Good to Great
Strategic Planning

March 21-22, 2016
Institutional Accomplishments

With your table team, identify 5 major SPC accomplishments over the last year. Input in form on the laptop.

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where do we want to be?</th>
<th>Where are we now?</th>
<th>How will we get there?</th>
<th>How will we know when we are there?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visioning Statement</td>
<td>Environmental Review &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td>Scorecard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOT Values</td>
<td></td>
<td>Action Plan</td>
<td>Metrics and Continuous Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Priorities

1. SACSCOC Reaffirmation
2. Ethical Decision-Making
3. Graduation, Persistence and Productive Grade Rate Improvement
Where are we now?

Environmental Review & Analysis

SWOT Values
Table teams discuss internal, external and stakeholder factors that influence the environmental scan. Enter recommendations into the laptop.
Table teams discuss internal and external factors to consider in this year’s SWOT analysis.

Enter recommendations into the laptop.
IT’S BREAK TIME!!!
ST. PHILIP’S COLLEGE
QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN:
ETHICAL DECISION-MAKING

Assessment Update Good to Great March 22 & 23 2016
QEP Directors: Dr. Paul Machen, Laura Miele, Irene Young
1. Assess student learning outcomes
   - Values: Students gain skills to assess their own values
   - Ethical Issues: Students recognize and are knowledgeable of ethical issues
   - Perspectives: Students analyze various ethical perspectives.

2. Assess the effectiveness of QEP key strategies via process outcomes
   - 1. Faculty and staff professional development
   - 2. Faculty-student best practice sharing for continuously improving assignment quality
   - 3. Student Engagement in EDM learning activities
   - 4. SPC Community Awareness SPC EDM QEP
QEP Assessment Instruments

- Personal & Social Responsibility (PSRI)
- Defining Issues Test Version-2 (DIT-2)
- SPC Direct Rubric Assessment
- QEP Faculty/Staff Evaluation Surveys
- QEP Student Assignment Evaluations
- Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)
- QEP Student Focus Groups
12, 634 SPC students invited to participate; 672 completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Striving for Excellence</th>
<th>Student Respondents</th>
<th>Institutional Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>National Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Climate for Excellence</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to Develop a Strong Work Ethic</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating Expectations about Excellence</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a Strong Work Ethic</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultivating Academic Integrity</th>
<th>Student Respondents</th>
<th>Institutional Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>National Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Climate for Academic Integrity</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Roles in Academic Integrity</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Academic Integrity</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refining Ethical and Moral Reasoning and Action</th>
<th>Student Respondents</th>
<th>Institutional Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>National Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Climate for Ethical and Moral Reasoning</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Support for Ethical and Moral Reasoning</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twelve course sections were randomly selected from Social & Behavioral Sciences and Communications & Learning for DIT-2 assessment; 267 DIT-2 forms submitted; 189 were valid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defining Issues Test, Version 2 - SPC Mean Scores by Schema</th>
<th>SPC</th>
<th>National Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Interest (Stage 2/3)</td>
<td>32.63</td>
<td>26.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain Norms (Stage 4)</td>
<td>38.39</td>
<td>37.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Conventional (P Score)</td>
<td>21.73</td>
<td>31.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Personal Interest Stage represents the least mature stage of moral development and Post Conventional the most mature stage of moral reasoning. National Mean is from the DIT-2 manual.
## SPC Direct Rubric Assessment

### Random Sample Fall 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sections Offered</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>Selected Sections</th>
<th>Selected Students</th>
<th>Target (95% Confidence Level)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Course F2F</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>13,218</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Course DL</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>13,218</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDEV 0370 F2F and DL</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>1016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Personal Responsibility/Ethical Decision-Making SLO results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Skillful</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Not Demonstrated</th>
<th>S+E</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PR_SLO1 (n=248)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR_SLO2 (n=248)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR_SLO3 (n=248)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR_All Outcomes (n=744)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personal Responsibility Results 2015-2016
### QEP Student Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)</th>
<th>% Emerging + % Skillful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1: Values</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2: Ethical Issues</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3: Perspectives</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Overall Personal Responsibility at SPC
Trend Comparison 2014-15/2015-16
(Assessed Annually - Cycle I and II)
226 participants signed in for 9 QEP Professional Development Events in fall 2015. 144 surveys were returned; 136 were complete. Of the 136 completed surveys

**Process Outcome 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QEP Faculty/Staff Evaluation Response Options</th>
<th>% strongly agreed or agreed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The QEP event met the stated objectives.</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The QEP event provided useful information about SPC QEP.</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The QEP event provided useful information about EDM.</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The QEP event provided examples of useful information for making an ethical decision.</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The QEP event provided examples of methods for engaging diverse students in EDM skill development activities.</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presenters answered questions completely and appropriately.</td>
<td>99.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was satisfied with the quality of this event.</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QEP Student Assignment Evaluations were administered to 12 course sections corresponding to the same student population surveyed with the DIT-2. 234 surveys returned; 233 completed.

