contact information.

3.6 Changes in policies, procedures, and program information are clearly and consistently communicated to students in a timely manner.

3.7 Orientation to technology is provided and technological support is available to students, including those receiving instruction using alternative methods of delivery.

For nursing education units engaged in distance education, the additional criterion is applicable:

3.8 Information related to technology requirements and policies specific to distance education is clear, accurate, consistent, and accessible.

Commentary:

Through review of the College Catalog, Nursing Student Handbook, nursing course syllabi, and nursing advisement documents as well as discussions with the students, faculty, and support personnel, the student policies described in the SSR (pp. 44-49) were verified. All documents are available on the College website. Upon admission and/or during the nursing orientation session, students sign several forms indicating that they understand the policies of the nursing program; forms include the simulation lab confidentiality agreement; photo/videotaping release form; receipt of the Handbook; and core performance standards. The students interviewed indicated awareness of Department/course policies and were able to verbalize how changes are communicated to them (SSR, p. 54). The students stated that they are notified of changes through written communications, including the Nursing Student Handbook, Desire2Learn (D2L) learning management system, e-mail, and course syllabi, and verbally by their class representative as well as during orientation for each class.
Nursing student policies differing from those of other students at the College were described by the nursing administration and faculty, who indicated that these policies are included in admission information, the Nursing Student Handbook and the Nursing Faculty Handbook. Policies specific to the nursing program include those related to health requirements (e.g., physical, immunizations, drug screenings); admission/retention/transfer/readmission/graduation; CPR certification; and criminal background reviews. Students are responsible for obtaining their immunization record, drug screening, and background reviews through an outside vendor as verified in a review of faculty meeting minutes. This information is sent to the students as part of the nursing admission process.

The student services listed in the SSR (pp. 49-50) were confirmed by the faculty, student services personnel, and students. The Academic Support Center provides general education tutoring either in person or online; supplemental instruction through student tutors; and student success resources. There are currently no nursing-specific tutors. Academic advisement is provided by College advisors from admission to the College until the student is accepted into the nursing program.

Based on the premise that PSCC is a major general education feeder school for students in the nine (9) nursing programs in the area, the College has developed a unique approach to pre-nursing counseling. A pre-nursing advisor coordinator works with at least one (1) dedicated pre-nursing advisor and science faculty member on each of the five (5) campuses to provide pre-nursing advising. These individuals are knowledgeable regarding the curriculum and admission standards for all of the local nursing programs. Once students are admitted to the PSCC nursing program, they are assigned a nursing faculty advisor who follows them throughout the program. The students indicated that the nursing faculty are very visible and easily available for ongoing advising.

Professional counselors are available including one (1) on each branch campus and three (3) on the main campus for personal counseling; career counseling; academic support such as study skills, test anxiety, and time management; identifying students in distress and with disruptive behaviors; making referrals; and acting as a behavioral intervention team. Faculty can refer or students can walk in or contact the office for an appointment. The Office of Services for Students with Disabilities offers information on how to apply for services, resources for testing, and assistive technology.

Each campus has an Educational Resource Center that includes the library; multimedia services; student study areas; and computers. Additional services identified and verified in the College Catalog and interviews include the Placement Office and Student Life and Recreation. Online student services are available, including new student application and academic major information; current student grades and course registration; student accounts; and transcript requests. At the Blount Campus, all listed services are provided Monday through Thursday until at least 6:00 p.m. and until 4:00 p.m. on Friday and Saturday, with the hours are extended as needed. At the Magnolia Campus, all services are available Monday through Saturday with hours varying according to the service. All service hours are posted at the campus offices and on the College website. The students reported no issues with accessing needed services on either campus and stated that the unique pre-nursing advising is very helpful and accurate.

Discussions with the financial aid and student records personnel and a review of documents onsite verified compliance with local, state, federal and governing body policies for educational and financial records. The documents include policies and procedures for the College with references to applicable Tennessee Board of Regents and federal laws. The College student records are all electronic and are now being maintained indefinitely, which differs from the Tennessee Board of Regents policies, which in some cases indicate a specific period of time.

Discussions with representatives from the records and financial aid offices verified that student records are kept in accordance with College policy and best practice standards (ACRO). Student records are kept
electronically, and no paper records exist at the main campus. Each area has access to only certain parts of the records that are needed within their designated functions.

Nursing student records were verified to be compliant with a “student document location/listing” information sheet. Twenty-seven randomly selected students folders from both campuses were reviewed. The content of the folders was inconsistent, with some missing documents and additional documents in others. The nursing administrative assistant is responsible for maintaining the folders and filing the various documents that the faculty are responsible for submitting.

The Financial Aid Director confirmed that the College is in compliance with the Higher Education Reauthorization Act Title IV. Initial student contact is via one-to-one counseling or online. Students use the College website and Studentaid.gov for entrance and exit counseling. Fliers with financial aid information are linked on the website. In addition, students complete a financial aid checklist with signature that verifies an understanding of the online information and their responsibilities in addition to a financial aid authorization form for utilization of funds.

Financial Aid awards are sent through the College e-mail system. Measures in place to monitor student compliance with the entrance requirements or exit interview/survey were not found. Compliance with course credits completion is in place. The Director of Financial Aid indicated the most recent default rates are as follows: 12.3% (2008); 13.3% (2009); and 15.2% (2010). The Financial Aid Department offers information in person and online, on loan repayments and default aversion/debt management in an effort to decrease the default rates.

The Director of Marketing indicated that this Department is responsible for all information released for the College. This includes the online, print, and media releases. Marketing relies on the Dean of Nursing to assist with this process. All documents reviewed, including brochures, hand-outs, College Catalog, and College website, were found to be consistent with information. The website and College hall monitors indicated the presence of the NLNAC site visitors and invited public comments to be sent directly to the NLNAC. Site visitors verified the NLNAC contact information and candidacy information were accurate.

An area of concern regarding integrity relates to a mandatory pre-semester student course orientation each fall (SSR, p. 44). According to advisors, faculty, students, and nursing administrators, students are required to attend a mandatory orientation session prior to the start of each year. The orientation is a minimum of seven (7) hours, which are not counted into the student credit hours for the course.

The SSR (p. 55) and interviews with the students, faculty, and library, information technology, and student services personnel verified that information related to technology use and support is readily available on the College website, provided during College orientation and pre-course orientation sessions, and by phone through the help desk. The College uses Desire2Learn (D2L) as the platform for course management and online courses. Specific information/orientation for D2L and web-based learning is available for the students and faculty.

Orientation to information technology is also provided by the Educational Resource Center during College Orientation and, for nursing students, prior to the first and third nursing course and as part of INFS 1010.

The College provides all faculty with classroom educational support through the Educational Technology Services online and in the active classroom multimedia studio. The faculty can access assistance with building courses, syllabi, and technology use for either a traditional face-to-face classroom or a distance learning classroom.
The faculty stated that technical support for the TWAV classrooms, particularly on the Magnolia Campus, is not always readily accessible when classes are in session. Student course surveys have also indicated that the technology is not always working properly. The faculty stated that since support is not always available, they have become adept at troubleshooting problems with the system. However, this detracts from the learning environment.

Policies for technology support and use are readily available on the College website, which includes access to the Policy and Procedure Manual, and the Tennessee Board of Regents website. The students receive instruction on library access and databases (SSR, p. 67) as confirmed by the librarian and students.

Orientation related to simulation laboratory technology is included as part of the skills laboratory orientation and is required for all students. The simulation laboratory faculty are responsible for orienting students to this technology.

**Summary:**

**Compliance:**

The program is in compliance with the Standard with the following areas needing development:

- Ensure that course credit hours reflect all mandatory requirements.
- Ensure that nursing student records held in the Nursing Department are completed in a timely manner.
STANDARD 4
Curriculum

The curriculum prepares students to achieve the outcomes of the nursing education unit, including safe practice in contemporary health care environments.

4.1 The curriculum incorporates established professional standards, guidelines, and competencies, and has clearly articulated student learning and program outcomes.

4.2 The curriculum is developed by the faculty and regularly reviewed for rigor and currency.

4.3 The student learning outcomes are used to organize the curriculum, guide the delivery of instruction, direct learning activities, and evaluate student progress.

4.4 The curriculum includes cultural, ethnic, and socially diverse concepts and may also include experiences from regional, national, or global perspectives.

4.5 Evaluation methodologies are varied, reflect established professional and practice competencies, and measure the achievement of student learning and program outcomes.

4.6 The curriculum and instructional processes reflect educational theory, interdisciplinary collaboration, research, and best practice standards while allowing for innovation, flexibility, and technological advances.

4.7 Program length is congruent with the attainment of identified outcomes and consistent with the policies of the governing organization, state and national standards, and best practices.

4.8 Practice learning environments are appropriate for student learning and support the achievement of student learning and program outcomes; current written agreements specify expectations for all parties and ensure the protection of students.

4.8.1 Student clinical experiences reflect current best practices and nationally established patient health and safety goals.

For nursing education units engaged in distance education, the additional criterion is applicable:

4.9 Learning activities, instructional materials, and evaluation methods are appropriate for the delivery format and consistent with student learning outcomes.

Commentary:

There is evidence that the curriculum was designed using current established professional standards, guidelines, and competencies. The faculty confirmed that the curriculum design was in place when they were first hired to teach in the program. The faculty indicated that they consistently evaluated and refined the courses each time the courses are taught. The program design incorporates the American Nurses Association (ANA) social policy statement and Code of Ethics; The Joint Commission National Patient Safety Goals; Quality and Safety Education for Nurses (QSEN) Competencies; and National League for Nursing (NLN) Competencies for Graduates of Associate Degree Programs (2010). The program also lists integrated concepts that guide the curriculum, including critical thinking; therapeutic communication; nursing process; application of theoretical knowledge and evidence-based practice; professionalism; accountability and integrity; use of information technology; management and leadership; application of personal and cultural values; principles of teaching/learning; and technical competence.
The faculty confirmed the ongoing review and revision of the curriculum. Evidence of revision is demonstrated in the student learning outcomes (SLOs). The SLOs were developed in 2010 and revised in 2012 to better reflect currency and increasing competency. The faculty stated that the SLOs organize the curriculum and confirmed that Table 4-1 (SSR, pp. 59-61) demonstrates the increasing complexity seen as the program progresses.

Table 4-1 tracks culture, diversity, and culturally competent care through the learning outcomes of each nursing course. The students and faculty described a number of experiences that provide evidence that this is a strong concept in the curriculum. Students working with the health department have been involved with an immunization program for children in disadvantaged areas. Students acquire experience with the homeless population in Knoxville by participating in the “Under the Bridge” program.

The faculty described the use of varied evaluation methods, including classroom tests; grading of projects; written papers; presentations; grading care plans; clinical evaluations; dosage calculation tests; and the standardized computer testing/remediation program. The students were able to articulate the course requirements and what is needed to pass each course. Clinical evaluation tools reflect clinical behaviors for the program. Each course identifies critical behaviors that are required to be performed at a satisfactory level to progress through the program. The major headings that organize the tools reflect the organizing concepts. The tools have been revised since first designed to better reflect the SLOs.

Mathematics, English, and anatomy and physiology faculty stated that they do not meet with the nursing faculty on an ongoing basis. They are supportive of the program and feel that the students who identify themselves as pre-nursing are engaged and work hard to be admitted to the program. The faculty use a variety of instructional techniques such as case studies; simulation; question-and-answer; PowerPoint presentations; small group discussion; and use of videos and other electronic media. They described the availability of education technology to support these teaching techniques. Interviews with the students confirmed the faculty’s use of these methods. Faculty using the TWAV system reported that the system is working much better this year and that they are more accustomed to it. The students related that they are pleased with the TWAV system because they feel the presentation of content is more consistent when the same instructor presents content to students on both campuses. The faculty rotate days on each campus. The students stated that they do not feel quite as engaged when the faculty member is not at their site. With the present set-up, the screen to view the class is located behind the faculty member. While the students in the class can see the other group, the instructor can only hear if there is a question. The students at the distance site can see the instructor at all times.

The printed curriculum plan illustrates that the program of study consists of five (5) semesters, including four (4) semesters of nursing courses and one (1) summer session for required general education courses if these were not taken prior to enrollment in the program. Many students complete the required general education and science courses prior to beginning the program of study. Table 4-2 (SSR, p. 62) lists all required nursing courses and the breakdown of theory and clinical hours. Theory credit hours are calculated on a 1:1 basis, and clinical is calculated on a 1:3 ratio. The program consists of 66 credit hours, with 39 credits (59%) allocated to nursing and 27 credits (41%) allocated to general education. There are no prerequisites for admission to the program, and all courses can be completed after admission. Students are encouraged to complete the required general education courses prior to the start of the program. Students are required to attend an orientation prior to the start of the program and again at the beginning of their sophomore year. Students interviewed stated that a large amount of information is shared during this orientation and it can be overwhelming. The faculty are aware of this issue and continue to refine the content presented.

