

Recommendation 1: The On-Site Committee recommends that the institution narrow the planned scope of its Quality Enhancement Plan.

3.3.2 The institution has developed a Quality Enhancement Plan that (1) demonstrates institutional capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the QEP; (2) includes broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the QEP; and (3) identifies goals and a plan to assess their achievement. (**Quality Enhancement Plan**)

3. **Institutional Capability for the Initiation, Implementation, and Completion of the Plan.** *The institution provides evidence that it has sufficient resources to initiate, implement, sustain, and complete the QEP.*

The scope of the I-PASS initiative is admirable and very aggressive; however, the institution's capability to implement and sustain it would be challenging when considering the resources and data required. The On-Site Committee thus determined that the scope of the QEP, as it currently stands, is too broad, jeopardizing the institution's ability to implement it effectively.

As it presently exists, the I-PASS initiative attempts to address both student learning and the environment. The Committee strongly feels that the institution can only successfully implement one of these in the implementation of its QEP. It is the view of the On-Site Committee that the stronger of the two and the one with a more viable scope is the environmental focus, which deals exclusively with the ACA 118 course, intrusive advisement, and the I-PASS Center. While components of the QEP related directly to student learning (which are linked to outcomes in the developmental courses) may be important, they do not have to be part of the QEP process. The Committee is very concerned that trying to achieve both will tax institutional resources.

Fayetteville Technical Community College's Response

The On-Site Committee's recommendations to FTCC's QEP were to focus on intrusive advising, ACA 118 and the **I-PASS** Center. The QEP retained the recommended activities related to environmental issues and developmental student success (Original QEP p. 1, 6-10 and 17-18; Revised QEP p. 7-11 and 17-18). The following issues or related activities were then deleted or modified:

Deleted or Modified Items	Original QEP	Revised QEP
Deleted early alert system	Pages 9 and 17	Pages 9 and 17
Deleted long-term tracking of the developmental cohort	Page 7 – 8	Page 7
Modified original short-term measurement	Page 6 – 7	Page 7 – 8
Modified original student learning outcomes	Page 13	Page 13
Deleted utilization of the Employee/Student Assistance Program (EAP/SAP)	Page 9	Page 9
Deleted literature review on building relationships	Pages 18 – 19	Page 18

Recommendation 2: The On-Site Committee recommends that the institution revise its assessment plan to be consistent with a more limited scope.

3.3.2 The institution has developed a Quality Enhancement Plan that (1) demonstrates institutional capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the QEP; (2) includes broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the QEP; and (3) identifies goals and a plan to assess their achievement. (**Quality Enhancement Plan**)

5. **Assessment of the Plan.** *The institution identifies goals and a plan to assess the achievement of those goals.*

The On-Site Committee found that the assessment plan is ambitious and reflects a project whose scope will be institutionally challenging to implement. The assessment plan provides an adequate justification for the link between proposed assessment measures and the determination of the potential impact to the QEP. However, the assessment plan fails to adequately distinguish between formative data needed to assess and improve the component pieces (Intrusive Advising, ACA 118, the I-PASS Center, etc.) of the proposed QEP during implementation and the data needed to summatively assess the institutional impact of the QEP as a whole at key implementation thresholds.

Formative data needed to assess and improve the implementation of Intrusive Advising could include:

- Tracking the performance of students impacted by intrusive advising
- Evaluations by students impacted by intrusive advising
- Peer review of advisors based on institutionally identified best practices
- Self-assessment of advisors based on the development of institutional best practices

Formative data needed to assess and improve the potential impact of ACA 118 could include:

- The assessment of the impact on student engagement based on the classroom assessment tool developed by CCSSE and compared to the 2009, 2012, and 2014 results of the college-wide implementation of the CCSSE survey
- Faculty perceptions of student engagement and college-readiness in courses subsequent to student enrollment in ACA 118