**Process Outcome 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent was your Ethical Decision-Making assignment relevant to your course?</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent was your Ethical Decision-Making assignment relevant to your college experience?</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent was your Ethical Decision-Making assignment relevant to your life skills?</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likert Scale Responses in the Student Assignment Evaluation range from 1 to 5, with 5 being the best. Three questions read: "To what extent was your Ethical Decision-Making QEP assignment relevant to your… 1) Course 2) College Experience and 3) Life Skills."
St. Philip's College
Developing a Personal Code of Values and Ethics
CCSSE 12l - Very Much and Quite a Bit

Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)

Process Outcome 3

Baseline 2015: 56.6
2017: 47.8
2019: 48.8
2021:

SPC
Large Colleges
National Cohort
Results of the student focus groups indicate 50% of students (n = 22) asked were familiar with Ethical Decision-Making as the topic of the 2016 Quality Enhancement Plan during the September groups. This increased to 81% during the November focus groups (n = 16).

A full report of the QEP activities and implementation is available on the QEP website.
Goal I: **Student Success**  
**Strategic Objective:**  
Provide academic and student support and align labor market-based pathways to achieve student completion.

Goal II: **Leadership**  
**Strategic Objective:**  
Provide opportunities for St. Philip’s College student and employees to develop as leaders.

Goal III: **Performance Excellence**  
**Strategic Objective:**  
Continuously improve our employee, financial, technological, physical and other capacities to enhance efficiency and effectiveness.

Goal IV: **Reaffirmation**  
**Strategic Objective:**  
Successful submission of the SACSCOC Response Report and QEP Proposal.
Define, Prioritize & Ladder SPC Values

Welcome Clarence Lowe
Star Force, LLC.
How will we get there?

Strategies

Action Plan
Each division will begin to develop their division’s strategic action plan.

- Which objectives pertain to your division?
- Which action plans align best in your division?
- What measures are associated with the action plans?

Key responses into the laptop.
Day in Review

Where do we want to be?
- Visioning Statement

Where are we now?
- Environmental Review & Analysis
- SWOT Values

How will we get there?
- Strategies
- Action Plan
Welcome Back!
Continue discussion regarding individual division strategic action plans.

- Which objectives pertain to your division?
- Which action plans align best in your division?
- What measures are associated with the action plans?

Key responses into the laptop.
How will we know when we are there?

Scorecard

Metrics and Continuous Improvement
SPC Scorecard
Productive Grade Rates

Targets

- Fall 09: 72.5%
- Fall 10: 71.4%
- Fall 11: 75.2%
- Fall 12: 77.4%
- Fall 13: 79.1%
- Fall 14: 80.5%
- Fall 15: 82.0%

Targets:
- Fall 09: 80.5%
- Fall 10: 80.9%
- Fall 11: 82.0%
- Fall 12: 80.5%
- Fall 13: 79.0%
- Fall 14: 80.5%
- Fall 15: 82.0%
Course Completion Rates

Year | Completion Rate | Target Completion Rate
--- | --------------- | ----------------------
Fall 09 | 86.3% | 85.8% |
Fall 10 | 85.8% | 90.4% |
Fall 11 | 90.4% | 91.7% |
Fall 12 | 91.7% | 92.9% |
Fall 13 | 92.9% | 93.0% |
Fall 14 | 93.0% | 93.9% |
Fall 15 | 93.9% | 95.0% |
Fall-to-Fall FTIC Persistence Rates

* The rate at which full-time, FTIC degree-seeking students persist from the fall term of entry (at census date) to the fall term of the following year. Full-time is defined as a student taking 12 or more semester credit hours. Students who earned awards and did not persist during the interval were excluded. Example: One year certificate students are excluded from this data.
Four-Year FTIC Graduation Rates

Full-Time Graduation Rates:
- 2005: 9.3%
- 2006: 12.0%
- 2007: 12.7%
- 2008: 11.6%
- 2009: 14.9%
- 2010: 16.1%
- 2011: 18.0%
- 2012: 20.0%

Part-Time Graduation Rates:
- 2005: 15.3%
- 2006: 14.0%
- 2007: 14.1%
- 2008: 13.9%
- 2009: 14.2%
- 2010: 13.7%
- 2011: 15.9%
- 2012: 14.4%

Targets:
- 2005: 8%
- 2006: 10%
- 2007: 12%
- 2008: 14%
- 2009: 16%
- 2010: 18%
- 2011: 20%
- 2012: 22%
Technical Students Employed within 6 Months of Graduation

*2015 THECB Almanac reports that 1% of Technical Students are both employed and enrolled within 6 months (77.3%). Additionally, 8.2% of technical students are enrolled in a 4-yr or 2-yr institution

** Combined total percentage
6-Year Transfer Rates

Targets


10.5% 9.5% 10.0% 12.3% 11.7% 12.2% 11.3% 20.8% 25.4%

Action Plan: New University partnerships and career pathways
Licensure Passage Rates


Targets

94.0% 94.5%
Tie Auction

- How much will we raise this year?
Closing Remarks