A variety of practice learning environments are utilized for clinical practice. The program currently uses 14 hospitals and a variety of community sites for student experiences. Contracts were reviewed onsite and
found to be complete and current with all appropriate information and signatures. A complete listing is found in Appendix F (SSR, pp. 89-90). Preceptors are used for the community rotation, which has provided the students with a wide range of experiences. The program has been challenged due to limitations on student numbers imposed by some clinical agencies as well as competition with other programs in the area. With the adoption of new charting and medication administration programs in hospitals, many agencies are electing not to have students during the transition to new procedures or allow students limited access to the new technology. The students verbalized that the faculty still provide them the opportunity to practice charting and that they feel this has not impacted their learning at the few hospitals where this has happened. One (1) current full-time faculty member has been given release-time to explore potential clinical sites. The faculty stated that clinical experiences are chosen based on prior clinical evaluations by students, suggestions of faculty, reputation in the community, patient census, and acuity.

Classroom Observation:
A session of NURS 2160 Lifespan Nursing III was observed on the Magnolia Campus; thirty-four students were in attendance. The faculty member was presenting live from the Blount Campus, with TWAV technology utilized so that students on both campuses could receive the theory in “real time.” Interviews with the students and faculty indicated that this dual-lecture format works well. The acoustics of the room made the use of a separate microphone unnecessary, although the faculty member had one available.

The class was held in a refurbished, spacious, and aesthetically pleasing classroom. The room contains several large tables with outlets for computers at each chair and is equipped with SMART classroom technology, including an instructor’s workspace; lectern; TWAV monitor and sound system; computer with LCD projector and screen; document display projector; whiteboard; and pull-down projection screen.

The students utilized a variety of electronic devices during the class. Several students had the e-book version of the textbook open and were able to take notes using the device, while other students were viewing copies of the PowerPoint slides, provided by the faculty member, and taking notes. The students were fully engaged and answered questions posed by the faculty member, who readily answered their questions as well.

Clinical Observation:
A clinical observation of Parkwest Medical Center was conducted. In discussion with the site visitors, the Education Director stated that PSCC is one (1) of six (6) schools participating in clinical at the facility. The hospital respects the PSCC graduates, and in Spring 2012, it hired two (2) nurses from the program’s first graduating class. The Medical Center is a 307-bed, full-service hospital that includes behavioral psychiatry. A 155-bed sister hospital is a full-service psychiatric hospital. The hospital hires students as “clinical nurse technicians” and as “externs” in the summer prior to the second year of the nursing program. The hospital utilizes the Tennessee Clinical Placement System, a computerized scheduling system, to assign schools and students to clinical units and for the students and faculty to access the hospital orientation requirements.

One (1) group of four (4) students was using the hospital for clinical experiences at the time of the visit. Two (2) second semester students and one (1) instructor were observed on a 47-bed combination medical-surgical, cardiac, and telemetry unit. The other two (2) students were on rotation to a pediatric hospital. The instructor is a part-time clinical faculty member who currently works as a night house supervisor at the hospital. The hospital administration voiced pleasure with this type of clinical faculty member, citing the following reasons: familiarity with the facility; serves as a liaison between the hospital and college; and can easily assist with much of the students’ orientation to the hospital.
During this rotation, students spend nine (9) 12-hour days on the unit and four (4) 12-hour days at a pediatric hospital. The student assignments are posted at the nursing station desk, and the students were able to verbalize the clinical objectives and daily focus. The instructor gives the unit manager the semester goals/objectives at the beginning of the semester. These are not posted on the unit, and the Education Director stated that this is by choice. Students are assigned to care for one (1) patient. For this instructor, the students visit the hospital in the evening prior to the experience to collect their assignment and read the chart, ensuring they come prepared for the clinical experience. Clinical begins at 7:00 a.m. with a report from the RN responsible for their patient. The students meet individually with the instructor during the course of the day and as a group during lunch and at the end of the day to discuss their patients in relation to the objectives. The students could easily verbalize their daily assignments and the calendar of events. The day ends at 7:00 p.m.

The students described the course content, objectives, assignments, schedules, and evaluation processes. They stated that they were pleased with the educational experience to date and indicated that the skills experienced in the skills/simulation laboratories were being practiced in the clinical. They also stated that the focus for patient care is not exclusively on skill acquisition. Rather, the experience challenged them to think about issues/concerns regarding patient care and utilize strategies and thinking processes to solve patient problems.

Summary:

Compliance:

The program is in compliance with the Standard with the following area needing development:

- Continue to refine the clinical evaluation tools to more clearly reflect the student learning outcomes.
STANDARD 5
Resources

Fiscal, physical, and learning resources promote the achievement of the goals and outcomes of the nursing education unit.

5.1 Fiscal resources are sufficient to ensure the achievement of the nursing education unit outcomes and commensurate with the resources of the governing organization.

5.2 Physical resources (classrooms, laboratories, offices, etc.) are sufficient to ensure the achievement of the nursing education unit outcomes and meet the needs of faculty, staff, and students.

5.3 Learning resources and technology are selected by the faculty and are comprehensive, current, and accessible to faculty and students, including those engaged in alternative methods of delivery.

For nursing education units engaged in distance education, the additional criterion is applicable:

5.4 Fiscal, physical, technological, and learning resources are sufficient to meet the needs of faculty and students and ensure that students achieve learning outcomes.

Commentary:

Discussions with the President, Vice President of Business and Finance, and Dean of Nursing clarified the fiscal resources as described in the SSR (p. 70). Although the state funding has significantly decreased in recent years (from 66% of the budget to 33%), the changes in the economic status of the area have led to a positive increase in student enrollment. Thus, student-generated tuition/fees have significantly increased. The President stated that the Governor of Tennessee has signified that a priority for the next state budget year (2013-2014) is to restore state funding for higher education. Thus, the College expects an increase in state revenues.

As noted in a review of documents and information provided onsite, funding for the College is divided between tuition/fees (66%) and state funds (33%). As stated in the SSR (p. 70), state funding formulas are in place related to the hiring of faculty. Thus, the PSCC nursing faculty are funded at the same level as the faculty for other nursing programs in the state: one (1) full-time faculty member per every ten (10) full-time students. With 106 students enrolled, the College should have funding for ten (10) full-time nursing faculty. While there are currently eight (8) full-time faculty, the College administrators stated that two (2) additional full-time faculty members will be hired for Fall 2013, thus meeting this directive.

The College also receives state capital improvement funds, federal Perkins funds, and PSCC Foundation support as well as other grants periodically. According to the President, the renovations on the Magnolia Campus and the new $22-million building on the Blount Campus were funded through state capital monies and the PSCC Foundation’s $6.5-million capital campaign. The purchase of furniture and equipment/supplies for the nursing unit, totally around $1.2 million, was almost completely funded through the Foundation. The Foundation is about to begin another capital campaign, which will provide additional funds for College development. The College maintains a contingency or reserve fund which can be utilized if needed. The state requires a budget minimum of 2%; this year, the College contingency fund is at 5% of the budget.

In order to hire qualified faculty, the College performed a market analysis for nursing and made the commitment to assign salaries that would be competitive. In doing so, the Human Resources Department
worked with all faculty to create a three-tiered pay scale according to teaching disciplines. Nursing is assigned to the highest pay scale level along with engineering, finance/accounting, advertising, economics, management, and hospitality areas. The base salary for a nursing instructor with up to three (3) years of experience is $41,540, and for a professor with over eight (8) years of experience, is $70,270. The Dean of Nursing stated that the higher pay for nursing was instrumental in an increase in all faculty salaries. The SSR (p. 42) reports that faculty evaluation processes may lead to merit pay increases, but the College administrators stated that this has never been operational.

In reviewing College and Nursing Department budgets for the past three (3) years, the distribution of resources was verified as reported in the SSR (p. 70). There are no other health-related programs at the College; therefore, no program comparisons are available. The nursing program budget is included in Appendix N (SSR, pp. 165-167).

The faculty and administration confirmed that all faculty are given faculty development and tuition reimbursement funds, and the faculty stated that, to date, they have never been refused. The faculty can receive funding for up to nine (9) credits per semester for coursework; continuing education conferences/workshops (including travel); certification examinations; nursing licenses; and medical examinations that are required for their position at the College.

According to the President, Vice President of Finance and Administration, and Dean of Nursing, there are plans for the nursing program to open an LPN/paramedic bridge program on the Strawberry Campus in Fall 2013. Indications are the facility will mirror those of the Magnolia and Blount Campuses. Also in discussion is the movement of the College to a Health Science Institute, which would centralize the nursing program onto one (1) campus.

As stated in the SSR (pp. 162, 165-167), reported by the librarian, and observed in a review of budgets, the library budget has been consistent over the past three (3) years. The expenditures are used for reference/circulating books, databases, eBooks, and journals for the nursing program (both campuses) and were reported by the nursing liaison librarian.

Physical resources discussed in the SSR (pp. 71-72) were verified through campus tours, review of building blueprints, and discussion with the administration, faculty, and staff. Each campus has at least one (1) 30-seat computer lab with proctored assistance; anatomy/physiology labs, including a cadaver; state-of-the-art microbiology lab; chemistry lab; multiple classrooms seating a minimum of 36 students at computer-ready tables; a tutoring center staffed a minimum of eight (8) hours per day; an auditorium seating 100; bookstore; food service area; fitness center; student lounge; specialty labs for various workforce programs; at least one (1) TWAV classroom; several open full-time faculty office areas that accommodate six (6) to ten (10) faculty; an open adjunct office area supporting 14 individuals with nine (9) computers, printer, locked filing cabinets, bookcases; offices for all student services; a faculty lounge area; and a mail/faculty supply room.

On both the Magnolia and Blount Campuses, the nursing program occupies at least one (1) dedicated TWAV classroom; a simulation lab; nursing skills lab; and faculty office area. The TWAV classroom has seating for 40 students at computer-ready tables; a faculty computer/technology data bank/teaching area; large flat-screen monitor behind the faculty station that projects the other campus classroom; whiteboard; microphone for faculty; two (2) 30-bank mobile computer cabinets; and appropriate distance technology, including projection capabilities from the whiteboards and computers to the other TWAV classroom.

The simulation labs on both campuses are identical. The labs include one (1) adult hospital unit with HillRom bed; simulated wall suction/oxygen and assessment tools; high-fidelity mannequin; over-bed table; night stand; computer data station including EHR capability; full vital monitoring station; two (2) bassinet units with simulated wall suction/oxygen and assessment tools; high-fidelity baby mannequin;
sink; additional high-fidelity child mannequin shared between campuses; medication distribution area; debriefing area for 12 students at tables; and storage area.

The nursing skills lab at both sites contains five (5) patient units each with privacy curtain; simulated wall suction/oxygen and assessment tools, medium-fidelity adult mannequins; over-bed table; night stand; chair; stretcher with medium-fidelity mannequin; MAR cart; sinks; student seating for 12; area for student manipulation equipment (IV insertion, wounds, etc.); whiteboard and bulletin board; LCD projection system; computer-assisted instruction; wall storage/counters; faculty office; and dedicated storage closet.

On the Blount Campus, the nursing suite is composed of three (3) office areas. The administration area has single office space for the nurse administrator, administrative assistant, and site/level coordinator and one (1) small conference area. There are two (2) shared, open faculty areas. One (1) area is occupied by five (5) nursing faculty and one (1) math faculty member. The second is occupied by two (2) nursing faculty and four (4) other faculty. Each faculty cubicle area, which are divided by four-foot partitions between groups of two (2) desks, contains a desk; phone; computer; bookcase; and locked file cabinet. Each area has a shared shredder and printer.

On the Magnolia Campus, there is a private office which is a converted closet for the site coordinator and shared faculty space for two (2) full-time faculty and the part-time faculty member as described. All offices are equipped identically to the Blount Campus offices.

As stated in the SSR (pp. 16, 71) and confirmed by the nurse administrator and faculty, the office space is inadequate for confidential telephone conversations and conferences with students. In addition, as the faculty numbers increase with the increasing student population, additional faculty space will be required. None is currently available.

Learning resources and technology as described in the SSR throughout and specifically in Standard 5 (pp. 72-75) were verified through conversations with the administration, faculty, staff and students; campus tours; and review of equipment lists, inventories, purchase orders; and faculty meeting minutes. The faculty are actively involved in the selection of resources and technology for the simulation and skills labs. The first individual hired by the College for the nursing program was the simulation/lab coordinator. This individual confirmed that she was responsible for the design, purchase, and implementation of these labs. The textbooks and supplemental standardized computer testing resources are selected and evaluated by the faculty. Evidence found in review of meeting minutes indicates that these and other items are regularly discussed at faculty meetings, and requests are submitted during the budget process and at other times during the academic year. According to the faculty, resource requests, to date, have not been refused. Several members of the Advisory Committee reported faculty initiative in locating unique and diverse community experiences for the students.

The SSR (pp.73-74) states that the faculty can request library resources through a nursing liaison librarian, with requests fulfilled on a College-wide first come, first served basis. Review of faculty meeting minutes verified active participation by the nursing faculty in library purchases. The nursing liaison librarian stated that she reviews the collection every two (2) years and submits a listing of materials for subject removal to the nurse administrator, who then distributes the list to the faculty for input. Those items approved by the nursing program for removal are then pulled from the collection. The onsite collection for both the Magnolia and Blount Campuses consists of approximately 20 medical reference books and 50 nursing books. Some books are older than 2007, and the librarian stated that these may be items provided by the faculty. Neither the nursing program nor the library has a formal policy for removal of items from the collection or for identifying historical materials. The Tennessee Board of Regents library inventory methods offer guidelines for such a policy.
A tour of the libraries on the Blount and Magnolia Campuses as well as the main campus revealed facilities that are visually similar. All of the libraries are very open with high ceilings and multiple seating tables, with areas around the perimeter that include offices; study rooms; periodical/book stacks; and computers for accessing the collections. The website identifies the library as a whole and then directs the user to each campus library for specifics. According to the librarian, approximately 1,000 books from the main campus collection are sent to each campus on a rotating yearly basis. Students on any campus can request materials from a different campus, which will be locally delivered the next day. The resources includes reference, reserve, and general books; hard copy periodicals; media/audiovisual preview room; extensive databases; and a minimum of 16 computer stations. All campuses are open, at a minimum, Monday through Thursday from 8:00 a.m. to 7:30 p.m. and Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.; with the exception of the main campus which is open Saturdays from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., the libraries are closed on Saturday and Sunday. Students can access the online library collection and databases 24/7 from remote locations.