Formative data needed to assess and improve the implementation of the I-PASS Center could include:

- Tracking the performance of students impacted by the I-PASS Center
- Evaluations by students impacted by the I-PASS Center

Summative data need to assess the institutional impact of the QEP as a whole at key implementation thresholds could include:

- Successful completion of development courses
- Successful completion of subsequent college level courses
- Improved persistence rates for students testing into developmental education
- Increased levels of student engagement as measured by the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) in 2012 and 2014 compared to the institutional baseline established in 2009.
- Faculty perception of increased student engagement as reflected in the Community College Faculty Survey of Student Engagement

Since the On-Site Committee recommended that the institution narrow the scope of its Quality Enhancement Plan, it will need to revise its assessment plan accordingly.

Fayetteville Technical Community College's Response

The original QEP included informal assessments of intrusive advising. The revised QEP now includes both informal (indirect) and formal (direct) assessment measures. Students will complete an intrusive advising session followed by a satisfaction survey which will include direct and indirect measures. The survey includes open-ended questions and other items built around a Likert scale. Survey topics include, but are not limited to, quality of service, helpfulness of advisor, term of enrollment and accuracy of information. (Original QEP p. 33-41; Revised QEP p. 34-42).

Formative data assessments, including achievement targets, have been included in the development of ACA 118. Developmental students will take ACA 118 in the first or second term of enrollment. All students enrolled in ACA 118 will take a pre- and post-test to evaluate overall learning and assess course effectiveness (Original QEP p. 33-41; Revised QEP p. 34-42). This data will be used to revise the course to meet the needs of developmental students. Summative data will include an analysis of the percentage of students who complete the course with an A, B or C. The achievement

target is an 80% successful completion rate (Original QEP p. 33-41; Revised QEP p. 34-42).

The ***I-PASS*** Center will be assessed in two ways. A statistical correlation will be run on developmental students enrolled in ENG 080, RED 080 and MAT 070 for tutoring, either face-to-face or with computer software. These students will have their Developmental Grade Point Average (DGPA) calculated for the semester. Further, the students' DGPA will be correlated with the amount of time spent in the ***I-PASS*** Center, specifically 0-15 hours, 16-30 hours, 31-45 hours and 46-60 hours (Original QEP p. 33-41; Revised QEP p. 34-42).

Additional Factors for the Successful Implementation of the QEP

The On-Site Committee indicated some challenges of FTCC's QEP. First, intrusive advising was a concern due to the amount of time each instructor would be spending working with students. To address this concern, more part-time instructors are being hired to assist with tutoring and student advising/registration. Thus far, the addition of the part-time instructors appears to have helped service the high volume of students. The money to pay part-time instructors was redirected in the State and Local Budget from PLATO® software purchase savings (Original QEP p. 25; Revised QEP p. 24-25).

Another concern presented by the On-Site Committee to FTCC was prioritizing and accountability because the scope of the QEP was so large. Now the QEP has been limited to three areas: intrusive advising, ACA 118 and the I-PASS Center. Currently,

the QEP is more manageable with realistic expectations. Further, the timeline for Year Zero illustrates the accomplishments FTCC has made thus far (Original QEP p. 20-21; Revised QEP p. 19-20). With only five items remaining for Year Zero, the timeline is shown to be both achievable and pragmatic (Original QEP p. 20-23; Revised QEP p. 19-23).

The final concern presented by the On-Site Committee to FTCC was funding and expansion. Much of the funding for the QEP is designated in the State and Local Funding section. A grant has already been secured for more than \$112,000 (Revised QEP p. 20). This will fund the opening of the second ***I-PASS*** Center on campus. This grant allows additional funds to be allocated for the Spring Lake ***I-PASS*** Center now, rather than in three years (Original QEP p. 22; Revised QEP p. 20). Both centers will be open for Fall Semester 2011. Additional research has been undertaken to look at computer software that is less expensive than PLATO® but still has proven student success.