The library website offers links to books, articles, multimedia, subject guides (includes nursing), library services, circulation information, collection development, distance learner services, faculty services, ID cards, off-campus logins, satellite ERCs, and tutorials. The nursing subject guide, last updated in November 2012, lists all library nursing resources. The website also includes featured databases, library contacts/hours, chat with the librarian, library blog, and social networking connections.

According to the Vice President of Information Services, the College computers and technology are replaced on a rotating basis every (3) three years according to College policy.

IT support and information is also available on the College website. The help desk is available Monday through Thursday from 7:30 a.m. to 9:00 p.m.; Friday from 7:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.; Saturday from 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.; and is closed Sunday. Support is provided by computer, phone, or e-mail through D2L, the help desk, live blogs, and chat groups.

Strength:

- State-of-the-art simulation laboratories

Compliance:

The program is in compliance with the Standard with the following areas needing development:

- Ensure physical resources are sufficient to ensure the achievement of the nursing education unit outcomes and the faculty, staff, and student needs, including adequate space for faculty offices and student conferencing.

- Ensure that a library resource policy is developed that addresses a timeframe for collection removal and identification of historical materials.
STANDARD 6
Outcomes

Evaluation of student learning demonstrates that graduates have achieved identified competencies consistent with the institutional mission and professional standards and that the outcomes of the nursing education unit have been achieved.

6.1 The systematic plan for evaluation emphasizes the ongoing assessment and evaluation of the student learning and program outcomes of the nursing education unit and NLNAC standards.

6.2 Aggregated evaluation findings inform program decision-making and are used to maintain or improve student learning outcomes.

6.3 Evaluation findings are shared with communities of interest.

6.4 Graduates demonstrate achievement of competencies appropriate to role preparation.

6.5 The program demonstrates evidence of achievement in meeting the following program outcomes:
   – Performance on licensure exam
   – Program completion
   – Program satisfaction
   – Job placement

6.5.1 The licensure exam pass rates will be at or above the national mean.

6.5.2 Expected levels of achievement for program completion are determined by the faculty and reflect program demographics, academic progression, and program history.

6.5.3 Program satisfaction measures (qualitative and quantitative) address graduates and their employers.

6.5.4 Job placement rates are addressed through quantified measures that reflect program demographics and history.

For nursing education units engaged in distance education, the additional criterion is applicable:

6.6 The systematic plan for evaluation encompasses students enrolled in distance education and includes evidence that student learning and program outcomes are comparable for all students.

Commentary:

PSCC has a written plan for systematic program of evaluation (SPE) that was designed by the nurse administrator with input from the faculty. The faculty stated that they have focused on the curriculum and have “just read” the SPE but plan to focus more on the SPE in the future. A systematic review of the SLOs and program outcomes for 2011-2012 is included in the SSR. Student outcomes are evaluated through licensure examination pass rates; graduate and employer surveys; Kaplan proctored assessment exams; ATI proctored exams; and faculty-developed evaluation tools (SSR, p. 77).

During interview, the faculty had a varying degree of understanding regarding the development and implementation of the SPE. They could not articulate the concept of the SPE as a “living document” that is the foundation of data-driven program revision. They confirmed that their work has focused on
curriculum development and that they plan to focus on the SPE revisions for the next year. Faculty members have a wide range of experience and backgrounds in service and education. It is clear that they are developing as a working team with much potential.

The SPE is contained in the SSR (pp. 177-203) and contains elements from the six (6) NLNAC Standards. Review of faculty meeting minutes for the past 24 months found no agenda items relating to the SPE. A number of Criteria do not have measureable expected levels of achievement (ELA) noted in the SPE, specifically in the Standard 6 Outcomes (pp. 195-196).

The faculty struggled to verify with the site visitors that they use the SPE Standards for ongoing assessment and evaluation of the SLOs and program outcomes. Examples were given by the faculty reflecting the use of data, such as end-of-course student evaluations, to drive change in the nursing program. A Program Evaluation Committee has been formed to oversee the SPE and assist in the collection and analysis of data. Data have been collected in various ways, but the actual use of data to drive program change is not clearly documented in the SPE. The site visitors verified collection and use of data in review of documents provided by the nurse administrator, which are kept in separate notebooks labeled “Evaluation Committee and Admission, Progression, and Retention.” During interview, the faculty noted that data collection, aggregation, and program revisions are areas to be improved over the next academic year as the program progresses. The faculty verbalized participation in the development and review of the data collected in response to the program evaluation plan such as student evaluation of courses and/or clinical.

The program utilizes faculty and course evaluations, graduate surveys, employer surveys, and clinical site evaluations to inform program decision-making and to maintain and improve the SLOs. The faculty are developing and learning how to use information from the evaluation tools and surveys to improve the program. The site visitors reviewed an example of these tools onsite.

The students demonstrate achievement of course competencies by completing a standardized exam at the end of each course in the program. The student scores are collected and trended for program evaluation. The program has developed an “aggregated evaluation findings” table for comparison of SLOs, which were reviewed onsite. The program does not measure SLOs individually but only has a cohort group. For example, Blount Campus versus Mongolia Campus student grade average, Kaplan average, and Kaplan national average for each nursing course (NURS 1150 Fundamentals, NURS 1160 Lifespan I, NURS 2150 Lifespan II, NURS 2160 Lifespan III, and NURS 2170 Transitions). The faculty stated that Kaplan is used to measure the SLOs and program outcomes. However, there is no direct correlation between either the SLOs or program outcomes found on the syllabi reviewed. Site visitors noted indirect correlations.

Learning outcomes are evaluated through analysis of licensure examination pass rates, program retention, program satisfaction for employers and students, and job placement rates. Other standardized benchmarking measures such as Kaplan and ATI are being utilized. Aggregated data for evaluation of the SLOs are provided in the SSR (pp. 82-84).

The Nursing Faculty Handbook states that the Nursing Advisory Board was established at the onset of program planning in 2009. Meetings are held biannually to discuss trends in education, employment, and individual needs for the program. Information regarding licensure examination pass rates, admission criteria, curriculum changes, and success of students and graduates is shared with the Advisory Board members as verified in a review of meeting minutes. The Advisory Board is informed of aggregate program data such as licensure examination pass rates and course feedback. Evaluations of clinical facilities are shared with the agencies. This information is collected by the lead instructor and forwarded to the Advisory Board.
Individual discussions with an Advisory Board member and a nurse leader at Park West Medical Center verified that data are made available about the program development and graduates of the program. Both the students and employers of PSCC graduates expressed a high degree of satisfaction with the program during the clinical visit. In addition, qualitative statements in the SSR (p. 81) suggest that employers are satisfied with the graduates.

The site visitors verified through review of Advisory Board meeting minutes that data are shared with the communities of interest. The Advisory Board is only for information sharing and does not act as a decision-making board as evidenced by review of minutes. The Advisory Board meeting minutes dated December 1, 2011 state, “Incorporate the QSEN concepts into the curriculum and outcomes”; however, this not reflected in the SLOs or program outcomes.

Since the program is new, there are very little data mentioned in the SPE. However, the Department of Nursing mentioned useful data that have been collected and the resulting changes in the program. The data/changes documented in the faculty meeting minutes reviewed onsite include syllabi review and revision; program delivery using TWAV; written final examinations to measure student outcomes; use of KSPLAN/ATI data; clinical evaluation ratings by students to assist in clinical site evaluation; and admission process.

The nursing program has established that preparation of graduates to achieve competencies is evaluated by using the graduate survey. Although limited responses have been received from graduates, those responding indicated that they feel prepared to function in the role of the beginning nurse. Data collection for the graduates has been difficult to maintain as the response rates have been limited. As stated in the SSR (p. 82), the response rate for the first graduating class was 28% (8/29). The program recognizes this as a challenge and has plans to improve survey responses with electronic surveys.

The first class of the nursing program graduated in May 2012. Therefore, there are limited data available regarding performance on the licensure examination; job placement; program completion; and program satisfaction.

Licensure Examination Pass Rates
The ELA for licensure examination pass rates is 85%. The licensure examination pass rates are acceptable, with a recent overall rate of 96.5% and a 100% pass rate upon a second attempt by one (1) graduate as referenced in the SSR (p. 80). The TBN Rules and Regulations state that the nursing education program shall have a pass rate of 85% or greater achieved by the candidates taking the licensure examination for the first time (SSR, p. 79).

Job Placement
Upon review of graduate surveys, “informal” records by graduates, 97% of graduates (28/29) were employed in an RN position six (6) months post-graduation per the data reported in the SSR (p. 81). The site visitors reviewed the five (5) written student return surveys, confirming job placement.

Program Completion
Data included in the SSR (p. 80) was verified by the site visitors. Program retention rates are tracked by the program according to the SSR; the program completion rate is reported as 72.5% (29/40). However, the program has set no ELA for program completion as per the SPE (SSR, p. 194). The nurse administrator stated that program completion rates are being monitored, with data beginning to be collected.

Graduate Satisfaction
The SSR (p. 141) states that graduates are surveyed at six (6) months post-graduation; it reports that “graduates have been responding in adequate numbers” but does not elaborate. The response rate for 2010
was 28% (SSR, p. 82). The five (5) graduate follow-up surveys that were returned indicated that the graduates feel they were either moderately or well prepared in the program to function as a beginning nurse.

**Employer Satisfaction**

Employer satisfaction data have been collected and was verified by the site visitors. The four (4) employer/placement surveys returned were reviewed onsite. All employers ranked the program as “excellent” on the survey instrument using a five-point Likert scale, for program satisfaction questions as part of the survey in the SSR (pp. 175-176). Employer satisfaction data are not included in program data in either the SSR (Table 6.5.3, p. 82) or the SPE (p. 195).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Outcomes</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Expected Level of Achievement</th>
<th>Current Year 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Licensure Exam Pass Rates</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Completion Rates</td>
<td>None stated (p. 194)</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Placement Rates</td>
<td>None stated (p. 195)</td>
<td>97%*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Satisfaction*</td>
<td>None stated (p. 195)</td>
<td>97%*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Satisfaction*</td>
<td>None stated (p.195)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Limited data - return rate of 28%.

**Summary:**

**Compliance:**

The program is in compliance with the Standard with the following areas needing development:

- Establish specific expected levels of achievement for all NLNAC Standards and Criteria in the systematic plan for evaluation.

- Ensure all program evaluation is adequately documented in faculty and committee meeting minutes, systematic plan for evaluation, and Nursing Advisory Board minutes to confirm that aggregated evaluation findings are used to inform program decision-making.

- Develop strategies to adequately measure the competencies of the role preparation for graduates.

- Revise the expected level of achievement for licensure exam pass rates to be congruent with the NLNAC Criterion.

- Ensure the expected level of achievement for program completion rates is congruent with the NLNAC guideline of 150% of the time of the stated program length.

- Develop plans to increase the return rate of graduate and employer surveys to adequately measure program outcomes and guide program decision-making.
III. RECOMMENDATION FOR ACCREDITATION STATUS:

Recommendation:

Initial Accreditation:

Initial accreditation as the program is in compliance with all Accreditation Standards. Next review in five (5) years.
Visiting Team Worksheet  
Associate, Baccalaureate & Master Level  
Outcomes Assessment Accreditation Model Beta Release  
for  
Technology  

Visiting Team Report  
for the  
The Association of Technology, Management, and Applied Engineering  

Institution: Pellissippi State Community College  
President or CEO: Dr. L. Anthony Wise, Jr., President  
City & State: Knoxville, TN  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous ATMAE Accreditation(s):</th>
<th>Visiting Team Members:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| None (Initial Accreditation)     | Name: Mr. Bob Dixon, Chair  
                                | Organization: Walters State Community College  
                                | Name: Mr. Danny Lawson  
                                | Organization: Northeast State Community College  
                                | Name: Dr. Ahmad Zagari  
                                | Organization: Morehead State University |

| Current Accreditation Request Date: 02/10/2012 | Program(s) Reviewed (with Options): |
| Date of Accreditation Self-Study Report: 02/21/2013 | Program: AAS Engineering Technology/ Civil Engineering  
| Date of Visiting Team Report: 03/29/2013 | Program: AAS Engineering Technology/ Electrical Construction Management  
|                                           | Program: AAS Engineering Technology/ Electrical Engineering  
|                                           | Program: AAS Engineering Technology/ Industrial Maintenance  
|                                           | Program: AAS Engineering Technology/ Manufacturing  
|                                           | Program: AAS Engineering Technology/ Mechanical Engineering  


I. The On-Site Visit

A. Date of the Visit  03/27/2013 through 03/29/2013

B. The Visiting Team (provide names, addresses, and telephone numbers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair:</th>
<th>Mr. Bob Dixon, Walters State Community College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>500 S. Davy Crockett Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, State Zip:</td>
<td>Morristown, TN 37813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>423-318-2758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member 1:</th>
<th>Mr. Danny Lawson, Northeast State Community College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>2425 Highway 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, State Zip:</td>
<td>Blountville, TN 37617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>423-323-0234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member 2:</th>
<th>Dr. Ahmad Zagari, Morehead State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>210 A Lloyd Cassity Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, State Zip:</td>
<td>Morehead, KY 40351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>606-783-2425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. On-Site Visit Agenda (provide the specific agenda followed during the visit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, 3/27/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 - 4:30</td>
<td>Sami Ghezawi, Associate Professor to meet with team at hotel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 - 5:00</td>
<td>Meeting with Dr. Jeffries, Dean of the Engineering and Media Technologies Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 - 6:00</td>
<td>Tour Engineering Technology classrooms and labs and provide access to team resource room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 – 7:00</td>
<td>Dinner (Dr. Lewis, Dr. Jeffries, Mr. Carl Mallette, Mr. George Cox, Mr. Pat Riddle, Dr. Ghezawi)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7:00 – 7:30 | Class room observations  
CET 1100 Fund Arch Drawing - Armour  
EET 1001 Intro Elec Engineering Tech - Mallette  
MET 2022 Fluid Mech & Power Appl w/Lab - Kocak |
| 7:30 – 8:00 | Meet at the resource room; Sami Ghezawi drives team back to the hotel    |

| Thursday, 3/28/2013 |
| 8:00 – 9:00 | Tour Campus with Dr. Sami Ghezawi |
| 9:00 – 10:00 | Meeting with Students in the resource room (3 students from each area) |
### Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 10:30</td>
<td>Office meetings&lt;br&gt;Team Member 1 – Dr. L. Anthony Wise Jr. President&lt;br&gt;Team Member 2 – Dr. Ted Lewis, Vice President Academic Affairs&lt;br&gt;Team Member 3 – Ron Kesterson, Vice President Business and Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 - 11:00</td>
<td>Office meetings&lt;br&gt;Team Member 1 – Dr. Rebecca Ashford Vice President Student Affairs. Goins 107B (panel interview including personnel from Admissions and Registration Services, Enrollment Development and Retention Services, the Student Success Center, and Placement Office)&lt;br&gt;Team Member 2 – Richard Smelser, Director of Financial Aid GN157F&lt;br&gt;Team Member 3 – John Heuer, Coordinator/ Institutional Effectiveness Research and Planning GN258a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 – 11:30</td>
<td>Office meetings&lt;br&gt;Team Member 1 – Peggy Wilson, Vice President, College Advancement&lt;br&gt;Team Member 2 – Lois Reynolds, Assistant Vice President/Academic Affairs&lt;br&gt;Team Member 3 – Teri Brahams, Executive Director/Business and Community Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 – 1:00</td>
<td>Lunch meeting with Advisory Committee members and students (3 graduates and 3 current students from each area CET, EET, and MET)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 – 1:30</td>
<td>Class room observations&lt;br&gt;ENGT 1010 Eng Tech Technical Comm - Ross&lt;br&gt;EET 1210 Active Devices I-LAB - Mallette&lt;br&gt;CET 2560 Arch 3D Modeling w/Lab – Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 – 2:00</td>
<td>Office Meeting&lt;br&gt;Team Member 1 – Carl Mallette, EET Program Coordinator&lt;br&gt;Team Member 2 - George Cox, CET Program Coordinator&lt;br&gt;Team Member 3 – Pat Riddle, MET Program Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 – 5:00</td>
<td>Resource Room review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 – 6:00</td>
<td>Box Dinner, Team members only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 – 12:00</td>
<td>Open agenda for any of the following activities:&lt;br&gt;Tour branch campuses&lt;br&gt;Resource Room review&lt;br&gt;Follow up interviews as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 – 1:00</td>
<td>Lunch (Dr. Wise, Dr. Lewis, Lois Reynolds, Dr. Jeffries, Dr. Ghezawi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>Final Report Out – President’s Conference Room , Dr. Wise, Dr. Lewis, Dr. Jeffries, Dr. Ghezawi&lt;br&gt;Dr. Ghezawi drives team back to their hotel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**D. Current Accreditation Status of Programs** (provide the current accreditation status of all programs and program options under consideration)

**Currently Accredited Programs:** None; this is an initial accreditation visit.
Programs Under Consideration for Initial Accreditation

Engineering Technology
   Civil Engineering Concentration
   Electrical Construction Management Concentration
   Electrical Engineering Concentration
   Industrial Maintenance Concentration
   Manufacturing Concentration
   Mechanical Engineering Concentration

II. General Information

   A. The Institution (summarize the information about the institution included in the self-study report)

   Pellissippi State was founded in 1974 as State Technical Institute at Knoxville. Since then, the College has expanded the teaching of technology, the use of technology in instruction, and the transfer of technology to local business and industry in support of regional economic development.

   Pellissippi State Community College is located in Tennessee's third largest metropolitan area. It primarily serves Knox and Blount counties. Pellissippi State Community College is authorized to award degrees by the Tennessee General Assembly through the governance system of the Tennessee Board of Regents (TBR) and the guidance and support of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC). The TBR system consists of 46 post-secondary educational institutions with a combined annual enrollment of more than 200,000 students, making it the nation's sixth largest system of public higher education. TBR's six state universities, 13 two-year colleges, and 27 technology centers offer classes in 90 of Tennessee's 95 counties. The TBR system is a $2.2 billion per year enterprise.

   B. Administrative Unit(s) Information (include specific organization and personnel information about the department, college, and division housing the programs being evaluated)

      The hierarchy of leadership for the program and options under consideration for accreditation is as follows:

      Dr. L. Anthony Wise, Jr., President

      Dr. Ted Lewis, Vice President of Academic Affairs

      Dr. Margaret Ann Jeffries, Professor and Dean, Engineering and Media Technologies Department

      George M. Cox, Professor, Program Coordinator Civil Engineering and Electrical Construction Management concentration

      Carl Mallette, Professor, Program Coordinator Electrical Engineering concentration

      Pat Riddle, Professor, Program Coordinator Mechanical Engineering, Manufacturing, and Industrial Maintenance concentrations
Other administrative leadership positions include:
Business and Finance
Ron Kesterson, Vice President

College Advancement
Peggy Wilson, Vice President

Student Affairs
Dr. Rebecca Ashford, Vice President

Information Services
Jerry Bryan, Vice President

Human Resources and Affirmative Action
Karen Queener, Executive Director

Business and Community Services
Teri Brahams, Executive Director

Tennessee Consortium for International Studies
Tracey Bradley, Director

Preamble

Compliance with Standards (describe how each program and option complies with, or fails to comply with each standard - the final line shall indicate whether the program or option is in non-compliance, partial compliance, or compliance)

PA.1 Preparation of Self-Study Report
The Self-Study Report shall follow the guidelines and be completed by a representative portion of the institutions administrative staff, teaching faculty, and students.

All programs and options are in compliance.

All Program/Option Same: ✗Compliance ☐Partial Compliance ☐Non-Compliance

PA.2 Program Definition
A program is a set of courses leading to a degree. A program may have more than one option, specialization or concentration, but specific course requirements for each option shall be clearly specified, and as appropriate all program/options shall meet ATMAE standards. In situations where an option is not appropriate for ATMAE accreditation based upon the approved definition of technology, management, and applied engineering, the request for accreditation should clearly state which option, concentration, or specialization is seeking accreditation and which ones are excluded. The case for exclusion should be made with the application for accreditation. If an option, concentration or specialization is excluded and the program becomes accredited, the program must identify specifically which concentrations, options and specializations are and are not accredited in all their publications and promotional materials that mention accreditation.

All programs and options are in compliance.

All Program/Option Same: ✗Compliance ☐Partial Compliance ☐Non-Compliance
7.0 Standards for Accreditation

Program Inputs:

7.1 Program Title, Mission, and General Outcomes: The program/option title, definition and mission shall be compatible with the ATMAE definition of Technology, Management, and Applied Engineering. The program/option shall lead to a degree at the associate, bachelors, or masters level. ATMAE approved definitions for degree programs are as follows:

a. Associate Degree: Programs/options that prepare individuals for positions that contribute to the design and development, production, distribution or operational support of complex technical systems.

b. Baccalaureate Degree: Programs/options that prepare individuals for positions that involve the management of complex technological systems.

c. Master's Degree: Programs/options that prepare individuals for career advancement in that involve the management of complex technological systems

General outcomes shall be established for each program/option that provide a framework for the development of specific measurable competencies. Validation of the general outcomes shall be accomplished through a combination of external experts, an industrial advisory committee and, after the program is in operation, follow up studies of graduates.

Only institutions legally authorized under applicable state law to provide degree programs beyond the secondary level and that are recognized by the appropriate regional and/or national accrediting agency are considered for accreditation. Evidence must exist that the programs are understood and accepted by the university/college community, and the business/industry community.

Note: Each program/option shall have appropriate titles consistent with the approved ATMAE definition of Technology, Management, and Applied Engineering. Representative student transcripts for each program and/or option shall be made available for the visiting team.

All programs and options are in compliance.

All Program/Option Same: ☑Compliance ☐Partial Compliance ☐Non-Compliance

7.2 Competency Identification & Validation: Measurable competencies shall be identified and validated for each program/option. These competencies must closely relate to the general outcomes established for the program/option and validation shall be accomplished through a combination of external experts, an industrial advisory committee and, after the program is in operation, follow up studies of program graduates.

All programs and options are in compliance.

All Program/Option Same: ☑Compliance ☐Partial Compliance ☐Non-Compliance
7.3 Transfer Course Work: The institution shall have policies in place to ensure that coursework transferred to the program is evaluated and approved by program faculty. All transfer coursework accepted must meet the ATMAE foundation course requirements for the program/option.

All programs and options are in compliance.

All Program/Option Same: ☒Compliance ☐Partial Compliance ☐Non-Compliance

7.4 Identification of Competency Measures: Assessment measures shall exist for each of the measurable competencies identified for the program/option.

All programs and options are in compliance.

All Program/Option Same: ☒Compliance ☐Partial Compliance ☐Non-Compliance

7.5 Program Structure & Course Sequencing: Each program/option shall meet minimum foundation semester hour requirements. Programs/options may exceed maximum foundation semester hour requirements specified in each area, but appropriate justification must be provided. A specific list of courses and credit hours that are being counted toward each category shall be included in the Self Study Report (please use the attached table 7.5). Minimum and maximum foundation semester hour requirements for degree programs/options are listed below:

a. **Associate Degree:** Programs/options shall be a minimum of 60 semester hours and shall meet the following minimum/maximum foundation semester hour requirements:

- Communications (must include both oral and written courses)..............6-9
- Mathematics ........................................................................3-12
- Physical Sciences* ................................................................3-12
- Management and/or Technical .................................................29-45
- General Electives .....................................................................0-12

*Life Sciences may be appropriate for selected programs of study.

Students must successfully complete a minimum of 12 semester hours of management and/or technical course work at the institution seeking accreditation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Req’d Hours</th>
<th>Pro/Opt 1 AAS Engineering Technology – Civil Engineering</th>
<th>Pro/Opt 2 AAS Engineering Technology – Electrical Construction Management</th>
<th>Pro/Opt 3 AAS Engineering Technology – Electrical Engineering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>3-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sci</td>
<td>3-12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt &amp;/or Tech.</td>
<td>29-45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Electives</td>
<td>0-12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Board of Certified Safety Professionals (BCSP) evaluates programs in safety designed to gain recognition for students in the safety profession may have specific requirements based on local market needs and on national professional safety practice studies and standards. Examples are BCSP Technical Report #3 and ANSI Z590.2.

Appropriate laboratory activities shall be included in the program/option and a reasonable balance shall be maintained between the practical application of “how” and the conceptual application of “why.” Master’s degree programs and/or options may not have formal laboratory activities, but must maintain a balance between the practical application of “how” and the conceptual application of “why.”

There shall be evidence of appropriate sequencing of courses in each program/option to ensure that applications of mathematics, science, written and oral communications are covered in technical and management courses. Examples of graded student work and textbooks for each management and/or technical course shall be provided for the visiting team. Further, sequencing should ensure that advanced level courses build upon concepts covered in beginning level courses.

A review of the IBEW Articulation Agreement indicates students can articulate up to 34 semester hours into the Electrical Construction management option. Thirty of these hours are articulated as technical course credits, and four are articulated as credits for a college level physics course. The remaining hours consist of fifteen hours of General Education courses and fifteen hours of technical courses. There is an issue that allows students that do not articulate all courses through the IBEW program to obtain credit for up to six of these technical hours through prior learning examination. Interpretation of the agreement makes it possible, however unlikely, that a student could complete this degree with less than the required 12 hours of technical coursework. The program is already working to change the articulation agreement to remedy this issue but, at the time of the visit, the change has not been completely implemented.

The Electrical Construction Management option is in partial compliance. All others are in compliance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Req’d Hours</th>
<th>Pro/Opt 4 AAS Engineering Technology – Industrial Maintenance</th>
<th>Pro/Opt 5 AAS Engineering Technology – Manufacturing</th>
<th>Pro/Opt 6 AAS Engineering Technology – Mechanical Engineering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>3-12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sci</td>
<td>3-12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt &amp;/or Tech.</td>
<td>29-45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Electives</td>
<td>0-12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The Board of Certified Safety Professionals (BCSP) evaluates programs in safety designed to gain recognition for students in the safety profession may have specific requirements based on local market needs and on national professional safety practice studies and standards. Examples are BCSP Technical Report #3 and ANSI Z590.2.
7.6 **Student Admission & Retention Standards:** There shall be evidence showing that the quality of technology, management, and applied engineering students is comparable to the quality of students enrolled in other majors at the institution. The standards for admission and retention of technology, management, and applied engineering students shall compare favorably with institutional standards. Sources of admission information may include test scores and grade rankings. Sources of retention information shall include general grade point averages of technology, management, and applied engineering students compared to programs in other institutional programs.

All programs and options are in compliance.

All Program/Option Same: ☑Compliance ☐Partial Compliance ☐Non-Compliance

7.7 **Student Enrollment:** There shall be evidence of an adequate number of program majors to sustain the program, and to operate it efficiently and effectively. Program enrollment shall be tracked and verified.

All programs and options are in compliance.

All Program/Option Same: ☑Compliance ☐Partial Compliance ☐Non-Compliance

7.8 **Administrative Support & Faculty Qualifications:** There must be evidence of appropriate administrative support from the institution for the technology, management, and applied engineering program/option including appropriately qualified administrators, an adequate number of full time faculty members and budgets sufficient to support program/option goals. Full time faculty assigned to teach courses in the technology, management, and applied engineering program/option must be appropriately qualified. Faculty qualifications shall include emphasis upon the extent, currency and pertinence of: (a) academic preparation; (b) industrial professional experience (such as technical supervision and management); (c) applied industrial experience (such as applied applications); (d) membership and participation in appropriate technology, management, and applied engineering professional organizations; and (e) scholarly activities. The following minimum qualifications for full time faculty are required (except in unusual circumstances which must be individually justified):

a. **Associate Degree:** The minimum academic qualifications for a regular full-time faculty member is expected to be an earned bachelor’s degree in a discipline, or in certain cases for documented reasons, an associate’s degree plus professional certification/licensure closely related to the faculty member’s instructional assignments.

   Policies and procedures for faculty selection, appointment, reappointment and tenure shall be clearly specified and shall be conducive to the maintenance of high quality instruction. Faculty teaching, advising, and service loads shall be reasonable and comparable to the faculty in other professional program areas.

All programs and options are in compliance.

All Program/Option Same: ☑Compliance ☐Partial Compliance ☐Non-Compliance

7.9 **Facilities, Equipment & Technical Support:** Facilities and equipment, including the technical personnel support necessary for maintenance, shall be adequate to support program/option goals. Evidence shall be presented showing the availability of computer equipment and software programs to cover functions and applications in each program area. Facility and equipment needs shall be included in the long range goals for the program.
All programs and options are in compliance.

All Program/Option Same: ☑Compliance ☐Partial Compliance ☐Non-Compliance

7.10 **Program Goals:** Each program shall have current short and long range goals, and plans for achieving these goals.

All programs and options are in compliance.

All Program/Option Same: ☑Compliance ☐Partial Compliance ☐Non-Compliance

**Program Operation:**

7.11 **Program/Option Operation:** Evidence shall be presented showing the adequacy of instruction including: (a) motivation and program advising of students; (b) scheduling of instruction; (c) quality of instruction; (d) observance of safety standards; (e) availability of resource materials; (f) teaching and measurement of competencies (specific measurable competencies shall be identified for each course along with the assessment measures used to determine student mastery of the competencies); (g) supervision of instruction; and (h) placement services available to graduates.

Management and/or technical course syllabi must be presented which clearly describe appropriate course objectives, content, references utilized, student activities, and evaluation criteria. Representative examples of student’s management and/or technical graded work shall be available for each course.

All Program/Option Same: ☑Compliance ☐Partial Compliance ☐Non-Compliance

**Outcome Measures:**

7.12 **Graduate Satisfaction with Program/Option:** Graduate evaluations of the program/option shall be made on a regular basis (two to five years). These evaluations shall include attitudes related to the importance of the general outcomes and specific competencies identified for the program/option. Summary data shall be available for graduate evaluations of the program/option.

As a result of preparing the self-study, the program recognized the gap of not having a history of graduate follow-up survey data. To their credit, they created a survey to gather data relevant to the General Outcomes and competencies defined by the program, and have administered the instrument and compiled the feedback received. Program coordinators voiced their recognition of the survey as an important tool for gathering data to improve the program. At this point, there has been no systematic procedure documented to insure the process is sustained.

All programs and options are in partial compliance.

Civil Engineering: ☐Compliance ☑Partial Compliance ☐Non-Compliance
Electrical Construction Mgmt.: ☐Compliance ☑Partial Compliance ☐Non-Compliance
Electrical Engineering: ☐Compliance ☑Partial Compliance ☐Non-Compliance
Industrial Maintenance: ☐Compliance ☑Partial Compliance ☐Non-Compliance
Manufacturing: ☐Compliance ☑Partial Compliance ☐Non-Compliance
Mechanical Engineering: ☐Compliance ☑Partial Compliance ☐Non-Compliance
7.13 Employment of Graduates: Placement, job titles, and salaries of graduates shall be tracked on a regular basis (two to five years). The jobs held by graduates shall be consistent with program/option goals. Summary data shall be available for the employment of graduates.

All programs and options are in compliance.

All Program/Option Same:  ☒Compliance  □Partial Compliance  □Non-Compliance

7.14 Job Advancement of Graduates: The advancement of graduates within organizations shall be tracked on a regular basis (two to five years) to ensure promotion to positions of increasing responsibility. Summary data shall be available for the job advancement of graduates.

All programs and options are in compliance.

All Program/Option Same:  ☒Compliance  □Partial Compliance  □Non-Compliance

7.15 Employer Satisfaction with Job Performance: Employer satisfaction with the job performance of graduates shall be tracked on a regular basis (two to five years) including employer attitudes related to the importance of the specific competencies identified for the program. Summary data shall be available showing employer satisfaction with the job performance of graduates.

As a result of preparing the self-study, the program recognized the gap of not having a history of employer follow-up survey data. To their credit, they created a survey to gather data relevant to the General Outcomes and competencies defined by the program, and have administered the instrument and compiled the feedback received. Program coordinators voiced their recognition of the survey as an important tool for gathering data to improve the program. At this point, there has been no systematic procedure documented to insure the process is sustained.

All programs and options are in partial compliance.

Civil Engineering:  □Compliance  ☒Partial Compliance  □Non-Compliance
Electrical Construction Mgmt.:  □Compliance  ☒Partial Compliance  □Non-Compliance
Electrical Engineering:  □Compliance  ☒Partial Compliance  □Non-Compliance
Industrial Maintenance:  □Compliance  ☒Partial Compliance  □Non-Compliance
Manufacturing:  □Compliance  ☒Partial Compliance  □Non-Compliance
Mechanical Engineering:  □Compliance  ☒Partial Compliance  □Non-Compliance

7.16 Graduate Success in Advanced Program: If a goal of the program/option is to prepare students for advanced studies, then the success in the advanced study programs shall be tracked and confirmed. Summary data shall be available showing success in advanced programs.

One of the program’s General Outcomes states that graduates will be able to “Obtain employment within the discipline or matriculate to a four-year program in engineering or industrial technology”. Student tracking data collected by the institution’s Placement Services office and displayed in Tables 17.13.2 through 17.13.4 indicates they are aware that they have graduates that are continuing their education. However, they do not have data that indicates the levels of success of these students should they be in advanced programs. The institution has access to the Student Clearinghouse database, from which some data related to the success of transfer students can be extracted. Since some four-year institutions that
accept program graduates also make use of this resource, they will be able to begin collecting data to support this standard.

All programs and options are in partial compliance.

Civil Engineering: ☐ Compliance ☒ Partial Compliance ☐ Non-Compliance
Electrical Construction Mgmt.: ☐ Compliance ☒ Partial Compliance ☐ Non-Compliance
Electrical Engineering: ☐ Compliance ☒ Partial Compliance ☐ Non-Compliance
Industrial Maintenance: ☐ Compliance ☒ Partial Compliance ☐ Non-Compliance
Manufacturing: ☐ Compliance ☒ Partial Compliance ☐ Non-Compliance
Mechanical Engineering: ☐ Compliance ☒ Partial Compliance ☐ Non-Compliance

7.17 Student Success in Passing Certification Exams: If a goal of the program/option is to prepare students to pass certification examinations, then the success in passing these examinations shall be tracked and confirmed. Summary data shall be available showing success in passing certification exams.

All programs and options are in compliance.

All Program/Option Same: ☒ Compliance ☐ Partial Compliance ☐ Non-Compliance

7.18 Advisory Council Approval of Overall Program: An industrial advisory committee shall exist for each program/option and shall participate in general outcome and competency validation and the evaluation of overall program success. If more than one program of study or program option is available, then appropriately qualified industrial representatives shall be added to the committee or more than one committee shall be maintained. Policies for the advisory committee shall exist that include: (a) criteria for member selection; (b) procedures for selecting members; (c) length of member appointment; (d) committee responsibilities; (e) frequency of meetings (at least one per year); and (f) methods of conducting business. A roster of advisory committee members and minutes of advisory committee meetings shall be made available to the visiting team.

All programs and options are in compliance.

All Program/Option Same: ☒ Compliance ☐ Partial Compliance ☐ Non-Compliance

7.19 Outcome Measures Used to Improve Program: Evidence shall be presented showing how multiple outcome measures for example (Graduate Satisfaction with Program/Option, Employment of Graduates, Job Advancement of Graduates, Employer Satisfaction with Job Performance, Graduate Success in Advanced Programs, Student Success in Passing Certification Exams, and Advisory Committee Approval of Program) have been used to improve the overall program/option (please use the attached table 7.19). Evidence that program stakeholders participate in this process must be demonstrated.

The program and its concentrations have advisory committees that are well supported by area business and industry, and they obtain feedback that is relevant to outcome and competency measures that is used to improve the program. Sometimes this closure of the continuous improvement loop is well documented, other times it is not. Employment data is also being tracked. As has been mentioned earlier in this report, they have only recently developed and administered employer follow-up and graduate follow-up surveys, but there has not been sufficient time to develop and implement improvement plans in response to the results.
All programs and options are in partial compliance.

Civil Engineering: [ ] Compliance [ ] Partial Compliance [ ] Non-Compliance
Electrical Construction Mgmt.: [ ] Compliance [ ] Partial Compliance [ ] Non-Compliance
Electrical Engineering: [ ] Compliance [ ] Partial Compliance [ ] Non-Compliance
Industrial Maintenance: [ ] Compliance [ ] Partial Compliance [ ] Non-Compliance
Manufacturing: [ ] Compliance [ ] Partial Compliance [ ] Non-Compliance
Mechanical Engineering: [ ] Compliance [ ] Partial Compliance [ ] Non-Compliance

### IV. Summaries and Recommendations

#### A. Summaries:

1. Place a “C” in the appropriate space if the Program/Option meets all the criteria of the standard.
2. Place a “P” in the appropriate space if the Program/Option meets most of the stated criteria for the standard, but has weaknesses or deficiencies that need to be corrected.
3. Place an “N” in the appropriate space if the Program/Option fails to substantially meet the criteria of the standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA.2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>Program/Option</td>
<td>Program/Option</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AAS Engineering Technology – Manufacturing</td>
<td>AAS Engineering Technology – Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA.2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Visiting Team Recommendation (the recommendation should include accreditation level and conditions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/Options (Please List)</th>
<th>Accreditation</th>
<th>Accreditation Report in 2 Years</th>
<th>Accreditation On-Site Visit in 2 Years</th>
<th>Non Accreditation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAS Engineering Technology – Civil Engineering</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAS Engineering Technology – Electrical Construction Management</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAS Engineering Technology – Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAS Engineering Technology – Industrial Maintenance</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAS Engineering Technology – Manufacturing</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAS Engineering Technology – Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Conditions:

1. **Accreditation - Report in Two Years:** A written progress report is required in two years which details the corrective action taken to meet standards.

2. **Accreditation Report and On-Site Visit in Two Years:** A written progress report by the institution and an on-site visit by one of the initial visiting team members is required in two years.

3. **Non-Accreditation:** Denial of accreditation occurs when a program does not substantially comply with standards. If a program receives Non-Accreditation status, the application for reaccreditation will be considered as an initial application and the maximum period of accreditation granted will be four years.
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.

### Pellissippi State Community College

#### Year 3: 2012-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Satisfaction Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>Student Engagement Survey (NSSE and CCSSE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Alumni Satisfaction Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>Employer Satisfaction Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>Student Engagement Survey (NSSE and CCSSE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>Comprehensive Satisfaction Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal approved to assess the perspectives of employers in Pellissippi State’s service area. The Employer Survey will be administered to employers of graduates who successfully completed an associate degree during 2012-2013 academic year. Comparisons and analysis will be conducted utilizing past (2008 and 2003) Employer Survey data.
Pellissippi State Community College

Performance Funding 2012-2013 Standard 1D

Employer Satisfaction Survey

Introduction

Pellissippi State has 11 degree programs that lead directly to employment in business, computer science, engineering technology, media technologies, health sciences, or paralegal services upon graduation with an Associate of Applied Science (AAS) degree. While these programs are not intended for transfer to a baccalaureate-degree granting institution, the College has a number of articulation agreements and 2 + 2 agreements whereby the AAS degree will transfer fully or with completion of a limited number of bridge courses to specified universities. For the AAS graduates who enter the workforce directly, the placement rate has consistently been 94 percent or higher.

The career program faculty communicate frequently with their counterparts in business and industry within the college service area to ensure that their programs remain in line with the needs of area employers. Programs and courses are updated based on regularly-scheduled meetings with advisory committees; one-on-one contact with employers; various assessment activities required by the College and its governing bodies; and requirements of accrediting organizations. In addition to these activities, the College regularly surveys employers of graduates to determine their perceptions of the preparation students have received for their jobs. The most recent survey was conducted in spring of 2013 for graduates of the two previous academic years, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013.
This report explains the purpose of the employer survey, describes the methodology used, summarizes the findings, compares this survey with the previous one, and presents conclusions based on the findings.

**Purpose of Employer Survey**

Faculty and staff at the College realize that it is important not only that students have up-to-date knowledge and skills for their jobs, but also that they have the critical thinking skills to apply their knowledge and adapt to conditions within the workplace. Thus, they must have not only the technical skills required, but they must also have personal characteristics and knowledge generally expected of a college graduate in order to relate appropriately to colleagues and others in the workplace. The employer survey is intended to garner the perspectives of employers on recent graduates they have hired in order to determine the effectiveness of the overall education provided by Pellissippi State, as well as of the technical education. The career programs use the survey results to gauge the effectiveness of technical preparation and determine whether the programs need enhancement or restructure. The College as a whole uses the information to determine the effectiveness of efforts across the curriculum to impart critical thinking, communication, and general education knowledge and skills.

The survey addresses the following topics:

- the overall performance level of Pellissippi state graduates;
- graduates’ level of competence to carry out the work that is assigned to them in their particular field;
- the comparative quality and extent of graduates’ general education background and that of their colleagues in comparable positions;
• the comparative quality of graduates’ technical skills and those of other employees in comparable positions;
• the extent to which the graduates possess the characteristics expected of a college graduate.

The results of the survey may also provide information to help students and graduates make informed career decisions. The results are provided to the career program departments and to various student services departments, such as Placement, Advising, and Counseling, who may use them to provide guidance to students in selection of courses, majors, and careers.

**Methodology**

In order to determine which employers hired Pellissippi State graduates from the two academic years under consideration (2011-2012, 2012-2013), the office of Institutional Effectiveness, Assessment, and Planning (IEAP) contacted the Placement office. The director of Placement provided a list of graduates who had reported their employment status and the employers who hired them upon their graduation from Pellissippi State. This employment information is provided when students complete a placement status report (Appendix 1) at graduation. The particular career programs involved in the survey were business administration, computer science and information technology, engineering technology, media technologies, and nursing. IEAP staff acquired telephone numbers for the employers who were listed and made calls following a script of the questions provided in Appendix 2. In order to increase the number of responses, staff also called students when it was reported that they were no longer employed or if they had not replied to a request for an update of their employment status. Several of the students who were called supplied names and contact information for current employers.
Results were kept for each program separately and then compiled, as reported in the chart in Appendix 3. A total of 69 employers responded to the report, with only 2 choosing not to answer questions. This response number is within the range of 50 to 75 projected when the plan for the survey was submitted to THEC in 2012. Frequency counts are provided on the chart of results along with simple percentages for each question.

Findings

This summary of findings is organized around employers’ perceptions of PSCC graduates in four categories: general workplace readiness; specialized/technical skills; general education for basic comprehension; general work and relational attributes, or “soft skills.”

General Workplace Readiness

The first group of questions on the survey relate to the employee’s preparation for the workplace:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Overall, describe the performance level of graduate of Pellissippi State/Employee.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84.00%</td>
<td>16.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you feel the graduate of Pellissippi State/employee was properly trained to carry out the work in his/her particular field?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Would you hire this graduate/employee again for the same position?</td>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>Probably Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93.00%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Would you recommend this graduate/employee for a promotion?</td>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>Probably Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.16%</td>
<td>31.34%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the employers who responded, 100 percent felt that the employee was well-trained to enter the workforce. Eighty-four percent rated the employee as performing at an “excellent” level, while the remaining 16 percent rated the employee’s performance as “good”; and 93 percent
would definitely rehire the employee. These responses paint a very positive picture of PSCC’s reputation for preparing students to go into the workforce.

Specialized/Technical Skills

Another group of questions relates to the specific technical skills required for the employee to perform his or her job:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. How do the graduate's/employee's technical skills compare with those</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of other employees in comparable positions?</td>
<td>84.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Overall, how does this graduate's/employee's quality of education in</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>his/her area of specialization compare with that of other employees in</td>
<td>84.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comparable positions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On both questions regarding the skills and the broader educational requirements for the particular job, 84 percent of employers rated PSCC graduates as excellent, 10 percent as good, and 3 percent as average in comparison with colleagues. This information is positive for Pellissippi State’s career programs as a whole, but it will be particularly useful to the various departments to see responses about the skills of graduates of their programs.

General Education

Two questions relate to the quality of PSCC’s preparation of students for taking their place as college-educated workers and citizens:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Overall, how do you think this graduate's/employee's general education</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>background compares with that of colleagues in comparable positions?</td>
<td>78.00%</td>
<td>16.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds my Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets my expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not meet my expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Overall, to what extent does this graduate/employee possess the</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characteristics that you would expect from a college graduate?</td>
<td>37.00%</td>
<td>63.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seventy-eight percent of employers considered graduates’ general education knowledge to be excellent, and 16 percent rated that knowledge as good for a total of 94 percent, while 3 percent rated it average in comparison with that of other employees. Students in AAS programs are
required to take only 15 credit hours of general education courses, while associate of arts (AA) and associate of science (AS) students experience a broader scope of courses and disciplines with their 41 required credit hours. In light of the much smaller number of general education courses taken by AAS students, the ratings are very encouraging for the College. Also the indication that 63 percent of graduates meet employers’ expectations for a college graduate and 37 percent exceed those expectations speaks well for the total experience of a PSCC graduate.

“Soft Skills”

Employers were also asked to rate the employee’s general communication, interpersonal, and problem-solving skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal communication skills</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written communication skills</td>
<td>67.00%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Knowledge and skills</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving skills</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work ethic</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employers awarded high marks to PSCC graduates on interpersonal skills, technical knowledge and skills, and problem-solving skills, with “excellent” ratings in the 70 to 75 percent range and “good” ratings from 21 to 27 percent. On their work ethic, graduates were rated as “excellent” by 84 percent of employers and “good” by 15 percent. The ratings for communication skills were somewhat less positive, with 67 percent being rated “excellent,” 30 percent “good,” and 3 percent “average” on verbal skills and 66 percent “excellent,” 25 percent “good,” 6 percent “average,” and 3 percent “fair” on writing skills. The results suggest some areas for improvement in preparing students to communicate in the workplace.
The additional comments (Appendix 4) from the survey are primarily positive, but they also suggest areas for improvement for particular programs.

**Comparison with 2008 Employer Satisfaction Survey**

The results of the 2013 employer survey paint a more positive picture of employer perceptions of PSCC graduates than did those of the previous (2008) survey. In terms of overall performance, in 2013, 84 percent of employers consider their PSCC employees to be “excellent” and 16 percent “good,” as compared with 62 percent and 35 percent in 2008, a total of 100 percent compared with 97 percent. This year, 93 percent would “definitely” rehire their employees, compared with 58 percent in 2008. In comparison with colleagues, 84 percent in 2013 consider their PSCC graduate employees to be “excellent” and 10 percent “good” in preparation for their particular technical jobs, while 56 considered them “excellent” and 42 percent “good” in 2008. In terms of general education knowledge, 94 percent consider this knowledge to be excellent or good in comparison with others, while in 2008, 85 percent had that perception. Of this year’s employers, 100 percent said their employees meet or exceed their expectations for college graduates; in 2008, 92 percent had that perception. Finally, the ratings were higher this year in every category of “soft skills,” and 99 percent of 2013 employers considered PSCC students to be either “excellent” or good” in terms of their work ethic compared with 93 percent in 2008.

**Conclusions**

Overall, the results of the employer survey are positive and indicate that particular programs, as well as the College as a whole, are preparing students to enter the workforce and
perform at a level that is more than adequate to meet employer needs; and ratings in most categories are more positive than they were in 2008. All employers expressed the opinion that graduates perform at an excellent or good level and that they have been properly trained. Employees’ technical training is also highly rated. The percent of graduates who are rated as “excellent” is lower on communication skills than on technical preparation, and there is a growing emphasis on these skills in PSCC courses and culture as a whole.

All departments in the College are engaged in the QEP initiative, Strong to the Core, which emphasizes improving student performance in the core competencies of written communication, oral communication, and mathematics through incorporation of active learning strategies to increase engagement. Technical disciplines have always employed active learning as a matter of course, but broader incorporation of these strategies in general education courses is expected to improve all students’ competencies in the core areas.

These results will be shared with the entire college, and results specific to the particular career programs will be passed on directly to those departments, along with the additional comments that are relevant to them. These surveys of employers are an important part of each program’s efforts to ensure that program material is up to date, relevant, and adequate to employers’ needs. Program faculty will consider survey information, along with input from the other sources mentioned in the introduction, in making revisions to their programs.
Appendix 1

PELLISSIPPI STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PLACEMENT STATUS REPORT

NAME_______________________________________________________________________________________

ADDRESS ___________________________________________________________________________________

CITY ______________________________________ STATE ________ZIP_______________________________

STUDENT ID ____________________________________PHONE NO __________________________________

PROGRAM MAJOR_________________________________CERTIFICATE _____________________________

CIRCLE COMPLETION DATE:       FALL 2012       SPRING 2013       SUMMER 2013       FALL 2013

ENROLLED FOR FURTHER EDUCATION, PLEASE SPECIFY ________________________________

CURRENTLY IN MILITARY_________ SERVICE BRANCH _____________________________

*******************************************************************************************

EMPLOYED AND USE SOME OR ALL PSTCC TRAINING ON MY JOB ____
EMPLOYED, BUT USE NONE OF MY TRAINING ____
UNEMPLOYED, BUT SEEKING EMPLOYMENT ____
UNEMPLOYED, NOT SEEKING EMPLOYMENT:
   FAMILY/HOME RESPONSIBILITIES____
   MEDICAL CONDITION____
   VOLUNTEER/RELIGIOUS SERVICE____

EMPLOYER_____________________________________________PHONE NO_________________________

ADDRESS _________________________________________________________________________________

CITY_______________________________STATE_________________ZIP_____________________________

JOB TITLE ________________________________________________________________________________

NAME OF IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR ___________________________________________________________

CURRENT ANNUAL GROSS SALARY (PLEASE CIRCLE):
LESS THAN 15,000          20,000-25,000          30,000-35,000          40,000-50,000
15,000-20,000               25,000-30,000           35,000-40,000          MORE THAN 50,000

*******************************************************************************************

USE OF PLACEMENT SERVICES:

RESUME WRITING ___ INTERVIEWING SKILLS ___ COMPLETION OF FILE ___
HAVE NOT USED PLACEMENT SERVICES: ___
OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH PLACEMENT SERVICES:
   VERY SATISFIED__ SATISFIED__ DISSATISFIED__ VERY DISSATISFIED__

SIGNATURE____________________________________________________DATE_______________
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Employer Survey
Pellissippi State Community College

General Directions: Pellissippi State Community College is conducting a survey of employers who have hired Pellissippi State graduates during the last two years. The information will be used for on-going program improvements and will be held in strictest confidence. Your cooperation and assistance will be greatly appreciated.

There are ten (10) questions which should only take about 5 minutes to answer.

Date: ____________________________
Name: ______________________________________ Title: ________________________________
Company: ____________________________________________ Phone: ____________________________

Q 1 May we proceed with the questions?
[ ] Yes [ ] No

Survey Questions
Q 2 Overall, describe the performance level of graduate of Pellissippi State/employee:
Excellent  [ ]  Good  [ ]  Average  [ ]  Fair  [ ]  Poor  [ ]

Q 3 Do you feel the graduate of Pellissippi State/employee was properly trained to carry out the work in his/her particular field?
Yes  [ ]  No  [ ]

Q 4 Would you hire this graduate/employee again for the same position?
Definitely  [ ]  Probably  [ ]  Probably Not  [ ]  Definitely Not  [ ]

Q 5 Would you recommend this graduate/employee for a promotion?
Definitely  [ ]  Probably  [ ]  Probably Not  [ ]  Definitely Not  [ ]

Q 6 Overall, how do you think this graduate's/employee's general education background compares with that of colleagues in comparable positions?
Excellent  [ ]  Good  [ ]  Average  [ ]  Fair  [ ]  Poor  [ ]  No opinion  [ ]

Q 7 How do the graduate's/employee's technical skills compare with those of other employees in comparable positions?
Excellent  [ ]  Good  [ ]  Average  [ ]  Fair  [ ]  Poor  [ ]  No opinion  [ ]

Q 8 Overall, how does this graduate/employee's quality of education in his/her area of specialization compare with that of other employees in comparable positions?
Excellent  [ ]  Good  [ ]  Average  [ ]  Fair  [ ]  Poor  [ ]  No opinion  [ ]

Q 9 Overall, to what extent does this graduate/employee possess the characteristics that you would expect from a college graduate?
Exceeds my expectation  [ ]  Meets my expectation  [ ]  Does not meet my expectation  [ ]

Q 10 Please indicate your opinion of the following statements as they relate to this graduate/employee who is/was employed by your company/organization:
Excellent  Good  Average  Fair  Poor
Verbal communication skills  [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
Written communication skills  [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
Interpersonal skills  [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
Technical knowledge and skills  [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
Problem solving skills  [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
Work ethic  [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Q 11 What additional skills do you wish the employee possessed?
• Leadership skills.
• Maturity.
• More ability and confidence in his writing skills.
• Better interpersonal and verbal communication skills.
• He is an excellent employee and tries to pass on his knowledge to other employees.
• Nothing I can think of.
# APPENDIX 3 - Results of Employer Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Reply</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>97.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **May we proceed with the questions?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Reply</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>84.00%</td>
<td>16.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Overall, describe the performance level of graduate of Pellissippi State/Employee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Reply</th>
<th>Definitely</th>
<th>Probably</th>
<th>Probably Not</th>
<th>Definitely Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>93.00%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Do you feel the graduate of Pellissippi State/employee was properly trained to carry out the work in his/her particular field?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Reply</th>
<th>Definitely</th>
<th>Probably</th>
<th>Probably Not</th>
<th>Definitely Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>67.16%</td>
<td>31.34%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Would you hire this graduate/employee again for the same position?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Reply</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>78.00%</td>
<td>16.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Would you recommend this graduate/employee for a promotion?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Reply</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>84.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Overall, how do you think this graduate's/employee's general education background compares with that of colleagues in comparable positions?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Reply</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>84.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **How do the graduate's/employee's technical skills compare with those of other employees in comparable positions?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Reply</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>84.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. **Overall, how does this graduate/employee's quality of education in his/her area of specialization compare with that of other employees in comparable positions?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Reply</th>
<th>Exceeds my Expectations</th>
<th>Meets my expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet my expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>37.00%</td>
<td>63.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. **Overall, to what extent does this graduate/employee possess the characteristics that you would expect from a college graduate?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Reply</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>67.00%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Verbal communication skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Reply</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>66.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Written communication skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Reply</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>27.00%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interpersonal skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Reply</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>73.00%</td>
<td>24.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Technical Knowledge and skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Reply</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>21.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Problem solving skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Reply</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>83.58%</td>
<td>14.92%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. **Please indicate your opinion of the following statements as they relate to this graduate/employee who is/was employed by your company/organization:**
Appendix 4

Comments from Employer Survey 2013

Question 3: Do you feel the graduate of Pellissippi State/employee was properly trained to carry out the work in his/her particular field?

1) BUA: “but need more Excel basics”
2) Media: “No need to teach Adobe Fireworks. Need more Dreamweaver.”

Question 5: Would you recommend this graduate/employee for a promotion?

“Not at this time.”
“Not because of his skills.”

Question 11: Additional skills desired

Leadership skills: 4
Maturity: 1
More ability and confidence in his writing skills: 2
Better interpersonal and verbal communication skills: 1

Additional comments:
Always maintains a professional approach to her job.
Needs more Excel work.
Need to cover more on common tools, such as Jenkins QA tools.
Wish graduates had more internship.
He is an excellent employee and tries to pass on his knowledge to other employees: 2
Great nurse.
Compassionate.
PSTCC has a great nursing program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Program</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>2011 Grad</th>
<th>Non-Respondents</th>
<th>Grade Adjustment</th>
<th>Total Placeable</th>
<th>Total Placed</th>
<th>Percent Placed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEDIA TECHNOLOGIES</td>
<td>3.AAS</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPING</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER PRODUCTION</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV COMPUTER SCIENCE PREP</td>
<td>2.C2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP SCIENCE &amp; INFO TECH</td>
<td>3.AAS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH WRITING DESIGN</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURVEYING</td>
<td>3.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVIL ENGINEERING STUDIES</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAME &amp; SIMULATION DESIGN</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERIOR DESIGN TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>3.AAS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>3.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURGERY</td>
<td>3.C1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>3.C1</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE PROF TECH</td>
<td>3.C1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHOTOGRAPHY</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEB PAGE AUTHORING</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-COMMERCE WEB DESIGN</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBILE WEB DESIGN</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION BUS PRINCIPLE</td>
<td>4.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICAL TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL CURRICULAR ARTS</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL ARTS</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL LINGUISTIC ARTS</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>3.C1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICITY</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRIAL MAINTENANCE TECH</td>
<td>3.C1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION BUS PRINCIPLE</td>
<td>4.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS TECH</td>
<td>2.C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Programs Exempt from Job Placement Standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010 CIP</th>
<th>Academic Program</th>
<th>Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08.13.01.02</td>
<td>TEACHING</td>
<td>2.3.AST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.24.01.01</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY PARALLEL</td>
<td>2.3.AS, 2.AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.24.01.01</td>
<td>PRE-BUSINESS TRANSFER</td>
<td>2.1C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.24.01.04</td>
<td>GENERAL EDUCATION CORE</td>
<td>2.1C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.34.01.01</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL STUDIES</td>
<td>2.3.AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.24.01.02</td>
<td>COMPUTER STAFF</td>
<td>2.1C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.22.01.01</td>
<td>PRE-BUSINESS TRANSFER</td>
<td>2.1C2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total

| 434 | 19 | 415 | 81 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 323 | 310 | 96% |

**Percentage of Non-Respondents:** 4%

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

### Institutional Comments (Optional):

---
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PLACEMENT STATUS REPORT

NAME_______________________________________________________________________________________

ADDRESS ___________________________________________________________________________________

CITY ______________________________________ STATE ________ZIP_______________________________

STUDENT ID ____________________________________PHONE NO __________________________________

PROGRAM MAJOR_________________________________CERTIFICATE _____________________________

CIRCLE COMPLETION DATE:       FALL 2012       SPRING 2013       SUMMER 2013       FALL 2013

ENROLLED FOR FURTHER EDUCATION, PLEASE SPECIFY___________________________________________

CURRENTLY IN MILITARY_________ SERVICE BRANCH _____________________________________________

***************************************************************************

EMPLOYED AND USE SOME OR ALL PSTCC TRAINING ON MY JOB ____
EMPLOYED, BUT USE NONE OF MY TRAINING ____
UNEMPLOYED, BUT SEEKING EMPLOYMENT ____
UNEMPLOYED, NOT SEEKING EMPLOYMENT:
   FAMILY/HOME RESPONSIBILITIES____
   MEDICAL CONDITION____
   VOLUNTEER/RELIGIOUS SERVICE____

EMPLOYER_____________________________________________PHONE NO_________________________

ADDRESS _________________________________________________________________________________

CITY_______________________________STATE_________________ZIP_____________________________

JOB TITLE ________________________________________________________________________________

NAME OF IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR _____________________________________________________________

CURRENT ANNUAL GROSS SALARY (PLEASE CIRCLE):
LESS THAN 15,000          20,000-25,000          30,000-35,000          40,000-50,000
15,000-20,000               25,000-30,000           35,000-40,000          MORE THAN 50,000

***************************************************************************

USE OF PLACEMENT SERVICES:

RESUME WRITING____ INTERVIEWING SKILLS____ COMPLETION OF FILE____

HAVE NOT USED PLACEMENT SERVICES:____

OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH PLACEMENT SERVICES:
    VERY SATISFIED____ SATISFIED____ DISSATISFIED____ VERY DISSATISFIED____

SIGNATURE____________________________________________________DATE_______________
### 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).

---

**Pellissippi State Community College**

**Year 3: 2012-13**

**Maximum Points:** 10

**Requested Points:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>QEP or SLI</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Title and Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>QEP</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Strong to the Core (Goal is to improve student learning outcomes in targeted courses and overall student success measures through increasing interaction among faculty and learners in core curriculum areas.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>QEP</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Strong to the Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>QEP</td>
<td>Sustaining</td>
<td>Strong to the Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>QEP</td>
<td>Sustaining</td>
<td>Strong to the Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>QEP</td>
<td>Sustaining</td>
<td>Strong to the Core</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scoring Rubric for Assessment Implementation: Sustaining QEP/SLI**

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]

2. Describe the assessment taken during the year and present the results of those assessments with the addition of previous results, as they are available. [0 – 3 points]

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

4. 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]

**Institutional Comments (Optional):**

---
Review of the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)

Pellissippi State’s QEP, Strong to the Core, was undertaken to incorporate active learning strategies into core courses to increase student engagement and thereby improve student performance in the core competencies of writing, mathematics, and oral communication. The QEP was developed with input from faculty, administration, staff, and students and approved with the College’s reaffirmation of accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges in 2012.

As originally conceived and described in a primary document and an Addendum, improvement in student performance in the competencies was to be measured by improvements in three student learning outcomes:

- Improve the ability of students in ENGL 1010 Composition I to write clear, well-organized, sufficiently developed analyses. Competency level: 70% minimum
- Improve the ability of students in MATH 1130 College Algebra to develop mathematical problem solving skills by modeling real world behavior in mathematics and other disciplines and by applying mathematical concepts to real-life problems. Competency level: 70% minimum
- Improve the ability of students in SPCH 2100 Public Speaking to plan, research and present an effective persuasive speech. Competency level: 74% minimum

The choice of these courses was guided by evidence of lower than desired success rates in two of the three courses selected, weaknesses in student critical thinking based on the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), and the expressed desire by employers that graduates be proficient in communication and problem solving. As the QEP Implementation Team began to design specific approaches to implementation and to establish benchmarks, they realized a student’s abilities to think critically and to communicate are essential to improvement in the three core areas. The Team developed these questions to guide assessment of the acquisition these skills:
To what extent do active learning strategies improve student learning in the outcomes of critical thinking and communication competence within the core courses?

To what extent do active learning strategies increase student engagement?

To what extent do active learning strategies impact retention, success rates, completion rates and aggregate GPA?

To what extent can active learning strategies be applied to student support functions, such as orientation, advising, and tutoring?

A QEP director was appointed in fall 2011 to coordinate implementation, assessment, and faculty development activities, including the establishment of a Teaching and Learning Center for QEP meetings and a library of resource materials. A webpage was created to make resources readily available to faculty, and a series of weekly Brown Bag Lunchees was scheduled, featuring discussion of topics relevant to the QEP. During the fall 2012 academic in-service, Fall Festival of Student Success, formal and informal Faculty Inquiry Groups (FIGs) were created to provide the framework for the exchange of ideas. Throughout the in-service activities, faculty members were introduced to methods of assessing learning strategies to determine the impact on targeted outcomes within their individual classrooms.

Description of QEP Assessment Activities and Results for 2012–2013

Both formative and summative assessments of QEP activities have been conducted. Formative assessments include Tennessee Board of Regents (TBR) General Education Assessment conducted annually in the three core courses; the semantic differential, which assesses student engagement after in-class activities; and instructor post-activity reports.

The parts of the TBR assessment that are used to measure QEP effectiveness are the following:

- a final argumentative essay in ENGL 1010 scored on the basis of five TBR learning outcomes,
- embedded questions in the MATH 1130 common final exam that assess student learning outcomes three and five from the TBR math rubric, which are indicators of proficiency in critical thinking and communication outcomes,
• a persuasive speech in SPCH 2100, with concentration on PSCC criteria (6 and 7) that have been added to the TBR rubric to measure problem-solving and oral communication specifically.

Table 1 shows formative results measured by the assessment rubrics and semantic differential.

Table 1: Formative Assessment Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TBR GEA* ASSESSMENT MEASURES</th>
<th>BASELINE 2010-2011</th>
<th>BASELINE FALL 2011</th>
<th>ANNUAL FALL 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| English Fall to Fall All %, QEP % Satisfactory In-class Argumentative Essay | All n = 143
Unity 73%, Development 54%, Organization 57%, Style 49%, Documentation 46% | All n = 175
QEP n = 30
Unity 78.9%, Development 70.3%, Organization 76.6%, Style 58.3%, Documentation 49.7% | All n = 124
QEP n = 11
Unity 77.4%, Development 52.4%, Organization 65.3%, Style 58.1%, Documentation 51.6% |

| Additional QEP English Learning Outcome Rubric Fall to Fall | Developed Spring 2012 | QEP n = 11
Diction/Word Choice 82% Satisfactory Adherence to Rhetorical Pattern of Argument 72.7% Satisfactory |
| Math Objective 3 Critical Thinking % Successful | n = 768
1423/2304 61.8% | n = 338
618/1014 60.9% | n = 437
886/1311 67.6% |
| Math Objective 5 Communication % Successful | n = 768
1509/2304 69% | n = 338
692/1014 68.2% | n = 437
1014/1311 77.3% |
| Persuasive Speech General Education Goals 6 and 7 Meets, does better or exceeds expectations | n = 73
Problem Solving 78%
Oral Communication 74% | n = 112
Problem Solving 73.2%
Oral Communication 76.8% | To be reported Fall 2013 |
| Semantic Differential IM** of 4-7 | Written Summer 2011 | Created and Posted Spring 2012 | Faculty Responses
IM = 4.63/5
Student Responses
IM = 4.88/7 |

* GEA: TBR General Education Assessment  **IM = Institutional Mean

While the competency of achieving unity is above the 70% target mark for ENGL 1010, the formative data for the argumentative essay reflect weaknesses in development, organization, style and documentation. In 2012, the English faculty developed more specific outcomes relative to
communication and critical thinking and created a **rubric to directly address these revised criteria**. However, given the small sample size of the QEP course sections, it is difficult to draw conclusions at this time. To gain more appropriate data on the progress of students exposed to alternate learning strategies, the English faculty continue to refine their objectives, learning strategies, and assessments.

In the 2012 QEP progress report, the QEP mathematics faculty used the results from final exam problems related to objective 3 on the TBR rubric to measure critical thinking. After review of that data, they decided to include for QEP assessment three final exam problems for objective 5 to assess students’ competency in communicating in an algebraic language. Results for objective 5 are above the 70% competency goal, and results on objective 3 are improving. The upward swing for both objective 3 and objective 5 will motivate faculty to continue their efforts and share their results.

The speech faculty added **two competencies, criteria 6 and 7, to the original five of the TBR rubric.** For the QEP their emphasis has been on developing learning strategies related to these two criteria, which assess competencies in critical thinking and oral communication. The results shown exceed the 74% target; results of the most recent assessment are not yet available.

**The semantic differential** measures the level and intensity of students’ attitudes and opinions of engagement immediately after a learning activity in the classroom, as well as allowing for almost instant feedback for students and faculty. It encourages instructors’ adaptability, reflection, and critical analysis as well as students’ internalization of the concepts. The **results of the semantic differential for 2012-2013** show a 4.63/5 average on the instructor responses, indicating that they were satisfied with the activities. Student responses of 4.88/7 indicate that they had a mostly positive attitude about the strategies, suggesting that they were engaged. Results for particular activities led faculty to repeat and/or improve those activities.

**Faculty post-activity QEP reports** are used to document the **various active learning strategies** and to report both student and instructor results on the semantic differential. These reports take a **myriad of forms dependent on the activity**, the assessed outcomes, and the various courses. Each discipline is developing formats for reports appropriate to the discipline’s goals and methodologies. The **post-activity reports are posted** on the QEP website and are available to all instructors for sharing and discussion.
The following summative assessments are elements of the overall college assessment plan, some of which are reported to TBR and THEC (Tennessee Higher Education Commission):

- **College Basic Academic Subjects Examination (CBASE)** – mandated exit exam for graduating students, which yields the largest sample of data across a wide range of disciplines; administered every semester;
- **Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)** – mandated by TBR and THEC; administered biannually to sophomore-level students; provides limited baseline and summative information on engagement;
- **Critical Thinking Assessment Test (CAT)** – pilot conducted in spring 2013; provides data on higher order critical thinking and effective communication in real world situations.

Table 2 shows Summative Assessment Results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBASE PSCC mean (IM) National norm (NN)</td>
<td>n* = 608 S.D.* = 53.2 IM = 279 NN = 273</td>
<td>n = 721 S.D. = 53.9 IM = 277 NN = 273</td>
<td>n = 877 S.D. = 57.5 IM = 280 NN = 275</td>
<td>n = 1041 S.D. = 55.6 IM = 266 NN = 276</td>
<td>n = 1186 S.D. = 52.446 IM = 265 NN = 277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSSE Means Report (Biannual) Selected items: 5a-5f</td>
<td>2009 Table</td>
<td>2011Table</td>
<td>Train the Trainers</td>
<td>Results not available yet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT results PSCC mean (IM) National Mean (NM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 43 S.D. = 5.27 IM = 12.00 NM = 13.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *n = Total number of students taking the test; **S D = Standard deviation

The CBASE means for 2011-2012 and 2012–2013 show a slight downward trend, which is a concern for the College, particularly since Pellissippi State’s results have consistently been above the national mean. Because CBASE is administered to graduates and QEP strategies have been implemented only in introductory courses, there is no opportunity yet to assess the impact of CBASE on QEP results. It is expected that the QEP, as it evolves and expands to other courses, will have a positive impact on the exit exam scores.
Questions 5a–5f on the CCSSE relate specifically to the assessment of higher order thinking skills as indicators of levels of student critical thinking. For 5a–5e, the Pellissippi State mean continues to be above the mean for large colleges and for our peer cohort, but results for question 5f focusing on using information to perform a new skill are below those benchmarks. This indicates that additional learning materials need to be developed to give students opportunities to practice these skills.

In 2012 the College began to gather baseline data using the nationally validated and reliable Critical Thinking Assessment Test (CAT) to uniquely assess critical thinking, both directly and indirectly, yielding both formative and summative data. Specifically, CAT assesses the four areas of evaluation and interpretation of information, problem solving, creative thinking, and effective communication. The CAT instrument also provides further faculty development opportunities in the areas of assessment and communication. As this instrument is more widely integrated into the QEP assessment process, it will offer a more complete collection of data to assess improvement in student success.

Additionally, the QEP Implementation Team is tracking the effect of QEP active learning strategies in the college-wide areas of retention rates (fall to fall), success rates within core courses, completion rates, and aggregate GPA, all shown in Table 3.

### Table 3: Retention, Success Rates and Aggregate GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSESSMENT MEASURES</th>
<th>BASELINE 2010-2011</th>
<th>BASELINE 2011-2012</th>
<th>ANNUAL 2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retention rates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall to Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 1010</td>
<td>92% MATH 1130</td>
<td>92% MATH 1130</td>
<td>ENGL 1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92% MATH 1130</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>92.5% MATH 1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCH 2100</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
<td>89.3% SPCH 2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Success rates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 1010</td>
<td>66.8% MATH 1130</td>
<td>66.7% MATH 1130</td>
<td>ENGL 1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.8% MATH 1130</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>64.3% MATH 1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCH 2100</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>72.6% SPCH 2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Success rates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 1010</td>
<td>54.6% MATH 1130</td>
<td>57.8% MATH 1130</td>
<td>ENGL 1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.6% MATH 1130</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>56% MATH 1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCH 2100</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>54.7% SPCH 2100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examination of these important measures shows that slight changes are beginning to surface. Retention rates are remaining steady or improving in the core courses. Both MATH 1130 and SPCH 2100 saw significant improvement in success rates, due in some measure to increased involvement in QEP. Other indicators are stable and should begin to consistently improve as the QEP becomes more established and refined, as the students experiencing QEP strategies continue their education, and as more faculty members incorporate core QEP practices into their courses.

**Improvement of the QEP Based on Assessment Results**

The Implementation Team has been working throughout the last two years to strengthen and improve the ambitious QEP initiative. The number of faculty implementing QEP activities has increased each semester. CAT has been piloted in three QEP sections, and both formative and summative data will be expanded with its implementation in all three core courses. Based on data from these courses and from the post-activity reports, QEP faculty continue to develop and share active learning strategies and methods to assess their efficacy. The College is committed to continued support and expansion of professional development opportunities for all faculty, staff, and administrators.

Based on the current QEP results, the following steps have been taken:

- After reviewing the 2012 QEP report, participating English faculty limited the focus of the QEP to communication and critical thinking learning outcomes. While scores are lower in the QEP sections (as indicated in Table 1), the sample is so small that results are not really meaningful.
Moving forward, all English instructors are being trained to incorporate at least one of three designated active learning strategies and report the results.

- During 2012-2013, the mathematics faculty participating in QEP activities addressed classroom challenges by holding professional development sessions open to the entire department to share local and conference ideas and report classroom results. In addition, within the Academic Support Center, the College’s primary tutoring center, a computer lab was established to provide focused assistance with math student learning objectives and the supplemental MyMathLab computer support. The lab was used more than 370 times by 77 students during the fall semester.

- Expansion of the QEP initiative has begun in the Liberal Arts department with implementation and documentation of results across all SPCH 2100 sections and inclusion of additional Liberal Arts disciplines. Meetings every other Friday and day-long workshops twice a semester promote useful discussions among the part-time and full-time speech faculty and allow creative exploration of new tools and ideas. In spring 2013 QEP lead teachers for history, music, and theatre were trained and began incorporating and reporting on active learning strategies in their classes; they are now enlisting additional faculty in their disciplines.

**Analysis of the QEP and Anticipated Activities for Next Year**

Relying upon the strong leadership provided by the Implementation Team and experienced core faculty, the QEP initiative will expand in 2013–2014 to disciplines not included in the original core. The three core disciplines will take the following steps to improve their results.

The English Department, which has relied on voluntary participation in QEP implementation, will make the following improvements to move toward more well-defined strategies and specific classroom activities that all faculty employ:

- develop three student engagement activities focused on a particular grammar or mechanics skill and post the activities on the ENGL 1010 instructional café in D2L so that all faculty may easily access them and report results from their classes;
• reconsider the criteria from the QEP/TBR rubric that they are focusing on and develop activities to support the revised focus; new activities will also be posted and reported on by each faculty member who teaches ENGL1010.

The Mathematics Department has fully supported the QEP efforts since its inception and will continue to do so through the following activities:

• design activities for MATH 1130 students focused on improving their ability to analyze their own solutions to problems requiring critical thinking;
• expand active learning to faculty members who teach MATH 1030, MATH 1530, MATH 1630, and MATH 1830 and provide mentoring for those faculty by QEP leaders within the department;
• present successful QEP strategies at state and national conferences;
• hold departmental meetings throughout the year including additional training for faculty on MyMathLab, Desire2Learn and other software packages;
• develop plans to expand the focused computer support for MyMathLab at all campuses.

As leaders in the implementation of college-wide faculty development and involvement in the QEP, speech faculty will accomplish the following:

• continue and augment successful strategies for guiding students to become better critical thinkers and to present effective speeches to persuade,
• share those successful practices and strategies with colleagues across the College and state,
• collaborate with and mentor other Liberal Arts faculty as QEP expands to philosophy, sociology, and Spanish.

Summative assessment will be expanded as we implement biannual administration of the Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE). This instrument provides assessment of attitudes of entering freshmen and, in connection with CCSSE, will show how students’ perceptions of engagement with the College change from their first semester to a semester in their sophomore year (fall 2013 to spring 2015).

The New Faculty Academy, an initiative conceived by the QEP director in the role of coordinator of faculty development, will enhance the training of new full-time faculty in professional and QEP best
practices throughout the first semester of employment, thus laying the groundwork for integration of new faculty into the QEP experience. This expansion of faculty in-service will allow time for instruction, active practice, and reflection on QEP techniques that encourage student growth in thinking critically and creatively and that promote students’ abilities to self-assess and to give feedback to instructors.

In addition to specific improvements outlined above, our data and process analysis during the 2012–2013 academic year has suggested these additional prospective steps:

- Employ aggressive efforts to raise student, faculty and administration awareness of the available assessment processes and the need to document stages of those, the need for clear iteration of the ties between learning outcomes and course objectives in the syllabi and in the classroom, the importance of assessing and documenting effectiveness within advising and other student services activities, and the need for continued creation of active learning strategies.
- Create effective tools, such as physical bookmarks, talking points cards, and presentation coaching, to allow administrators and staff to confidently emphasize the QEP as a major component of the college culture at every opportunity.
- Expand QEP outreach to other groups beyond students, faculty, and administration.

The overall concept of improving student engagement with active learning strategies has been well-received, creating a more dynamic culture at Pellissippi State. The QEP has helped to create awareness in faculty that students who are engaged have the ability to think more clearly and convey those thoughts more effectively both orally and in writing. New active learning strategies have been developed, implemented, improved, and shared. Faculty training has expanded, particularly with regard to promoting development of student competency in critical thinking and communication. Improvement in student attainment of these competencies has not yet been demonstrated and documented to the extent that we hope eventually to achieve, but we have had only one full year of implementation at this point and more faculty and disciplines are being involved each semester. The QEP faculty’s active learning strategies and data collection processes are helping to build a more accurate assessment of the College’s strengths and encouraging more conversation and experimentation among faculty and staff.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sub-Population</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>3 Yr Avg Benchmark</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>2,130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-Population (Outcomes: Fall Enrollment)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Population</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>3 Yr Avg Benchmark</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community College Transfers with 24+ SCH to Univs</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College Graduates Enrolled at Public Universities</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Comments:**

Please place any comments in this text box.

http://lumprod2.pstcc.edu/tag.b26c5d0d59a59b7f.render.userLayoutRootNode.uP?uP

_root=root &uP_sparam=activeTab&activeTab=u13l1s2&uP_tparam=frm&frm=

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.

### Pellissippi State Community College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 3: 2012-13</th>
<th>Maximum Points: 25</th>
<th>Recommended Points: 22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sub-Population</strong></td>
<td><strong>2008-09</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Population (Outcomes: Fall Enrollment)</th>
<th><strong>Fall 2009</strong></th>
<th><strong>Fall 2010</strong></th>
<th><strong>Fall 2011</strong></th>
<th><strong>3 Yr Avg Benchmark</strong></th>
<th><strong>Fall 2012</strong></th>
<th><strong>Percent Attained</strong></th>
<th><strong>Pts Recommended</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Community College Transfers with 24+ SCH to Univ</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community College Graduates Enrolled at Public Universities</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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